

REGISTRATION REPORT
Part B
Section 3
Efficacy Data and Information
Concise summary

Product code: ADM.06001.H.2.B

Product name: Edaptis

Chemical active substances:

Mesosulfuron-methyl, 12 g/L

Pinoxaden, 60 g/L

Safener:

Mefenpyr-diethyl, 35 g/L

Central Zone

Zonal Rapporteur Member State: Poland

CORE ASSESSMENT
(authorization)

Sponsor: ADAMA Agan Ltd.

Applicant: ADAMA Polska Sp. z o.o.

Submission date: June 2021, updated: July 2022, August 2023

MS Finalisation date: October 2022 (initial Core Assessment)

September 2023, updated December 2023 (final Core Assessment)

Version history

When	What
June 2021	Initial dRR – ADAMA Polska Sp. z o.o.
July 2022	Updated dRR (additional efficacy trials for spring wheat added) – ADAMA Polska Sp. z o.o.
October 2022	Initial zRMS assessment The report in the dRR format has been prepared by the Applicant, therefore all comments, additional evaluations and conclusions of the zRMS are presented in grey commenting boxes. Minor changes are introduced directly in the text and highlighted in grey . Not agreed or not relevant information are struck through and shaded for transparency .
August 2023	Data in the efficacy tables presented separately for the winter and spring cereal crops. New data summaries highlighted in blue – Adama Polska Sp. z o.o.
September 2023	Final report (Core Assessment updated following the commenting period) Additional information/assessments included by the zRMS in the report in response to comments received from the cMS and the Applicant are highlighted in yellow . Information no longer relevant is struck through and shaded .
December 2023	Final report (Core Assessment updated following the second commenting period) Additional information/assessments included by the zRMS in the report in response to comments received from the cMS DE are highlighted in green . Not agreed or not relevant information are struck through and shaded for transparency.

Table of Contents

3	Efficacy Data and Information (including Value Data) on the Plant Protection Product (KCP 6)	5
3.1	Summary and conclusions of zRMS on Section 3: Efficacy (KCP 6)	5
3.2	Efficacy data (KCP 6)	11
3.2.1	Preliminary tests (KCP 6.1)	18
3.2.1.1	Justification of the combination of the active substances in the co-formulation	20
3.2.1.2	Justification of the ratio of the active substances in the co-formulation	24
3.2.1.3	Comparison of the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B to that of AG-PM1-72 OD	27
3.2.1.4	Comparison of crop safety of ADM.06001.H.2.B to that of AG-PM1-72 OD	30
3.2.2	Minimum effective dose (KCP 6.2)	33
3.2.2.1	Minimum effective dose for control of Blackgrass (<i>Alopecurus myosuroides</i> : ALOMY)	35
3.2.2.2	Minimum effective dose for control of Loose silky bent (<i>Apera spica-venti</i> : APESV)	37
3.2.2.3	Minimum effective dose for control of Oat species (<i>Avena</i> spp.: AVESS)	40
3.2.2.4	Minimum effective dose for control of Brome species (<i>Bromus</i> spp.: BROSS)	43
3.2.2.5	Minimum effective dose for control of Italian ryegrass (<i>Lolium multiflorum</i> : LOLMU)	46
3.2.2.6	Minimum effective dose for control of Perennial ryegrass (<i>Lolium perenne</i> : LOLPE)	48
3.2.2.7	Minimum effective dose for control of Annual meadowgrass (<i>Poa annua</i> : POAAN)	49
3.2.2.8	Minimum effective dose for control of Rough-stalked meadowgrass (<i>Poa trivialis</i> : POATR)	51
3.2.3	Efficacy tests (KCP 6.2)	59
3.2.3.1	Single application in the spring	67
3.2.3.2	Single application in spring following application of another herbicide in autumn	126
3.2.3.3	Summary and conclusions	153
3.3	Information on the occurrence or possible occurrence of the development of resistance (KCP 6.3)	154
3.4	Adverse effects (KCP 6.4)	161
3.4.1	Phytotoxicity to host crop (KCP 6.4.1)	165
3.4.1.1	Phytotoxicity on winter wheat	170
3.4.1.2	Phytotoxicity on spring wheat	179
3.4.1.3	Phytotoxicity on triticale	183
3.4.1.4	Phytotoxicity on rye	187
3.4.2	Effects on yield of treated plants or plant products (KCP 6.4.2)	193
3.4.2.1	Crop yield on winter wheat (in the absence of weeds)	193
3.4.2.2	Crop yield on spring wheat (in the absence of weeds)	196
3.4.2.3	Crop yield on triticale (in the absence of weeds)	198
3.4.2.4	Crop yield on rye (in the absence of weeds)	200
3.4.3	Effects on quality of plants and plant products (KCP 6.4.3)	204
3.4.3.1	Quality of the grain in winter wheat (in the absence of weeds)	204
3.4.3.2	Quality of the grain in spring wheat (in the absence of weeds)	210
3.4.3.3	Quality of the grain in triticale (in the absence of weeds)	211
3.4.3.4	Quality of the grain in rye (in the absence of weeds)	217
3.4.4	Effects on transformation processes (KCP 6.4.4)	223
3.4.5	Impact on treated plants or plant parts to be used for propagation (KCP 6.4.5)	227
3.5	Observations on other undesirable or unintended side-effects (KCP 6.5)	232

3.5.1	Impact on succeeding crops (KCP 6.5.1)	233
3.5.2	Impact on other plants including adjacent crops (KCP 6.5.2).....	245
3.5.3	Effects on beneficial and other non-target organisms (KCP 6.5.3).....	251
3.6	Other/special studies	251
3.7	List of test facilities including the corresponding certificates.....	251
Appendix 1:	List of data submitted in support of the evaluation	253

3 Efficacy Data and Information (including Value Data) on the Plant Protection Product (KCP 6)

Transformation of the dRR (applicant version) into the RR (zRMS version)

Comments of zRMS:

Conclusions from the evaluation were prepared using grey commenting boxes placed at the end of each chapter. Textual changes were done using grey highlights in the text. The parts of the text amended or added by the zRMS evaluator are highlighted in grey, whereas the parts struck off are also ~~visibly marked with the grey font.~~

3.1 Summary and conclusions of zRMS on Section 3: Efficacy (KCP 6)

Abstract

This application has been submitted for authorization of the herbicide ADM.06001.H.2.B (Edaptis) containing 60 g/L pinoxaden (chemical group: phenylpyrazoline, HRAC group: 1 - Acetyl CoA Carboxylase inhibitors), 12 g/L mesosulfuron-methyl (chemical group: sulfonyleureas; HRAC group: 2 - Acetolactate Synthase inhibitors) and 35 g/L mefenpyr-diethyl as safener. ADM.06001.H.2.B is intended to be used at dose rates of: 0.75 L/ha and 1.0 L/ha for the post-emergence control of grass weed species (ALOMY, APESV, AVESS, BROSS, LOLMU, LOLPE, POAAN, POATR) and broad-leaved weed species (ANTAR, BRSNW, CAPBP, DESSO, SINAR, STEME, THLAR) in winter wheat, winter rye, winter triticale and in spring wheat.

Efficacy

The Applicant has submitted 168 valid efficacy trials carried out in the years 2018-2020. The trials were conducted in 3 EPPO zones: Maritime (CZ, DE, FR), North-East (PL) and South-East (HU, RO).

ADM.06001.H.2.B is effective or moderately effective herbicide in the control of the claimed weed species. For some weed species (ALOMY, BROSE, BROST, CAPBP, STEME, THLAR), depending on zone or dose rate tested, moderate tolerance or tolerance has been noted. For some weed species, depending on the zone, due to limited efficacy data, the concerned MSs are kindly advised to consider extrapolation and make a decision concerning acceptance of species on the national level.

~~Efficacy data for spring wheat is not sufficient in PL.~~ Spring wheat has been finally accepted in Poland, due to possibility of extrapolation of efficacy data from winter wheat to spring wheat (national extrapolation table, updated in September 2023). The application timing accepted in Poland was BBCH 20-39. Due to limited efficacy trials carried out in spring cereals, the concerned MSs are kindly advised to consider extrapolation of efficacy data from winter cereals and make a decision concerning acceptance consider spring wheat on the national level.

As no efficacy trials and limited selectivity trials were conducted at BBCH 13-20 in spring cereals, the concerned MSs are kindly advised to make a decision concerning acceptance application timing BBCH 13-20 in spring wheat on the national level.

Phytotoxicity, yield, transformation processes, germination, succeeding crops and adjacent crops

ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the highest recommended dose rate of 1.0 L/ha caused no phytotoxicity in winter wheat, spring wheat, winter triticale and winter rye in North-East EPPO zone. In Maritime zone and South-East EPPO zone visual phytotoxicity symptoms with usually transient character were noted. Therefore, ADM.06001.H.2.B can be safely used with certain remarks in the label. It is recommended to include in the labels in Maritime and South-East EPPO zone remark on possibility of transient phytotoxicity occurring after application of ADM.06001.H.2.B. Based on the trials results on grain yield and yield quality, it can be concluded that ADM.06001.H.2.B applied once at the maximum recommended dose rate of 1.0 L/ha had no adverse effect on grain yield in most of the trials conducted on winter wheat, spring wheat, winter triticale and winter rye. Significant reductions of grain yield and grain quality parameters were noted in some trials carried out mostly in Maritime and South-East EPPO zone and were usually associated with phytotoxicity, that has earlier appeared. To prevent phytotoxicity occurrence that could affect yield, it is recommended to include in the label remark to avoid overlapping of the spray liquid and not to perform treatments in time when crops are under stress due to unfavorable environmental conditions and when crops are weakened or damaged by pests, frosts,

flooding or drought. In case of application on rye, the ADM.06001.H.2.B labels in the Maritime and South-East EPPO zone are recommended to include cautionary statements to only apply to actively growing healthy crops and only in situations where target weed infestations are likely to substantially impact on crop yield and there are limited alternative options available to provide effective control.

No adverse effect on transformation processes (bread making) and seed germination is expected after application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at the highest recommended dose rate of 1.0 L/ha.

To avoid the risk of adverse effects on adjacent crops, being in accordance with the rules of good agricultural practice, it is recommended to include in the product label, the following remark:

When using ADM.06001.H.2.B:

- *Do not allow spray drift to the neighbouring crop plantations.*
- *Use $\geq 50\%$ low drift nozzles to reduce the risk of spray drift to the neighbouring crop plantations*

Specific label recommendations/restrictions are proposed for the possible and safe sowing/planting of rotational crops and succeeding crops after application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at the maximum rate of 1.0 L/ha, for 2 scenarios, depending on the time of application and % of crop interception:

Application in March-April (BBCH 13-19) - 25% crop interception

Autumn crops, planting August-September - min interval 3 months (90 days):

Following minimum cultivation: Wheat

Following deep cultivation: Oilseed rape, peas, barley (all cereals)

Spring crops: Planted at least 300 days after application

Following minimum cultivation: Wheat, barley (all cereals), maize, sorghum, soya, sunflower

Following deep cultivation: All crops

Crop failure: Planted within 30 days of an application

Following minimum cultivation: Wheat, maize

Following deep cultivation: All cereals, maize, sorghum, soya and sunflower

Application in April-June (BBCH 20-39) – 50% crop interception

Autumn crops, planting August-September - min interval 2 months (60 days)

Following minimum cultivation: Wheat

Following deep cultivation: Oilseed rape, peas, barley (all cereals)

Spring crops: Planted at least 250 days after application

Following minimum cultivation: Wheat, barley (all cereals), maize, sorghum, soya, sunflower

Following deep cultivation: All crops

Crop failure: Planted within 30 days of an application

Following minimum cultivation: Wheat, maize, soya

Following deep cultivation: All cereals, oilseed rape, peas, maize, sorghum and sunflower

Additional restrictions should be included in the label of ADM.06001.H.2.B: “In case of crop failure, after deep cultivation (to 20 cm) spring barley can be sown from a min. 4 days after application and sunflower can be sown from a min. 19 days after application. After minimum cultivation (to 5 cm) maize can be sown from a min. 19 days after application”.

Resistance management strategy

To avoid development of resistance the following resistance management strategy is proposed to be included in the label of ADM.06001.H.2.B:

“The herbicide ADM.06001.H.2.B contains two active substances: pinoxaden from phenylpyrazoline chemical group – ACCase inhibitor (HRAC group: 1) and mesosulfuron-methyl from sulfonylurea chemical group – ALS inhibitor (HRAC group: 2). To prevent possible resistance development, the following rules should be applied:

- *use the herbicide ADM.06001.H.2.B only once per growth season, according to the label recommendations including time and the recommended dose rate,*
- *use the herbicide ADM.06001.H.2.B when weeds are at the most susceptible stages of development,*
- *use the herbicide ADM.06001.H.2.B alternately with other herbicides belonging to different chemical groups with different modes of action,*
- *implement a sustainable weed control program,*
- *rotate crops to enable a variety of weed control options,*
- *rotate cultural practices to lower the reliance on herbicides,*

- *routinely check the performance of the crop protection product to ensure adequate efficacy is achieved,*
- *inform the authorization holder about not satisfying efficacy achieved,*
- *use only certified seeds,*
- *clean agricultural equipment to prevent the transfer of weed propagating material to other positions.”*

The recommended resistance management strategy is to be considered by cMSs.

Table 3.1-1: Table of intended uses

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Use- No. *	Member state(s)	Crop and/ or situation (crop destination / purpose of crop)	F G or I **	Pests or Group of pests controlled (additionally: developmental stages of the pest or pest group)	Application				Application rate			PHI (days)	Remarks: e.g. g safener/synergist per ha	zRMS Conclusion (efficacy)
					Method / Kind	Timing / Growth stage of crop & season	Max. number a) per use b) per crop/ season	Min. interval between applications	kg, L product / ha a) max. rate per appl. b) max. total rate per crop/season	g, kg a.s./ha a) max. rate per appl. b) max. total rate per crop/season	Water L/ha min / max			
Zonal uses (field or outdoor uses, certain types of protected crops)														
1	AT, DE, BE, NL, CZ, PL, HU, IE	Winter-wheat; rye, triticale	F	ALOMY, APESV, AVESS, BROSS, LOLMU, LOLPE, POAAN, POATR, Broad-leaved-weeds	Foliar; spraying; overall	BBCH 13-20 (spring)	a) 1 b) 1	-	a) 0.75 L/ha b) 0.75 L/ha	a) 9 / 45 g/ha b) 9 / 45 g/ha	80 / 300	n.a.***	Mefenpyr-diethyl applied as a safener at 26.3 g/ha In PL applied also in tank mix with adjuvat Insert : 0,5-1,0 + 0,2 l/ha (Insert) And with Camaro 306 SE: 0,5 + 0,5 l/ha (Camaro 306 SE)	
2	AT, DE, BE, NL, CZ, PL, HU, IE	Winter wheat (TRZAW), winter rye (SECCW), winter triticale (TTLWI)	F	*****ALOMY, APESV, AVESS, BROSS, LOLMU, LOLPE, POAAN, POATR, annual broad-leaved weeds	Foliar, spraying, overall	BBCH 20-39 (spring)	a) 1 b) 1	-	a) 1 L/ha b) 1 L/ha	a) 12 / 60 g/ha b) 12 / 60 g/ha	80 / 300	n.a.***	Mefenpyr-diethyl applied as a safener at 35.0 g/ha In PL applied also in tank mix with adjuvat Insert : 0,5-1,0 + 0,2 l/ha (Insert) And with Camaro 306 SE: 0,5 + 0,5 l/ha (Camaro 306 SE) Dose range 0.75-1.0 L/ha	A A APESV, AVESS, CAPBP, DESSO, THLAR (DE) C SECCW (AT)
3	AT, BE, NL, CZ, PL, HU,	Spring wheat (TRZAS)	F	*****ALOMY, APESV, AVESS, BROSS, LOLMU, LOLPE, POAAN, POATR,	Foliar, spraying, overall	BBCH 13-39 (spring)	a) 1 b) 1	-	a) 1 L/ha b) 1 L/ha	a) 12 / 60 g/ha b) 12 / 60 g/ha	80 / 300	n.a.***	Mefenpyr-diethyl applied as a safener at 35.0 g/ha	A (PL) Application timing BBCH 20-39

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Use- No. *	Member state(s)	Crop and/ or situation (crop destination / purpose of crop)	F G or I **	Pests or Group of pests controlled (additionally: developmental stages of the pest or pest group)	Application				Application rate			PHI (days)	Remarks: e.g. g safener/synergist per ha	zRMS Conclusion (efficacy)
					Method / Kind	Timing / Growth stage of crop & season	Max. number a) per use b) per crop/ season	Min. interval between applications	kg, L product / ha a) max. rate per appl. b) max. total rate per crop/season	g, kg a.s./ha a) max. rate per appl. b) max. total rate per crop/season	Water L/ha min / max			
	IE, (DE***)			annual broad-leaved weeds									In-PL-applied also in tank-mix with adjuvant Insert: 0,5-1,0 + 0,2 l/ha (Insert) And with Camaro-306 SE: 0,5 + 0,5 l/ha (Camaro- 306-SE) Dose range 0.75-1.0 L/ha	C TRZAS and application timing to be confirmed
4	DE	Winter wheat (TRZAW), winter rye (SECCW), winter triticale (TTLWI)	F	*****APESV, AVESS, THLAR -annual broad- leaved weeds	Foliar, spraying, overall	BBCH 20-39 (spring)	a) 1 b) 1	-	a) 0.75 L/ha b) 0.75 L/ha	a) 9 / 45 g/ha b) 9 / 45 g/ha	80 / 300	n.a.***	Mefenpyr-diethyl applied as a safener at 26.3 g/ha	A
5	DE	Spring wheat (TRZAS)	F	ALOMY, APESV, AVESS, BROSS, POAAN, POATR, annual broad-leaved weeds	Foliar, spraying, overall	BBCH 13-20 (spring)	a) 1 b) 1	-	a) 1 L/ha b) 1 L/ha	a) 12 / 60 g/ha b) 12 / 60 g/ha	80 / 300	n.a.***	Mefenpyr-diethyl applied as a safener at 35.0 g/ha	N
6	DE	Spring wheat (TRZAS)	F	*****ALOMY, APESV, AVESS, BROSS, POAAN, POATR, annual broad-leaved weeds LOLMU	Foliar, spraying, overall	BBCH 20-39 (spring)	a) 1 b) 1	-	a) 1 L/ha b) 1 L/ha	a) 12 / 60 g/ha b) 12 / 60 g/ha	80 / 300	n.a.***	Mefenpyr-diethyl applied as a safener at 35.0 g/ha	A
7	DE	Spring wheat (TRZAS)	F	ALOMY, APESV, AVESS, BROSS, POAAN, POATR, annual broad-leaved weeds	Foliar, spraying, overall	BBCH 13-20 (spring)	a) 1 b) 1	-	a) 0.75 L/ha b) 0.75 L/ha	a) 9 / 45 g/ha b) 9 / 45 g/ha	80 / 300	n.a.***	Mefenpyr-diethyl applied as a safener at 26.3 g/ha	N

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Use- No. *	Member state(s)	Crop and/ or situation (crop destination / purpose of crop)	F G or I **	Pests or Group of pests controlled (additionally: developmental stages of the pest or pest group)	Application				Application rate			PHI (days)	Remarks: e.g. g safener/synergist per ha	zRMS Conclusion (efficacy)
					Method / Kind	Timing / Growth stage of crop & season	Max. number a) per use b) per crop/ season	Min. interval between applications	kg, L product / ha a) max. rate per appl. b) max. total rate per crop/season	g, kg a.s./ha a) max. rate per appl. b) max. total rate per crop/season	Water L/ha min / max			
8	DE	Spring wheat (TRZAS)	F	*****APESV, AVESS, annual broad- leaved-weeds LOLMU	Foliar, spraying, overall	BBCH 20-39 (spring)	a) 1 b) 1	-	a) 0.75 L/ha b) 0.75 L/ha	a) 9 / 45 g/ha b) 9 / 45 g/ha	80 / 300	n.a.***	Mefenpyr-diethyl applied as a safener at 26.3 g/ha	A

* Use number(s) in accordance with the list of all intended GAPs in Part B, Section 0 should be given in column 1.

** F: professional field use, Fn: non-professional field use, Fpn: professional and non-professional field use, G: professional greenhouse use, Gn: non-professional greenhouse use, Gpn: professional and non- professional greenhouse use, I: indoor application

*** The PHI is covered by the conditions of use and/or the vegetation period remaining between the application of the plant protection product and the use of the product (e. g. harvest)

**** The German GAP is split in use 5 and 6) i.e.before and after GS 20 due to mitigation required

*****The range of individual weed species accepted by cMss to be confirmed on the national level.

Column 15: zRMS conclusion.

A	Acceptable
R	Acceptable with further restriction
C	To be confirmed by cMS
N	Not acceptable / evaluation not possible

Comments of zRMS on: GAP table

ZRMS has made amendments to the GAP table in accordance with the updated GAP table included in part B0 and submitted by the applicant in September 2022. The amendments concerned application timing of ADM.06001.H.2.B in winter cereals and inclusion of the dose range in the column 14.

Originally the GAP table presented by the applicant in the dRR included also spring uses in winter cereals at BBCH 13-20 (use no 1). However, BBCH 13-20 of winter cereals are developed before winter while the spring starting point is at BBCH 21. This was confirmed by available efficacy data for ADM.06001.H.2.B where nearly all efficacy trials for spring uses in winter cereals were performed at BBCH >21 and the available data do not cover spring application to winter cereals at BBCH 13-20. Finally, the spring application to winter cereals at BBCH 13-20 has been removed from the GAP table by the applicant.

Range of weed species accepted by cMS DE, has been included in GAP table.

3.2 Efficacy data (KCP 6)

Introduction

This document summarises the information related to the efficacy of the plant protection product ADM.06001.H.2.B containing pinoxaden, which was included into Annex I of Council Directive 91/414/EEC (Directive 2016/370/EC, 15th March 2016) and approved in accordance with Regulation (EC) No. 1107/2009 by Commission Implementing Regulation (EC) No. 540/2011 (25th May 2011) and mesosulfuron-methyl, which was included into Annex I of Council Directive 91/414/EEC (Directive 2003/119/EC, 5th December 2003), approved in accordance with Regulation (EC) No. 1107/2009 by Commission Implementing Regulation (EC) No. 540/2011 (25th May 2011) and approval renewed from 1st July 2017 by Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2017/755 (28th April 2017).

The EFSA Scientific Report (2013;11(6):3269) and SANCO report (SANCO/11794/2013 rev 3, 29th January 2016) for pinoxaden are considered to provide the relevant review information or a reference to where such information can be found.

The EC final renewal report (SANTE/11827/2016 rev 2, 23rd March 2017) and the EFSA Scientific Report (2016;14(10): 4584) for the renewal of mesosulfuron-methyl are considered to provide the relevant review information or a reference to where such information can be found.

The Annex I of the Inclusion Directives for pinoxaden (2016/370) and for mesosulfuron-methyl (2017/755) provides specific provisions under Part B which need to be considered by the applicant in the preparation of their of their submission and by the MS prior to granting an authorisation.

For the implementation of the uniform principles of Annex VI, the conclusions of the review report on pinoxaden and in particular Appendices I and II thereof, as finalised in the Standing Committee on the Food Chain and Animal Health on 29th January 2016 shall be taken into account.

For the implementation of the uniform principles as referred to in Article 29(6) of Regulation (EC No. 1107/2009), the conclusions of the renewal report on mesosulfuron-methyl (SANTE/11827/2016) and in particular Appendices I and II thereof, as finalised in the Standing Committee on the Food Chain and Animal Health on 23rd March 2017 shall be taken into account.

There are no specific additional points that Member States need to pay particular attention to with regard to granting of authorisations of plant protection products containing pinoxaden relating to efficacy or other Section 3 data requirements.

Member States need to pay particular attention to the following specific additional point relating to efficacy or other Section 3 data requirements with regard to granting of authorisations of plant protection products with regard to mesosulfuron-methyl.

- the protection of non-target terrestrial plants

This registration report gives a concise summary of data on the efficacy, crop safety and other Section 3 data points submitted in support of the registration of ADM.06001.H.2.B, an Oil Dispersion (OD) formulation containing 60 g/L pinoxaden, 12 g/L mesosulfuron-methyl and 35 g/L mefenpyr-diethyl (safener) in the EU Central Registration zone (zRMS: PL, cMS: AT, BE, CZ, DE, HU, IE, NL) for use as a herbicide for control of grass and broad-leaved weeds in winter and spring cereal crops.

Description of active substances

Pinoxaden was introduced by Syngenta AG and first marketed in 2006. Subsequently products containing pinoxaden, as sole active substance and in co-formulations with other herbicides, were introduced worldwide for use in cereals. Pinoxaden is a herbicide belonging to the phenylpyrazolines

family (“den”) and mode of action is classified in HRAC group 1 (ACCase inhibitors), which has herbicidal activity against grass weed species.

Mesosulfuron-methyl is an herbicide belonging to the sulfonyleureas family and mode of action is classified in HRAC group 2 (ALS inhibitors), which has herbicidal activity against grass and broad-leaved weed species

Mefenpyr-diethyl was developed and introduced by Bayer Crop Science for use in cereals. It is a safener and registered in combination with various herbicides in countries worldwide.

Mode of action

Pinoxaden is a post emergent herbicide and is readily taken up by the leaves and translocated both up (acropetally) and down (basipetally) in the plant to the growing shoot and roots. Pinoxaden provides very little soil activity, as it is rapidly degraded in soil and poorly taken up by the roots. After foliar absorption, pinoxaden is translocated and distributed by phloem and xylem within a plant, where it exerts its action on the lipid synthesis in dividing cells. Pinoxaden inhibits both the chloroplastic and cytosolic ACCase enzyme in monocotyledonous weeds. The chloroplastic enzyme is responsible for the “de novo” fatty acid biosynthesis, and the cytosolic ACCase, responsible for the elongation of VLFA (very long chain fatty acids). Its product, the cytosolic malonyl-CoA is involved in anthocyan biosynthesis. One of the properties of the existing herbicides (aryloxyphenoxypropionates and cyclohexanediones - fop’s and dim’s) is their specific inhibition of the chloroplastic ACCase in monocotyledonous plants only. There is also evidence from biochemical studies and metabolite profiling that pinoxaden has a different molecular binding site on the chloroplastic ACCase enzymethan the “fop” herbicides such as clodinafop. It is claimed that this is supported by the resistance profile of pinoxaden on certain target site resistant *Lolium* biotypes, which is different to clodinafop. Crop tolerance within monocotyledonous species is based on different metabolic kinetics. Tolerant crops like wheat, triticale and rye can metabolize the herbicide faster than susceptible monocotyledonous weeds.

Mesosulfuron-methyl is a sulfonyleurea compound that has a herbicidal mode of action that involves inhibition of acetolactate synthase (ALS). Acetolactate synthase is the first enzyme in the biosynthesis of branched-chain amino acids such as valine, leucine or isoleucine. Therefore mesosulfuron-methyl affects the formation of protein and influences the division of cells to inhibit plant growth and cause leaf discoloration followed by necrosis, eventually leading to plant death. The active substance is distributed systemically throughout the whole plant via the phloem after uptake through both the leaves and to a lesser extent the roots, primarily acting on the foliage. When applied early, soil activity can occur on germinating seed and seedlings in the top soil layer but generally mesosulfuron-methyl has limited residual efficacy through the soil. The efficacy of mesosulfuron-methyl against susceptible weed species is reliant on good weather conditions following application to promote active weed growth and uptake of the active ingredient. Mesosulfuron-methyl has good activity against a range of annual grass and broad-leaved weed species and selectivity in cereals is due to a more rapid rate of metabolism and degradation to inactive metabolites in the plant, which occurs from splitting of the urea compounds and hydrolysis of esters.

Mefenpyr-diethyl is a safener used in combination with herbicides. The compound was developed for use in cereals. The safener, when applied in combination with herbicides, allows selective post-emergence control of grass weeds in cereal crops without antagonizing the herbicidal effectiveness. Mode of action studies with fenoxaprop-P-ethyl showed that the initial rate of herbicide uptake via the foliage was slightly lower in presence than in absence of the safener. This effect, however, was apparent in barley and wheat as well as in wild oat and therefore not related to the selective biological action of the safener. The selective action of the safener is based on its property to trigger an enhanced detoxification of the herbicide in the cereal crops, but not in the grass weed species. Relevant metabolites in plants are monoethyl ester, dicarboxylic acid and after decarboxylation the metabolite 1-(2,4-dichlorophenyl)-5-methylpyrazole-3-carboxylic acid.

Table 3.2-1: Details of the active substances

Active substance	pinoxaden	mesosulfuron-methyl	mefenpyr-diethyl
Chemical group	phenylpyrazoline	sulfonylurea	Safener
Mode of action	inhibition of Acetyl CoA carboxylase	inhibition of acetolactate synthase (ALS)	/
HRAC group	1	2	/
Plant translocation	Systemic	Systemic	/
Biological action	Post-emergence herbicide	Post-emergence herbicide	Safener

Description of the plant protection product

ADM.06001.H.2.B, formulated as an Oil Dispersion (OD) formulation, containing 60 g pinoxaden/L, 12 g mesosulfuron-methyl/L and 35 g/L mefenpyr-diethyl (safener), is intended for use as a herbicide for the control of grass and broad-leaved weed species in the spring in winter wheat, winter triticale, winter rye and spring wheat.

The ~~maximum~~ proposed label rates of ADM.06001.H.2.B for control of grass and broad-leaved weed species in winter cereals are 0.75 L product/ha, ~~when the crops are within the growth stage range of 13-20 (BBCH)~~ and 1.0 L product/ha, when the crops are within the growth stage range of 20-39 (BBCH), with a maximum of 1 application per season made in water volumes ranges of or within 80-300 L/ha.

The maximum proposed label rate of ADM.06001.H.2.B for control of grass and broad-leaved weed species in spring cereals is 1.0 L product/ha, when the crops are within the growth stage range of 13-39 (BBCH) and with a with a maximum of 1 application per season made in water volumes ranges of or within 80-300 L/ha, with a lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha giving effective control of some target weeds.

The rate supported for Germany could change to a maximum proposed label rate of 0.75 L product/ha for use in spring wheat, when the crop is within the growth stage range of 13-39 (BBCH), due to potential mitigation measures required.

Table 3.2-2: Simplified table of requested uses for ADM.06001.H.2.B

Uses		Member State(s)	Requested rate(s)	Comments
Crop(s)	Target(s)			
Winter wheat, winter rye, winter triticale	Grass weeds ALOMY, APESV, AVESS, BROSS, LOLMU, LOLPE, POAAN, POATR, Broad-leaved weeds ANTAR, BRSNW, CAPBP, DESSO, SINAR, STEME, THLAR	AT, DE, BE, NL, CZ, PL, HU, IE	0.75 L/ha	Maximum 1 application per season. Application in spring when crops are within growth stage range of 13-20 (BBCH). Application volume range of 80-300 L/ha water
			0.75-1.0 L/ha	Maximum 1 application per season. Application in spring when crops are within growth stage range of 20-39 (BBCH). Application volume range of 80-300 L/ha water
Spring wheat	Grass weeds ALOMY, APESV, AVESS, BROSS, LOLMU, LOLPE, POAAN, POATR, Broad-leaved weeds ANTAR, BRSNW, CAPBP, DESSO, SINAR, STEME, THLAR	AT, DE*, BE, NL, CZ, PL, HU, IE	0.75-1.0 L/ha	Maximum 1 application per season. Application in spring when crops are within growth stage range of 13-39 (BBCH). Application volume range of 80-300 L/ha water

* rate supported for Germany could change to a maximum rate of 0.75 L product/ha due to potential mitigation measures required

Further details are in the table “All intended uses” in Part B - Section 0.

Description of the target pests

Table 3.2-3: Glossary of pests mentioned in the dossier

EPPO code	Scientific name	Common name
ALOMY	<i>Alopecurus myosuroides</i>	Blackgrass
APESV	<i>Apera spica-venti</i>	Loose silky bent
AVEFA	<i>Avena fatua</i>	Spring wild oat
AVELU	<i>Avena sterilis</i> subsp. <i>ludoviciana</i>	Winter wild oat
AVESA	<i>Avena sativa</i>	Common oat
AVESS	<i>Avena</i> spp.	Unspecified Oat species
BROSE	<i>Bromus secalinus</i>	Rye brome
BROST	<i>Bromus sterilis</i>	Barren brome
BROSS	<i>Bromus</i> spp.	Unspecified Brome species
LOLMU	<i>Lolium multiflorum</i>	Italian ryegrass
LOLPE	<i>Lolium perenne</i>	Perennial ryegrass
POAAN	<i>Poa annua</i>	Annual meadowgrass
POATR	<i>Poa trivialis</i>	Rough-stalked meadowgrass
ANTAR	<i>Anthemis arvensis</i>	Field chamomile
BRSNW	<i>Brassica napus</i> (winter)	Winter rape
CAPBP	<i>Capsella bursa-pastoris</i>	Shepherd's purse
DESSO	<i>Descurainia sophia</i>	Flixweed
SINAR	<i>Sinapis arvensis</i>	Charlock
STEME	<i>Stellaria media</i>	Common chickweed
THLAR	<i>Thlaspi arvense</i>	Field pennycress

Crop production is a competitive balance between crop and weed for light and nutrients. Weeds compete with cereals for water, light, nutrients and space, causing reductions in yield quality and quantity. They can also be host to pests and diseases, and create a bridge for these to be carried over from one crop to the next.

Leaving weeds uncontrolled can:

- Increase the weed seed burden in the soil affecting other crops in the rotation
- Reduce the efficiency of combining
- Contaminate grain samples with weed seed
- Potentially increase moisture levels in the straw and grain
- Delay harvest, lead to drying costs, require pre-harvest desiccation
- Impact marketable grain *e.g.* where high quality is demanded for malting and seed crops
- Increase selection pressure for resistance development

Weeds emerge at different times and the interaction between weed and crop growth is important. Most problems occur when weeds and crops emerge at the same time. The extent of the adverse impact of weeds on a crop is dependent on weed species, weed density, competitive ability of the crops and growth stages when weeds compete.

Table 3.2-4: Major / minor status of intended uses (for all cMS and zRMS)

Crop and/or situation	Crop status		Pests or group of pests controlled	Pest status	
	Major	minor		Major	minor
Wheat (TRZAX)	AT, BE, CZ, DE, HU, IE, NL, PL	-	Grasses and broad-leaved weeds	AT, BE, CZ, DE, HU, IE, NL, PL	-
Rye (SECCE)	AT, CZ, DE, PL	BE, HU, IE, NL	Grasses and broad-leaved weeds	AT, CZ, DE, PL	BE, HU, IE, NL
Triticale (TTLSS)	AT, DE, PL	BE, CZ, HU, IE, NL	Grasses and broad-leaved weeds	AT, DE, PL	BE, CZ, HU, IE, NL

Compliance with the Uniform Principles

This overall assessment has been performed according to the uniform principles. All summarised data are from trials carried out to GEP and in accordance with relevant EPPO guidelines.

Information on trials submitted (3.2 Efficacy data)

Table 3.2-5: Presentation of trials (efficacy trials, preliminary trials)

Table 3.2.3: Presentation of trials (efficacy trials, preliminary trials)										
Target(s)*	Crop(s)*	Country	Years	Type of trial**	Number of trials(number of valid trials)				GEP, non-GEP, official***	Comments (any other relevant information)
					Green-house	Maritime	North-east	South-east		
Grass and broad-leaved weeds	TRZAW	Czech Republic	2018	E+MED	-	3 (3)	-	-	GEP	
			2018-2019	E	-	1 (1)	-	-	GEP	
			2020	E+MED	-	10 (10)	-	-	GEP	
		France	2016	P	-	4 (4)	-	-	GEP	
			2020	P	-	2 (2)	-	-	GEP	
			2018	E	-	3 (2)	-	-	GEP	
				E+MED	-	8 (8)	-	-	GEP	
			2018-2019	E	-	2 (0)	-	-	GEP	
			2019-2020	E	-	3 (3)	-	-	GEP	
			2020	E+MED	-	9 (9)	-	-	GEP	
		Germany	2016	P	-	3 (3)	-	-	GEP	
			2020	P	-	2 (2)	-	-	GEP	
			2018	E+MED	-	9 (9)	-	-	GEP	
			2018-2019	E	-	2 (2)	-	-	GEP	
			2020	E	-	2 (2)	-	-	GEP	
				E+MED	-	11 (11)	-	-	GEP	
			P+E+MED	-	5 (5)	-	-	GEP		
		Hungary	2018	E+MED	-	-	-	7 (7)	GEP	
			2018-2019	E	-	-	-	4 (3)	GEP	
			2019-2020	E	-	-	-	4 (4)	GEP	
			2020	E+MED	-	-	-	16 (16)	GEP	
		Poland	2018	E	-	-	1 (1)	-	GEP	
				E+MED	-	-	8 (8)	-	GEP	
			2019-2020	E	-	-	2 (2)	-	GEP	
			2020	E	-	-	1 (1)	-	GEP	
				E+MED	-	-	16 (16)	-	GEP	
		Romania	2020	P	-	-	-	1 (1)	GEP	
			2018	E	-	-	-	1 (1)	GEP	
				E+MED	-	-	-	6 (6)	GEP	
			2019-2020	E	-	-	-	2 (2)	GEP	
			2020	E+MED	-	-	-	16 (16)	GEP	
	TRZAS	Czech Republic	2020	E+MED	-	2 (2)	-	-	GEP	
		France	2018	E+MED	-	1 (1)	-	-	GEP	
		Poland	2018	E+MED	-	-	3 (3)	-	GEP	
	TRZDU	Hungary	2020	P	-	-	-	1 (1)	GEP	
			2018	E+MED	-	-	-	2 (2)	GEP	
			2020	E+MED	-	-	-	1 (1)	GEP	
	HORVW	Germany	2018	E+MED	-	1 (1)	-	-	GEP	
	HORVS	Germany	2018	E+MED	-	2 (2)	-	-	GEP	
	SECCW	Germany	2020	P	-	1 (1)	-	-	GEP	
2020			P+E+MED	-	1 (1)	-	-	GEP		
TTLWI	Germany	2020	E+MED	-	2 (2)	-	-	GEP		
			P+E+MED	-	1 (1)	-	-	GEP		
	Hungary	2018	E+MED	-	-	-	1 (1)	GEP		
	Romania	2018	E+MED	-	-	-	3 (3)	GEP		
non-crop	France	2020	P	1 (1)	-	-	-	Non-GEP		
		2021	P	2 (2)	-	-	-	GEP		
	Italy	2020	P	1 (1)	-	-	-	GEP		
		2020	P	1 (1)	-	-	-	GEP		
Grand Total					5 (5)	89 (86)	30 (30)	65 (64)		

* According to the GAP table (with exception of HORVW, HORVS and TRZDU, which are not intended crops)

** P = preliminary trial, MED = minimum effective dose, E = efficacy trial

*** GEP: Good Experimental Practices. Official: carried out by a national official organisation

Table 3.2-6: Presentation of reference standards used in trials in cereals (efficacy trials, preliminary trials)

Reference standards	Country(ies) where the product is registered ⁽¹⁾	Authorisation number	Active substance(s) (a.s)	Formulation		Registered appl'n rate (/ha) ⁽³⁾	Appl'n rate in trials (per treatment)	Remark ⁽⁴⁾
				Type ⁽²⁾	Concentration of a.s.			
Axial 50 EC	CZ	-	pinoxaden	EC	50 g/L	-	0.9 L, 1.8 L	
	PL	R-105/2014				0.6-1.2 L	0.9 L, 1.8 L	
	RO	2748/19.12.2007				0.9 L	1.2 L, 2.4 L	
	HU	-				-	0.9 L, 1.8 L 1.0 L, 2.0 L 1.2 L, 2.4 L	
	DE	026326-00				0.9 L, 1.2 L	1.2 L, 2.4 L	
Axial Pratic	FR	2100138	pinoxaden	EC	50 g/L	0.9 L, 1.2 L	0.9 L, 1.8 L 1.2 L, 2.4 L	
Axial Plus	CZ	4684-1	pinoxaden	EC	50 g/L	0.6 L, 0.9 L	0.9 L, 1.8 L	
Axial One	FR	2110095	florasulam + pinoxaden	EC	5 + 45 g/L	1.3 L	1.3 L	
Atlantis OD	CZ	4686-0	iodosulfuron-methyl-sodium + mesosulfuron-methyl	OD	2 + 10 g/L	0.6 L, 1.0 L, 1.2 L	0.6 L, 1.2 L 1.0 L, 2.0 L	
	HU	04.2/6605-1/2016				1.0-1.5 L	1.0 L, 2.0 L	
Atlantis OD (+ Mero)	HU	04.2/6605-1/2016 (04.2/1794-1/2016)	iodosulfuron-methyl-sodium + mesosulfuron-methyl (rapeseed fatty acid esters)	OD (EC)	2 + 10 g/L (733 g/L)	1.0-1.5 L (1.0 L)	1.0 L, 2.0 L (1.0, 2.0 L)	
Atlantis Flex	RO	347PC/29.11.2017	mesosulfuron-methyl + propoxycarbazone	WG	47 + 67.5 g/Kg	0.2 Kg, 0.33 Kg	0.2 Kg, 0.4 Kg 0.33 Kg, 0.66 Kg	
Atlantis Pro	FR	2140257	iodosulfuron-methyl-sodium + mesosulfuron-methyl	OD	2 + 10 g/L	1.0-1.5 L	1.5 L, 3.0 L	
Atlantis Pro (+ Actirob B)	FR	2140257 (9400076)	iodosulfuron-methyl-sodium + mesosulfuron-methyl (methylated rapeseed oil)	OD (EC)	2 + 10 g/L (842 g/L)	1.0-1.5 L/ha (max 2 L)	1.0 L, 2.0 L (1.0 L)	

- (1) only on use(s) applied for (with the test product)
(2) e.g. WP (wetable powder), EC (emulsifiable concentrate), etc.
(3) dose(s) / dose range authorized on that use in the country
(4) Other relevant information (e.g. uses, number of applications, spray volume, method of application, etc.)

3.2.1 Preliminary tests (KCP 6.1)

ADM.06001.H.2.B is a new co-formulation product that combines the complementary and overlapping selective post-emergence herbicidal activities of pinoxaden and mesosulfuron-methyl to provide cereal growers with an effective control of an extensive range of grass and broad-leaved weeds in cereals.

Whilst products containing either pinoxaden or mesosulfuron-methyl alone are approved for use in cereals, ADM.06001.H.2.B offers the convenience and benefits associated with the use of two complementary and overlapping activities of two active ingredients in a single product.

A total of 3 greenhouse studies and 14 field trials carried out in 2016 and 2020 have generated data on the efficacy of tank mixtures of pinoxaden and mesosulfuron-methyl products applied at rates delivering the same amount of the respective active substance to that delivered by ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha (60 g pinoxaden/ha and 12 g mesosulfuron-methyl/ha) or the lower rate of 0.75 L (45 g pinoxaden/ha and 9 g mesosulfuron-methyl/ha) against major target grass weeds. All of these studies and trials included comparisons with the straight products containing pinoxaden and mesosulfuron-methyl applied alone at equivalent rates.

Additionally, these studies and trials also generated data on the efficacy of pinoxaden and mesosulfuron-methyl products applied together in tank mixture at rates giving different ratios of the 2 active substances (30 + 12 g a.i./ha, 45 + 7.5 g a.i./ha, 45 + 9 g a.i./ha, 60 + 6 g a.i./ha, 60 + 9.99 g a.i./ha, 45 + 12 g a.i./ha, 60 + 12 g a.i./ha, 60 + 15 g a.i./ha) against major target grass weeds.

Furthermore, a total of 2 greenhouse studies and 7 field trials carried out in 2020 that generated data on the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B against major target grass and broad-leaved weeds on cereals included a comparison with that of AG-PM1-72 OD, a similar OD formulation containing the same amounts of active substances and applied at the same rates of 0.75 L (45 g pinoxaden/ha and 9 g mesosulfuron-methyl/ha) and 1.0 L product/ha (60 g pinoxaden/ha and 12 g mesosulfuron-methyl/ha).

A total of 3 greenhouse studies and 12 field trials carried out in 2020 that generated data on the crop safety of ADM.06001.H.2.B on cereals included a comparison with that of AG-PM1-72 OD, a similar OD formulation containing the same amounts of active substances and applied at the same rates of 1.0 L product/ha in 7 efficacy trials and also at twice this rate (2.0 L product/ha) in 7 crop selectivity trials.

All trials were carried out by organisations that are officially recognised as competent to carry out efficacy testing in accordance with Regulation (EU) 284/2013 by the authorities in the relevant countries. Whilst one of the greenhouse study (trial ID: 21744020) was not officially to GEP, conduct of the study was broadly following the principles of GEP and relevant guidelines.

The materials and methods used in the efficacy and crop selectivity trials from which data are summarised to demonstrate the comparability of the performance of ADM.06001.H.2.B with that of AG-PM1-72 OD are given in Section 3.2.3. The materials and methods used in all other trials are given in Table 3.2-7.

Table 3.2-7: Details on trial methodology (preliminary trials) *

Greenhouse studies		
Guidelines	General guidelines	EPPO PP1/152 (4), EPPO PP1/181 (4)
	Specific guidelines	EPPO PP1/93 (3)
Experimental design	Plot design	RCBD (8)
	Plot size	0.64- 1.77 1.96 m ² (6) not specified (2)
	Number of replications	4 (8)
Crop	Trials per crop	non-crop (5) TRZAW (1) TRZAS (2) SECSS (3) TTLSS (3)
	Varieties per crop	non-crop (5) TRZAW: Alixan (1) TRZAS: Kws Sharki (1), Bologna (1) SECSS: Schlagler (1), KWS Serafino (1), n/d (1) TTLSS: Trica (1), Lombardo (1), n/d (1)
	Sowing period	under controlled conditions
Application	Crop stage (BBCH) at application	Post-emergence non-crop (5) TRZAW: n/d (1) 13 (1) TRZAS: 13-14 (2) SECSS: 13-21 (2) (3) n/d (1) TTLSS: 13-21 (2) (3) n/d (1)
Application (continued)	Weeds stage (BBCH) and population at application	ALOMY (6) (5): 13 to 21 (BBCH), min. 5-10 plants/pot AVEFA (2): 13-21 (BBCH), min. 5-10 plants/pot BROSP (4): 13-21 (BBCH), min. 5-10 plants/pot LOLMU (7) (5): 13-21 (BBCH), min. 5-10 plants/pot POAAN (2): 13-14 (BBCH), min. 5-10 plants/pot
	Number of applications	1 (8)
	Spray volumes	100 L/ha (2) 200 L/ha (6) (8)
Assessments	Assessment types	Visual % weed control, % weed ground cover, phytotoxicity (%), crop vigour (0-100 scale)
Other relevant information	Field / Greenhouse	Greenhouse
Maritime EPPO climatic zone		
Guidelines	General guidelines	EPPO PP1/152 (3/4), EPPO PP1/181 (3/4), EPPO PP1/135 (3/4), PP 1/225(1/2)
	Specific guidelines	EPPO PP1/93 (3), CEB M013
Experimental design	Plot design	RCBD (12)
	Plot size	10- 50 27 m ² (12)
	Number of replications	4 (12)
Crop	Trials per crop	TRZAW (11), SECCW (1)
	Varieties per crop	TRZAW: ALTIGO (1) Bergamo (1), Costello (1), Dekan (2), Desamo (1), Expert (1), Kerubino (1), Premio (1), Rubisko (2) SECCW: Serafino (1)
	Sowing period	TRZAW: Sep (2), Oct (7), Nov (2) SECCW: Oct (1)
Application	Crop stage (BBCH) at application	Post-emergence TRZAW: 13-39 (11) TRZAS: 30-31 (1)
	Weeds stage (BBCH) and population at application	ALOMY (5): 14-63 (BBCH), 23-280 pl/m ² (4), 4.5% (1) APESV (3): 23-31 (BBCH), 10-89 pl/m ² BROTE (1): 21-25 (BBCH), 101 pl/m ² LOLMU (3): 12-29 (BBCH), 5.8-64.5 pl/m ²
	Number of applications	1 (12)
	Spray volumes	200 L/ha (6) (7), 254 L/ha (1), 300 L/ha (5) (4)
Assessments	Assessment types	Visual % weed control, % weed ground cover, number of weeds or seed heads/m ²
Other relevant information	Field / Greenhouse	Field

South-east EPPO climatic zone		
Guidelines	General guidelines	EPPO PP1/152 (4), EPPO PP1/181 (4), EPPO PP1/135 (4)
	Specific guidelines	EPPO PP1/93 (3)
Experimental design	Plot design	RCBD (2)
	Plot size	21-24 m ² (2)
	Number of replications	4 (2)
Crop	Trials per crop	TRZAW (1), TRZDU (1)
	Varieties per crop	TRZAW: ALTIGO (1) TRZDU: Wintergold (1)
	Sowing period	TRZAW: Oct (1) TRZDU: Oct (1)
Application	Crop stage (BBCH) at application	Post-emergence TRZAW: 32-33 (1) TRZDU: 29-30 (1)
	Weeds stage (BBCH) and population at application	ALOMY (1): 22-33 (BBCH), 14.3 pl/m ² LOLMU (1): 29-31 (BBCH), 43 pl/m ²
	Number of applications	1 (2)
	Spray volumes	241 L/ha (1), 250 L/ha (1)
Assessments	Assessment types	Visual % weed control, % weed ground cover, number of weeds or seed heads/m ²
Other relevant information	Field / Greenhouse	Field

*Details on trial methodology for the last 7 efficacy bridging field trials and 5 selectivity bridging field trials are compiled together with data presented in the chapters 3.2.3 Efficacy tests (see table 3.2-21) and 3.4.1 Phytotoxicity to host crops (see table 3.4-4).

3.2.1.1 Justification of the combination of the active substances in the co-formulation

A total of 3 greenhouse studies and 14 field trials carried out in 2016 and 2020 have generated data on the efficacy of tank mixtures of pinoxaden and mesosulfuron-methyl products applied at rates delivering the same amount of the respective active substance to that delivered by ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha (60 g pinoxaden/ha and 12 g mesosulfuron-methyl/ha) or the lower rate of 0.75 L (45 g pinoxaden/ha and 9 g mesosulfuron-methyl/ha) against major target grass weeds. All of these studies and trials included comparisons with the straight products containing pinoxaden and mesosulfuron-methyl applied alone at equivalent rates.

Of the greenhouse studies, 1 was conducted in Germany, 1 was conducted in Italy and 1 was conducted in France.

Treatments were applied when weeds were at growth stages within the range of 13-21 (BBCH) in the greenhouse studies.

Across the 3 greenhouse studies, data were generated on efficacy against herbicide sensitive ALOMY biotypes (in two three studies), herbicide sensitive LOLMU biotypes (in two three studies), herbicide sensitive BROSS (BROSE in one study and BROER in one study) and herbicide resistant biotypes (to HRAC MoA Group 1 and/or HRAC MoA Group 2) of ALOMY and LOLMU in 2 studies.

Of the field trials, 12 were conducted within the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (6 in France, 6 in Germany) and 2 were conducted within the South-east EPPO climatic zone (1 in Hungary, 1 in Romania).

Across the field trials, data were generated on efficacy against ALOMY (6 trials), APESV (3 trials), BROTE (1 trial), LOLMU (4 trials).

Of the 14 field trials, 12 trials were carried out on winter wheat, 1 trial was carried out on durum wheat and 1 trial was carried out on winter rye. Across these trials, treatments were made between March and May when crop growth stages were within the range of 13-39 25-33 (BBCH). Weed growth stages at application covered were in the range of 14-63 (BBCH) and weed populations ranged from 5.8 to 280 plants/m².

An overall summary of the efficacy of tank mixtures of pinoxaden and mesosulfuron-methyl products compared to that of the straight pinoxaden and mesosulfuron-methyl products against individual target grass weed species at the later assessment timings across greenhouse studies and field trials in each of the EPPO climatic zones is given in Table 3.2 7.

Table 3.2-7: Component justification: comparison of overall percentage efficacy of tank mixtures of pinoxaden and mesosulfuron-methyl products compared to straight component active substances against grass weed species at later assessment timings

EPPO climatic zone (situation)	Weed species	No. of trials /studies	At application			Untreated		Mean % efficacy								tank mixture compared to g mesosulfuron-methyl/ha*	
			Weed stage range (BBCH)	Weed density range pl/m² (%GC)		heads/m² (pl/m²)	% ground cover	g pinoxaden/ha + g mesosulfuron-methyl/ha		g pinoxaden/ha		tank mixture compared to g pinoxaden/ha*		g mesosulfuron-methyl/ha			
								45 + 9	60 + 12	45	60	45	60	9.99	12	9.99	12
Green-house	ALOMY (sensitive)	2	13-21	5-10 pl/pot	Mean	-	95.0 (1 study)	-	92.4	-	87.4	-	2 studies =	-	27.9	-	2 studies >
					Min-max	-	-	-	84.8-100.0	-	74.8-100.0			-	2.5-53.3		
	ALOMY (ACCase-R)	2	13-14	5 pl/pot (1) n/d (1)	Mean	-	95.0 (1 study)	-	74.2	-	37.2	-	1 study > 1 study n/d	-	26.1	-	1 study > 1 study n/d
					Min-max	-	-	-	48.3-100.0	-	13.1-61.3			-	5.8-46.3		
	ALOMY (SU-ALS-R)	1	13-14	n/d	Mean	-	n/d	-	70.3	-	13.8	-	1 study n/d	-	48.3	-	1 study n/d
	BROER (sensitive)	1	13-14	10 pl/pot	Mean	-	n/d	-	89.8	-	65.3	-	1 study >	-	76.5	-	1 study =
	BROSE (sensitive)	1	13-21	5 pl/pot	Mean	-	80	-	82.5	-	2.5	-	1 study >	-	31.3	-	1 study >
	LOLMU (sensitive)	2	13-21	5 pl/pot (1) n/d (1)	Mean	-	95.0 (1 study)	-	97.4	-	87.4	-	1 study > 1 study n/d	-	76.9	-	1 study > 1 study n/d
					Min-max	-	-	-	94.8-100.0	-	74.8-100.0			-	53.8-100		
	LOLMU (ACCase-R + SU-ALS-R: target site)	1	21	5 pl/pot	Mean	-	90.0 (1 study)	-	7.5	-	0	-	1 study >	-	0	-	1 study >
	LOLMU (ACCase-R + SU-R: metabolic)	1	13-21	5 pl/pot	Mean	-	95.0 (1 study)	-	30.0	-	50.0	-	1 study =	-	0	-	1 study >
	LOLMU (ACCase-R)	1	13-14	n/d	Mean	-	n/d	-	99.0	-	8.6	-	1 study n/d	--	5.1	-	1 study n/d
LOLMU (SU-ALS-R))	1	13-14	n/d	Mean	-	n/d	-	47.8	-	34.7	-	1 study n/d	-	9.7	-	1 study n/d	

EPPO climatic zone (situation)	Weed species	No. of trials /studies	At application			Untreated		Mean % efficacy											
			Weed stage range (BBCH)	Weed density range pl/m² (%GC)		heads/m² (pl/m²)	% ground cover	g pinoxaden/ha + g mesosulfuron-methyl/ha		g pinoxaden/ha		tank mixture compared to g pinoxaden/ha*		g mesosulfuron-methyl/ha		tank mixture compared to g mesosulfuron-methyl/ha*			
								45 + 9	60 + 12	45	60	45	60	9.99	12	9.99	12		
Maritime	ALOMY	5	14-63	23-280 (4-30)	Mean	386.2	-	-	94.9	-	69.4	69.1	-	3 trials > 1 trials =	-	77.9	77.8	-	2 trials > 3 trials =
					Min-max	46.4-826.1	-	-	83.2-99.9	100	-	53.8-82.0			-	33.5-99.6	99.5		
					S.D.	-	-	-	6.74	-	13.60	-			27.19				
	APESV	3	23-31	10-89 (5-16)	Mean	125.9	-	-	94.6	-	82.1	82.0	-	1 trial > 2 trials =	-	70.6	72.9	-	2 trials > 1 trials =
					Min-max	11.1-265.0	-	-	83.8-100.0	-	46.3-100.0	-			33.8-100.0				
					S.D.	-	-	-	9.35	-	31.00	-			33.71				
	BROTE	1	21-25	101 (23)	Mean	346	-	-	69.0	-	0.0	-	1 trial >	-	94.0	-	1 trial <		
	LOLMU	1 (visual)	23-29	64.5	Mean	(79.8)	-	-	99.7	-	95.3	-	1 trial >	-	89.3	-	1 trial >		
		2 (head counts)	12-23	5.8-9.5 (4-5)	Mean	74.9	-	-	95.6	-	88.5	-	1 trial > 1 trial =	-	82.0	-	2 trials >		
					Min-max	29.8-120.0	-	-	91.1-100.0	-	76.9-100.0			-	72.2-91.8				
South-east	ALOMY	1	22-33	14.25 (10)	Mean	23.75	-	-	100.0	-	81.1	-	1 trial >	-	78.9	-	1 trial >		
	LOLMU	1	29-31	43 (13)	Mean	92.6	-	-	100.0	-	100.0	-	1 trial =	-	87.0	-	1 trial =		

#No. of trials where >, < or =, based on statistically significant differences at 95% confidence level

In the greenhouse studies, the efficacy of the tank mixture of pinoxaden and mesosulfuron-methyl products applied at rates of 60 g pinoxaden/ha + 12 g mesosulfuron-methyl/ha was in most cases markedly higher than that of the same rates of pinoxaden and mesosulfuron-methyl applied alone against sensitive biotypes of ALOMY, BROSS and LOLMU.

In these studies, the efficacy of the tank mixture of pinoxaden and mesosulfuron-methyl products applied at rates of 60 g pinoxaden/ha + 12 g mesosulfuron-methyl/ha was in most cases also markedly higher than that of the same rates of pinoxaden and mesosulfuron-methyl applied alone against ACCase and/or ALS resistant biotypes of ALOMY and LOLMU.

In the field trials, the overall efficacy of the tank mixture of pinoxaden and mesosulfuron-methyl products applied at rates of 60 g pinoxaden/ha + 12 g mesosulfuron-methyl/ha was consistently higher than that of the same rates of pinoxaden and mesosulfuron-methyl applied alone against 3 of the grass weed species (ALOMY, APESV, LOLMU) in trials in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone and ALOMY in a trial in the South-east EPPO climatic zone.

Therefore the efficacy of tank mixtures of pinoxaden and mesosulfuron-methyl products, applied at rates matching the amount of the respective active substances delivered by ADM.06001.H.2.B applied the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, or the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, was shown to be higher than that of the equivalent rates of pinoxaden and mesosulfuron-methyl products applied alone against some of the main target grass weed species (ALOMY, APESV, BROSS, LOLMU). In the greenhouse studies, this included biotypes of ALOMY and LOLMU with resistance to the ACCase and/or ALS inhibitor modes of action.

Based on presented data, the combination of pinoxaden and mesosulfuron-methyl in ADM.06001.H.2.B is therefore fully justified on the basis of higher efficacy, compared to either active substance applied alone, against major target grass weed species for which label claims are supported for proposed uses in cereals. Data also shows that this includes higher control of biotypes of ALOMY and LOLMU with developed resistance to the modes of action of one or both of the active substances and therefore the combination of the two in ADM.06001.H.2.B contributes towards resistance management.

3.2.1.2 Justification of the ratio of the active substances in the co-formulation

A total of 3 greenhouse studies and 14 field trials carried out in 2016 and 2020 have generated data on the efficacy of pinoxaden and mesosulfuron-methyl products applied together in tank mixture at rates giving different ratios of the 2 active substances (30 + 12 g a.i./ha, 45 + 7.5 g a.i./ha, 45 + 9 g a.i./ha, 60 + 6 g a.i./ha, 60 + 9.99 g a.i./ha, 45 + 12 g a.i./ha, 60 + 12 g a.i./ha, 60 + 15 g a.i./ha) against major target grass weeds.

Of the greenhouse studies. 1 was conducted in Germany, 1 was conducted in Italy and 1 was conducted in France.

Treatments were applied when weeds were at growth stages within the range of 13-21 (BBCH) in the greenhouse studies.

Across the 3 greenhouse studies, data were generated on efficacy against herbicide sensitive ALOMY biotypes (in two three studies), herbicide sensitive LOLMU biotypes (in two three studies), herbicide sensitive BROSS (BROSE in one study and BROER in one study) and herbicide resistant biotypes (to HRAC MoA Group 1 and/or HRAC MoA Group 2) of ALOMY and LOLMU in 2 studies.

Of the field trials, 12 were conducted within the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (6 in France, 6 in Germany) and 2 were conducted within the South-east EPPO climatic zone (1 in Hungary, 1 in Romania).

Across the field trials, data were generated on efficacy against ALOMY (6 trials), APESV (3 trials), BROTE (1 trial) and LOLMU (4 trials).

Of the 14 field trials, 12 were carried out on winter wheat, 1 was carried out on durum wheat and 1 was carried out on winter rye. Across these trials, treatments were made between March and May when crop growth stages were within the range of 13-39 25-33 (BBCH). Weed growth stages at application covered were in the range of 14-63 (BBCH) and weed populations ranged from 5.8 to 280 plants/m².

A summary of mean percentage efficacy of tank mixtures of pinoxaden and mesosulfuron-methyl products, applied at various rates giving different ratios of the two active substances, against individual grass weed species at later assessment timings across greenhouse studies and field trials in each of the EPPO climatic zones is given in Table 3.2-8.

Table 3.2-8: Mean percentage efficacy of pinoxaden and mesosulfuron-methyl products applied in tank mixtures at different ratios against grass weeds at later assessment timings

EPPO climatic zone (situation)	Weed species	No. of trials /studies	At application			Untreated		Mean % efficacy							
			Weed stage range (BBCH)	Weed density range pl/m² (%GC)		heads/m² (pl/m²)	% ground cover	g pinoxaden/ha + g mesosulfuron-methyl/ha							
								60 + 12	30 + 12	45 + 7.5	45 + 9	45 + 12	60 + 6	60 + 9.99	60 + 15
Greenhouse	ALOMY (sensitive)	2	13-21	5-10 pl/pot	Mean	-	95.0 (1 study)	92.4	76.8	-	80.7	79.8	90.7	-	89.5
					Min-max	-	-	84.8-100.0	53.8-90.8	-	63.1-100.0	59.5-100.0	81.3-100.0	-	79.0-100.0
					60 + 12 g a.i./ha compared to other ratios*							1 trial > 1 trial =	-	1 trial > 1 trial =	1 trial > 1 trial =
	ALOMY (ACCase-R)	2 (or 1#)	13-14	5 pl/pot (1) n/d (1)	Mean	-	95.0 (1 study)	74.2	59.6	-	58.5	68.5	63.8	13.5#	97.5#-
					Min-max	-	-	48.3-100.0	19.1-100	-	18.1-98.8	36.9-100.0	28.7-98.8	-	-
					60 + 12 g a.i./ha compared to other ratios*							1 trial = 1 trial n/d	-	1 trial = 1 trial n/d	1 trial = 1 trial n/d
	ALOMY (ALS-R)	1	13-14	n/d	Mean	-	n/d	70.3	59.2		66.7	70.4	81.0	62.0	-
					60 + 12 g a.i./ha compared to other ratios*							1 trial n/d	-	1 trial n/d	1 trial n/d
	BROER (sensitive)	1	13-14	10 pl/pot	Mean	-	n/d	89.8	89.8	-	85.3	89.8	91.0	-	89.8
					60 + 12 g a.i./ha compared to other ratios*							1 trial =	-	1 trial =	1 trial =
	BROSE (sensitive)	1	13-21	5 pl/pot	Mean	-	80	82.5	68.8	-	75.0	68.8	75.0	-	75.0
					60 + 12 g a.i./ha compared to other ratios*							1 trial =	-	1 trial =	1 trial =
	LOLMU (sensitive)	2	13-21	5 pl/pot (1) n/d (1)	Mean	-	95.0 (1 study)	97.4	82.9	-	82.9	81.0	96.0	-	90.5
					Min-max	-	-	94.8-100.0	65.8-100.0	-	65.8-100.0	62.0-100.0	92.0-100.0	-	81.0-100.0
					60 + 12 g a.i./ha compared to other ratios*							1 trial > 1 trial =	-	1 trial > 1 trial =	1 trial > 1 trial =
	LOLMU (ACCase-R + SU-R: target site)	1	21	5 pl/pot	Mean	-	90.0 (1 study)	7.5	6.3	-	1.3	5.0	2.5	-	3.8
					60 + 12 g a.i./ha compared to other ratios*							1 trial =	-	1 trial >	1 trial =
	LOLMU (ACCase-R + SU-R: metabolic)	1	13-21	5 pl/pot	Mean	-	95.0 (1 study)	30.0	6.3	-	10.0	50.0	35.0	-	13.8
					60 + 12 g a.i./ha compared to other ratios*							1 trial >	-	1 trial >	1 trial <
	LOLMU (ACCase-R)	1	13-14	n/d	Mean	-	n/d	99.0	95.7	-	93.3	92.7	85.4	96.0	-
					60 + 12 g a.i./ha compared to other ratios*							1 trial n/d	-	1 trial n/d	1 trial n/d
	LOLMU (SU-R)	1	13-14	n/d	Mean	-	n/d	47.8	8.0	-	39.6	29.2	15.1	53.1	-
					60 + 12 g a.i./ha compared to other ratios*							1 trial n/d	-	1 trial n/d	1 trial n/d

EPPO climatic zone (situation)	Weed species	No. of trials /studies	At application			Untreated		Mean % efficacy								
			Weed stage range (BBCH)	Weed density range p/m² (%GC)		heads/m² (p/m²)	% ground cover	g pinoxaden/ha + g mesosulfuron-methyl/ha								
								60 + 12	30 + 12	45 + 7.5	45 + 9	45 + 12	60 + 6	60 + 9.99	60 + 15	
Maritime	ALOMY	3	14-29	23-138 (4-8)	Mean	352.8	16.0 (1 trial)	98.2 98.3	-	91.6 91.5	96.4 96.3	-	89.4	96.5 96.6	-	
					Min-max	52.9-817.6	-	95.8-99.9 100	-	81.3-100.0 99.6	92.0-100.0 99.9	-	76.3-100.0	92.0-99.9 100	-	
					S.D.	-	-	2.15	-	9.50	4.04	-	12.04	4.07	-	
					60 + 12 g a.i./ha compared to other ratios*				-	1 trial > 2 trials =	3 trials =	-	1 trial > 2 trials =	3 trials =	-	
		2	21-63	280 (4-30)	Mean	436.3	-	89.8	69.9	-	77.2 77.4	83.8	87.4	-	90.7	
					Min-max	46.4-826.1	-	83.2-96.4	46.2-93.6	-	60.0 60.2-94.5	69.0-98.6	78.9-95.9	-	86.2-95.2	
					S.D.	-	-	9.36	33.49	-	24.37	20.93	11.99	-	6.39	
					60 + 12 g a.i./ha compared to other ratios*				1 trial > 1 trial =	-	1 trial > 1 trial =	2 trials =	1 trial > 1 trial = 2 trials =	-	2 trials =	
	APESV	1	24	10 (6)	Mean	11.1	-	100.0	-	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	100.0	-	
					60 + 12 g a.i./ha compared to other ratios*				-	1 trial =	1 trial =	-	1 trial =	1 trial =	-	
		2	23-31	69-89 (5-16)	Mean	183.3	40.7	91.9	83.8	-	92.9	85.3	88.5	-	93.4	
					Min-max	101.5-265.0	13.8-67.5	83.8-100.0	67.5-100.0	-	85.8-100.0	70.8-99.8	77.2-99.8	-	86.8-100.0	
					S.D.	-	-	11.46	22.98	-	10.04	20.51	15.98	-	9.33	
					60 + 12 g a.i./ha compared to other ratios*				1 trial > 1 trial =	-	1 trial > 1 trial = 2 trials =	1 trial > 1 trial =	2 trials > 1 trial = 2 trials =	3 trials =	2 trials =	
		BROTE	1	21-25	101 (23)	Mean	346.0	52.5	69.0	-	70.0	72.0 71.0	-	89.0	53.0	-
						60 + 12 g a.i./ha compared to other ratios*				-	1 trial =	1 trial =	-	1 trial > 1 trial =	1 trial >	-
	LOLMU	1 (heads)	12	9.5 (4)	Mean	29.8	-	100.0	-	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	100.0	-	
					60 + 12 g a.i./ha compared to other ratios*				-	1 trial =	1 trial =	-	1 trial =	1 trial =	-	
		1 (heads)	13-23	5.8 (5)	Mean	120.0	-	91.1	85.4	-	85.1	83.6	84.3	-	89.1	
					60 + 12 g a.i./ha compared to other ratios*				1 trial =	-	1 trial =	1 trial =	1 trial =	-	1 trial =	
		1 (visual)	29-31	138 (8)	Mean	(138.0)	11.3	99.7	-	98.2	98.8	-	97.3	99.1	-	
					60 + 12 g a.i./ha compared to other ratios*				-	1 trial =	1 trial =	-	1 trial =	1 trial =	-	
South-east	ALOMY	1	22-33	14.3 (10)	Mean	23.8	-	100.0	86.1	-	86.1	97.9	94.7	100.0	-	
					60 + 12 g a.i./ha compared to other ratios*				1 trial >	-	1 trial >	1 trial =	1 trial =	1 trial =	-	
	LOLMU	1	29-31	43 (13)	Mean	92.6	-	100.0	98.0	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	
					60 + 12 g a.i./ha compared to other ratios*				1 trial =	-	1 trial =	1 trial =	1 trial =	1 trial =	-	

* No of trials where >, < or =, based on statistically significant differences at 95% confidence level

In the greenhouse studies, reducing the amounts of pinoxaden in some cases resulted in lower efficacy of the tank mixture, compared to that involving a pinoxaden:mesosulfuron-methyl ratio of 1:0.2 and delivering 60 g + 12 g a.i./ha, against both sensitive and ACCase resistant biotypes of ALOMY and sensitive and also ACCase and/or ALS resistant biotypes of LOLMU.

In the field trials, reducing the amounts of pinoxaden or mesosulfuron-methyl in some cases resulted in lower efficacy of the tank mixture, compared to that involving a pinoxaden:mesosulfuron-methyl ratio of 1:0.2 and delivering 60 g + 12 g a.i./ha, against of pinoxaden or the lowest rate of mesosulfuron-methyl tested against ALOMY and APESV in Maritime EPPO climatic zone trials and against ALOMY in 1 trial in the South-east EPPO climatic zone.

Based on presented data, the ratio of pinoxaden or mesosulfuron-methyl in ADM.06001.H.2.B is therefore fully justified on the basis of higher efficacy, compared to those containing lower amounts of either of the active substances, against major target grass weed species for which label claims are supported for proposed uses in cereals. Data also shows that this includes biotypes of ALOMY and LOLMU with developed resistance to the modes of action of one or both of the active substances.

3.2.1.3 Comparison of the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B to that of AG-PM1-72 OD

ADM.06001.H.2.B is an Oil Dispersion (OD) formulation containing 60 g/L pinoxaden and 12 g/L mesosulfuron-methyl and AG-PM1-72 OD is a similar OD formulation containing the same amounts of both active substances.

A total of 9 trials carried out in 2020 that generated data on the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B against major target grass and broad-leaved weeds on cereals included a comparison with that of AG-PM1-72 OD, a similar OD formulation containing the same amounts of active substances and applied at the same rates of 0.75 L (45 g pinoxaden/ha and 9 g mesosulfuron-methyl/ha) and 1.0 L product/ha (60 g pinoxaden/ha and 12 g mesosulfuron-methyl/ha).

Of these trials, 2 were conducted in greenhouse conditions (1 in Germany and 1 in Italy) and 7 were conducted within the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (all in Germany). Of the 7 trials carried out in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone, 5 trials were carried out on winter wheat, 1 trial was carried out on ~~durum wheat~~ winter triticale and 1 trial was carried out on winter rye.

Across these 9 trials, data were generated against ALOMY (5 trials), AVEFA (3 trials), LOLMU (2 trials), POAAN (3 trials), APESV (1 trial), ~~AVEST (1 trial)~~, STEME (1 trial), DESSO (1 trial), BRSNN/BRSNW (2 trials) and Brome species (1 on BROSE, 1 on BROER and 2 on BROST).

An overall summary of the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B compared to that of AG-PM1-72 OD against individual target weed species by the final assessment timings across trials in each of the EPPO climatic zones is given in Table 3.2-9.

Table 3.2-9: Comparison of overall percentage efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B to AG-PM1-72 OD against grass and broad-leaved weed species on cereals by the final assessment timings

EPPO climatic zone (situation)	Weed species	No. of trials	At application				Untreated		Mean % efficacy					
			Weed stage range (BBCH)	Weed density range pl/m ² (%GC)			heads/m ² (pl/m ²)	% ground cover	ADM.06001.H.2.B	AG-PM1-72 OD	ADM.06001.H.2.B compared to AG-PM1-72 OD applied at 0.75 L/ha*	ADM.06001.H.2.B	AG-PM1-72 OD	ADM.06001.H.2.B compared to AG-PM1-72 OD applied at 1.0 L/ha*
									0.75 L/ha	0.75 L/ha		1.0 L/ha	1.0 L/ha	
Grass weeds														
Green-house	ALOMY	2	13	5pl/pot (5%)		Mean	-	90.0 (1 trial)	83.2	86.7	1 trial < 1 trial =	95.4	95.8	2 trials =
						Min-max	-	-	72.5-93.8	82.0-91.3		90.8-100.0	91.5-100.0	
						S.D.	-	-	15.06	6.58		6.51	6.01	
	AVEFA	2	13-21	5pl/pot (5%)		Mean	-	75.0 (1 trial)	81.0	76.4	1 trial > 1 trial =	91.4	87.3	1 trial > 1 trial =
						Min-max	-	-	75.0-87.0	70.0-82.8		85.0-97.8	82.5-92.0	
						S.D.	-	-	8.49	9.05		9.05	6.72	
	BROER	1	13-14	5pl/pot (5%)		Mean	-	-	72.0	62.5	1 trial >	83.3	82.8	1 trial =
	BROSE	1	13-21	5pl/pot (5%)		Mean	-	95	56.3	37.5	1 trial >	43.8	50.0	1 trial =
	LOLMU	2	13-21	5pl/pot (5%)		Mean	-	90.0 (1 trial)	82.7 90.8	81.2 88.8	2 trials = 1 trial > 1 trial =	86.7 97.3	86.7 97.9	2 trials =
						Min-max	-	-	70.3-95.0	67.3-95.0		78.3-95.0	79.5-93.9	
						S.D.	-	-	87.8-93.8	83.8-93.8		96.3-98.3	96.3-99.5	
Maritime	ALOMY	3	20-28	21-59.8 (1-8.5%)		Mean	83.4	10.9 (2 trials)	-	-	-	83.5	84.0	3 trials =
						Min-max	75.0-87.8	9.5-12.3	-	-		73.5-94.0	70.5-97.0	
						S.D.	-	-	-	-		10.26	13.26	
	BROST	2	15-30	80-388.5 (27.8-90%)		Mean	398.5	46.3 (1 trial)	-	-	-	62.6	63.5	2 trials =
						Min-max	104.0-693.0	-	-	-		50.7-74.5	51.3-75.8	
						S.D.	-	-	-	-		16.86	17.33	
	AVEFA	1	25-30	13.3 (2.3%)		Mean	34	-	-	-	-	100.0	100.0	1 trial =
	APESV	1	22-25	241.5 (11.5%)		Mean	328.3	13.0	-	-	-	98.0	98.0	1 trial =
	POAAN	1	25-29	35.0 (3.5%)		Mean	184.8	-	-	-	-	85.5	85.1	1 trial =
Broad-leaved weeds														
Maritime	BRSNN /BRSNW	2	19-30	5-8.3 (0.5-9.3%)		Mean	(6.6)	3.3	-	-	-	98.5	98.5	3 2 trials =
						Min-max	(5.0-8.3)	3.0-3.5	-	-		98.0-99.0	98.0-99.0	
						S.D.	-	-	-	-		0.71	0.71	
	DESSO	1	18-30	11.8 (8.8)		Mean	(34.0)	-	-	-	-	100.0 82	100.0 80	1 trial =

EPPO climatic zone (situation)	Weed species	No. of trials	At application				Untreated		Mean % efficacy					
			Weed stage range (BBCH)	Weed density range pl/m² (%GC)			heads/m² (pl/m²)	% ground cover	ADM.06001.H.2.B	AG-PM1-72 OD	ADM.06001.H.2.B compared to AG-PM1-72 OD applied at 0.75 L/ha*	ADM.06001.H.2.B	AG-PM1-72 OD	ADM.06001.H.2.B compared to AG-PM1-72 OD applied at 1.0 L/ha*
									0.75 L/ha	0.75 L/ha		1.0 L/ha	1.0 L/ha	
	STEME	1	19-30	5.0 (0.5)		Mean	(184.8)	-	-	-	85.5 43.8	85.1 92	1 trial =	

* No of trials where >, < or =, based on statistically significant differences at 95% confidence level

The overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the label rates of 0.75 L and/or 1.0 L product/ha, was comparable to that of AG-PM1-72 OD applied at the same rates across trials carried out in control conditions and within the Maritime climatic zone and the differences were not statistically significant on the majority of the trials.

Whilst all field trials have been carried out in the Maritime climatic zone, it is reasonable to consider that the efficacy of product is sufficiently similar under different climatic conditions for the data generated in trials carried out in the Maritime climatic zone to be fully supportive of demonstrating comparability of the performance of ADM.06001.H.2.B with that of AG-PM1-72 OD under conditions in the North-east and South-east climatic zones.

On the basis of demonstrating comparability between the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B and that of AG-PM1-72 OD, containing the same amounts of both active substances and applied at the same rates, the data generated with AG-PM1-72 OD from 2018-20 trials are summarised together with data generated with ADM.06001.H.2.B from 2020 trials to support label claims for control of target weeds by ADM.06001.H.2.B.

3.2.1.4 Comparison of crop safety of ADM.06001.H.2.B to that of AG-PM1-72 OD

ADM.06001.H.2.B is an Oil Dispersion (OD) formulation containing 60 g/L pinoxaden and 12 g/L mesosulfuron-methyl and AG-PM1-72 OD is a similar OD formulation containing the same amounts of both active substances.

A total of 15 trials (14 GEP and 1 non-GEP) carried out in 2020 that generated data on the crop safety of ADM.06001.H.2.B on cereals included a comparison with that of AG-PM1-72 OD, a similar OD formulation containing the same amounts of active substances and applied at the same rates of 1.0 L product/ha in 7 efficacy trials and also at twice this rate (2.0 L product/ha) in 8 crop selectivity trials.

Of these trials, 3 crop selectivity trials were conducted in greenhouse conditions (1 in Germany, 1 in France and 1 in Italy) and 12 (5 crop selectivity trials and 7 efficacy trials) were conducted within the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (all in Germany). Of all the trials carried out within the Maritime EPPO climatic zone, 7 were carried out on winter wheat, 1 was carried out spring wheat, 2 were carried out on triticale and 2 were carried out on rye. Of the 3 crop selectivity trials carried out under greenhouse conditions, three types of crops were tested in each trial with spring wheat on 2 trials, winter wheat on 1 trial, rye on 3 trials and triticale on 3 trials.

All 5 crop selectivity trials that were carried out within the Maritime EPPO climatic zone, also generated data on crop yield and quality data, following a single application of both ADM.06001.H.2.B and AG-PM1-72 OD) at the rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also at twice this rate (2.0 L product/ha).

On 14 of these trials, ADM.06001.H.2.B and AG-PM1-72 OD was applied at a single timing in the spring, when crop growth stages were within the range of 13-39 (BBCH) and therefore representative of the proposed label range for the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B. On the other 1 non-GEP trial, the crop growth stage was 13 (BBCH). ~~noted.~~

Trials were carried out on a range of different commercially representative and commonly grown cultivars of cereals.

Overall summaries of the crop safety of ADM.06001.H.2.B and AG-PM1-72 OD across trials carried out in cereals are given in Table 3.2-10 (greenhouse trials) and Table 3.2-11 (field trials).

Table 3.2-10: Overall summary of the crop safety of ADM.06001.H.2.B and AG-PM1-72 OD across all trials carried out on cereals under greenhouse conditions

Number of trials with...		Crop selectivity trials (greenhouse)											
		TRZAW (1 trial) /TRZAS (2 trials)				SECSS (3 trials)				TTLSS (3 trials)			
		ADM.06001.H.2.B		AG-PM1-72 OD		ADM.06001.H.2.B		AG-PM1-72 OD		ADM.06001.H.2.B		AG-PM1-72 OD	
		1.0 L/ha	2.0 L/ha	1.0 L/ha	2.0 L/ha	1.0 L/ha	2.0 L/ha	1.0 L/ha	2.0 L/ha	1.0 L/ha	2.0 L/ha	1.0 L/ha	2.0 L/ha
Maximum of phytotoxicity recorded during the trials	0%	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	>0% to 5%		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	>5% to 10%												
	>10% to 15%	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	>15 %	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Level of symptoms at the last assessments	0%	2	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1
	>0% to 5%		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	>5% to 10%	1		1	1	1		1		1			1
	>10% to 15%		1	1	1		1		1		1	1	1
	>15 %		1										

Table 3.2-11: Overall summary of the crop safety of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) across all trials carried out in cereals within Maritime EPPO climatic zone

Number of trials with...		Crop selectivity trials (5 trials)				Efficacy trials (7 trials)	
		ADM.06001.H.2.B		AG-PM1-72 OD		ADM.06001.H.2.B	AG-PM1-72 OD
		1.0 L/ha	2.0 L/ha	1.0 L/ha	2.0 L/ha	1.0 L/ha	1.0 L/ha
Maximum of phytotoxicity recorded during the trials	0%	3	3	3	3	6	6
	>0% to 5%			1			
	>5% to 10%	1	1	1			
	>10% to 15%	1			1		
	>15 %		1		1	1	1
Level of symptoms at the last assessments	0%	4	4	4	3	7	7
	>0% to 5%				1		
	>5% to 10%	1		1			
	>10% to 15%						
	>15 %		1		1		

**Comments of zRMS on:
Preliminary tests (3.2.1)**

**Comments of zRMS on:
preliminary tests (3.2.1)**

Ratio and Co-formulation justification

ADM.06001.H.2.B is a new co-formulated herbicide containing 60 g/L pinoxaden and 12 g/L mesosulfuron-methyl. Combination of two active substances provides effective post-emergence control of grass weeds (due to both pinoxaden and mesosulfuron-methyl activity) and some annual broad-leaved weed species (due to mesosulfuron-methyl activity). Seventeen trials (3 greenhouse trials and 14 field trials) carried out in 2016 and 2020 have been submitted by the applicant to justify the benefits of co-formulation mixture of pinoxaden with mesosulfuron-methyl as compared with products containing single active substances. These trials were also submitted to justify the most effective ratio of pinoxaden and mesosulfuron methyl in the co-formulation. Preliminary tests were carried out in winter wheat (11 trials conducted in Maritime EPPO zone in DE and FR and 1 trial conducted in South-East EPPO zone in RO), winter triticale (1 trial conducted in DE) and durum wheat (1 trial conducted in HU). Greenhouse trials in the absence of crops were carried out in DE, FR and IT. The presented trials demonstrate efficacy results against some of the main target grass weed species (ALOMY, APESV, BROSS, LOLMU). The benefits of use co-formulation mixture in comparison with single pinoxaden and mesosulfuron-methyl formulations have been shown in almost all the trials in the control of almost all target weed species (excluding only one trial result for BROTE, where the efficacy for single mesosulfuron-methyl was higher than efficacy of mixture pinoxaden with mesosulfuron-methyl). Statistically higher efficacy of combination pinoxaden with mesosulfuron-methyl in comparison with pinoxaden and mesosulfuron-methyl using alone has been demonstrated in more than half of the trials for almost all target weed species. Moreover higher efficacy in the control of biotypes ALOMY and LOLMU resistant to the mode of action of pinoxaden, mesosulfuron-methyl or for modes of action of both active substances has been demonstrated for co-formulation mixture of these two active substances, providing additional benefits for resistance management strategy.

To establish the most effective ratio of pinoxaden and mesosulfuron methyl in the co-formulation, the following ratios have been tested in the trials: 30 + 12 g a.i./ha, 45 + 7.5 g a.i./ha, 45 + 9 g a.i./ha, 60 + 6 g a.i./ha, 60 + 9.99 g a.i./ha, 45 + 12 g a.i./ha, 60 + 12 g a.i./ha, 60 + 15 g a.i./ha. Based on the submitted trial results the most effective ratio has been demonstrated for 60 g pinoxaden/ha + 12 g mesosulfuron-methyl/ha in the most of the submitted trials for almost all target weed species showing increase or statistically significant increase of efficacy in comparison with lower tested ratios of active substances. The ratio 45 + 9 g a.i./ha corresponding to the lower recommended dose rate of 0,75 L/ha of ADM.06001.H.2.B has also demonstrated satisfying efficacy results and higher in comparison with lower ratio (30 + 12 g a.i./ha) in some of the trials. **Based on the submitted preliminary efficacy trial results it can be concluded that the use of co-formulation of pinoxaden and mesosulfuron-methyl has been convincingly justified. Additionally the proper ratio of active substances in ADM.06001.H.2.B (60 or 45 g pinoxaden/ha + 12 or 9 g mesosulfuron-methyl/ha) has been proved.**

Bridging trials

Efficacy and selectivity datapackage includes trials carried out in the years 2018-2019 with the earlier formulation AG-PM1-72 OD containing the same amount of active substances as the final formulation ADM.06001.H.2.B: 60 g/L pinoxaden and 12 g/L mesosulfuron-methyl. Nine efficacy and eight selectivity bridging trials carried out in 2020 have been presented to demonstrate the similarity between AG-PM1-72 OD and ADM.06001.H.2.B. Efficacy trials were carried out in the field (7 trials conducted in DE on TRZAW (5), SECCW (1) and TTLWI (1) with efficacy data for AG-PM1-72 OD and ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at dose rate of 1,0 L/ha) or under greenhouse conditions (2 trials conducted in DE, in the absence of the crops with efficacy data for AG-PM1-72 OD and ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at both recommended dose rates: 0.75 and 1.0 L/ha). All 7 field efficacy bridging trials submit also data on phytotoxicity of the tested formulations. The presented bridging trials demonstrate efficacy results against some of the main target grass weed species (ALOMY (5 trials), APESV (1 trial), AVEFA (3 trials), BROSE (1 trial), BROER (1 trial), BROST (2 trials), LOLMU (2 trials), POAAN (3 trials)) or broadleaved weed species (BRSNN/BRSNW (2 trials), DESSO (1 trial), STEME (1 trial)). Three of eight selectivity trials were conducted in greenhouse, including German trial with tested crops: TRZAS, SECCW and TTLWI, French trial with tested crops: TRZAW, SECSS and TTLSS and Italian trial with tested crops: TRZAS, SECSS and TTLSS). The last 5, field trials were conducted in DE with tested crops: TRZAW (2), TRZAS (1), SECCW (1) and TTLWI (1). Summarizing efficacy trial results, ADM.06001.H.2.B at dose rate of 0.75 L/ha performed comparably or better than AG-PM1-72 OD at the same dose in most of the trials in the control of most of the target weed species (excluding only 1 trial with statistically higher efficacy for AG-PM1-72 OD in the control of ALOMY). ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at dose rate of 1.0

L/ha performed comparably as AG-PM1-72 OD at the same dose in almost all trials (excluding only 1 trial with statistically higher efficacy for AG-PM1-72 OD in the control of STEME). Summarizing selectivity trial results, it can be concluded that both formulations applied at recommended dose rate of 1.0 L/ha are selective for all target crops. Phytotoxicity symptoms observed after application of AG-PM1-72 OD or ADM.06001.H.2.B at recommended dose rate of 1.0 L/ha had no significant influence on the yield or its quality parameters of tested crops (data on yield and yield quality parameters from 5 field selectivity bridging trials are contained in BAD document).

Based on the trial results it can be concluded that trials with AG-PM1-72 OD can be used in the efficacy and selectivity evaluation of the target herbicide ADM.06001.H.2.B. For simplicity, only the code name ADM.06001.H.2.B will be used in the evaluation.

3.2.2 Minimum effective dose (KCP 6.2)

One hundred and forty-two (142) of the ~~170~~ 172 trials conducted between 2018 and 2020 ~~that~~ generated data on the efficacy of a single spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha against grass and broad-leaved weeds in cereals also included comparison to lower rates of 0.25 L (70 trials), 0.35 L (73 trials), 0.5 L (142 trials) and 0.75 L (142 trials) product/ha, representing 25%, 35%, 50% and 75% of the maximum proposed label rate. The data from these trials are summarised in support of justifying the minimum effective dose rate for control of target grass and broad-leaved weeds in cereals by ADM.06001.H.2.B.

Of these trials, 64 were carried out in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone, 26 were carried out in the North-east EPPO climatic zone and 52 were carried out in the South-east EPPO climatic zone.

Based on data presented in Section 3.2.1.3 that demonstrates comparability between the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B and that of AG-PM1-72 OD, both containing the same amounts of the two active substances and applied at the same rate, data for AG-PM1-72 OD from trials in 2018-2019 are summarised together with that for ADM.06001.H.2.B from trials in 2020, as fully supportive of justifying the minimum effective dose rate for control of target grass weeds in cereals by ADM.06001.H.2.B.

Agronomic practices, growth stages of the crop at the proposed timings of application in the spring and areas where the crops are grown are sufficiently similar for data generated in trials on any relevant winter or spring cereal crop type to be fully supportive of justifying the minimum effective dose rate for control of target grass weeds in all cereal crops types, on which use is proposed, by ADM.06001.H.2.B.

Although giving effective control of some broad-leaved weed species, the primary targets of ADM.06001.H.2.B are grass weeds. The proposed maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha has therefore been identified as that giving optimum control of target grass weed species. Furthermore, as a range of different weed species are typically present and warranting control in cereal crops, the 1.0 L product/ha rate of ADM.06001.H.2.B, or in some situations the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, should be used to give effective control all of those weed species that are present at the time of application and against which it has activity and also of weeds at different stages of development. Therefore data are only presented in this section to demonstrate minimum effective dose for control of target grass weeds and not for broad-leaved weed species.

A summary of the number of trials that generated data used to demonstrate minimum effective dose rates for control of grass ~~and broad-leaved~~ weeds by ADM.06001.H.2.B in cereals are listed in table 3.2.-12.

.

The materials and methods used in the efficacy trials from which data are summarised to justify minimum effective dose for control of grass and broad-leaved weeds in cereals are given in Section 3.2.3.1.

In this section data are summarised across trials at representative assessments carried out approximately 3-5 weeks after application and at later timings, generally following full ear emergence of the grass weeds in the trial. These assessment timings are considered to be the most appropriate to show the efficacy of a post-emergence herbicide under a range of different environmental conditions. Data from other assessment timings on the trials are included in Appendix 3.

Efficacy data are only summarised here from trials where mean densities of individual weed species in the untreated control plots were $\geq 5\%$ plants/m² or $\geq 2\%$ ground cover at both application and assessment.

3.2.2.1 Minimum effective dose for control of Blackgrass (*Alopecurus myosuroides*: ALOMY)

A total of 34 trials carried out between 2018 and 2020 generated data on the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at a range of rates (0.25 L, 0.35 L, 0.5 L, 0.75 L and 1.0 L product/ha or 0.5 L, 0.75 L and 1.0 L product/ha) against ALOMY in cereal crops.

Single post-emergence applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) were made in the spring (between March and May) on all trials, when crop growth stages were in the range 21-33 (BBCH), and therefore representative of the proposed timings for the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B.

Of these trials, 18 were carried out within the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (9 in France, 9 in Germany), 7 were carried out within the North-east EPPO climatic zone (all in Poland) and 9 were carried out within the South-east EPPO climatic zone (5 in Hungary, 4 in Romania).

Across trials, the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) against ALOMY has been tested in wide ranging locations, cultural practices, climatic conditions and weed biotypes, densities and growth stages that are fully representative of those in the spring in areas where cereal crops are grown in all countries relevant to this submission.

A summary of mean percentage efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at a range of rates against ALOMY across trials in cereal crops in each of the climatic zones is given in Table 3.2-13.

Table 3.2-13: Dose justification; mean overall percentage efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72-OD) applied at a range of rates against ALOMY across trials in cereal crops

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS at appl'n (BBCH)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	Assessment timing	No. of trials		Untreated			Mean % efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)					Statistical comparison (no. of trials)#	
						pl/m ²	% GC	heads/m ²	0.25 L/ha	0.35 L/ha	0.5 L/ha	0.75 L/ha	1.0 L/ha	1.0 L to 0.5 L/ha	1.0 L to 0.75 L/ha
Maritime (18 trials)	12-65 (18)	7.0-607.8 pl/m ² (16), 13.3-25% GC (2)	Earlier assessments (22-39 DA-A) based on overall visual control	16	Mean	114.5 (11)	21.9 (15)	-	-	-	58.2	66.8	73.9	> (11), = (5)	> (4), = (12)
					Min-Max	14.0-607.8	6.0-66.3	-	-	-	25.0-96.5	12.7-97.4	27.9-98.3		
					S.D.	-	-	-	-	-	20.35	24.51	19.52		
			Later assessment (68 DA-A) based on overall visual control	2	Mean	-	19.2 (2)	-	22.5	34.4	48.8	57.4	68.9	> (2)	> (1), = (1)
					Min-Max	-	16.3-22.0	-	17.5-27.5	23.8-45.0	25.0-72.5	28.8-86.0	48.8-89.0		
					S.D.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
			Later assessments (32-84 DA-A) based on numbers of weed seed heads	17	Mean	-	-	314.3 (17)	-	-	61.2	76.6	81.2	> (10), = (7)	> (4), = (13)
					Min-Max	-	-	62.1-1140	-	-	22.9-97.2	42.1-99.9	36.7-99.5		
					S.D.	-	-	-	-	-	23.32	17	17.97		
North-east (7 trials)	11-25 (7)	7.0-53.0 pl/m ² (7)	Earlier assessments (21-28 DA-A) based on overall visual control	7	Mean	23.6 (5)	10.2 (4)	-	-	-	73.1	83.3	91.6	> (5), n/d (2)	> (2), = (3), n/d (2)
					Min-Max	12.0-37.5	1.0-16.5	-	-	-	61.3-85.0	71.3-88.8	90.0-95.0		
					S.D.	-	-	-	-	-	7.59	5.96	2.00		
			Later assessments (42 DA-A) based on overall visual control	2	Mean	n/d	n/d	-	-	-	80.7	84.4	98.2	n/d (2)	n/d (2)
					Min-Max	-	-	-	-	-	80.0-81.3	83.8-85.0	97.5-98.8		
					S.D.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
			Later assessments (44-56 DA-A) based on numbers of weed seed heads	5	Mean	-	-	-	-	-	84.5	95.4	97.3	> (2), = (3)	> (1), = (4)
					Min-Max	-	-	-	-	-	68.7-100	76.8-100	93.0-100		
					S.D.	-	-	-	-	-	12.50	10.39	3.65		
South-east (9 trials)	15-47 (9)	5.0-22.0 pl/m ² (9)	Earlier assessments (14-28 DA-A) based on overall visual control	8	Mean	14.3 (6)	19.0 (3)	-	-	-	66.9	78.7	88.1	> (7), = (1)	> (6), = (2)
					Min-Max	5.3-23.2	12.0-25.0	-	-	-	45.0-90.0	56.3-100	70.0-100		
					S.D.	-	-	-	-	-	15.07	15.46	11.74		
			Later assessments (48 DA-A) based on overall visual control	2	Mean	22.4 (2)	25.0 (2)	-	-	-	90.0	100	100	> (2)	= (2)
					Min-Max	21.5-23.2	25.0-25.0	-	-	-	87.5-92.5	100-100	100-100		
					S.D.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
			Later assessments (14-41 DA-A) based on numbers of weed seed heads	7	Mean	-	-	41.6 (7)	-	-	75.0	86.7	96.2	> (4), = (3)	> (2), = (5)
					Min-Max	-	-	23.8-85.3	-	-	46.3-95.7	65.0-99.2	85.0-100		
					S.D.	-	-	-	-	-	20.83	12.89	5.58		

No. of trials where >, = or <, based on statistically significant differences at 95% confidence level

Data generated in trials carried out across Maritime, North-east and South-east EPPO climatic zones clearly show the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 1.0 L product/ha against ALOMY in cereal crops to be generally higher and more consistent compared to that of lower rates of 0.75 L product/ha and below. Overall, whilst the 1.0 L product/ha rate of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) gave a higher overall level of efficacy compared to the 0.75 L product/ha across trials, differences were statistically only significant on 7 of the trials at the later assessments.

Based on the presented data, it is therefore reasonable to conclude that the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha is fully justified as the minimum effective dose for the control of ALOMY in cereal crops by ADM.06001.H.2.B under conditions in countries in the Maritime, North-east and South-east EPPO climatic zones, but lower rates of down to 0.75 L product/ha may in some cases give acceptable control.

3.2.2.2 Minimum effective dose for control of Loose silky bent (*Apera spica-venti*: APESV)

A total of 44 trials carried out between 2018 and 2020 generated data on the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at a range of rates (0.25 L, 0.35 L, 0.5 L, 0.75 L and 1.0 L product/ha or 0.5 L, 0.75 L and 1.0 L product/ha) against APESV in cereal crops.

Single post-emergence applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) were made in the spring (between March and May) on all trials, when crop growth stages were in the range 15-39 22-39 (BBCH) in the majority of the trials, and when crop stage was 15-21 in only one Czech Republic trial, and therefore fully representative of the proposed timings for the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B.

Of these trials, 15 were carried out within the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (7 8 in Czech Republic, 8 7 in Germany), 15 were carried out within the North-east EPPO climatic zone (all in Poland) and 14 were carried out within the South-east EPPO climatic zone (6 in Hungary, 8 in Romania).

Across trials, the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) against APESV has been tested in wide ranging locations, cultural practices, climatic conditions and weed biotypes, densities and growth stages that are fully representative of those in the spring in areas where cereal crops are grown in all countries relevant to this submission.

A summary of mean percentage efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at a range of rates against APESV across trials in cereal crops in each of the climatic zones is given in Table 3.2-14.

Table 3.2.14: Dose justification; mean overall percentage efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72-OD) applied at a range of rates against APESV across trials in cereal crops

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS at appl'n (BBCH)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	Assessment timing	No. of trials		Untreated			Mean % efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)					Statistical comparison (no. of trials)#	
						pl/m ²	% GC	heads/m ²	0.25 L/ha	0.35 L/ha	0.5 L/ha	0.75 L/ha	1.0 L/ha	1.0 L to 0.5 L/ha	1.0 L to 0.75 L/ha
Maritime (15 trials)	13-38 (15)	5.0-241.5 pl/m ² (14), 7.0% GC (1)	Earlier assessments (23-30 DA-A) based on overall visual control	15	Mean	61.0 (12)	11.8 (12)	-	-	-	81.8	91.3	93.5	> (8), = (7)	> (2), = (13)
					Min-Max	5.5-241.5	2.8-34.3	-	-	-	40.0-95.0	65.0-100	71.3-100		
					S.D.	-	-	-	-	-	15.09	9.53	8.27		
				12	Mean	48.9 (9)	11.7 (9)	-	55.4	72.3	80.3	90.0	92.7	> (6), = (6)	> (2), = (10)
					Min-Max	5.5-140.0	2.8-34.3	-	0.0-90.0	3.05-95.0	40.0-95.0	65.0-100	71.3-100		
					S.D.	-	-	-	34.11	20.95	16.35	10.21	8.97		
			Later assessments (40-87 DA-A) based on numbers of weed seed heads	15	Mean	-	-	91.5 (15)	-	-	92.6	96.8	99.2	> (3), = (12)	= (15)
					Min-Max	-	-	7.2-392.8	-	-	59.8-100	74.7-100	93.0-100		
					S.D.	-	-	-	-	-	13.03	6.68	1.88		
				12	Mean	-	-	77.4 (12)	66.6	83.4	91.8	96.5	99.3	> (2), = (10)	= (12)
					Min-Max	-	-	7.2-392.8	14.7-100	36.6-100	59.8-100	74.7-100	93.0-100		
					S.D.	-	-	-	30.37	20.69	14.58	7.46	2.03		
North-east (15 trials)	11-33 (15)	8.0-46.3 pl/m ² (15)	Earlier assessments (20-29 DA-A) based on overall visual control	15	Mean	19.2 (14)	5.7 (7)	-	-	-	82.7	90.3	93.8	> (10), = (4), n/d (1)	> (2), = (12), n/d (1)
					Min-Max	4.5-46.0	1.0-14.8	-	-	-	56.3-91.3	68.8-97.5	75.0-100		
					S.D.	-	-	-	-	-	9.12	6.99	6.40		
				13	Mean	20.2 (12)	6.5 (6)	-	61.3	68.4	81.6	89.7	93.3	> (9), = (3), n/d (1)	> (1), = (11), n/d (1)
					Min-Max	4.5-46.0	2.0-14.8	-	42.5-78.8	48.8-82.5	56.3-91.3	68.8-97.5	75.0-100		
					S.D.	-	-	-	10.10	10.22	9.37	7.31	6.76		
			Later assessments (61-70 DA-A) based on overall visual control	3	Mean	29.5 (2)	-	-	81.7	90.4	98.8	98.8	100	= (2), n/d (1)	= (2), n/d (1)
					Min-Max	22.0-37.0	-	-	75-95	83.8-100	96.3-100	96.3-100	100-100		
					S.D.	-	-	-	11.55	8.49	2.14	2.14	0.00		
				12	Mean	-	-	40.0 (12)	-	-	93.7	98.2	99.7	> (4), = (8)	> (2), = (10)
					Min-Max	-	-	8.0-158.0	-	-	68.2-100	89.8-100	97.2-100		
					S.D.	-	-	-	-	-	10.75	3.32	0.84		
			Later assessments (38-77 DA-A) based on numbers of weed seed heads	10	Mean	-	-	45.3 (10)	78.7	88.0	93.4	98.3	99.7	> (3), = (7)	> (1), = (9)
					Min-Max	-	-	11.5-158.0	12.5-100	52.2-100	68.2-100	89.8-100	97.2-100		
					S.D.	-	-	-	28.89	17.4	11.63	3.43	0.89		

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS at appl'n (BBCH)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	Assessment timing	No. of trials		Untreated			Mean % efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)					Statistical comparison (no. of trials)#	
						pl/m ²	% GC	heads/m ²	0.25 L/ha	0.35 L/ha	0.5 L/ha	0.75 L/ha	1.0 L/ha	1.0 L to 0.5 L/ha	1.0 L to 0.75 L/ha
South-east (14 trials)	13-47 (14)	12.0-263.5 pl/m ² (14)	Earlier assessments (14-28 DA-A) based on overall visual control	14	Mean	45.2 (14)	26.0 (11)	-	-	-	79.2 78.7	86.4 87.5	91.6 92.6	> (11), = (3)	> (7), = (7)
					Min-Max	4.5-272.5	5.0-50.0	-	-	-	45.0-100	56.3-100	58.8-100		
					S.D.	-	-	-	-	-	18.25	13.94	11.98		
				10	Mean	55.1 (10)	24.5 (8)	-	71.0 69.6	79.9 78.4	87.0 86.3	89.6 91.6	92.4 93.9	> (7), = (3)	> (5), = (7)
					Min-Max	4.5-272.5	5.0-50.0	-	37.5-95.0	42.5-100	51.3-100	56.3-100	58.8-100		
					S.D.	-	-	-	19.46	17.17	14.37	13.60	13.27		
			Later assessments (28-47 DA-A) based on overall visual control	5	Mean	26.9 (5)	31.0 (5)	-	-	-	69.5	82.5	93.3	> (5)	> (3), = (2)
					Min-Max	21.5-44.7	20.0-35.0	-	-	-	45.0-95.0	61.3-100	77.5-100		
					S.D.	-	-	-	-	-	23.23	17.14	10.06		
				2	Mean	34.5 (2)	27.5 (2)	-	78.8	84.4	94.4	100	100	> (2)	= (2)
					Min-Max	24.2-44.7	20.0-35.0	-	75.0-82.5	81.3-87.5	93.8-95	100-100	100-100		
					S.D.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
			Later assessments (29-104 DA-A) based on numbers of weed seed heads	9	Mean	-	-	146.7 (9)	-	-	90.3	93.8	97.4	> (4), = (5)	> (3), = (6)
					Min-Max	-	-	12.5-729.3	-	-	66.3-100	79.1-100	87.3-100		
					S.D.	-	-	-	-	-	10.94	7.97	4.39		
				8	Mean	-	-	163.2 (8)	66.2	80.9	91.6	95.1	97.9	> (3), = (5)	> (2), = (6)
					Min-Max	-	-	12.5-729.3	43.3-96.1	58.8-99.0	66.3-100	79.1-100	87.3-100		
					S.D.	-	-	-	17.14	11.91	10.92	7.32	4.42		

No. of trials where >, = or <, based on statistically significant differences at 95% confidence level

Data generated in trials carried out across Maritime and North-east EPPO climatic zones clearly show the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at both 1.0 L and 0.75 L product/ha against APESV in cereal crops to be generally higher and more consistent compared to that of lower rates of 0.5 L product/ha and below.

Data generated in trials carried out across the South-east EPPO climatic zone clearly show the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 1.0 L product/ha against APESV in cereal crops to be generally higher and more consistent compared to that of lower rates of 0.75 L product/ha and below. Overall, whilst the 1.0 L product/ha rate of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) gave a higher overall level of efficacy compared to the 0.75 L product/ha across trials, differences were statistically only significant on 5 of the trials at the later assessments.

Based on the presented data, it is therefore reasonable to conclude that the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha is fully justified as the minimum effective dose for the control of APESV in cereal crops by ADM.06001.H.2.B under conditions in countries in the South-east EPPO climatic zone, but lower rates of down to 0.75 L product/ha may in some cases give acceptable control. With generally lower weed densities and under conditions in Maritime and North-east EPPO climatic zone countries, the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha is fully justified as the minimum effective dose for the control of APESV in cereal crops by ADM.06001.H.2.B.

3.2.2.3 Minimum effective dose for control of Oat species (*Avena* spp.: AVESS)

A total of 24 trials carried out between 2018 and 2020 generated data on the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at a range of rates (0.25 L, 0.35 L, 0.5 L, 0.75 L and 1.0 L product/ha, 0.35 L, 0.5 L, 0.75 L and 1.0 L product/ha or 0.5 L, 0.75 L and 1.0 L product/ha) against Oat species in cereal crops.

The specific species of Oat occurring in these trials were *Avena fatua* (AVEFA) in 18 trials, *Avena sterilis* subsp. *ludoviciana* (AVELU) in 2 trials, *Avena sativa* (AVESA) on 1 trial and were not identified in the other 3 trials.

Single post-emergence applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) were made in the spring (between March and May) on all trials, when crop growth stages were in the range 22-39 (BBCH), and therefore representative of the proposed timings for the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B.

Of these trials, 7 were carried out in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (3 in Czech Republic, 4 in Germany), 6 were carried out in the North-east EPPO climatic zone (all in Poland) and 11 were carried out in the South-east EPPO climatic zone (6 in Hungary, 5 in Romania).

Across trials, the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) against Oat species has been tested in wide ranging locations, cultural practices, climatic conditions and weed biotypes, densities and growth stages that are fully representative of those in the spring in areas where cereal crops are grown in all countries relevant to this submission.

A summary of mean percentage efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at a range of rates against Oat species across trials in cereal crops in each of the climatic zones is given in Table 3.2-15.

Table 3.2-15: Dose justification; mean overall percentage efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72-OD) applied at a range of rates against Oat species across trials in cereal crops

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS at appl'n (BBCH)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	Assessment timing	No. of trials		Untreated			Mean % efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)					Statistical comparison (no. of trials)#	
						pl/m ²	% GC	heads/m ²	0.25 L/ha	0.35 L/ha	0.5 L/ha	0.75 L/ha	1.0 L/ha	1.0 L to 0.5 L/ha	1.0 L to 0.75 L/ha
AVEFA (18 trials)															
Maritime (6 trials) Winter cereals	10-35 (6)	7.8-23.5 pl/m ² (6)	Earlier assessments (22-28 DA-A) based on overall visual control	6	Mean	13.0 (5)	4.2 (5)	-	-	-	84.4	86.4	88.6	> (2), = (4)	= (6)
					Min-Max	8.3-25.0	1.0-7.0	-	-	-	40.0-95.5	48.0-98.0	58.0-98.0		
					S.D.	-	-	-	-	-	21.88	19.02	15.30		
				5	Mean	14.1 (4)	4.2 (5)	-	52.9 67.3	77.2	82.4	84.0	86.7	> (1), = (4)	= (5)
					Min-Max	8.3-25.0	1.0-7.0	-	35.8 79.5-90.0	35.0-90.0	40.0-95.5	48.0-95.8	58.0-98.0		
					S.D.	-	-	-	35.88	23.70	23.80	20.28	16.32		
			Later assessments (37-63 DA-A) based on numbers of weed seed heads	6	Mean	-	-	27.7 (6)	-	-	91.7	96.7	98.8	> (1), = (5)	= (6)
					Min-Max	-	-	5.0-50.0	-	-	52.0-100	80.0-100	93.0-100		
					S.D.	-	-	-	-	-	19.45	8.16	2.86		
				5	Mean	-	-	28.4 (5)	78.1 76.1	81.1	90.0	96.0	98.6	> (1), = (4)	= (5)
					Min-Max	-	-	5.0-50.0	36.0 26.0-100	35.0-100	52.0-100	80.0-100	93.0-100		
					S.D.	-	-	-	28.12	28.40	21.26	8.94	3.13		
North-east (4 trials) Winter cereals	10-30 (4)	7.0-20.0 pl/m ² (4)	Earlier assessments (21-27 DA-A) based on overall visual control	4	Mean	13.1 (4)	1.0 (1)	-	52.8	60.0	72.2	82.5	90.3	> (3), = (1)	> (2), = (2)
					Min-Max	7.5-18.0	-	-	35.0-70.0	50.0-77.5	60.0-86.3	65.0-93.8	82.5-97.5		
					S.D.	-	-	-	16.20	12.42	13.53	12.39	6.16		
			Later assessments (33-70 DA-A) based on numbers of weed seed heads	4	Mean	-	-	19.7 (4)	79.0	88.6	96.9	100	100	> (1), = (3)	= (4)
					Min-Max	-	-	9.0-24.8	44.3-100	64.7-100	88.6-100	100-100	100-100		
					S.D.	-	-	-	24.28	16.26	5.55	0.00	0.00		
South-east (8 trials) Winter cereals	11-45 (8)	5.0-19.5 pl/m ² (8)	Earlier assessments (13-28 DA-A) based on overall visual control	8	Mean	13.2 (7)	22.0 (5)	-	45.2	58.8	72.7	88.8	95.3	> (6), = (2)	> (4), = (4)
					Min-Max	5.0-20.0	15.0-30.0	-	10.0-86.3	25.0-92.5	46.3-98.8	66.3-100	82.5-100		
					S.D.	-	-	-	29.41	24.32	19.08	12.10	5.86		
			Later assessments (38-47 DA-A) based on overall visual control	2	Mean	12.2 (2)	22.5 (2)	-	83.2	91.3	98.2	100	100	= (2)	= (2)
					Min-Max	11.2-13.2	20.0-25.0	-	82.5-83.8	90.0-92.5	97.5-98.8	100-100	100-100		
					S.D.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
			Later assessments (32-57 DA-A) based on numbers of weed seed heads	5	Mean	-	-	25.0 (5)	33.4	48.9	66.5	89.1	96.7	> (5)	> (2), = (3)
					Min-Max	-	-	13.0-40.0	13.7-58.7	34.4-64.5	48.9-84.6	72.3-100	86.1-100		
					S.D.	-	-	-	17.13	10.99	12.72	10.27	6.03		
AVELU (2 trials)															
South-east (2 trials) Winter cereals	12-37 (2)	5.0-229.0 pl/m ² (2)	Earlier assessments (27-28 DA-A) based on overall visual control	2	Mean	63.0 (1)	6.0 (1)	-	43.8	53.2	66.3	79.9	95.0	> (2)	> (2)
					Min-Max	-	-	-	22.5-65.0	30.0-76.3	50.0-82.5	67.5-92.3	91.5-98.5		
			Later assessments (35-50 DA-A) based on numbers of weed seed heads	2	Mean	-	-	19.9 (2)	51.8	58.4	74.1	86.1	96.1	> (2)	= (2)
					Min-Max	-	-	19.8-20.0	30.0-73.6	39.0-77.9	63.0-85.2	80.0-92.2	95.0-97.3		

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS at appl'n (BBCH)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	Assessment timing	No. of trials		Untreated			Mean % efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)					Statistical comparison (no. of trials)#	
						pl/m²	% GC	heads/m²	0.25 L/ha	0.35 L/ha	0.5 L/ha	0.75 L/ha	1.0 L/ha	1.0 L to 0.5 L/ha	1.0 L to 0.75 L/ha
AVESA (1 trial)															
Maritime (1 trial) Spring cereals	22-23 (1)	75.3 pl/m² (1)	Earlier assessment (28 DA-A) based on overall visual control	HORVS 1	Mean	75.3 (1)	11.3 (1)	-	99.0	99.0	99.0	99.0	99.0	= (1)	= (1)
			Later assessment (39 DA-A) based on numbers of weed seed heads	HORVS 1	Mean	-	-	148.0 (1)	100	100	100	100	100	= (1)	= (1)
AVESS (3 trials)															
North-east (3 trials) Spring cereals	13 ⇔ (3)	7.0-14.0 pl/m² ⇔ (3)	Earlier assessments (21 DA-A) based on overall visual control	TRZAS 2	Mean	n/d (2)	n/d (2)	-	70.0	76.9	88.8	90.0	92.5	n/d (2)	n/d (2)
					Min-Max	-	-	-	70.0-70.0	76.3-77.5	88.8-88.8	90.0-90.0	92.5-92.5		
			Later assessments (55-68 DA-A) based on overall visual control	TRZAS 2	Mean	n/d (2)	n/d (2)	-	71.9	81.9	87.5	100	100	n/d (2)	n/d (2)
					Min-Max	-	-	-	71.3-72.5	81.3-82.5	87.5-87.5	100-100	100-100		
			Earlier assessments (21 DA-A) based on overall visual control	TRZAS 3	Mean	n/d (2)	n/d (2)	-	-	-	88.0	90	-	n/d (3)	n/d (3)
					Min-Max	-	-	-	-	-	86.3-88.8	90-90	-		
			Later assessments (55-68 DA-A) based on overall visual control	TRZAS 3	S.D.	-	-	-	-	-	1.2	0	-	n/d (3)	n/d (3)
					Mean	n/d (2)	n/d (2)	-	-	-	87.9	100	-		
		Min-Max	-	-	-	-	-	87.5-88.8	100-100	-					
		S.D.	-	-	-	-	-	0.61	0	-					
South-east (1 trial) Winter cereals	13.23 (1)	10.0 pl/m² (1)	Earlier assessment (14 DA-A) based on overall visual control	1	Mean	10.0 (1)	-	-	26.3	40.0	56.3	81.3	93.8	> (1)	> (1)
			Later assessment (37 DA-A) based on numbers of weed seed heads	1	Mean	-	-	22.5 (1)	36.1	48.2	62.3	80.7	94.3	> (1)	> (1)

No. of trials where >, = or <, based on statistically significant differences at 95% confidence level

Data generated in trials carried out across North-east and South-east EPPO climatic zones clearly show the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 1.0 product/ha against Oat species (AVEFA, AVELU, AVESS) in cereal crops to be generally higher and more consistent compared to that of lower rates of 0.75 L product/ha and below. Overall, whilst the 1.0 L product/ha rate of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) gave a higher overall level of efficacy compared to the 0.75 L product/ha across trials, differences were rarely statistically significant at the later assessments.

Data generated in trials carried out across the Maritime EPPO climatic zone clearly show the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at both 1.0 L and 0.75 L product/ha against AVEFA in cereal crops to be generally higher and more consistent compared to that of lower rates of 0.5 L product/ha and below, whilst no pronounced rate response was evident with all five rates giving an identical level of control of AVEFA on which data was generated on 1 of the trials.

Based on the presented data, it is therefore reasonable to conclude that the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha is fully justified as the minimum effective dose for the control of Oat species in cereal crops by ADM.06001.H.2.B under conditions in countries in the North-east and South-east EPPO climatic zones, but lower rates of down to 0.75 L product/ha may in some cases give acceptable control. With generally lower weed densities and under conditions in Maritime EPPO climatic zone countries, the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha is fully justified as the minimum effective dose for the control of Oat species in cereal crops by ADM.06001.H.2.B.

3.2.2.4 Minimum effective dose for control of Brome species (*Bromus* spp.: BROSS)

A total of 20 trials carried out between 2018 and 2020 generated data on the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at a range of rates (0.25 L, 0.35 L, 0.5 L, 0.75 L and 1.0 L product/ha or 0.5 L, 0.75 L and 1.0 L product/ha) against Brome species in cereal crops.

The specific species of Brome occurring in these trials were *Bromus secalinus* (BROSE) in 8 trials, *Bromus sterilis* (BROST) in 11 trials and were not identified in the other 1 trial.

Single post-emergence applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) were made in the spring (between March and May) on all trials, when crop growth stages were in the range 22-39 (BBCH), and therefore representative of the proposed timings for the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B.

Of these trials, 11 were carried out in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (3 in Czech Republic, 8 in Germany) and 9 were carried out in the South-east EPPO climatic zone (3 in Hungary, 6 in Romania).

Across trials, the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) against Brome species has been tested in wide ranging locations, cultural practices, climatic conditions and weed biotypes, densities and growth stages that are fully representative of those in the spring in areas where cereal crops are grown in all countries relevant to this submission.

Whilst no data to justify the minimum effective dose rate for control of Brome species have been generated in trials in cereal crops in the North-east EPPO climatic zone, data from trials performed in Czech Republic and Germany, which border Poland in the North-east EPPO climatic zone, are presented in support of justifying the minimum effective dose rate in Poland. Given the geographical proximity of the three countries, it is reasonable to consider that climatic conditions and weed biotypes and densities will be sufficiently analogous for ADM.06001.H.2.B to give similar efficacy and dose response in Poland (North-east EPPO climatic zone) to that given in trials carried out in Czech Republic (Maritime EPPO climatic zone) and Germany (Maritime EPPO climatic zone).

A summary of mean percentage efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at a range of rates against Brome species across trials in cereal crops in each of the climatic zones is given in Table 3.2-16.

Table 3.2-16: Dose justification; mean overall percentage efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72-OD) applied at a range of rates against Brome species across trials in cereal crops

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS at appl'n (BBCH)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	Assessment timing	No. of trials		Untreated			Mean % efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)					Statistical comparison (no. of trials)#	
						pl/m ²	% GC	heads/m ²	0.25 L/ha	0.35 L/ha	0.5 L/ha	0.75 L/ha	1.0 L/ha	1.0 L to 0.5 L/ha	1.0 L to 0.75 L/ha
BROSE (8 trials)															
Maritime (2 trials)	22-27 (2)	213.8-251.5 pl/m ² (2)	Earlier assessments (28 DA-A) based on overall visual control	2	Mean	232.6 (2)	29.4 (2)	-	-	-	48.9	61.7	70.4	> (2)	> (2)
					Min-Max	213.8-251.5	26.8-32.0	-	-	-	34.8-63.0	53.3-70.0	63.3-77.5		
			Later assessments (52-54 DA-A) based on numbers of weed seed heads	2	Mean	-	-	492.5 (2)	-	-	45.1	59.4	69.2	> (2)	> (2)
					Min-Max	-	-	447.8-537.3	-	-	31.8-58.3	50.5-68.3	61.3-77.0		
South-east (6 trials)	21-48 (6)	17.0-25.5 pl/m ² (6)	Earlier assessments (14-28 DA-A) based on overall visual control	5	Mean	21.7 (5)	20.0 (5)	-	-	-	67.5	80.3	91.0	> (5)	> (5)
					Min-Max	17.0-25.5	15.0-25.0	-	-	-	43.8-87.5	62.5-95.0	81.3-100		
					S.D.	-	-	-	-	-	18.82	13.53	8.79		
			Later assessments (44-48 DA-A) based on overall visual control	2	Mean	17.0	15.0	-	48.8	57.5	68.8	77.5	83.8	> (1)	> (1)
					Min-Max	22.9 (2)	25.0 (2)	-	-	-	83.8	93.8	100		
					Min-Max	20.2-25.5	25.0-25.0	-	-	-	80.0-87.5	92.5-95.0	100-100		
			Later assessments (14-52 DA-A) based on numbers of weed seed heads	4	Mean	-	-	35.6 (4)	-	-	45.8	64.6	79.9	> (4)	> (4)
					Min-Max	-	-	25.5-40.5	-	-	31.8-68.5	53.0-78.5	69.5-86.2		
					S.D.	-	-	-	-	-	15.82	10.95	7.36		
					Mean	-	-	25.5	45.0	55.7	68.5	78.5	86.2		
BROST (11 trials)															
Maritime (9 trials)	13-39 (9)	22.0-388.5 pl/m ² (9)	Earlier assessments (18-28 DA-A) based on overall visual control	9	Mean	167.8 (8)	29.2 (8)	-	-	-	35.8	44.1	54.4	> (8), = (1)	> (4), = (5)
					Min-Max	20.0-500.0	3.5-80.0	-	-	-	0.0-63.0	15.0-69.0	20.0-81.0		
					S.D.	-	-	-	-	-	18.79	18.94	20.73		
			Later assessments (37-81 DA-A) based on numbers of weed seed heads	9	Mean	-	-	301.1 (9)	-	-	43.5	56.0	67.7	> (5), = (4)	> (2), = (7)
					Min-Max	-	-	37.0-1083.8	-	-	12.4-90.9	27.3-95.2	41.9-97.8		
					S.D.	-	-	-	-	-	25.14	22.70	17.67		

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS at appl'n (BBCH)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	Assessment timing	No. of trials		Untreated			Mean % efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)					Statistical comparison (no. of trials)#	
						pl/m ²	% GC	heads/m ²	0.25 L/ha	0.35 L/ha	0.5 L/ha	0.75 L/ha	1.0 L/ha	1.0 L to 0.5 L/ha	1.0 L to 0.75 L/ha
South-east (2 trials)	13-25 (2)	13.0-73.0 pl/m ² (2)	Earlier assessments (27-29 DA-A) based on overall visual control	2	Mean	43.0 (2)	-	-	-	-	16.9	70.7	85.7	> (2)	> (2)
					Min-Max	12.5-21.3	-	-	-	-	12.5-21.3	68.8-72.5	82.5-88.8		
			Later assessments (46-49 DA-A) based on numbers of weed seed heads	2	Mean	-	-	207.2 (2)	-	-	15.1	41.8	66.4	> (2)	> (2)
					Min-Max	-	-	64.3-350.0	-	-	9.8-20.4	27.2-56.5	54.2-78.7		
BROSS (1 trial)															
South-east (1 trial)	38-55 (1)	6.0 pl/m ² (1)	Earlier assessment (15 DA-A) based on overall visual control	1	Mean	n/d (1)	n/d (1)	-	-	-	78.8	91.5	96.5	> (1)	> (1)
			Later assessment (21 DA-A) based on numbers of weed seed heads	1	Mean	-	-	18.3 (1)	-	-	79.9	90.3	97.3	> (1)	> (1)

No. of trials where >, = or <, based on statistically significant differences at 95% confidence level

Data generated in trials carried out across Maritime and South-east EPPO climatic zones clearly show the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 1.0 product/ha against Brome species (BRODI, BROSE, BROST, BROSS) in cereal crops to be generally higher and more consistent compared to that of lower rates of 0.75 L product/ha and below. Overall, the 1.0 L product/ha rate of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) gave a markedly higher overall level of efficacy compared to the 0.75 L product/ha across trials and differences were statistically significant in the majority of cases.

Based on the presented data, it is therefore reasonable to conclude that the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha is fully justified as the minimum effective dose for the control of Brome species in cereal crops by ADM.06001.H.2.B under conditions in countries in the Maritime, North-east and South-east EPPO climatic zones.

3.2.2.5 Minimum effective dose for control of Italian ryegrass (*Lolium multiflorum*: LOLMU)

A total of 21 trials carried out between 2018 and 2020 generated data on the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at a range of rates (0.25 L, 0.35 L, 0.5 L, 0.75 L and 1.0 L product/ha or 0.5 L, 0.75 L and 1.0 L product/ha) against LOLMU in cereal crops.

Single post-emergence applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) were made in the spring (between March and June) on all trials, when crop growth stages were in the range 21-39 (BBCH), and therefore representative of the proposed timings for the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B.

Of these trials, 12 were carried out within the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (4 in Czech Republic, 7 in France, 1 in Germany) and 9 were carried out within the South-east EPPO climatic zone (7 in Hungary, 2 in Romania).

Across trials, the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) against LOLMU has been tested in wide ranging locations, cultural practices, climatic conditions and weed biotypes, densities and growth stages that are fully representative of those in the spring in areas where cereal crops are grown in all countries relevant to this submission.

Whilst no data to justify the minimum effective dose rate for control of LOLMU have been generated in trials in cereal crops in the North-east EPPO climatic zone, data from trials performed in Czech Republic and Germany, which border Poland in the North-east EPPO climatic zone, are presented in support of justifying the minimum effective dose rate in Poland. Given the geographical proximity of the three countries, it is reasonable to consider that climatic conditions and weed biotypes and densities will be sufficiently analogous for ADM.06001.H.2.B to give similar efficacy and dose response in Poland (North-east EPPO climatic zone) to that given in trials carried out in Czech Republic (Maritime EPPO climatic zone) and Germany (Maritime EPPO climatic zone).

A summary of mean percentage efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at a range of rates against LOLMU across trials in cereal crops in the Maritime and South-east EPPO climatic zones is given in Table 3.2-17.

Table 3.2-17: Dose justification; mean overall percentage efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72-OD) applied at a range of rates against LOLMU across trials in cereal crops

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS at appl'n (BBCH)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	Assessment timing	No. of trials		Untreated			Mean % efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)					Statistical comparison (no. of trials)#	
						pl/m ²	% GC	heads/m ²	0.25 L/ha	0.35 L/ha	0.5 L/ha	0.75 L/ha	1.0 L/ha	1.0 L to 0.5 L/ha	1.0 L to 0.75 L/ha
Maritime (12 trials)	11-33 (12)	7.0-113.0 pl/m ² (12)	Earlier assessments (18-35 DA-A) based on overall visual control	ALL 12	Mean	46.0 (12)	22.9 (7)	-	-	-	58.8	65.5	71.2	> (6), = (6)	> (2), = (10)
					Min-Max	8.0-138.5	1.5-55.0	-	-	-	15.0-100	15.0-100	20.0-100		
					S.D.	-	-	-	-	-	30.49	31.64	29.24		
				TRZAS 3	Mean	64.0 (3)	34.7 (3)	-	-	-	61.7	78.3	88.3	> (3)	> (1), = (2)
					Min-Max	38.0-79.0	24.0-55.0	-	-	-	35.0-80.0	55.0-100	65.0-100		
					S.D.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
			TRZAW 8	Mean	40.0 (9)	14.0 (4)	-	-	-	-	57.9	61.2	65.4	> (3), = (6)	> (1), = (8)
					Min-Max	8-138.5	1.5-19.5	-	-	-	15.0-100	15.0-100	20.0-100		
					S.D.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
			Later assessment (55 DA-A) based on overall visual control	TRZAW 1	Mean	142.0 (1)	-	-	-	-	24.3	29.7	48.9	> (1)	> (1)
			Later assessments (35-92 DA-A) based on numbers of weed seed heads	ALL 11	Mean	-	-	63.3 (11)	-	-	68.8	82.2	87.0	> (7), = (4)	> (2), = (9)
					Min-Max	-	-	11.3-132.5	-	-	17.6-100	12.5-100	21.2-100		
					S.D.	-	-	-	-	-	27.40	26.73	25.31		
				TRZAS 3	Mean	-	-	71.5 (3)	-	-	81.3	92.6	100	> (3)	> (1), = (2)
					Min-Max	-	-	19.8-120.5	-	-	65.2-89.7	80.5-100	100-100		
					S.D.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
			TRZAW 8	Mean	-	-	60.3 (8)	-	-	-	64.1	78.2	82.2	> (4), = (4)	> (1), = (7)
					Min-Max	-	-	11.3-132.5	-	-	17.6-100	12.5-100	21.2-100		
South-east (9 trials)	12-48 (9)	7.0-199.0 pl/m ² (9)	Earlier assessments (23-28 DA-A) based on overall visual control	8	Mean	76.5 (8)	42.4 (7)	-	-	-	65.1	81.0	87.3	> (7), = (1)	> (4), = (4)
					Min-Max	10.0-199.0	7.5-75.0	-	-	-	45.0-82.5	63.8-100	71.0-100		
					S.D.	-	-	-	-	-	14.45	10.54	8.71		
			Later assessments (17-74 DA-A) based on numbers of weed seed heads	1	Mean	15.0 (1)	7.5 (1)	-	20.0	42.5	81.0	88.3	90.0	= (1)	= (1)
					Mean	-	-	309.9 (9)	-	-	67.5	91.3	97.4		
					Min-Max	-	-	11.3-1083.3	-	-	0.0-93.0	72.3-100	86.3-100		
					S.D.	-	-	-	-	-	28.21	8.49	4.89		
				1	Mean	-	-	100.0 (1)	0.0	0.0	0.0	95.0	99.0	> (1)	> (1)

No. of trials where >, = or <, based on statistically significant differences at 95% confidence level

Data generated in trials carried out across Maritime and South-east EPPO climatic zones clearly show the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 1.0 L product/ha against LOLMU in cereal crops to be generally higher and more consistent compared to that of lower rates of 0.75 L product/ha and below. Overall, whilst the 1.0 L product/ha rate of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) gave a higher overall level of efficacy compared to the 0.75 L product/ha across trials, differences were statistically only significant on 5 of the trials at the later assessments.

Based on the presented data, it is therefore reasonable to conclude that the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha is fully justified as the minimum effective dose for the control of LOLMU in cereal crops by ADM.06001.H.2.B under conditions in countries in the Maritime, North-east and South-east EPPO climatic zones, but lower rates of down to 0.75 L product/ha may in some cases give acceptable control.

3.2.2.6 Minimum effective dose for control of Perennial ryegrass (*Lolium perenne*: LOLPE)

Whilst no data are presented to justify the minimum effective dose rate for control of LOLPE from trials in cereal crops weed biotypes, densities and susceptibility to herbicides of this *Lolium* species and that of LOLMU in EU countries are considered to be sufficiently similar for data generated on the efficacy and dose response of ADM.06001.H.2.B on LOLMU to also provide supportive evidence of efficacy and dose response against LOLPE. Therefore, data generated on LOLMU in the Maritime (12 trials) and South-east (9 trials) EPPO climatic zones, as summarised in Section 3.2.2.5, are supportive of justifying the minimum effective dose rate for control of LOLPE within these climatic zones.

Whilst no data are presented to justify the minimum effective dose rate for control of LOLMU, and by extrapolation LOLPE, from trials in cereal crops in the North-east EPPO climatic zone, data from trials performed in Czech Republic and Germany, which border Poland in the North-east EPPO climatic zone, are presented in support of the label claim in Poland. Given the geographical proximity of the three countries, it is reasonable to consider that climatic conditions and weed biotypes and densities will be sufficiently analogous for ADM.06001.H.2.B to give similar efficacy and dose response in Poland (North-east EPPO climatic zone) to that given in trials carried out in Czech Republic (Maritime EPPO climatic zone) and Germany (Maritime EPPO climatic zone).

Based on extrapolation from data on LOLMU, it is therefore reasonable to propose that the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha is fully justified as the minimum effective dose for the control of LOLPE in cereal crops by ADM.06001.H.2.B under conditions in countries in the Maritime, North-east and South-east EPPO climatic zones, but lower rates of down to 0.75 L product/ha may in some cases give acceptable control.

3.2.2.7 Minimum effective dose for control of Annual meadowgrass (*Poa annua*: POAAN)

A total of 28 trials carried out between 2018 and 2020 generated data on the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at a range of rates (0.25 L, 0.35 L, 0.5 L, 0.75 L and 1.0 L product/ha, 0.35 L, 0.5 L, 0.75 L and 1.0 L product/ha or 0.5 L, 0.75 L and 1.0 L product/ha) against POAAN in cereal crops.

Single post-emergence applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) were made in the spring (between March and May) on all trials, when crop growth stages were in the range 22-39 (BBCH), and therefore representative of the proposed timings for the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B.

Of these trials, 13 were carried out within the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (2 in Czech Republic, 5 in France, 6 in Germany), 6 were carried out within the North-east EPPO climatic zone (all in Poland) and 9 were carried out within the South-east EPPO climatic zone (5 in Hungary, 4 in Romania).

Across trials, the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) against POAAN has been tested in wide ranging locations, cultural practices, climatic conditions and weed biotypes, densities and growth stages that are fully representative of those in the spring in areas where cereal crops are grown in all countries relevant to this submission.

A summary of mean percentage efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at a range of rates against POAAN across trials in cereal crops in each of the climatic zones is given in Table 3.2-18.

Table 3.2-18: Dose justification; mean overall percentage efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72-OD) applied at a range of rates against POAAN across trials in cereal crops

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS at appl'n (BBCH)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	Assessment timing	No. of trials		Untreated			Mean % efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)					Statistical comparison (no. of trials)#	
						pl/m ²	% GC	heads/m ²	0.25 L/ha	0.35 L/ha	0.5 L/ha	0.75 L/ha	1.0 L/ha	1.0 L to 0.5 L/ha	1.0 L to 0.75 L/ha
Maritime (13 trials)	12-65 (13)	5.3-35.0 pl/m ² (13)	Earlier assessments (22-33 DA-A) based on overall visual control	13	Mean	23.3 (12)	8.8 (8)	-	-	-	48.1	58.6	61.7	> (9), = (4)	> (3), = (10)
					Min-Max	5.3-81.8	2.4-23.8	-	-	-	10.0-95	10.0-98.6	25.0-99.8		
					S.D.	-	-	-	-	-	27.25	32.05	31.69		
				11	Mean	16.8 (10)	8.8 (8)	-	-	39.1	47.3	58.9	61.6	> (8) (6) , = (3) (5)	> (2), = (9)
					Min-Max	5.3-81.8	2.4-23.8	-	-	5.0-66.5	10.0-77.5	10.0-95.0	25.0-98.5		
					S.D.	-	-	-	-	17.81	22.91	29.70	30.42		
				8	Mean	16.4 (7)	7.9 (7)	-	17.6	35.8	43.7	57.6	59.7	> (5) (4) , = (3) (4)	> (1), = (7)
					Min-Max	5.3-81.8	2.4-23.8	-	0.0-44.3	5.0-52.5	10.0-77.5	10.0-95.0	25.0-98.5		
					S.D.	-	-	-	14.69	15.25	21.81	32.06	31.86		
			Later assessments (43-85 DA-A) based on overall visual control	10	Mean	18.7 (9)	12.4 (6)	-	-	-	66.2	78.3	83.7	> (7), = (3)	> (2), = (8)
					Min-Max	5.3-35.0	3.3-25.0	-	-	-	10.0-100	10.0-100	30.0-100		
					S.D.	-	-	-	-	-	27.22	27.56	23.17		
				9	Mean	17.3 (8)	12.4 (6)	-	-	50.5	62.5	75.9	81.8	> (7), = (2)	> (2), = (7)
					Min-Max	5.3-35.0	3.3-25.0	-	-	5.0-88.9	10.0-100	10.0-100	30.0-100		
					S.D.	-	-	-	-	22.65	25.98	28.09	23.81		
				6	Mean	17.4 (5)	9.9 (5)	-	25.7	41.2	54.3	71.2	79.9	> (6)	> (2), = (4)
					Min-Max	5.3-35.0	3.3-18.3	-	0.0-43.8	5.0-58.8	10.0-82.5	10.0-95.0	30.0-100		
					S.D.	-	-	-	19.69	18.87	23.95	31.93	26.96		
			Later assessments (41 DA-A) based on numbers of weed seed heads	2	Mean	-	-	21.0 (2)	56.5	63.0	59.5	62.5	61.0	= (2)	= (2)
					Min-Max	-	-	18.0-24.0	50.0-63.0	38.0-88.0	44.0-75.0	50.0-75.0	59.0-63.0		
North-east (6 trials)	14-59 (6)	5.0-20.5 pl/m ² (6)	Earlier assessments (26-29 DA-A) based on overall visual control	6	Mean	14.7 (6)	6.5 (4)	-	60.7	70.4	84.3	87.7	91.0	> (4), = (2)	> (2), = (4)
					Min-Max	5.0-22.0	1.0-9.5	-	51.3-72.5	56.3-85.0	70.0-91.3	72.5-93.8	77.5-100		
					S.D.	-	-	-	8.16	10.55	7.36	7.82	7.51		
			Later assessments (38-69 DA-A) based on overall visual control	6	Mean	16.4 (6)	6.5 (4)	-	71.8	77.5	86.4	90.9	95.1	> (4), = (2)	> (2), = (4)
					Min-Max	5.0-32.0	1.0-9.5	-	55.0-87.5	71.3-88.8	73.8-97.5	75.0-97.5	85.0-100		
					S.D.	-	-	-	10.86	7.07	7.60	8.47	6.25		
South-east (9 trials)	12-65 (9)	9.0-173.5 pl/m ² (9)	Earlier assessments (21-28 DA-A) based on overall visual control	9	Mean	45.4 (9)	16.8 (8)	-	44.3	51.5	69.5	80.4	88.9	> (9)	> (6), = (3)
					Min-Max	10.0-173.5	4.0-30.0	-	20.0-80.0	22.5-85.0	46.7-91.3	66.3-100	72.5-100		
					S.D.	-	-	-	22.70	23.09	13.32	11.11	10.08		
			Later assessments (39-71 DA-A) based on overall visual control	7	Mean	52.6 (7)	19.6 (6)	-	44.3	51.1	75.4	84.7	93.2	> (7)	> (4), = (3)
					Min-Max	10.0-173.5	3.8-31.7	-	20.0-73.8	20.0-83.8	58.8-93.8	68.3-100	82.5-100		
					S.D.	-	-	-	26.20	29.71	14.25	14.83	7.33		

No. of trials where >, = or <, based on statistically significant differences at 95% confidence level

Data generated in trials carried out across Maritime, North-east and South-east EPPO climatic zones clearly show the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 1.0 L product/ha against POAAN in cereal crops to be generally higher and more consistent compared to that of lower rates of 0.75 L product/ha and below. Overall, whilst the 1.0 L product/ha rate of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) gave a higher overall level of efficacy compared to the 0.75 L product/ha across trials, differences were statistically only significant on 8 of the trials at the later assessments.

Based on the presented data, it is therefore reasonable to conclude that the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha is fully justified as the minimum effective dose for the control of POAAN in cereal crops by ADM.06001.H.2.B under conditions in countries in the Maritime, North-east and South-east EPPO climatic zones, but lower rates of down to 0.75 L product/ha may in some cases give acceptable control.

3.2.2.8 Minimum effective dose for control of Rough-stalked meadowgrass (*Poa trivialis*: POATR)

A total of 1 trial carried out in 2020 generated data on the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at a range of rates (0.25 L, 0.35 L, 0.5 L, 0.75 L and 1.0 L product/ha) against POATR in cereal crops.

A single post-emergence application of ADM.06001.H.2.B was made in the spring in March on this trial, when the crop growth stage was at 29-31 (BBCH), and therefore representative of the proposed timings for the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B.

This trial was carried out within the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (in Germany).

On this trial, the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B against POATR has been tested in a location, cultural practices, climatic conditions and a weed biotype, density and growth stage that are representative of those in the spring in areas where cereal crops are grown in all countries relevant to this submission.

A summary of mean percentage efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at a range of rates against POATR on this trial in a cereal crop in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone is given in Table 3.2-19.

Table 3.2-19: Dose justification; mean overall percentage efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at a range of rates against POATR across trials in cereal crops

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS at appl'n (BBCH)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	Assessment timing	No. of trials		Untreated			Mean % efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B					Statistical comparison (no. of trials)#	
						pl/m ²	% GC	heads/m ²	0.25 L/ha	0.35 L/ha	0.5 L/ha	0.75 L/ha	1.0 L/ha	1.0 L to 0.5 L/ha	1.0 L to 0.75 L/ha
Maritime (1 trial)	17-31 (1)	106.0 pl/m ² (1)	Earlier assessment (29 DA-A) based on overall visual control	1	Mean	106.0 (1)	21.8 (1)	-	21.3	37.5	46.3	81.3	87.5	> (1)	= (1)
			Later assessment (72 DA-A) based on numbers of weed seed heads	1	Mean	-	-	427.5 (1)	36.2	50.9	77.7	94.1	98.0	> (1)	= (1)

No. of trials where >, = or <, based on statistically significant differences at 95% confidence level

Data generated in the 1 trial carried out in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone clearly show the efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD applied at 1.0 L product/ha against POATR in a cereal crop to be higher compared to that of the lower rates of 0.75 L product/ha and below. Whilst the 1.0 L product/ha rate of AG-PM1-72 OD gave higher levels of efficacy compared to the 0.75 L product/ha at both the earlier and later assessments, differences were not statistically significant.

Whilst limited data are presented to justify the minimum effective dose rate for control of POATR from trials in cereal crops in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone and no data were generated in the North-east and South-east EPPO climatic zones, weed biotypes, densities and susceptibility to herbicides of this *Poa* species and that of POAAN in EU countries are considered to be sufficiently similar for data generated on the efficacy and dose response of ADM.06001.H.2.B on POAAN to also provide supportive evidence of efficacy and dose response against POATR. Therefore, data generated on POAAN in the Maritime (13 trials), North-east (6 trials) and South-east (9 trials) EPPO climatic zones, as summarised in Section 3.2.2.7, are supportive of justifying the minimum effective dose rate for control of POATR within these climatic zones.

Based on the presented data, it is therefore reasonable to conclude that the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha is fully justified as the minimum effective dose for the control of POATR in cereal crops by ADM.06001.H.2.B under conditions in countries in the Maritime, North-east and South-east EPPO climatic zones, but lower rates of down to 0.75 L product/ha may in some cases give acceptable control.

A summary of the number of trials that generated data used to demonstrate minimum effective dose rates for control of representative broad-leaved weeds by ADM.06001.H.2.B in cereals are listed in the additional table 3.2.19 a.

Table 3.2-19 a: A summary of the number of trials used to demonstrate minimum effective dose rates for control of broad-leaved weeds by ADM.06001.H.2.B in cereals

Weed species	EPPO climatic zone	Crop	Country	Number of trials		
				Year		Total
				2018	2020	
ANTAR	North-east	TRZAW	Poland	2	-	2
	South-east	TRZAW	Hungary	1	-	1
BRSNW	Maritime	TRZAW	Germany	-	3	3
	North-east	TRZAW	Poland	-	6	6
CAPBP	Maritime	TRZAW	Czech Republic	1	5	12
			Germany	1	3	
		TRZAS	Czech Republic	-	2	
	North-east	TRZAW	Poland	-	5	5
	South-east	TRZAW	Hungary	1	2	3
DESSO	Maritime	TRZAW	Czech Republic	-	1	4
			Germany	-	1	
		SECCW	Germany	-	1	
		TTLWI	Germany	-	1	
SINAR	South-east	TRZAW	Hungary	-	1	2
		TRZDU	Hungary	1	-	
THLAR	Maritime	TRZAW	Czech Republic	1	3	6
			Germany	-	1	
		TRZAS	Czech Republic	-	1	
	North-east	TRZAW	Poland	1	1	2
	South-east	TRZDU	Hungary	1	-	1

MED trial results for the representative broad-leaved weed species: ANTAR, BRSNW, CAPBP, DESSO, SINAR and THLAR have been presented in the tables: 3.2-19b-3.2-19g.

Table 3.2-19b: Dose justification; mean overall percentage efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72-OD) applied at a range of rates against ANTAR across trials in cereal crops

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS at appl'n (BBCH)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	Assessment timing	No. of trials		Untreated		Mean % efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)					Statistical comparison (no. of trials)#	
						pl/m ²	% GC	0.25 L/ha	0.35 L/ha	0.5 L/ha	0.75 L/ha	1.0 L/ha	1.0 L to 0.5 L/ha	1.0 L to 0.75 L/ha
North-east (2 trials)	14-16 (2)	10.3-12.0 pl/m ² (2)	Earlier assessments (23 DA-A) based on overall visual control	2	Mean	12.7 (2)	1.0 (2)	62.5 (1)	71.3 (1)	76.3	86.3	92.0	> (2)	> (1), = (1)
					Min-Max	10.5-14.8	1.0-1.0	62.5	71.3	76.3-76.3	82.5-90.0	87.5-96.3		
South-east (1 trial)	19-33 (1)	7.0 pl/m ² (1)	Earlier assessments (23 DA-A) based on overall visual control	1	Mean	7.0 (1)	-	-	-	60.0	85.0	90.0	> (1)	> (1)
					Min-Max	7.0	-	-	-	60.0	85.0	90.0		
			Later assessments (51 DA-A) based on overall visual control	1	Mean	7.0 (1)	-	-	-	82.5	91.0	95.8	> (1)	> (1)
					Min-Max	7.0	-	-	-	82.5	91.0	95.8		

Table 3.2-19c: Dose justification; mean overall percentage efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72-OD) applied at a range of rates against BRSNW across trials in cereal crops

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS at appl'n (BBC H)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	Assessment timing	No. of trials		Untreated		Mean % efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)					Statistical comparison (no. of trials)#	
						pl/m ²	% GC	0.25 L/ha	0.35 L/ha	0.5 L/ha	0.75 L/ha	1.0 L/ha	1.0 L to 0.5 L/ha	1.0 L to 0.75 L/ha
Maritime (3 trials)	16-51 (3)	4.8-9.0 pl/m ² (3)	Earlier assessments (28-32 DA-A) based on overall visual control	3	Mean	6.7 (3)	3.1 (3)	90.8 (1)	92.0 (1)	72.0	82.5	82.5	> (1), = (2)	= (3)
					Min-Max	4.8-8.3	1.1-4.3	90.8	92.0	25.0-97.0	55.0-98.0	55.0-98.0		
					S.D.	-	-	-	-	33.3	19.5	19.5		
			Later assessments (58 DA-A) based on overall visual control	2	Mean	6.6 (2)	3.7 (2)	99.0 (1)	99.0 (1)	99.0 (2)	99.0 (2)	99.0 (2)	= (2)	= (2)
					Min-Max	4.8-8.3	3.5-3.8	99.0	99.0	98.0-99.0	98.0-99.0	98.0-99.0		
					S.D.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
North-east (6 trials)	12-35 (6)	5.0 - 8.3 pl/m ² (1)	Earlier assessments (21-28 DA-A) based on overall visual control	6	Mean	6.8 (6)	4.3 (5)	33.5 (4)	48.4 (4)	64.4	71.9	80.2	> (5), = (1)	> (2), = (4)
					Min-Max	5.0-9.3	1.0-8.0	0-71.3	0-72.5	0-87.8	2.5-97.5	35.0-98.3		
					S.D.	-	-	33.6	28.7	29.6	32.0	21.9		
			Later assessments (38-63 DA-A) based on overall visual control	6	Mean	6.8 (6)	4.3 (5)	33.5 (4)	48.5 (4)	64.7	72.7	81.2	> (5), = (1)	> (3), = (3)
					Min-Max	5.0-9.3	1.0-8.0	0-71.3	0-72.5	0-87.8	5.0-97.5	37.5-98.3		
					S.D.	-	-	33.6	28.7	29.7	31.1	20.9		

Table 3.2-19d: Dose justification; mean overall percentage efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72-OD) applied at a range of rates against CAPBP across trials in cereal crops

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS at appl'n (BBC H)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	Assessment timing	No. of trials		Untreated		Mean % efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)					Statistical comparison (no. of trials)#	
						pl/m ²	% GC	0.25 L/ha	0.35 L/ha	0.5 L/ha	0.75 L/ha	1.0 L/ha	1.0 L to 0.5 L/ha	1.0 L to 0.75 L/ha
Maritime (12 trials)	14-65 (12)	5.0-56.0 pl/m ² (12)	Earlier assessments (22-39 DA-A) based on overall visual control	ALL 12	Mean	10.6 (9)	5.9 (10)	47.0 (7)	54.7 (7)	65.2	72.7	82.3	> (10), = (2)	> (6), = (6)
					Min-Max	6.0-23.0	1.0-16.3	10.0-100	10.0-100	30.0-100	40.0-100	56.3-100		
					S.D.	-	-	35.8	33.5	21.6	19.7	15.7		
				TRZAS 2	Mean	6.9	5.3	-	-	65.0	72.5	75.7	> (2),	> (1), = (1)
					Min-Max	6.8-7.0	5.0-5.5	-	-	60.0-70.0	70.0-75.0	70.0-81.3		
				TRZAW 10	Mean	11.6 (7)	6.1 (8)	47.0 (7)	54.7 (7)	65.2	72.7	83.7	> (8), = (2)	> (5), = (5)
					Min-Max	6.0-23.0	1.0-16.3	10.0-100	10.0-100	30.0-100	40.0-100	56.3-100		
			Later assessments (35-84 DA-A) based on overall visual control	ALL 8	Mean	10.2 (6)	8.0 (6)	46.6 (4)	64.4 (4)	71.7	80.3	85.5	> (6), = (2)	> (4), < (1), = (3)
					Min-Max	6.8-17.0	4.0-17.3	10.0-100	15.0-100	30.0-100	40.0-100	60.0-100		
					S.D.	-	-	33.4	31.8	20.0	18.4	13.5		
				TRZAS 2	Mean	7.2	6.0	-	-	65.0	73.8	75.7	> (2),	> (1), = (1)
					Min-Max	6.8-7.5	5.0-7.0	-	-	60.0-70.0	70.0-77.5	70.0-81.3		
				TRZAW 6	Mean	11.7 (4)	8.9 (4)	46.6 (4)	64.4 (4)	74.0	82.5	88.8	> (4), = (2)	> (3), < (1), = (2)
					Min-Max	9.3-17.0	4.0-17.3	10.0-100	15.0-100	30.0-100	40.0-100	60.0-100		
North-east (5 trials)	14-61 (5)	7.0-21.0 pl/m ² (5)	Earlier assessments (21-29 DA-A) based on overall visual control	5	Mean	14.5 (5)	1.0 (1)	35.5	40.0	42.8	45.8	59.9	> (3), = (2)	> (2), = (3)
					Min-Max	7.0-25.0	1.0	0-73.8	0-88.8	0-90.0	0-95.0	32.0-97.5		
					S.D.	-	-	31.4	35.6	36.7	38.9	25.1		
			Later assessments (41-61 DA-A) based on overall visual control	5	Mean	14.3 (5)	1.0 (1)	31.0	39.5	42.8	49.5	65.5	> (3), = (2)	> (3), = (2)
					Min-Max	7.0-25.0	1.0	0-76.3	0-91.3	0-93.8	0-100	35.0-100		
					S.D.	-	-	33.3	36.3	37.6	40.7	26.3		
South-east (3 trials)	14-61 (3)	6-13.5 pl/m ² (3)	Earlier assessments (13-14 DA-A) based on overall visual control	3	Mean	8.2 (2)	3.5 (1)	-	-	52.5	61.7	71.4	> (3)	> (2), = (1)
					Min-Max	6.0-13.5	3.5	-	-	15.0-77.5	27.5-81.3	40.0-86.3		
					S.D.	-	-	-	-	27.0	24.3	22.2		
			Later assessments (28 DA-A) based on overall visual control	3	Mean	9.9 (2)	1.0 (1)	-	-	57.9	63.3	75.8	> (3)	> (3)
					Min-Max	6.3-13.5	1.0	-	-	30.0-81.3	30.0-85.0	47.5-92.5		
					S.D.	-	-	-	-	21.2	23.9	20.1		

Table 3.2-19e: Dose justification; mean overall percentage efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72-OD) applied at a range of rates against DESSO across trials in cereal crops

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS at appl'n (BBC H)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	Assessment timing	No. of trials		Untreated		Mean % efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)					Statistical comparison (no. of trials)#	
						pl/m ²	% GC	0.25 L/ha	0.35 L/ha	0.5 L/ha	0.75 L/ha	1.0 L/ha	1.0 L to 0.5 L/ha	1.0 L to 0.75 L/ha
Maritime (4 trials)	23-39 (4)	5.0-84.0 pl/m ² (4)	Earlier assessments (22-27 DA-A) based on overall visual control	4	Mean	54.3 (3)	10.7 (4)	56.3 (2)	66.3 (2)	66.1	72.1	79.8	> (2), = (2)	> (1), = (3)
					Min-Max	5.0-146.0	3.5-23.4	47.5-65.0	65.0-67.5	47.0-80.0	57.0-79.0	75.0-86.0		
					S.D.	-	-	-	-	12.0	9.0	4.2		
			Later assessments (40-60 DA-A) based on overall visual control	4	Mean	54.6 (3)	10.3 (4)	68.2 (2)	75.7 (2)	72.1	81.5	89.7	> (3), = (1)	> (1), = (3)
					Min-Max	6.0-146.0	2.5-22.2	55.0-81.3	65.0-86.3	48.3-92.8	65.8-92.5	82.0-95.8		
					S.D.	-	-	-	-	16.1	10.3	5.9		

Table 3.2-19 f: Dose justification; mean overall percentage efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72-OD) applied at a range of rates against SINAR across trials in cereal crops

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS at appl'n (BBC H)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	Assessment timing	No. of trials		Untreated		Mean % efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)					Statistical comparison (no. of trials)#	
						pl/m ²	% GC	0.25 L/ha	0.35 L/ha	0.5 L/ha	0.75 L/ha	1.0 L/ha	1.0 L to 0.5 L/ha	1.0 L to 0.75 L/ha
South-east (2 trials)	12-35 (2)	5.0-6.0 pl/m ² (2)	Earlier assessments (28 DA-A) based on overall visual control	2	Mean	5.0 (1)	-	-	-	78.8	81.3	88.2	> (1), = (1)	> (1), = (1)
					Min-Max	5.0	-	-	-	62.5-95.0	65.0-97.5	77.5-98.8		
			Later assessments (34-36 DA-A) based on overall visual control	2	Mean	5.3 (1)	-	-	-	80.6	82.3	88.5	> (1), = (1)	> (1), = (1)
					Min-Max	5.3	-	-	-	63.8-97.3	67.5-97.0	77.5-99.5		

Table 3.2-19 g: Dose justification; mean overall percentage efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72-OD) applied at a range of rates against THLAR across trials in cereal crops

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS at appl'n (BBC H)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	Assessment timing	No. of trials		Untreated		Mean % efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)					Statistical comparison (no. of trials)#	
						pl/m ²	% GC	0.25 L/ha	0.35 L/ha	0.5 L/ha	0.75 L/ha	1.0 L/ha	1.0 L to 0.5 L/ha	1.0 L to 0.75 L/ha
Maritime (6 trials)	17-65 (6)	7.0-43.3 pl/m ² (5)	Earlier assessments (15-28 DA-A) based on overall visual control	ALL 6	Mean	15.3 (5)	8.4 (5)	56.3 (3)	57.5 (3)	72.5	77.6	85.8	> (5), = (1)	> (4), = (2)
					Min-Max	7.3-44.3	4.0-20.3	18.8-100	22.5-100	37.5-100	37.5-100	50.0-100		
					S.D.	-	-	33.4	32.1	20.3	19.8	17.1		
				TRZAS 1	Mean	8.8	5.0	-	-	60.0	73.8	82.5	> (1)	> (1)
					Min-Max	8.8	5.0	-	-	60.0	73.8	82.5		
				TRZAW 5	Mean	16.9 (4)	9.2 (4)	56.3 (3)	57.5 (3)	75.0	78.4	86.4	> (4), = (1)	> (3), = (2)
					Min-Max	7.3-44.3	4.0-20.3	18.8-100	22.5-100	37.5-100	37.5-100	50.0-100		
			Later assessments (35-97 DA-A) based on overall visual control	5	Mean	15.4 (5)	9.1 (4)	75.0 (2)	85.0 (2)	84.0	86.5	95.3	> (4), = (1)	> (3), = (2)
					Min-Max	7.3-45.0	4.0-22.5	50.0-100	70.0-100	70.0-100	75.0-100	82.5-100		
					S.D.	-	-	-	-	10.3	9.1	6.8		
				TRZAS 1	Mean	8.8	5.0	-	-	70.0	75.0	82.5	> (1)	> (1)
					Min-Max	8.8	5.0	-	-	70.0	75.0	82.5		
				TRZAW 4	Mean	17.1 (4)	10.5 (3)	75.0 (2)	85.0 (2)	87.6	89.4	98.5	> (3), = (1)	> (2), = (2)
					Min-Max	7.3-45.0	4.0-22.5	50.0-100	70.0-100	80.0-100	81.3-100	94.0-100		
North-east (2 trials)	14-30 (2)	5.8-6.0 pl/m ² (2)	Earlier assessments (27-28 DA-A) based on overall visual control	2	Mean	6.4 (2)	5.5 (2)	15.0 (1)	22.5 (1)	55.0	61.3	83.5	> (2)	> (2)
					Min-Max	6.0-6.8	5.0-6.0	15.0	22.5	35.0-75.0	41.3-81.3	77.5-89.5		
			Later assessments (38-44 DA-A) based on overall visual control	2	Mean	6.4 (2)	5.5 (2)	16.3 (1)	25.0 (1)	55.7	61.3	83.9	> (2)	> (2)
					Min-Max	6.0-6.8	5.0-6.0	16.3	25.0	36.3-75.0	41.3-81.3	78.3-89.5		
South-east (1 trial)	18-31 (1)	7.0 pl/m ² (1)	Earlier assessments (28 DA-A) based on overall visual control	1	Mean	-	-	-	-	95.0	97.0	100	> (1)	= (1)
					Min-Max	-	-	-	-	95.0	97.0	100		
			Later assessments (34 DA-A) based on overall visual control	1	Mean	-	-	-	-	97.3	97.0	100	= (1)	= (1)
					Min-Max	-	-	-	-	95.0	97.0	100		

Comments of zRMS on: Minimum effective dose (3.2.2)

One hundred forty two efficacy trials conducted between 2018 and 2020 in 3 EPPO zones: Maritime (MAR), North-East (NE) and South-East (SE) present data to determine the Minimum Effective Dose (MED) of ADM.06001.H.2.B. The trials were carried out with ADM.06001.H.2.B or its earlier version AG-PM1-72 OD. The similarity between ADM.06001.H.2.B and AG-PM1-72 OD has been demonstrated in a series of bridging trials presented in a separate chapter (Preliminary tests (3.2.1)). For simplification, only the code name ADM.06001.H.2.B will be used in the assessment. ADM.06001.H.2.B was tested in a range of dose rates: 0.25 L/ha, 0.35 L/ha, 0.5 L/ha, 0.75 L/ha and 1.0 L/ha. Dose rates 0.25 L/ha and 0.35 L/ha were tested in about half of trials performed, while dose rates 0.5 L/ha and 0.75 L/ha were tested in all 142 MED trials. The target dose rate is 1.0 L/ha and lower dose rates correspond to 25%, 35%, 50% and 75% of the target dose rate 1.0 L/ha respectively. As indicated in the EPPO guideline PP 1/225 (2) Minimum effective dose, information on MED is required for a range of targets which are considered to be the most important, and for which control provides the major agricultural benefit. As it was stated by the applicant, the primary targets for ADM.06001.H.2.B were grass weeds and data in 3.2.2 chapter have been presented only for ALOMY, APESV, AVEFA, AVELU, AVESA, AVESV, BROSE, BROST, BROSS, LOLMU, POAAN, POAATR.

Based on the submitted trial results, the dose rate of 1.0 L/ha of ADM.06001.H.2.B has been determined as MED for ALOMY, BROSS, LOLMU and POAAN in MAR, NE and SE EPPO zone; for APESV only in SE EPPO zone and for AVESV in NE and SE EPPO zone, while the lower dose rate of 0.75 L/ha has been determined as MED for APESV in Maritime and North-East zone, and for AVESV in Maritime EPPO zone. Lower dose rates: 0.25 L/ha, 0.35 L/ha and 0.5 L/ha were visibly less effective as compared to the dose rates 0.75 and 1.0 L/ha.

At the request of cMS DE, additional data regarding MED trial results have been presented for the representative broad-leaved weed species: ANTAR, BRSNW, CAPBP, DESSO, SINAR and THLAR in the tables: 3.2-19a-3.2-19g. The increase of efficacy with increasing dose rate was clearly demonstrated for broad-leaved weed species. Dose rate of 1.0 L/ha of ADM.06001.H.2.B was justified as MED for ANTAR (in NE and SE EPPO zone), BRSNW (in NE EPPO zone), CAPBP (in MAR, NE and SE EPPO zone), DESSO (in MAR EPPO zone), SINAR (in SE EPPO zone) and for THLAR (in MAR and N-E EPPO zone).

Based on the efficacy results, it can be concluded, that the minimum effective dose rate 1.0 L/ha has been justified for the most target weed species. Lower dose rate 0.75 was the minimum effective dose for some weed species in some zones and can be also recommended, giving satisfying efficacy results. Information on weed susceptibility depending on the recommended dose rate of ADM.06001.H.2.B and EPPO zone has been presented in a separate chapter (Efficacy tests (3.2.3)).

3.2.3 Efficacy tests (KCP 6.2)

A total of 172 trials carried out between 2018 and 2020 have generated data on the efficacy of a single spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against target grass and broad-leaved weeds in cereals.

Of these 172 trials, 20 trials also generated data on the efficacy in a spray program with ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied in spring at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha following an autumn application of a post-emergence herbicide against target grass and broad-leaved weeds in cereals.

All trials carried out to demonstrate the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) against target grass and broad-leaved weeds in cereals are listed in Table 3.2-20.

Table 3.2-20: List of trials carried out to demonstrate the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) against target grass and broad-leaved weeds in cereals

Trial number	EPPO climatic zone	Country	Year trial conducted	Crop	Targets	ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) rates included in trial (L/ha)
FR18HEYCERW551C ^a	Maritime	France	2018	TRZAW	ALOMY, LOLMU ^c	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
DE20HENNNGW172E ^a	Maritime	Germany	2020	TRZAW	BROST, DESSO	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
FR20HETRZAW553A ^a	Maritime	France	2020	TRZAW	POAAN	0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0

Trial number	EPPO climatic zone	Country	Year trial conducted	Crop	Targets	ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) rates included in trial (L/ha)
CZ20HETRZAW002A ^a	Maritime	Czech Republic	2020	TRZAW	APESV, LOLMU, CAPBP, THLAR	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
DE20HENNNGW173A ^a	Maritime	Germany	2020	TRZAW	BROST, CAPBP	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
CZ18HETRZAW076A ^a	Maritime	Czech Republic	2018	TRZAW	APESV, POAAN, CAPBP	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
DE20HENNNGW171C	Maritime	Germany	2020	TRZAW	APESV ^c , CAPBP ^c , STEME	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
DE20HENNNGW174B ^a	Maritime	Germany	2020	TRZAW	ALOMY, POAAN, CAPBP	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
FR18HEYCERW551D ^a	Maritime	France	2018	TRZAW	ALOMY, STEME	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
CZ20HETRZAW004B ^a	Maritime	Czech Republic	2020	TRZAW	AVEFA, DESSO	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
DE20HENNNGW170D ^{ab}	Maritime	Germany	2020	SECCW	ALOMY, DESSO	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
DE20HENNNGW174C ^a	Maritime	Germany	2020	TRZAW	POAAN, POATR	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
CZ20HETRZAW007A ^a	Maritime	Czech Republic	2020	TRZAW	APESV, POAAN, CAPBP	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
CZ20HETRZAW005A ^a	Maritime	Czech Republic	2020	TRZAW	BROST	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
DE20HENNNGW172D ^{ab}	Maritime	Germany	2020	TRZAW	AVEFA	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
CZ18HETRZAW070A ^a	Maritime	Czech Republic	2018	TRZAW	APESV, CAPBP, THLAR	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
FR18HEYCERW557B ^a	Maritime	France	2018	TRZAW	ALOMY, LOLMU	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
DE20HENNNGW171D ^a	Maritime	Germany	2020	TRZAW	ALOMY, APESV, CAPBP ^c , THLAR	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
DE18HENNNGG187L ^a	Maritime	Germany	2018	HORVS	AVESA	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
DE18HENNNGG188N	Maritime	Germany	2018	HORVS	AVESA	0.5, 0.75
FR18HEYCERW557D ^a	Maritime	France	2018	TRZAW	LOLMU, KAPPA	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
CZ20HETRZAS002B ^a	Maritime	Czech Republic	2020	TRZAS	LOLMU, CAPBP	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
DE20HENNNGW171B ^a	Maritime	Germany	2020	TRZAW	APESV	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
FR20HETRZAW552F ^a	Maritime	France	2020	TRZAW	LOLMU	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
DE18HENNNGG185F ^a	Maritime	Germany	2018	TRZAW	APESV	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
FR20HETRZAW551A ^a	Maritime	France	2020	TRZAW	ALOMY	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
DE20HENNNGW173B ^{ab}	Maritime	Germany	2020	TTLWI	BROST	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
DE18HENNNGG191R ^a	Maritime	Germany	2018	HORVW	BROST	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
DE20HENNNGW171A ^a	Maritime	Germany	2020	TTLWI	APESV, DESSO	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
DE20HENNNGW173D ^a	Maritime	Germany	2020	TRZAW	BROST, LOLMU	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
DE18HENNNGG193V ^a	Maritime	Germany	2018	TRZAW	POAAN, BRSNW ^c , CAPBP	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
DE20HENNNGW170B ^{ab}	Maritime	Germany	2020	TRZAW	ALOMY	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
FR18HEYCERW553B ^a	Maritime	France	2018	TRZAW	LOLMU, POAAN	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
FR18HEYCERW555B ^a	Maritime	France	2018	TRZAW	ALOMY	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
DE20HENNNGW174D ^{ab}	Maritime	Germany	2020	TRZAW	POAAN, BRSNW, STEME	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
DE18HENNNGG193W ^a	Maritime	Germany	2018	TRZAW	POAAN	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
DE18HENNNGG191P ^a	Maritime	Germany	2018	TRZAW	BROSE	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
CZ20HETRZAS002C ^a	Maritime	Czech Republic	2020	TRZAS	LOLMU, CAPBP, THLAR	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
FR18HEYCERW551E ^a	Maritime	France	2018	TRZAW	ALOMY, LOLMU ^c	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
CZ20HETRZAW005B ^a	Maritime	Czech Republic	2020	TRZAW	BROST	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
CZ20HETRZAW003B ^a	Maritime	Czech Republic	2020	TRZAW	APESV, CAPBP, THLAR	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
DE20HENNNGW172B ^a	Maritime	Germany	2020	TRZAW	AVEFA	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
FR18HEYCERW558A	Maritime	France	2018	TRZAW	LOLMU	0.75, 1.0
CZ18HETRZAW074A ^a	Maritime	Czech Republic	2018	TRZAW	BROST	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
CZ20HETRZAW002D ^a	Maritime	Czech Republic	2020	TRZAW	APESV, AVEFA, LOLMU, THLAR	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
DE20HENNNGW170C ^a	Maritime	Germany	2020	TRZAW	ALOMY, CAPBP	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
DE18HENNNGG191Q ^a	Maritime	Germany	2018	TRZAW	BROSE	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
CZ20HETRZAW003A ^a	Maritime	Czech Republic	2020	TRZAW	APESV, CAPBP, STEME	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
FR18HEYCERE568B ^a	Maritime	France	2018	TRZAS	LOLMU	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
CZ20HETRZAW003C ^a	Maritime	Czech Republic	2020	TRZAW	APESV, CAPBP, STEME	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
FR18HEYCERW552F ^a	Maritime	France	2018	TRZAW	LOLMU, STEME	0.75, 1.0
DE20HENNNGW172A ^a	Maritime	Germany	2020	TTLWI	AVEFA	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
FR20HETRZAW551B ^a	Maritime	France	2020	TRZAW	ALOMY	0.5, 0.75, 1.0

Trial number	EPPO climatic zone	Country	Year trial conducted	Crop	Targets	ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PMI-72 OD) rates included in trial (L/ha)
DE20HENNGW171E ^a	Maritime	Germany	2020	TRZAW	APESV, POAAN	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
DE20HENNGW170E ^a	Maritime	Germany	2020	TRZAW	ALOMY, BRSNW	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
DE20HENNGW170A ^{ab}	Maritime	Germany	2020	TRZAW	ALOMY	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
FR18HEYCERW554A	Maritime	France	2018	TRZAW	ALOMY ^c , APESV ^c	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
FR20HETRZAW553C ^a	Maritime	France	2020	TRZAW	POAAN, ANGAR , STEME	0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
FR20HETRZAW552E ^a	Maritime	France	2020	TRZAW	LOLMU, POAAN, RAPPA	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
FR20HETRZAW553B ^a	Maritime	France	2020	TRZAW	POAAN, STEME	0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
DE20HENNGW174A	Maritime	Germany	2020	TRZAW	APESV ^c , STEME	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
CZ20HETRZAW004A ^a	Maritime	Czech Republic	2020	TRZAW	AVEFA	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
DE18HENNGG185G ^a	Maritime	Germany	2018	TRZAW	APESV, BRSNW	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
DE18HENNGG185H ^a	Maritime	Germany	2018	TRZAW	APESV, STEME	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
FR18HEYCERW556B	Maritime	France	2018	TRZAW	ALOMY, STEME	0.75, 1.0
DE20HENNGW173C ^{ab}	Maritime	Germany	2020	TRZAW	APESV, BROST, BRSNW	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
DE18HENNGG183A ^a	Maritime	Germany	2018	TRZAW	ALOMY	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
DE18HENNGG183B ^a	Maritime	Germany	2018	TRZAW	ALOMY	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
FR20HETRZAW551C ^a	Maritime	France	2020	TRZAW	ALOMY, STEME	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
FR20HETRZAW551D ^a	Maritime	France	2020	TRZAW	ALOMY	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
PL18HETRZAS010A ^a	North-east	Poland	2018	TRZAS	AVESS	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
PL18HETRZAS010B ^a	North-east	Poland	2018	TRZAS	AVESS	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
PL18HETRZAS013B	North-east	Poland	2018	TRZAS	AVESS	0.5, 0.75
PL18HETRZAW008A ^a	North-east	Poland	2018	TRZAW	ALOMY	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
PL18HETRZAW008B ^a	North-east	Poland	2018	TRZAW	ALOMY	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
PL18HETRZAW008C ^a	North-east	Poland	2018	TRZAW	ALOMY, APESV, ANTAR, STEME	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
PL18HETRZAW009A ^a	North-east	Poland	2018	TRZAW	APESV	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
PL18HETRZAW009B ^a	North-east	Poland	2018	TRZAW	APESV	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
PL18HETRZAW009C ^a	North-east	Poland	2018	TRZAW	APESV, ANTAR, STEME	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
PL18HETRZAW011A	North-east	Poland	2018	TRZAW	ALOMY, THLAR	0.75, 1.0
PL18HETRZAW014A ^a	North-east	Poland	2018	TRZAW	APESV, POAAN, THLAR	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
PL18HETRZAW014B ^a	North-east	Poland	2018	TRZAW	APESV, POAAN, STEME	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
PL20HETRZAW007A ^a	North-east	Poland	2020	TRZAW	ALOMY, APESV	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
PL20HETRZAW007B ^a	North-east	Poland	2020	TRZAW	ALOMY	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
PL20HETRZAW007C ^a	North-east	Poland	2020	TRZAW	ALOMY, BRSNW	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
PL20HETRZAW007D ^a	North-east	Poland	2020	TRZAW	ALOMY, BRSNW, THLAR	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
PL20HETRZAW008A ^a	North-east	Poland	2020	TRZAW	APESV, BRSNW, CAPBP	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
PL20HETRZAW008B ^a	North-east	Poland	2020	TRZAW	APESV, STEME	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
PL20HETRZAW008C ^a	North-east	Poland	2020	TRZAW	APESV	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
PL20HETRZAW008D ^a	North-east	Poland	2020	TRZAW	APESV, CAPBP	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
PL20HETRZAW009A ^a	North-east	Poland	2020	TRZAW	AVEFA, CAPBP, STEME	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
PL20HETRZAW009B ^a	North-east	Poland	2020	TRZAW	AVEFA, BRSNW	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
PL20HETRZAW009C ^a	North-east	Poland	2020	TRZAW	APESV, AVEFA	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
PL20HETRZAW009D ^a	North-east	Poland	2020	TRZAW	AVEFA	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
PL20HETRZAW010A ^a	North-east	Poland	2020	TRZAW	APESV, POAAN, CAPBP, STEME	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
PL20HETRZAW010B ^a	North-east	Poland	2020	TRZAW	APESV, POAAN	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
PL20HETRZAW010C ^a	North-east	Poland	2020	TRZAW	APESV, POAAN, BRSNW	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
PL20HETRZAW010D ^a	North-east	Poland	2020	TRZAW	POAAN, BRSNW, CAPBP, STEME	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
PL20HETRZAX015A	North-east	Poland	2020	TRZAW	ALOMY, APESV	1.0
HU18HEYCERE111A ^a	South-east	Hungary	2018	TRZDU	ALOMY, SINAR, THLAR	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
HU18HEYCERE111B ^a	South-east	Hungary	2018	TRZAW	ALOMY, CAPBP, STEME	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
HU18HEYCERE113A ^a	South-east	Hungary	2018	TRZAW	AVELU	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
HU18HEYCERE113B ^a	South-east	Hungary	2018	TRZDU	AVEFA, AVELU	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
HU18HEYCERE114A ^a	South-east	Hungary	2018	TRZAW	BROSS	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
HU18HEYCERE115A ^a	South-east	Hungary	2018	TRZAW	LOLMU, BRSNW ^c	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
HU18HEYCERE115B ^a	South-east	Hungary	2018	TTLWI	LOLMU, STEME ^c	0.5, 0.75, 1.0

Trial number	EPPO climatic zone	Country	Year trial conducted	Crop	Targets	ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) rates included in trial (L/ha)
HU18HEYCERE115C ^a	South-east	Hungary	2018	TRZAW	APESV, LOLMU, ANTAR, STEME	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
HU18HEYCERE116A ^a	South-east	Hungary	2018	TRZAW	POAAN	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
HU18HEYCERE116B ^a	South-east	Hungary	2018	TRZAW	POAAN, STEME	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
HU20HETRZAW202A ^a	South-east	Hungary	2020	TRZAW	APESV, STEME	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
HU20HETRZAW202B ^a	South-east	Hungary	2020	TRZAW	APESV	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
HU20HETRZAW202C ^a	South-east	Hungary	2020	TRZAW	APESV	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
HU20HETRZAW203A ^a	South-east	Hungary	2020	TRZAW	AVEFA	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
HU20HETRZAW203B ^a	South-east	Hungary	2020	TRZAW	AVEFA	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
HU20HETRZAW203C ^a	South-east	Hungary	2020	TRZAW	AVESS	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
HU20HETRZAW204A ^a	South-east	Hungary	2020	TRZAW	BROST, STEME	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
HU20HETRZAW204B ^a	South-east	Hungary	2020	TRZAW	BROST	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
HU20HETRZAW205A ^a	South-east	Hungary	2020	TRZDU	LOLMU	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
HU20HETRZAW205B ^a	South-east	Hungary	2020	TRZAW	LOLMU	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
HU20HETRZAW205C ^a	South-east	Hungary	2020	TRZAW	LOLMU, CAPBP	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
HU20HETRZAW206A ^a	South-east	Hungary	2020	TRZAW	APESV, LOLMU, POAAN, STEME	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
HU20HETRZAW206B ^a	South-east	Hungary	2020	TRZAW	APESV, POAAN, STEME	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
HU20HETRZAW206C ^a	South-east	Hungary	2020	TRZAW	POAAN, STEME	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
HU20HETRZAW201A ^a	South-east	Hungary	2020	TRZAW	ALOMY, CAPBP	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
HU20HETRZAW201B ^a	South-east	Hungary	2020	TRZAW	ALOMY	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
HU20HETRZAW201C ^a	South-east	Hungary	2020	TRZAW	ALOMY, SINAR	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
RO18HEYCERW057A ^a	South-east	Romania	2018	TRZAW	ALOMY, STEME	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
RO18HEYCERW057B ^a	South-east	Romania	2018	TTLWI	ALOMY	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
RO18HEYCERW059A ^a	South-east	Romania	2018	TRZAW	APESV	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
RO18HEYCERW059B ^a	South-east	Romania	2018	TTLWI	APESV	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
RO18HEYCERW061A ^a	South-east	Romania	2018	TTLWI	AVEFA, STEME ^c	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
RO18HEYCERW061B ^a	South-east	Romania	2018	TRZAW	AVEFA, STEME, SINAR ^c	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
RO18HEYCERW063A ^a	South-east	Romania	2018	TRZAW	BROSE	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
RO18HEYCERW063B ^a	South-east	Romania	2018	TRZAW	BROST BROSE	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
RO18HEYCERW065A ^a	South-east	Romania	2018	TRZAW	POAAN	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
RO18HEYCERW066A ^a	South-east	Romania	2018	TRZAW	POAAN, STEME ^c	0.5, 0.75
RO20HETRZAW227A ^a	South-east	Romania	2020	TRZAW	ALOMY, STEME	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
RO20HETRZAW227B ^a	South-east	Romania	2020	TRZAW	ALOMY, STEME ^c	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
RO20HETRZAW228A ^a	South-east	Romania	2020	TRZAW	LOLMU, STEME ^c	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
RO20HETRZAW228B ^a	South-east	Romania	2020	TRZAW	LOLMU, STEME	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
RO20HETRZAW230A ^a	South-east	Romania	2020	TRZAW	APESV, BROSE	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
RO20HETRZAW230B ^a	South-east	Romania	2020	TRZAW	APESV, STEME	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
RO20HETRZAW230C ^a	South-east	Romania	2020	TRZAW	APESV, STEME	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
RO20HETRZAW234A ^a	South-east	Romania	2020	TRZAW	AVEFA, STEME ^c	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
RO20HETRZAW234B ^a	South-east	Romania	2020	TRZAW	AVEFA, STEME ^a	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
RO20HETRZAW234C ^a	South-east	Romania	2020	TRZAW	AVEFA, STEME ^c	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
RO20HETRZAW235A ^a	South-east	Romania	2020	TRZAW	APESV, BROSE	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
RO20HETRZAW235B ^a	South-east	Romania	2020	TRZAW	APESV, BROSE	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
RO20HETRZAW235C ^a	South-east	Romania	2020	TRZAW	APESV, BROSE	0.5, 0.75, 1.0
RO20HETRZAW236A ^a	South-east	Romania	2020	TRZAW	POAAN	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
RO20HETRZAW236B ^a	South-east	Romania	2020	TRZAW	POAAN	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
RO20HETRZAW236C ^a	South-east	Romania	2020	TRZAW	POAAN	0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0
CZ18HETRZAW113A	Maritime	Czech Republic	2018-2019	TRZAW	BROST BRSSN	0.75, 1.0 (alone and in program)
DE18HETRZAW195A	Maritime	Germany	2018-2019	TRZAW	ALOMY, BRSSN	0.75, 1.0 (alone and in program)
DE18HETRZAW195B	Maritime	Germany	2018-2019	TRZAW	ALOMY, STEME	0.75, 1.0 (alone and in program)
FR18HEYCERW561A	Maritime	France	2018-2019	TRZAW	ALOMY ^c	0.75, 1.0 (alone and in program)
FR18HEYCERW561F	Maritime	France	2018-2019	TRZAW	ALOMY ^c	0.75, 1.0 (alone and in program)
FR19HEYCERW561A	Maritime	France	2019-2020	TRZAW	ALOMY	0.75, 1.0 (alone and in program)
FR19HEYCERW561C	Maritime	France	2019-2020	TRZAW	ALOMY, STEME ^c	0.75, 1.0 (alone and in program)
FR19HEYCERW562D	Maritime	France	2019-2020	TRZAW	LOLMU	0.75, 1.0 (alone and in program)
HU18HETRZAW800A	South-east	Hungary	2018-2019	TRZAW	ALOMY	0.75, 1.0 (alone and in program)
HU18HETRZAW800B	South-east	Hungary	2018-2019	TRZAW	ALOMY, STEME ^c	0.75, 1.0 (alone and in program)
HU18HETRZAW801A	South-east	Hungary	2018-2019	TRZAW	LOLMU ^c	0.75, 1.0 (alone and in program)
HU18HETRZAW801B	South-east	Hungary	2018-2019	TRZAW	LOLMU, STEME	0.75, 1.0 (alone and in program)
HU19HETRZAW006A	South-east	Hungary	2019-2020	TRZAW	ALOMY	0.75, 1.0 (alone and in program)
HU19HETRZAW007A	South-east	Hungary	2019-2020	TRZAW	LOLMU	0.75, 1.0 (alone and in program)
HU19HETRZAW007B	South-east	Hungary	2019-2020	TRZAW	LOLMU, CAPBP	0.75, 1.0 (alone and in program)
HU19HETRZAW008A	South-east	Hungary	2019-2020	TRZAW	APESV	0.5, 1.0 (alone and in program)
PL19HETRZAW501A	North-east	Poland	2019-2020	TRZAW	ALOMY, BRSSN	0.75, 1.0 (alone and in program)
PL19HETRZAW501B	North-east	Poland	2019-2020	TRZAW	APESV, STEME	0.5, 1.0 (alone and in program)

Trial number	EPPO climatic zone	Country	Year trial conducted	Crop	Targets	ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) rates included in trial (L/ha)
RO19HETRZAW208A	South-east	Romania	2019-2020	TRZAW	BROST, THLAR ^c	0.75, 1.0 (alone and in program)
RO19HETRZAW208B	South-east	Romania	2019-2020	TRZAW	BROSE, STEME ^b	0.75, 1.0 (alone and in program)

^a Data from trial also used to justify minimum effective dose in Section 3.2.2

^b Data from trial also used demonstrate comparability between the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B and that of AG-PM1-72 OD in Section 3.2.1.3

^c Data from trial not considered to be valid and excluded from overall summaries in this Section

All efficacy trials were carried out by organisations that are officially recognised as competent to carry out efficacy testing in accordance with Regulation (EU) 284/2013 by the authorities in the relevant countries.

Table 3.2-21: Details on trial methodology

Maritime EPPO climatic zone		
Guidelines	General guidelines	EPPO PP1/152 (3/4), EPPO PP1/181 (3/4), EPPO PP1/135 (3/4), PP 1/225(1/2)
	Specific guidelines	EPPO PP1/93 (2/3), CEB M013
Experimental design	Plot design	RCBD (78)
	Plot size	10-30 m ² (78)
	Number of replications	4 (78)
Crop	Trials per crop	TRZAW (68), TRZAS (3), TTLWI (3), HORVS (2), HORVW (1), SECCW (1)
	Varieties per crop	TRZAW: Akteur (1), Annie (2), Bardotka (1), Benchmark (2), Bergamo (2), Bernstein (1), Bohemia (1), Boregar (3), Cellule (2), Cheignon (3), Chiron (2), Complice (1), Costello (2), Dagmar (1), Dekan (1), Descartes (1), Diderot (2), Discus (1), Euclide (2), Expert (1), Fakir (1), Findus (1), Fontas (1), Fructidor (1), Geo (1), Golem (2), Informer (1), Julie (1), Kadrilj (1), Kerubino (2), Lenny (1), LG Absalon (1), Mutic (1), n/r (1), Nemo (1), Nordkap (1), Pionier (1), Reform (3), RGT Aktion (2), RGT Cesario (1), RGT Reform (1), Rubisco (1), Rubisko (1), Rumor (1), Sacramento (1), Scenario (1), Sheriff (1), Talent (1), Texacco (1), Tobak (1), Togano (1) TRZAS: Calixo (1), KWS Sharki (1), Sensas (1) HORVW: California (1) HORVS: Quench (2) TTLWI: Barolo (1), Temuco (2) SECCW: KWS Serafino (1)
	Sowing period	TRZAW: n/d (2), Nov (7), Oct (42), Sep (14), Jan (1), Dec (2) TRZAS: Mar (2), Apr (1) HORVW: Jan (1) HORVS: Mar (2) TTLWI: Oct (2), Sep (1) SECCW: Sep (1)
Application	Crop stage (BBCH) at application	Post-emergence TRZAW: 15-39 (68) TRZAS: 23-37 (3) HORVW: 31-32 (1) HORVS: 30-32 (2) TTLWI: 30-39 (3) SECCW: 23-26 (1)
	Weeds stage (BBCH) and population at application	Annual broad-leaved weeds BRSNN/BRSNW (5): 13-59 (BBCH), 4.8-16.3 pl/m ² CAPBP (14): 14-65 (BBCH), 5.0-56 pl/m ² (11), 3.3-14.5% GC (3) DESSO (4): 18-69 (BBCH), 5.0-84 pl/m ² RAPRA (2): 13-19 (BBCH), 10-39 pl/m ² STEME (13): 15-39 (BBCH), 5-42 pl/m ² THLAR (6): 17-65 (BBCH), 7-43.3 pl/m ² (5), 5.8% GC (1) Grass weeds ALOMY (26): 12-28 to 65 (BBCH), 6.3-731 pl/m ² (24) or 13.3-25% GC (2) APESV (18): 12 to 32-38 (BBCH), 5.0-241.5 pl/m ² (17) or 7.0% GC (1) AVEFA (6): 10-35 (BBCH), 7.8-23.5 pl/m ² AVESA (2): 22-23 (BBCH), 75.3-77.25 pl/m ² BROSE (2): 22-27 (BBCH), 213.8-251.5 pl/m ² BROST (10): 13-39 (BBCH), 22.0-388.5 pl/m ² LOLMU (15): 11-33 (BBCH), 5.0-113.0 pl/m ² POAAN (13): 12-65 (BBCH), 5.3-35.0 pl/m ² POATR (1): 17-31 (BBCH), 106.0 pl/m ² Spray program autumn/spring ALOMY (6): A1: 0-12/A2: 13-30 (BBCH), A1: 16.8-524 pl/m ² /A2: 17.3-731 pl/m ² BROST (1): A1: 11-13/A2: 21-26 (BBCH), A1: 20.8 pl/m ² /A2: 30.0 pl/m ² LOLMU (1): A1: 11/A2: 22 (BBCH), A1: 44 pl/m ² /A2: 54 pl/m ²
	Number of applications	1 (78)
	Spray volumes	100 L/ha (1), 150 L/ha (8), 200 L/ha (40), 240 L/ha (4), 250 L/ha (1), 260 L/ha (1), 266 L/ha (1), 270 L/ha (1), 300 L/ha (21)
	Assessment types	Visual % weed control, % weed ground cover, number of weeds or seed heads/m ² , phytotoxicity (%), crop vigour (0-10/0-100 scale)
Other relevant information	Field / Greenhouse	Field
North-east EPPO climatic zone		
Guidelines	General guidelines	EPPO PP1/152 (4), EPPO PP1/181 (4), EPPO PP1/135 (4), PP 1/225(1/2)
	Specific guidelines	EPPO PP1/93 (3)
Experimental design	Plot design	RCBD (30)
	Plot size	12-24 m ² (31)
	Number of replications	4 (31)

Crop	Trials per crop	TRZAW (28), TRZAS (3)
	Varieties per crop	TRZAW: Arkadia (3), Bogatka (1), Bogotka (1), Hondia (1), Joker (1), Julius (3), Kepler (1), Lindbergh (1), Ostroga (3), Patras (4), Princeps (1), Rotax (1), Sailor (1), Sikorka (2), Skagen (1), Tonacja (2), Zeppelin (1) TRZAS: Arabella (1), Mandaryna (2)
	Sowing period	TRZAW: Oct (15), Sep (13) TRZAS: Apr (3)
Application	Crop stage (BBCH) at application	Post-emergence TRZAW: 22-37 (28) TRZAS: 24-32 (3)
	Weeds stage (BBCH) and population at application	Annual broad-leaved weeds ANTAR (2): 14-16 (BBCH), 10.3-12 pl/m ² BRNN/BRSNW (7): 12-35 (BBCH), 5.0-8.3 pl/m ² CAPBP (5): 14-55 (BBCH), 7-20.8 pl/m ² STEME (8): 11-61 (BBCH), 5-11 pl/m ² THLAR (3): 14-30 (BBCH), 5.8-8 pl/m ² Grass weeds ALOMY (10): 11-25 (BBCH), 7.0-53.0 pl/m ² APESV (18): 11-35 (BBCH), 7.0-185.0 pl/m ² AVEFA (4): 10-30 (BBCH), 7.0-20.0 pl/m ² AVESS (3): 13 (BBCH), 7.0-14.0 pl/m ² POAAN (6): 14-59 (BBCH), 5.0-20.5 pl/m ² Spray program autumn/spring ALOMY (1): A1: 10-12/A2: 14-25 (BBCH), A1: 26 pl/m ² /A2: 28.8 pl/m ² APESV (1) A1: 10-13/A2: 21-31 (BBCH), A1: 140 pl/m ² /A2: 185 pl/m ²
	Number of applications	1 (31)
	Spray volumes	150 L/ha (1), 200 L/ha (18), 230 L/ha (4), 250 L/ha (6), 300 L/ha (2)
Assessments	Assessment types	Visual % weed control, % weed ground cover, number of weeds or seed heads/m ² , phytotoxicity (%), crop vigour (0-10/0-100 scale)
Other relevant information	Field / Greenhouse	Field
South-east EPPO climatic zone		
Guidelines	General guidelines	EPPO PP1/152 (4), EPPO PP1/181 (4), EPPO PP1/135 (4), PP 1/225(1/2)
	Specific guidelines	EPPO PP1/93 (3)
Experimental design	Plot design	RCBD (63)
	Plot size	14-30 m ² (63)
	Number of replications	3 (1), 4 (62)
Crop	Trials per crop	TRZAW (56), TRZDU (3), TTLWI (4)
	Varieties per crop	TRZAW: Adhoc (1), Altigo (5), Amicus (1), Anapurna (2), Balaton (3), Basilio (2), Cellule (2), CH Combin (1), Gaudio (1), Gaudis (1), Genius (5), GK Békés (2), GK Csillag (1), Glosa (4), Hystar (1), KG GK Kunhalom (1), KWS Exotic (1), Lithium (1), Lukullus (1), Lupus (2), MV Kolo (1), MV Nádor (1), Otilia (6), PG 102 (4), PR22R28 (1), PV 153 (1), Solehio (4) TRZDU: Winter gold (2), Wintergold (1) TTLWI: Stil (1), SU Agendus (1), Tarzan (2)
	Sowing period	TRZAW: Nov (4), Oct (48), Sep (4) TRZDU: Oct (2), Sep (1) TTLWI: Oct (3), Sep (1)
Application	Crop stage (BBCH) at application	Post-emergence TRZAW: 14-39 (56) TRZDU: 29-32 (3) TTLWI: 25-31 (4)
	Weeds stage (BBCH) and population at application	Annual broad-leaved weeds ANTAR (1): 19-33 (BBCH), 7 pl/m ² BRNN/BRSNW (1): 32-51 (BBCH), 7 pl/m ² CAPBP (4): 16-59 (BBCH), 5-13.5 pl/m ² SINAR (3): 12-35 (BBCH), 5-7.75 pl/m ² (2), 10%GC (1) STEME (25): 10-65 (BBCH), 5.8-76 pl/m ² THLAR(2): 18-34 (BBCH), 7-19.25 pl/m ²

Application (continued)	Weeds stage (BBCH) and population at application (continued)	Grass weeds ALOMY (12): 15-47 (BBCH), 5.0-60.0 pl/m ² APESV (15): 11-47 (BBCH), 12.0-263.5 pl/m ² AVEFA (8): 11-45 (BBCH), 5.0-19.5 pl/m ² AVELU (2): 12-37 (BBCH), 5.0-229.0 pl/m ² AVESS (1): 13-23 (BBCH), 10.0 pl/m ² BROSE (7): 21-48 (BBCH), 17.0-25.5 pl/m ² BROST (3): 13-25 (BBCH), 13.0-73.0 pl/m ² BROSS (1): 38-55 (BBCH), 6.0 pl/m ² LOLMU (13):10-48 (BBCH), 7.0-199.0 pl/m ² POAAN (10): 12-65 (BBCH), 9.0-173.5 pl/m ² Spray program autumn/spring ALOMY (3): A1: 0-11/A2: 18-29 (BBCH), A1: 0 (1), 1-20 (2) pl/m ² /A2: 5.3-60 pl/m ² APESV (1): A1: 9-10/A2: 11-13 (BBCH), A1: 5 pl/m ² /A2: 15.3 pl/m ² BROSE (1): A1: 0 /A2: 22-32 (BBCH), A1: 0 pl/m ² /A2: 22.8 pl/m ² BROST (1): A1: 0 /A2: 21-31 (BBCH), A1: 0 pl/m ² /A2: 15 pl/m ² LOLMU (4): A1: 0-29/A2: 11-29 (BBCH), A1: 10-532.5 pl/m ² /A2: 10-197.5 pl/m ²
	Number of applications	1 (63)
	Spray volumes	150 L/ha (6), 200 L/ha (10), 241 L/ha (2), 243 L/ha (8), 247 L/ha (1), 248 L/ha (1), 250 L/ha (18), 300 L/ha (17)
Assessments	Assessment types	Visual % weed control, % weed ground cover, number of weeds or seed heads/m ² , phytotoxicity (%), crop vigour (0-10/0-100 scale)
Other relevant information	Field / Greenhouse	Field

Justification for data outside country of submission

Agronomic practices in the cultivation of cereals are considered to be sufficiently similar across countries within the Central Registration zone for data generated across all trials to be fully supportive of demonstrating the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B in all countries.

Populations of target grass and broad-leaved weeds are considered to be sufficiently similar between EU countries relevant to this submission for the data generated in all trials to be fully representative and supportive of demonstrating the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B across all EU Central Registration zone countries.

Justification for the use of biological efficacy data included in this dossier is made according to EPPO PP 1/241(1) “Guidance on comparable climates”.

Efficacy trials on from which data are summarised in this dossier were carried out in the following EPPO climatic zones:

Maritime: Czech Republic, France, Germany

North-east: Poland

South-east: Hungary, Romania

Trials carried out in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone have been conducted in areas where climatic conditions are representative of those in Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Germany and the Netherlands. Data generated in these trials are therefore fully supportive towards demonstrating the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B in the EU Central Registration zone with respect to these countries.

Trials carried out in the North-East EPPO climatic zone have been conducted in areas where climatic conditions are representative of those in Poland. Data generated in these trials are therefore fully supportive towards demonstrating the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B in the EU Central Registration zone with respect to Poland.

Trials carried out in the South-east EPPO climatic zone have been conducted in areas where climatic conditions are representative of those in Romania and Hungary. Data generated in these trials are therefore fully supportive towards demonstrating the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B in the EU Central Registration zone with respect to these countries.

Trials methodology in relation to EPPO

Trials were conducted according to the EPPO guidelines stated in Table 3.2-21. The hyperlinks to the GEP certificates of the official testing organisation are provided in Section 3.7.

In all trials, layout was according to randomised complete block design with 3-4 replicates per treatment. All normal crop husbandry measures, with the exception of herbicides, were applied to the trials area by the grower, according to crop requirements and in accordance with good agricultural practice. Trials included a range of soil types and locations to determine crop tolerance and efficacy under a range of conditions. All trials were placed within regions representative of those where cereal crops are grown in the relevant EU countries and where the target weeds are indigenous to the area covered.

Applications on all efficacy trials were made using small plot sprayers designed to simulate application using commercial sprayers representative of those used to apply herbicides/in cereals.

The standard reference products were applied according to the label recommendations.

3.2.3.1 Single application in the spring

Efficacy against Blackgrass (*Alopecurus myosuroides*: ALOMY)

A total of 48 trials conducted between 2018 and 2020 have generated data on the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against ALOMY in cereals.

Single post-emergence applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) were made in the spring (between February and May) on all trials, when crop growth stages were in the range of 14-21-35 (BBCH) in the majority of the trials, and when crop stage was 14-16 in only one Hungarian trial, and therefore fully representative of the proposed timings for the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B.

Of these trials, 26 were carried out in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (14-15 in France, 12-11 in Germany), 10 were carried out in the North-east EPPO climatic zone (all in Poland) and 12 were carried out in the South-east EPPO climatic zone (8 in Hungary, 4 in Romania).

All the ALOMY trials, in each EPPO zone were conducted on winter cereals. Efficacy trials presenting data on *Alopecurus myosuroides* control were conducted on winter cereals (45 trials on TRZAW, 1 trial on TRZDU, 1 trial on TTLWI and 1 trial on SECCW).

Detailed data on efficacy from individual trials (with an indication of specific crops) have been presented in BAD document.

Efficacy data from 3 of the trials in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (all in France) are considered not to accurately represent that of the treatments. ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) and standard reference products gave low and variable control on all of these trials. This was attributed to non-homogenous populations of ALOMY across the trial area on 1 of the trials and to periods of low temperatures inhibiting weed growth and development prior to and following application, thereby reducing uptake of the herbicides by the plants, on the other 2 trials. On this basis, data from these 3 trials has not been included in the following summary table.

Across all other trials, the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) against ALOMY has been tested in wide ranging locations, cultural practices, climatic conditions and weed biotypes, densities and growth stages that are fully representative of those in the spring in areas where cereal crops are grown in all countries relevant to this submission.

An overall summary of the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, compared to that

of standard reference products applied at label rates, against ALOMY from earlier and later assessments across all trials with valid data in each EPPO climatic zone is given in Table 3.2-22.

Table 3.2-22: Overall summary of the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against ALOMY

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS (BBCH) at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	% efficacy ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) across all trials					Direct comparisons of % efficacy to standard reference products									
			No. of trials	Weed density at assessm't	Appl'n rate/ha	Mean	Min-Max	No. of trials	ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)		Standard reference products				Comparison of efficacy to standard reference product#		
									Mean	Min-Max	Trade name	Appl'n rate /ha	Mean	Min-Max			
Maritime (23 trials)	12-65 (23)	7.0-731.0 pl/m² (21), 13.3-25% GC (2)	21	14.0-731.0 pl/m² (15), 6.0-92.0% GC (19)	0.75 L	68.8	12.7-97.4	Earlier assessments (15-39 DA-A) based on overall visual control across 21 trials									
								2	67.1	65.0-69.3	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	74.7	70.0-79.3	= (1), < (1)		
								8	71.8	12.7-97.4	Atlantis OD/Atlantis Pro	1.2 L	79.3	41.6-99.0	> (1), = (4), < (3)		
								7	71.3	53.8-97.4	Atlantis Pro	1.5 L	81.6	61.8-99.0	= (2), < (5)		
								2	57.4	28.8-86.0	Atlantis WG	0.2 Kg	41.3	21.3-61.3	> (1), = (1)		
								1	28.8	-	Atlantis WG	0.3 Kg	25.0	-	= (1)		
								4	71.6	47.5-93.0	Atlantis WG	0.4 Kg	73.3	65.0-82.5	> (1), = (2), < (1)		
								2	57.4	28.8-86.0	Atlantis Flex	0.2 Kg	54.9	28.8-81.0	= (2)		
					1.0 L	75.2	27.9-98.3	2	75.9	74.3-77.5	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	74.7	70.0-79.3	> (1), = (1)		
								8	78.0	27.9-98.3	Atlantis OD/Atlantis Pro	1.2 L	79.3	41.6-99.0	> (1), = (7)		
								7	77.1	63.8-97.6	Atlantis Pro	1.5 L	81.6	61.8-99.0	= (5), < (2)		
								2	68.9	48.8-89.0	Atlantis WG	0.2 Kg	41.3	21.3-61.3	> (2)		
								1	48.8	-	Atlantis WG	0.3 Kg	25.0	-	> (1)		
								4	74.6	55.0-91.0	Atlantis WG	0.4 Kg	73.3	65.0-82.5	> (1), = (2), < (1)		
								2	68.9	48.8-89.0	Atlantis Flex	0.2 Kg	54.9	28.8-81.0	> (2)		
	12-65 (23)	7.0-731.0 pl/m² (21), 13.3-25% GC (2)	22	20.0-1500.0 heads/m² (22)	Later assessment (68 DA-A) based on overall visual control on 1 trial												
					1	35.8 pl/m² (1)	0.75 L	60.0	-	1	60.0	-	Atlantis Pro	1.5 L	64.5	-	= (1)
							1.0 L	65.0	-	1	65.0	-	Atlantis Pro	1.5 L	64.5	-	= (1)
					Later assessments (32-84 DA-A) based on reductions in weed seed heads across 22 trials												
					0.75 L	79.3	42.1-100	2	87.4	74.8-100	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	88.3	83.5-93.0	= (1), < (1)		
								9	85.1	63.8-99.9	Atlantis OD/Atlantis Pro	1.2 L	82.5	58.0-98.4	> (1), = (5), < (3)		
								7	77.1	42.1-99.9	Atlantis Pro	1.5 L	85.4	48.1-99.6	> (1), = (5), < (1)		
								2	87.3	80.0-94.5	Atlantis WG	0.2 Kg	74.6	65.0-84.1	> (1), = (1)		
								1	80.0	-	Atlantis WG	0.3 Kg	78.0	-	= (1)		
								5	68.9	43.4-89.0	Atlantis WG	0.4 Kg	70.3	39.7-83.4	> (1), = (3), < (1)		
								2	87.3	80.0-94.5	Atlantis Flex	0.2 Kg	69.8 78.2	46.0 63.0	63.0-93.5	> (1), = (1)	
								1.0 L	83.2	36.7-100	2	89.4	78.8-100	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	88.3	83.5-93.0
					9	89.4	74.8-99.5				Atlantis OD/Atlantis Pro	1.2 L	82.5	58.0-98.4	> (1), = (8)		
					7	82.8	44.0-99.5				Atlantis Pro	1.5 L	85.4	48.1-99.6	= (6), < (1)		
					2	86.3	76.0-96.5				Atlantis WG	0.2 Kg	74.6	65.0-84.1	= (2)		
					1	76.0	-				Atlantis WG	0.3 Kg	78.0	-	= (1)		
					5	73.0	36.7-94.0				Atlantis WG	0.4 Kg	70.3	39.7-83.4	> (2), = (2), < (1)		
					2	86.3	76.0-96.5				Atlantis Flex	0.2 Kg	69.8 78.2	46.0 63.0	63.0-93.5	> (1), = (1)	

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS (BBCH) at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	% efficacy ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) across all trials					Direct comparisons of % efficacy to standard reference products							
			No. of trials	Weed density at assessm't	Appl'n rate/ha	Mean	Min-Max	No. of trials	ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)		Standard reference products				Comparison of efficacy to standard reference product#
									Mean	Min-Max	Trade name	Appl'n rate /ha	Mean	Min-Max	
North-east (10 trials)	11-25 (10)	7.0-53.0 pl/m² (10)	Earlier assessments (21-28 DA-A) based on overall visual control across all 10 trials												
			9	12.0-37.5 pl/m² (7), 1.0-53.8% GC (6), n/d (2)	0.75 L	80.7	52.5-90.3	9	80.7	52.5-90.3	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	80.4 84.0	67.5-93.8	= (1), < (6), n/d (2)
								4	82.7	71.3-87.5	Atlantis Star	0.33 Kg	89.7	82.5-96.3	= (2), < (2)
			10	10.0-37.5 pl/m² (8), 1.0-53.8% GC (6), n/d (2)	1.0 L	91.2 90.9	78.3-95.0	10	91.2 90.9	78.3-95.0	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	85.7 85.3	67.5-95.0	> (1), = (6), < (1), n/d (2)
								4	91.2	90.0-93.8	Atlantis Star	0.33 Kg	89.7	82.5-96.3	> (2), = (2)
			Later assessments (42 DA-A) based on overall visual control across 2 trials												
			2	n/d (2)	0.75 L	84.4	83.8-85.0	2	84.4	83.8-85.0	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	84.4	83.8-85.0	n/d (2)
					1.0 L	98.2	97.5-98.8	2	98.2	97.5-98.8	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	84.4	83.8-85.0	n/d (2)
			Later assessments (37-104 DA-A) based on reductions in weed seed heads across 8 trials												
			7	12.0-200.0 heads/m² (7)	0.75 L	95.5	76.8-100	7	95.5	76.8-100	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	93.5	85.0-100	> (2), = (3), < (2)
								4	94.2	76.8-100	Atlantis Star	0.33 Kg	99.2	96.7-100	= (3), < (1)
			8	10.0-200.0 heads/m² (9*)	1.0 L	98.5	93.0-100	8	98.5	93.0-100	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	95.0 94.5	85.0-100	= (7), < (2)
								4	98.3	93.0-100	Atlantis Star	0.33 Kg	99.2	96.7-100	= (3), < (1)

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS (BBCH) at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	% efficacy ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) across all trials					Direct comparisons of % efficacy to standard reference products								
			No. of trials	Weed density at assessm't	Appl'n rate/ha	Mean	Min-Max	No. of trials	ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)		Standard reference products				Comparison of efficacy to standard reference product#	
									Mean	Min-Max	Trade name	Appl'n rate /ha	Mean	Min-Max		
South-east (12 trials)	15-47 (12)	5.0-60.0 pl/m² (12)	Earlier assessments (14-31 DA-A) based on overall visual control across 11 trials													
			11	5.3-25.0 pl/m² (4), 1.0-21.5% GC (4)	0.75 L	81.8	56.3-100	3	90.1	82.0-99.5	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	86.9	82.5-89.3	> (2), < (1)	
								8	78.7	56.3-100	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	83.9	61.3-100	= (5), < (3)	
								1	83.8	-	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	85.0	-	= (1)	
				1.0 L	89.5	70.0-100	3	93.4	88.3-99.5	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	86.9	82.5-89.3	> (2), = (1)		
							8	88.1	70.0-100	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	83.9	61.3-100	> (5), = (3)		
							1	100	-	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	85.0	-	> (1)		
			Later assessments (48 DA-A) based on overall visual control across 2 trials													
			2	21.5-23.2 pl/m² (2), 25.0% GC (2)	0.75 L	100	100-100	2	100	100-100	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	100	100-100	= (2)	
					1.0 L	100	100-100	2	100	100-100	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	100	100-100	= (2)	
			Later assessments (14-58 DA-A) based on reductions in weed seed heads across 10 trials													
			10	23.8-269.8 heads/m² (10)	0.75 L	88.4	63.3-99.2	3	93.1	85.5-98.7	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	67.6	30.3-89.5	> (1), = (1), < (1)	
								7	86.5	63.3-99.2	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	73.4	47.4-94.3	> (3), = (2), < (2)	
								2	69.4	63.0-76.0	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	72.7	68.2-77.2	= (2)	
					1.0 L	95.9	83.5-100	3	95.9	88.7-100	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	67.6	30.3-89.5	> (1), = (2)	
								7	95.9	83.5-100	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	73.4	47.4-94.3	> (4), = (3)	
								2	91.8	84.0-100	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	72.7	68.2-77.2	> (2)	

No. of trials where >, = or <, based on statistically significant differences at 95% confidence level; [±] Number of datapoints. On 1 of the trials, single applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B were made at two separate timings.

Applied at the proposed maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) gave good overall control across trials in the South-east and North-east EPPO climatic zones and moderately good overall control across trials in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone.

The overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 1.0 L product/ha was comparable to, or higher than that of standard reference products containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD, Atlantis Pro, Atlantis WG), where included in the majority of the trials applied at label rates. Compared to other standard reference products where included in a few of the trials and applied at label rates, the overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 1.0 L product/ha was higher than that of Atlantis Flex (mesosulfuron-methyl + propoxycarbazone) and comparable to that of Atlantis Star (iodosulfuron-methyl-sodium + mesosulfuron-methyl + thienencarbazone-methyl).

Applied at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) gave moderately good control across trials in the South-east and North-east EPPO climatic zones and moderate control across trials in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone.

The overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 0.75 L product/ha was lower at earlier assessments, but similar in terms of reductions in numbers of weed seed heads at later assessments, compared to that of standard reference products containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD, Atlantis Pro, Atlantis WG), where included in the majority of the trials applied at label rates. Compared to other standard reference products where included in a few of the trials and applied at label rates, the overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 0.75 L product/ha was similar to, or higher than that of Atlantis Flex (mesosulfuron-methyl + propoxycarbazone) and similar to, or lower than that of Atlantis Star (iodosulfuron-methyl-sodium + mesosulfuron-methyl + thienencarbazone-methyl).

In the few trials in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone where ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) gave relatively low levels of control, the standard reference products also gave similarly low levels of control, indicating that environmental conditions (e.g. low temperatures, dry soil conditions) resulted in the weeds not being actively growing at the time of application and thereby resulting in reduced herbicide uptake and efficacy on these trials. The ADM.06001.H.2.B label will include a statement advising that application should only be made when weeds are actively growing.

There is also the possibility that in trials in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone where ADM.06001.H.2.B and also the standard reference product gave low control of ALOMY that weed biotypes with reduced susceptibility to HRAC mode of application group 2 (ALS inhibitors) were prevalent at the site. In locations where this is the case, herbicides with this mode of action should not be relied upon for control of ALOMY. ADM.06001.H.2.B labels will include statements to this effect, advising ADM.06001.H.2.B should only be applied in tank mixtures and sequences with herbicides with different modes of action in situations where resistance biotypes of ALOMY are known to be a problem.

The presented data demonstrates ALOMY to be Susceptible to ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and Moderately Susceptible to the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha under conditions in countries in the North-east and South-east EPPO climatic zones. With generally higher weed densities and under conditions in Maritime EPPO climatic zone countries, the data shows ALOMY to be Moderately Susceptible to ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and Moderately Tolerant to the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha.

Efficacy against Loose silky bent (*Apera spica-venti*: APESV)

A total of ~~50~~ 49 trials conducted between 2018 and 2020 have generated data on the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, and also the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against APESV in cereals.

Single post-emergence applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) were made in the spring (between March and May) on all trials, when crop growth stages were in the range of ~~15-39~~ 22-39 (BBCH) in the majority of the trials, and when crop stage was 15-21 in only one Czech Republic trial, and therefore ~~fully~~ representative of the proposed timings for the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B.

Of these trials, 17 were carried out in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (7 in Czech Republic, 1 in France, 9 in Germany), ~~18~~ 17 were carried out in the North-east EPPO climatic zone (all in Poland) and 15 were carried out in the South-east EPPO climatic zone (7 in Hungary, 8 in Romania).

All the APESV trials, in each EPPO zone were conducted on winter cereals. Efficacy trials presenting data on *Apera spica-venti* control were conducted on winter cereals (47 trials on TRZAW and 2 trials on TTLWI).

Detailed data on efficacy from individual trials (with an indication of specific crops) have been presented in BAD document.

Efficacy data from 2 of the trials in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (1 in Germany, 1 in France) are considered not to accurately represent that of the treatments. ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) and standard reference products gave low and variable control on all of these trials. This was attributed to either non-homogenous populations of APESV across the trial area on 1 of the trials and relatively low weed populations at application that then declined, on the other trial. On this basis, data from these 2 trials has not been included in the following summary table.

Across trials, the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) against APESV has been tested in wide ranging locations, cultural practices, climatic conditions and weed biotypes, densities and growth stages that are fully representative of those in the spring in areas where cereal crops are grown in all countries relevant to this submission.

An overall summary of the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, compared to that of standard reference products applied at label rates, against APESV from earlier and later assessments across all trials with valid data in each EPPO climatic zone is given in Table 3.2-23.

Table 3.2-23: Overall summary of the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against APESV

Eppo climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS (BBCH) at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	% efficacy ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) across all trials					Direct comparisons of % efficacy to standard reference products									
			No. of trials	Weed density at assessm't	Appl'n rate/ha	Mean	Min-Max	No. of trials	ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)		Standard reference products				Comparison of efficacy to standard reference product#		
									Mean	Min-Max	Trade name	Appl'n rate/ha	Mean	Min-Max			
Maritime (15 trials)	13-38 (15)	5.0-241.5 pl/m² (14), 7% GC (1)	Earlier assessments (23-30 DA-A) based on overall visual control across all 16 15 trials														
			15	5.5-241.5 pl/m² (12), 2.8-34.3% GC (12)	0.75 L	91.3	65.0-100	3	84.7	65.0-99.0	Atlantis OD	0.5 L	76.8	50.0-90.5	> (1), = (2)		
								8	91.6	65.0-100	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	88.5	45.0-100	> (2), = (5), < (1)		
								1	100	-	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	96.0	-	= (1)		
								2	96.3	92.5-100	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	94.8	89.5-100	= (2)		
								4	86.7	76.0-91.3	Atlantis WG	0.2 Kg	63.8	2.5-99.0	> (2), = (1), < (1)		
								2	83.7	76.0-91.3	Atlantis Flex	0.2 Kg	45.7	0.0-91.3	> (1), < (1)		
								1	96.5	-	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	37.5	-	> (1)		
					1.0 L	93.5	71.3-100	3	85.9	71.3-96.3	Atlantis OD	0.5 L	76.8	50.0-90.5	> (1), = (2)		
								8	93.8	71.3-100	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	88.5	45.0-100	> (4), = (4)		
								1	100	-	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	96.0	-	= (1)		
								2	96.2	92.3-100	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	94.8	89.5-100	= (2)		
								4	90.5	78.8-98.0	Atlantis WG	0.2 Kg	63.8	2.5-99.0	> (2), = (2)		
								2	85.1	78.8-91.3	Atlantis Flex	0.2 Kg	45.7	0.0-91.3	> (1), < (1)		
								1	98.0	-	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	37.5	-	> (1)		
			Later assessments (39-87 DA-A) based on reductions in weed seed heads across all 16 15 trials														
			15	7.2-392.8 heads/m² (15)	0.75 L	96.8	74.7-100	3	99.3	98.0-100	Atlantis OD	0.5 L	97.7	93.0-100	= (3)		
								8	99.8	98.0-100	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	95.5	68.4-100	> (1), = (7)		
								1	100	-	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	100	-	= (1)		
								2	98.3	96.5-100	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	95.2	91.8-98.5	> (1), = (1)		
								4	90.0	74.7-99.0	Atlantis WG	0.2 Kg	72.2	12.2-99.6	> (2), = (1), < (1)		
								2	85.5	74.7-96.2	Atlantis Flex	0.2 Kg	55.5	10.9-100	> (1), = (1)		
								1	98.0	-	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	36.8	-	> (1)		
					1.0 L	99.2	93.0-100	3	100	100-100	Atlantis OD	0.5 L	97.7	93.0-100	> (1), = (2)		
								8	100	100-100	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	95.5	68.4-100	> (1), = (7)		
								1	100	-	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	100	-	= (1)		
								2	98.9	97.8-100	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	95.2	91.8-98.5	> (1), = (1)		
								4	97.9	93.0-100	Atlantis WG	0.2 Kg	72.2	12.2-99.6	> (2), = (2)		

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS (BBCH) at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	% efficacy ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) across all trials					Direct comparisons of % efficacy to standard reference products								
			No. of trial s	Weed density at assessm't	Appl' n rate/h a	Mea n	Min- Max	No. of trial s	ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)		Standard reference products				Comparison of efficacy to standard reference product#	
									Mean	Min-Max	Trade name	Appl'n rate /ha	Mean	Min-Max		
								2	96.5	93.0-100	Atlantis Flex	0.2 Kg	55.5	10.9-100	> (1), = (1)	
1	98.0	-	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	36.8	-	> (1)									
North-east (18 17 trials)	11-35 (18 17)	7.0-185.0 pl/m² (18 17)	Earlier assessments (20-29 DA-A) based on overall visual control across all 18 17 trials													
			16 15	4.5-190.0 pl/m² (16 15), 1.0-14.8% GC (7)	0.75 L	88.9 90.3	67.5-68.8-97.5	14	88.1	67.5-97.5	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	86.1	55.0-98.8	> (3), = (9), n/d (1), < (1)	
								2	93.8	91.3	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	94.4	92.5-96.3	= (2)	
								3	90.1	83.8-94.0	Atlantis Star	0.2 Kg	90.3	88.8-91.3	= (3)	
								1	91.3	-	Atlantis Star	0.33 Kg	83.8	-	> (1)	
			18 17	4.5-190.0 pl/m² (16 17), 1.0-14.8% GC (7)	1.0 L	92.8 92.7	73.8-100	14	91.9	73.8-100	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	86.1	55.0-98.8	> (5), = (8), n/d (1)	
								4 3	96.0 96.7	93.8-96.3-97.5	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	96.0 94.6	93.8-97.5-96.3	> (1), = (2)	
								3	95.0	93.8-96.3	Atlantis Star	0.2 Kg	90.3	88.8-91.3	> (1), = (2)	
								1	97.5	-	Atlantis Star	0.33 Kg	83.8	-	> (1)	
			Later assessments (61-70 DA-A) based on overall visual control across 3 trials													
			3	22.0-37.0 pl/m², n/d (1)	0.75 L	98.8	96.3-100	3	98.8	96.3-100	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	85.0	73.8-95.0	> (1), = (1), n/d (1)	
								1	96.3	-	Atlantis Star	0.2 Kg	96.3	-	= (1)	
					1.0 L	100	100-100	3	100	100-100	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	85.0	73.8-95.0	> (2), n/d (1)	
								1	100	-	Atlantis Star	0.2 Kg	96.3	-	= (1)	
			Later assessments (38-104 DA-A) based on reductions in weed seed heads across 18 14 trials													
			13 12	8.0-392.5 heads/m² (13 12)	0.75 L	98.0 98.2	89.8-100	11	98.1	89.8-100	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	93.4	75.2-100	> (3), = (8)	
								2	97.4	94.8-100	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	94.2	88.3-100	= (2)	
								2	100	100-100	Atlantis Star	0.2 Kg	100	100-100	= (2)	
								1	100	-	Atlantis Star	0.33 Kg	100	-	= (1)	
			15 14	6.3-392.5 heads/m² (15 14)	1.0 L	99.7	97.2-100	11	99.7	97.2-100	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	93.4	75.2-100	> (3), = (8)	
								4 3	99.7 99.6	98.8-98.9-100	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	97.1 96.1	97.1-97.5-96.3	> (1), = (2)	
								2	100	100-100	Atlantis Star	0.2 Kg	100	100-100	= (2)	
								1	100	-	Atlantis Star	0.33 Kg	100	-	= (1)	

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS (BBCH) at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	% efficacy ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) across all trials					Direct comparisons of % efficacy to standard reference products							
			No. of trial s	Weed density at assessm't	Appl' n rate/h a	Mea n	Min- Max	No. of trial s	ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)		Standard reference products				Comparison of efficacy to standard reference product#
									Mean	Min-Max	Trade name	Appl'n rate /ha	Mean	Min-Max	
South-east (15 trials)	11-47 (15)	12.0-263.5 pl/m² (15)	Earlier assessments (14-28 DA-A) based on overall visual control across all 15 trials												
			14	4.5-272.5 pl/m² (15), 5.0-50.0% GC (12)	0.75 L	88.2 87.5	56.3-100	10	91.6	56.3-100	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	85.0	48.8-100	> (5), = (5)
								6	92.8	83.5-100	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	91.7	66.3-100	> (1), = (3), < (2)
								1	97.8	-	Atlantis OD	1.5 L	100	-	< (1)
								6	77.9	56.3-95.0	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	75.2	37.5-93.8	> (3), = (2), < (1)
			15		1.0 L	93.1	58.8-100	10	93.9	58.8-100	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	85.0	48.8-100	> (6), = (4)
								6	95.1	85.0-100	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	91.7	66.3-100	> (1), = (4), < (1)
								1	100	-	Atlantis OD	1.5 L	100	-	= (1)
								6	87.7	58.8-100	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	75.2	37.5-93.8	> (6)
			Later assessments (28-47 DA-A) based on overall visual control across 5 trials												
			5	21.5-44.7 pl/m² (5), 20.0-35.0% GC (5)	0.75 L	82.5	61.3-100	2	100	100-100	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	100	100-100	= (2)
								3	70.9	61.3-78.8	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	77.9	65.0-87.5	= (2), < (1)
					1.0 L	93.3	77.5-100	2	97.2	88.8-100	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	100	100-100	= (2)
								3	88.8	77.5-100	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	77.9	65.0-87.5	> (3)
South-east (15 trials) (continued)	11-47 (15)	12.0-263.5 pl/m² (15)	Later assessments (29-104 DA-A) based on reductions in weed seed heads across 10 trials												
			9	12.5-729.3 heads/m² (10)	0.75 L	94.2 93.8	79.1-100	8	95.1	79.1-100	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	91.7	75.1-100	= (8)
								6	94.2	82.9-100	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	97.8	95.0-100	= (4), < (2)
								1	98.3	-	Atlantis OD	1.5 L	100	-	< (1)
								3	93.0	79.1-100	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	85.0	59.9-100	> (2), = (1)
			10		1.0 L	97.6	87.3-100	8	97.9	87.3-100	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	91.7	75.1-100	> (2), = (6)
								6	98.2	93.5-100	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	97.8	95.0-100	= (6)
								1	100	-	Atlantis OD	1.5 L	100	-	= (1)
								3	95.8	97.3-100	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	85.0	59.9-100	> (2), = (1)

No. of trials where >, = or <, based on statistically significant differences at 95% confidence level

Applied at the proposed maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) gave very good overall control across trials in the Maritime, North-east and South-east EPPO climatic zones.

The overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 1.0 L product/ha was comparable to, or higher than that of standard reference products containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD, Atlantis Pro, Atlantis WG), where included in the majority of the trials applied at label rates. Compared to other standard reference products where included in a few of the trials and applied at label rates, the overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 1.0 L product/ha was higher than that of Atlantis Flex (mesosulfuron-methyl + propoxycarbazone) and comparable to that of Atlantis Star (iodosulfuron-methyl-sodium + mesosulfuron-methyl + thien carbazole-methyl).

Applied at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) gave very good overall control across trials in the Maritime and North-east EPPO climatic zones and good overall control across trials in the South-east EPPO climatic zone.

The overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 0.75 L product/ha was generally similar to that of standard reference products containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD, Atlantis Pro, Atlantis WG), where included in the majority of the trials applied at label rates. Compared to other standard reference products where included in a few of the trials and applied at label rates, the overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 0.75 L product/ha was similar to, or higher than that of Atlantis Flex (mesosulfuron-methyl + propoxycarbazone) and Atlantis Star (iodosulfuron-methyl-sodium + mesosulfuron-methyl + thien carbazole-methyl).

The presented data demonstrates APESV to be Highly Susceptible to ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also to the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha under conditions in countries in the Maritime and North-east EPPO climatic zones, whilst the data shows APESV to be Highly Susceptible to ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and Susceptible to the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha under conditions in South-east EPPO climatic zone countries.

Efficacy against Oat species (*Avena* spp.: AVESS)

A total of ~~26~~ 25 trials conducted between 2018 and 2020 have generated data on the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against Oat species in cereals.

The specific species of Oat occurring in these trials were *Avena fatua* (AVEFA) in ~~18~~ 17 trials, *Avena sterilis* subsp. *ludoviciana* (AVELU) in ~~2~~ 1 trials, *Avena fatua* (AVEFA) and *Avena sterilis* subsp. *ludoviciana* (AVELU) in 1 trial, *Avena sativa* (AVESA) in 2 trials and were not identified in the other 4 trials.

~~The 2 trials conducted on *Avena fatua* (AVEFA), located in the Maritime zone and 3 trials conducted on AVESS, located in the Noreast EPPO zone were conducted on spring wheat. All other oat trials were conducted on winter cereals.~~ Efficacy trials presenting data on *Avena* spp. control were conducted mainly on winter cereals (20 trials, including 17 trials on TRZAW, 1 trial on TRZDU and 2 trials on TTLWI) and on spring cereals (5 trials including 3 trials on TRZAS and 2 trials on HORVS). The 2 trials conducted on *Avena fatua sativa* (AVESA), were located in the Maritime zone and were conducted on spring barley. The 3 trials conducted on AVESS, located in the North-east EPPO zone were conducted on spring wheat. All other oat trials were conducted on winter cereals.

Detailed data on efficacy from individual trials (detailing specific crops) have been presented in BAD document.

Single post-emergence applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) were made in the spring (between March and May) on all trials, when crop growth stages were in the range of ~~13~~ 22-39 (BBCH). and therefore ~~fully~~ representative of the proposed timings for the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B.

Of these trials, 8 were carried out in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (3 in Czech Republic, 5 in Germany), 7 were carried out in the North-east EPPO climatic zone (all in Poland) and ~~11~~ 10 were carried out in the South-east EPPO climatic zone (~~6~~ 5 in Hungary, 5 in Romania).

Across trials, the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) against Oat species has been tested in wide ranging locations, cultural practices, climatic conditions and weed biotypes, densities and growth stages that are fully representative of those in the spring in areas where cereal crops are grown in all countries relevant to this submission.

An overall summary of the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, compared to that of standard reference products applied at label rates, against Oat species from earlier and later assessments across trials in each EPPO climatic zone is given in Table 3.2-24.

Table 3.2-24: Overall summary of the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against Oat species

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials) Crop	Weed GS (BBCH) at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	% efficacy ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) across all trials					Direct comparisons of % efficacy to standard reference products										
			No. of trials	Weed density at assessm't	Appl'n rate/ha	Mean	Min-Max	No. of trials	ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)		Standard reference products				Comparison of efficacy to standard reference product#			
									Mean	Min-Max	Trade name	Appl'n rate /ha	Mean	Min-Max				
Efficacy against AVEFA (18 trials) on winter cereals																		
Maritime (6 trials) Winter cereals	10-35 (6)	7.8-23.5 pl/m ² (6)	Earlier assessments (22-28 DA-A) based on overall visual control across all 6 trials															
			6	8.3-25.0 pl/m ² (5), 1.0-7.0% GC (5)	0.75 L	86.4	48.0-98.0	2	69.7	48.0-91.3	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	66.9	45.0-88.8	= (2)			
								3	79.1	48.0-98.0	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	81.9	60.0-94.3	> (1), = (1)			
								3	93.6	90.0-95.8	Atlantis WG	0.2 Kg	80.1	56.3-94.0	> (1), = (2)			
					1.0 L	88.6	58.0-98.0	1	90.0	-	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	90.0	-	= (1)			
								2	75.3	58.0-92.5	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	66.9	45.0-88.8	= (2)			
								3	82.8	58.0-98.0	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	81.9	60.0-94.3	> (1), = (1)			
			6	5.0-50.0 heads/m ² (6)	0.75 L	96.7	80.0-100	3	94.3	90.0-98.0	Atlantis WG	0.2 Kg	80.1	56.3-94.0	> (1), = (2)			
								1	90.0	-	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	90.0	-	= (1)			
								Later assessments (37-63 DA-A) based on reductions in weed seed heads across all 6 trials										
					6	5.0-50.0 heads/m ² (6)	0.75 L	96.7	80.0-100	2	90.0	80.0-100	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	85.0	70.0-100	= (2)	
										3	93.3	80.0-100	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	95.0	85.0-100	= (3)	
										3	100	100-100	Atlantis WG	0.2 Kg	87.6	71.1-97.7	> (2), = (1)	
			1.0 L	98.8			93.0-100	1	100	-	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	100	-	= (1)			
								2	96.5	93.0-100	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	85.0	70.0-100	= (2)			
								3	97.7	93.0-100	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	95.0	85.0-100	= (3)			
			North-east (4 trials) Winter cereals	10-30 (4)	7.0-20.0 pl/m ² (4)	Earlier assessments (21-27 DA-A) based on overall visual control across all 4 trials												
						4	7.5-18.0 pl/m ² (4)	0.75 L	82.5	65.0-93.8	4	82.5	65.0-93.8	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	86.3	80.0-90.0	> (1), = (2), < (1)
1.0 L	90.3	82.5-97.5						4	90.3	82.5-97.5	> (1), = (2), < (1)							
Later assessments (33-70 DA-A) based on reductions in weed seed heads across all 4 trials																		
4	0.75 L 1.0 L	97.5 100				90.0 100-100	4	97.5 100	90.0 100-100	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	95.3 99.8	81.3 99-100	> (1), = (3)	0.75 L			
		97.8 100				91.3 100-100	4	97.8 100	91.3 100-100	91.3-100				> (1), = (3)	1.0 L			
South-east (8 trials) Winter cereals	11-45 (8)	5.0-19.5 pl/m ² (8)				Earlier assessments (13-18 DA-A) based on overall visual control across all 8 trials												
						8	5.0-19.5 (7), n/d (1)	0.75 L	93.1 88.8	77.5 66.3-100	8	93.1 88.8	77.5 66.3-100	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	81.2 77.9	53.8 37.5-100	> (4), = (3), < (1)
											1	91.8	-	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	95.0	-	= (1)
											2	87.6	86.3-88.8	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	94.4	93.8-95.0	< (2)
											3	92.5	77.5-100	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	96.7	90.0-100	= (2), < (1)
								1.0 L	97.5 95.3	92.5 82.5-100	8	97.5 95.3	92.5 82.5-100	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	81.2 77.9	53.8 37.5-100	> (5), = (3)
			1	95.8	-						Atlantis OD	1.0 L	95.0	-	= (1)			
			2	95.9	95.0-96.8						Atlantis OD	1.2 L	94.4	93.8-95.0	= (2)			
			3	97.5	92.5-100						Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	96.7 90.4	90.0 81.3-100	= (3)			
			Later assessments (38-47 DA-A) based on overall visual control across 2 trials															
			2		0.75 L	100	100-100	2	100	100-100	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	100	100-100	= (2)			

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials) Crop	Weed GS (BBCH) at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	% efficacy ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) across all trials					Direct comparisons of % efficacy to standard reference products							
			No. of trials	Weed density at assessm't 11.2-13.2 pl/m² (2)	Appl'n rate/ha	Mean	Min-Max	No. of trials	ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)		Standard reference products				Comparison of efficacy to standard reference product#
									Mean	Min-Max	Trade name	Appl'n rate /ha	Mean	Min-Max	
					1.0 L	100	100-100	2	100	100-100	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	100	100-100	= (2)

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials) Crop	Weed GS (BBCH) at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	% efficacy ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) across all trials					Direct comparisons of % efficacy to standard reference products									
			No. of trials	Weed density at assessm't	Appl'n rate/ha	Mean	Min-Max	No. of trials	ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)		Standard reference products				Comparison of efficacy to standard reference product#		
									Mean	Min-Max	Trade name	Appl'n rate /ha	Mean	Min-Max			
South-east (8 trials) (continued) Winter cereals	11-45 (8)	5.0-19.5 pl/m² (8)	Later assessments (28-57 DA-A) based on reductions in weed seed heads across 5 trials														
			5	13.0-40.0 heads/m² (5)	0.75 L	89.1	72.3-100	5	89.1	72.3-100	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	75.2	46.6-92.1	> (2), = (2), < (1)		
								1	92.2	-	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	98.5	-	= (1)		
								2	90.6	88.8-92.4	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	97.0	93.9-100	< (1), = (1)		
								2	86.2	72.3-100	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	91.5	82.9-100	= (1), < (1)		
					1.0 L	96.7	86.1-100	5	96.7	86.1-100	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	75.2	46.6-92.1	> (2), = (3)		
								1	97.2	-	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	98.5	-	= (1)		
								2	100	100-100	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	97.0	93.9-100	= (2)		
								2	93.1	86.1-100	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	91.5	82.9-100	= (2)		
Efficacy against AVELU (2 trials) on winter cereals																	
South-east (2 trials) Winter cereals	12-37 (2)	5.0-229.0 pl/m² (2)	Earlier assessments (27-28 DA-A) based on overall visual control across 2 trials														
			2	63.0 pl/m² (1), n/d (1)	0.75 L	79.9	67.5-92.3	2	79.9	67.5-92.3	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	94.2	91.8-96.5	= (1), < (1)		
											Atlantis OD	1.0 L	98.7	99.0-98.3	< (2)		
					1.0 L	95.0	91.5-98.5	2	95.0	91.5-98.5	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	94.2	91.8-96.5	> (1), = (1)		
											Atlantis OD	1.0 L	98.7	99.0-98.3	= (2)		
			Later assessments (35-50 DA-A) based on reductions in weed seed heads across 2 trials														
			2	19.8-20.0 heads/m² (2)	0.75 L	86.1	80.0-92.2	2	86.1	80.0-92.2	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	93.9	90.0-97.0	= (2)		
											Atlantis OD	1.0 L	98.5	99.0-96.0	= (1), < (1)		
					1.0 L	96.1	95.0-97.3	2	96.1	95.0-97.3	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	93.9	90.0-97.0	= (2)		
Atlantis OD	1.0 L	98.5									99.0-96.0	= (2)					
Efficacy against AVESA (2 trials) on spring cereals																	
Maritime (2 trials) TRZAS HORVS	22-23 (2)	77,25-75.3 pl/m² (2)	Earlier assessment (28 DA-A) based on overall visual control on 2 trials														
			2	77,2-75.3 pl/m² (2)	0.75 L	99.0	-	2	99.0	99.0	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	99.0	-	= (1)		
											Atlantis OD	1.5 L	99.0	-	= (1)		
					1.0 L	99.0	-	1	99.0	-	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	99.0	-	= (1)		
											Atlantis OD	1.2 L	99.0	-	= (1)		
			Later assessment (39 DA-A) based on reductions in weed seed heads on 2 trials														
			2	153,2-148.0 heads/m² (2)	0.75 L	100	-	2	100	-	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	100	-	= (1)		
											Atlantis OD	1.5 L	100	-	= (1)		
					1.0 L	100	-	1	100	-	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	100	-	= (1)		
											Atlantis OD	1.2 L	100	-	= (1)		
											Atlantis OD	1.5 L	100	-	= (1)		
			Efficacy against AVESS (3 trials) on spring cereals														
			North-east (3 trials) TRZAS	13 (3)	9.0-14.0 pl/m² (3)	Earlier assessments (21 DA-A) based on overall visual control across 3 trials											
3	n/d (3)	0.75 L				90.0	90.0-90.0	3	90.0	90.0-90.0	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	81.9	81.3-82.5	n/d (2)		
											Atlantis OD	1.2 L	90.0	-	= (1)		
		1.0 L				92.5	92.5-92.5	2	92.5	92.5-92.5	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	81.9	81.3-82.5	n/d (2)		
Later assessments (55-68 DA-A) based on overall visual control across 2 trials																	
3	n/d (3)	0.75 L				100	100-100	3	100	100-100	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	84.4	83.8-85.0	n/d (2)		
											Atlantis OD	1.2 L	96.3	-	n/d (1)		
		1.0 L				100	100-100	2	100	100-100	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	84.4	83.8-85.0	n/d (2)		

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials) Crop	Weed GS (BBCH) at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	% efficacy ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) across all trials					Direct comparisons of % efficacy to standard reference products							
			No. of trials	Weed density at assessm't	Appl'n rate/ha	Mean	Min-Max	No. of trials	ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)		Standard reference products				Comparison of efficacy to standard reference product#
									Mean	Min-Max	Trade name	Appl'n rate /ha	Mean	Min-Max	
South-east (1 trial) Winter cereals	13-23 (1)	10.0 pl/m² (1)	Earlier assessment (14 DA-A) based on overall visual control on 1 trial on winter cereals												
			1	10.0 pl/m² (1)	0.75 L	81.3	-	1	81.3	-	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	86.3	-	< (1)
					1.0 L	93.8	-	1	93.8	-	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	91.3	-	> (1)
											Atlantis OD	0.6 L	86.3	-	> (1)
											Atlantis OD	1.2 L	91.3	-	= (1)
			Later assessment (37 DA-A) based on reductions in weed seed heads on 1 trial												
			1	22.5 heads/m² (1)	0.75 L	80.7	-	1	80.7	-	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	88.5	-	< (1)
					1.0 L	94.3	-	1	94.3	-	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	93.5	-	< (1)
											Atlantis OD	0.6 L	88.5	-	= (1)
											Atlantis OD	1.2 L	93.5	-	= (1)

No. of trials where >, = or <, based on statistically significant differences at 95% confidence level

ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the proposed maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha gave similar levels of control of all Oat species (AVEFA, AVELU, AVESA, AVESS) on which data was generated across trials within the Maritime, North-east and South-east EPPO climatic zones. AVEFA and AVESA are 2 of the main Oat species that occur as weeds in cereal crops in Europe and data generated on efficacy against these species and also AVELU and AVESS are considered to support a label claim for all Oat species, by extrapolation.

Applied at the proposed maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) gave excellent overall control across trials in the South-east EPPO climatic zone and good overall control across trials in the Maritime and North-east EPPO climatic zones.

The overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 1.0 L product/ha was comparable to, or higher than that of standard reference products containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD, Atlantis WG), where included in the majority of the trials applied at label rates. Compared to other standard reference products where included in a few of the trials and applied at label rates, the overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 1.0 L product/ha was comparable to that of Atlantis Flex (mesosulfuron-methyl + propoxycarbazone).

ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha gave similar levels of control of all Oat species (AVEFA, AVELU, AVESS) on which data was generated across trials within the Maritime, North-east and South-east EPPO climatic zones. AVEFA and AVESA are 2 of the main Oat species that occur as weeds in cereal crops in Europe and data generated on efficacy against these species and also AVELU and AVESS are considered to support a label claim for all Oat species, by extrapolation.

Applied at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) gave good overall control across trials in the Maritime, North-east and South-east EPPO climatic zones.

The overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 0.75 L product/ha was lower at earlier assessments, but similar in terms of reductions in numbers of weed seed heads at later assessments, compared to that of standard reference products containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD, Atlantis Pro), where included in the majority of the trials applied at label rates. Compared to other standard reference products where included in a few of the trials and applied at label rates, the overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 0.75 L product/ha was comparable to, or lower than that of Atlantis Flex (mesosulfuron-methyl + propoxycarbazone).

The presented data demonstrates AVESS to be Susceptible to ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also to the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha under conditions in countries in the Maritime and North-east EPPO climatic zones, whilst the data shows AVESS to be Highly Susceptible to ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and Susceptible to the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha under conditions in South-east EPPO climatic zone countries.

Efficacy against Brome species (*Bromus* spp.: BROSS)

A total of 23 trials conducted between 2018 and 2020 have generated data on the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against Brome species in cereals.

The specific species of Brome occurring in these trials were *Bromus secalinus* (BROSE) in 9 trials, *Bromus sterilis* (BROST) in 13 trials and were not identified in the other 1 trial.

Single post-emergence applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) were made in the spring (between March and May) on all trials, when crop growth stages were in the range of 22-39 (BBCH), and therefore representative of the proposed timings for the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B.

Of these trials, 12 were carried out in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (4 in Czech Republic, 8 in Germany) and 11 were carried out in the South-east EPPO climatic zone (3 in Hungary, 8 in Romania).

All the BROSS trials, in each EPPO zone were conducted on winter cereals. Efficacy trials presenting data on *Bromus* spp. control were conducted on winter cereals (21 trials on TRZAW, 1 trial on HORVW and 1 trial on TTLWI).

Detailed data on efficacy from individual trials (with an indication of specific crops) have been presented in BAD document.

Across trials, the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) against Brome species has been tested in wide ranging locations, cultural practices, climatic conditions and weed biotypes, densities and growth stages that are fully representative of those in the spring in areas where cereal crops are grown in all countries relevant to this submission.

Whilst no data are presented to demonstrate efficacy against Brome species from trials in cereal crops in the North-east EPPO climatic zone, data from trials performed in Czech Republic and Germany, which border Poland in the North-east EPPO climatic zone, are presented in support of the label claim in Poland. Given the geographical proximity of the three countries, it is reasonable to consider that climatic conditions and weed biotypes and densities will be sufficiently analogous for ADM.06001.H.2.B to give similar efficacy in Poland (North-east EPPO climatic zone) to that given in trials carried out in Czech Republic (Maritime EPPO climatic zone) and Germany (Maritime EPPO climatic zone).

An overall summary of the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, compared to that of standard reference products applied at label rates, against Brome species from earlier and later assessments across trials in the Maritime and South-east EPPO climatic zones is given in Table 3.2-25.

Table 3.2-25: Overall summary of the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against Brome species

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS (BBCH) at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	% efficacy ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) across all trials					Direct comparisons of % efficacy to standard reference products							
			No. of trials	Weed density at assessm't	Appl'n rate/ha	Mean	Min-Max	No. of trials	ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)		Standard reference products				Comparison of efficacy to standard reference product#
									Mean	Min-Max	Trade name	Appl'n rate /ha	Mean	Min-Max	
Efficacy against BROSE (9 trials)															
Maritime (2 trials)	22-27 (2)	213.8-251.5 pl/m² (2)	Earlier assessments (28 DA-A) based on overall visual control across 2 trials												
			2	213.8-251.5 pl/m² (2), 26.8-32.0% GC (2)	0.75 L	61.7	53.3-70.0	2	61.7	53.3-70.0	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	61.9	51.8-72.0	= (2)
						70.4	63.3-77.5	2	70.4	63.3-77.5	Atlantis OD	1.5 L	71.8	62.0-81.5	> < (2)
					1.0 L	70.4	63.3-77.5	2	70.4	63.3-77.5	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	61.9	51.8-72.0	< > (2)
						71.8	62.0-81.5	= (1), < (1)							
			Later assessments (52-54 DA-A) based on reductions in weed seed heads across 2 trials												
			2	448.0-537.0 heads/m² (2)	0.75 L	59.4	50.5-68.3	2	59.4	50.5-68.3	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	59.7	49.5-69.8	= (2)
						69.2	61.3-77.0	2	69.2	61.3-77.0	Atlantis OD	1.5 L	69.2	60.0-78.3	< (2)
					1.0 L	69.2	61.3-77.0	2	69.2	61.3-77.0	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	59.7	49.5-69.8	> (2)
69.2	60.0-78.3	= (2)													
South-east (7 trials)	21-48 (7)	17.0-25.5 pl/m² (7)	Earlier assessments (14-28 DA-A) based on overall visual control across 6 trials												
			6	17.0-25.5 pl/m² (6), 15.0-25.0% GC (6)	0.75 L	79.6	62.5-95.0	1	77.5	-	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	72.5	-	= (1)
								3	87.9	76.3-95.0	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	94.2	82.5-100	< (3)
								3	71.3	62.5-77.5	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	80.8	75.0-87.5	= (1), < (2)
					1.0 L	89.8	81.3-100	1	83.8	-	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	72.5	-	> (1)
								3	94.6	83.8-100	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	94.2	82.5-100	= (3)
								3	85.0	81.3-90.0	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	80.8	75.0-87.5	> (1), = (2)
			Later assessments (44-48 DA-A) based on overall visual control across 2 trials												
			2	20.2-25.5 pl/m² (2), 25.0% GC (2)	0.75 L	93.8	92.5-95.0	2	93.8	92.5-95.0	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	100	100-100	< (2)
					1.0 L	100	100-100		100	100-100					= (2)
			Later assessments (14-52 DA-A) based on reductions in weed seed heads across 5 trials												
			5	25.5-45.5 heads/m² (5)	0.75 L	68.2	53.0-82.5	1	78.5	-	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	73.3	-	= (1)
								1	82.5	-	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	87.5	-	< (1)
								4	64.6	53.0-78.5	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	76.4	64.4-87.4	< (4)
					1.0 L	82.1	69.5-91.3	1	86.2	-	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	73.3	-	> (1)
								1	91.3	-	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	87.5	-	= (1)
								4	79.9	69.5-86.2	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	76.4	64.4-87.4	= (4)

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS (BBCH) at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	% efficacy ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) across all trials					Direct comparisons of % efficacy to standard reference products							
			No. of trials	Weed density at assessm't	Appl'n rate/ha	Mean	Min-Max	No. of trials	ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)		Standard reference products				Comparison of efficacy to standard reference product#
									Mean	Min-Max	Trade name	Appl'n rate /ha	Mean	Min-Max	
Efficacy against BROST (13 trials)															
Maritime (10 trials)	13-39 (10)	22.0-388.5 pl/m ² (10)	Earlier assessments (18-28 DA-A) based on overall visual control across 10 trials												
			10	20.0-500.0 pl/m ² (9), 3.5-80.0% GC (8)	0.75 L	46.2	15.0-69.0	3	55.8	47.5-65.0	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	63.8	55.0-70.0	= (1), < (2)
								1	55.0	-	Atlantis OD	1.5 L	57.5	-	= (1)
								5	45.5	20.0-69.0	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	62.3	20.0-86.0	= (1), < (4)
								3	38.3	15.0-52.5	Corello	0.25 Kg	79.6	66.3-90.0	< (3)
					1.0 L	55.5	20.0-81.0	3	65.8	65.0-67.5	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	63.8	55.0-70.0	= (3)
								1	67.5	-	Atlantis OD	1.5 L	57.5	-	> (1)
								5	56.0	20.0-81.0	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	62.3	20.0-86.0	= (4), < (1)
								3	47.5	25.0-65.0	Corello	0.25 Kg	79.6	66.3-90.0	< (3)
			Later assessments (37-81 DA-A) based on reductions in weed seed heads across 10 trials												
			10	37.0-1083.8 heads/m ² (10)	0.75 L	53.4	27.3-95.2	3	66.2	30.2-95.2	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	80.5	59.7-92.9	= (3)
								1	95.2	-	Atlantis OD	1.5 L	94.3	-	= (1)
								5	51.8	31.3-69.0	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	84.1	65.5-93.6	< (5)
								3	49.8	27.3-73.1	Corello	0.25 Kg	91.3	84.7-98.1	= (1), < (2)
					1.0 L	65.5	41.9-97.8	3	74.5	45.5-97.8	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	80.5	59.7-92.9	= (3)
								1	97.8	-	Atlantis OD	1.5 L	94.3	-	= (1)
								5	63.6	41.9-81.0	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	84.1	65.5-93.6	= (2), < (3)
								3	64.4	56.0-80.2	Corello	0.25 Kg	91.3	84.7-98.1	= (1), < (2)
			Efficacy against BROST (13 trials)												
South-east (3 trials)	13-25 (3)	13.0-73.0 pl/m ² (3)	Earlier assessments (25-29 DA-A) based on overall visual control across 3 trials												
			3	13.0-73.0 pl/m ² (3), 12.0% GC (1)	0.75 L	73.8	68.8-80.0	23	73.8	68.8-80.0	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	89.4	83.8-93.0	< (3)
					1.0 L	85.9	82.5-88.8		85.9	82.5-88.8					= (1.2), < (1.1)
			Later assessments (46-52 DA-A) based on reductions in weed seed heads across 3 trials												
			3	23.0-350.0 heads/m ² (3)	0.75 L	56.5	27.2-85.7	23	56.5	27.2-85.7	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	77.7	55.5-89.2	= (2), < (1)
		1.0 L	75.4	54.2-93.4		75.4	54.2-93.4					> (1), = (1), < (1)			
Efficacy against BROSS (1 trial)															
South-east (1 trial)	38-55 (1)	6.0 pl/m ² (1)	Earlier assessment (15 DA-A) based on overall visual control on 1 trial												
			1	n/d (1)	0.75 L	91.5	-	1	91.5	-	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	90.5	-	= (1)
					1.0 L	96.5	-		96.5	-					> (1)
			Later assessment (21 DA-A) based on reductions in weed seed heads on 1 trial												
			1	18.3 heads/m ² (1)	0.75 L	90.3	-	1	90.3	-	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	95.9	-	< (1)
		1.0 L	97.3	-		97.3	-					= (1)			

No. of trials where >, = or <, based on statistically significant differences at 95% confidence level

ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the lower rate of 1.0 L product/ha gave similar levels of control of both Brome species (BROSE, BROST) on which data was generated across trials within the Maritime EPPO climatic zone, whilst it gave similar levels of control of all Brome species (BROSE, BROST, BROSS) across trials within the South-east EPPO climatic zone. BROSE and BROST are 2 of the main Brome species that occur as weeds in cereal crops in Europe and data generated on efficacy against these are considered to support a label claim for all Brome species, by extrapolation.

Applied at the proposed maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) gave moderately good overall control across trials in the South-east climatic zone and good overall control across trials in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone.

The overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 1.0 L product/ha was similar or lower at earlier assessments, but generally similar in terms of reductions in numbers of weed seed heads at later assessments, compared to that of the standard reference product containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD), where included in the majority of the trials applied at label rates. Compared to other standard reference products where included in a few of the trials and applied at label rates, the overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 1.0 L product/ha was similar to that of Atlantis Flex (mesosulfuron-methyl + propoxycarbazone) and lower than that of Corello (pyroxsulam).

ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha gave similar levels of control of both Brome species (BROSE, BROST) on which data was generated across trials within the Maritime EPPO climatic zone, whilst it gave similar levels of control of all Brome species (BROSE, BROST, BROSS) across trials within the South-east EPPO climatic zone. BROSE and BROST are 2 of the main Brome species that occur as weeds in cereal crops in Europe and data generated on efficacy against these are considered to support a label claim for all Brome species, by extrapolation.

Applied at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) gave moderate overall control across trials in the Maritime and South-east EPPO climatic zones.

The overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 0.75 L product/ha was lower than that of standard reference products containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD), where included in the majority of the trials applied at label rates. Compared to other standard reference products where included in a few of the trials and applied at label rates, the overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 0.75 L product/ha was lower than that of Atlantis Flex (mesosulfuron-methyl + propoxycarbazone) and Corello (pyroxsulam).

The presented data demonstrates BROSS to be Moderately Tolerant to ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also to the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha under conditions in countries in the Maritime and North-east EPPO climatic zones. With generally lower weed densities and under conditions in South-east EPPO climatic zone countries, the data shows BROSS to be Moderately Susceptible to ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and Moderately Tolerant to the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha.

Efficacy against Italian ryegrass (*Lolium multiflorum*: LOLMU)

A total of 28 trials conducted between 2018 and 2020 have generated data on the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against LOLMU in cereals.

Single post-emergence applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) were made in the spring (between February and ~~June~~ May) on all trials, when crop growth stages were in the range of 21-39 (BBCH), and therefore representative of the proposed timings for the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B.

Of these trials, 15 were carried out in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (4 in Czech Republic, 10 in France, 1 in Germany) and 13 were carried out in the South-east EPPO climatic zone (11 in Hungary, 2 in Romania).

Efficacy trials presenting data on *Lolium multiflorum* control were conducted mainly on winter cereals (25 trials, including 23 trials on TRZAW, 1 trial on TRZDU and 1 trial on TTLWI) and on spring cereals (3 trials on TRZAS).

Detailed data on efficacy from individual trials (with an indication of specific crops) have been presented in BAD document.

Efficacy data from 1 of the trials in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (in France) and 1 of the trials in the South-east EPPO climatic zone (in Hungary) are considered not to accurately represent that of the treatments. AG-PM1-72 OD and standard reference products gave low and variable control on both of these trials. This was attributed to suspected weed biotypes with reduced susceptibility to HRAC mode of application group 2 (ALS inhibitors) being prevalent at the site of 1 of the trials and later flushes of weeds emerging after application on the other trial. On this basis, data from these 2 trials has not been included in the following summary table.

Across all other trials, the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) against LOLMU has been tested in wide ranging locations, cultural practices, climatic conditions and weed biotypes, densities and growth stages that are fully representative of those in the spring in areas where cereal crops are grown in all countries relevant to this submission.

Whilst no data are presented to demonstrate efficacy against LOLMU from trials in cereal crops in the North-east EPPO climatic zone, data from trials performed in Czech Republic and Germany, which border Poland in the North-east EPPO climatic zone, are presented in support of the label claim in Poland. Given the geographical proximity of the three countries, it is reasonable to consider that climatic conditions and weed biotypes and densities will be sufficiently analogous for ADM.06001.H.2.B to give similar efficacy in Poland (North-east EPPO climatic zone) to that given in trials carried out in Czech Republic (Maritime EPPO climatic zone) and Germany (Maritime EPPO climatic zone).

An overall summary of the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, compared to that of standard reference products applied at label rates, against LOLMU from earlier and later assessments across all trials with valid data in each EPPO climatic zone is given in Table 3.2-26.

Table 3.2-26: Overall summary of the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against LOLMU

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS (BBCH) at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	% efficacy ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) across all trials					Direct comparisons of % efficacy to standard reference products									
			CROP No. of trials	Weed density at assessm't	Appl'n rate/ha	Mean	Min-Max	No. of trials	ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)		Standard reference products				Comparison of efficacy to standard reference product#		
									Mean	Min-Max	Trade name	Appl'n rate /ha	Mean	Min-Max			
Maritime (14 trials)	11-33 (14)	7.0-113.0 pl/m² (14)	Earlier assessments (18-35 DA-A) based on overall visual control across all 14 trials														
			ALL 14	8.0-138.5 pl/m² (14), 1.5-55.0% GC (8)	0.75 L	65.7	15.0-100	1	55.0	-	Atlantis Pro	1.0 L	53.8	-	= (1)		
								10	72.2	15.0-100	Atlantis OD/Atlantis Pro	1.2 L	77.6	50.0-100	> (3), = (5), > (2)		
								5	62.9	27.6-94.5	Atlantis Pro	1.5 L	79.1	55.4-96.0	= (3), < (2)		
								1	20.0	-	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	20.0	-	= (1)		
					1.0 L	71.5	20.0-100	1	65.0	-	Atlantis Pro	1.0 L	53.8	-	= (1)		
								10	77.1	22.5-100	Atlantis OD/Atlantis Pro	1.2 L	77.6	50.0-100	> (3), = (6), < (1)		
								5	69.2	50.5-94.6	Atlantis Pro	1.5 L	79.1	55.4-96.0	= (5)		
			TRZAS 2	58.5 pl/m²	0.75 L	90	80-100	2	90	80-100	Atlantis Pro	1.0 L	86.7	80-100	> (2), < (1)		
					1.0 L	100	100-100	2	100	100-100					> (2), = (1)		
			TRZAW 12	48.1 pl/m²	0.75 L	61.6	15-100	12	61.6	15-100	All iodosulfuron + mesosulfuron formulations	1.2-1.5 L	69.6	20-99.9	> (2), = (7), > (3)		
					1.0 L	66.7	20-100	12	66.7	20-100					> (3), = (7), > (2)		
			Later assessments (55-84 DA-A) based on overall visual control across 3 trials														
			TRZAW 3	83.5-185.0 pl/m² (3), 26.3% GC (1)	0.75 L	70.8	29.7-93.5	1	89.3	-	Atlantis Pro	1.2 L	96.8	-	< (1)		
								2	61.6	29.7-93.5	Atlantis Pro	1.5 L	77.1	54.8-99.5	< (2)		
					1.0 L	79.6	48.9-97.8	1	92.0	-	Atlantis Pro	1.2 L	96.8	-	= (1)		
								2	73.4	48.9-97.8	Atlantis Pro	1.5 L	77.1	54.8-99.5	= (2)		
			Later assessments (35-92 DA-A) based on reductions in weed seed heads across 11 trials														
			ALL 11	11.3-132.5 heads/m² (11)	0.75 L	77.6	10.0-100	1	97.4	-	Atlantis Pro	1.0 L	99.3	-	= (1)		
								9	85.8	12.5-100	Atlantis OD/Atlantis Pro	1.2 L	90.3	40.0-100	> (2), = (6), < (1)		
								3	60.5	12.5-97.7	Atlantis Pro	1.5 L	80.5	69.7-100	= (2), < (1)		
								1	60.0	-	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	85.0	-	< (1)		
					1.0 L	82.3	10.5-100	1	100	-	Atlantis Pro	1.0 L	99.3	-	= (1)		
								9	91.2	21.2-100	Atlantis OD/Atlantis Pro	1.2 L	90.3	40.0-100	> (2), = (7)		
								3	64.8	21.2-99.2	Atlantis Pro	1.5 L	80.5	69.7-100	= (2), < (1)		
								1	63.0	-	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	85.0	-	< (1)		
					TRZAS 3	71.5 heads/m²	0.75 L	92.6	80.5-100	3	92.6	80.5-100	Atlantis	1.0-1.2 L	96.7	87.8-100	> (1), = (1), < (1)
							1.0 L	100	100-100	3	100	100-100					> (1), = (2)
			TRZAW 8	60.3 heads/m²	0.75 L	78.2	12.5-100	8	78.2	12.5-100	All iodosulfuron + mesosulfuron formulations	1.2-1.5 L	85.2	40-100	> (1), = (5), < (2)		
					1.0 L	82.2	21.2-100	8	82.2	21.2-100					> (1), = (5), < (2)		

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS (BBCH) at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	% efficacy ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) across all trials					Direct comparisons of % efficacy to standard reference products								
			CROP No. of trials	Weed density at assessm't	Appl'n rate/ha	Mean	Min-Max	No. of trials	ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)		Standard reference products				Comparison of efficacy to standard reference product#	
									Mean	Min-Max	Trade name	Appl'n rate /ha	Mean	Min-Max		
South-east (12 trials)	10-48 (12)	7.0-199.0 pl/m²	Earlier assessments (23-28 DA-A) based on overall visual control across 11 trials													
			TRZAW 11	10.0-228.0 pl/m² (11), 7.5-75.0% GC (8)	0.75 L	80.3	48.8-100	1	88.3	-	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	60.0	-	> (1)	
								3	78.4	48.8-96.5	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	85.2	60.0-100	< (3)	
								8	81.0	63.8-100	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	81.1	56.3-100	> (1), = (6), < (1)	
					1.0 L	86.9	60.0-100	1	100	-	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	100	-	= (1)	
								1	90.0	-	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	60.0	-	> (1)	
								3	86.0	60.0-100	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	85.2	60.0-100	> (1), = (2)	
								8	87.3	71.0-100	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	81.1	56.3-100	> (4), = (3), < (1)	
								1	100	-	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	100	-	= (1)	
			Later assessments (14-95 DA-A) based on reductions in weed seed heads across all 12 trials													
			TRZAW 12	11.3-1083.3 heads/m² (12)	0.75 L	89.5	52.0-100	1	95.0	-	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	0.0	-	= (1)	
								3	84.0	52.0-100	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	82.7	48.0-100	= (3)	
								9	91.3	72.3-100	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	84.8	85.0-100	= (8), < (1)	
								2	96.3	92.5-100	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	91.3	82.6-100	> (1), = (1)	
					1.0 L	96.3	79.0-100	1	99.0	-	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	0.0	-	= (1)	
								3	93.0	79.0-100	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	82.7	48.0-100	= (3)	
								9	97.4	86.3-100	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	84.8	85.0-100	> (1), = (8)	
								2	100	100-100	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	91.3	82.6-100	> (1), = (1)	

No. of trials where >, = or <, based on statistically significant differences at 95% confidence level

Table 3.2-26a: Overall summary of the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against LOLMU in Maritime EPPO zone (only CZ and DE).

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS (BBCH) at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	% efficacy ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) across all trials					Direct comparisons of % efficacy to standard reference products							
			No. of trials	Weed density at assessm't	Appl'n rate/ha	Mean	Min-Max	No. of trials	ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)		Standard reference products				Comparison of efficacy to standard reference product#
									Mean	Min-Max	Trade name	Appl'n rate /ha	Mean	Min-Max	
Maritime (CZ+DE - 3 trials conducted on TRZAW)	13-32 (3)	13.8- 32.3pl/m² (3)	Earlier assessments (18-28 DA-A) based on overall visual control across all 3 trials												
			3	9.0-31.3 pl/m² (3)	0.75 L	72.0	20.0-100	2	98.0	96.0-100	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	86.2	80.0-92.3	> (2)
								1	20.0	-	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	20.0	-	= (1)
					1.0 L	72.0	20.0-100	2	98.0	96.0-100	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	86.2	80.0-92.3	> (2)
								1	20.0	-	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	20.0	-	= (1)
			Later assessments (45-81 DA-A) based on reductions in weed seed heads across 3 trials												
			3	29.8-87.0 heads/ m² (3)	0.75 L	86.7	60.0-100	2	100	100-100	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	93.6	88.1-99.0	> (1), = (1)
								1	60.0	-	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	85.0	-	< (1)
					1.0 L	87.7	63.0-100	2	100	100-100	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	93.6	88.1-99.0	> (1), = (1)
								1	63.0	-	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	85.0	-	< (1)
Maritime (CZ - 2 trials conducted on TRZAS)	12-33 (2)	33.5- 82.3pl/m² (2)	Earlier assessments (28 DA-A) based on overall visual control across all 2 trials												
			2	38.0-79.0 pl/m² (2)	0.75 L	90.0	20.0-100	2	90.0	80.0-100	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	90.0	80.0-100	> (1), < (1)
					1.0 L	100	20.0-100	2	100	100-100	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	90.0	80.0-100	= (1), > (1)
			Later assessments (35-49 DA-A) based on reductions in weed seed heads across 2 trials												
			2	19.8-74.3 heads/ m² (2)	0.75 L	90.3	80.5-100	2	90.3	80.5-100	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	93.9	87.8-100	> (1), < (1)
					1.0 L	100	100-100	2	100	100-100	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	93.9	87.8-100	> (1), = (1)

Applied at the proposed maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) gave good overall control across trials in the South-east EPPO climatic zone and moderately good overall control across trials in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone.

The overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 1.0 L product/ha was similar to, or lower than that of standard reference products containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD, Atlantis Pro), where included in the majority of the trials applied at label rates. Compared to another standard reference product, where included in a few of the trials and applied at label rate, the overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at 1.0 L product/ha was not consistently different to that of Atlantis Flex (mesosulfuron-methyl + propoxycarbazone).

Applied at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) gave good overall control across trials in the South-east EPPO climatic zone and moderately good overall control across trials in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone.

The overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 0.75 L product/ha was similar to, or lower than that of standard reference products containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD, Atlantis Pro), where included in the majority of the trials applied at label rates. Compared to another standard reference product, where included in a few of the trials and applied at label rate, the overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 0.75 L product/ha was not consistently different to that of Atlantis Flex (mesosulfuron-methyl + propoxycarbazone).

There is the possibility that in the trial in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone where AG-PM1-72 OD and also the standard reference product gave low control of LOLMU that weed biotypes with reduced susceptibility to HRAC mode of application group 2 (ALS inhibitors) were prevalent at the site. In locations where this is the case, herbicides with this mode of action should not be relied upon for control of LOLMU. ADM.06001.H.2.B labels will include statements to this effect, advising ADM.06001.H.2.B should only be applied in tank mixtures and sequences with herbicides with different modes of action in situations where resistance biotypes of LOLMU are known to be a problem.

The presented data demonstrates LOLMU to be Susceptible to ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also to the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha under conditions in countries in the South-east EPPO climatic zone, whilst the data shows LOLMU to be Moderately Susceptible to ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also to the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha under conditions in countries in the Maritime and North-east EPPO climatic zones.

Comment of zRMS:

To support registration in PL, zRMS has added additional table 3.2-26a to present efficacy data of ADM.06001.H.2.B in the control of LOLMU from the trials carried out in Czech Republic and Germany. Based on efficacy results achieved in the trials conducted on winter wheat, LOLMU can be classified as moderately susceptible (MS) to ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at dose rates of 0.75 and 1.0 L/ha.

Efficacy against Perennial ryegrass (*Lolium perenne*: LOLPE)

Whilst no data are presented to demonstrate efficacy against LOLPE from trials in cereal crops, weed biotypes, densities and susceptibility to herbicides of this *Lolium* species and that of LOLMU in EU countries are considered to be sufficiently similar for data generated on the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B on LOLMU to also provide supportive evidence of efficacy against LOLPE. Therefore, data generated on LOLMU in the Maritime (15 trials) and South-east (13 trials) EPPO climatic zones, as summarised earlier in this Section, are supportive of demonstrating efficacy against LOLPE within these climatic zones.

Whilst no data are presented to demonstrate efficacy against LOLMU, and by extrapolation LOLPE, from trials in cereal crops in the North-east EPPO climatic zone, data from trials performed in Czech Republic and Germany, which border Poland in the North-east EPPO climatic zone, are presented in support of the label claim in Poland. Given the geographical proximity of the three countries, it is reasonable to consider that climatic conditions and weed biotypes and densities will be sufficiently analogous for ADM.06001.H.2.B to give similar efficacy in Poland (North-east EPPO climatic zone) to that given in trials carried out in Czech Republic (Maritime EPPO climatic zone) and Germany (Maritime EPPO climatic zone).

Based on extrapolation from data on LOLMU, it is therefore reasonable to propose that LOLPE is Susceptible to ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also to the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha under conditions in countries in the South-east EPPO climatic zone and Moderately Susceptible to ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also to the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha under conditions in countries in the Maritime and North-east EPPO climatic zones.

Comment of zRMS:

Due to no efficacy data for LOLPE, the concerned MSs are kindly advised to consider extrapolation possibility from relative weed species LOLMU and make a decision concerning acceptance of LOLPE on the national level.

Efficacy against Annual meadowgrass (*Poa annua*: POAAN)

A total of 29 trials conducted between 2018 and 2020 have generated data on the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha in 30 29 of the trials, and also the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha in all trials, against POAAN in cereals.

Single post-emergence applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) were made in the spring (between March and May) on all trials, when crop growth stages were in the range of 22-39 (BBCH), and therefore representative of the proposed timings for the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B.

Of these trials, 13 were carried out in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (2 in Czech Republic, 5 in France, 6 in Germany), 6 were carried out in the North-east EPPO climatic zone (all in Poland) and 10 were carried out in the South-east EPPO climatic zone (5 in Hungary, 5 in Romania).

All the efficacy trials presenting data on *Poa annua* control were conducted on TRZAW.

Detailed data on efficacy from individual trials have been presented in BAD document.

Across trials, the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) against POAAN has been tested in wide ranging locations, cultural practices, climatic conditions and weed biotypes, densities and growth stages that are fully representative of those in the spring in areas where cereal crops are grown in all countries relevant to this submission.

An overall summary of the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, compared to that of standard reference products applied at label rates, against POAAN from earlier and later assessments across trials in each EPPO climatic zone is given in Table 3.2-27.

Table 3.2-27: Overall summary of the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against POAAN

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS (BBCH) at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	% efficacy ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) across all trials					Direct comparisons of % efficacy to standard reference products									
			No. of trials	Weed density at assessm't	Appl'n rate/ha	Mean	Min-Max	No. of trials	ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)		Standard reference products				Comparison of efficacy to standard reference product#		
									Mean	Min-Max	Trade name	Appl'n rate /ha	Mean	Min-Max			
Maritime (13 trials)	12-65 (13)	5.3-35.0 pl/m² (13)	Earlier assessments (22-33 DA-A) based on overall visual control across all 13 trials														
			13	5.3-81.8 pl/m² (12), 2.4-23.8% GC (8)	0.75 L	58.6	10.0-98.6	4	42.0	10.0-95.0	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	45.3	25.0-75.0	> (1), = (2), < (1)		
								4	42.0	10.0-95.0	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	62.3	31.0-98.0	= (2), < (2)		
								5	60.2	15.0-98.6	Atlantis Pro	1.2 L	73.5	35.0-100	= (1), < (4)		
								1	98.6	-	Atlantis Pro	1.5 L	100	-	= (1)		
								4	73.2	53.8-93.8	Atlantis WG	0.2 Kg	66.4	55.0-97.3	> (1), = (3)		
								3	66.4	53.8-85.0	Atlantis WG	0.3 Kg	73.9	60.5-93.8	= (2), < (1)		
					1.0 L	61.7	25.0-99.8	3	66.4	53.8-85.0	Atlantis Flex	0.2 Kg	68.8	50.0-93.8	= (3)		
								4	44.1	25.0-96.3	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	45.3	25.0-75.0	> (1), = (2), < (1)		
								4	44.1	25.0-96.3	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	62.3	31.0-98.0	= (2), < (2)		
								5	65.0	25.0-99.8	Atlantis Pro	1.2 L	73.5	35.0-100	= (2), < (3)		
								1	99.8	-	Atlantis Pro	1.5 L	100	-	= (1)		
								4	75.4	52.5-98.5	Atlantis WG	0.2 Kg	66.4	55.0-97.3	> (1), = (3)		
								3	67.7	52.5-90.0	Atlantis WG	0.3 Kg	73.9	60.5-93.8	= (2), < (1)		
								3	67.7	52.5-90.0	Atlantis Flex	0.2 Kg	68.8	50.0-93.8	= (3)		
			Later assessments (43-85 DA-A) based on overall visual control across 10 trials														
			10	5.3-35.0 pl/m² (9), 3.3-25.0% GC (6)	0.75 L	78.3	10.0-100	2	48.8	10.0-87.5	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	60.0	50.0-70.0	> (1), < (1)		
								2	48.8	10.0-87.5	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	84.0	70.0-98.0	< (2)		
								4	89.1	62.5-100	Atlantis Pro	1.2 L	89.3	60.0-100	= (4)		
								4	78.6	68.3-95.0	Atlantis WG	0.2 Kg	77.7	51.3-98.0	> (1), = (3)		
								3	78.6	68.3-95.0	Atlantis WG	0.3 Kg	85.7	70.5-99.0	= (2), < (1)		
								3	78.6	68.3-98.0	Atlantis Flex	0.2 Kg	86.5	74.3-99.0	= (2), < (1)		
					1.0 L	83.7	30.0-100	2	65.0	30.0-100	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	60.0	50.0-70.0	> (1), < (1)		
								2	65.0	30.0-100	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	84.0	70.0-98.0	= (1), < (1)		
								4	89.4	62.5-100	Atlantis Pro	1.2 L	89.3	60.0-100	= (4)		
								3	83.5	74.3-98.8	Atlantis WG	0.2 Kg	77.7	51.3-98.0	> (2), = (2)		
								3	83.5	74.3-98.8	Atlantis WG	0.3 Kg	85.7	70.5-99.0	= (2), < (1)		
								3	83.5	74.3-98.8	Atlantis Flex	0.2 Kg	86.5	74.3-99.0	= (3)		
			Later assessments (41 DA-A) based on reductions in weed seed heads across 2 trials														
			2	18.0-24.0 pl/m² (2)	0.75 L	62.5	50.0-75.0	2	62.5	50.0-75.0	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	62.5	50.0-75.0	= (2)		
											Atlantis OD	1.0 L	56.5	50.0-63.0	= (2)		
					1.0 L	61.0	59.0-63.0	2	61.0	59.0-63.0	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	62.5	50.0-75.0	= (2)		
											Atlantis OD	1.0 L	56.5	50.0-63.0	= (2)		

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS (BBCH) at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	% efficacy ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) across all trials					Direct comparisons of % efficacy to standard reference products							
			No. of trials	Weed density at assessm't	Appl'n rate/ha	Mean	Min-Max	No. of trials	ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)		Standard reference products				Comparison of efficacy to standard reference product#
									Mean	Min-Max	Trade name	Appl'n rate /ha	Mean	Min-Max	
North-east (6 trials)	14-59 (6)	5.0-20.5 pl/m ² (6)	Earlier assessments (26-29 DA-A) based on overall visual control across all 6 trials												
			6	5.0-22.0 pl/m ² (6), 1.0-9.5% GC (3)	0.75 L	87.7	72.5-93.8	6	87.7	72.5-93.8	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	88.3	81.3-91.3	> (1), = (4), < (1)
								4	87.4	72.5-93.8	Atlantis Star	0.2 Kg	88.7	77.5-96.3	= (4)
					1.0 L	91	77.5-100	6	91.0	77.5-100	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	88.3	81.3-91.3	> (2), = (4)
								4	91.3	77.5-100	Atlantis Star	0.2 Kg	88.7	77.5-96.3	> (1), = (3)
			Later assessments (38-69 DA-A) based on overall visual control across all 6 trials												
			6	5.0-32.0 pl/m ² (6), 1.0-9.5% GC (4)	0.75 L	90.9	75.0-97.5	6	90.9	75.0-97.5	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	94.8	85.0-100	= (4), < (2)
								4	90.2	75.0-97.5	Atlantis Star	0.2 Kg	91.1	82.5-100	= (3), < (1)
					1.0 L	95.1	85.0-100	6	95.1	85.0-100	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	94.8	85.0-100	= (5), < (1)
								4	95.0	85.0-100	Atlantis Star	0.2 Kg	91.1	82.5-100	= (3), = (1)
South-east (10 trials)	12-65 (10)	9.0-173.5 pl/m ² (10)	Earlier assessments (21-28 DA-A) based on overall visual control across all 10 trials												
			10	10.0-173.5 pl/m ² (10), 4.0-30.0% GC (9)	0.75 L	82.3	66.3-100	9	80.4	66.3-100	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	79.8	50.0-100	> (3), = (3), < (3)
								2	73.4	66.3-80.5	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	91.4	88.0-94.8	< (2)
								7	82.4	68.8-100	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	88.2	68.3-100	= (3), < (4)
								3	86.3	78.8-92.5	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	80.0	60.0-100	> (2), < (1)
			9	10.0-173.5 pl/m ² (10), 4.0-30.0% GC (9)	1.0 L	88.9	72.5-100	9	88.9	72.5-100	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	79.8	50.0-100	> (4), = (5)
								2	84.4	74.0-94.8	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	91.4	88.0-94.8	= (1), < (1)
								6	88.6	72.5-100	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	86.2	68.3-93.8	> (1), = (5)
								3	94.2	87.5-100	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	80.0	60.0-100	> (2), = (1)
			Later assessments (39-71 DA-A) based on overall visual control across 8 trials												
			8	10.0-173.5 pl/m ² (7), 3.8-31.7% GC (7)	0.75 L	86.6	68.3-100	7	84.7	68.3-100	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	88.9	78.3-100	> (2), = (1), < (4)
								2	74.4	68.3-80.5	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	94.9	94.8-95.0	< (2)
								5	88.9	69.3-100	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	94.5	84.0-100	= (3), < (2)
								2	100	100-100	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	96.9	93.8-100	> (1), = (1)
			7	10.0-173.5 pl/m ² (7), 3.8-31.7% GC (7)	1.0 L	93.2	82.5-100	7	93.2	82.5-100	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	88.9	78.3-100	> (2), = (5)
								2	90.6	86.3-80.5	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	94.9	94.8-95.0	= (2)
								4	92.8	82.5-100	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	93.1	84.0-100	= (4)
								2	100	100-100	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	96.9	93.8-100	> (1), = (1)

No. of trials where >, = or <, based on statistically significant differences at 95% confidence level

Applied at the proposed maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) gave excellent overall control across trials in the North-east EPPO climatic zone and good overall control across trials in the Maritime and South-east EPPO climatic zones.

The overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 1.0 L product/ha was comparable to, or higher than that of standard reference products containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD, Atlantis Pro, Atlantis WG), where included in the majority of the trials applied at label rates. Compared to other standard reference products where included in a few of the trials and applied at label rates, the overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 1.0 L product/ha was comparable to, or higher than that of Atlantis Flex (mesosulfuron-methyl + propoxycarbazone) and slightly higher than that of Atlantis Star (iodosulfuron-methyl-sodium + mesosulfuron-methyl + thien carbazole-methyl).

Applied at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) gave good overall control across trials in the Maritime, North-east and South-east EPPO climatic zones.

The overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 0.75 L product/ha was slightly lower than that of standard reference products containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD, Atlantis Pro, Atlantis WG), where included in the majority of the trials applied at label rates. Compared to other standard reference products where included in a few of the trials and applied at label rates, the overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 0.75 L product/ha was not consistently different to that of Atlantis Flex (mesosulfuron-methyl + propoxycarbazone) and comparable to that of Atlantis Star (iodosulfuron-methyl-sodium + mesosulfuron-methyl + thien carbazole-methyl).

In the few trials in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone where ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) gave relatively low levels of control, the standard reference products also gave similarly low levels of control, indicating that environmental conditions (e.g. low temperatures, dry soil conditions) resulted in the weeds not being actively growing at the time of application and thereby resulting in reduced herbicide uptake and efficacy on these trials. The ADM.06001.H.2.B label will include a statement advising that application should only be made when weeds are actively growing.

There was a general trend that weeds were at more advanced growth stages at application in those trials where ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) gave lower levels of control. On this basis, the proposed labels will specify that ADM.06001.H.2.B should be applied when weeds are at earlier stages of development to achieve optimum control of POAAN.

The presented data demonstrates POAAN to be Susceptible to ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also to the lower 0.75 L product/ha rate under conditions in countries in the Maritime, North-east and South-east EPPO climatic zones.

Comment of zRMS:

Based on the results from ten Maritime EPPO zone trials, achieved 43-85 DAA, POAAN can be classified as moderately susceptible weed species in this zone.

Efficacy against Rough-stalked meadowgrass (*Poa trivialis*: POATR)

A total of 1 trial conducted in 2020 have generated data on the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against POATR in cereals.

A single post-emergence application of ADM.06001.H.2.B was made in the spring in March on this trial, when the crop growth stage was at 29-31 (BBCH), and therefore representative of the proposed timings for the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B.

This trial was carried out in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone on winter wheat (in Germany).

On this trial, the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B against POATR has been tested in a location, cultural practices, climatic conditions and a weed biotype, density and growth stage that are representative of those in the spring in areas where cereal crops are grown in all countries relevant to this submission.

An overall summary of the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, compared to that of standard reference products applied at label rates, against POATR from earlier and later assessments on this trial in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone is given in Table 3.2-28.

Table 3.2-28: Overall summary of the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B applied the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against POATR

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS (BBCH) at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	% efficacy ADM.06001.H.2.B across all trials					Direct comparisons of % efficacy to standard reference products							
			No. of trials	Weed density at assessm't	Appl'n rate/ha	Mean	Min-Max	No. of trials	ADM.06001.H.2.B		Standard reference products				Comparison of efficacy to standard reference product#
									Mean	Min-Max	Trade name	Appl'n rate /ha	Mean	Min-Max	
Maritime (1 trial)	17-31 (1)	106.0 pl/m² (1)	Earlier assessment (29 DA-A) based on overall visual control on 1 trial												
			1	106.0 pl/m² (1), 21.8% GC (1)	0.75 L	81.3	-	1	81.3	-	Atlantis WG	0.2 Kg	83.8	-	= (1)
											Atlantis WG	0.3 Kg	93.8	-	= (1)
											Atlantis Flex	0.2 Kg	90.0	-	= (1)
					1.0 L	87.5	-	1	87.5	-	Atlantis WG	0.2 Kg	83.8	-	= (1)
											Atlantis WG	0.3 Kg	93.8	-	= (1)
											Atlantis Flex	0.2 Kg	90.0	-	= (1)
			Later assessment (72 DA-A) based on reductions in weed seed heads on 1 trial												
			1	427.5 heads/m² (1)	0.75 L	94.1	-	1	94.1	-	Atlantis WG	0.2 Kg	96.6	-	= (1)
											Atlantis WG	0.3 Kg	98.2	-	= (1)
											Atlantis Flex	0.2 Kg	99.2	-	= (1)
					1.0 L	98.0	-	1	98.0	-	Atlantis WG	0.2 Kg	96.6	-	= (1)
											Atlantis WG	0.3 Kg	98.2	-	= (1)
											Atlantis Flex	0.2 Kg	99.2	-	= (1)

No. of trials where >, = or <, based on statistically significant differences at 95% confidence level

Applied at the proposed maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, ADM.06001.H.2.B gave excellent control in the 1 trial in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone.

The efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at 1.0 L product/ha was similar to that of the standard reference product containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl applied at label rates and also to that of Atlantis Flex (mesosulfuron-methyl + propoxycarbazone) applied at label rate.

Applied at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) gave good control in the 1 trial in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone.

The efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at 0.75 L product/ha was slightly lower than that of the standard reference product containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl applied at label rates and also Atlantis Flex (mesosulfuron-methyl + propoxycarbazone) applied at label rate, although the differences were not statistically significant.

Whilst limited data are presented to demonstrate efficacy against POATR from trials in cereal crops in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone and no data were generated in the North-east and South-east EPPO climatic zones, weed biotypes, densities and susceptibility to herbicides of this *Poa* species and that of POAAN in EU countries are considered to be sufficiently similar for data generated on the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B on POAAN to also provide supportive evidence of efficacy against POATR. Therefore, data generated on POAAN in the Maritime (13 trials), North-east (6 trials) and South-east (10 trials) EPPO climatic zones, as summarised earlier in this Section, are supportive of demonstrating efficacy against POATR within these climatic zones.

The presented data shows POATR to be Susceptible to ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also to the lower 0.75 L product/ha rate under conditions in countries in the Maritime, North-east and South-east EPPO climatic zone.

Comment of zRMS:

Due to limited efficacy data for POATR, the concerned MSs are kindly advised to consider extrapolation possibility from relative weed species POAAN and make a decision concerning acceptance of POATR on the national level.

Efficacy against Field chamomile (*Anthemis arvensis*: ANTAR)

A total of 3 trials conducted in 2018 have generated data on the efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against ANTAR in cereals.

Single post-emergence applications of AG-PM1-72 OD were made in the spring (between ~~March and April~~ and May) on all trials, when crop growth stages were in the range of 25-33 (BBCH), and therefore representative of the proposed timings for the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B.

Of these trials, 2 were carried out in the North-east EPPO climatic zone (both in Poland) and 1 was carried out in the South-east EPPO climatic zone (in Hungary).

All the efficacy trials presenting data on *Anthemis arvensis* control were conducted on TRZAW

Detailed data on efficacy from individual trials have been presented in BAD document.

Across all trials, the efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD against ANTAR has been tested in different locations, cultural practices, climatic conditions and weed biotypes, densities and growth stages that are fully representative of those in the spring in areas where cereal crops are grown in countries relevant to this submission.

Whilst no data are presented to demonstrate efficacy against ANTAR from trials in cereal crops in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone, weed biotypes, densities and susceptibility to herbicides of ANTAR in EU countries are considered to be sufficiently similar for data generated in the South-east and North-east EPPO climatic zones to also provide supportive evidence of efficacy against ANTAR within the Maritime EPPO climatic zone.

An overall summary of the efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, compared to that of a standard reference product applied at label rates, against ANTAR from earlier and later assessments across trials in the North-east and South-east EPPO climatic zones is given in Table 3.2-29.

Table 3.2-29: Overall summary of the efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD applied the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against ANTAR

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS (BBCH) at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	% efficacy AG-PM1-72 OD across all trials					Direct comparisons of % efficacy to standard reference product							
			No. of trials	Weed density at assessm't	Appl'n rate/ha	Mean	Min-Max	No. of trials	AG-PM1-72 OD		Standard reference product			Comparison of efficacy to standard reference product#	
									Mean	Min-Max	Trade name	Appl'n rate /ha	Mean		Min-Max
North-east (2 trials)	14-16 (2)	10.3-12.0 pl/m ² (2)	2	10.5-14.8 pl/m ² (2)	Earlier assessments (28 DA-A) based on overall visual control across both trials										
					0.75 L	86.3	82.5-90.0	1	90.0	-	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	100	-	< (1)
								1	82.5	-	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	92.5	-	< (1)
								1	96.3	-	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	100	-	= (1)
								1	87.5	-	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	92.5	-	< (1)
South-east (1 trial)	19-33 (1)	7.0 pl/m ² (1)	Earlier assessment (23 DA-A) based on overall visual control on 1 trial												
			1	7.0 pl/m ² (1)	0.75 L	85.0	-	1	85.0	-	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	93.0	-	< (1)
					1.0 L	90.0	-	1	90.0	-					< (1)
			Later assessment (51 DA-A) based on overall visual control on 1 trial												
			1	7.0 pl/m ² (1)	0.75 L	91.0	-	1	91.0	-	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	96.8	-	< (1)
					1.0 L	95.8	-	1	95.8	-					= (1)

No. of trials where >, = or <, based on statistically significant differences at 95% confidence level

Applied at the proposed maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, AG-PM1-72 OD gave good overall control across trials in the North-east and South-east EPPO climatic zones.

The overall efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD applied at 1.0 L product/ha was slightly lower at earlier assessments, but comparable at later assessments where carried out, compared to that of a standard reference products containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD), where included in all the trials applied at label rates.

Applied at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, AG-PM1-72 OD gave good overall control across trials in the North-east and South-east EPPO climatic zones.

The overall efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD applied at 0.75 L product/ha was lower than that of a standard reference products containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD), where included in all the trials applied at label rates.

The presented data demonstrates ANTAR to be Susceptible to ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, and also to the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, under conditions in countries in the Maritime, North-east and South-east EPPO climatic zones.

Comment of zRMS:

Due to limited efficacy data, the concerned MSs are kindly advised to make a decision concerning acceptance of ANTAR on the national level.

Efficacy against Winter oilseed rape (*Brassica napus* (winter): BRSNW)

A total of 13 trials conducted between 2018 and 2020 have generated data on the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against BRSNW in cereals.

Single post-emergence applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) were made in the spring (between March and May) on all trials, when crop growth stages were in the range of 23-33 (BBCH), and therefore representative of the proposed timings for the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B.

Of these trials, 5 were carried out in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (all in Germany), 7 were carried out in the North-east EPPO climatic zone (all in Poland) and 1 was carried out in the South-east EPPO climatic zone (in Hungary).

All the efficacy trials presenting data on *Brassica napus* volunteers control were conducted on TRZAW.

Detailed data on efficacy from individual trials have been presented in BAD document.

Across all trials, the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) against BRSNW has been tested in wide ranging locations, cultural practices, climatic conditions and weed biotypes, densities and growth stages that are fully representative of those in the spring in areas where cereal crops are grown in all countries relevant to this submission.

Efficacy data from 1 of the trials in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (in Germany) and the trial in the South-east EPPO climatic zone (in Hungary) are considered not to accurately represent that of the treatments. AG-PM1-72 OD and standard reference products gave low and variable control on these 2 trials. This was attributed to non-homogenous populations of BRSNW across the trial area on 1 of the trials and the only available assessment carried out 15 days after application, when herbicides had not reached full efficacy yet, in the other trial. On this basis, data from these trials have not been included in the following summary table.

Whilst no data are presented to demonstrate efficacy against BRSNW from trials in cereal crops in the South-east EPPO climatic zone, weed biotypes, densities and susceptibility to herbicides of BRSNW in EU countries are considered to be sufficiently similar for data generated in the Maritime and North-east

EPPO climatic zones to also provide supportive evidence of efficacy against BRSNW within the South-east EPPO climatic zone.

An overall summary of the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, compared to that of standard reference products applied at label rates, against BRSNW from earlier and later assessments across trials in each EPPO climatic zone is given in Table 3.2-30.

Table 3.2-30: Overall summary of the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against BRSNW

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS (BBCH) at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	% efficacy ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) across all trials					Direct comparisons of % efficacy to standard reference products							
			No. of trials	Weed density at assessm't	Appl'n rate/ha	Mean	Min-Max	No. of trials	ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)		Standard reference products				Comparison of efficacy to standard reference product#
									Mean	Min-Max	Trade name	Appl'n rate /ha	Mean	Min-Max	
Norht-east (7 trials)	10-18 (6), n/d (1)	5-8.3 pl/m ² (6), n/d (1)	Earlier assessments (21-28 DA-A) based on overall visual control across all 7 trials												
			7	5.0-9.3 pl/m ² (7)	0.75 L	70.7	2.5-97.5	4	61.5	2.5-90.8	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	82.2	57.5-96.3	= (2), < (2)
								3	83.1	63.8-97.5	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	88.4	66.3-100	= (2), < (1)
								3	89	78.8-97.5	Atlantis Star	0.2 Kg	93.2	83.8-100	= (3)
								1	88	-	Atlantis Star	0.33 Kg	100	-	< (1)
					1.0 L	80.3	35-98.3	4	72.4	35-98.3	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	82.2	57.5-96.3	= (2), < (2)
								3	90.8	80.8-97	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	88.4	66.3-100	> (1), = (1), < (1)
								3	91.8	80-98.3	Atlantis Star	0.2 Kg	93.2	83.8-100	= (3)
								1	94.5	-	Atlantis Star	0.33 Kg	100	-	< (1)
			Later assessments (38-63 DA-A) based on overall visual control across all 7 trials												
			7	5.3-9.3 pl/m ² (7)	0.75 L	71.4	5-97.5	4	62.7	5-90.8	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	82.9	60-96.3	= (2), < (2)
								3	83.1	63.8-97.5	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	88.4	66.3-100	= (2), < (1)
								3	89.4	80-97.5	Atlantis Star	0.2 Kg	93.2	83.8-100	= (3)
								1	88	-	Atlantis Star	0.33 Kg	100	-	< (1)
					1.0 L	81.2	37.5-98.3	4	74	37.5-98.3	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	82.9	60-96.3	= (2), < (2)
								3	90.8	80.8-97	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	88.4	66.3-100	> (1), = (1), < (1)
								3	91.8	80-98.3	Atlantis Star	0.2 Kg	93.2	83.8-100	= (3)
								1	94.5	-	Atlantis Star	0.33 Kg	100	-	< (1)
Maritime (4 trials)	16-51 (4)	4.8-16.3 pl/m ² (4)	Earlier assessments (15-32 DA-A) based on overall visual control across all 4 trials												
			4	4.8-16.3 pl/m ² (4)	0.75 L	64.2	9.25-98	1	9.3	-	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	90.0	-	< (1)
								1	94.5	-	Atlantis WG	0.2 Kg	94.5	-	= (1)
								1	94.5	-	Atlantis WG	0.3 Kg	95.0	-	= (1)
								1	55	-	Atlantis WG	0.4 Kg	55.0	-	= (1)
								1	94.5	-	Atlantis Flex	0.2 Kg	95.0	-	= (1)
								1	98	-	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	98	-	= (1)
					1.0 L	64.5	10.5-98	1	10.5	-	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	90.0	-	< (1)
								1	94.5	-	Atlantis WG	0.2 Kg	94.5	-	= (1)
								1	94.5	-	Atlantis WG	0.3 Kg	95.0	-	= (1)
								1	55	-	Atlantis WG	0.4 Kg	55.0	-	= (1)
								1	94.5	-	Atlantis Flex	0.2 Kg	95.0	-	= (1)
								1	98	-	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	98	-	= (1)

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS (BBCH) at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	% efficacy ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) across all trials					Direct comparisons of % efficacy to standard reference products							
			No. of trials	Weed density at assessm't	Appl'n rate/ha	Mean	Min-Max	No. of trials	ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)		Standard reference products				Comparison of efficacy to standard reference product#
									Mean	Min-Max	Trade name	Appl'n rate /ha	Mean	Min-Max	
Maritime (4 trials) (continued)	16-51 (4)	4.8-16.3 pl/m ⁱ (4)	Later assessments (58-74 DA-A) based on overall visual control across 3 trials												
			3	4.8-16.3 pl/m ² (3)	0.75 L	70.5	14.5-99	1	14.5	-	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	97.8	-	< (1)
								1	99	-	Atlantis WG	0.2 Kg	99.0	-	= (1)
								1	99	-	Atlantis WG	0.3 Kg	99	-	= (1)
					1.0 L	71.1	16.3-99	1	99	-	Atlantis Flex	0.2 Kg	99	-	= (1)
								1	99	-	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	98	-	= (1)
								1	16.3	-	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	97.8	-	< (1)
			1	99				-	Atlantis WG	0.2 Kg	99.0	-	= (1)		
			1	99				-	Atlantis WG	0.3 Kg	99	-	= (1)		
			1	99				-	Atlantis Flex	0.2 Kg	99	-	= (1)		
			1	99	-	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	98	-	= (1)					

No. of trials where >, = or <, based on statistically significant differences at 95% confidence level

Applied at the proposed maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) gave moderately good overall control across trials in the Maritime and North-east EPPO climatic zones.

The overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 1.0 L product/ha was comparable to, or lower than that of standard reference products containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD, Atlantis WG), where included in the majority of the trials applied at label rates. Compared to other standard reference products where included in a few of the trials and applied at label rates, the overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at 1.0 L product/ha was comparable to, or lower than that of Atlantis Star (iodosulfuron-methyl-sodium + mesosulfuron-methyl + thien carbazole-methyl) and comparable to that of Atlantis Flex (mesosulfuron-methyl + propoxycarbazone).

Applied at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) gave moderately good overall control across trials in the Maritime and North-east EPPO climatic zones.

The overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 0.75 L product/ha was comparable to, or lower than that of standard reference products containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD, Atlantis WG), where included in the majority of the trials applied at label rates. Compared to other standard reference products where included in a few of the trials and applied at label rates, the overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at 0.75 L product/ha was comparable to, or lower than that of Atlantis Star (iodosulfuron-methyl-sodium + mesosulfuron-methyl + thien carbazole-methyl) and comparable to that of Atlantis Flex (mesosulfuron-methyl + propoxycarbazone).

The presented data demonstrates BRSNW to be Moderately Susceptible to ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, and also to the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, under conditions in countries in the Maritime, North-east and South-east EPPO climatic zones.

Comment of zRMS:

Due to no valid efficacy trials from South-East EPPO zone, the concerned MSs, basing on data from Maritime and North-East EPPO zone, are kindly advised to make a decision concerning acceptance of BRSNW on the national level.

Efficacy against Shepherd's purse (*Capsella bursa-pastoris*: CAPBP)

A total of 23 trials conducted between 2018 and 2020 have generated data on the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against CAPBP in cereals.

Single post-emergence applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) were made in the spring (between March and June) on all trials, when crop growth stages were in the range of ~~15-39~~ 22-39 (BBCH) in the majority of the trials, and when crop stage was 15-21 in only one Czech Republic trial, and therefore ~~fully~~ representative of the proposed timings for the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B.

Of these trials, 4 were carried out in the South-east EPPO climatic zone (Hungary), 5 were carried out in the North-east EPPO climatic zone (all Poland) and 14 were carried out in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (Czech Republic and Germany).

Efficacy trials presenting data on *Capsella bursa-pastoris* control were conducted mostly on TRZAW (21 trials) and on TRZAS (2 trials).

Detailed data on efficacy from individual trials (with an indication of specific crops) have been presented in BAD document.

Across all trials, the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) against CAPBP has been tested in wide ranging locations, cultural practices, climatic conditions and weed biotypes, densities and growth stages that are fully representative of those in the spring in areas where cereal crops are grown in all countries relevant to this submission.

Efficacy data from 1 trial in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (Germany) are considered not to accurately represent that of the treatments. ADM.06001.H.2.B (~~or AG-PM1-72 OD~~) and standard reference products gave low and variable control on these trials. This was attributed to treatments being applied following a period of below average minimum temperatures and night frosts. Following extended periods of cold conditions, growth and development of the weeds would have been minimal at the time of application. Both ADM.06001.H.2.B (~~or AG-PM1-72 OD~~) and the standard reference products are post-emergence herbicides that require weeds to be actively growing at the time of application for sufficient systemic uptake to give acceptable levels of control. ADM.06001.H.2.B labels will include a statement advising that application should only be made to actively growing weeds, otherwise inadequate control may occur. On this basis, data from these trials have not been included in the following summary table.

Efficacy data from another one trial conducted in Maritime EPPO zone (Germany) is not considered to be valid because of low efficacy achieved after application of ADM.06001.H.2.B and standard reference product. Weed density (pl/m²) was not determined at application in this trial. Data from this trial has not been included in the following summary table.

An overall summary of the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, compared to that of standard reference products applied at label rates, against CAPBP from earlier and later assessments across trials in each EPPO climatic zone is given in Table 3.2-31.

Table 3.2-31: Overall summary of the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against CAPBP

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS (BBCH) at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	% efficacy ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) across all trials					Direct comparisons of % efficacy to standard reference products								
			CROP No. of trials	Weed density at assessm't	Appl'n rate/ha	Mean	Min-Max	No. of trials	ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)		Standard reference products				Comparison of efficacy to standard reference product#	
									Mean	Min-Max	Trade name	Appl'n rate /ha	Mean	Min-Max		
North-east (5)	14-61 (5)	7-20.8 pl/m ² (5)	Earlier assessments (21-29 DA-A) based on overall visual control across 5 trials													
			TRZAW 5	7-25 pl/m ² (5)	0.75 L	45.8	0-95	5	45.8	0-95	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	72.0	57,5-97,5	= (2), < (3)	
								2	83.8	72,5-95	Atlantis Star	0.2 Kg	88.8	80-97,5	= (1), < (1)	
					1.0 L	60.4	32-97.5	5	60.4	32-97,5	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	72.0	57,5-97,5	= (2), < (3)	
								2	85.7	73,8-97,5	Atlantis Star	0.2 Kg	88.8	80-97,5	= (1), < (1)	
			Later assessments (41-61 DA-A) based on overall visual control across 5 trials													
			TRZAW 5	7-25 pl/m ² (5)	0.75 L	49.5	0-100	5	49.5	0-100	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	81.0	60-100	= (1), < (4)	
								2	86.3	72,5-100	Atlantis Star	0.2 Kg	92.5	85-100	= (1), < (1)	
					1.0 L	65.5	35-100	5	65.5	35-100	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	81.0	60-100	= (1), < (4)	
								2	86.9	73,8-100	Atlantis Star	0.2 Kg	92.5	85-100	= (1), < (1)	
South-east (4)	14-61 (4)	5-13.5 pl/m ² (4)	Earlier assessments (13-28 DA-A) based on overall visual control across 4 trials													
			TRZAW 4	5-13.5 pl/m ² (3), n/d (1)	0.75 L	66.3	27.5-81.3	3	61.7	27,5-81,3	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	61.7	20-87,5	= (2), < (1)	
								1	80	-	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	87.5	-	< (1)	
					1.0 L	74.8	40-88	3	71.4	40-88	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	61.7	20-87,5	> (2), = (1)	
								1	85	-	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	87.5	-	= (1)	
			Later assessments (28-84 DA-A) based on overall visual control across 4 trials													
			TRZAW 4	5-13.5 pl/m ² (3), n/d (1)	0.75 L	67.8	30-85	3	63.3	30-85	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	82.1	77,5-91,3	= (1), < (2)	
								1	81.3	-	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	90.0	-	< (1)	
					1.0 L	78.5	47.5-92.5	3	75.8	47,5-92,5	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	82.1	77,5-91,3	> (1), = (1), < (1)	
								1	86.5	-	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	90.0	-	< (1)	
Maritime (12)	15-65 (12)	5-56 pl/m ² (12)	Earlier assessments (15-39 DA-A) based on overall visual control across 13 trials													
			ALL 12	6-23 pl/m ² (9), 5.5-16.3 % GC (4)	0.75 L	70-72.7	37.5-40.0-100	6	74.4	40-100	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	93.1	70-100	> (1), = (2), < (3)	
								3	60.3	40-100	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	92.7	80-100	= (1), < (2)	
								3	75	70-80	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	100.0	100-100	< (3)	
								1	57.5	-	Atlantis WG	0.2 Kg	60.0	-	= (1)	
								1	57.5	-	Atlantis WG	0.3 Kg	45.0	-	= (1)	
								1	83	-	Atlantis WG	0.4 Kg	100.0	-	< (1)	
								1	37.5	-	Atlantis WG	1-2 Kg	25.0	-	> (1)	
								1	47.5-57.5	47.5-57.5	Atlantis Flex	0.2 Kg	51.3-52.5	50-52.5	= (1), = (1)	
								1	60	-	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	75.0	-	< (1)	
					1.0 L	79.7-82.3	47.5-56.3-100	6	86.3	60-100	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	93.1	70-100	> (1), = (3), < (2)	
								3	79.7	60-100	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	92.7	80-100	= (2), < (1)	
								3	82.1	70-95	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	100.0	-	< (3)	
								1	56.3	-	Atlantis WG	0.2 Kg	60.0	-	= (1)	
								1	56.3	-	Atlantis WG	0.3 Kg	45.0	-	= (1)	
								1	100	-	Atlantis WG	0.4 Kg	100.0	-	= (1)	
								1	47.5	-	Atlantis WG	1-2 Kg	25.0	-	> (1)	
								1	51.9-56.3	47.5-56.3	Atlantis Flex	0.2 Kg	51.3-52.5	50-52.5	= (1)	
								1	67.5	-	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	75.0	-	= (1)	
			TRZAW 10	11.6 pl/m ² 6.1 % GC	0.75 L	72.7	40-100	11	72.7	40-100	Atlantis	Reg rate	86.9	45-100	> (2), = (3), < (5)	
			TRZAS	6.9 pl/m ²	0.75 L	83.7	56.3-100	11	83.7	56.3-100					> (1), = (5), < (4)	
								2	72.5	70-75	Atlantis	Reg rate	100	100-100	< (2)	

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS (BBCH) at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	% efficacy ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) across all trials					Direct comparisons of % efficacy to standard reference products							
			CROP No. of trials	Weed density at assessm't	Appl'n rate/ha	Mean	Min-Max	No. of trials	ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)		Standard reference products				Comparison of efficacy to standard reference product#
									Mean	Min-Max	Trade name	Appl'n rate /ha	Mean	Min-Max	
			2	5.3 % GC	1.0 L	75.7	70-81.3	2	75.7	70-81.3					< (2)
Later assessments (35-84 DA-A) based on overall visual control across 9 8 trials															
9 ALL 8	6.8-17 pl/m² (6), 5 -17.3 %GC (3)	0.75 L	73.2 80.3	7.5 40.0-100	3	73.3	40-100	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	90.0	70-100	= (1), < (2)			
					2	70	40-100	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	85.0	70-100	= (1), < (1)			
					3	75.8	70-80	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	100.0	100-100	< (3)			
					1	97	-	Atlantis WG	0.2 Kg	95.0	-	= (1)			
					1	97	-	Atlantis WG	0.3 Kg	100.0	-	= (1)			
					1	98	-	Atlantis WG	0.4 Kg	99.0	-	= (1)			
					1	97	-	Atlantis Flex	0.2 Kg	100.0	-	= (1)			
		1.0 L	81.3 85.5	47.5 60.0-100	3	84.6	60-100	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	90.0	70-100	= (1), < (2)			
					2	80	60-100	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	85.0	70-100	= (1), < (1)			
					3	82.1	70-95	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	100.0	100-100	< (3)			
					1	85	-	Atlantis WG	0.2 Kg	95.0	-	< (1)			
					1	85	-	Atlantis WG	0.3 Kg	100.0	-	< (1)			
					1	99	-	Atlantis WG	0.4 Kg	99.0	-	= (1)			
					1	85	-	Atlantis Flex	0.2 Kg	100.0	-	< (1)			
		TRZAW 6	11.7 pl/m² 9 % GC	0.75 L 1.0 L	82.5 88.8	40-100 60-100	6 6	82.5 88.8	40-100 60-100	Atlantis	Reg rate	96.5	80-100	= (3), < (3) = (2), < (4)	
		TRZAS 2	7.2 pl/m² 6 % GC	0.75 L 1.0 L	73.8 75.7	70-77.5 70-81.3	2 2	73.8 75.7	70-77.5 70-81.3	Atlantis	Reg rate	100	100-100	< (2) < (2)	

No. of trials where >, = or <, based on statistically significant differences at 95% confidence level

Applied at the proposed maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) gave moderately good overall control across trials in the South-east and Maritime EPPO climatic zone, and moderate overall control across trials in the North-east EPPO climatic zone.

The overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 1.0 L product/ha was comparable to, or lower than that of standard reference products containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD, Atlantis WG) in the North-east and Maritime EPPO climatic zone, applied at label rates. In the South-east EPPO climatic zone, the overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 1.0 L product/ha was comparable to, or higher than that of standard reference product Atlantis OD (iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl). Compared to the standard reference product Atlantis Star (iodosulfuron-methyl-sodium + mesosulfuron-methyl + thienencarbazone-methyl), where included in some trials in the North-east EPPO climatic zone and applied at label rate, the overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 1.0 L product/ha was lower than that of the standard reference product. Compared to the standard reference product Atlantis Flex (mesosulfuron-methyl + propoxycarbazone), where included in some trials in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone and applied at label rate, the overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 1.0 L product/ha was comparable to or lower than that of the standard reference product.

Applied at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) gave moderate overall control across trials in the South-east and Maritime EPPO climatic zone, and low overall control across trials in the North-east EPPO climatic zone.

The overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 0.75 L product/ha was comparable to, or lower than that of standard reference products containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD, Atlantis WG) in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone, applied at label rates. In the South-east and North-east EPPO climatic zone, the overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 0.75 L product/ha was lower than that of standard reference product Atlantis OD (iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl). Compared to the standard reference product Atlantis Star (iodosulfuron-methyl-sodium + mesosulfuron-methyl + thienencarbazone-methyl), where included in some trials in the North-east EPPO climatic zone and applied at label rate, the overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 0.75 L product/ha was lower than that of the standard reference product. Compared to the standard reference product Atlantis Flex (mesosulfuron-methyl + propoxycarbazone), where included in some trials in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone and applied at label rate, the overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 0.75 L product/ha was comparable to or lower than that of the standard reference product.

The presented data demonstrates CAPBP to be Moderately Susceptible to ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and Moderately Tolerant to the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha under conditions in countries in the South-east ~~and Maritime EPPO~~ climatic zone. Under conditions in North-east EPPO climatic zone countries, the data shows CAPBP to be Moderately Tolerant to ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and Tolerant to the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha. Under conditions of Maritime climatic zone countries, the data shows CAPBP to be Moderately Susceptible to ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and at lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha.

Efficacy against Flixweed (*Descurainia sophia*: DESSO)

A total of 4 trials conducted in 2020 have generated data on the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against DESSO in cereals.

Single post-emergence applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) were made in the spring (between March and May) on all trials, when crop growth stages were in the range 23-39 (BBCH), and therefore ~~fully~~ representative of the proposed timings for the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B.

All of the trials were carried out in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (1 in Czech Republic, 3 in Germany).

Efficacy trials presenting data on *Descurainia sophia* control were conducted on winter cereals (2 trials on TRZAW, 1 trial on TTLWI and 1 trial on SECCW).

Detailed data on efficacy from individual trials (with an indication of specific crops) have been presented in BAD document.

Across all trials, the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) against DESSO has been tested in wide ranging locations, cultural practices, climatic conditions and weed biotypes, densities and growth stages that are fully representative of those in the spring in areas where cereal crops are grown in countries relevant to this submission.

An overall summary of the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, compared to that of standard reference products applied at label rates, against DESSO from earlier and later assessments across trials in each EPPO climatic zone is given in Table 3.2-32.

Table 3.2-32: Overall summary of the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against DESSO

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS (BBCH) at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	% efficacy ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) across all trials					Direct comparisons of % efficacy to standard reference products					
			No. of trials	Weed density at assessm't	Appl'n rate/ha	Mean	Min-Max	No. of trials	ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)	Standard reference products			Comparison of efficacy to standard reference product#
									Mean	Trade name	Appl'n rate /ha	Mean	
Maritime (4)	18-69 (4)	5-84 pl/m² (4)	Earlier assessments (22-27 DA-A) based on overall visual control across all 4 trials										
			4	5-146 pl/m² (4), 3.5 %GC (1)	0.75 L	72.2	57-79	1	73.8	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	81.3	= (1)
								1	73.8	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	83.8	= (1)
								1	78.8	Atlantis WG	0.2 Kg	76.3	= (1)
								1	57.0	Atlantis WG	0.4 Kg	77.8	< (1)
								1	79.0	Atlantis Flex	0.33Kg	89	= (1)
					1.0 L	79.8	75-86	1	75.0	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	81.3	= (1)
								1	75.0	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	83.8	= (1)
								1	81.3	Atlantis WG	0.2 Kg	76.3	= (1)
								1	77.0	Atlantis WG	0.4 Kg	77.8	= (1)
								1	86.0	Atlantis Flex	0.33Kg	89	= (1)
			Later assessments (41-60 DA-A) based on overall visual control across 4 trials										
			4	6-146 pl/m² (4), 2.5 %GC (1)	0.75 L	81.5	65.8-92.5	1	88.8	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	92.5	≤ (1)
								1	88.8	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	99.3	< (1)
								1	92.5	Atlantis WG	0.2 Kg	91.3	= (1)
								1	65.8	Atlantis WG	0.4 Kg	82.5	< (1)
								1	79.0	Atlantis Flex	0.33Kg	89	= (1)
					1.0 L	89.7	82-95.7	1	95.8	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	92.5	= (1)
								1	95.8	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	99.3	= (1)
								1	95.0	Atlantis WG	0.2 Kg	91.3	= (1)
								1	82.0	Atlantis WG	0.4 Kg	82.5	= (1)
								1	86.0	Atlantis Flex	0.33Kg	89	= (1)

No. of trials where >, = or <, based on statistically significant differences at 95% confidence level

Applied at the proposed maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) gave good overall control across trials in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone.

The overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 1.0 L product/ha was comparable to that of standard reference products containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD, Atlantis WG), where included in the majority of the trials applied at label rates. Compared to the standard reference product Atlantis Flex (mesosulfuron-methyl + propoxycarbazone), where included in 1 trial and applied at label rate, the overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 1.0 L product/ha was comparable to that of the standard reference product.

Applied at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) gave moderately good overall control across trials in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone.

The overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 0.75 L product/ha was comparable to or lower than that of standard reference products containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD, Atlantis WG), where included in the majority of the trials applied at label rates. Compared to the standard reference product Atlantis Flex (mesosulfuron-methyl + propoxycarbazone), where included in 1 trial and applied at label rate, the overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 0.75 L product/ha was lower than that of the standard reference product.

The presented data demonstrates DESSO to be Susceptible to ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and Moderately Susceptible to the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha under conditions in countries in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone.

Efficacy against Charlock (*Sinapis arvensis*: SINAR)

A total of 3 trials conducted between 2018 and 2020 have generated data on the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against SINAR in cereals.

Single post-emergence applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) were made in the spring in April on all trials, when crop growth stages were in the range of 23-32 (BBCH), and therefore representative of the proposed timings for the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B.

All of these 3 trials were carried out in the South-east EPPO climatic zone (all 2 in Hungary and 1 in Romania).

Efficacy trials presenting data on *Sinapis arvensis* control were conducted on winter cereals (2 trials on TRZAW and 1 trial on TRZDU).

Detailed data on efficacy from individual trials (with an indication of specific crops) have been presented in BAD document.

Across all trials, the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) against SINAR has been tested in different locations, cultural practices, climatic conditions and weed biotypes, densities and growth stages that are fully representative of those in the spring in areas where cereal crops are grown in countries relevant to this submission.

Efficacy data from 1 of these trials, conducted in Romania, are considered not to accurately represent that of the treatments. AG-PM1-72 OD and standard reference products gave low and variable control on these trials. This was attributed to the application of the treatments during a very dry period. Following extended periods of drought conditions, growth and development of the weeds would have been minimal at the time of application. Both AG-PM1-72 OD and the standard reference products are post-emergence herbicides that require weeds to be actively growing at the time of application for sufficient systemic uptake to give acceptable levels of control. ADM.06001.H.2.B labels will include a statement advising that application should only be made to actively growing weeds, otherwise inadequate control may occur. On this basis, data from this trial have not been included in the following summary table.

An overall summary of the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, compared to that of standard reference products applied at label rates, against SINAR from earlier and later assessments across trials in the South-east EPPO climatic zone is given in Table 3.2-33.

Table 3.2-33: Overall summary of the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against SINAR

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS (BBCH) at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	% efficacy ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) across all trials					Direct comparisons of % efficacy to standard reference products							
			No. of trials	Weed density at assessm't	Appl'n rate/ha	Mean	Min-Max	No. of trials	ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)		Standard reference products				Comparison of efficacy to standard reference product#
									Mean	Min-Max	Trade name	Appl'n rate /ha	Mean	Min-Max	
South-east (2)	12-35 (2)	5-6 pl/m ² (2)	Earlier assessments (28 DA-A) based on overall visual control across 2 trials												
			2	5 pl/m ² (1), n/d (1)	0.75 L	81.3	65-97.5	2	81.3	65-97.5	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	93.3	87.5-99	≥ (1), = (1)
					1.0 L	88.2	77.5-98.8	2	88.2	77.5-98.8	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	93.3	87.5-99	≥ (1), = (1)
			Later assessments (34-36 DA-A) based on overall visual control across 2 trials												
			2	5.3 pl/m ² (1), n/d (1)	0.75 L	82.3	67.5-97	2	82.3	67.5-97	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	94.5	90-99	≥ (1), = (1) ≤ (2)
					1.0 L	88.5	77.5-99.5	2	88.5	77.5-99.5	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	94.5	90-99	≥ (1), = (1)

No. of trials where >, = or <, based on statistically significant differences at 95% confidence level

Applied at the proposed maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) gave good overall control across trials in the South-east EPPO climatic zone.

In one of the trials, the overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 1.0 L product/ha was not consistently different to that of standard reference product containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD) applied at a label rate. In other trial the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the highest recommended dose rate was lower than that of the standard reference product.

Applied at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) gave moderately good overall control across trials in the South-east EPPO climatic zone.

In one of the trials, the overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 1.0 L product/ha was not consistently different to that of standard reference product containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD) applied at a label rate. In other trial the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 0.75 L product/ha was lower than that of the standard reference product.

The presented data demonstrates SINAR to be Susceptible to ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and Moderately Susceptible to the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha under conditions in countries in the South-east EPPO climatic zone.

Comment of zRMS:

Due to limited efficacy data only from South-East EPPO zone, the concerned MSs are kindly advised to make a decision concerning acceptance of SINAR on the national level.

Efficacy against Common chickweed (*Stellaria media*: STEME)

A total of ~~44~~ 46 trials conducted between 2018 and 2020 have generated data on the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against STEME in cereals.

Single post-emergence applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) were made in the spring (between March and May) on all trials, when crop growth stages were in the range ~~15~~ 22-39 (BBCH) in most of the trials, at 15-21 (BBCH) in only one trial conducted in Czech Republic, and therefore ~~fully~~ representative of the proposed timings for the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B.

Of these trials, 25 were carried out in the South-east EPPO climatic zone (Hungary, Romania), 8 were carried out in the North-east EPPO climatic zone (all in Poland) and 13 were carried out in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (Czech Republic, France and Germany).

Efficacy trials presenting data on *Stellaria media* control were conducted on winter cereals (44 trials on TRZAW and 2 trials on TTLWI).

Detailed data on efficacy from individual trials (with an indication of specific crops) have been presented in BAD document.

Across all trials, the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) against STEME has been tested in wide ranging locations, cultural practices, climatic conditions and weed biotypes, densities and growth stages that are fully representative of those in the spring in areas where cereal crops are grown in all countries relevant to this submission.

Efficacy data from ~~12~~ 9 trials in the South-east EPPO climatic zone (Romania and Hungary) are considered not to accurately represent that of the treatments. ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) and standard reference products gave low and variable control on these trials. This was attributed to treatments being applied following a period of below average minimum temperatures and night frosts or a very dry period. Following extended periods of cold or dry conditions, growth and development of the weeds would have been minimal at the time of application. Both ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-

72 OD) and the standard reference products are post-emergence herbicides that require weeds to be actively growing at the time of application for sufficient systemic uptake to give acceptable levels of control. ADM.06001.H.2.B labels will include a statement advising that application should only be made to actively growing weeds, otherwise inadequate control may occur. On this basis, data from these trials have not been included in the following summary table.

An overall summary of the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, compared to that of standard reference products applied at label rates, against STEME from earlier and later assessments across trials in each EPPO climatic zone is given in Table 3.2-34.

Table 3.2-34: Overall summary of the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against STEME

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS (BBCH) at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	% efficacy ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) across all trials					Direct comparisons of % efficacy to standard reference products								
			No. of trials	Weed density at assessm't	Appl'n rate/ha	Mean	Min-Max	No. of trials	ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)		Standard reference products				Comparison of efficacy to standard reference product#	
									Mean	Min-Max	Trade name	Appl'n rate /ha	Mean	Min-Max		
North-east (8)	11-67 (8)	5-11 pl/m² (8)	Earlier assessments (21-29 DA-A) based on overall visual control across 8 trials													
			7	5-15.5 pl/m² (8)	0.75 L	63.1 65.3	0-99.7	6	61 63.3	0-99.7	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	82.8 87.4	55 77.5-100	= (4), < (2)	
								1	77.5	-	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	90.0	-	< (1)	
								2	79.4	68.8-90	Atlantis Star	0.2 Kg	90.7	83.8-97.5	< (2)	
			8		1.0 L	73.6	48.8-99	7	72.3	48.8-99	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	82.8	55-100	> (1), = (3), < (3)	
								1	82.5	-	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	90.0	-	< (1)	
								2	83.2	73.8-92.5	Atlantis Star	0.2 Kg	90.7	83.8-97.5	= (1), < (1)	
			Later assessments (41-61 DA-A) based on overall visual control across 6 trials													
			5	5-8.3 pl/m² (6)	0.75 L	52.1 57.0	0-92.5	6	52.1 57.0	0-92.5	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	88.5 86.2	77.5-100 97.5	= (2), < (3)	
								2	80.7	68.8-92.5	Atlantis Star	0.2 Kg	91.9	83.8-100	< (2)	
			6		1.0 L	68.8	43.8-98.8	6	68.8	43.8-98.8	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	88.5	77.5-100	= (2), < (3), > (1)	
								2	86.3	73.8-98.8	Atlantis Star	0.2 Kg	91.9	83.8-100	= (1), < (1)	
South-east (14) (16)	10-69 (14) (16)	5.8-76 pl/m² (14) (16)	Earlier assessments (10-28 DA-A) based on overall visual control across 14 16 trials													
			14 16	5.8-76 pl/m² (14) (15), n/d (1)	0.75 L	41.5 40.2	10-76.3	8 9	47.5 45.6	30-71.3	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	54.5 52.9	30-90.5	> (1), = (3), < (5)	
								2	43.2	15-71.3	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	84.3 95.3	84.3-84.3 95.3-95.3	< (1)	
								9 10	38.8 38.0	10-76.3	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	58.6 55.0	26.3 12.5-95	= (4), < (6)	
								6 5	33.8 37.8	10-53.8	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	36.9 38.3	25-50	> (2), = (1), < (2)	
			14 16	5.8-76 pl/m² (14) (15), n/d (1)	1.0 L	50.8 49.0	17.5-90	8 9	50.9 48.7	20-89.5	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	54.5 52.9	30-90.5	> (2), = (3), < (4)	
								2	53.5	17.5-89.5	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	84.3 95.3	84.3-84.3 95.3-95.3	< (1)	
								9 10	49.7 47.5	20-90	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	58.6 55.0	26.3 12.5-95	> (3), = (5) 4 , < (3)	
								6 5	44 46.3	26.3-58.8	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	36.9 38.3	25-50	> (3), = (2)	
			Later assessments (21-61 DA-A) based on overall visual control across 14 16 trials													
			14 16	5-8.3 pl/m² (6) 5.8-76 pl/m² (15), n/d (1)	0.75 L	48 43.4	40 3.8-91	8 9	51.9 48.0	37.5 17.5-91	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	63.1 59.1	21.3-91	> (1), = (2), < (6)	
								2	70.5	50-91	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	78.3 82.4	66.5-90 98.3	= (1), < (2)	
								9 10	44.2 40.1	40 3.8-90	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	69.0 62.6	26.3 5.0-96.8	= (2), < (8)	
								6 5	31.3	10-52.5	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	34.0	25-41.3	> (2)= (1), < (2)	
			14 16	5-8.3 pl/m² (6) 5.8-76 pl/m² (15), n/d (1)	1.0 L	53.1	26.3 11.3-95.3	8 9	56.7 53.3	36.3- 26.3-95.3	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	63.1 59.1	21.3-91	> (2), < (5), = (2)	

EPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS (BBCH) at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	% efficacy ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) across all trials					Direct comparisons of % efficacy to standard reference products							
			No. of trials	Weed density at assessm't	Appl'n rate/ha	Mean	Min-Max	No. of trials	ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)		Standard reference products				Comparison of efficacy to standard reference product#
									Mean	Min-Max	Trade name	Appl'n rate /ha	Mean	Min-Max	
							2	80.2	65-95.3	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	78.3 82.4	66.5-90 98.3	= ≤ (1), = (1)	
							9 10	56.2 51.8	26.3 11.3-95.3	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	69.0 62.6	26.3 50-96.8	> (1), = (2), = (3), < (5)	
							6 5	41	26.3-58.8	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	34.0	25-41.3	> (2), = (3)	
Maritime (13)	13-65 (10), n/d (3)	5-42 pl/m² (13)	Earlier assessments (15-35 DA-A) based on overall visual control across 13 trials												
			13	5-42 pl/m² (10), 2.6-15 %GC (3)	0.75 L	49.3	0-98	1	91	-	Atlantis OD	0.5 L	97.5	-	= (1)
								3	52.8	12.5-91	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	65.4	37.5-91.3	= (2), < (1)
								1	22.5	-	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	30.0	-	< (1)
								6	61.6	0-98	Atlantis Pro	1.2 L	92.5	70-100	= (1), < (5)
								2	48.9	0-97.8	Atlantis Pro	1.5 L	85.0	70-100	= (1), < (1)
								3	30.1	7.3-45	Atlantis WG	0.2 Kg	66.0	26.5-91.5	= (1), < (3)
								2	41.5	38-45	Atlantis WG	0.3 Kg	85.8	80-91.5	< (2)
					1.0 L	53.3	0-99	3	30.1	7.3-45	Atlantis Flex	0.2 Kg	63.9	15.3-95	= (1), < (2)
								1	88.8	-	Atlantis OD	0.5 L	97.5	-	= (1)
								3	53.8	17.5-88.8	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	65.4	37.5-91.3	= (2), < (1)
								1	27.5	-	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	30.0	-	= (1)
								6	66.1	0-99	Atlantis Pro	1.2 L	92.5	70-100	= (1), < (5)
								2	49.5	0-99	Atlantis Pro	1.5 L	85.0	70-100	= (1), < (1)
								3	35.6	15-50	Atlantis WG	0.2 Kg	66.0	26.5-91.5	= (1), < (2)
								2	45.9	41.8-50	Atlantis WG	0.3 Kg	85.8	80-91.5	< (2)
								3	35.6	15-50	Atlantis Flex	0.2 Kg	63.9	15.3-95	= (1), < (2)
			Later assessments (46-67 DA-A) based on overall visual control across 7 6 trials												
			7 6	5-42 pl/m² (5), 67.5 %GC (1)	0.75 L	50.9 58.4	6.3-99	4	76	32.5-99	Atlantis Pro	1.2 L	98.0	93.9-100	= (2), < (2)
								1	97.3	#DIV/0! 97.3	Atlantis Pro	1.5 L	99.0	#DIV/0! 99.0	= (1)
								2	23.2	6.3-40	Atlantis WG	0.2 Kg	69.0	41.2-96.8	< (2)
								2	23.2	6.3-40	Atlantis WG	0.3 Kg	94.7	90.4-99	< (2)
								2	23.2	6.3-40	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	81.6	64.1-99	< (2)
					1.0 L	53.1 61.5	3.1-99	4	80.5	38.8-99	Atlantis Pro	1.2 L	98.0	93.9-100	= (3), < (1)
								1	98.8	#DIV/0!	Atlantis Pro	1.5 L	99.0	#DIV/0!	= (1)
								2	23.5	3.1-43.8	Atlantis WG	0.2 Kg	69.0	41.2-96.8	< (2)
								2	23.5	3.1-43.8	Atlantis WG	0.3 Kg	94.7	90.4-99	< (2)
								2	23.5	3.1-43.8	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	81.6	64.1-99	< (2)

No. of trials where >, = or <, based on statistically significant differences at 95% confidence level

Applied at the proposed maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) gave moderate overall control across trials in the South-east and Maritime EPPO climatic zone, and moderately good overall control across trials in the North-east EPPO climatic zone.

The overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 1.0 L product/ha was lower than that of standard reference products containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD, Atlantis Pro, Atlantis WG) in the North-east, South-east and Maritime EPPO climatic zone, applied at label rates. Compared to the standard reference product Atlantis Star (iodosulfuron-methyl-sodium + mesosulfuron-methyl + thiencarbazone-methyl), where included in some trials in the North-east EPPO climatic zone and applied at label rate, the overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 1.0 L product/ha was lower than that of the standard reference product. Compared to the standard reference product Atlantis Flex (mesosulfuron-methyl + propoxycarbazone), where included in some trials and applied at label rate, the overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 1.0 L product/ha was lower than that of the standard reference product in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone and higher in the South-east EPPO climatic zone.

Applied at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) gave low overall control across trials in the South-east and moderate overall control across trials in the Maritime and North-east EPPO climatic zones.

The overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at ~~1.0 L~~ 0.75 L product/ha was lower than that of standard reference products containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD, Atlantis Pro, Atlantis WG) in the North-east, South-east and Maritime EPPO climatic zone, applied at label rates. Compared to the standard reference product Atlantis Star (iodosulfuron-methyl-sodium + mesosulfuron-methyl + thiencarbazone-methyl), where included in some trials in the North-east EPPO climatic zone and applied at label rate, the overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at ~~1.0 L~~ 0.75 L product/ha was lower than that of the standard reference product. Compared to the standard reference product Atlantis Flex (mesosulfuron-methyl + propoxycarbazone), where included in some trials and applied at label rate, the overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at ~~1.0 L~~ 0.75 L product/ha was lower than that of the standard reference product in the South-east and Maritime EPPO climatic zone.

In the trials in the Maritime and South-east EPPO climatic zone where ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) gave relatively low levels of control, the standard reference products also gave low levels of control, indicating that environmental conditions (e.g. low temperatures, dry soil conditions) resulted in the weeds not being actively growing at the time of application and thereby resulting in reduced herbicide uptake and efficacy on these trials. The ADM.06001.H.2.B label will include a statement advising that application should only be made when weeds are actively growing.

The presented data demonstrates STEME to be Moderately Susceptible to ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and Moderately Tolerant to the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha under conditions in countries in the North-east EPPO climatic zone. Under conditions in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone countries, the data shows STEME to be Moderately Tolerant to ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also to the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha. Under conditions in the South-east EPPO climatic zone countries, the data shows STEME to be Moderately Tolerant to ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and Tolerant to the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha.

Efficacy against Field pennycress (*Thlaspi arvense*: THLAR)

A total of 11 trials conducted between 2018 and 2020 have generated data on the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against THLAR in cereals.

Single post-emergence applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) were made in the spring (between April and June) on all trials, when crop growth stages were in the range 18-24-37 (BBCH), and therefore fully representative of the proposed timings for the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B.

Of these trials, 3 were carried out in the North-east EPPO climatic zone (Poland), 6 were carried out in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (all 5 in Czech Republic and 1 in Germany), and 2 were carried out in the South-east EPPO climatic zone (1 in Hungary, 1 in Romania).

Efficacy trials presenting data on *Thlaspi arvense* control were conducted mostly on winter cereals (9 trials on TRZAW and 1 trial on TRZDU). One trial in the Maritime EPPO zone was carried out on TRZAS.

Detailed data on efficacy from individual trials (with an indication of specific crops) have been presented in BAD document.

Across all trials, the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) against THLAR has been tested in wide ranging locations, cultural practices, climatic conditions and weed biotypes, densities and growth stages that are fully representative of those in the spring in areas where cereal crops are grown in all countries relevant to this submission.

Efficacy data from 1 trial in the South-east EPPO climatic zone (Romania) is considered not to accurately represent that of the treatments. ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) and standard reference products gave low and variable control on these trials. This was attributed to treatments being applied following a period of below average minimum temperatures and night frosts. Following extended periods of cold conditions, growth and development of the weeds would have been minimal at the time of application. Both ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) and the standard reference products are post-emergence herbicides that require weeds to be actively growing at the time of application for sufficient systemic uptake to give acceptable levels of control. ADM.06001.H.2.B labels will include a statement advising that application should only be made to actively growing weeds, otherwise inadequate control may occur. On this basis, data from this trial have not been included in the following summary table.

An overall summary of the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, compared to that of standard reference products applied at label rates, against THLAR from earlier and later assessments across trials in each EPPO climatic zone is given in Table 3.2-35.

Table 3.2-35: Overall summary of the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against THLAR

EPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS (BBCH) at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	% efficacy ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) across all trials					Direct comparisons of % efficacy to standard reference products								
			CROP No. of trials	Weed density at assessm't	Appl'n rate/ha	Mean	Min-Max	No. of trials	ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)		Standard reference products				Comparison of standard reference product#	
									Mean	Min-Max	Trade name	Appl'n rate /ha	Mean	Min-Max		
North-east (3)	14-30 (3)	5.8-8 pl/m² (3)	Earlier assessments (27-28 DA-A) based on overall visual control across 3 trials													
			TRZAW 3	6-8 pl/m² (3)	0.75 L	57.5	41.3-81.3	1	41.3	-	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	83.5	-	< (1)	
								2	65.7	50-81.3	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	95.2	90.3-100	< (2)	
								1	81.3	-	Atlantis Star	0.33 Kg	100.0	-	< (1)	
					1.0 L	81.9	77.5-89.5	1	77.5	-	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	83.5	-	= (1)	
								2	84.2	78.8-89.5	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	95.2	90.3-100	< (2)	
								1	89.5	-	Atlantis Star	0.33 Kg	100	-	< (1)	
			Later assessments (37-44 DA-A) based on overall visual control across 3 trials													
			TRZAW 3	6-8 pl/m² (3)	0.75 L	57.5	41.3-81.3	1	41.3	-	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	83.5	-	< (1)	
								2	65.7	50-81.3	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	95.2	90.3-100	< (2)	
								1	81.3	-	Atlantis Star	0.33 Kg	100.0	-	< (1)	
					1.0 L	82.2	78.3-89.5	1	78.3	-	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	83.5	-	= (1)	
								2	84.2	78.8-89.5	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	95.2	90.3-100	< (2)	
								1	89.5	-	Atlantis Star	0.33 Kg	100	-	= (1)	
South-east (1)	18-31 (1)	7 pl/m² (1)	Earlier assessments (28 DA-A) based on overall visual control on 1 trial													
			TRZAW 1	n/d (1)	0.75 L	97	-	1	97	-	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	99.3	-	= (1)	
					1.0 L	100	-	1	100	-	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	99.3	-	= (1)	
			Later assessments (34 DA-A) based on overall visual control on 1 trial													
			TRZAW 1	n/d (1)	0.75 L	97	-	1	97	-	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	99.0	-	= (1)	
					1.0 L	100	-	1	100	-	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	99.0	-	= (1)	
Maritime (6)	19-65 (6)	7.0-43.3 pl/m² (5), n/d (1)	Earlier assessments (15-28 DA-A) based on overall visual control across 6 trials													
			TRZAW All 6	7.3-44.3 pl/m² (5), n/d (1)	0.75 L	77.6	37.5-100	2	90	80-100	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	95.0	90-100	= (1), < (1)	
								3	82.7	73.8-91.8	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	98.4	95.3-100	< (3)	
								1	37.5	-	Atlantis WG	0.2 Kg	32.5	-	= (1)	
					1.0 L	85.8	50-100	1	37.5	-	Atlantis Flex	0.2 Kg	50	-	< (1)	
								2	95	90-100	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	95.0	90-100	= (2)	
								3	91.5	82.5-100	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	98.4	95.3-100	= (1), < (2)	
			TRZAS TRZAW 5		0.75 L	77.6 78.4	37.5-100	1	50	-	Atlantis WG	0.2 Kg	32.5	-	> (1)	
								1	50	-	Atlantis Flex	0.2 Kg	50	-	= (1)	
								5	77.6 78.4	37.5-100	Atlantis	Reg rate	86.3	32.5-100	< (3), = (2)	
			1.0 L		85.8 86.4	50-100	5	85.8 86.4	50-100	Atlantis	Reg rate	86.3 83.6	32.5-100	< (1), = (2), > (1)		
							1	73.8	-	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	100	-	< (1)		
							1	82.5	-	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	100	-	< (1)		
			Later assessments (35-97 DA-A) based on overall visual control across 5 trials													
			TRZAW All 5	7.3-44.3 pl/m² (5)	0.75 L	86.5	75-100	2	90.7	81.3-100	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	100.0	100	= (1), < (1)	
								3	83.8	75-93.8	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	98.9	96.8-100	< (3)	
					1.0 L	95.3	82.5-100	2	100	100-100	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	100.0	100	= (2)	
								3	92.2	82.5-100	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	98.9	96.8-100	= (1), < (2)	
			TRZAS		0.75 L	86.5 89.4	75 82.5-100	4	86.5 89.4	75 82.5-100	Atlantis	Reg rate	99.4 99.2	96.8-100	< (3), = (1)	

			TRZAW 4	45.4 17.1 pl/m ² 9.7 10.5 % GCr	1.0 L	95.3 98.5	82.5 94-100	4	95.3 98.5	82.5 94-100	Atlantis	Reg rate	99.4 99.2	96.8-100	< (1), = (3)
			TRZAS 1	8.8 5 % pl/m ² GCr	0.75 L	75	-	1	75	-	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	100	-	< (1)
					1.0 L	82.5	-	1	82.5	-	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	100	-	< (1)

No. of trials where >, = or <, based on statistically significant differences at 95% confidence level

Applied at the proposed maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) gave excellent overall control across trials in the South-east and Maritime EPPO climatic zone and moderately good overall control across trials in the North-east EPPO climatic zone.

The overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 1.0 L product/ha was comparable to, or lower than that of standard reference products containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD, Atlantis WG) applied at label rates. Compared to the standard reference product Atlantis Star (iodosulfuron-methyl-sodium + mesosulfuron-methyl + thienencarbazone-methyl), where included in a trial in the North-east EPPO climatic zone and applied at label rate, the overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 1.0 L product/ha was lower than that of the standard reference product. Compared to the standard reference product Atlantis Flex (mesosulfuron-methyl + propoxycarbazone), where included in 1 trial and applied at label rate, the overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 1.0 L product/ha was comparable to that of the standard reference product in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone.

Applied at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) gave excellent overall control in the trial in the South-east EPPO climatic zone, good overall control across trials in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone and moderate overall control across trials in the North-east EPPO climatic zone.

The overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 0.75 L product/ha was comparable to, or lower than that of standard reference products containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD, Atlantis WG) applied at label rates. Compared to the standard reference product Atlantis Star (iodosulfuron-methyl-sodium + mesosulfuron-methyl + thienencarbazone-methyl), where included in a trial in the North-east EPPO climatic zone and applied at label rate, the overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 0.75 L product/ha was lower than that of the standard reference product. Compared to the standard reference product Atlantis Flex (mesosulfuron-methyl + propoxycarbazone), where included in 1 trial and applied at label rate, the overall efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 0.75 L product/ha was lower than that of the standard reference product in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone.

The presented data demonstrates THLAR to be Susceptible to ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, and also to the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, under conditions in countries in the Maritime and South-east EPPO climatic zones. Under conditions in North-east EPPO climatic zone countries, the data shows THLAR to be Moderately Susceptible to ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and Moderately tolerant to the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha.

Comment of zRMS:

Due to limited efficacy data from South-East EPPO zone, the concerned MSs, basing on data from Maritime and North-East EPPO zone, are kindly advised to make a decision concerning acceptance of THLAR on the national level.

3.2.3.2 Single application in spring following application of another herbicide in autumn

Efficacy against Blackgrass (*Alopecurus myosuroides*: ALOMY)

A total of 10 trials conducted in 2018 and 2019 have generated data on the efficacy of spray programs with an autumn application of a post-emergence herbicide, followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against ALOMY in cereals.

In these trials, all product treatments applied in autumn were done according to label rates. Trinity (300 g/L pendimethalin + 250 g/L chlortoluron + 40 g/L diflufenican, SC) was applied at 2.0 L product/ha or at 1.5 L product/ha in combination with Defy or Boxer (800 g/L prosulfocarb, EC) at 3.0 L product/ha, Expert (140 g/Kg metribuzin + 420 g/Kg flufenacet) was applied at 0.35 Kg product/ha and Herold and Fosburi (200 g/L diflufenican + 400 g/L flufenacet, SC) were applied at 0.25 L, 0.5 L or 0.6 L product/ha.

Autumn treatments (A1) were applied between October and December on all trials, when crop growth stages were in the range of 0-13 (BBCH). Spring treatments (A2) were applied between February and April on all trials, when the cereal crop growth stages ranged from 14-32 (BBCH). Application timings are therefore representative of the proposed timings for the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B except in 1 trial in which some of the cereal plants were still at a lower growth stage.

Of these trials, 6 were carried out in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (2 in Germany, 4 in France), 1 was carried out in the North-east EPPO climatic zone (Poland) and 3 were carried out in the South-east EPPO climatic zone (all in Hungary).

Across trials, the efficacy of an autumn/spring spray program with ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) against ALOMY has been tested in wide ranging locations, cultural practices, climatic conditions and weed biotypes, densities and growth stages that are fully representative of those in areas where cereal crops are grown in all countries relevant to this submission.

Efficacy data from 2 of the trials in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (all in France) are considered not to accurately represent that of the treatments. ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) and standard reference products gave low and variable control on all of these trials. This was attributed to periods of low temperatures inhibiting weed growth and development prior to and following application, thereby reducing uptake of the herbicides by the plants. On this basis, data from these 2 trials has not been included in the following summary tables.

An overall summary of the efficacy of spray programs with an autumn application of a post-emergence herbicide, followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, compared to the efficacy of spray programs with an autumn application of a post-emergence herbicide, followed by a spring application of a standard reference product and the single applications against ALOMY from earlier and later assessments across trials in each EPPO climatic zone is given in Table 3.2-36 (spray program with Trinity), Table 3.2-37 (spray program with Trinity + Defy/Boxer), Table 3.2-38 (spray program with Expert) and Table 3.2-39 (spray program with Herold/Fosburi).

Table 3.2-36: Overall summary of the efficacy of a spray program with Trinity applied in autumn followed by an application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) in spring at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against ALOMY

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS (BBCH) at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at assessm't	Appl'n rate/ha	Direct comparisons of % efficacy of the spray program with ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) to the spray program with the standard reference products and the single applications													
					No. of trials	Trinity at 2.0 L/ha (A1) + ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) (A2)		Trinity at 2.0 L/ha (A1) + Atlantis OD (A2)				Trinity at 2.0 L/ha (A1)		ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) (A2)		Comparison of efficacy of the spray programs#	Comparison of efficacy of the spray program to single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) #	
						Mean	Min-Max	Trade name	Appl'n rate /ha	Mean	Min-Max	Mean	Min-Max	Mean	Min-Max			
Maritime (2)	A1: 0-11 (2) A2: 15-28 (2)	A1: 16.8-35 pl/m ² (2) A2: 17.3-731 pl/m ² (2)	Earlier assessments (183 DA-A1/ 15 DA-A2) based on overall visual control across 2 trials															
			731 plants/m ² (1), 28.8% GC (1)	0.75 L	2	72.8	65.5-80	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	75.4	75-75.8	25.3	24.3-26.3	67.1	65-69.3	> ≤ (1), = (1)	> (1), = (1)	
				1.0 L	2	76.1	72.3-80	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	75.4	75-75.8	25.3	24.3-26.3	75.9	70-79.3	= (2)	= (2)	
			Later assessment (233 DA-A1 / 73 DA-A2) based on reductions in weed seed heads across 2 trials															
			20.0-1118.3 heads/m ² (2)	0.75 L	2	87	77-97	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	85.4	83-87.5	30	21-39	87.4	74.8-100	> ≤ (1), = (1)	= (2)	
				1.0 L	2	92.1	84.3-100	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	85.4	83-87.5	30	21-39	89.4	78.8-100	> ≤ (1), = (1)	> (1), = (1)	
South-east (2)	A1: 0-11 (2) A2: 21-31 (2)	A1: 1-20 pl/m ² (2) A2: 12-60 pl/m ² (2)	Earlier assessments (161-165 DA-A1/ 27-31 DA-A2) based on overall visual control on 1 trial															
			7.3-12 pl/m ² (2)	0.75 L	2	95.3	90.5-100	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	97.5	95-100	94.4	88.8-100	90.8	88.8-100	= (2)	> (1), = (1)	
				1.0 L	2	97.5	95-100	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	97.5	95-100	94.4	88.8-100	93.9	88.3-99.5	= (2)	> (1), = (1)	
			Later assessment (188-192 DA-A1 / 54-58 DA-A2) based on reductions in weed seed heads on 1 trial															
			20.0-1118.3 heads/m ² (2)	0.75 L	+2	96	92-100	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	96 97.3	92-100 94.6-100	93.4	86.8-100	92.1	85.5-98.7	= (2)	> (1), = (1)	
				1.0 L	+2	97.4	94.8-100	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	97.3	94.6-100	93.4	86.8-100	93.9	88.7-99.1	= (2)	> (1), = (1)	

No. of trials where >, = or <, based on statistically significant differences at 95% confidence level

Table 3.2-37: Overall summary of the efficacy of a spray program with Trinity + Defy/Boxer applied in autumn followed by an application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) in spring at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against ALOMY

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS (BBCH) at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at assessm't	Appl'n rate/ha	Direct comparisons of % efficacy of the spray program with ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) to the spray program with the standard reference products and the single applications													Comparison of efficacy of the spray programs#	Comparison of efficacy of the spray program to single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) #
					No. of trials	Trinity + Defy/Boxer at 1.5 + 3.0 L/ha (A1) + ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) (A2)		Trinity + Defy/Boxer at 1.5 + 3.0 L/ha (A1) + Atlantis OD/Atlantis Pro (A2)				Trinity + Defy/Boxer at 1.5 + 3.0 L/ha (A1)			ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) (A2)				
						Mean	Min-Max	Trade name	Appl'n rate /ha	Mean	Min-Max	Trade name	Mean	Min-Max	Mean	Min-Max			
Maritime (2)	A1: 10-12 (2) A2: 13-30 (2)	A1: 216-524 pl/m ² (2) A2: 216-359 pl/m ² (2)	Earlier assessments (158-159 DA-A1 / 28 DA-A2) based on overall visual control across 2 trials																
			216-524 pl/m ² (2)	0.75 L	2	98.4	96,8-100	Atlantis Pro	1.5 L	98.3	96.5-100	Defy	97.4	94.8-100	74.4 72.5	63.8-85 60-85	= (2)	> (2)	
				1.0 L	2	98.4	96,8-100	Atlantis Pro	1.5 L	98.3	96.5-100	Defy	97.4	94.8-100	74.4	63.8-85	= (2)	> (2)	
			Later assessments (DA-A1/ DA-A2) based on reductions in weed seed heads across 2 trials																
			216-359 pl/m ² (2)	0.75 L	2	100	99.9-100	Atlantis Pro	1.5 L	100	99.9-100	Defy	98.3	96.8-99.7	89.4	84.3-94.4	= (2)	> (2)	
1.0 L	2	100		100-100	Atlantis Pro	1.5 L	100	99.9-100	Defy	98.3	96.8-99.7	87	76.3-97.7	= (2)	= (1), > (1)				
North-east (1)	A1: 10-12 (1) A2: 14-25 (1)	A1: 26 pl/m ² (1) A2: 28.8 pl/m ² (1)	Earlier assessments (182 DA-A1 / 27 DA-A2) based on overall visual control on 1 trial																
			28.8 pl/m ² (1)	0.75 L	1	99.5	-	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	99.5	-	Boxer	84.8	-	90.3	-	= (1)	> (1)	
				1.0 L	1	100	-	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	99.5	-	Boxer	84.8	-	94.5	-	= (1)	= (1)	
			Later assessments (212 DA-A1/ 57 DA-A2) based on reductions in weed seed heads on 1 trial																
			172 heads/m ² (1)	0.75 L	1	100	-	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	100	-	Boxer	100	-	100	-	= (1)	= (1)	
1.0 L	1	100		-	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	100	-	Boxer	100	-	100	-	= (1)	= (1)				
South-east (1)	A1: 0 (1) A2: 18-29 (1)	A1: 0 (1) A2: 5.3 pl/m ² (1)	Earlier assessments (184 DA-A1 / 14 DA-A2) based on overall visual control on 1 trial																
			5.5 pl/m ² (1)	0.75 L	1	99	-	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	98.5	-	Boxer	95	-	88.8	-	= (1)	> (1)	
				1.0 L	1	100	-	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	98.5	-	Boxer	95	-	92.5	-	= (1)	> (1)	
			Later assessments (190 DA-A1 / 20 DA-A2) based on reductions in weed seed heads on 1 trial																
			24.8 heads/m ² (1)	0.75 L	1	98.7 98.1	-	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	100	-	Boxer	96.9	-	95	-	= (1)	= (1)	
1.0 L	1	100		-	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	100	-	Boxer	96.9	-	100	-	= (1)	= (1)				

No. of trials where >, = or <, based on statistically significant differences at 95% confidence level

Table 3.2-38: Overall summary of the efficacy of a spray program with Expert applied in autumn followed by an application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) in spring at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against ALOMY

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS (BBCH) at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at assessm't	Appl'n rate/ha	Direct comparisons of % efficacy of the spray program with ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) to the spray program with the standard reference products and the single applications										
					No. of trials	Expert at 0.35 Kg/ha (A1) + ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) (A2)		Expert at 0.35 Kg/ha (A1) + Atlantis OD at 1.0 L/ha (A2)		Expert at 0.35 Kg/ha (A1)		ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) (A2)		Comparison of efficacy of the spray programs#	Comparison of efficacy of the spray program to single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) #
						Mean	Min-Max	Mean	Min-Max	Mean	Min-Max	Mean	Min-Max		
South-east (3)	A1: 0-11 (3) A2: 21-29 (3)	A1: 0-20 pl/m ² (3), A2: 5.3-60 pl/m ² (3)	Earlier assessments (161-184 DA-A1 /14-31 DA-A2) based on overall visual control across 3 trials												
			5.5-12 pl/m ² (3)	0.75 L	3	94.4	88.8-98.5	94.3	87.5-97.8	37.6	5-87.8	90.1	82-99.5	= (3)	> (1), = (2)
				1.0 L	3	97.1	95-99	94.3	87.5-97.8	37.6	5-87.8	93.4	88.3-99.5	= (2), > (1)	> (1), = (2)
			Later assessments (188-192 DA-A1 /20-58 DA-A2) based on reductions in weed seed heads across 3 trials												
			24.8-269.8 heads/m ² (3)	0.75 L	3	95.8	93.9-98.5	88.6	72.4-97.8	34.9	2-86.8	93.1	85.5-98.7	= (2), > (1)	> (1), = (2)
				1.0 L	3	97.9	96-100	88.6	72.4-97.8	34.9	2-86.8	95.9	88.7-100	= (2), > (1)	> (1), = (2)

No. of trials where >, = or <, based on statistically significant differences at 95% confidence level

Table 3.2-39: Overall summary of the efficacy of a spray program with Herold/Fosburi applied in autumn followed by an application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) in spring at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against ALOMY

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS (BBCH) at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at assessm't	Appl'n rate/ha	Direct comparisons of % efficacy of the spray program with ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) to the spray program with the standard reference products and the single applications														Comparison of efficacy of the spray programs#	Comparison of efficacy of the spray program to single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) #
					No. of trials	Herold/Fosburi (A1) + ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) (A2)		Herold/Fosburi (A1) + Atlantis OD/Atlantis Pro (A2)				Herold/Fosburi L/ha (A1)				ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) (A2)				
						Mean	Min-Max	Trade name	Appl'n rate /ha	Mean	Min-Max	Trade name	Appl'n rate /ha	Mean	Min-Max	Mean	Min-Max			
North-east (1)	A1: 10-12 (1) A2: 14-25 (1)	A1: 26 pl/m ² (1), A2: 28.8 pl/m ² (1)	Earlier assessments (182 DA-A1 / 27 DA-A2) based on overall visual control on 1 trial																	
			28.8 pl/m ² (1)	0.75 L	1	92.8	-	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	95.3	-	Herold	0.25 L	65	-	90.3	-	= (1)	= (1)	
				1.0 L	1	99.5	-	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	95.3	-	Herold	0.25 L	65	-	94.5	-	= (1)	= (1)	
			Later assessments (212 DA-A1 / 57 DA-A2) based on reductions in weed seed heads on 1 trial																	
			172 heads/m ² (1)	0.75 L	1	100	-	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	100	-	Herold	0.25 L	83.8	-	100	-	= (1)	= (1)	
				1.0 L	1	100	-	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	100	-	Herold	0.25 L	83.8	-	100	-	= (1)	= (1)	
Maritime (4)	A1: 0-12 (4) A2: 13-30 (4)	A1: 16.8-524 pl/m ² (4) A2: 17.3-731 pl/m ² (4)	Earlier assessments (158-183 DA-A1 / 15-28 DA-A2) based on overall visual control across 4 trials																	
			216-731 pl/m ² (3), 28.8% GC (1)	0.75 L	2	77.9	75.8-80	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	82.5	78.8-86.3	Herold	0.6 L	35.9	33-38.8	67.1	65-69.3	= (1), < (1)	> (2)	
					2	99	98-100	Atlantis Pro	1.5 L	98.8	97.5-100	Fosburi	0.5 L	97.4	94.8-100	72.5	60-85	= (2)	> (2)	
				1.0 L	2	79.9	78.5-81.3	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	82.5	78.8-86.3	Herold	0.6 L	35.9	33-38.8	75.9	74.3-77.5	= (1), < (1)	> (1), = (1)	
					2	99.2	98.3-100	Atlantis Pro	1.5 L	98.8	97.5-100	Fosburi	0.5 L	97.4	94.8-100	74.4	63.8-85	= (2)	> (2)	
			Later assessments (185-242 DA-A1 / 54-74 DA-A2) based on reductions in weed seed heads across 4 trials																	
			20-1509 heads/m ² (4)	0.75 L	2	91.6	84.3-99	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	96.5	93-100	Herold	0.6 L	44.1	38.3-50	87.4	74.8-100	= (1), < (1)	> (1), = (1)	
					2	100	100-100	Atlantis Pro	1.5 L	100	100-100	Fosburi	0.5 L	98.9	97.7-100	89.4	84.3-94.4	= (2)	> (2)	
				1.0 L	2	94.1	88.3-100	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	96.5	93-100	Herold	0.6 L	44.1	38.3-50	89.4	78.8-100	= (1), < (1)	> (1), = (1)	
					2	100	99.9-100	Atlantis Pro	1.5 L	100	100-100	Fosburi	0.5 L	98.9	97.7-100	87	76.3-97.7	= (2)	> (1), = (1)	

No. of trials where >, = or <, based on statistically significant differences at 95% confidence level

Spray program with Trinity

The spray program with Trinity applied in autumn, followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha gave good control of ALOMY in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone and excellent control in the South-east EPPO climatic zone.

The efficacy of the spray program with Trinity applied in autumn and ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied in spring at 1.0 L product/ha was generally comparable to that of the spray program with Trinity applied in autumn and the standard reference product containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD). Compared to the single application of Trinity, the efficacy of the spray program was higher in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone and comparable in the South-east EPPO climatic zone. Compared to the single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, the efficacy of the spray program was comparable in both zones.

The spray program with Trinity applied in autumn, followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha gave good control of ALOMY in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone and excellent control in the South-east EPPO climatic zone.

The efficacy of the spray program with Trinity applied in autumn and ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied in spring at 0.75 L product/ha was generally comparable to that of the spray program with Trinity applied in autumn and the standard reference product containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD). Compared to the single applications of Trinity and of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at 0.75 L/ha, the efficacy of the spray program was higher in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone and comparable in the South-east EPPO climatic zone.

The presented data demonstrates ALOMY to be susceptible to a spray program with Trinity applied in autumn followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha under conditions in countries in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone and highly susceptible in the South-East EPPO climatic zone. Data also demonstrate, that the efficacy of a spray program with Trinity and ADM.06001.H.2.B at 0.75 L/ha is superior to the single application of Trinity in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone. This cannot be demonstrated under conditions of the South-east EPPO climatic zone. ~~and ADM.06001.H.2.B at 1.0 L/ha in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone.~~

Spray program with Trinity + Defy/Boxer

The spray program with Trinity + Defy/Boxer applied in autumn, followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha gave excellent control of ALOMY in the Maritime, South-east and North-East EPPO climatic zone.

The efficacy of the spray program with Trinity + Defy/Boxer applied in autumn and ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied in spring at 1.0 L product/ha was generally comparable to that of the spray program with Trinity + Defy/Boxer applied in autumn and the standard reference product containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD, Atlantis Pro). Compared to the single application of Trinity + Defy/Boxer, the efficacy of the spray program was comparable with the single application already giving excellent control across all tested EPPO climatic zones. Compared to the single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, the efficacy of the spray program was comparable in the South-east and the North-East EPPO climatic zone with the single application giving already excellent control.

In the Maritime EPPO climatic zone the single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha was slightly lower than with the spray program.

The spray program with Trinity + Defy/Boxer applied in autumn, followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha gave excellent control of ALOMY in the Maritime, South-east and North-East EPPO climatic zone.

The efficacy of the spray program with Trinity + Defy/Boxer applied in autumn and ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied in spring at 0.75 L product/ha was generally comparable to that of the spray program with Trinity + Defy/Boxer applied in autumn and the standard reference product containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD, Atlantis Pro). Compared to the single application of Trinity + Defy/Boxer, the efficacy of the spray program was comparable with the single application already giving excellent control across all tested EPPO climatic zones. Compared to the single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, the efficacy of the spray program was comparable in the South-east and the North-East EPPO climatic zones with the single application giving already excellent control. In the Maritime EPPO climatic zone, the single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha was slightly lower than with the spray program.

The presented data demonstrates ALOMY to be highly susceptible to a spray program with Trinity + Defy/Boxer applied in autumn followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha under conditions in countries in the Maritime, South-east and North-east EPPO climatic zones. Data can also demonstrate that the efficacy of the spray program with Trinity + Boxer/Defy and ADM.06001.H.2.B at both rates is superior to the single applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone. This cannot be demonstrated under conditions in the South-east and North-east EPPO climatic zones. Data also cannot demonstrate that the efficacy of the spray program with Trinity + Boxer/Defy and ADM.06001.H.2.B at both rates is superior to the single application of Trinity + Defy Boxer across EPPO climatic zones.

Spray program with Expert

The spray program with Expert applied in autumn, followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha gave excellent control of ALOMY in the South-east EPPO climatic zone.

The efficacy of the spray program with Expert applied in autumn and ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied in spring at 1.0 L product/ha was higher than that of the spray program with Expert applied in autumn and the standard reference product containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD). Compared to the single application of Expert, the efficacy of the spray program was higher. Compared to the single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, the efficacy of the spray program was comparable, with the single application giving already excellent control.

The spray program with Expert applied in autumn, followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha gave excellent control of ALOMY in the South-east EPPO climatic zone.

The efficacy of the spray program with Expert applied in autumn and ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied in spring at 0.75 L product/ha was higher than that of the spray program with Expert applied in autumn and the standard reference product containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD). Compared to the single application of Expert, the efficacy of the spray program was higher. Compared to the single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, the efficacy of the spray program was comparable.

The presented data demonstrates ALOMY to be highly susceptible to a spray program with Expert applied in autumn followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha under conditions in countries in the South-east EPPO climatic zone. Data also demonstrate, that the efficacy of a spray program with Expert and ADM.06001.H.2.B at both rates is superior to the single application of Expert. This cannot be demonstrated compared to the single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at both rates.

Spray program with Herold/Fosburi

The spray program with Herold or Fosburi applied in autumn, followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha gave good to excellent control of ALOMY in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone and excellent control in the North-East EPPO climatic zone.

The efficacy of the spray program with Herold or Fosburi applied in autumn and ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied in spring at 1.0 L product/ha was generally comparable to that of the spray program with Herold or Fosburi applied in autumn and the standard reference product containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD, Atlantis Pro). Compared to the single application of Herold or Fosburi, the efficacy of the spray program was higher in the North-east EPPO climatic zone and comparable or higher in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone, with the single application already giving excellent control in some trials. Compared to the single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, the efficacy of the spray program was comparable in the North-east EPPO climatic zone with the single application giving already excellent control. In the Maritime EPPO climatic zone the single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha was lower than the efficacy of the spray program.

The spray program with Herold or Fosburi applied in autumn, followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha gave good to excellent control of ALOMY in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone and excellent control in the North-East EPPO climatic zone.

The efficacy of the spray program with Herold or Fosburi applied in autumn and ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied in spring at 0.75 L product/ha was generally comparable to that of the spray program with Herold or Fosburi applied in autumn and the standard reference product containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD, Atlantis Pro). Compared to the single application of Herold or Fosburi, the efficacy of the spray program was higher in the North-east EPPO climatic zone and comparable or higher in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone, with the single application already giving excellent control in some trials. Compared to the single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, the efficacy of the spray program was comparable in the North-east EPPO climatic zone with the single application giving already excellent control. In the Maritime EPPO climatic zone the single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha was comparable to or lower than the efficacy of the spray program.

The presented data demonstrates ALOMY to be highly susceptible to a spray program with Herold or Fosburi applied in autumn followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha under conditions in countries in the North-east EPPO climatic zone and to be susceptible to highly susceptible at both rates under conditions of the Maritime EPPO climatic zone. Data can also demonstrate that the efficacy of the spray program with Herold or Fosburi and ADM.06001.H.2.B at both rates can be superior to the

single applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B and Herold or Fosburi in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone and superior to the single application of Herold and Fosburi in the North-east EPPO climatic zone. This cannot be demonstrated for the spray program with Herold or Fosburi and ADM.06001.H.2.B at both rates compared to the single application ADM.06001.H.2.B under conditions in the North-east EPPO climatic zone.

Efficacy against Loose silky bent (*Apera spica-venti*: APESV)

A total of 2 trials conducted in 2019 have generated data on the efficacy of spray programs with an autumn application of a post-emergence herbicide, followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against APESV in cereals.

In these trials, all product treatments applied in autumn were done according to label rates. Trinity (300 g/L pendimethalin + 250 g/L chlortoluron + 40 g/L diflufenican, SC) was applied at 1.5 L product/ha in combination with Boxer (800 g/L prosulfocarb, EC) at 3.0 L product/ha, Expert (140 g/Kg metribuzin + 420 g/Kg flufenacet) was applied at 0.35 Kg product/ha and Herold (200 g/L diflufenican + 400 g/L flufenacet, SC) were applied at 0.25 L product/ha.

Autumn treatments (A1) were applied between October and November on all trials, when crop growth stages were in the range of 10-13 (BBCH). Spring treatments (A2) were applied in April on both trials, when the cereal crop growth stages ranged from 29-32 (BBCH). Application timings are therefore representative of the proposed timings for the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B.

Of these trials, 1 was carried out in the North-east EPPO climatic zone (Poland) and 1 was carried out in the South-east EPPO climatic zone (Hungary).

Across trials, the efficacy of an autumn/spring spray program with ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) against APESV has been tested in wide ranging locations, cultural practices, climatic conditions and weed biotypes, densities and growth stages that are fully representative of those in areas where cereal crops are grown in all countries relevant to this submission.

An overall summary of the efficacy of spray programs with an autumn application of a post-emergence herbicide, followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, compared to the efficacy of spray programs with an autumn application of a post-emergence herbicide, followed by a spring application of a standard reference product and the single applications against APESV from earlier and later assessments across trials in each EPPO climatic zone is given in Table 3.2-40 (spray program with Trinity + Boxer), Table 3.2-41 (spray program with Expert) and Table 3.2-42 (spray program with Herold).

Table 3.2-40: Overall summary of the efficacy of a spray program with Trinity + Boxer applied in autumn followed by an application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) in spring at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against APESV

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS (BBCH) at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at assessm't	Appl'n rate/ha	Direct comparisons of % efficacy of the spray program with ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) to the spray program with the standard reference products and the single applications								
					No. of trials	Trinity + Boxer at 1.5 + 3.0 L/ha (A1) + ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) (A2)	Trinity + Boxer at 1.5 + 3.0 L/ha (A1) + Atlantis OD			Trinity + Boxer at 1.5 + 3.0 L/ha (A1)	ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) (A2)	Comparison of efficacy of the spray programs#	Comparison of efficacy of the spray program to single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) #
						Mean	Trade name	Appl'n rate /ha	Mean	Mean	Mean		
North-east (1)	A1: 10-13 (1) A2: 21-31 (1)	A1: 140 pl/m ² (1) A2: 185 pl/m ² (1)	Earlier assessments (209 DA-A1 / 27 DA-A2) based on overall visual control on 1 trial										
			190 pl/m ² (1)	0.5 L	1	98.8	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	100	100	67.5	= (1)	> (1)
				1.0 L	1	100	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	100	100	73.8	= (1)	> (1)
			Later assessments (246 DA-A1/ 64 DA-A2) based on reductions in weed seed heads on 1 trial										
			392.5 heads/m ² (1)	0.5 L	1	98.8	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	99.2	99.9	96.1	= (1)	= (1)
				1.0 L	1	100	Atlantis OD	0.6 L	99.2	99.9	100	= (1)	= (1)
South-east (1)	A1: 9-10 (1) A2: 11-13 (1)	A1: 5 15.3 pl/m ² (1) A2: 15.3 pl/m ² (1)	Earlier assessments (182 DA-A1 / 25 DA-A2) based on overall visual control on 1 trial										
			15.3 pl/m ² (1)	0.5 L	1	100	Atlantis OD	1.5 L	100	100	97.8	= (1)	> (1)
				1.0 L	1	100	Atlantis OD	1.5 L	100	100	100	= (1)	= (1)
			Later assessments (280 DA-A1 / 61 DA-A2) based on reductions in weed seed heads on 1 trial										
			26.8 heads/m ² (1)	0.5 L	1	100	Atlantis OD	1.5 L	100	100	98.3	= (1)	> (1)
				1.0 L	1	100	Atlantis OD	1.5 L	100	100	100	= (1)	= (1)

No. of trials where >, = or <, based on statistically significant differences at 95% confidence level

Table 3.2-41: Overall summary of the efficacy of a spray program with Expert applied in autumn followed by an application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) in spring at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against APESV

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS (BBCH) at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at assessm't	Appl'n rate/ha	Direct comparisons of % efficacy of the spray program with ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) to the spray program with the standard reference products and the single applications						
					No. of trials	Expert at 0.35 Kg/ha (A1) + ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) (A2)	Expert at 0.35 Kg/ha (A1) + Atlantis OD at 1.5 L/ha (A2)	Expert at 0.35 Kg/ha (A1)	ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) (A2)	Comparison of efficacy of the spray programs#	Comparison of efficacy of the spray program to single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) #
						Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean		
South-east (1)	A1: 9-10 (1) A2: 11-13 (1)	A1: 5 pl/m² (1) A2: 15.3 pl/m² (1)	Earlier assessments (182 DA-A1 / 25 DA-A2) based on overall visual control on 1 trial								
			15.3 pl/m² (1)	0.5 L	1	100	100	100	97.8	= (1)	> (1)
				1.0 L	1	100	100	100	98.3 100	= (1)	= (1)
			Later assessments (280 DA-A1 / 61 DA-A2) based on reductions in weed seed heads on 1 trial								
			26.8 heads/m² (1)	0.5 L	1	100	100	100	100 98.3	= (1)	> (1)
				1.0 L	1	100	100	100	100	= (1)	= (1)

No. of trials where >, = or <, based on statistically significant differences at 95% confidence level

Table 3.2-42: Overall summary of the efficacy of a spray program with Herold applied in autumn followed by an application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) in spring at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against APESV

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS (BBCH) at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at assessm't	Appl'n rate/ha	Direct comparisons of % efficacy of the spray program with ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) to the spray program with the standard reference products and the single applications						
					No. of trials	Herold at 0.25 L/ha (A1) + ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) (A2)	Herold at 0.25 L/ha (A1) + Atlantis OD at 0.6 L/ha (A2)	Herold at 0.25 L/ha (A1)	ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) (A2)	Comparison of efficacy of the spray programs#	Comparison of efficacy of the spray program to single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) #
						Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean		
North-east (1)	A1: 10-13 (1) A2: 21-31 (1)	A1: 140 pl/m ² (1) A2: 185 pl/m ² (1)	Earlier assessments (209 DA-A1 / 27 DA-A2) based on overall visual control on 1 trial								
			15.3 pl/m ² (1)	0.5 L	1	98.8	100	98.8	67.5	= (1)	> (1)
				1.0 L	1	98.8	100	98.8	73.8	= (1)	> (1)
			Later assessments (212 DA-A1 / 57 DA-A2) based on reductions in weed seed heads on 1 trial								
			26.8 heads/m ² (1)	0.5 L	1	99.8	99.2	97.9	96.1	= (1)	= (1)
				1.0 L	1	100	99.2	97.9	100	= (1)	= (1)

No. of trials where >, = or <, based on statistically significant differences at 95% confidence level

Spray program with Trinity + Boxer

The spray program with Trinity + Boxer applied in autumn, followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha gave excellent control of APESV in the South-east and North-East EPPO climatic zones.

The efficacy of the spray program with Trinity + Boxer applied in autumn and ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied in spring at 1.0 L product/ha was comparable to that of the spray program with Trinity + Boxer applied in autumn and the standard reference product containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD). Compared to the single applications of Trinity + Boxer and of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, the efficacy of the spray program was comparable with the single applications already giving excellent control across both EPPO climatic zones.

The spray program with Trinity + Boxer applied in autumn, followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha gave excellent control of APESV in the South-east and North-East EPPO climatic zones.

The efficacy of the spray program with Trinity + Boxer applied in autumn and ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied in spring at 0.75 L product/ha was comparable to that of the spray program with Trinity + Boxer applied in autumn and the standard reference product containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD). Compared to the single applications of Trinity + Boxer and of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, the efficacy of the spray program was comparable with the single applications already giving excellent control across both EPPO climatic zones.

The presented data demonstrates APESV to be highly susceptible to a spray program with Trinity + Boxer applied in autumn followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha under conditions in countries in the South-east and North-east EPPO climatic zone. Data cannot demonstrate that the efficacy of the spray program with Trinity + Boxer and ADM.06001.H.2.B at both rates is superior to the single applications Trinity + Boxer and of ADM.06001.H.2.B.

Spray program with Expert

The spray program with Expert applied in autumn, followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha gave excellent control of APESV in the South-east EPPO climatic zone.

The efficacy of the spray program with Expert applied in autumn and ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied in spring at 1.0 L product/ha was comparable to that of the spray program with Expert applied in autumn and the standard reference product containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD). Compared to the single applications of Expert and of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, the efficacy of the spray program was comparable with the single applications already giving excellent control.

The spray program with Expert applied in autumn, followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha gave excellent control of APESV in the South-east EPPO climatic zone.

The efficacy of the spray program with Expert applied in autumn and ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied in spring at 0.75 L product/ha was comparable to that of the spray program with Expert applied in autumn and the standard reference product containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD). Compared to the single applications of Expert and of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, the efficacy of the spray program was comparable with the single applications already giving excellent control.

The presented data demonstrates APESV to be highly susceptible to a spray program with Expert applied in autumn followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha under conditions in countries in the South-east EPPO climatic zone. Data cannot demonstrate that the efficacy of the spray program with Expert and ADM.06001.H.2.B at both rates is superior to the single applications of Expert and of ADM.06001.H.2.B at both rates.

Spray program with Herold

The spray program with Herold applied in autumn, followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha gave excellent control of APESV in the North-east EPPO climatic zone.

The efficacy of the spray program with Herold applied in autumn and ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied in spring at 1.0 L product/ha was comparable to that of the spray program with Herold applied in autumn and the standard reference product containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD). Compared to the single applications of Herold and of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, the efficacy of the spray program was comparable with the single applications already giving excellent control.

The spray program with Herold applied in autumn, followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha gave excellent control of APESV in the North-east EPPO climatic zone.

The efficacy of the spray program with Herold applied in autumn and ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied in spring at 0.75 L product/ha was comparable to that of the spray program with Herold applied in autumn and the standard reference product containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD). Compared to the single applications of Herold and of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, the efficacy of the spray program was comparable with the single applications already giving excellent control.

The presented data demonstrates APESV to be highly susceptible to a spray program with Herold applied in autumn followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha under conditions in countries in the North-east EPPO climatic zone. Data cannot demonstrate that the efficacy of the spray program with Herold and ADM.06001.H.2.B at both rates is superior to the single applications of Herold and of ADM.06001.H.2.B at both rates.

Efficacy against Brome species (*Bromus* spp.: BROSS)

A total of 3 trials conducted in 2018 and 2019 have generated data on the efficacy of spray programs with an autumn application of a post-emergence herbicide, followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against Brome species in cereals.

The specific species of Brome occurring in these trials were *Bromus secalinus* (BROSE) in 1 trial and *Bromus sterilis* (BROST) in 2 trials.

In these trials, all product treatments applied in autumn were done according to label rates. Topsail (800 g/L prosulfocarb, EC) was applied at 3.0 L product/ha, Roxy (800 g/L prosulfocarb, EC) was applied at 4.0 L product/ha and Herold (200 g/L diflufenican + 400 g/L flufenacet, SC) were applied at 0.6 L product/ha.

Autumn treatments (A1) were applied in November on all trials, when crop growth stages were in the range of 01-12 (BBCH). Spring treatments (A2) were applied between March and April on all trials, when the cereal crop growth stages ranged from 20-32 (BBCH). Application timings are therefore representative of the proposed timings for the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B.

Of these trials, 1 was carried out in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (Czech Republic) and 2 were carried out in the South-east EPPO climatic zone (all in Romania).

Across trials, the efficacy of a autumn/spring spray program with ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) against Brome species has been tested in wide ranging locations, cultural practices, climatic conditions and weed biotypes, densities and growth stages that are fully representative of those in areas where cereal crops are grown in all countries relevant to this submission.

An overall summary of the efficacy of spray programs with an autumn application of a post-emergence herbicide, followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, compared to the efficacy of spray programs with an autumn application of a post-emergence herbicide, followed by a spring application of a standard reference product and the single applications against Brome species from earlier and later assessments across trials in each EPPO climatic zone is given in Table 3.2-43 (spray program with Topsail/Roxy) and Table 3.2-44 (spray program with Herold).

Table 3.2-43: Overall summary of the efficacy of a spray program with Topsail or Roxy applied in autumn followed by an application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) in spring at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against Brome species

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS (BBCH) at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at assessm't	Appl'n rate/ha	Direct comparisons of % efficacy of the spray program with ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) to the spray program with the standard reference products and the single applications									Comparison of efficacy of the spray programs#	Comparison of efficacy of the spray program to single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) #
					No. of trials	Topsail/Roxy at 3.0 or 4.0 L/ha (A1) + ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) (A2)	Topsail/Roxy at 3.0 or 4.0 L/ha (A1) + Atlantis OD at 1.2 L/ha (A2)	Topsail/Roxy at 3.0 or 4.0 L/ha (A1)			ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) (A2)				
						Mean	Mean	Trade name	Appl'n rate /ha	Mean	Mean				
Efficacy against BROSE (1 trial)															
South-east (1)	A1: 0 (1) A2: 22-32 (1)	A1: 0 pl/m² (1), A2: 22.8 pl/m² (1)	Earlier assessments (175 DA-A1 /25 DA-A2) based on overall visual control on 1 trial												
			22.75 pl/m² (1)	0.75 L	1	85	87.5	Topsail	3.0 L	36.3	76.3	= (1)	> (1)		
				1.0 L	1	91.3	87.5	Topsail	3.0 L	36.3	83.8	= (1)	> (1)		
			Later assessments (202 DA-A1 /52 DA-A2) based on reductions in weed seed heads on 1 trial												
			45.5 heads/m² (1)	0.75 L	1	90.1	92.3	Topsail	3.0 L	30.6	83	= (1)	> (1)		
				1.0 L	1	97.9	92.3	Topsail	3.0 L	30.6	91.8	> (1)	> (1)		
Efficacy against BROST (2 trials)															
Maritime (1)	A1: 11-13 (1) A2: 21-26 (1)	A1: 20.8 pl/m² (1), A2: 30.0 pl/m² (1)	Earlier assessments (175 DA-A1 /25 DA-A2) based on overall visual control on 1 trial												
			55.8 pl/m² (1)	0.75 L	1	62.5	57.5	Roxy	4.0 L	45.0	65.0	= (1)	= (1)		
				1.0 L	1	65.0	57.5	Roxy	4.0 L	45.0	65.0	= (1)	= (1)		
			Later assessments (203 DA-A1 /55 DA-A2) based on reductions in weed seed heads on 1 trial												
			102.5 heads/m² (1)	0.75 L	1	19.2	46.9	Roxy	4.0 L	0.0	30.2	= (1)	= (1)		
				1.0 L	1	45.0	46.9	Roxy	4.0 L	0.0	45.5	= (1)	= (1)		
South-east (1)	A1: 0 (1) A2: 21-31 (1)	A1: 0 pl/m² (1), A2: 15 pl/m² (1)	Earlier assessments (175 DA-A1 /25 DA-A2) based on overall visual control on 1 trial												
			15 pl/m² (1)	0.75 L	1	86.3	87.5	Topsail	3.0 L	28.8	80	= (1)	> (1)		
				1.0 L	1	91.3	87.5	Topsail	3.0 L	28.8	86.3	> (1)	> (1)		
			Later assessments (202 DA-A1 /52 DA-A2) based on reductions in weed seed heads on 1 trial												
			23 heads/m² (1)	0.75 L	1	91.4	94.6	Topsail	3.0 L	18.2	85.7	= (1)	> (1)		
				1.0 L	1	100	94.6	Topsail	3.0 L	18.2	93.4	= (1)	> (1)		

No. of trials where >, = or <, based on statistically significant differences at 95% confidence level

Table 3.2-44: Overall summary of the efficacy of a spray program with Herold applied in autumn followed by an application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) in spring at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against Brome species

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS (BBCH) at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at assessm't	Appl'n rate/ha	Direct comparisons of % efficacy of the spray program with ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) to the spray program with the standard reference products and the single applications									
					No. of trials	Herold (A1) + ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) (A2)	Herold (A1) + Atlantis OD (A2)			Herold (A1)		ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) (A2)	Comparison of efficacy of the spray programs#	Comparison of efficacy of the spray program to single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) #
						Mean	Trade name	Appl'n rate /ha	Mean	Appl'n rate /ha	Mean	Mean		
Efficacy against BROSE (1 trial)														
South-east (1)	A1: 0 (1) A2: 22-32 (1)	A1: 0 pl/m ² (1), A2: 22.8 pl/m ² (1)	Earlier assessments (175 DA-A1 /25 DA-A2) based on overall visual control on 1 trial											
			22.75 pl/m ² (1)	0.75 L	1	90	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	92.5	0.6 L	51.3	76.3	= (1)	> (1)
				1.0 L	1	95	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	92.5	0.6 L	51.3	83.8	= (1)	> (1)
			Later assessments (202 DA-A1 /52 DA-A2) based on reductions in weed seed heads on 1 trial											
			45.5 heads/m ² (1)	0.75 L	1	95	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	97.8	0.6 L	42.9	83.0	= (1)	> (1)
				1.0 L	1	100	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	97.8	0.6 L	42.9	91.8	= (1)	> (1)
Efficacy against BROST (1 trial)														
Maritime (1)	A1: 11-13 (1) A2: 21-26 (1)	A1: 20.8 pl/m ² (1), A2: 30.0 pl/m ² (1)	Earlier assessments (175 DA-A1 /25 DA-A2) based on overall visual control on 1 trial											
			55.8 pl/m ² (1)	0.75 L	1	67.5	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	61.3	0.6 L	55.0	65.0	= (1)	= (1)
				1.0 L	1	72.5	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	61.3	0.6 L	55.0	65.0	= (1)	= (1)
			Later assessments (203 DA-A1 /55 DA-A2) based on reductions in weed seed heads on 1 trial											
			102.5 heads/m ² (1)	0.75 L	1	26.2	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	47.5	0.6 L	0.0	30.2	= (1)	= (1)
				1.0 L	1	39.3	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	47.5	0.6 L	0.0	45.5	= (1)	= (1)
South-east (1)	A1: 0 (1) A2: 21-31 (1)	A1: 0 pl/m ² (1), A2: 15 pl/m ² (1)	Earlier assessments (175 DA-A1 /25 DA-A2) based on overall visual control on 1 trial											
			15 pl/m ² (1)	0.75 L	1	92.5	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	95	0.6 L	51.3	80	= (1)	> (1)
				1.0 L	1	100	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	95	0.6 L	51.3	86.3	> (1)	> (1)
			Later assessments (202 DA-A1 /52 DA-A2) based on reductions in weed seed heads on 1 trial											
			23 heads/m ² (1)	0.75 L	1	96.8	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	100	0.6 L	43.4	85.7	= (1)	> (1)
				1.0 L	1	100	Atlantis OD	1.2 L	100	0.6 L	43.4	93.4	= (1)	> (1)

No. of trials where >, = or <, based on statistically significant differences at 95% confidence level

Spray program with Topsail or Roxy

The spray program with Topsail or Roxy applied in autumn, followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha gave excellent control of the Brome species in the South-east EPPO climatic zone and moderate control in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone. The Brome species tested in the trials (BROST and BROSE) are some of the main Brome species that occur as weeds in cereal crops in Europe and data generated on efficacy against this weed are considered to support a label claim for all Brome species, by extrapolation.

The efficacy of the spray program with Topsail or Roxy applied in autumn and ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied in spring at 1.0 L product/ha was higher than that of the spray program with Topsail or Roxy applied in autumn and the standard reference product containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD). Compared to the single applications of Topsail or Roxy, the efficacy of the spray program was higher in both EPPO zones. Compared to the single applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at 1.0 L/ha, the efficacy of the spray program was higher in the South-east EPPO climatic zone and comparable in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone.

The spray program with Topsail or Roxy applied in autumn, followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha gave good control of Brome species in the South-east EPPO climatic zone and moderate control in the Maritime EPPO zone.

The efficacy of the spray program with Topsail or Roxy applied in autumn and ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied in spring at 0.75 L product/ha was comparable to or higher or lower than that of the spray program with Topsail or Roxy applied in autumn and the standard reference product containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD). Compared to the single applications of Topsail or Roxy, the efficacy of the spray program was higher. Compared to the single applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at 0.75 L/ha, the efficacy of the spray program was higher in the South-east EPPO climatic zone and slightly lower in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone.

The presented data demonstrates BROSS to be highly susceptible to a spray program with Topsail or Roxy applied in autumn followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and susceptible to a spray program with Topsail or Roxy applied in autumn followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha under conditions in countries in the South-east EPPO climatic zone. In the Maritime EPPO climatic zone countries, the data shows BROSS to be moderately tolerant to a spray program with Topsail or Roxy applied in autumn followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also at the lower rate of 0.75 L/ha. Data also demonstrate, that the efficacy of a spray program with Topsail or Roxy and ADM.06001.H.2.B at both rates is superior to the single application of Topsail or Roxy under conditions of both EPPO climatic zones, and to a single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at both rates in the South-east EPPO climatic zone, whilst this cannot be shown for countries within the Maritime EPPO climatic zone.

Spray program with Herold

The spray program with Herold applied in autumn, followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha gave moderately good control of Brome species in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone and excellent control in the South-east EPPO climatic zone. The Brome species tested in the trials (BRODI and BROSE) are some of the main Brome species that occur as weeds in cereal crops in Europe and data generated on efficacy against this weed are considered to support a label claim for all Brome species, by extrapolation.

The efficacy of the spray program with Herold applied in autumn and ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied in spring at 1.0 L product/ha was comparable to that of the spray program with Herold applied in autumn and the standard reference product applied in spring, containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD) in the South-east climatic zone and higher or lower in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone. Compared to the single applications of Herold and ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, the efficacy of the spray program was higher.

The spray program with Herold applied in autumn, followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha gave moderate control of Brome species in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone and excellent control in the South-east EPPO climatic zone.

The efficacy of the spray program with Herold applied in autumn and ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied in spring at 0.75 L product/ha was comparable to that of the spray program with Herold applied in autumn and the standard reference product containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD) in spring in the South-east climatic zone and higher or lower in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone. Compared to the single application of Herold and to the single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at 0.75 L product/ha, the efficacy of the spray program was generally higher.

The presented data demonstrates BROSS to be moderately susceptible to a spray program with Herold applied in autumn followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and moderately tolerant to a spray program with Herold applied in autumn followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha under conditions in countries in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone. In the South-east EPPO climatic zone countries, the data shows BROSS to be highly susceptible to a spray program with Herold applied in autumn followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and susceptible to a spray program with Herold applied in autumn followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha. Data also demonstrate, that the efficacy of a spray program with Herold and ADM.06001.H.2.B at both rates is superior to the single application of Herold and also mostly superior to the single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at both rates in all EPPO climatic zones.

Efficacy against Italian ryegrass (*Lolium multiflorum*: LOLMU)

A total of 5 trials conducted in 2018 and 2019 have generated data on the efficacy of spray programs with an autumn application of a post-emergence herbicide, followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against LOLMU in cereals.

In these trials, all product treatments applied in autumn were done according to label rates. Trinity (300 g/L pendimethalin + 250 g/L chlortoluron + 40 g/L diflufenican, SC) was applied at 2.0 L product/ha or at 1.5 L product/ha in combination with Defy or Boxer (800 g/L prosulfocarb, EC) at 3.0 L product/ha, Expert (140 g/Kg metribuzin + 420 g/Kg flufenacet) was applied at 0.35 Kg product/ha and Fosburi (200 g/L diflufenican + 400 g/L flufenacet, SC) was applied at 0.5 L product/ha.

Autumn treatments (A1) were applied between October and November on all trials, when crop growth stages were in the range of 10-22 (BBCH). Spring treatments (A2) were applied between February and March on all trials, when the cereal crop growth stages ranged from 21-30 (BBCH). Application timings are therefore representative of the proposed timings for the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B.

Of these trials, 1 was carried out in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (France) and 4 were carried out in the South-east EPPO climatic zone (all in Hungary).

Across trials, the efficacy of a autumn/spring spray program with ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) against LOLMU has been tested in wide ranging locations, cultural practices, climatic conditions and weed biotypes, densities and growth stages that are fully representative of those in areas where cereal crops are grown in all countries relevant to this submission.

Efficacy data from 1 of the trials in the South-east EPPO climatic zone (all in Hungary) are considered not to accurately represent that of the treatments. ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) and standard reference product gave low and variable control on all of these trials. This was attributed to the massive emergence of LOLMU late in spring after application A2. Those weeds are not controlled by post weed emergence herbicides tested in the trial. On this basis, data from this trial has not been included in the following summary tables.

An overall summary of the efficacy of spray programs with an autumn application of a post-emergence herbicide, followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, compared to the efficacy of spray programs with an autumn application of a post-emergence herbicide, followed by a spring application of a standard reference product and the single applications against LOLMU from earlier and later assessments across trials in each EPPO climatic zone is given in Table 3.2-45 (spray program with Trinity), 3.2-46 (spray program with Trinity + Defy/Boxer), Table 3.2-47 (spray program with Expert) and Table 3.2-48 (spray program with Fosburi).

Table 3.2-45: Overall summary of the efficacy of a spray program with Trinity applied in autumn followed by an application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) in spring at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against LOLMU

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS (BBCH) at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at assessm't	Appl'n rate/ha	Direct comparisons of % efficacy of the spray program with ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) to the spray program with the standard reference products and the single applications						
					No. of trials	Trinity at 2.0 L/ha (A1) + ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) (A2)	Trinity at 2.0 L/ha (A1) + Atlantis OD at 1.0 L/ha (A2)	Trinity at 2.0 L/ha (A1)	ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) (A2)	Comparison of efficacy of the spray programs#	Comparison of efficacy of the spray program to single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) #
						Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean		
South-east (1)	A1: 10-29 (1) A2: 10-30 (1)	A1: 27 pl/m ² (1) A2: 197.5 pl/m ² (1)	Earlier assessments (160 DA-A1 / 24 DA-A2) based on overall visual control on 1 trial								
			228 pl/m ² (1)	0.75 L	1	70	85.0	32.5	48.8	= (1)	> (1)
				1.0 L	1	81.8	85	32.5	60	= (1)	> (1)
			Later assessments (231 DA-A1 /95 DA-A2) based on reductions in weed seed heads on 1 trial								
			252 heads/m ² (1)	0.75 L	1	67	95	0	52	= (1)	= (1)
				1.0 L	1	88	95.0	0	79	= (1)	= (1)

No. of trials where >, = or <, based on statistically significant differences at 95% confidence level

Table 3.2-46: Overall summary of the efficacy of a spray program with Trinity + Defy/Boxer applied in autumn followed by an application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) in spring at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against LOLMU

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS (BBCH) at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	No. of trials	Weed density at assessm't	Appl'n rate/ha	Direct comparisons of % efficacy of the spray program with ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) to the spray program with the standard reference products and the single applications														Comparison of efficacy of the spray program to single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) #
						No. of trials	Trinity + Defy/Boxer at 1.5 + 3.0 L/ha (A1) + ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) (A2)		Trinity + Defy/Boxer at 1.5 + 3.0 L/ha (A1) + Standard reference products (A2)				Trinity + Defy/Boxer at 1.5 + 3.0 L/ha (A1)			ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) (A2)		Comparison of efficacy of the spray programs#		
							Mean	Min-Max	Trade name	Appl'n rate /ha	Mean	Min-Max	Trade name	Mean	Min-Max	Mean	Min-Max			
Maritime (1)	A1: 11 (1) A2: 22 (1)	A1: 44 pl/m ² (1), A2: 54 pl/m ² (1)	Earlier assessments (111 DA-A1 /27 DA-A2) based on overall visual control on 1 trial																	
			1	55.5 pl/m ² (1)	0.75 L	1	100	-	Atlantis Pro	1.5 L	100	-	Defy	99.5	-	94.5	-	= (1)	> (1)	
					1.0 L	1	100	-	Atlantis Pro	1.5 L	100	-	Defy	99.5	-	94.6	-	= (1)	> (1)	
			Later assessments (168 DA-A1 /84 DA-A2) based on reductions in weed seed heads on 1 trial																	
			1	185 heads/m ² (1)	0.75 L	1	99.9	-	Atlantis Pro	1.5 L	100	-	Defy	100	-	93.5	-	= (1)	> (1)	
					1.0 L	1	100	-	Atlantis Pro	1.5 L	100	-	Defy	100	-	97.8	-	= (1)	= (1)	
South-east (2)	A1: 0-12 (2) A2: 22-26 (2)	A1: 10-50 pl/m ² (2), A2: 10-52 pl/m ² (2)	Earlier assessments (153-158 DA-A1 /28 DA-A2) based on overall visual control on 2 trials																	
			2	15-52 pl/m ² (2)	0.75 L	2	100	100-100	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	100	100-100	Boxer	100	100-100	93.3	90-96.5	= (2)	> (2)	
					1.0 L	2	100	100-100	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	100	100-100	Boxer	100	100-100	99.0	98-100	= (2)	> (1), = (1)	
			Later assessments (214 DA-A1 /84-89 DA-A2) based on reductions in weed seed heads on 2 trials																	
			2	21.5-34.3 heads/m ² (2)	0.75 L	2	99.9	100	100-100	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	100	100-100	Boxer	100	100-100	100	100-100	= (2)	= (2)
					1.0 L	2	100	100-100	Atlantis OD	1.0 L	100	100-100	Boxer	100	100-100	100	100-100	= (2)	= (2)	

No. of trials where >, = or <, based on statistically significant differences at 95% confidence level

Table 3.2-47: Overall summary of the efficacy of a spray program with Expert applied in autumn followed by an application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) in spring at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against LOLMU

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS (BBCH) at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at assessm't	Appl'n rate/ha	Direct comparisons of % efficacy of the spray program with ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) to the spray program with the standard reference products and the single applications										Comparison of efficacy of the spray programs#	Comparison of efficacy of the spray program to single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) #
					No. of trials	Expert at 0.35 Kg/ha (A1) + ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) (A2)		Expert at 0.35 Kg/ha (A1) + Atlantis OD at 1.0 L/ha (A2)		Expert at 0.35 Kg/ha (A1)		ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) (A2)				
						Mean	Min-Max	Mean	Min-Max	Mean	Min-Max	Mean	Min-Max			
South-east (3)	A1: 0-29 (3) A2: 10-30 (3)	A1: 10-50 pl/m² (3), A2: 10-191.5 pl/m² (3)	Earlier assessments (153-160 DA-A1 /24-28 DA-A2) based on overall visual control on 3 trials													
			15-228 pl/m² (3)	0.75 L	3	88.3	65-100	88.3	65-100	78.7	37.5-100	78.4	48.8-96.5	> 1, = (3) 2	> (3) 2, = 1	
				1.0 L	3	94.3	82.8-100	88.3	65-100	78.7	37.5-100	86.0	60-100	> (1), = (2) = 3	> (2), = (1) > 3	
			Later assessments (214-231 DA-A1 /84-95 DA-A2) based on reductions in weed seed heads on 3 trials													
			21.5-252 heads/m² (3)	0.75 L	3	91.7	75-100	86.7	60-100	77.3	32-100	84.0	52-100	= (3)	= (3)	
				1.0 L	3	95.7	87-100	86.7	60-100	77.3	32-100	93.0	79-100	= (3)	= (3)	

No. of trials where >, = or <, based on statistically significant differences at 95% confidence level

Table 3.2-48: Overall summary of the efficacy of a spray program with Fosburi applied in autumn followed by an application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) in spring at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against LOLMU

EPPO climatic zone (total no. of trials)	Weed GS (BBCH) at appl'n (no. of trials)	Weed density at appl'n (no. of trials)	No. of trials	Weed density at assessm't	Appl'n rate/ha	Direct comparisons of % efficacy of the spray program with ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) to the spray program with the standard reference products and the single applications						
						No. of trials	Fosburi (A1) + ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) (A2)	Fosburi (A1) + Atlantis Pro at 1.5 L/ha (A2)	Fosburi (A1) at 0.5 L/ha	ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) (A2)	Comparison of efficacy of the spray programs#	Comparison of efficacy of the spray program to single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) #
							Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean		
Maritime (1)	A1: 11 (1) A2: 22 (1)	A1: 44 pl/m ² (1), A2: 54 pl/m ² (1)	Earlier assessments (111 DA-A1 /27 DA-A2) based on overall visual control on 1 trial									
			1	55.5 pl/m ² (1)	0.75 L	1	100	100	99.5	94.5	= (1)	> (1)
					1.0 L	1	100	100	99.5	94.6	= (1)	> (1)
			Later assessments (168 DA-A1 /84 DA-A2) based on reductions in weed seed heads on 1 trial									
			1	185 heads/m ² (1)	0.75 L	1	100	100	100	93.5	= (1)	> (1)
					1.0 L	1	100	100	100	97.8	= (1)	= (1)

No. of trials where >, = or <, based on statistically significant differences at 95% confidence level

Spray program with Trinity

The spray program with Trinity applied in autumn, followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha gave good control of LOLMU in the South-east EPPO climatic zone. LOLMU is one of the main Lolium species that occur as weeds in cereal crops in Europe and data generated on efficacy against this weed are considered to support a label claim for all Lolium species, by extrapolation.

The efficacy of the spray program with Trinity applied in autumn and ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied in spring at 1.0 L product/ha was lower than that of the spray program with Trinity applied in autumn and the standard reference product containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD) in the South-east EPPO climatic zone. Compared to the single applications of Trinity and of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, the efficacy of the spray program was higher.

The spray program with Trinity applied in autumn, followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha gave moderately good control of LOLMU in the South-east EPPO climatic zone.

The efficacy of the spray program with Trinity applied in autumn and ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied in spring at 0.75 L product/ha was lower than that of the spray program with Trinity applied in autumn and the standard reference product containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD) in the South-east EPPO climatic zone. Compared to the single applications of Trinity and of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, the efficacy of the spray program was higher.

The presented data demonstrates LOLMU to be susceptible to a spray program with Trinity applied in autumn followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and moderately susceptible to a spray program with Trinity applied in autumn followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha under conditions in countries in the South-east EPPO climatic zone. Data also demonstrate, that the efficacy of a spray program with Trinity and ADM.06001.H.2.B at both rates is superior to the single applications.

Spray program with Trinity + Defy/Boxer

The spray program with Trinity + Defy/Boxer applied in autumn, followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha gave excellent control of the Lolium species LOLMU in the Maritime and South-east EPPO climatic zones. LOLMU is one of the main Lolium species that occur as weeds in cereal crops in Europe and data generated on efficacy against these weeds are considered to support a label claim for all Lolium species, by extrapolation.

The efficacy of the spray program with Trinity + Defy/Boxer applied in autumn and ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied in spring at 1.0 L product/ha was generally comparable to that of the spray program with Trinity + Defy/Boxer applied in autumn and the standard reference products containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD, Atlantis Pro). Compared to the single applications of Trinity + Defy/Boxer and of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, the efficacy of the spray program was comparable in the Maritime and South-east EPPO climatic zones, with the single applications already giving excellent control.

The spray program with Trinity + Defy/Boxer applied in autumn, followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha gave excellent control of the Lolium species LOLMU in the Maritime and South-east EPPO climatic zones.

The efficacy of the spray program with Trinity + Defy/Boxer applied in autumn and ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied in spring at 0.75 L product/ha was generally comparable to that of the spray program with Trinity + Defy/Boxer applied in autumn and the standard reference products

containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD, Atlantis Pro). Compared to the single application of Trinity + Defy/Boxer, the efficacy of the spray program was comparable and compared to the single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD), the efficacy of the spray program was higher in the Maritime EPPO zone. In the South-east EPPO climatic zones, the efficacy of the spray program was comparable to the single applications of Trinity + Defy/Boxer and of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, which gave already excellent control.

The presented data demonstrates LOLMU to be highly susceptible to a spray program with Trinity + Defy/Boxer applied in autumn followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha under conditions in countries in the Maritime and South-east EPPO climatic zones. Data also demonstrate, that the efficacy of a spray program with Trinity + Defy/Boxer and ADM.06001.H.2.B at both rates can be superior to that of the single applications in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone. In the South-east EPPO climatic zone, the superior efficacy of the single applications compared to the spray program of Trinity + Defy/Boxer and ADM.06001.H.2.B at both rates cannot be demonstrated.

Spray program with Expert

The spray program with Expert applied in autumn, followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha gave excellent control of the Lolium species LOLMU in the South-east EPPO climatic zone. The Lolium species tested in these trials is one of the main Lolium species that occur as weeds in cereal crops in Europe and data generated on efficacy against this weed are considered to support a label claim for all Lolium species, by extrapolation.

The efficacy of the spray program with Expert applied in autumn and ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied in spring at 1.0 L product/ha was higher than that of the spray program with Expert applied in autumn and the standard reference product containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD). Compared to the single applications of Expert and of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at 1.0 L/ha, the efficacy of the spray program was higher.

The spray program with Expert applied in autumn, followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha gave good control of the Lolium species LOLMU in the South-east EPPO climatic zone. The Lolium species tested in the trials is one of the main Lolium species that occur as weeds in cereal crops in Europe and data generated on efficacy against this weed are considered to support a label claim for all Lolium species, by extrapolation.

The efficacy of the spray program with Expert applied in autumn and ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied in spring at 0.75 L product/ha was higher than that of the spray program with Expert applied in autumn and the standard reference product containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis OD). Compared to the single applications of Expert and of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at 0.75 L/ha, the efficacy of the spray program was higher.

The presented data demonstrates LOLMU to be highly susceptible to a spray program with Expert applied in autumn followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and susceptible at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha under conditions in countries in the South-east EPPO climatic zones. Data also demonstrate, that the efficacy of a spray program with Expert and ADM.06001.H.2.B at both rates is superior to the single applications of Expert and of ADM.06001.H.2.B under conditions of the South-east EPPO climatic zones.

Spray program with Fosburi

The spray program with Fosburi applied in autumn, followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha gave excellent control in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone. The Lolium species tested in the trials (LOLMU) is one of the main Lolium species that occur as weeds in cereal crops in Europe and data generated on efficacy against this weed are considered to support a label claim for all Brome species, by extrapolation.

The efficacy of the spray program with Fosburi applied in autumn and ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied in spring at 1.0 L product/ha was comparable to that of the spray program with Fosburi applied in autumn and the standard reference product containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis Pro) applied in spring.

Compared to the single application of Fosburi, the efficacy of the single applications of Fosburi and of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at 1.0 L product/ha were comparable to the spray program, with the single applications already giving excellent control.

The spray program with Fosburi applied in autumn, followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha gave excellent control in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone. The *Lolium* species tested in the trials (LOLMU) is one of the main *Lolium* species that occur as weeds in cereal crops in Europe and data generated on efficacy against this weed are considered to support a label claim for all Brome species, by extrapolation.

The efficacy of the spray program with Fosburi applied in autumn and ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied in spring at 0.75 L product/ha was comparable to that of the spray program with Fosburi applied in autumn and the standard reference products containing iodosulfuron-methyl and mesosulfuron-methyl (Atlantis Pro).

Compared to the single applications of Fosburi, the efficacy of the spray program was comparable, with the single applications already giving excellent control, and efficacy of the spray program was higher than that of a single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at 0.75 L product/ha.

The presented data demonstrates LOLMU to be highly susceptible to a spray program with Fosburi applied in autumn followed by a spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha. Data also demonstrate, that the efficacy of a spray program with Fosburi and ADM.06001.H.2.B at 0.75 L/ha is superior to the single application ADM.06001.H.2.B, whilst this cannot be demonstrated for the spray program with Fosburi and ADM.06001.H.2.B compared to the single application of Fosburi and of ADM.06001.H.2.B at 1.0 L/ha.

3.2.3.3 Summary and conclusions

A total of ~~166~~ 168 trials carried out between 2018 and 2020 have generated valid data on the efficacy of a single spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and/or the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha against target grass and broad-leaved weeds in cereals.

Additionally, ~~16~~ 17 of these trials have also generated valid data on the efficacy of a single spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, and also the lower rate of either 0.5 L or 0.75 L product/ha, when preceded by an autumn application of authorised herbicides.

Across trials, the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) against target grass and broad-leaved weed species has been tested in wide ranging locations, cultural practices, climatic conditions and weed biotypes, densities and growth stages that are fully representative of those in the spring in areas where cereal crops are grown in all countries relevant to this submission.

A single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, and also at the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, generally gave effective post-emergence control of grass and broad-leaved weeds across trials that were in the majority of cases similar or higher than that given by standard reference products applied at approved label rates by the later assessments.

Furthermore, the data shows that a spring of application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) following an autumn application of authorised herbicides effectively contribute in the majority of cases to the overall efficacy of a spray program for control of grass weed species in cereal crops, including ALOMY, APESV and BROSS, and also in some cases LOLMU.

Based on data generated across multiple trials, label claims for control of the following grass and broad-leaved weed species in winter wheat, triticale, rye and spring wheat by ADM.06001.H.2.B applied the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, and the lower rate of 0.75 L product/ha, and according to label recommendations are considered to be fully supported:

Weed species	EPPO climatic zone					
	Maritime		North-east		South-east	
	0.75 L/ha rate	1.0 L/ha rate	0.75 L/ha rate	1.0 L/ha rate	0.75 L/ha rate	1.0 L/ha rate
Grass weed species						
ALOMY	MT	MS	MS	S	MS	S
APESV	HS	HS	HS	HS	S	HS
AVESS	S	S	S	S	S	HS
BROSS BROSE	MT	MT	MT	MT	MT	MS
BROST	MT	MT	MT	MT	MT	MS
LOLMU	MS	MS	MS	MS	S	S
LOLPE	MS	MS	MS	MS	S	S
POAAN	MS	MS	S	S	S	S
POATR	MS	MS	S	S	S	S
Broad-leaved weed species						
ANTAR	S	S	S	S	S	S
BRSNW	MS	MS	MS	MS	MS	MS
CAPBP	MT MS	MS	T	MT	MT	MS
DESSO	MS	S	-	-	-	-
SINAR	-	-	-	-	MS	S
STEME	MT	MT	MT	MS	MT T	T MT
THLAR	S	S	MT	MS	S	S
Label claim			Control level range (%)			
Tolerant (T)			0-49.9			
Moderately tolerant (MT)			50-69.9			
Moderately susceptible (MS)			70-84.9			
Susceptible (S)			85-94.9			
Highly susceptible (HS)			95-100			

Comments of zRMS on: Efficacy tests (3.2.3)

A total of 168 valid efficacy field trials carried out between 2018 and 2020 were considered for the evaluation of herbicide ADM.06001.H.2.B containing 60 g/L pinoxaden and 12 g/L mesosulfuron-methyl. The trials were conducted in 3 EPPO zones: Maritime (CZ, DE, FR)- 75 trials, North-East (PL) – 31 trials and South-East (HU, RO) – 62 trials. All the efficacy field trials were carried out by the officially GEP-recognized testing units. A part of the trials presents efficacy data for AG-PM1-72 OD (earlier version of ADM.06001.H.2.B, for which similarity has been proved in a range of bridging trials presented in a separate chapter (Preliminary tests (3.2.1)). For simplification, only the code name ADM.06001.H.2.B will be used in the assessment. ADM.06001.H.2.B is intended to be used for the control of grass weed species (ALOMY, APESV, AVESS, BROSS, LOLMU, LOLPE, POAAN, POATR) and broad-leaved weed species (ANTAR, BRSNW, CAPBP, DESSO, SINAR, STEME, THLAR) at two recommended dose rates: 0,75 L/ha and 1,0 L/ha at application timing ranging from BBCH 20-39 in winter wheat, winter triticale and winter rye and 13-39 in spring wheat.

Conclusions from the evaluation

Overall classification of weed susceptibility (according to SANCO/10055/2013 Rev. 4, 3 October 2013) has been presented separately for individual EPPO zones below:

	Weed susceptibility	
ADM.06001.H.2.B Dose Rate	0.75 L/ha	1.0 L/ha
MARITIME zone		
Grass weed species		
ALOMY	MT	MS
APESV	HS	HS
AVESS**	S	S
BROSE	MT ¹	MT ¹
BROST	MT	MT
LOLMU	MS	MS
LOLPE	MS ²	MS ²
POAAN	MS	MS
POATR	MS ³	MS ³
Broad-leaved weed species		
ANTAR	S ⁴	S ⁴
BRSNW	MS	MS
CAPBP	MS	MS
DESSO	MS	S
STEME	MT	MT
THLAR	S	S
NORTH-EAST zone		
Grass weed species		
ALOMY	MS	S
APESV	HS	HS
AVESS****	S ⁸	S ⁸
BROSE	no data	no data
BROST	MT ⁸	MT ⁸
LOLMU	MS ⁸	MS ⁸
LOLPE	no data	no data
POAAN	S	S
POATR	no data	no data
Broad-leaved weed species		
ANTAR	not sufficient data	not sufficient data
BRSNW	MS	MS
CAPBP	T	MT

STEME	MT	MS
THLAR	MT	MS
SOUTH-EAST zone		
Grass weed species		
ALOMY	MS	S
APESV	S	HS
AVESS***	S	HS
BROSE	MT	MS
BROST	MT	MS
LOLMU	S	S
LOLPE	S ²	S ²
POAAN	S	S
POATR	S ³	S ³
Broad-leaved weed species		
ANTAR	S ⁷	S ⁷
BRSNW	MS ⁵	MS ⁵
CAPBP	MT	MS
SINAR	MS ⁹	S ⁹
STEME	T	MT
THLAR	S ⁶	S ⁶

¹ limited number of trials, extrapolation data from South-East EPPO zone or from BROST to be considered by cMSs.

² extrapolation from LOLMU to be considered by cMSs

³ limited number of trials (MAR zone) and no data (SE zone), extrapolation from POAAN to be considered by cMSs

⁴ no efficacy data, extrapolation data from South-East and North-East EPPO zone to be considered by cMSs

⁵ extrapolation data from Maritime and North-East EPPO zone to be considered by cMSs

⁶ limited number of trials, extrapolation data from Maritime or North-East EPPO zone to be considered by cMSs

⁷ limited number of trials, extrapolation data from North-East EPPO zone to be considered by cMSs.

⁸ extrapolation data or additional data from Martime zone (DE, CZ)

⁹ limited number of trials

** AVEFA occurred in 6 trials conducted in winter wheat (5) and winter triticale (1); AVESA occurred in 2 trials conducted in spring barley

*** AVEFA occurred in 8 trials conducted in winter wheat (6), durum wheat (1) and winter triticale (1); AVELU occurred in 2 trials conducted in winter wheat (1) and durum wheat (1).

**** AVEFA occurred in 4 trials conducted in winter wheat, AVESS occurred in 3 trials conducted in spring wheat

The number of trials available for individual weed species and for each concerned EPPO zone: Maritime (MAR), North-East (NE), South-East (SE) is as follows:

Grass weeds:

ALOMY: 48 trials (26 MAR, 10 NE, 12 SE) carried out in winter cereals only

APESV: 49 trials (17 MAR, 17 NE, 15 SE) carried out in winter cereals only

AVESS (AVEFA, AVESA, AVELU, AVESS): 25 trials (8 MAR, 7 NE, 10 SE) carried out in winter cereals: 20 trials (6 MAR, 4 NE, 10 SE) and in spring cereals: 5 trials (2 MAR + 3 NE). The number of trials for individual oat species is presented under the table presenting the overall classification of weed susceptibility.

BROSE: 9 trials (2 MAR, 7 SE) carried out in winter cereals only

BROST: 13 trials (10 MAR, 3 SE) carried out in winter cereals only

BROSS: 1 trial (SE) conducted in winter wheat.

LOLMU: 28 trials (15 MAR, 13 SE) carried out in winter cereals: 25 trials (12 MAR, 13 SE) and in spring wheat: 3 trials (MAR)

LOLPE: no trials available

POAAN: 29 trials (13 MAR, 6 NE, 10 SE) carried out in winter wheat only

POATR: 1 trial (MAR) carried out in winter wheat.

Broad-leaved weeds:

ANTAR: 3 trials (2 NE, 1 SE) carried out in winter wheat only.

BRSNW: 13 trials (5 MAR, 7 NE, 1 SE) carried out in winter wheat only.

CAPBP: 23 trials (14 MAR, 5 NE, 4 SE) carried out in winter wheat: 21 trials (12 MAR, 5 NE, 4 SE) and in spring wheat: 2 trials (MAR)

DESSO: 4 trials (MAR) carried out in winter cereals only.

SINAR: 3 trials (SE) carried out in winter cereals only.

STEME: 46 trials (13 MAR, 8 NE, 25 SE) carried out in winter cereals only.

THLAR: 11 trials (6 MAR, 3 NE, 2 SE) carried out in winter cereals: 10 trials (5 MAR, 3 NE, 2 SE) and in spring wheat: 1 trial (MAR)

Based on the submitted trial results it can be concluded, that ADM.06001.H.2.B is effective or moderately effective herbicide in the control of the claimed weed species. For some weed species (ALOMY, BROSE, BROST, CAPBP, STEME, THLAR), depending on zone or dose rate tested, moderate tolerance or tolerance has been noted.

As shown in the zRMS summary table, for some weed species, depending on the zone, due to limited efficacy data (no data or only 1-2 valid trials), the concerned MSs are kindly advised to consider extrapolation possibilities (from other EPPO zones or from relative weed species) and make a decision concerning acceptance of species with limited data on the national level.

As no efficacy trials were conducted at BBCH 13-20 in spring cereals, the concerned MSs are kindly advised to make a decision concerning acceptance application timing BBCH 13-20 in spring wheat on the national level.

~~Efficacy data for spring wheat is not sufficient in PL.~~ Spring wheat has been finally accepted in Poland, due to possibility of extrapolation of efficacy data from winter wheat to spring wheat (national extrapolation table, updated in September 2023). The application timing accepted in Poland was BBCH 20-39. Due to limited efficacy trials carried out in spring cereals, the concerned MSs are kindly advised to consider extrapolation of efficacy data from winter cereals and make a decision concerning acceptance spring wheat on the national level.

The applicant has submitted additional data on the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B used in the program with authorised herbicides containing active substances: pendimethalin, chlortoluron, diflufenican, prosulfocarb, metribuzin, flufenacet in various combinations, applied in the autumn. Results from 17 of 168 valid trials presents efficacy in the control of ALOMY, APESV, BROSS and LOLMU in the herbicide programs. The benefits of the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B following an autumn application of authorised herbicides, are visibly seen, giving often higher effectiveness in relation to a single spring herbicide applications. It should be pointed out that spray programs are not claimed for this application and are not the subject of evaluation. The presented data can be considered as only additional, however not relevant to the assessment overall.

3.3 Information on the occurrence or possible occurrence of the development of resistance (KCP 6.3)

EPPO guideline number	Title
EPPO guideline PP 1/213 (4)	Resistance Risk Analysis

ADM.06001.H.2.B contains pinoxaden, an ACCase inhibitor herbicide (HRAC mode of action group 1) belonging to the phenylpyrazolines family (“den”), which has herbicidal activity against grass weed species, and mesosulfuron-methyl, an ALS inhibitor (HRAC mode of action group 2) belonging to the sulfonyleureas family, which has herbicidal activity against grass and broad-leaved weed species and therefore combines two active substances with different modes of action.

Since the introduction of the first aryloxyphenoxypropionate herbicides in the mid of 1970s, and with the subsequent introduction of further HRAC mode of action group 1 (ACCase inhibitors) active substances, there has been a steady increase in the number of resistant biotypes, with reported cases of resistance to this mode of action in 49 different grass weed species worldwide to date. To date, cases of resistance of broad-leaved and grass weed species to HRAC group 1 (ACCase inhibitors) mode of action in Europe are relatively less widespread and occur in a lower number of species, compared to the rest of the world. Currently, resistance to ACCase inhibitors has been reported in 15 different grass weed species in Europe, as recorded on www.weedscience.org (Heal, I. The international Survey of Herbicide Resistant Weeds. Online. Thursday, July 8, 2021. Available www.weedscience.org).

Since the introduction of the first sulfonyleurea herbicides in the early 1980s, and with the subsequent introduction of further HRAC mode of action group 2 (ALS inhibitors) active substances there has been a steady increase in the number of resistant biotypes, with reported cases of resistance to this mode of action in 166 different weed species worldwide to date. To date, cases of resistance of broad-leaved and grass weed species to HRAC group 1 (ALS inhibitors) mode of action in Europe are generally less widespread and occur in a lower number of species, compared to the rest of the world. Currently, resistance to ALS inhibitors has been recorded in 21 different grass weed species and 25 different broad-leaved weed species in Europe, as recorded on www.weedscience.org (Heal, I. The international Survey of Herbicide Resistant Weeds. Online. Thursday, July 8, 2021. Available www.weedscience.org).

Cases of multiple resistance in grass weeds in Europe between HRAC group 1 herbicides to which pinoxaden belongs and those in one or more other HRAC mode of action groups occur in various species. This includes cases of multiple resistance with herbicides in 5 different HRAC mode of action groups (0, 2, 3, 5, 15).

Cases of multiple resistance in weeds in Europe between HRAC group 1 + 2 herbicides to which mesosulfuron-methyl belongs and those in one or more other HRAC mode of action groups occur in various grass and broad-leaved species. This includes cases of multiple resistance in grass weed species with herbicides in 6 other HRAC mode of action groups (0, 1, 3, 5, 9, 15) and in broad-leaved weed species with herbicides in 2 other HRAC mode of action groups 4, 5).

As the modes of action of the two active substances in ADM.06001.H.2.B, cases of grass weeds with multiple resistance to herbicides in both HRAC groups 1 and 2 are listed below:

- *Alopecurus myosuroides* in Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Poland, Spain, Sweden and Turkey,
- *Apera spica-venti* in Denmark, Germany and Poland,
- *Avena fatua* in Germany, Poland and the United Kingdom,
- *Avena sterilis* in Italy, Turkey and the United Kingdom,
- *Echinochloa crus-galli* var. *crus-galli* in Italy and Turkey,
- *Echinochloa oryzoides* in Turkey,
- *Lolium perenne* in Denmark and Germany,

- *Lolium perenne* spp. *multiflorum* in Denmark, France and Italy
- *Phalaris brachystachys* in Turkey

Two sensitivity monitoring studies were conducted between 2019 and 2020 to evaluate that of populations of ALOMY, LOLMU, LOLPE and LOLRI to either pinoxaden or mesosulfuron-methyl alone, or both together, in cereal growing areas across Europe.

Overall, the data from these monitoring studies demonstrate that in the majority of cases the combination of pinoxaden and mesosulfuron-methyl in ADM.06001.H.2.B has good efficacy against populations of LOLRI with suspected herbicide resistance, moderate to good efficacy against populations of ALOMY and LOLMU, with suspected herbicide resistance and low to moderate efficacy against populations of LOLPE with suspected herbicide resistance and has low potential for the selection of resistant populations of ALOMY, LOLMU and LOLRI in the field. Results can be considered inconclusive based on the very low sample size of LOLPE.

The majority of weed species generally produce only one generation per year and the development of resistance is normally a relatively slow process. It is difficult to establish the likelihood of a particular species of weed developing resistance to a herbicide.

Weed species do however differ in their propensity to develop resistance to herbicides and based on prevalence of recorded cases and numbers of modes of action to which individual species have already developed resistance, the risk of resistance developing to a herbicide in weed species, for which claims for control are supported for ADM.06001.H.2.B, ranges from **medium** (e.g. *Avena* spp., *Bromus* spp.) to **high** (e.g. *Alopecurus myosuroides*, *Lolium* spp.) for target grass weeds and from **low** to **medium** for target broad-leaved weed species.

Number of recorded cases of resistance to HRAC mode of action group 1 herbicides, and also the number of different grass weed species involved, are high worldwide and also relatively high in Europe. The risk of resistance arising from the use of pinoxaden is therefore considered to be high.

Number of recorded cases of resistance to HRAC mode of action group 2 herbicides, and also the number of different grass weed species involved, are high worldwide and also relatively high in Europe. The risk of resistance arising from the use of mesosulfuron-methyl is therefore considered to be high.

However, as ADM.06001.H.2.B is a co-formulated mixture containing two active substances with different modes of action that have overlapping and complementary activity, the overall risk of resistance arising from the use of such a co-formulation is considered to be **medium** as they reduce the exposure and hence selection pressure on the weeds.

Control of annual grass and broad-leaved weed species in cereal crops in commercial practice typically involves more than one application of a herbicide and tank mixtures of herbicides, utilising multiple active substances with different modes of action, which reduces the potential for the development of resistance.

Crop rotation of cereal crops particularly with spring sown broad-leaved crops, with the use of different herbicide modes of action in these crops and also for control of weeds between crops, reduces the potential for the development and spread of resistant weed biotypes.

Whilst seldom sufficient to reduce weed populations below those having a significant adverse impact on the crop when used alone, cultural control methods (including ploughing prior to sowing, delayed autumn drilling and mechanical weeding) can also be utilised and contribute to an overall strategy for control of annual grass and broad-leaved weeds in cereals. In practice, these are used together with chemical control and strongly contribute to an effective resistance management strategy.

The overall risk of resistance relating to agronomic practices is therefore considered to be **medium**.

Based on available criteria, the risk of resistance arising from the unrestricted use of ADM.06001.H.2.B ranges from **low-high risk (1-3)** with respect to target weeds, is **medium risk (2)** with respect to combination of the active substances in the product and is **medium risk (0.5)** with respect to agronomic practices. Therefore, the calculated overall risk of resistance arising from the use of ADM.06001.H.2.B

with an ‘unrestricted use pattern’ ranges from **low to medium (1-3)** dependent on risk for individual weed species.

The overall risk of resistance arising from the use of ADM.06001.H.2.B with an ‘unrestricted use pattern’ is medium to high, with high risk specifically with respect to that for weed species with a high propensity to develop resistance. This low to medium resistance risk for ADM.06001.H.2.B for an unrestricted use pattern is specifically mitigated by the following:

- The combination of two active substances in the co-formulation with different modes of action and overlapping and complementary spectrum of activity against target grass weeds
- Limiting the number of applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B to of one application per season
- Maintaining the recommended label rate demonstrated to give effective control
- Use in alternation with other herbicides with different modes of action
- Prompting the user to follow all relevant measures advocated by the Herbicide Resistance Action Committee (HRAC)

This further reduces the risk and it can be considered that the overall risk of resistance developing to pinoxaden and mesosulfuron-methyl is acceptable when ADM.06001.H.2.B is applied according to label recommendations when the management strategy outlined below is applied.

In addition to the specific resistance management measures listed for ADM.06001.H.2.B, the management strategy to reduce the risk of resistance developing to pinoxaden and mesosulfuron-methyl from the use of ADM.06001.H.2.B is based on Good Agricultural Practices (GAP), current measures advocated by HRAC and current national guidance where available, including the following:

- Correct identification of the problem for which a herbicide is required
- Application to be made when weeds are at the most susceptible stages of development
- Crop management practices including the avoidance of frequent use of herbicides with a similar mode of action
- Implementation of a sustainable weed control program
- Rotation of crops to enable a variety of weed control options
- Rotation of cultural practices to lower the reliance on herbicides
- Rotation of herbicide mode of action to reduce the likelihood of resistance to a specific product group
- Routine checking of the performance of the crop protection product to ensure adequate efficacy is achieved

This should ensure there is no adverse shift in the sensitivity of the weed populations to either of the active ingredients included in the product.

Comments of zRMS on:

Information on the occurrence or possible occurrence of the development of resistance (3.3)

The herbicide ADM.06001.H.2.B contains two active substances: pinoxaden (chemical group: phenylpyrazoline, HRAC group: 1 - Acetyl CoA Carboxylase inhibitors) and mesosulfuron-methyl (chemical group: sulfonylureas; HRAC group: 2 - Acetolactate Synthase inhibitors). Resistance to ACCase inhibitor herbicides can be caused by mutation in the ACCase gene, resulting in amino acid substitutions (target-site resistance – TSR) or by a range of processes including enhanced metabolism, herbicide detoxication and reduced uptake and translocation (non target-site resistance – NTSR). The vast majority of reported cases of ALS inhibitor herbicides is caused by a single mutations in the ALS gene (TSR), resulting in the change of the structure of ALS enzyme and causing the target site less sensitive to herbicide binding. Resistance to ALS inhibitor herbicides can be also caused by various ALS mutations which can also lead to different patterns of

cross resistance among ALS inhibitors families. Resistance due to rapid increase in the activity of enzyme detoxication occurs less frequently for ALS inhibitor herbicides. According to the International Herbicide-Resistant Weed Database (www.weedscience.org, date of access: July, 2022), cases of 50 grass weed species (including 16 different monocotyledonous weed species noted in Europe (amongst them: ALOMY, APESV, AVEFA, BROST, LOLPE, LOLMU) resistant to ACC-case inhibitor herbicides have been reported since 1982 to 2020. The last case reported by HRAC in Europe comes from 2020 (resistance of *Zea mays ssp. Mexicana* in France).

It was highlighted by the applicant, that cases of resistance of weed species to HRAC group 1 (ACCCase inhibitors) mode of action in Europe are relatively less widespread and occur in a lower number of species, compared to the rest of the world. On the basis of the database mentioned above, cases of 169 grass and broad-leaved weed species (including 21 different grass weeds and 25 different broad-leaved weed species noted in Europe (amongst them: ALOMY, APESV, AVEFA, BROST, CAPBP, LOLPE, LOLMU, POAAN, STEME) resistant to ACC-case inhibitor herbicides **ALS inhibitors** have been reported since 1982 to 2020. For the following weed species: ALOMY, APESV, AVEFA, AVEST, ECHCG, ECHOR, LOLPE, LOLMU, PHABR multiple resistance for HRAC group 1 and at the same time to HRAC 2 group was noted.

Currently (December 2023), 75 cases of herbicide resistance to HRAC group 1 herbicides are known in 16 weed species in Europe (www.weedscience.org). Globally, 51 weed species show resistance to ACCCase-inhibiting herbicides. For HRAC group 2 herbicides, 157 cases of herbicide resistance in 51 weed species are known in Europe. Globally, 174 weed species show herbicide resistance to HRAC group 2.

Sensitivity monitoring studies demonstrated that, ADM.06001.H.2.B under suspected herbicide resistance, has good efficacy, moderate to good efficacy or low to moderate efficacy against LOLRI, ALOMY and LOLMU or LOLPE respectively. Low potential for the selection of resistant populations has been determined for ALOMY, LOLMU and LOLRI in the field conditions. The results achieved for LOLPE can be considered inconclusive based on the very low sample size.

The calculated overall risk of resistance for ADM.06001.H.2.B has been determined from low to medium dependent on risk for individual weed species.

The overall inherent risk of resistance for the herbicides, due to high number of resistance cases for both HRAC groups 1 and 2, can be considered as high.

The overall inherent risk of resistance for weeds, can be considered medium to high for target grass weeds and low to medium for target broad-leaved weeds.

The overall agronomic risk of resistance can be considered as medium.

The overall risk of resistance can be considered as medium to high.

Based on the the data submitted by the applicant and the recommendations of Good Experimental Practice, to avoid development of resistance the following resistance management strategy is proposed to be included in the label of ADM.06001.H.2.B :

“The herbicide ADM.06001.H.2.B contains two active substances: pinoxaden from phenylpyrazoline chemical group – ACCCase inhibitor (HRAC group: 1) and mesosulfuron-methyl from sulfonylurea chemical group – ALS inhibitor (HRAC group: 2). To prevent possible resistance development, the following rules should be applied:

- use the herbicide ADM.06001.H.2.B only once per growth season, according to the label recommendations including time and the recommended dose rate,*
- use the herbicide ADM.06001.H.2.B when weeds are at the most susceptible stages of development,*
- use the herbicide ADM.06001.H.2.B alternately with other herbicides belonging to different chemical groups with different modes of action,*
- implement a sustainable weed control program,*
- rotate crops to enable a variety of weed control options,*
- rotate cultural practices to lower the reliance on herbicides,*
- routinely check the performance of the crop protection product to ensure adequate efficacy is achieved,*
- inform the authorization holder about not satisfying efficacy achieved,*
- use only certified seeds,*
- clean agricultural equipment to prevent the transfer of weed propagating material to other positions.”*

The zRMS considers the resistance management strategy to be sufficient but all cMS may wish to consider these recommendations in line with the resistance situation in individual countries or their own specific requirements.

3.4 Adverse effects (KCP 6.4)

In addition to assessments for phytotoxicity having been carried out on all 170 efficacy trials, 97 crop selectivity trials have been conducted between 2018 and 2020 specifically to evaluate crop safety and potential adverse impact on crop yield and quality following the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at the highest proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, and also at twice this rate (2.0 L product/ha) to simulate sprayer overlap, in cereals.

Additionally, processing (milling, bread making) has been carried out on grain sampled at commercial harvest following a single application of AG-PM1-72 OD at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha on 2 trials carried out in 2018 on winter wheat.

Furthermore, germination testing has been carried out on seed sampled at commercial harvest following a single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, and also at twice this rate (2.0 L product/ha) to simulate sprayer overlap, from 62 of the crop selectivity trials carried out between 2018 and 2020 on cereals.

Information on trials submitted (3.4 Crop selectivity data)

Table 3.4-1: Presentation of trials (crop selectivity trials, transformation trials)

Crop*	Country	Type of trial**	Number of trials (no. of valid trials)				Years	GEP, non-GEP, official***	Comments (any other relevant information)
			Mar. zone	N-E zone	S-E zone	Greenhouse			
Winter wheat	Czech Republic	S + Y + Q	1 (1)	-	-	-	2020	GEP	
		S + Y + Q + P	2 (2)	-	-	-	2018	GEP	
	Germany	S + Y + Q	1 (1)	-	-	-	2020	GEP	
		S + Y + Q + P	4 (4)	-	-	-	2018-2020	GEP	
	France	S + Y	2 (2)	-	-	-	2018	GEP	
		S + Y + Q	3 (3)	-	-	-	2018-2020	GEP	
		S + Y + Q + P	2 (2)	-	-	-	2020	GEP	
		TF	2 (2)	-	-	-	2018	GEP	
	Poland	S + Y + Q	-	2 (2)	-	-	2020	GEP	
		S + Y + Q + P	-	6 (6)	-	-	2018-2020	GEP	
	Hungary	S + Y + Q + P	-	-	5 (5)	-	2018-2020	GEP	
Winter wheat (continued)	Romania	S + Y + Q	-	-	2 (2)	-	2018-2020	GEP	
		S + Y + Q + P	-	-	2 (2)	-	2020	GEP	
TOTAL	-	-	17 (17)	8 (8)	9 (9)	-	2018-2020	-	
Spring wheat	Germany	S + Y + Q	2 (2)	-	-	-	2018-2020	GEP	
		S + Y + Q + P	1 (1)	-	-	-	2018	GEP	
	France	S + Y + Q	3 (3)	-	-	-	2018-2020	GEP	
		S + Y + Q + P	1 (1)	-	-	-	2020	GEP	
	Poland	S + Y + Q	-	2 (2)	-	-	2018	GEP	
		S + Y + Q + P	-	1 (1)	-	-	2020	GEP	
	Hungary	S + Y + Q	-	-	2 (2)	-	2020	GEP	
		S + Y + Q + P	-	-	2 (2)	-	2018	GEP	
	Romania	S + Y + Q	-	-	1 (1)	-	2020	GEP	
		S + Y + Q + P	-	-	1 (1)	-	2020	GEP	
TOTAL	-	-	7 (7)	3 (3)	6 (6)	-	2018-2020	-	
Winter triticale	Czech Republic	S + Y + Q + P	2 (2)	-	-	-	2018-2020	GEP	

Crop*	Country	Type of trial**	Number of trials (no. of valid trials)				Years	GEP, non-GEP, official***	Comments (any other relevant information)
			Mar. zone	N-E zone	S-E zone	Greenhouse			
	Germany	S + Y + Q + P	4 (4)	-	-	-	2018-2020	GEP	
	France	S + Y	1 (1)	-	-	-	2018	GEP	
		S + Y + Q	3 (3)	-	-	-	2018-2020	GEP	
	Poland	S + Y + Q	-	2 (2)	-	-	2020	GEP	
		S + Y + Q + P	-	5 (5)	-	-	2018-2020	GEP	
	Hungary	S + Y + Q	-	-	1 (1)	-	2018	GEP	
		S + Y + Q + P	-	-	3 (3)	-	2018-2020	GEP	
	Romania	S + Y + Q	-	-	2 (2)	-	2018-2020	GEP	
		S + Y + Q + P	-	-	1 (1)	-	2020	GEP	
	TOTAL	-	10 (10)	7 (7)	7 (7)	-	2018-2020	-	
Winter rye	Czech Republic	S + Y + Q + P	2 (2)	-	-	-	2018-2020	GEP	
	Germany	S + Y + Q + P	4 (4)	-	-	-	2018-2020	GEP	
	France	S	1 (1)	-	-	-	2018	GEP	
		S + Y	2 (2)	-	-	-	2018	GEP	
		S + Y + Q	2 (2)	-	-	-	2018-2020	GEP	
	Poland	S + Y + Q + P	-	7 (7)	-	-	2018-2020	GEP	
	Hungary	S + P	-	-	1 (1)	-	2018	GEP	
		S + Y + Q + P	-	-	3 (3)	-	2018-2020	GEP	
	Romania	S + Y + Q + P	-	-	3 (3)	-	2018-2020	GEP	
	TOTAL	-	11 (11)	7 (7)	7 (7)	-	2018-2020	-	
Winter wheat, rye, triticale	France	PRE	-	-	-	1 (1)	2020	non-GEP	
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	1 (1)	2020	-	
Spring wheat, rye, triticale	Germany	PRE	-	-	-	1 (1)	2020	GEP	
	Italy	PRE	-	-	-	1 (1)	2020	GEP	
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	2 (2)	2020	-	
GRAND TOTAL	-	-	45 (45)	25 (25)	29 (29)	3 (3)	2018-2020	-	

* According to the GAP table

** PRE = preliminary trial, S = selectivity trial, Y = trial with yield assessment, Q = trial with quality assessment, T = trial on the basis of the study of impact on transformation process (TP: Physical transformation, TF: transformation involving microbial fermentation), P = trial with assessment of impact on propagation

*** Official: carried out by a national official organisation

Table 3.4-2: Presentation of reference standards used in trials in cereal crops (crop selectivity trials, transformation trials)

Reference standards	Country(ies) where the product is registered ⁽¹⁾	Authorisation number	Active substance(s) (a.s)	Formulation		Registered appl'n rate (/ha) ⁽³⁾	Appl'n rate in trials (per treatment)	Remark ⁽⁴⁾
				Type ⁽²⁾	Concentration of a.s.			
Axial 50 EC	CZ	-	pinoxaden	EC	50 g/L	-	0.9 L, 1.8 L	
	PL	R-105/2014				0.6-1.2 L	0.9 L, 1.8 L	
	RO	2748/19.12.2007				0.9 L	1.2 L, 2.4 L	
	HU	-				-	0.9 L, 1.8 L 1.0 L, 2.0 L 1.2 L, 2.4 L	
	DE	026326-00				0.9 L, 1.2 L	1.2 L, 2.4 L	
Axial Pratic	FR	2100138	pinoxaden	EC	50 g/L	0.9 L, 1.2 L	0.9 L, 1.8 L 1.2 L, 2.4 L	
Axial Plus	CZ	4684-1	pinoxaden	EC	50 g/L	0.6 L, 0.9 L	0.9 L, 1.8 L	
Axial One	FR	2110095	florasulam + pinoxaden	EC	5 + 45 g/L	1.3 L	1.3 L	
Atlantis OD	CZ	4686-0	iodosulfuron-methyl-sodium + mesosulfuron-methyl	OD	2 + 10 g/L	0.6 L, 1.0 L, 1.2 L	0.6 L, 1.2 L 1.0 L, 2.0 L	
	HU	04.2/6605-1/2016				1.0-1.5 L	1.0 L, 2.0 L	
Atlantis OD (+ Mero)	HU	04.2/6605-1/2016 (04.2/1794-1/2016)	iodosulfuron-methyl-sodium + mesosulfuron-methyl (rapeseed fatty acid esters)	OD (EC)	2 + 10 g/L (733 g/L)	1.0-1.5 L (1.0 L)	1.0 L, 2.0 L (1.0, 2.0 L)	
Atlantis Flex	RO	347PC/29.11.2017	mesosulfuron-methyl + propoxycarbazone	WG	47 + 67.5 g/Kg	0.2 Kg, 0.33 Kg	0.2 Kg, 0.4 Kg 0.33 Kg, 0.66 Kg	
Atlantis Pro	FR	2140257	iodosulfuron-methyl-sodium + mesosulfuron-methyl	OD	2 + 10 g/L	1.0-1.5 L	1.5 L, 3.0 L	
Atlantis Pro (+ Actiob B)	FR	2140257 (9400076)	iodosulfuron-methyl-sodium + mesosulfuron-methyl (methylated rapeseed oil)	OD (EC)	2 + 10 g/L (842 g/L)	1.0-1.5 L/ha (max 2.0 L)	1.0 L, 2.0 L (1.0 L)	

- (1) only on use(s) applied for (with the test product)
(2) e.g. WP (wetable powder), EC (emulsifiable concentrate), etc.
(3) dose(s) / dose range authorized on that use in the country
(4) Other relevant information (e.g. uses, number of applications, spray volume, method of application, etc.)

3.4.1 Phytotoxicity to host crop (KCP 6.4.1)

Assessments for phytotoxic symptoms and other effects on crop growth and development have been carried out on 165 of the 170 trials conducted between 2018 and 2020 that generated data on the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the highest proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha against weeds in cereals. The other 5 efficacy trials generated data on the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the highest proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha in spring barley (1 trial), winter barley (1 trial) and durum wheat (3 trials), which are not intended crops, and therefore data from these trials are not summarised within this section.

Assessments for phytotoxic symptoms and other effects on crop growth and development have also been carried out on 97 crop selectivity trials carried out between 2018 and 2020 for the specific purpose of generating data on the crop safety of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the highest proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, and also at twice this rate (2.0 L product/ha) to simulate sprayer overlap, in cereals.

Based on data presented in Section 3.2.1.4 that demonstrates comparability between the crop safety of ADM.06001.H.2.B and that of AG-PM1-72 OD, both containing the same amounts of the two active substances and applied at the same rate, in studies and trials on wheat, triticale and rye, data for AG-PM1-72 OD from trials in 2018-2019 are summarised together with that for ADM.06001.H.2.B from trials in 2020, as fully supportive of demonstrating the crop safety of ADM.06001.H.2.B in relevant cereals crops.

All crop selectivity trials carried out to demonstrate the crop safety of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) in cereals are listed in Table 3.4-3.

Table 3.4-3: List of crop selectivity trials carried out to demonstrate the crop safety of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) in cereals

Crop	Trial number	EPP0 climatic zone	Country	Cultivar	Year trials conducted
Winter wheat	FR20HSTRZAW554D	Maritime	France	Campesino	2020
	FR18HSTRZAW551B	Maritime	France	Expert	2018
	DE20HSTRZAW175B	Maritime	Germany	Spontan	2020
	CZ18HSTRZAW078B	Maritime	Czech Republic	Sacramento	2018
	DE20HSTRZAW175A	Maritime	Germany	Sheriff	2020
	FR20HSTRZAW554C	Maritime	France	Chevignon	2020
	FR18HSTRZAW551F	Maritime	France	Syllon	2018
	CZ18HSTRZAW078A	Maritime	Czech Republic	Golem	2018
	DE18HSTRZAW189F	Maritime	Germany	Elixer	2018
	DE18HSTRZAW189G	Maritime	Germany	Reform	2018
	DE18HSTRZAW189H	Maritime	Germany	Julius	2018
	FR18HSTRZAW551E	Maritime	France	Mathéo	2018
	FR20HSTRZAW554E	Maritime	France	Oregrain	2020
	CZ20HSTRZAW010A	Maritime	Czech Republic	Rgt Aktion	2020
	FR18HSTRZAW551A	Maritime	France	Libravo	2018
	PL20HSTRZAW011B	North-east	Poland	Patras	2020
	PL20HSTRZAW011A	North-east	Poland	Dagmar	2020
	PL18HSTRZAW016B	North-east	Poland	Patras	2018
	PL18HSTRZAW016D	North-east	Poland	Ostroga	2018
	PL18HSTRZAW016A	North-east	Poland	Sailor	2018
	PL20HSTRZAW011C	North-east	Poland	Hondia	2020
	PL20HSTRZAW011D	North-east	Poland	Tonacja	2020
	PL18HSTRZAW016C	North-east	Poland	Lavantus	2018
	HU20HSTRZAW201A	South-east	Hungary	SY Moisson	2020
	HU18HSTRZAW121A	South-east	Hungary	Genius	2018
	RO18HSTRZAW067A	South-east	Romania	Ingenio	2018
	HU18HSTRZAW121B	South-east	Hungary	GK Csillag	2018
Winter wheat (continued)	RO20HSTRZAW239C	South-east	Romania	Anapurna	2020
	RO20HSTRZAW239A	South-east	Romania	Exotic	2020
	RO20HSTRZAW239B	South-east	Romania	Apache	2020
	HU20HSTRZAW201B	South-east	Hungary	MV Ikva	2020
	HU20HSTRZAW201C	South-east	Hungary	KG Kunhalom	2020
Spring wheat	FR18HSTRZAS551A	Maritime	France	Lennox	2018
	FR18HSTRZAS551B	Maritime	France	Calixo	2018
	DE18HSTRZAS189E	Maritime	Germany	Quintus	2018
	DE18HSTRZAS189D	Maritime	Germany	Tybalt	2018
	DE20HSTRZAS176A	Maritime	Germany	Sharki	2020
	FR20HSTRZAS556A	Maritime	France	Alhambra	2020
	FR20HSTRZAS556B	Maritime	France	Lennox	2020
	PL18HSTRZAS017B	North-east	Poland	Serenada	2018
	PL20HSTRZAS012A	North-east	Poland	Katoda	2020
	PL18HSTRZAS017A	North-east	Poland	Arabella	2018
	HU18HSTRZAS121B	South-east	Hungary	Floradur	2018
	HU20HSTRZAS201B	South-east	Hungary	GK Március	2020
	HU20HSTRZAS201A	South-east	Hungary	Jarissa	2020
	RO20HSTRZAS238B	South-east	Romania	Triso	2020
	HU18HSTRZAS121A	South-east	Hungary	Astrid	2018
	RO20HSTRZAS238A	South-east	Romania	Granny	2020
Winter triticale	DE18HSTTLWI189K	Maritime	Germany	Rhenio	2018
	FR18HSTTLSS551A	Maritime	France	RGT Eleac	2018
	FR18HSTTLSS551C	Maritime	France	Vuka	2018
	DE20HSTTLWI178A	Maritime	Germany	Barolo	2020
	DE18HSTTLWI189J	Maritime	Germany	Grenado	2018
	FR18HSTTLSS551D	Maritime	France	Kaulos	2018
	CZ18HSTTLSS081A	Maritime	Czech Republic	Adverdo	2018
	CZ20HSTTLWI014A	Maritime	Czech Republic	Claudius	2020
	DE18HSTTLWI189I	Maritime	Germany	Lombardo	2018
	FR20HSTTLSS558B	Maritime	France	Omeac	2020
	PL20HSTTLSS014B	North-east	Poland	Rotondo	2020
	PL18HSTTLSS018D	North-east	Poland	Twingo	2018

Crop	Trial number	EPPO climatic zone	Country	Cultivar	Year trials conducted
	PL18HSTTLSS018B	North-east	Poland	Gringo	2018
	PL20HSTTLSS014C	North-east	Poland	Trapero	2020
	PL20HSTTLSS014A	North-east	Poland	Meloman	2020
	PL18HSTTLSS018A	North-east	Poland	Meloman	2018
	PL18HSTTLSS018C	North-east	Poland	Subito	2018
	HU20HSTTLWI201A	South-east	Hungary	Borowik	2020
	RO20HSTTLSS240B	South-east	Romania	Haiduc	2020
	HU20HSTTLWI201B	South-east	Hungary	GK Szemes	2020
	HU18HSTTLWI21B	South-east	Hungary	GK Szemes	2018
	RO20HSTTLSS240A	South-east	Romania	Tarzan	2020
	RO18HSTTLSS068A	South-east	Romania	Titan	2018
Winter rye	HU18HSTTLWI21A	South-east	Hungary	SU Agendus	2018
	CZ20HSSECCW013A	Maritime	Czech Republic	Inspector	2020
	DE18HSSECCW189A	Maritime	Germany	SU Forsetti	2018
	DE18HSSECCW189B	Maritime	Germany	KWS Bono	2018
	DE18HSSECCW189C	Maritime	Germany	Helltop	2018
	DE20HSSECCW177A	Maritime	Germany	Binntto	2020
	FR18HSSECCS551A	Maritime	France	Composite	2018
	FR18HSSECCS551B	Maritime	France	Daniello	2018
	FR18HSSECCS551C	Maritime	France	KWS Serafino	2018
	FR18HSSECCS551D	Maritime	France	Livado	2018
	FR20HSSECCS557A	Maritime	France	SU Performer	2020
	CZ18HSSECCS080A	Maritime	Czech Republic	Inspector	2018
	PL18HSSECCS019A	North-east	Poland	Binntto	2018
	PL18HSSECCS019B	North-east	Poland	Dańkowskie Złote	2018
	PL18HSSECCS019C	North-east	Poland	Amilo	2018
Winter rye (continued)	PL18HSSECCS019D	North-east	Poland	Tur F1	2018
	PL20HSSECCS013A	North-east	Poland	KWS Jethro	2020
	PL20HSSECCS013B	North-east	Poland	Brasetto	2020
	PL20HSSECCS013C	North-east	Poland	Theofano	2020
	HU18HSSECCW121A	South-east	Hungary	SU Cossani	2018
	HU18HSSECCW121B	South-east	Hungary	Varda	2018
	HU20HSSECCW201A	South-east	Hungary	Protector	2020
	HU20HSSECCW201B	South-east	Hungary	Varda	2020
	RO20HSSECCS237A	South-east	Romania	Suceveana	2020
	RO20HSSECCS237B	South-east	Romania	Amilo	2020
	RO20HSSECCS237C	South-east	Romania	Suceveana	2020

All crop selectivity trials were carried out by organisations that are officially recognised as competent to carry out efficacy testing in accordance with Regulation (EU) 284/2013 by the authorities in the relevant countries.

Table 3.4-4: Details on trial methodology

Maritime EPPO climatic zone		
Guidelines	General guidelines	EPPO PP1/152 (4), EPPO PP1/181 (4), EPPO PP1/135 (4), CEB MG12
	Specific guidelines	EPPO PP1/93 (3)
Experimental design	Plot design	RCBD (43)
	Plot size	12.4-27.5 m ² (43)
	Number of replications	4 (43)
Crop	Trials per crop	Winter wheat (15) Spring wheat (7) Winter triticale (10) Winter rye (11)
	Varieties per crop	Winter wheat: Campesino (1), Chevignon (1), Elixer (1), Expert (1), Golem (1), Julius (1), Libravo (1), Mathéo (1), Oregrain (1), Reform (1), Rgt Aktion (1), Sacramento (1), Sherriff (1), Spontan (1), Syllon (1) Spring wheat: Alhambra (1), Calixo (1), Lennox (2), Quintus (1), Sharki (1), Tybalt (1) Winter triticale: Adverdo (1), Barolo (1), Claudius (1), Grenado (1), Kaulos (1), Lombardo (1), Omeac (1), Rgt Eleac (1), Rhenio (1), Vuka (1) Winter rye: Binnito (1), Composite (1), Daniello (1), Helltop (1), Inspector (2), KWS Bono (1), KWS Serafino (1), Livado (1), SU Forsetti (1), SU Performer (1)
	Sowing period	Winter wheat: September (2), October (11), November (2) Spring wheat: March (5), April (2) Winter triticale: September (4), October (4), November (4), December (1) Winter rye: September (5), October (5), November (1)
Application	Crop stage (BBCH) at application	Winter wheat: 1 timing (11 trials) from 22 to 39 (BBCH); 2 timings (4 trials) from 20 to 30 (BBCH) (first timing) and from 32 to 39 (BBCH) (second timing) Spring wheat: 1 timing (5 trials) from 21 to 39 (BBCH); 2 timings (2 trials) from 13 to 23 (BBCH) (first timing) and at 37 (BBCH) (second timing) Winter triticale: 1 timing (7 trials) from 23 to 37 (BBCH); 2 timings (3 trials) from 24 to 31 (BBCH) (first timing) and from 32 to 34 (BBCH) (second timing) Winter rye: 1 timing (7 trials) from 26 to 33 (BBCH); 2 timings (4 trials) from 25 to 31 (BBCH) (first timing) and from 33 to 49 (BBCH) (second timing)
	Number of applications	1 (30), 2 (13)
	Spray volumes	150 L/ha (1), 200 L/ha (19), 250 L/ha (1), 260 L/ha (4), 300 L/ha (18)
Assessments	Assessment types	Phytotoxicity, crop vigour, lodging, crop yield, HLW, TGW, Protein content, Zeleny index
	Assessment dates	Winter wheat: between 7-83 DAA, at harvest Spring wheat: between 10-53 DAA, at harvest Winter triticale: between 8-91 DAA, at harvest Winter rye: between 7-106 DAA, at harvest
Other relevant information	Field / Greenhouse	Field
North-east EPPO climatic zone		
Guidelines	General guidelines	EPPO PP1/152 (4), EPPO PP1/181 (4), EPPO PP1/135 (4)
	Specific guidelines	EPPO PP1/93 (3)
Experimental design	Plot design	RCBD (25)
	Plot size	15-30 m ² (25)
	Number of replications	4 (25)
Crop	Trials per crop	Winter wheat (8) Spring wheat (3) Winter triticale (7) Winter rye (7)
	Varieties per crop	Winter wheat: Dagmar (1), Hondia (1), Lavantus (1), Patras (2), Ostroga (1), Tonacja (1), Sailor (1) Spring wheat: Arabella (1), Katoda (1), Serenada (1) Winter triticale: Gringo (1), Meloman (2), Rotondo (1), Subito (1), Trapero (1), Twingo (1) Winter rye: Amilo (1), Binnito (1), Brassetto (1), Dankowskie Zlote (1), KWS Jethro (1), Theofano (1), Tur F1 (1)
	Sowing period	Winter wheat: September (7), October (1) Spring wheat: March (1), April (2) Winter triticale: September (5), October (2) Winter rye: September (7)
Application	Crop stage (BBCH) at application	Winter wheat: 1 timing (8 trials) from 28 to 39 (BBCH) Spring wheat: 1 timing (3 trials) from 23 to 30 (BBCH)

		Winter triticale: 1 timing (7 trials) from 26 to 39 (BBCH) Winter rye: 1 timing (7 trials) from 30 to 39 (BBCH)
	Number of applications	1 (x)
	Spray volumes	200 L/ha (23), 250 L/ha (1), 300 L/ha (1)
Assessments	Assessment types	Phytotoxicity, crop vigour, lodging, crop yield, HLW, TGW
	Assessment dates	Winter wheat: between 7-56 DAA, at harvest Spring wheat: between 14-42 DAA, at harvest Winter triticale: between 14-63 DAA, at harvest Winter rye: between 4-48 DAA, at harvest
Other relevant information	Field / Greenhouse	Field
South-east EPPO climatic zone		
Guidelines	General guidelines	EPPO PP1/152 (4), EPPO PP1/181 (4), EPPO PP1/135 (4)
	Specific guidelines	EPPO PP1/93 (3)
Experimental design	Plot design	RCBD (29)
	Plot size	21-32 m ² (25)
	Number of replications	4 (29)
Crop	Trials per crop	Winter wheat (9) Spring wheat (6) Winter triticale (7) Winter rye (7)
	Varieties per crop	Winter wheat: Anapurna (1), Apache (1), Exotic (1), Genius (1), Gk Csillag (1), Ingenio (1), Kg Kunhalom (1), Mv Ikva (1), Sy Moisson (1) Spring wheat: Astrid (1), Floradur (1), Gk Március (1), Granny (1), Jarissa (1), Triso (1) Winter triticale: Borowik (1), Gk Szemes (2), Haiduc (1), SU Agendus (1), Tarzan (1), Titan (1) Winter rye: Amilo (1), Protector (1), SU Cossani (1), Suceveana (2), Varda (2)
	Sowing period	Winter wheat: October (7), November (2) Spring wheat: March (5), April (1) Winter triticale: October (7) Winter rye: September (2), October (5)
Application	Crop stage (BBCH) at application	Winter wheat: 1 timing (9 trials) from 21 to 39 (BBCH) Spring wheat: 1 timing (6 trials) from 14-33 (BBCH) Winter triticale: 1 timing (7 trials) from 21 to 34 (BBCH) Winter rye: 1 timing (7 trials) from 21 to 35 (BBCH)
	Number of applications	1 (29)
	Spray volumes	150 L/ha (3), 200 L/ha (6), 243 L/ha (5), 248 L/ha (1), 250 L/ha (9), 300 L/ha (5)
Assessments	Assessment types	Phytotoxicity, crop vigour, lodging, crop yield, HLW, TGW
	Assessment dates	Winter wheat: between 12-76 DAA, at harvest Spring wheat: between 7-41 DAA, at harvest Winter triticale: between 13-53 DAA, at harvest Winter rye: between 12-60 DAA, at harvest
Other relevant information	Field / Greenhouse	Field

Justification for data outside country of submission

Agronomic practices in the cultivation of cereals are considered to be sufficiently similar across countries within the EU Central Registration zone for data generated across all trials to be fully supportive of demonstrating the crop safety of ADM.06001.H.2.B in all countries.

Justification for the use of crop safety data included in this dossier is made according to EPPO PP 1/241(1) “Guidance on comparable climates”.

Crop selectivity trials from which data are summarised in this dossier were carried out in the following EPPO climatic zones:

Maritime: Czech Republic, Germany, Maritime regions of France

North-east: Poland

South-east: Hungary, Romania

Trials carried out in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone have been conducted in areas where climatic conditions are representative of those in Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Germany, the Netherlands. Data generated in these trials are therefore fully supportive towards demonstrating the crop safety of ADM.06001.H.2.B in the EU Central Registration zone with respect to these countries.

Trials carried out in the North-east EPPO climatic zone have all been conducted in Poland and data generated in these trials are therefore fully supportive towards demonstrating the crop safety of ADM.06001.H.2.B in the EU Central Registration zone with respect to this country.

Trials carried out in the South-east EPPO climatic zone have all been conducted in Romania and Hungary and data generated in these trials are therefore fully supportive towards demonstrating the crop safety of ADM.06001.H.2.B in the EU Central Registration zone with respect to both these countries.

Trials methodology in relation to EPPO

Trials were conducted according to the EPPO guidelines stated in Table 3.4-4. The hyperlinks to the GEP certificates of the official testing organisation are provided in Section 3.7.

In all trials, layout was according to randomised complete block design with 4 replicates per treatment. All normal crop husbandry measures, with the exception of herbicides, were applied to the trials area by the grower, according to crop requirements and in accordance with good agricultural practice. Trials included a range of soil types and locations to determine crop tolerance under a range of conditions. All trials were placed within regions representative of those where cereal crops are grown in the relevant EU countries.

Applications on all crop selectivity trials were made using small plot sprayers designed to simulate application using commercial sprayers representative of those used to apply herbicides in cereal crops.

In 1 of the trials, whilst the growth stage was outside the label range, this was at the second of the two separate single application timings in the spring. At this timing, the crop stage was in the range of 37-49 (BBCH), but with the majority of the crop at 37 (BBCH) and therefore still representative of the proposed label range.

The standard reference products were applied according to the label recommendations at authorised label rates and also at twice these rates.

3.4.1.1 Phytotoxicity on winter wheat

Assessments for phytotoxicity and other adverse effects on crop growth and development have been carried out at regular intervals following single applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at up to the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha on 152 of the 159 trials conducted between 2018 and 2020 that generated data on efficacy against target weeds in winter wheat. Of these trials, 68 were carried out in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (14 in Czech Republic, 29 in Germany, 25 in France), 28 were carried out in North-east EPPO climatic zone (all in Poland) and 56 were carried out in the South-east EPPO climatic zone (31 in Hungary, 25 in Romania).

On these 152 trials, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) was applied at a single timing in the spring, when crop growth stages were within the range of 15-39 (BBCH), on 131 of these trials, at two separate single timings in the spring, when crop stages were within the range of 22-23 (BBCH) at the first timing and 33-34 (BBCH) at the second timing, on 1 trial and at spring application preceded by an autumn application of authorised herbicides, when crop growth stages were within the range of 14-32 (BBCH) on the other 20 trials.

Assessments for phytotoxicity and other adverse effects on crop growth and development have also been carried out at regular intervals following single applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, and also at twice this rate to simulate sprayer overlap, on a total of 32 crop selectivity trials conducted between 2018 and 2020 for the specific purpose of demonstrating the crop safety in winter wheat in the absence of impact of weeds.

Of these trials, 15 were carried out in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (7 in France, 3 in Czech Republic, 5 in Germany), 8 were carried out in North-east EPPO climatic zone (all in Poland) and 9 were carried out in South-east EPPO climatic zone (5 in Hungary, 4 in Romania).

On these 32 trials, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) was applied at a single timing in the spring, when crop growth stages were within the range of 22-39 (BBCH), on 28 of these trials and at two separate single timings in the spring, when crop stages were within the range of 20-30 (BBCH) at the first timings and 32-39 (BBCH) at the second timings, on the other 4 trials.

The range of crop growth stages at which ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) was applied across all of these trials (14-39 BBCH) is ~~fully~~ representative of the proposed label range of ~~13~~ 20-39 (BBCH) in winter cereals.

Across **efficacy and selectivity** trials, applications were made in water volumes ranging from 100 to 300 L/ha and therefore fully representative of the proposed label ranges either of or within 80-300 L/ha.

Across trials, the crop safety of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) has been tested under a wide range of climatic and agronomic conditions that are considered fully representative of those under which winter wheat is grown across countries in the EU Central Registration zone. Trials were carried out on a range of different commercially representative and commonly grown cultivars of winter wheat.

Overall summaries of the crop safety of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) across trials carried out in winter wheat are given in Table 3.4-5 (Crop selectivity trials), in Table 3.4-6 (Efficacy trials) and Table 3.4-7 (Efficacy trials – spring application preceded by an autumn application of authorised herbicides). In those trials where treatments were applied at two separate single timings, phytotoxicity data are summarised from the one at which ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) caused the highest levels.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Table 3.4-7: Overall summary of the crop safety of a single spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) preceded by an autumn application of authorised herbicides across efficacy trials carried out in winter wheat

EPPO climatic zone (no. of trials)	Timing	Levels of phytotoxicity	Number of trials							
			Herold 600 SC / Herold SC / Fosburi + ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)			Roxy 800 EC / Topsail + AG-PM1-72 OD		Trinity + ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)	Trinity + Defi / Boxer 800 EC + ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)	Expert Met 56 WG + AG-PM1-72 OD
			2 trials	5 trials	3 trials	2 trials	1 trial	8 trials	9 trials	8 trials
			0.25 L/ha + 1.0 L/ha	0.5 L/ha + 1.0 L/ha	0.6 L/ha + 1.0 L/ha	3.0 L/ha + 1.0 L/ha	4.0 L/ha + 1.0 L/ha	2.0 L/ha + 1.0 L/ha	1.5 L/ha + 3.0 L/ha + 1.0 L/ha	0.35 Kg/ha + 1.0 L/ha
			A1 + A2	A1 + A2	A1 + A2	A1 + A2	A1 + A2	A1 + A2	A1 + A1 + A2	A1 + A1 + A2
Maritime (8 trials)	Maximum level of symptoms recorded	0%	-	4	3	-	1	4	2	-
		0.1% to 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		>5% to 10%	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
		>10% to 15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		>15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
	Final assessment timings	0%	-	4	3	-	1	4	2	-
		0.1% to 5%	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
		>5% to 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
		>10% to 15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		>15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
North-east (2 trials)	Maximum level of symptoms recorded	0%	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
		0.1% to 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		>5% to 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		>10% to 15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		>15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
	Final assessment timings	0%	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
		0.1% to 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		>5% to 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		>10% to 15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		>15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
South-east (10 trials)	Maximum level of symptoms recorded	0%	-	-	2	2	-	4	4	8
		0.1% to 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		>5% to 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		>10% to 15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		>15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Final assessment timings	0%	-	-	2	2	-	4	4	8
		0.1% to 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		>5% to 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		>10% to 15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		>15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 3.4-7 (continued): Overall summary of the crop safety of a single spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) preceded by an autumn application of authorised herbicides across efficacy trials carried out in winter wheat

[illegible]

Table 3.4-7 (continued): Overall summary of the crop safety of a single spring application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) preceded by an autumn application of authorised herbicides across efficacy trials carried out in winter wheat

EPPO climatic zone (no. of trials)	Timing	Levels of phytotoxicity	Number of trials													
			Herold 600 SC / Herold SC / Fosburi			Roxy 800 EC / Topsail		Trinity	Trinity + Deff / Boxer 800 EC		Expert Met 56 WG	ADM.06001. H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)	Atlantis OD / Atlantis 12 OD			Atlantis Pro
			2 trials	5 trials	5 trials	2 trials	1 trial	8 trials	4 trials	9 trials	8 trials	20 trials	1 trial	10 trials	5 trials	5 trials
			0.25 L/ha	0.5 L/ha	0.6 L/ha	3.0 L/ha	4.0 L/ha	2.0 L/ha	1.5 L/ha + 1.5 L/ha	1.5 L/ha + 3.0 L/ha	0.35 Kg	1.0 L/ha	0.6 L/ha	1.0 L/ha	1.2 L/ha	1.5 L/ha
			A1	A1	A1	A1	A1	A1	A1	A1	A1	A2	A2	A2	A2	A2
Maritime (8 trials)	Maximum level of symptoms recorded	0%	-	4	3	-	1	4	-	2	-	6	-	2	1	3
		0.1% to 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		>5% to 10%	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
		>10% to 15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
		>15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
	Final assessment timings	0%	-	4	3	-	1	4	-	2	-	8	-	2	1	5
		0.1% to 5%	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
		>5% to 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		>10% to 15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		>15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
North-east (2 trials)	Maximum level of symptoms recorded	0%	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	2	1	-	1	-
		0.1% to 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		>5% to 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		>10% to 15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		>15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Final assessment timings	0%	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	2	1	-	1	-
		0.1% to 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		>5% to 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
South-east (10 trials)	Maximum level of symptoms recorded	0%	-	-	2	2	-	3	-	-	7	10	-	8	2	-
		0.1% to 5%	-	-	-	-	-	1	4	4	1	-	-	-	-	-
		>5% to 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		>10% to 15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		>15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Final assessment timings	0%	-	-	2	2	-	3	4	4	7	10	-	8	2	-
		0.1% to 5%	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-

ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha caused no phytotoxicity or other adverse effects on the crop on 119 of the 132 efficacy trials, 18 of the 20 efficacy trials with spring application preceded by an autumn application of authorised herbicides or 23 of the 32 crop selectivity trials.

On the other trials, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 1.0 L product/ha caused only low levels of phytotoxicity ($\leq 10\%$) on 18 trials, moderate levels on 3 trials and high levels on 3 trials. Symptoms included general phytotoxicity, foliar discoloration, chlorosis, internode shortening, crop biomass reductions, crop vigour reductions, crop thinning and crop stunting. These phytotoxic symptoms were generally transient or declined to low levels by later assessments and standard reference products applied at label rates caused similar or higher levels of the same symptoms on most of the trials.

ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at twice the maximum proposed label rate (2.0 L product/ha) to simulate sprayer overlap caused no phytotoxic damage or other adverse effects on the crop on 23 of the 32 crop selectivity trials.

On the other trials, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 2.0 L product/ha caused only low levels of phytotoxicity ($< 10\%$) on 8 trials and moderate levels on 1 trial. Symptoms included chlorosis, foliar discoloration, internode shortening, crop biomass reductions, crop vigour reductions and crop stunting. These phytotoxic symptoms were generally transient or declined to lower levels by later assessments and standard reference products applied at twice label rates caused similar or higher levels of the same symptoms on most of the trials.

Across trials, there was no evidence that the occurrence or severity of phytotoxicity caused by ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) was related to the growth stage of the crop. On the crop selectivity trials where separate single applications of AG-PM1-72 OD were made at two timings in the spring, the timing at which higher levels of phytotoxicity occurred was not consistently at the earlier or later timing.

There was no statistically significant adverse impact of AG-PM1-72 OD applied at the proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also at twice this rate (2.0 L/product/ha) on crop yield on the 1 crop selectivity trial on which higher levels of phytotoxicity occurred (as summarised in Section 3.4.2.1).

On one of these trials in which ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) caused more severe levels of phytotoxicity, these were attributed to more extreme unseasonal climatic conditions having resulted in the crop having been under stress at the time of and following application. It is therefore considered that on the relatively few trials in winter wheat in which ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) caused higher levels of phytotoxicity this was due to the crop having been under stress to some extent at the time of or following application as a result of adverse environmental conditions. The ADM.06001.H.2.B labels will include cautionary statements to avoid application when crops are under stress due to adverse environmental conditions and that crop damage may occur when extremes in climatic conditions follow application.

Considering that ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at twice the proposed maximum label rate caused up to moderate levels of phytotoxicity on a few of the trials, the proposed labels for ADM.06001.H.2.B will advise to avoid sprayer overlap to reduce the risk of phytotoxic damage occurring.

Based on the absence of phytotoxic symptoms or effects on crop growth and development or only relatively low and mainly transient levels of symptoms or effects across trials, it can be concluded that a single post-emergence application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at up to the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 product/ha in the spring is crop safe on winter wheat when applied according to label recommendations.

3.4.1.2 Phytotoxicity on spring wheat

Assessments for phytotoxicity and other adverse effects on crop growth and development have been carried out at regular intervals following single applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at up to the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha on a total of 5 trials conducted between 2018 and 2020 that generated data on efficacy against target weeds in spring wheat. Of these trials, 3 were carried out in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (2 in Czech Republic, 1 in France) and 2 were carried out in North-east EPPO climatic zone (both in Poland).

On all of these trials, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) was applied at a single timing in the spring, when crop growth stages were within the range of 23-37 (BBCH).

Assessments for phytotoxicity and other adverse effects on crop growth and development have also been carried out at regular intervals following single applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, and also at twice this rate to simulate sprayer overlap, on a total of 16 crop selectivity trials conducted between 2018 and 2020 for the specific purpose of demonstrating the crop safety in spring wheat in the absence of impact of weeds.

Of these trials, 7 were carried out in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (4 in France, 3 in Germany), 3 were carried out in North-east EPPO climatic zone (all in Poland) and 6 were carried out in South-east EPPO climatic zone (4 in Hungary, 2 in Romania).

On these 16 trials, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) was applied at a single timing in the spring, when crop growth stages were within the range of 14-21-39 (BBCH), on 13 trials, when growth stages were within the range 14-16 in 1 Hungarian trial and at two separate single timings in the spring, when crop stages were within the range of 13-23 (BBCH) at the first timings and at 32-37 (BBCH) at the second timings, on the other 2 French trials.

The range of crop growth stages at which ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) was applied across all of these trials (13-39 BBCH) is fully representative of the proposed label range of 13-39 (BBCH).

Across trials, applications were made in water volumes ranging from 150 to 300 L/ha and therefore fully representative of the proposed label ranges either of or within 80-300 L/ha.

Across trials, the crop safety of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) has been tested under a wide range of climatic and agronomic conditions that are considered fully representative of those under which spring wheat is grown across countries in the EU Central Registration zone. Trials were carried out on a range of different commercially representative and commonly grown cultivars of spring wheat.

Overall summaries of the crop safety of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) across trials carried out in spring wheat are given in Table 3.4-8 (Crop selectivity trials) and Table 3.4-9 (Efficacy trials). In those trials where treatments were applied at two separate single timings, phytotoxicity data are summarised from the one at which ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) caused the highest levels.

[illegible]

Table 3.4-9: Overall summary of the crop safety of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) across all efficacy trials carried out in spring wheat

EPPO climatic zone (no. of trials)	Timing	Levels of phytotoxicity	Number of trials						
			ADM.06001.H.2.B	Axial Pratic / Axial Plus / Axial 50 EC		Atlantis OD / Atlantis Pro			Atlantis OD (+ Adigor)
			5 trials	5 trials	1 trial	2 trials	1 trial	2 trials	1 trial
			1.0 L/ha	0.9 L/ha	1.2 L/ha	0.6 L/ha	1.0 L/ha	1.2 L/ha	1.2 L/ha
Maritime (3 trials)	Maximum level of symptoms recorded	0	3	3	1	-	1	2	1
		0.1% to 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		>5% to 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		>10% to 15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		>15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Final assessment timings	0	3	3	1	-	1	2	1
		0.1% to 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		>5% to 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		>10% to 15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		>15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
North-east (2 trials)	Maximum level of symptoms recorded	0	2	2	-	2	-	-	-
		0.1% to 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		>5% to 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		>10% to 15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		>15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Final assessment timings	0	2	2	-	2	-	-	-
		0.1% to 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		>5% to 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		>10% to 15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		>15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha caused no phytotoxicity or other adverse effects on the crop on any of the 5 efficacy trials or 14 of the 16 crop selectivity trials.

On the other trials, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 1.0 L product/ha caused only low levels of phytotoxicity ($\leq 10\%$) on 1 trial and higher levels on 1 trial. Symptoms included delayed growth stage, crop vigour reductions and crop stunting. These phytotoxic symptoms were generally transient or declined to low levels by later assessments and standard reference products applied at label rates generally caused similar levels of the same symptoms on 2 of these trials.

ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at twice the maximum proposed label rate (2.0 L product/ha) to simulate sprayer overlap caused no phytotoxic damage or other adverse effects on the crop on 12 of the 16 crop selectivity trials.

On the other trials, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 2.0 L product/ha caused only low levels of phytotoxicity ($< 10\%$) on 2 trials, moderate levels on 1 trial and high levels on 3 trials. Symptoms included chlorosis, necrosis, delayed growth stage, crop vigour reductions and crop stunting, with symptoms leading to plant mortality on one of the trials. These phytotoxic symptoms were generally transient or declined to lower levels by later assessments and standard reference products applied at twice label rates generally caused similar levels of the same symptoms on 1 of these trials.

There was no statistically significant adverse impact of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha on crop yield on any of the 3 crop selectivity trials, or the 2.0 L product/ha on any of the 2 trials, on which higher levels of phytotoxicity occurred (as summarised in Section 3.4.2.2).

Across trials, there was no evidence that the occurrence or severity of phytotoxicity caused by ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) was related to the growth stage of the crop.

On 1 of the trials in which ADM.06001.H.2.B caused more severe levels of phytotoxicity, this was attributed to more extreme unseasonal climatic conditions having resulted in the crop having been under stress at the time of or following application. It is therefore considered that on the relatively few trials in spring wheat in which ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) caused higher levels of phytotoxicity this was due to the crop having been under stress to some extent at the time of or following application as a result of adverse environmental conditions. The ADM.06001.H.2.B labels will include cautionary statements to avoid application when crops are under stress due to adverse environmental conditions and that crop damage may occur when extremes in climatic conditions follow application.

Considering that ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at twice the proposed maximum label rate caused up to high levels of phytotoxicity on some of the trials, the proposed labels for ADM.06001.H.2.B will advise to avoid sprayer overlap to reduce the risk of phytotoxic damage occurring.

Based on the absence of phytotoxic symptoms or effects on crop growth and development or only relatively low and mainly transient levels of symptoms or effects across trials, it can be concluded that a single post-emergence application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at up to the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 product/ha in the spring is crop safe on spring wheat when applied according to label recommendations.

3.4.1.3 Phytotoxicity on winter triticale

Assessments for phytotoxicity and other adverse effects on crop growth and development have been carried out at regular intervals following single applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at up to the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha on a total of 7 trials conducted between 2018 and 2020 that generated data on efficacy against target weeds in triticale. Of these trials, 3 were carried out in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (all in Germany) and 4 were carried out in South-east EPPO climatic zone (3 in Romania, 1 in Hungary).

On all of these trials, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) was applied at a single timing in the spring, when crop growth stages were within the range of 25-39 (BBCH).

Assessments for phytotoxicity and other adverse effects on crop growth and development have also been carried out at regular intervals following single applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, and also at twice this rate to simulate sprayer overlap, on a total of 24 crop selectivity trials conducted between 2018 and 2020 for the specific purpose of demonstrating the crop safety in triticale in the absence of impact of weeds.

Of these trials, 10 were carried out in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (4 in France, 4 in Germany, 2 in Czech Republic), 7 were carried out in North-east EPPO climatic zone (all in Poland) and 7 were carried out in South-east EPPO climatic zone (4 in Hungary, 3 in Romania).

On these 24 trials, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) was applied at a single timing in the spring, when crop growth stages were within the range of 21-39 (BBCH), on 21 trials and at two separate single timings in the spring, when crop growth stages were within the range of 24-31 (BBCH) at the first timings and 32-34 (BBCH) at the second timings, on the other 3 trials.

Whilst no data has been generated in support of demonstrating the crop safety of ADM.06001.H.2.B in spring triticale, plant physiology, agronomic practices and susceptibility to phytotoxicity caused by herbicides can be considered to be very similar between winter and spring triticale. Data from trials carried out in winter triticale are therefore considered to be supportive of demonstrating the crop safety of spring applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha in spring triticale.

The range of crop growth stages at which ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) was applied across all of these trials (21-39 BBCH) is fully representative of the proposed label range of 13-20-39 (BBCH) in winter cereals.

Across trials, applications were made in water volumes ranging from 150 to 300 L/ha and therefore fully representative of the proposed label ranges either of or within 80-300 L/ha.

Across trials, the crop safety of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) has been tested under a wide range of climatic and agronomic conditions that are considered fully representative of those under which triticale is grown across countries in the EU Central Registration zone. Trials were carried out on a range of different commercially representative and commonly grown cultivars of triticale.

Overall summaries of the crop safety of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) across trials carried out in triticale are given in Table 3.4-10 (Crop selectivity trials) and 3.4-10 (Efficacy trials). In those trials where treatments were applied at two separate single timings, phytotoxicity data are summarised from the one at which ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) caused the highest levels.

[illegible]

Table 3.4-11: Overall summary of the crop safety of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) across all efficacy trials carried out in winter triticale

EPPO climatic zone (no. of trials)	Timing	Levels of phytotoxicity	Number of trials									
			ADM.06001.H.2.B	Axial 50 EC			Atlantis OD (+ Biopower or Mero)		Atlantis WG (+ Biopower)	Atlantis Flex (+ Biopower)	Ariane C	Abak
			7 trials 1.0 L/ha	6 trials 0.9 L/ha	5 trials 1.2 L/ha	2 trials 0.6 L/ha	2 trials 1.2 L/ha	2 trials 0.2 Kg/ha	1 trial 0.33 Kg/ha	2 trials 1.5 L/ha	1 trial 0.265 Kg/ha	
Maritime (3 trials)	Maximum level of symptoms recorded	0	2	2	1	-	-	2	-	2	1	
		0.1% to 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		>5% to 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		>10% to 15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		>15%	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	
	Final assessment timings	0	3	2	1	-	-	2	1	2	1	
		0.1% to 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		>5% to 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		>10% to 15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		>15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
South-east (4 trials)	Maximum level of symptoms recorded	0	3	3	3	2	1	-	-	-	-	
		0.1% to 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		>5% to 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		>10% to 15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		>15%	1	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	
	Final assessment timings	0	3	3	3	2	2	-	-	-	-	
		0.1% to 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		>5% to 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		>10% to 15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		>15%	1	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	

ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha caused no phytotoxicity or other adverse effects on the crop on 6 ~~5~~ of the 7 efficacy trials or 18 of the 24 crop selectivity trials.

On the other trials, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 1.0 L product/ha caused only low levels of phytotoxicity ($\leq 10\%$) on 5 trials and up to high levels on 2 trials. Symptoms included general phytotoxicity, chlorosis, necrosis, crop vigour reductions, delays in ear emergence, foliar yellowing, crop biomass reductions and crop stunting. These phytotoxic symptoms were generally transient and standard reference products applied at label rates caused similar or higher levels of the same symptoms on most of the trials.

ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at twice the maximum proposed label rate (2.0 L product/ha) to simulate sprayer overlap caused no phytotoxic damage or other adverse effects on the crop on 16 of the 24 crop selectivity trials.

On the other trials, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 2.0 L product/ha caused only low levels of phytotoxicity ($< 10\%$) on 6 trials and up to high levels on 2 trials. Symptoms included bleaching, chlorosis, necrosis, crop vigour reductions, delays in ear emergence, foliar yellowing and crop biomass reductions. These phytotoxic symptoms were generally transient and standard reference products applied at twice label rates caused similar or higher levels of the same symptoms on most of the trials.

There was no statistically significant adverse impact of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha on crop yield on the 1 crop selectivity trial, on which higher levels of phytotoxicity occurred (as summarised in Section 3.4.2.3).

Across trials, there was no evidence that the occurrence or severity of phytotoxicity caused by ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) was related to the growth stage of the crop. On the crop selectivity trials where separate single applications of AG-PM1-72 OD were made at two timings in the spring, the timing at which higher levels of phytotoxicity occurred was not consistently at the earlier or later timing.

On trials carried out on other cereal crops, those in which ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) caused more severe levels of phytotoxicity, this was attributed to more extreme unseasonal climatic conditions having resulted in the crop having been under stress at the time of or following application. It is therefore considered that on the relatively few trials in triticale in which ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) caused higher levels of phytotoxicity this was due to the crop having been under stress to some extent at the time of or following application as a result of adverse environmental conditions. The ADM.06001.H.2.B labels will include cautionary statements to avoid application when crops are under stress due to adverse environmental conditions and that crop damage may occur when extremes in climatic conditions follow application.

Considering that ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at twice the proposed maximum label rate caused up to high levels of phytotoxicity on a few of the trials, the proposed labels for ADM.06001.H.2.B will advise to avoid sprayer overlap to reduce the risk of phytotoxic damage occurring.

Based on the absence of phytotoxic symptoms or effects on crop growth and development or only relatively low and mainly transient levels of symptoms or effects across trials, it can be concluded that a single post-emergence application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at up to the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 product/ha in the spring is crop safe on triticale when applied according to label recommendations.

3.4.1.4 Phytotoxicity on winter rye

Assessments for phytotoxicity and other adverse effects on crop growth and development have been carried out at regular intervals following single applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at up to the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha on 1 trial conducted in 2020 that generated data on efficacy against target weeds in rye. This trial was carried out in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (in Germany).

On this trial, ADM.06001.H.2.B was applied at a single timing in the spring, when crop growth stages were within the range of 23-26 (BBCH).

Assessments for phytotoxicity and other adverse effects on crop growth and development have also been carried out at regular intervals following single applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, and also at twice this rate to simulate sprayer overlap, on a total of 25 crop selectivity trials conducted between 2018 and 2020 for the specific purpose of demonstrating the crop safety in rye in the absence of impact of weeds.

Of these trials, 11 were carried out in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (5 in France, 4 in Germany, 2 in Czech Republic), 7 were carried out in South-east EPPO climatic zone (4 in Hungary, 3 in Romania) and 7 were carried out in North-east EPPO climatic zone (all in Poland).

On these 25 trials, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) was applied at a single timing in the spring, when crop growth stages were within the range of 21-39 (BBCH), on 21 of these trials and at two separate single timings in the spring, when crop stages were within the range of 25-37-31 (BBCH) at the first timings and 33-49 (BBCH) at the second timings, on the other 4 trials.

Whilst no data has been generated in support of demonstrating the crop safety of ADM.06001.H.2.B in spring rye, plant physiology, agronomic practices and susceptibility to phytotoxicity caused by herbicides can be considered to be very similar between winter and spring rye. Data from trials carried out in winter rye are therefore considered to be supportive of demonstrating the crop safety of spring applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha in spring rye.

The range of crop growth stages at which ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) was applied across all of these trials (14 21-49 BBCH) is fully representative of the proposed label range of 13 20-39 (BBCH) in winter cereals. In the one trial where the growth stage was outside the label range, this was at the second of the two separate single application timings in the spring. At this timing, the crop stage was in the range of 37-49 (BBCH) but with the majority of the crop at 37 (BBCH) and therefore still representative of the proposed label range.

Across trials, applications were made in water volumes ranging from 150 to 300 L/ha and therefore fully representative of the proposed label ranges either of or within 80-300 L/ha.

Across trials, the crop safety of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) has been tested under a wide range of climatic and agronomic conditions that are considered fully representative of those under which rye is grown across countries in the EU Central Registration zone. Trials were carried out on a range of different commercially representative and commonly grown cultivars of rye.

Overall summaries of the crop safety of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) across trials carried out in rye are given in Table 3.4-12 (Crop selectivity trials) and Table 3.4-13 (Efficacy trials). In those trials where treatments were applied at two separate single timings, phytotoxicity data are summarised from the one at which ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) caused the highest levels.

[illegible]

Table 3.4-13: Overall summary of the crop safety of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) in efficacy trial carried out in winter rye

EPPO climatic zone (no. of trials)	Timing	Levels of phytotoxicity	Number of trials		
			ADM.06001.H.2.B	Axial 50 EC	Atlantis WG (+ Biopower)
			1 trial	1 trial	1 trial
			1.0 L/ha	1.2 L/ha	0.4 Kg/ha
Maritime (1 trial)	Maximum level of symptoms recorded	0	1	1	1
		0.1% to 5%	-	-	-
		>5% to 10%	-	-	-
		>10% to 15%	-	-	-
		>15%	-	-	-
	Final assessment timings	0	1	1	1
		0.1% to 5%	-	-	-
		>5% to 10%	-	-	-
		>10% to 15%	-	-	-
		>15%	-	-	-

ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha caused no phytotoxicity or other adverse effects on the crop on the 1 efficacy trial or 10 of the 25 crop selectivity trials.

On the other trials, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 1.0 L product/ha caused only low levels of phytotoxicity ($\leq 10\%$) on 3 trials, up to moderate levels on 5 trials and up to high levels on 7 trials. Symptoms included chlorosis, necrosis, crop vigour reductions, increased lodging, delays in ear emergence, reductions in ear density, foliar yellowing, crop biomass reductions, foliar discoloration, internode shortening, deformed ears and crop stunting. These phytotoxic symptoms were generally transient or declined to low levels by later assessments on some of the trials and standard reference products applied at label rates generally caused similar levels of the same symptoms on most of the trials.

ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at twice the maximum proposed label rate (2.0 L product/ha) to simulate sprayer overlap caused no phytotoxic damage or other adverse effects on the crop on 6 of the 25 crop selectivity trials.

On the other trials, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 2.0 L product/ha caused only low levels of phytotoxicity ($< 10\%$) on 3 trials, up to moderate levels on 1 trial and up to high levels on 15 trials. Symptoms included the same ones as those caused by the 1.0 L product/ha rate and additionally delayed growth stage. These phytotoxic symptoms were generally transient or declined to lower levels by later assessments on some of the trials and standard reference products applied at twice label rates generally caused similar levels of the same symptoms on most of the trials.

There was no statistically significant adverse impact of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha on crop yield on 12 of the 14 crop selectivity trials, or the 2.0 L product/ha on 9 of these trials, on which higher levels of phytotoxicity occurred (as summarised in Section 3.4.2.4).

Across trials, there was no evidence that the occurrence or severity of phytotoxicity caused by ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) was related to the growth stage of the crop. On the crop selectivity trials where separate single applications of AG-PM1-72 OD were made at two timings in the spring, the timing at which higher levels of phytotoxicity occurred was not consistently at the earlier or later timing.

On 7 of the trials in which ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) caused more severe levels of phytotoxicity, these were attributed to more extreme unseasonal climatic conditions having resulted in the crop having been under stress at the time of or following application. The ADM.06001.H.2.B labels will include cautionary statements to avoid application when crops are under stress due to adverse environmental conditions and that crop damage may occur when extremes in climatic conditions follow application. Furthermore, specifically relating to application on rye, the ADM.06001.H.2.B labels will include cautionary statements to only apply to actively growing healthy crops and only in situations where target weed infestations are likely to substantially impact on crop yield and there are limited alternative options available to provide effective control.

Considering that ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at twice the proposed maximum label rate caused up to high levels of phytotoxicity on many of the trials, the proposed labels for ADM.06001.H.2.B will advise to avoid sprayer overlap to reduce the risk of phytotoxic damage occurring.

Based on the absence of phytotoxic symptoms or effects on crop growth and development or only relatively low to moderate and mainly transient levels of symptoms or effects on most trials, it can be concluded that a single post-emergence application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at up to the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 product/ha in the spring is crop safe on rye when applied according to label recommendations, including those specifically relating to use on rye.

Comments of zRMS on:
Phytotoxicity to host crop (3.4.1)

The effect of ADM.06001.H.2.B on the crop growth and development was evaluated basing on 97 selectivity trials carried out in Maritime EPPO zone (43 trials), North-East EPPO zone (25 trials), South-East EPPO zone (29 trials) and 165 efficacy trials conducted in EPPO zones: Maritime (75 trials), North-East (30 trials) and South-East (60 trials) in two growth seasons 2018 and 2020. A maximum recommended dose rate of 1.0 L/ha (1N) was considered in efficacy trials and dose rates: 1.0 L/ha (1N) and 2.0 L/ha (2N) were considered in selectivity trials to evaluate possible phytotoxicity of the tested herbicide ADM.06001.H.2.B. A part of the selectivity and efficacy trials presents data for AG-PM1-72 OD (earlier version of ADM.06001.H.2.B, for which similarity has been proved in a range of bridging trials presented in a separate chapter (Preliminary tests (3.2.1))). For simplification, only the code name ADM.06001.H.2.B will be used in the assessment. Summary of phytotoxicity of ADM.06001.H.2.B to individual crops and in particular EPPO zones is presented below:

Winter wheat: 152 efficacy trials conducted in Maritime zone (68), North-East zone (28) and South-East zone (56); 32 selectivity trials conducted in Maritime zone (15), North-East zone (8) and South-East zone (9).

Maritime EPPO zone

No phytotoxicity symptoms after application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at 2N dose and/or at 1N dose, were observed in 8 of 15 selectivity trials and in 54 of 68 efficacy trials. The maximum phytotoxicity >15% was noted in 3 efficacy trials at 1N dose rate of ADM.06001.H.2.B. In selectivity trials, the maximum phytotoxicity was at the level >10-15% noted in only 1 trial at 2N dose rate of ADM.06001.H.2.B.

North-East EPPO zone

No phytotoxicity symptoms, after application of ADM.06001.H.2.B were recorded in selectivity and efficacy trials.

South-East EPPO zone

No phytotoxicity symptoms were observed in 7 of 9 selectivity trials and in 55 of 56 efficacy trials. The maximum phytotoxicity was at the level 0.1-5%, noted in 2 selectivity trials at 1N and 2N dose rate of ADM.06001.H.2.B. and in only 1 efficacy trial at 1N dose rate of ADM.06001.H.2.B.

Spring wheat: 5 efficacy trials conducted in Maritime zone (3) and North-East zone (2); 16 selectivity trials conducted in Maritime zone (7), North-East zone (3) and South-East zone (6).

Maritime EPPO zone

No phytotoxicity symptoms after application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at 1N dose were observed in 5 of 7 selectivity trials and in 3 efficacy trials. No adverse effects were also noted in 4 of 7 selectivity trials after application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at 2N dose. The maximum phytotoxicity >15% was noted in 2 selectivity trials at 2N dose and in 1 selectivity trial at 1N dose of ADM.06001.H.2.B.

North-East EPPO zone

No phytotoxicity symptoms, after application of ADM.06001.H.2.B were recorded in selectivity and efficacy trials.

South-East EPPO zone

No phytotoxicity symptoms after application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at 2N dose were observed in 5 of 6 selectivity trials and no phytotoxicity was noted in all selectivity trials at 1 N dose of ADM.06001.H.2.B. The maximum level of phytotoxicity was >15%, noted in 1 selectivity trial at 2N dose rate of ADM.06001.H.2.B.

Winter triticale: 7 efficacy trials conducted in Maritime zone (3) and South-East zone (4); 24 selectivity trials conducted in Maritime zone (10), North-East zone (7) and South-East zone (7).

Maritime EPPO zone

No phytotoxicity symptoms, after application of ADM.06001.H.2.B were observed in 4 of 10 selectivity trials at 2 N dose and in 5 of 10 selectivity trials at 1 N dose rate of ADM.06001.H.2.B. The maximum phytotoxicity was >15%, noted in 2 selectivity trial at 2N dose and in 1 selectivity trial at 1N dose of ADM.06001.H.2.B. No adverse effects were recorded in 2 efficacy trials. The maximum phytotoxicity >15% was recorded in 1 efficacy trial at 1N dose of ADM.06001.H.2.B.

North-East EPPO zone

No phytotoxicity, after application of ADM.06001.H.2.B was recorded in selectivity trials.

South-East EPPO zone

No phytotoxicity symptoms, after application of ADM.06001.H.2.B were observed in 5 of 7 selectivity trials at 2 N dose and in 6 of 7 selectivity trials at 1 N dose rate of ADM.06001.H.2.B. The maximum phytotoxicity was at the level 0.1-5%, noted in 2 selectivity trials at 2N dose and in 1 selectivity trial at 1N dose of ADM.06001.H.2.B. No adverse effects were recorded in 3 of 4 efficacy trials. The maximum phytotoxicity >15% was recorded in 1 efficacy trial at 1N dose of ADM.06001.H.2.B.

According to the GAP table and as explained by the applicant during evaluation process, spring triticale is not a claimed crop. Therefore the extrapolation of trial results from winter triticale to spring triticale is not a subject of the evaluation.

Winter rye: 1 efficacy trial conducted in Maritime zone; 25 selectivity trials conducted in Maritime zone (11), North-East zone (7) and South-East zone (7).

Maritime EPPO zone

No phytotoxicity symptoms, after application of ADM.06001.H.2.B were recorded in efficacy trial. No adverse effects were noted in 1 of 11 selectivity trials at 1N and 2N dose of ADM.06001.H.2.B. The maximum phytotoxicity was >15%, noted in 5 selectivity trials at 1N dose and in 9 selectivity trials at 2N dose of ADM.06001.H.2.B.

North-East EPPO zone

No phytotoxicity, after application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at 1N dose was recorded in 7 selectivity trials. No adverse effects were noted in 4 of 7 selectivity trials at 2N dose of ADM.06001.H.2.B. The maximum phytotoxicity >15% has been recorded in 2 selectivity trials at 2N dose of ADM.06001.H.2.B.

South-East EPPO zone

No phytotoxicity symptoms, after application of ADM.06001.H.2.B were observed in 1 of 7 selectivity trials at 2 N dose and in 2 of 7 selectivity trials at 1 N dose rate of ADM.06001.H.2.B. The maximum phytotoxicity was >15%, noted in 4 selectivity trials at 2N dose and in 2 selectivity trials at 1N dose of ADM.06001.H.2.B.

According to the GAP table and as explained by the applicant during evaluation process, spring rye is not a claimed crop. Therefore the extrapolation of trial results from winter rye to spring rye is not a subject of the evaluation.

Generally, **visual** phytotoxicity symptoms (general phytotoxicity, foliar discolorations, chlorosis, necrosis, internode shortening, crop biomass reductions, crop vigor reductions, thinning, stunting, delayed growth stage, bleaching, delays in ears emergence, increased lodging, deformed ears) observed mainly in Maritime and South-East EPPO zone, after application of ADM.06001.H.2.B. and also reference products were transient and declined to lower levels during the later assessments.

Based on the submitted trial results it can be concluded that ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the highest recommended dose rate of 1.0 L/ha is selective herbicide and can be safely used in winter wheat, spring wheat, winter triticale and winter rye in North-East EPPO zone. In Maritime zone and South-East EPPO zone ADM.06001.H.2.B can be safely used with certain remarks in the label. It is recommended to include in the label remark on possibility of transient phytotoxicity occurring after application of ADM.06001.H.2.B. In order to prevent phytotoxicity, it is recommended to include a warning in the labels in all cMSs to avoid overlapping

of the spray liquid, not to perform treatments in time when crops are under stress due to unfavourable environmental conditions and when crops are weakened or damaged by pests, frosts, flooding or drought..

In case of application on rye, due to the recommendation given by the applicant and accepted by zRMS, the ADM.06001.H.2.B labels in the Maritime and South-East EPPO Zone should include cautionary statements to only apply to actively growing healthy crops and only in situations where target weed infestations are likely to substantially impact on crop yield and there are limited alternative options available to provide effective control.

As all efficacy trials and most of selectivity trials were conducted at BBCH growth stage ranging from 21 to 39 in spring cereals, the concerned MSs are kindly advised to make a decision concerning acceptance application timing BBCH 13-20 in spring wheat on the national level.

3.4.2 Effects on yield of treated plants or plant products (KCP 6.4.2)

Ninety-six (96) of the 97 crop selectivity trials carried out between 2018 and 2020 generated data on crop yield at normal commercial harvest following a single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the highest proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, and also at twice this rate (2.0 L product/ha) to simulate sprayer overlap, in the absence of weeds in cereals.

Of these trials, 42 were conducted within the Maritime EPPO climatic zone, 25 were conducted within the North-east EPPO climatic zone and 29 were conducted within the South-east EPPO climatic zone.

Of these trials, 32 were carried out on winter wheat, 16 were carried out on spring wheat, 24 were carried out on triticale and 24 were carried out on rye.

The materials and methods used in all crop selectivity trials are given in Section 3.4.1.

Crop yield data are summarised across trials in this Section and that from each trial are included in Appendix 4.

Based on data presented in Section 3.2.1.4 that demonstrates comparability between the crop safety of ADM.06001.H.2.B and that of AG-PM1-72 OD, both containing the same amounts of the two active substances and applied at the same rate, in studies and trials on wheat, triticale and rye, data for AG-PM1-72 OD from trials in 2018-2019 are summarised together with that for ADM.06001.H.2.B from trials in 2020, as fully supportive of demonstrating the absence of adverse impact on yield of ADM.06001.H.2.B in relevant cereals crops.

3.4.2.1 Crop yield on winter wheat (in the absence of weeds)

Evaluations of crop yield have been carried out at normal commercial harvest following single applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, and also at twice this rate to simulate sprayer overlap, on 32 crop selectivity trials conducted between 2018 and 2020 for the specific purpose of demonstrating crop safety in winter wheat in the absence of impact of weeds.

Of these trials, 15 were carried out in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (7 in France, 3 in Czech Republic, 5 in Germany), 8 were carried out in North-east EPPO climatic zone (all in Poland) and 9 were carried out in South-east EPPO climatic zone (5 in Hungary, 4 in Romania).

On these 32 trials, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) was applied at a single timing in the spring, when crop growth stages were within the range of 21-39 (BBCH), on 28 trials and at two separate single timings in the spring, when crop stages were within the range of 20-30 (BBCH) at the first timings and 32-39 (BBCH) at the second timings, on the other 4 trials.

Across trials, the potential impact of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) on crop yield has been tested under a wide range of climatic and agronomic conditions that are considered to be fully representative of those under which winter wheat is grown across countries in the EU Central Registration zone. Trials were carried out on a range of different commercially representative and commonly grown cultivars of winter wheat.

Single applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) caused no phytotoxic symptoms or significant reductions in crop yield on 23 of these 32 trials when applied at the highest proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and at twice the proposed label rate (2.0 L product/ha).

ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the highest proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and/or at twice this rate (2.0 L product/ha) caused mainly low to moderate and transient levels of phytotoxicity and/or other adverse effects on crop growth and development on the other 9 trials.

A comparison of levels of phytotoxicity and crop yield on these 9 crop selectivity trials is given in Table 3.4-14.

Table 3.4-14: Comparison of levels of phytotoxicity to crop yield on 9 crop selectivity trials carried out on winter wheat in which ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 1.0 L and/or 2.0 L product/ha caused phytotoxic symptoms

EPPO climatic zone	Trial no.	Variety	Product			Maximum level of phytotoxicity (%) (timing)		Yield in the untreated control (t/ha)	Crop yield (as % of untreated)	
			Name	1N rate (L/ha)	Application timing (crop growth stage, BBCH)	1N rate	2N rate		1N rate	2N rate
Maritime	CZ18HSTRZAW078A	Golem	AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	26-27	5.0 (53 DAA)	6.5 (53 DAA)	6.5	99.0	96.7
			Axial Plus	0.9	26-27	5.2 (25 DAA)	5.2 (25 DAA)		98.1	98.6
	DE18HSTRZAW189G	Reform	AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	37-39	4.0 (7 DAA)	5.3 (7 DAA)	9.8	98.9	100.5
			Axial 50 EC	1.2	37-39	0	0		100.0	100.0
	DE18HSTRZAW189H	Julius	AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	27-29	4.3 (14 DAA)	9.0 (14 DAA)	3.1	96.6	91.5
			Axial 50 EC	1.2	27-29	0	0		92.3	93.1
	FR18HSTRZAW551A	Libravo	AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	30	0	1.5 (12 DAA)	10.1	97.8	99.8
				1.0	33	10.0 (7 DAA)	12.5 (7 DAA)		100.1	99.4
			Axial Pratic	1.2	30	0	2.8 (12 DAA)		99.8	98.6
				1.5 + 1.0	30	8.5 (12 DAA)	25.0 (12 DAA)		98.6	98.0
	FR18HSTRZAW551E	Mathéo	AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	29-30	3.6 (12 DAA)	8.5 (12 DAA)	9.4	100.6	96.7
				1.0	33-37	7.0 (12 DAA)	9.0 (12 DAA)		95.8	95.1
			Axial Pratic	1.2	29-30	5.3 (12 DAA)	13.8 (12 DAA)		100.6	96.0
				1.5 + 1.0	29-30	13.3 (12 DAA)	22.0 (12 DAA)		94.4	93.6
	FR18HSTRZAW551F	Syllon	AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	29-30	1.3 (11 DAA)	6.9 (11 DAA)	7.2	99.8	97.2
				1.0	37-39	0	1.5 (12 DAA)		97.2	96.0
			Axial Pratic	1.2	29-30	3.3 (11 DAA)	7.5 (11 DAA)		100.6	99.3
				1.5 + 1.0	29-30	6.5 (11 DAA)	17.2 (11 DAA)		96.6	97.0
	CZ20HSTRZAW010A	Rgt Aktion	ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	26-27	2.2 (26 DAA)	3.7 (14 DAA)	5.7	100.7	95.4
			Axial 50 EC	0.9	26-27	2.5 (21 DAA)	1.3 (66 DAA)		95.4	107.8
South-east	HU18HSTRZAW121B	Gk Csillag	AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	37-39	2.5 (19 DAA)	4.0 (19 DAA)	5.2	97.1*	95.4*
			Axial 50 EC	1.0	37-39	0	0		100.7	100.8
			Atlantis OD + Mero	1.0 + 1.0	37-39	6.0 (19 DAA)	18.5 (19 DAA)		92.6*	88.3*
	HU20HSTRZAW201B	Mv Ikva	ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	31	0.3 (13 DAA)	2.6 (13 DAA)	7.5	102.7	100.1
			Axial 50 EC	1.2	31	0.3 (13 DAA)	1.6 (13 DAA)		100.5	97.0
			Atlantis OD	1.0	31	0.8 (13 DAA)	0.8 (13 DAA)		103.2	99.0

*statistically significant reductions compared to the untreated control at the 95% confidence level

On 8 of the 9 trials in which ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the highest proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and/or also at twice this rate (2.0 L product/ha) caused low to moderate and mainly transient levels of phytotoxicity symptoms, there were no subsequent significant reductions in crop yield. On the other 1 trial, relatively slight effects on plant growth caused by AG-PM1-72 OD applied at the highest proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also at twice this rate (2.0 L product/ha) earlier in the season resulted in corresponding slight but significant reductions in crop yield. The standard reference product applied at the authorised label rate and twice this rate caused higher levels of the same phytotoxic symptoms and more pronounced reductions in crop yield to those caused by AG-PM1-72 OD. However, the magnitude of the reduction (2.9%) caused by AG-PM1-72 OD applied at the 1.0 L product/ha rate on this trial is not considered to constitute a substantial adverse impact on crop yield.

Based on the absence of effects across trials, it is therefore reasonable to conclude that a single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, and applied according to label recommendations, has no adverse impact on crop yield on winter wheat.

3.4.2.2 Crop yield on spring wheat (in the absence of weeds)

Evaluations of crop yield have been carried out at normal commercial harvest following single applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, and also at twice this rate to simulate sprayer overlap, on 16 crop selectivity trials conducted between 2018 and 2020 for the specific purpose of demonstrating crop safety in spring wheat in the absence of impact of weeds.

Of these trials, 7 were carried out in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (4 in France, 3 in Germany), 3 were carried out in the North-east EPPO climatic zone (all in Poland) and 6 were carried out in the South-east EPPO climatic zone (4 in Hungary, 2 in Romania).

On these 16 crop selectivity trials, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) was applied at a single timing in the spring when crop growth stages were within the range of 14-39 (BBCH), on 14 trials and at two separate single timings in the spring when crop growth stages were within the range of 13-23 (BBCH) at the first timings and at 37 (BBCH) at second timings, on the other 2 trials.

Across trials, the potential impact of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) on crop yield has been tested under a wide range of climatic and agronomic conditions that are considered to be fully representative of those under which spring wheat is grown across countries in the EU Central Registration zone. Trials were carried out on a range of different commercially representative and commonly grown cultivars of spring wheat.

Single applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) caused no phytotoxic symptoms or significant reductions in crop yield on 14 of these 16 trials when applied at the highest proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha or on 12 of the 16 crop selectivity trials when applied at twice the proposed label rate (2.0 L product/ha).

ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the highest proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and/or at twice this rate (2.0 L product/ha) caused mainly low to moderate and transient levels of phytotoxicity and/or other adverse effects on crop growth and development on the other 4 trials.

A comparison of levels of phytotoxicity and crop yield on these 4 crop selectivity trials is given in Table 3.4-15.

Table 3.4-15: Comparison of levels of phytotoxicity to crop yield on 4 crop selectivity trials carried out on spring wheat in which ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 1.0 L and/or 2.0 L product/ha caused phytotoxic symptoms

EPP0 climatic zone	Trial no.	Variety	Product			Maximum level of phytotoxicity (%) (timing)		Yield in the untreated control (t/ha)	Crop yield (as % of untreated)	
			Name	1N rate (L/ha)	Application timing (crop growth stage. BBCH)	1N rate	2N rate		1N rate	2N rate
Maritime	FR18HSTRZAS551B	Calixo	AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	23	0	4.5 (10 DAA)	7.4	103.2	98.1
				1.0	37	0	0		103.4	105.6
			Axial Pratic	1.2	23	0	0		104.9	102.4
			Atlantis PRO + Actirob B	1.0 + 1.0	23	0	3.8 (10 DAA)		102.2	98.1
	FR20HSTRZAS556A	Alhambra	ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	37-39	36.5 (20 DAA)	63.0 (20 DAA)	4.5	96.0	96.3
			Axial Pratic	1.2	37-39	0	0		95.7	98.5
	FR20HSTRZAS556B	Lennox	ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	21-30	10.0 (13 DAA)	62.3 (13 DAA)	5.8	94.4	93.9
			Axial Pratic	1.2	21-30	0	0		96.1	94.0
South-east	HU18HSTRZAS121A	Astrid	AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	14-16	0	30.0 (32 DAA)	2.0	98.4	78.0*
			Axial 50 EC	1.0	14-16	0	0		98.6	96.6

*statistically significant reductions compared to the untreated control at the 95% confidence level

On all 4 of the trials in which ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the highest proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha caused mostly relatively low and/or transient levels of phytotoxicity symptoms, there were no subsequent significant reductions in crop yield.

On 1 of the 4 trials in which ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at twice the highest proposed label rate (2.0 L product/ha) caused mostly low to moderate and/or transient levels of phytotoxicity symptoms, there were no subsequent significant reductions in crop yield. On the other 1 trial, the phytotoxicity caused by AG-PM1-72 OD applied at twice the proposed label rate (2.0 L product/ha) earlier in the season resulted in corresponding significant reduction in crop yield, compared to the untreated control, the 1.0 L product/ha rate and standard reference product.

Considering that the levels of phytotoxicity caused by ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at twice the proposed maximum label rate can result in significant reductions in crop yield, particularly when application is made to crops suffering from stress, the proposed labels for ADM.06001.H.2.B will advise to avoid sprayer overlap to reduce the risk of phytotoxic damage occurring at levels that could adversely impact on crop yield.

Based on the absence of effects across trials, it is therefore reasonable to conclude that a single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, and applied according to label recommendations, has no adverse impact on crop yield on spring wheat.

3.4.2.3 Crop yield on winter triticale (in the absence of weeds)

Evaluations of crop yield have been carried out at normal commercial harvest following single applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, and also at twice this rate to simulate sprayer overlap, on a total of 24 crop selectivity trials conducted between 2018 and 2020 for the specific purpose of demonstrating crop safety in triticale in the absence of impact of weeds.

Of these trials, 10 were carried out in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (4 in France, 4 in Germany, 2 in Czech Republic), 7 were carried out in the North-east EPPO climatic zone (all in Poland) and 7 were carried out in the South-east EPPO climatic zone (4 in Hungary, 3 in Romania).

On these 24 crop selectivity trials, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) was applied at a single timing in the spring when crop growth stages were within the range of 21-39 (BBCH), on 21 trials and at two separate single timings in the spring when crop growth stages were within the range of 24-31 (BBCH) at the first timings and 32-34 (BBCH) at second timings, on the other 3 trials.

Whilst no data has been generated in support of demonstrating the absence of adverse impact on crop yield in spring triticale, plant physiology, agronomic practices and susceptibility to phytotoxicity caused by herbicides can be considered to be very similar between winter and spring triticale. Data from trials carried out in winter triticale are therefore considered to be supportive of demonstrating the absence of adverse impact on crop yield of spring applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha in spring triticale.

Across trials, the potential impact of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) on crop yield has been tested under a wide range of climatic and agronomic conditions that are considered to be fully representative of those under which triticale is grown across countries in the EU Central Registration zone. Trials were carried out on a range of different commercially representative and commonly grown cultivars of triticale.

Single applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) caused no phytotoxic symptoms or significant reductions in crop yield on 18 of these 24 trials when applied at the highest proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha or on 16 of the 24 crop selectivity trials when applied at twice the proposed label rate (2.0 L product/ha).

ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the highest proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and/or at twice this rate (2.0 L product/ha) caused mainly low and transient levels of phytotoxicity and/or other adverse effects on crop growth and development on the other 8 trials.

A comparison of levels of phytotoxicity and crop yield on these 8 crop selectivity trials is given in Table 3.4-16.

Table 3.4-16: Comparison of levels of phytotoxicity to crop yield on 8 crop selectivity trials carried out on winter triticale in which ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 1.0 L and/or 2.0 L product/ha caused phytotoxic symptoms

EPPO climatic zone	Trial no.	Variety	Product			Maximum level of phytotoxicity (%) (timing)		Yield in the untreated control (t/ha)	Crop yield (as % of untreated)	
			Name	1N rate (L/ha)	Application timing (crop growth stage, BBCH)	1N rate	2N rate		1N rate	2N rate
Maritime	DE18HSTTLWI189J	Grenado	AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	35-37	21.3 (13 DAA)	16.2 (51 DAA)	8.0	92.5	90.4*
			Axial 50 EC	1.2	35-37	34.8 (13 DAA)	36.3 (13 DAA)		92.0	88.6*
	DE18HSTTLWI189K	Rhenio	AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	23-24	0	5.0 (14 DAA)	7.5	95.6	84.9*
			Axial 50 EC	1.2	23-24	0	5.0 (14 DAA)		95.1	84.6*
	FR18HSTTLSS551A	Rgt Eleac	AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	29-31	0	3.8 (13 DAA)	6.2	89.8	93.2
			Axial Pratic	1.2	29-31	0.5 (14 DAA)	7.5 (14 DAA)		99.2	92.8
			Atlantis PRO + Actirob B	1.5 + 1.0	29-31	18.1 (13 DAA)	23.0 (13 DAA)		93.4	86.1
	FR18HSTTLSS551C	Vuka	AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	24	0	11.0 (13 DAA)	5.5	92.6	90.7
				1.2	24	2.5 (12 DAA)	4.5 (12 DAA)		103.1	102.0
			Axial Pratic	1.2	24	6.3 (8 DAA)	15.1 (8 DAA)		96.1	96.5
			Atlantis PRO + Actirob B	1.5 + 1.0	24	13.3 (12 DAA)	17.0 (12 DAA)		98.5	102.3
	FR18HSTTLSS551D	Kaulos	AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	25	7.0 (12 DAA)	12.3 (12 DAA)	6.2	96.5	99.9
				1.2	25	4.0 (12 DAA)	7.3 (12 DAA)		97.4	92.2
			Axial Pratic	1.2	25	5.0 (8 DAA)	6.3 (8 DAA)		100.5	88.8
			Atlantis PRO + Actirob B	1.5 + 1.0	25	7.8 (12 DAA)	14.3 (12 DAA)		96.5	99.3
	DE20HSTTLWI178A	Barolo	ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	32-33	5.3 (12 DAA)	10.0 (12 DAA)	8.3	98.2	97.2
			Axial 50 EC	1.2	32-33	7.0 (14 DAA)	9.5 (14 DAA)		101.2	99.7
South-east	HU18HSTTLWI121A	SU Agendus	AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	21-26	0	0.9 (22 DAA)	4.1	88.1	86.4
			Axial 50 EC	1.0	21-26	0	1.5 (22 DAA)		83.7	84.5
	HU20HSTTLWI201A	Borowik	ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	23-30	0.5 (13 DAA)	0.5 (13 DAA)	4.3	85.9	91.2
			Axial 50 EC	0.9	23-30	0.8 (13 DAA)	1.0 (13 DAA)		103.3	94.7
			Atlantis OD	1.0	23-30	0.8 (13 DAA)	0.5 (13 DAA)		98.3	100.1

*statistically significant reductions compared to the untreated control at the 95% confidence level

On 6 of the 8 trials in which ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the highest proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha caused mostly relatively low and transient levels of phytotoxicity symptoms, there were no subsequent pronounced effects on crop yield. Whilst ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at this rate caused low to moderate reductions in crop yield on the other 2 trials, the differences were not statistically significant, compared to the untreated control on 1 of the trials and statistical analysis was not carried out on the data from the other trial. On 1 of these trials, standard reference products applied at authorised label rates and twice these rate caused similar reductions to those caused by ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD).

On 4 of the 8 trials in which ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at twice the highest proposed label rate (2.0 L product/ha) caused mostly relatively low and transient levels of phytotoxicity symptoms, there were no subsequent adverse effects on crop yield. On 2 of the other trials, the phytotoxicity caused by AG-PM1-72 OD applied at twice the proposed label rate (2.0 L product/ha) earlier in the season resulted in corresponding statistically significant reductions in crop yield. The standard reference product applied at twice the authorised label rate also caused similar levels of phytotoxic symptoms and corresponding statistically significant reductions in crop yield on these 2 trials. Whilst ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at this rate also caused moderate reductions in crop yield on 2 other trials, the differences were not statistically significant, compared to the untreated control on 1 of the trials and statistical analysis was not carried out on the data from the other trial. On 1 of these trials, standard reference products applied at authorised label rates and twice these rate caused similar reductions to those caused by ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD).

Data presented in Section 3.4.1 demonstrates that on the relatively few trials on cereals where ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) caused higher levels of phytotoxicity, these were generally attributable to more extreme unseasonal climatic conditions having resulted in the crop having been under stress at the time of or following application. The ADM.06001.H.2.B labels will therefore include cautionary statements to avoid application when crops are under stress due to adverse environmental conditions and that crop damage and potential reductions in yield may occur when extremes in climatic conditions follow application.

Considering that the levels of phytotoxicity caused by ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at twice the proposed maximum label rate can result in significant reductions in crop yield, particularly when application is made to crops suffering from stress, the proposed labels for ADM.06001.H.2.B will advise to avoid sprayer overlap to reduce the risk of phytotoxic damage occurring at levels that could adversely impact on crop yield.

Based on the absence of effects across trials, it is therefore reasonable to conclude that a single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, and applied according to label recommendations, has no adverse impact on crop yield on triticale.

3.4.2.4 Crop yield on winter rye (in the absence of weeds)

Evaluations of crop yield have been carried out at normal commercial harvest following single applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, and also at twice this rate to simulate sprayer overlap, on 24 of the 25 crop selectivity trials conducted between 2018 and 2020 for the specific purpose of demonstrating crop safety in rye in the absence of impact of weeds. On 1 of these trials, uneven crop lodging occurred across the trial area prior to harvest and consequently impacted the harvesting process resulting in heterogeneous yield data, which has therefore been excluded from the summary presented here.

Of the other 23 trials, 10 were carried out in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (4 in France, 2 in Czech Republic, 4 in Germany), 7 were carried out in North-east EPPO climatic zone (all in Poland) and 6 were carried out in South-east EPPO climatic zone (3 in Hungary, 3 in Romania).

On these 23 trials, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) was applied at a single timing in the spring, when crop growth stages were within the range of 21-39 (BBCH), on 20 trials and at two separate single timings in the spring, when crop stages were within the range of 25-37 (BBCH) at the first timings and 33-49 (BBCH) at the second timings, on the other 3 trials.

Whilst no data has been generated in support of demonstrating the absence of adverse impact on crop yield in spring rye, plant physiology, agronomic practices and susceptibility to phytotoxicity caused by herbicides can be considered to be very similar between winter and spring rye. Data from trials carried out in winter rye are therefore considered to be supportive of demonstrating the absence of adverse impact on crop yield of spring applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha in spring rye.

Across trials, the potential impact of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) on crop yield has been tested under a wide range of climatic and agronomic conditions that are considered to be fully representative of those under which rye is grown across countries in the EU Central Registration zone. Trials were carried out on a range of different commercially representative and commonly grown cultivars of rye.

Single applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) caused no phytotoxic symptoms or significant reductions in crop yield on 9 of these 23 trials when applied at the highest proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha or on 6 of the 23 crop selectivity trials when applied at twice the proposed label rate (2.0 L product/ha).

ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the highest proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and/or at twice this rate (2.0 L product/ha) caused low to relatively high, but in some cases transient, levels of phytotoxicity and/or other adverse effects on crop growth and development on the other 17 trials.

A comparison of levels of phytotoxicity and crop yield on these 17 crop selectivity trials is given in Table 3.4-17.

Crop yield evaluations were not carried out on 1 other crop selectivity trial on which AG-PM1-72 OD applied at the highest proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and twice this rate (2.0 L product/ha) caused mainly low and/or transient phytotoxicity. In which case it is considered unlikely that there would have been any adverse impact on crop yield.

Table 3.4-17: Comparison of levels of phytotoxicity to crop yield on 18 crop selectivity trials carried out on winter rye in which ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 1.0 L and/or 2.0 L product/ha caused phytotoxic symptoms

EPPO climatic zone	Trial no.	Variety	Product			Maximum level of phytotoxicity (%) (timing)		Yield in the untreated control (t/ha)	Crop yield (as % of untreated)	
			Name	1N rate (L/ha)	Application timing (crop growth stage, BBCH)	1N rate	2N rate		1N rate	2N rate
Maritime	CZ20HSSECCW013A	Inspector	ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	32-33	7.6 (14 DAA)	24.3 (14 DAA)	5.4	98.3*	100.2
			Axial 50 EC	0.9	32-33	19.7 (14 DAA)	30.1 (14 DAA)		100.0	92.4*
			Atlantis OD	0.6	32-33	9.4 (14 DAA)	13.0 (14 DAA)		100.7	100.0
	DE18HSSECCW189A	SU Forsetti	AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	33	11.3 (88 DAA)	43.5 (88 DAA)	8.3	79.5*	61.7*
			Axial 50 EC	1.2	33	35.6 (14 DAA)	60.3 (14 DAA)		79.8*	84.5*
	DE18HSSECCW189C	Helltop	AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	31-33	35.1 (15 DAA)	45.1 (15 DAA)	8.6	80.3	88.5
			Axial 50 EC	1.2	31-33	43.7 (15 DAA)	60.0 (15 DAA)		85.1	87.7
	DE20HSSECCW177A	Binnntto	ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	30-31	15.0 (12 DAA)	18.8 (12 DAA)	8.9	100.1	101.2
			Axial 50 EC	1.2	30-31	5.0 (12 DAA)	15.0 (12 DAA)		103.8	100.3
	FR18HSSECCSS551A	Composite	AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	25-30	2.5 (7 DAA)	6.3 (7 DAA)	7.8	100.5	98.5
				1.0	37-49	7.5 (34 DAA)	12.5 (34 DAA)		96.1	96.3
			Axial Pratic	1.2	25-30	0	0		101.0	98.6
			Atlantis PRO + Actirob B	1.5 + 1.0	25-30	7.5 (7 DAA)	15.0 (7 DAA)		100.7	91.5
	FR18HSSECCSS551B	Daniello	AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	30-31	0	1.5 (8 DAA)	5.1	100.3	84.9*
				1.0	37-39	12.5 (36 DAA)	17.5 (36 DAA)		91.5*	74.4*
			Axial Pratic	1.2	30-31	0.5 (8 DAA)	1.5 (8 DAA)		94.2	106.7
			Atlantis PRO + Actirob B	1.5 + 1.0	30-31	6.3 (8 DAA)	8.8 (8 DAA)		97.4	89.7*
	FR18HSSECCSS551C	KWS Serafino	AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	25	22.5 (41 DAA)	28.8 (41 DAA)	7.1	93.2	95.3
				1.0	33	32.5 (14 DAA)	37.5 (14 DAA)		95.9	100.0
			Axial Pratic	1.2	25	35.0 (14 DAA)	47.5 (14 DAA)		94.0	88.6
			Atlantis PRO + Actirob B	1.5 + 1.0	25	35.1 (14 DAA)	60.0 (14 DAA)		91.9	81.0*
	FR18HSSECCSS551D	Livado	AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	25	25.0 (28 DAA)	27.5 (28 DAA)	No crop yield evaluation was carried out	-	-
				1.0	33	30.0 (14 DAA)	31.3 (14 DAA)		-	-
			Axial Pratic	1.2	25	30.0 (28 DAA)	38.8 (14 DAA)		-	-
			Atlantis PRO + Actirob B	1.5 + 1.0	33	25.0 (28 DAA)	30.0 (28 DAA)		-	-
	FR20HSSECCSS557A	SU Performer	ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	27	17.5 (14 DAA)	25.0 (14 DAA)	4.5	94.1	81.9*
			Axial Pratic	1.2	27	3.8 (14 DAA)	8.8 (14 DAA)		82.0*	82.2*
	CZ18HSSECCSS080A	Inspector	AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	26-31	16.3 (14 DAA)	33.8 (14 DAA)	6.0	95.3	94.3
			Atlantis OD	0.6	26-31	2.8 (49 DAA)	3.2 (49 DAA)		99.6	94.8

EPPO climatic zone	Trial no.	Variety	Product			Maximum level of phytotoxicity (%) (timing)		Yield in the untreated control (t/ha)	Crop yield (as % of untreated)	
			Name	1N rate (L/ha)	Application timing (crop growth stage, BBCH)	1N rate	2N rate		1N rate	2N rate
North-east	PL20HSSECSS013A	KWS Jethro	ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	31	0	5.3 (14 DAA)	7.3	98.5	100.0
			Axial 50 EC	0.9	31	7.8 (14 DAA)	9.5 (14 DAA)		99.0	99.4
	PL20HSSECSS013B	Brasetto	ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	30-31	0	20.0 (13 DAA)	6.2	102.0	102.3
			Axial 50 EC	0.9	30-31	0	0		101.4	100.7
	PL20HSSECSS013C	Theofano	ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	34-37	0	20.0 (13 DAA)	8.8	102.4	103.0
			Axial 50 EC	0.9	34-37	0	0		100.5	100.6
South-east	HU18HSSECCW121B	Varda	AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	31-32	4.0 (28 DAA)	5.8 (28 DAA)	3.2	94.7*	94.4*
			Axial 50 EC	1.0	31-32	5.0 (28 DAA)	8.5 (28 DAA)		94.6*	90.9*
	HU20HSSECCW201A	Protector	ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	26-31	13.4 (21 DAA)	37.2 (21 DAA)	4.7	106.6	79.3*
			Axial 50 EC	0.9	26-31	17.0 (13 DAA)	16.6 (21 DAA)		108.0	1017.7
			Atlantis OD	1.0	26-31	8.1 (21 DAA)	23.7 (21 DAA)		103.7	105.1
	RO20HSSECSS237A	Suceveana	ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	21-23	15.0 (14 DAA)	25.0 (14 DAA)	4.3	99.8	99.4
			Axial 50 EC	0.9	21-23	22.6 (14 DAA)	25.0 (14 DAA)		99.9	100.5
			Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	21-23	0	0		100.0	99.7
	RO20HSSECSS237B	Amilo	ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	30-32	20.0 (14 DAA)	30.0 (14 DAA)	4.1	99.8	99.4
			Axial 50 EC	0.9	30-32	55.0 (14 DAA)	60.0 (14 DAA)		99.9	100.5
			Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	30-32	0	10.0 (14 DAA)		100.0	99.7
	RO20HSSECSS237C	Suceveana	ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	34-35	20.0 (14 DAA)	30.0 (14 DAA)	2.9	100.5	99.2
			Axial 50 EC	0.9	34-35	55.0 (14 DAA)	60.0 (14 DAA)		101.5	101.7
			Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	34-35	0	10.0 (14 DAA)		100.3	101.6

*statistically significant reductions compared to the untreated control at the 95% confidence level

On 11 of the 17 trials in which ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the highest proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and/or also at twice this rate (2.0 L product/ha) caused phytotoxicity, there were no subsequent pronounced or statistically significant effects on crop yield.

On the 5 trials, the phytotoxicity caused by ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the highest proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha resulted in statistically significant reductions in crop yield on 4 trials and pronounced but not statistically significant reductions on the other 1 trial. The phytotoxicity caused by ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at twice the proposed label rate (2.0 L product/ha) resulted in statistically significant reductions in crop yield on 4 trials and pronounced but not statistically significant reductions on the other 1 trial. The magnitude of the reductions in crop yield generally reflected differences in the levels of phytotoxicity occurring on these trials and in most cases standard reference products applied at authorised label rates and twice these rates caused similar reductions in crop yield to those caused by ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD).

Data presented in Section 3.4.1 demonstrates that on most of the trials on rye where ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) caused higher levels of phytotoxicity, these were generally attributable to more extreme unseasonal climatic conditions having resulted in the crop having been under stress at the time of or following application. The ADM.06001.H.2.B labels will therefore include cautionary statements to avoid application when crops are under stress due to adverse environmental conditions and that crop damage and potential reductions in yield may occur when extremes in climatic conditions follow application. Furthermore, specifically relating to application on rye, the ADM.06001.H.2.B labels will include cautionary statements to only apply to actively growing healthy crops and only in situations where target weed infestations are likely to substantially impact on crop yield and there are limited alternative options available to provide effective control.

Considering that the levels of phytotoxicity caused by ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at twice the proposed maximum label rate can result in significant reductions in crop yield, particularly when application is made to crops suffering from stress, the proposed labels for ADM.06001.H.2.B will advise to avoid sprayer overlap to reduce the risk of phytotoxic damage occurring at levels that could adversely impact on crop yield.

Based on the absence of consistent or pronounced reductions in most of the trials, it is reasonable to conclude that a single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, and applied according to label recommendations, has no adverse impact on crop yield on rye.

**Comments of zRMS on:
Effects on yield of treated plants or plant products (3.4.2)**

Significant reduction of crop yield associated with the occurrence of phytotoxicity symptoms was noted in:

- 1 of 32 trials conducted on winter wheat, after application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at 1N and 2N dose (South-East zone)
- 1 of 16 trials conducted on spring wheat, after application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at 2N dose (South-East zone)
- 2 of 24 trials conducted on winter triticale, after application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at 2N dose (Maritime zone)
- 4 of 23 trials conducted on winter rye, after application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at 1N and 2N dose (Maritime zone (3) and South-East zone (1)).

Similar reductions in crop yield were also demonstrated after application of some reference products.

According to the GAP table and explanation given by the applicant during evaluation process, spring rye and spring triticale are not a claimed crops. Therefore the extrapolation of trial results from winter rye to spring rye and from winter triticale to spring triticale is not a subject of the evaluation.

Based on the trials results, it can be concluded that ADM.06001.H.2.B applied once at the maximum recommended dose rate of 1.0 L/ha had no adverse effect on grain yield in most of the trials conducted on winter wheat, spring wheat, winter triticale and winter rye. Significant reductions in grain yield were noted in some

trials and were associated with phytotoxicity, that was earlier demonstrated and described. To prevent phytotoxicity occurrence at the level that could cause crop yield reduction it is recommended to include in the label remark to avoid sprayer overlap and not to perform treatments in time when crops are under stress due to unfavorable environmental conditions and when crops are weakened or damaged by pests, frosts, flooding or drought. In case of application on rye, the ADM.06001.H.2.B labels in Maritime and South-East EPPO zone are recommended to include cautionary statements to only apply to actively growing healthy crops and only in situations where target weed infestations are likely to substantially impact on crop yield and there are limited alternative options available to provide effective control.

3.4.3 Effects on quality of plants and plant products (KCP 6.4.3)

Ninety (90) of the 97 crop selectivity trials carried out between 2018 and 2020 generated data on quality parameters of the harvested grain a single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the highest proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, and also at twice this rate (2.0 L product/ha) to simulate sprayer overlap, in the absence of weeds in cereals.

Of these trials, 37 were conducted within the Maritime EPPO climatic zone, 25 were conducted within the North-east EPPO climatic zone and 28 were conducted within the South-east EPPO climatic zone.

Of these trials, 30 were carried out on winter wheat, 16 were carried out on spring wheat, 23 were carried out on triticale and 21 were carried out on rye.

The materials and methods used in all crop selectivity trials are given in Section 3.4.1.

Quality parameter data are summarised across trials in this Section and that from each trial are included in Appendix 4.

Based on data presented in Section 3.2.1.4 that demonstrates comparability between the crop safety of ADM.06001.H.2.B and that of AG-PM1-72 OD, both containing the same amounts of the two active substances and applied at the same rate, in studies and trials on wheat, triticale and rye, data for AG-PM1-72 OD from trials in 2018-2019 are summarised together with that for ADM.06001.H.2.B from trials in 2020, as fully supportive of demonstrating the absence of adverse impact on grain quality of ADM.06001.H.2.B in relevant cereals crops.

3.4.3.1 Quality of the grain in winter wheat (in the absence of weeds)

Evaluations of quality parameters of the harvested grain have been carried out following single applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, and also at twice this rate to simulate sprayer overlap, on 30 of the 32 crop selectivity trials conducted between 2018 and 2020 for the specific purpose of demonstrating the crop safety in winter wheat in the absence of impact of weeds.

Of these trials, 13 were carried out in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (5 in France, 3 in Czech Republic, 5 in Germany), 8 were carried out in North-east EPPO climatic zone (all in Poland) and 9 were carried out in South-east EPPO climatic zone (5 in Hungary, 4 in Romania).

On these 30 trials, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) was applied at a single timing in the spring, when crop growth stages were within the range of 21-39 (BBCH), on 28 trials and at two separate single timings in the spring, when crop stages were within the range of 29-30 (BBCH) at the first timings and 33-39 (BBCH) at the second timings, on the other 2 trials.

Across trials, the potential impact of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) on quality of the grain has been tested under a wide range of climatic and agronomic conditions that are considered to be fully representative of those under which winter wheat is grown across countries in the EU Central Registration zone. Trials were carried out on a range of different commercially representative and commonly grown cultivars of winter wheat.

On 21 of these 30 trials, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the highest proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also at twice this rate (2.0 L product/ha) caused no phytotoxicity earlier in

the season and also had no significant adverse effects on grain quality. On 8 of these 30 trials, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the highest proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and/or at twice this rate (2.0 L product/ha) caused mainly low to moderate and transient levels of phytotoxicity and/or other adverse effects on crop growth and development.

A comparison of levels of phytotoxicity and grain quality parameters on these 8 trials is given in Table 3.4-18.

On 1 other trial, ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the highest proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha caused no phytotoxicity earlier in the season but had significant adverse effects on grain quality.

Grain quality evaluations were not carried out on 1 other crop selectivity trial on which AG-PM1-72 OD applied at the highest proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and/or at twice this rate (2.0 L product/ha) caused mainly low and/or transient phytotoxicity. Therefore, it is considered unlikely that there would have been any adverse impact on grain quality on these trials.

Table 3.4-18: Comparison of levels of phytotoxicity to yield quality parameters on 10 crop selectivity trials carried out on winter wheat in which ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 1.0 L and/or 2.0 L product/ha caused phytotoxic symptoms and/or adverse impact on grain quality

EPPO climatic zone	Trial no.	Variety	Product			Maximum level of phytotoxicity (%) (timing)		Quality parameter (unit)	Untreated value	Quality parameter (as % of untreated)	
			Name	1N rate (L/ha)	Application timing (crop growth stage, BBCH)	1N rate	2N rate			1N rate	2N rate
Maritime	CZ18HSTRZAW078A	Golem	AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	26-27	5.0 (53 DAA)	6.5 (53 DAA)	HLW (Kg/hL)	73.5	99.5	96.2
			Axial Plus	0.9	26-27	5.2 (25 DAA)	5.2 (25 DAA)			96.4	96.3
			AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	26-27	5.0 (53 DAA)	6.5 (53 DAA)	TGW (g)	38.3	97.4	100.1
			Axial Plus	0.9	26-27	5.2 (25 DAA)	5.2 (25 DAA)			97.1	100.9
			AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	26-27	5.0 (53 DAA)	6.5 (53 DAA)	Protein content (%)	12.1	99.2	99.6
			Axial Plus	0.9	26-27	5.2 (25 DAA)	5.2 (25 DAA)			100.2	98.3
	DE18HSTRZAW189G	Reform	AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	37-39	4.0 (7 DAA)	5.3 (7 DAA)	HLW (Kg/hL)	78.0	102.1	101.4
			Axial 50 EC	1.2	37-39	0	0			100.8	102.1
			AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	37-39	4.0 (7 DAA)	5.3 (7 DAA)	TGW (g)	34.9	103.7	102.0
			Axial 50 EC	1.2	37-39	0	0			100.0	103.7
	DE18HSTRZAW189H	Julius	AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	27-29	4.3 (14 DAA)	9.0 (14 DAA)	HLW (Kg/hL)	72.0	99.6	100.6
			Axial 50 EC	1.2	27-29	0	0			99.7	99.4
			AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	27-29	4.3 (14 DAA)	9.0 (14 DAA)	TGW (g)	27.6	98.5	100.3
			Axial 50 EC	1.2	27-29	0	0			96.6	96.6
	FR18HSTRZAW551A	Libravo	AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	30	0	1.5 (12 DAA)	No quality parameter evaluations were carried out		-	-
				1.0	30	10.0 (7 DAA)	12.5 (7 DAA)			-	-
			Axial Pratic	1.2	30	0	2.8 (12 DAA)			-	-
			Atlantis PRO + Actirob B	1.5 + 1.0	30	8.5 (12 DAA)	25.0 (12 DAA)			-	-
	FR18HSTRZAW551E	Mathéo	AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	29-30	3.6 (12 DAA)	8.5 (12 DAA)	HLW (Kg/hL)	73.6	99.9	98.7
				1.0	33-37	7.0 (12 DAA)	9.0 (12 DAA)			96.4	95.3
			Axial Pratic	1.2	29-30	5.3 (12 DAA)	13.8 (12 DAA)			100.7	99.1
			Atlantis PRO + Actirob B	1.5 + 1.0	29-30	13.3 (12 DAA)	22.0 (12 DAA)			97.3	97.2
	FR18HSTRZAW551F	Syllon	AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	29-30	1.3 (11 DAA)	6.9 (11 DAA)	HLW (Kg/hL)	76.4	99.4	99.2
				1.0	37-39	0	1.5 (12 DAA)			99.1	97.7*
			Axial Pratic	1.2	29-30	3.3 (11 DAA)	7.5 (11 DAA)			99.6	100.4
			Atlantis PRO + Actirob B	1.5 + 1.0	29-30	6.5 (11 DAA)	17.2 (11 DAA)			98.8	98.6
	CZ20HSTRZAW010A	Rgt Aktion	ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	26-27	2.2 (26 DAA)	3.7 (14 DAA)	HLW (Kg/hL)	78.9	102.5	102.9
			Axial 50 EC	0.9	26-27	2.5 (21 DAA)	1.3 (66 DAA)			104.5	101.9
			ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	26-27	2.2 (26 DAA)	3.7 (14 DAA)	TGW (g)	45.9	102.2	101.2
			Axial 50 EC	0.9	26-27	2.5 (21 DAA)	1.3 (66 DAA)			101.1	101.5

EPPO climatic zone	Trial no.	Variety	Product			Maximum level of phytotoxicity (%) (timing)		Quality parameter (unit)	Untreated value	Quality parameter (as % of untreated)	
			Name	1N rate (L/ha)	Application timing (crop growth stage, BBCH)	1N rate	2N rate			1N rate	2N rate
North-east	PL20HSTRZAW011C	Hondia	ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	31-32	0	0	HLW (Kg/hL)	67.6	99.3	97.7
			Axial 50 EC	1.2	31-32	0	0			99.2	97.2
			ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	31-32	0	0	TGW (g)	39.1	95.1*	96.3
			Axial 50 EC	1.2	31-32	0	0			95.7	97.2
South-east	HU18HSTRZAW121B	Gk Csillag	AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	37-39	2.5 (19 DAA)	4.0 (19 DAA)	HLW (Kg/hL)	78.5	100.2	99.7
			Axial 50 EC	1.0	37-39	0	0			99.7	99.8
			Atlantis OD + Mero	1 + 1	37-39	6.0 (19 DAA)	18.5 (19 DAA)			99.8	99.8
			AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	37-39	2.5 (19 DAA)	4.0 (19 DAA)	TGW (g)	42.0	99.9	99.5
			Axial 50 EC	1.0	37-39	0	0			99.8	99.9
			Atlantis OD + Mero	1 + 1	37-39	6.0 (19 DAA)	18.5 (19 DAA)			100.0	99.5
	HU20HSTRZAW201B	Mv Ikva	ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	31	0.3 (13 DAA)	2.6 (13 DAA)	HLW (Kg/hL)	72.3	111.5	105.1
			Axial 50 EC	1.2	31	0.3 (13 DAA)	1.6 (13 DAA)			106.9	106.8
			Atlantis OD	1.0	31	0.8 (13 DAA)	0.8 (13 DAA)			118.4	101.8
			ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	31	0.3 (13 DAA)	2.6 (13 DAA)	TGW (g)	33.5	99.4	96.4
			Axial 50 EC	1.2	31	0.3 (13 DAA)	1.6 (13 DAA)			97.0	96.0
			Atlantis OD	1.0	31	0.8 (13 DAA)	0.8 (13 DAA)			98.5	87.1

*statistically significant reductions compared to the untreated control at the 95% confidence level

There were no consistent or significant reductions in the various grain quality parameters evaluated on any of the 8 crop selectivity trials in which ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the highest proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha caused mainly low and transient levels of phytotoxicity earlier in the season.

There were no consistent or significant reductions in the various grain quality parameters evaluated on 7 of 8 crop selectivity trials in which ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at twice the highest proposed label rate (2.0 L product/ha) caused mainly low and transient levels of phytotoxicity earlier in the season.

On the other 1 trial, AG-PM1-72 OD applied at the 2.0 L product/ha had no significant effect on hectolitre weight of the grain when applied at the earlier timing but caused a very slight but statistically significant reduction when applied at the later timing. Although significant, the magnitude of the reduction in hectolitre weight of the grain on this 1 trial is not considered to constitute a substantial adverse effect on the overall quality of the grain by AG-PM1-72 OD.

On the 1 trial on which ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the 1.0 L and 2.0 L product/ha rates caused no phytotoxicity earlier in the season, a slight but statistically significant reduction in thousand grain weight occurred with the highest proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha but not with the 2.0 L product/ha rate. Although significant, this slight reduction in HLW is not considered to constitute a substantial adverse effect on the overall quality of the grain by ADM.06001.H.2.B.

Based on the absence of consistent or pronounced reductions in grain quality across trials, it is reasonable to conclude that a single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, and applied according to label recommendations, has no adverse impact on the quality of the grain in winter wheat.

3.4.3.2 Quality of the grain in spring wheat (in the absence of weeds)

Evaluations of quality parameters of the harvested grain have been carried out following single applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, and also at twice this rate to simulate sprayer overlap, on 16 crop selectivity trials conducted between 2018 and 2020 for the specific purpose of demonstrating the crop safety in spring wheat in the absence of impact of weeds.

Of these trials, 7 were carried out in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (4 in France, 3 in Germany), 3 were carried out in the North-east EPPO climatic zone (all in Poland) and 6 were carried out in the South-east EPPO climatic zone (4 in Hungary, 2 in Romania).

On these 16 crop selectivity trials, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) was applied at a single timing in the spring when crop growth stages were within the range of 14-39 (BBCH), on 14 trials and at two separate single timings in the spring when crop growth stages were within the range of 13-23 (BBCH) at the first timings and at 37 (BBCH) at second timings, on the other 2 trials.

Across trials, the potential impact of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) on quality of the grain has been tested under a wide range of climatic and agronomic conditions that are considered to be fully representative of those under which spring wheat is grown across countries in the EU Central Registration zone. Trials were carried out on a range of different commercially representative and commonly grown cultivars of spring wheat.

On 12 of these 16 trials, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the highest proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also at twice this rate (2.0 L product/ha) caused no phytotoxicity earlier in the season and also had no significant adverse effects on grain quality. On 4 of these 16 trials, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the highest proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and/or at twice this rate (2.0 L product/ha) caused mainly low to moderate and transient levels of phytotoxicity and/or other adverse effects on crop growth and development.

A comparison of levels of phytotoxicity and grain quality parameters on these 4 trials is given in Table 3.4-19.

Table 3.4-19: Comparison of levels of phytotoxicity to yield quality parameters on 4 crop selectivity trials carried out on spring wheat in which ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 1.0 L and/or 2.0 L product/ha caused phytotoxic symptoms

EPPO climatic zone	Trial no.	Variety	Product			Maximum level of phytotoxicity (%) (timing)		Quality parameter (unit)	Untreated value	Quality parameter (as % of untreated)	
			Name	1N rate (L/ha)	Application timing (crop growth stage, BBCH)	1N rate	2N rate			1N rate	2N rate
Maritime	FR18HSTRZAS551B	Calixo	AG-PM1-72 OD	1,0	23	0	4.5 (10 DAA)	HLW (Kg/hL)	84.4	99.7	99.5
				1.0	37	0	0			99.5	99.1
			Axial Pratic	1.2	23	0	0			100.1	100.8
			Atlantis PRO + Actirob B	1.0 + 1.0	23	0	3.8 (10 DAA)			100.2	99.6
	FR20HSTRZAS556A	Alhambra	ADM.06001.H.2.B	1,0	37-39	36.5 (20 DAA)	63.0 (20 DAA)	HLW (Kg/hL)	66.6	97.7	96.9
			Axial Pratic	1.2	37-39	0	0	HLW (Kg/hL)		97.2	99.6
	FR20HSTRZAS556B	Lennox	ADM.06001.H.2.B	1,0	21-30	10.0 (13 DAA)	62.3 (13 DAA)	HLW (Kg/hL)	71.4	98.9	97.9
			Axial Pratic	1.2	21-30	0	0	HLW (Kg/hL)		99.5	98.9
South-east	HU18HSTRZAS121A	Astrid	AG-PM1-72 OD	1,0	14-16	0	30.0 (32 DAA)	HLW (Kg/hL)	76.0	97.0	99.9
			Axial 50 EC	1.0	14-16	0	0	HLW (Kg/hL)		98.9	96.1
			AG-PM1-72 OD	1,0	14-16	0	30.0 (32 DAA)	TGW (g)	29.7	93.7	97.5
			Axial 50 EC	1.0	14-16	0	0	TGW (g)		111.5	101.5

There were no consistent or significant reductions in the various grain quality parameters evaluated on any of 4 crop selectivity trials in which ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the highest proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and/or at twice this rate (2.0 L product/ha) caused mainly low to moderate and transient levels of phytotoxicity earlier in the season.

Based on the absence of consistent or pronounced reductions in grain quality across trials, it is reasonable to conclude that a single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, and applied according to label recommendations, has no adverse impact on the quality of the grain in spring wheat.

3.4.3.3 Quality of the grain in winter triticale (in the absence of weeds)

Evaluations of quality parameters of the harvested grain have been carried out following single applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, and also at twice this rate to simulate sprayer overlap, on 23 of the 24 crop selectivity trials conducted between 2018 and 2020 for the specific purpose of demonstrating the crop safety in triticale in the absence of impact of weeds.

Of these trials, 9 were carried out in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (3 in France, 4 in Germany, 2 in Czech Republic), 7 were carried out in the North-east EPPO climatic zone (all in Poland) and 7 were carried out in the South-east EPPO climatic zone (4 in Hungary, 3 in Romania).

On these 23 crop selectivity trials, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) was applied at a single timing in the spring when crop growth stages were within the range of 21-39 (BBCH), on 21 trials and at two separate single timings in the spring when crop growth stages were within the range of 25-31 (BBCH) at the first timings and 32-34 (BBCH) at second timings, on the other 2 trials.

Whilst no data has been generated in support of demonstrating the absence of adverse impact on the quality of the harvested grain in spring triticale, plant physiology, agronomic practices and susceptibility to phytotoxicity caused by herbicides can be considered to be very similar between winter and spring triticale. Data from trials carried out in winter triticale are therefore considered to be supportive of demonstrating the absence of adverse impact on the quality of the harvested grain of spring applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha in spring triticale.

Across trials, the potential impact of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) on quality of the grain has been tested under a wide range of climatic and agronomic conditions that are considered to be fully representative of those under which triticale is grown across countries in the EU Central Registration zone. Trials were carried out on a range of different commercially representative and commonly grown cultivars of triticale.

On 16 of these 23 trials, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the highest proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also at twice this rate (2.0 L product/ha) caused no phytotoxicity earlier in the season and also had no significant adverse effects on grain quality. On 7 of these 23 trials, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the highest proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and/or at twice this rate (2.0 L product/ha) caused mainly low and transient levels of phytotoxicity and/or other adverse effects on crop growth and development.

A comparison of levels of phytotoxicity and/or grain quality parameters on these 7 trials is given in Table 3.4-20.

On 1 other trial, ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the highest proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also at twice this rate (2.0 L product/ha) caused no phytotoxicity earlier in the season but had significant adverse effects on grain quality.

Grain quality evaluations were not carried out on 1 other crop selectivity trial on which ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the highest proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and/or at twice this rate (2.0 L product/ha) caused mainly low and transient phytotoxicity. As ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) caused no significant reductions in crop yield on these trials, it is considered highly unlikely that there would have been any adverse impact on grain quality.

Table 3.4-20: Comparison of levels of phytotoxicity to yield quality parameters on 9 crop selectivity trials carried out on winter triticale in which ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 1.0 L and/or 2.0 L product/ha caused phytotoxic symptoms and/or adverse impact on grain quality

EPPO climatic zone	Trial no.	Variety	Product			Maximum level of phytotoxicity (%) (timing)		Quality parameter (unit)	Untreated value	Quality parameter (as % of untreated)	
			Name	1N rate (L/ha)	Application timing (crop growth stage, BBCH)	1N rate	2N rate			1N rate	2N rate
Maritime	DE18HSTTLWI189J	Grenado	AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	35-37	21.3 (13 DAA)	16.2 (51 DAA)	HLW (Kg/hL)	77.7	98.4*	97.2*
			Axial 50 EC	1.2	35-37	34.8 (13 DAA)	36.3 (13 DAA)			99.2	98.8*
			AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	35-37	21.3 (13 DAA)	16.2 (51 DAA)	TGW (g)	42.8	89.7*	84.3*
			Axial 50 EC	1.2	35-37	34.8 (13 DAA)	36.3 (13 DAA)			91.9*	88.0*
	DE18HSTTLWI189K	Rhenio	AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	23-24	0	5.0 (14 DAA)	HLW (Kg/hL)	74.4	99.5	99.8
			Axial 50 EC	1.2	23-24	0	5.0 (14 DAA)			99.0	99.7
			AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	23-24	0	5.0 (14 DAA)	TGW (g)	32.5	98.3	100.6
			Axial 50 EC	1.2	23-24	0	5.0 (14 DAA)			99.9	101.6
	FR18HSTTLSS551A	Rgt Eleac	AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	29-31	0	3.8 (13 DAA)	HLW (Kg/hL)	59.2	98.8	99.0
				1.0	32-33	0.5 (14 DAA)	7.5 (14 DAA)			96.6	100
			Axial Pratic	1.2	29-31	18.1 (13 DAA)	23.0 (13 DAA)			100.3	98.9
			Atlantis PRO + Actirob B	1.5 + 1.0	29-31	0	11.0 (13 DAA)			96.9	98.1
	FR18HSTTLSS551C	Vuka	AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	24	2.5 (12 DAA)	4.5 (12 DAA)	No quality parameter evaluations were carried out		-	-
				1.0	33	6.3 (8 DAA)	15.1 (8 DAA)			-	-
			Axial Pratic	1.2	24	13.3 (12 DAA)	17.0 (12 DAA)			-	-
			Atlantis PRO + Actirob B	1.5 + 1.0	24	7.0 (12 DAA)	12.3 (12 DAA)			-	-
	FR18HSTTLSS551D	Kaulos	AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	25	4.0 (12 DAA)	7.3 (12 DAA)	HLW (Kg/hL)	66.6	99.1	98.7
				1.0	34	5.0 (8 DAA)	6.3 (8 DAA)			99.3	95.1*
			Axial Pratic	1.2	25	7.8 (12 DAA)	14.3 (12 DAA)			99.5	100.8
			Atlantis PRO + Actirob B	1.5 + 1.0	25	5.3 (12 DAA)	10.0 (12 DAA)			100.0	99.3
	CZ20HSTTLWI014A	Claudius	ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	31-32	0	0	HLW (Kg/hL)	73.7	98.7*	98.9
			Axial 50 EC	0.9	31-32	0	0			99.7	99.7
			Atlantis OD	1.0	31-32	0	0			99.4	98.7*
			ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	31-32	0	0	TGW (g)	41.0	98.3	96.3
			Axial 50 EC	0.9	31-32	0	0			99.9	99.5
			Atlantis OD	1.0	31-32	0	0			100.1	98.9
	DE20HSTTLWI178A	Barolo	ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	32-33	7.0 (14 DAA)	9.5 (14 DAA)	HLW (Kg/hL)	75.5	99.9	98.3
			Axial 50 EC	1.2	32-33	0	2.5 (28 DAA)			96.6	99.9
			ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	32-33	7.0 (14 DAA)	9.5 (14 DAA)	TGW (g)	49.7	97.4	99.2
			Axial 50 EC	1.2	32-33	0	2.5 (28 DAA)			100.8	98.5

EPPO climatic zone	Trial no.	Variety	Product			Maximum level of phytotoxicity (%) (timing)		Quality parameter (unit)	Untreated value	Quality parameter (as % of untreated)	
			Name	1N rate (L/ha)	Application timing (crop growth stage, BBCH)	1N rate	2N rate			1N rate	2N rate
South-east	HU18HSTTLWI121A	SU Agendus	AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	21-26	0	0.9 (22 DAA)	HLW (Kg/hL)	54.5	107.0	110.1
			Axial 50 EC	1.0	21-26	0	1.5 (22 DAA)			107.6	103.9
			AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	21-26	0	0.9 (22 DAA)	TGW (g)	34.1	95.4	92.5
			Axial 50 EC	1.0	21-26	0	1.5 (22 DAA)			98.4	100.5
	HU20HSTTLWI201A	Borowik	ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	23-30	0.5 (13 DAA)	0.5 (13 DAA)	HLW (Kg/hL)	69.4	104.3	105.1
			Axial 50 EC	0.9	23-30	0.8 (13 DAA)	1.0 (13 DAA)			103.8	103.6
			Atlantis OD	1.0	23-30	0.8 (13 DAA)	0.5 (13 DAA)			102.6	102.7
			ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	23-30	0.5 (13 DAA)	0.5 (13 DAA)	TGW (g)	37.9	105.7	107.7
			Axial 50 EC	0.9	23-30	0.8 (13 DAA)	1.0 (13 DAA)			102.7	101.7
			Atlantis OD	1.0	23-30	0.8 (13 DAA)	0.5 (13 DAA)			98.5	104.8

*statistically significant reductions compared to the untreated control at the 95% confidence level

There were no consistent or significant reductions in the various grain quality parameters evaluated on 5 of the 7 crop selectivity trials in which ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the highest proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and/or at twice this rate (2.0 L product/ha) caused mainly low and transient levels of phytotoxicity earlier in the season.

On the other 2 trials, AG-PM1-72 OD applied at both the 1.0 L and 2.0 L product/ha rates caused slight but statistically significant reductions in hectolitre weight of the grain on 1 trial with a single application timing and also on 1 trial with 2 application timings but only when applied at the 2.0 L product/ha rate at the later timing. Although significant, the magnitude of the reductions in hectolitre weight of the grain on these 2 trials are not considered to constitute a substantial adverse effect on the overall quality of the grain by AG-PM1-72 OD. Additionally, on 1 of these 2 trials, AG-PM1-72 OD applied at 1 timing at both the 1.0 L and 2.0 L product/ha rates caused statistically significant reductions in TGW. The standard reference product applied at the authorised label rate, and also at twice this rate, also caused the same phytotoxic symptoms and corresponding significant reductions in TGW, similar to those caused by AG-PM1-72 OD applied at the proposed label rate (1.0 L product/ha) and twice this rate (2.0 L product/ha).

On the 1 trial on which ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at both the 1.0 L and 2.0 L product/ha rates caused no phytotoxicity earlier in the season, a very slight but statistically significant reduction in HLW of the grain occurred with the 1.0 L product/ha rate. Although significant, this very slight reduction in HLW is not considered to constitute a substantial adverse effect on the overall quality of the grain by ADM.06001.H.2.B.

Data presented in Section 3.4.1 demonstrates that on the relatively few trials on cereals where ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) caused higher levels of phytotoxicity, these were generally attributable to more extreme unseasonal climatic conditions having resulted in the crop having been under stress at the time of or following application. The ADM.06001.H.2.B labels will therefore include cautionary statements to avoid application when crops are under stress due to adverse environmental conditions and that crop damage and potential reductions in yield and grain quality may occur when extremes in climatic conditions occur following application.

Considering that the levels of phytotoxicity caused by ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at twice the proposed maximum label rate can result in significant reductions in crop yield and grain quality, particularly when application is made to crops suffering from stress, the proposed labels for ADM.06001.H.2.B will advise to avoid sprayer overlap to reduce the risk of phytotoxic damage occurring at levels that could adversely impact on crop yield and grain quality.

Based on the absence of consistent or pronounced reductions in grain quality across trials, it is reasonable to conclude that a single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, and applied according to label recommendations, has no adverse impact on the quality of the grain in triticale.

3.4.3.4 Quality of the grain in winter rye (in the absence of weeds)

Evaluations of quality parameters of the harvested grain have been carried out following single applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, and also at twice this rate to simulate sprayer overlap, on 22 of the 25 crop selectivity trials conducted between 2018 and 2020 for the specific purpose of demonstrating the crop safety in rye in the absence of impact of weeds. On 1 of these trials, uneven crop lodging occurred across the trial area prior to harvest resulting in heterogeneous grain quality data, which has therefore been excluded from the summary presented here.

Of other 21 trials, 8 were carried out in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (2 in France, 2 in Czech Republic, 4 in Germany), 7 were carried out in North-east EPPO climatic zone (all in Poland) and 6 were carried out in South-east EPPO climatic zone (3 in Hungary, 3 in Romania).

On these 21 trials, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) was applied at a single timing in the spring, when crop growth stages were within the range of 21-39 (BBCH), on 20 trials and at two separate single timings in the spring, when the crop growth stage was at 25 (BBCH) at the first timing and at 33 (BBCH) at the second timing, on the other 1 trial.

Whilst no data has been generated in support of demonstrating the absence of adverse impact on the quality of the harvested grain in spring rye, plant physiology, agronomic practices and susceptibility to phytotoxicity caused by herbicides can be considered to be very similar between winter and spring rye. Data from trials carried out in winter rye are therefore considered to be supportive of demonstrating the absence of adverse impact on the quality of the harvested grain of spring applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha in spring rye.

Across trials, the potential impact of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) on quality of the grain has been tested under a wide range of climatic and agronomic conditions that are considered to be fully representative of those under which rye is grown across countries in the EU Central Registration zone. Trials were carried out on a range of different commercially representative and commonly grown cultivars of rye.

On 6 of these 21 trials, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the highest proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and also at twice this rate (2.0 L product/ha) caused no phytotoxicity earlier in the season and also had no significant adverse effects on grain quality. On 15 of these 21 trials, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the highest proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and/or at twice this rate (2.0 L product/ha) caused low to relatively high, but in some cases transient, levels of phytotoxicity and/or other adverse effects on crop growth and development.

A comparison of levels of phytotoxicity and grain quality parameters on these 15 trials is given in Table 3.4-21.

Grain quality evaluations were not carried out on 3 other crop selectivity trials on which AG-PM1-72 OD applied at the highest proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and/or at twice this rate (2.0 L product/ha) caused mainly low to moderate and/or transient phytotoxicity. In which case it is considered unlikely that there would have been any adverse impact on grain quality.

Table 3.4-21: Comparison of levels of phytotoxicity to yield quality parameters on 18 crop selectivity trials carried out on winter rye in which ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at 1.0 L and/or 2.0 L product/ha caused phytotoxic symptoms

EPPO climatic zone	Trial no.	Variety	Product			Maximum level of phytotoxicity (%) (timing)		Quality parameter (unit)	Untreated value	Quality parameter (as % of untreated)	
			Name	1N rate (L/ha)	Application timing (crop growth stage, BBCH)	1N rate	2N rate			1N rate	2N rate
Maritime	CZ20HSSECCW013A	Inspector	ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	32-33	7.6 (14 DAA)	24.3 (14 DAA)	HLW (Kg/hL)	71.7	99.9	99.9
			Axial 50 EC	0.9	32-33	19.7 (14 DAA)	30.1 (14 DAA)			100.1	100.0
			Atlantis OD	0.6	32-33	9.4 (14 DAA)	13.0 (14 DAA)			99.9	100.0
			ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	32-33	7.6 (14 DAA)	24.3 (14 DAA)	TGW (g)	31.7	98.9	99.7
			Axial 50 EC	0.9	32-33	19.7 (14 DAA)	30.1 (14 DAA)			99.5	98.5
			Atlantis OD	0.6	32-33	9.4 (14 DAA)	13.0 (14 DAA)			99.6	100.1
	DE18HSSECCW189A	SU Forsetti	AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	33	11.3 (88 DAA)	43.5 (88 DAA)	HLW (Kg/hL)	75.3	99.1	97.4
			Axial 50 EC	1.2	33	35.6 (14 DAA)	60.3 (14 DAA)			99.2	99.5
			AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	33	11.3 (88 DAA)	43.5 (88 DAA)	TGW (g)	26.8	95.9	86.7
			Axial 50 EC	1.2	33	35.6 (14 DAA)	60.3 (14 DAA)			97.8	98.3
	DE18HSSECCW189C	Helltop	AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	31-33	35.1 (15 DAA)	45.1 (15 DAA)	HLW (Kg/hL)	79.8	99.6	99.1
			Axial 50 EC	1.2	31-33	43.7 (15 DAA)	60.0 (15 DAA)			99.3	99.5
			AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	31-33	35.1 (15 DAA)	45.1 (15 DAA)	TGW (g)	32.2	93.4	89.6*
			Axial 50 EC	1.2	31-33	43.7 (15 DAA)	60.0 (15 DAA)			97.1	96.1
	DE20HSSECCW177A	Binntto	ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	30-31	15.0 (12 DAA)	18.8 (12 DAA)	HLW (Kg/hL)	72.3	100.1	99.1
			Axial 50 EC	1.2	30-31	5.0 (12 DAA)	15.0 (12 DAA)			101.5	100.1
			ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	30-31	15.0 (12 DAA)	18.8 (12 DAA)	TGW (g)	35.3	95.3	94.3
			Axial 50 EC	1.2	30-31	5.0 (12 DAA)	15.0 (12 DAA)			97.2	97.4
	FR18HSSECCSS551A	Composite	AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	25-30	2.5 (7 DAA)	6.3 (7 DAA)	No quality parameter evaluations were carried out		-	-
				1.0	37-49	7.5 (34 DAA)	12.5 (34 DAA)			-	-
			Axial Pratic	1.2	25-30	0	0			-	-
			Atlantis PRO + Actirob B	1.5 + 1.0	25-30	7.5 (7 DAA)	15.0 (7 DAA)			-	-
	FR18HSSECCSS551B	Daniello	AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	30-31	0	1.5 (8 DAA)	No quality parameter evaluations were carried out		-	-
				1.0	37-39	12.5 (36 DAA)	17.5 (36 DAA)			-	-
			Axial Pratic	1.2	30-31	0.5 (8 DAA)	1.5 (8 DAA)			-	-
			Atlantis PRO + Actirob B	1.5 + 1.0	30-31	6.3 (8 DAA)	8.8 (8 DAA)			-	-

EPPO climatic zone	Trial no.	Variety	Product			Maximum level of phytotoxicity (%) (timing)		Quality parameter (unit)	Untreated value	Quality parameter (as % of untreated)	
			Name	1N rate (L/ha)	Application timing (crop growth stage, BBCH)	1N rate	2N rate			1N rate	2N rate
Maritime -continued	FR18HSSECSS551C	KWS Serafino	AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	25	22.5 (41 DAA)	28.8 (41 DAA)	HLW (Kg/hL)	73.7	100.2	98.6
				1.0	33	32.5 (14 DAA)	37.5 (14 DAA)			99.3	99.1
			Axial Pratic	1.2	25	35.0 (14 DAA)	47.5 (14 DAA)			100.4	100.2
			Atlantis PRO + Actirob B	1.5 + 1.0	25	35.1 (14 DAA)	60.0 (14 DAA)			99.7	99.2
	FR18HSSECSS551D	Livado	AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	25	25.0 (28 DAA)	27.5 (28 DAA)	No quality parameter evaluations were carried out		-	-
				1.0	33	30.0 (14 DAA)	31.3 (14 DAA)			-	-
			Axial Pratic	1.2	25	30.0 (28 DAA)	38.8 (14 DAA)			-	-
			Atlantis PRO + Actirob B	1.5 + 1.0	33	25.0 (28 DAA)	30.0 (28 DAA)			-	-
	FR20HSSECSS557A	SU Performer	ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	27	17.5 (14 DAA)	25.0 (14 DAA)	HLW (Kg/hL)	75.5	99.2*	92.9*
			Axial Pratic	1.2	27	3.8 (14 DAA)	8.8 (14 DAA)	TGW (g)	31.3	99.2*	99.4*
			ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	27	17.5 (14 DAA)	25.0 (14 DAA)			102.4	92.8*
			Axial Pratic	1.2	27	3.8 (14 DAA)	8.8 (14 DAA)	99.2	99.2		
	CZ18HSSECSS080A	Inspector	AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	26-31	16.3 (14 DAA)	33.8 (14 DAA)	HLW (Kg/hL)	76.2	97.3	96.2*
			Atlantis OD	0.6	26-31	2.8 (49 DAA)	3.2 (49 DAA)	TGW (g)	31.8	100.1	99.0
			AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	26-31	16.3 (14 DAA)	33.8 (14 DAA)			97.2	97.7
			Atlantis OD	0.6	26-31	2.8 (49 DAA)	3.2 (49 DAA)	Protein content (%)	11.0	96.1	92.3*
			AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	26-31	16.3 (14 DAA)	33.8 (14 DAA)			99.7	100.0
			Atlantis OD	0.6	26-31	2.8 (49 DAA)	3.2 (49 DAA)			101.4	99.7
North-east	PL20HSSECSS013A	KWS Jethro	ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	31	0	5.3 (14 DAA)	HLW (Kg/hL)	67.6	99.9	99.7
			Axial 50 EC	0.9	31	7.8 (14 DAA)	9.5 (14 DAA)	TGW (g)	24.6	99.9	99.3
			ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	31	0	5.3 (14 DAA)			100.0	101.8
			Axial 50 EC	0.9	31	7.8 (14 DAA)	9.5 (14 DAA)	101.2	100.7		
	PL20HSSECSS013B	Brasetto	ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	30-31	0	20.0 (13 DAA)	HLW (Kg/hL)	66.8	100.0	99.7
			Axial 50 EC	0.9	30-31	0	0	TGW (g)	28.2	99.7	99.4
			ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	30-31	0	20.0 (13 DAA)			103.4	101.8
			Axial 50 EC	0.9	30-31	0	0	101.9	103.4		
	PL20HSSECSS013C	Theofano	ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	34-37	0	20.0 (13 DAA)	HLW (Kg/hL)	71.6	100.3	100.0
			Axial 50 EC	0.9	34-37	0	0	TGW (g)	29.2	100.4	100.0
			ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	34-37	0	20.0 (13 DAA)			99.6	99.6
			Axial 50 EC	0.9	34-37	0	0	100.6	99.5		

EPPO climatic zone	Trial no.	Variety	Product			Maximum level of phytotoxicity (%) (timing)		Quality parameter (unit)	Untreated value	Quality parameter (as % of untreated)	
			Name	1N rate (L/ha)	Application timing (crop growth stage, BBCH)	1N rate	2N rate			1N rate	2N rate
South-east	HU18HSSECCW121B	Varda	AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	31-32	4.0 (28 DAA)	5.8 (28 DAA)	HLW (Kg/hL)	71.1	98.9	97.9
			Axial 50 EC	1.0	31-32	5.0 (28 DAA)	8.5 (28 DAA)			98.9	97.9
			AG-PM1-72 OD	1.0	31-32	4.0 (28 DAA)	5.8 (28 DAA)	TGW (g)	37.1	97.9	98.4
			Axial 50 EC	1.0	31-32	5.0 (28 DAA)	8.5 (28 DAA)			100.8	97.1
	HU20HSSECCW201A	Protector	ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	26-31	13.4 (21 DAA)	37.2 (21 DAA)	HLW (Kg/hL)	80.9	103.5	96.3
			Axial 50 EC	0.9	26-31	17.0 (13 DAA)	16.6 (21 DAA)			103.8	99.5
			Atlantis OD	1.0	26-31	8.1 (21 DAA)	23.7 (21 DAA)			101.5	98.1
			ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	26-31	13.4 (21 DAA)	37.2 (21 DAA)			91.7*	81.8*
			Axial 50 EC	0.9	26-31	17.0 (13 DAA)	16.6 (21 DAA)	TGW (g)	27.9	98.6	92.0*
			Atlantis OD	1.0	26-31	8.1 (21 DAA)	23.7 (21 DAA)			93.3*	92.4*
			ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	21-23	15.0 (14 DAA)	25.0 (14 DAA)	HLW (Kg/hL)	68.8	95.6	98.8
			Axial 50 EC	0.9	21-23	22.6 (14 DAA)	25.0 (14 DAA)			101.1	97.7
	RO20HSSECCS237A	Suceveana	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	21-23	0	0			98.2	96.8
			ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	21-23	15.0 (14 DAA)	25.0 (14 DAA)			84.4*	91.8*
			Axial 50 EC	0.9	21-23	22.6 (14 DAA)	25.0 (14 DAA)	TGW (g)	31.9	88.9*	87.0*
			Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	21-23	0	0			90.3*	82.8*
			ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	30-32	20.0 (14 DAA)	30.0 (14 DAA)	HLW (Kg/hL)	70.4	95.6	98.7
			Axial 50 EC	0.9	30-32	55.0 (14 DAA)	60.0 (14 DAA)			101.1	97.8
	RO20HSSECCS237B	Amilo	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	30-32	0	10.0 (14 DAA)			98.2	96.8
			ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	30-32	20.0 (14 DAA)	30.0 (14 DAA)			84.4*	91.8*
			Axial 50 EC	0.9	30-32	55.0 (14 DAA)	60.0 (14 DAA)	TGW (g)	45.3	88.9*	87.0*
			Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	30-32	0	10.0 (14 DAA)			90.3*	82.8*
			ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	34-35	20.0 (14 DAA)	30.0 (14 DAA)	HLW (Kg/hL)	67.1	99.9	100.2
			Axial 50 EC	0.9	34-35	55.0 (14 DAA)	60.0 (14 DAA)			99.7	100.0
	RO20HSSECCS237C	Suceveana	Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	34-35	0	10.0 (14 DAA)			99.9	99.8
			ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	34-35	20.0 (14 DAA)	30.0 (14 DAA)			99.4	99.7
			Axial 50 EC	0.9	34-35	55.0 (14 DAA)	60.0 (14 DAA)	TGW (g)	38.7	100.1	99.1
			Atlantis Flex	0.33 Kg	34-35	0	10.0 (14 DAA)			100.1	99.2

*statistically significant reductions compared to the untreated control at the 95% confidence level

On 11 of the 15 crop selectivity trials in which ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the highest proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha caused phytotoxicity, there were no subsequent pronounced or statistically significant effects on grain quality.

On the other 4 trials, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the 1.0 L product/ha caused statistically significant reductions in hectolitre weight of the grain on 1 trial and thousand grain weight on 3 trials.

On 9 of 15 crop selectivity trials in which ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at twice the highest proposed label rate (2.0 L product/ha) caused phytotoxicity, there were no subsequent pronounced or statistically significant effects on grain quality.

On the other 6 trials, ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the 2.0 L product/ha caused significant reductions in hectolitre weight of the grain on 1 trial, thousand grain weight on 4 trials and both hectolitre weight of the grain and thousand grain weight on 1 trial.

Where occurring, the magnitude of the reductions in grain quality caused by ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the 1.0 L and/or 2.0 L product/ha generally reflected differences in the levels of phytotoxicity on the trials and in most cases standard reference products applied at authorised label rates and twice these rate caused similar reductions in grain quality to those caused by ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD).

Data presented in Section 3.4.1 demonstrates that on most of the trials on rye where ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) caused higher levels of phytotoxicity, these were generally attributable to more extreme unseasonal climatic conditions having resulted in the crop having been under stress at the time of or following application. The ADM.06001.H.2.B labels will therefore include cautionary statements to avoid application when crops are under stress due to adverse environmental conditions and that crop damage and potential reductions in yield and grain quality may occur when extremes in climatic conditions follow application. Furthermore, specifically relating to application on rye, the ADM.06001.H.2.B labels will include cautionary statements to only apply to actively growing healthy crops and only in situations where target weed infestations are likely to substantially impact on crop yield and quality and there are limited alternative options available to provide effective control.

Considering that the levels of phytotoxicity caused by ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at twice the proposed maximum label rate can result in significant reductions in grain quality, particularly when application is made to crops suffering from stress, the proposed labels for ADM.06001.H.2.B will advise to avoid sprayer overlap to reduce the risk of phytotoxic damage occurring at levels that could adversely impact on grain quality.

Based on the absence of consistent or pronounced reductions in most of the trials, it is reasonable to conclude that a single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, and applied according to label recommendations, has no adverse impact on the quality of the grain in rye.

**Comments of zRMS on:
Effects on quality of plants and plant products (3.4.3)**

Significant reduction of yield quality parameters (HLW or TGW) associated with the occurrence of phytotoxicity symptoms was noted in:

- 1 of 30 trials conducted on winter wheat, after application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at 2N dose (HLW, Maritime zone).
- 1 of 23 trials on winter triticale, after application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at 1N dose (HLW, TGW, Maritime zone)
- 2 of 23 trials on winter triticale, after application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at 2N dose (HLW, Maritime zone)
- 1 of 23 trials on winter triticale, after application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at 2N dose (TGW, Maritime zone)
- 1 of 21 trials on winter rye, after application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at 1N dose (HLW, Maritime zone)
- 3 of 21 trials on winter rye, after application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at 1N dose (TGW, South-East zone)
- 2 of 21 trials on winter rye, after application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at 2N dose (HLW, Maritime zone)
- 5 of 21 trials on winter rye, after application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at 2N dose (TGW, South-East zone (3), Maritime zone (2))

Similar reductions in crop yield quality parameters were also demonstrated after application of some reference products.

Significant reduction of yield quality parameters (HLW or TGW) not associated with the occurrence of phytotoxicity symptoms was noted in:

- 1 of 30 trials conducted on winter wheat, after application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at 1N dose (TGW, North-East zone).
- 1 of 23 trials on winter triticale, after application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at 1N dose (HLW, Maritime zone)

According to the GAP table and explanation given by the applicant during evaluation process, spring rye and spring triticale are not a claimed crops. Therefore, the extrapolation of trial results from winter rye to spring rye and from winter triticale to spring triticale is not a subject of the evaluation.

Based on the trials results, it can be concluded that ADM.06001.H.2.B applied once at the maximum recommended dose rate of 1.0 L/ha had no adverse effect on the yield quality parameters in most of the trials conducted on winter wheat, spring wheat, winter triticale and winter rye. Significant reductions in crop yield quality parameters were noted in some trials and were usually associated with phytotoxicity, that was earlier demonstrated and described. To prevent phytotoxicity occurrence at the level that could cause crop yield quality reduction it is recommended to include in the label remark to avoid sprayer overlap and not to perform treatments in time when crops are under stress due to unfavourable environmental conditions and when crops are weakened or damaged by pests, frosts, flooding or drought. In case of application on rye, the ADM.06001.H.2.B labels in Maritime and South-East EPPO zone are recommended to include cautionary statements to only apply to actively growing healthy crops and only in situations where target weed infestations are likely to substantially impact on crop yield and there are limited alternative options available to provide effective control.

3.4.4 Effects on transformation processes (KCP 6.4.4)

Products containing either pinoxaden or mesosulfuron-methyl have been authorised and extensively used as herbicides in cereals across EU countries for many years, at rates which deliver the same or higher amounts of active substance to those delivered by ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, and have therefore been proven through widespread commercial use to have no adverse effects on relevant transformation processes (bread making).

Furthermore, data from trials on cereals (wheat, durum wheat, triticale, rye) summarised in this dossier show ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha to cause no phytotoxicity or adverse effects on crop yield or grain quality (hectolitre weight, thousand grain weight, protein content).

Additionally, processing (milling, bread making) has been carried out on grain sampled at commercial harvest following a single application of AG-PM1-72 OD at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha on 2 trials carried out in 2018 on winter wheat.

AG-PM1-72 OD and ADM.06001.H.2.B are the same formulation type (OD) and contain the same amounts of both pinoxaden (60 g/L) and mesosulfuron-methyl (12 g/L), differing only in the content of co-formulants. It is considered to be the active substances, rather than the formulation, that have potential to affect processing and therefore data generated with AG-PM1-72 OD on these trials are fully supportive of demonstrating that ADM.06001.H.2.B has no adverse effects on transformation processes.

Both of these trials were carried out in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (in France).

Both trials that generated samples of grain for processing and subsequent taint testing following an application of AG-PM1-72 OD in winter wheat are listed in Table 3.4-22.

Table 3.4-22: List of all trials that generated samples of grain for processing and taint testing following a single application of AG-PM1-72 OD in winter wheat

Crop	Trial number	Variety	EPPO climatic zone	Country	Year trial conducted	Transformation processes
TRZAW	FR18HPTRZAW551A	Alixan	Maritime	France	2018	Bread making
TRZAW	FR18HPTRZAW551B	Fructidor	Maritime	France	2018	Bread making

Both trials were carried out by organisations that are officially recognised as competent to carry out efficacy testing in accordance with Regulation (EU) 284/2013 by the authorities in the relevant countries.

Processing and taint testing phases of the studies were carried out by an accredited organisation to NF ISO 5529, NF ISO 5530-4, NF V 03-716 and NF ISO 4120.

Table 3.4-23: Details on trial methodology (trials generating samples for processing)

Maritime EPPO climatic zone		
Guidelines	General guidelines	EPPO PP1/181 (4), EPPO PP1/135 (4)
	Specific guidelines	EPPO PP 1/243 (2), EPPO PP 1/242 (2), CEB Method No. 218
Experimental design	Plot design	RCBD (2)
	Plot size	25 m ² (2)
	Number of replications	3 (2)
Crop	Trials per crop	Winter wheat (2)
	Varieties per crop	Alixan (1), Fructidor (1)
	Sowing period	October (1), November (1)
Application	Crop stage (BBCH) at application	from 30 to 31 (BBCH)
	Number of applications Interval between applications	1 (2)
	Spray volumes	200 L/ha (1), 225 L/ha (1)
Processing	Procedure – commodity	Zeleny indices and Chopin alveograph values- flour Baking test- dough
Assessments	Assessment types	HLW (kg/hL), TGW (g), protein content (%), moisture content (%), impurities content (%), cracked grain (%), Hagberg Falling number (s), % germination, Zeleny, tenacity/expandability (P/L), index of elasticity (Ie), extensibility (G), baking strength (W), crumb/100, dough/100, bread/100

Products included in trials carried out in winter wheat that generated samples for processing and taint tests are listed in Table 3.4-2.

Justification for data outside country of submission

Agronomic practices in the cultivation of cereal crops are considered to be sufficiently similar across countries within the Central Registration zone for data generated across all trials to be fully supportive of demonstrating the crop safety of ADM.06001.H.2.B in all countries.

Justification for the use of crop safety data included in this dossier is made according to EPPO PP 1/241(1) “Guidance on comparable climates”.

Both trials were carried out in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (in France) and are therefore fully supportive towards demonstrating any potential effects on processing caused by ADM.06001.H.2.B in the EU Central Registration zone, with respect to all relevant countries within this EPPO climatic zone.

It is considered that the potential for a product to have effects on processing procedures is sufficiently similar under different climatic conditions for data generated in trials carried out in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone to be fully supportive towards demonstrating that ADM.06001.H.2.B has no adverse effects on processing and causes no taints of the processed commodity under conditions in other relevant EPPO climatic zones.

Trials methodology in relation to EPPO

Trials were conducted according to the EPPO guidelines stated in 3.4-23. The hyperlinks to the GEP certificates of the official testing organisation are provided in Section 3.7.

On both trials, a single application of the treatments was made when crop growth stage were within the range of 30-31 (BBCH) and therefore representative of the proposed label range of 13-39 (BBCH) for the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B.

The standard reference product was applied according to the label recommendations.

Between trials, treatments were applied in water volumes of either 200 L or 225 L/ha and therefore representative of proposed label ranges either of or within 80-300 L/ha for the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B.

Sampling of the grain was carried out either 91 or 97 days after application of the treatments, which corresponded with normal commercial harvest when the crops were at growth stage 89 (BBCH).

A minimum 5 Kg sample of grain was taken from each plot. Samples were kept at ambient temperature and delivered to the processing facility either 77 or 78 days after sampling.

Processing

Processing (milling, bread making) was carried out on the grain sampled at commercial harvest following a single application of AG-PM1-72 OD at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha on winter wheat.

Bread making – bread making was carried following the NF V 03-716 procedure.

Measurements were made of physiochemical (Zeleny), Chopin alveograph and baking test parameters of the processing procedures.

Taint tests

Bread samples were subjected to triangle taint tests, where those produced from the grain from the AG-PM1-72 OD treated plots were compared to those produced from grain from plots treated with the standard reference product (Axial One). Taint tests were carried out in accordance with EPPO standard 1/242(2). For the triangle taint tests, a set of three coded samples were presented to 18 assessors, two samples from the same treatment and one from the other treatment in each test. The assessors were then asked to identify the different sample and to describe any differences perceived in the flavour and odour between the samples in each test.

A summary of these key quality parameters of the grain sampled from the 2 trials and the subsequent processing procedures is given in tables: 3.4.4-1.

Table 3.4.4: Key quality parameters of the grain and processing procedures

Trial No. (Variety)	FR18HPTRZAW551A (Alixan)		FR18HPTRZAW551B (Fructidor)	
Measured parameter (unit)	AG-PM1-72 OD 1.0 L/ha	Axial One 1.3 L/ha	AG-PM1-72 OD 1.0 L/ha	Axial One 1.3 L/ha
Grain quality parameters				
Hectolitre weight (kg/hL)	77.833	77.700	80.567	80.433
Protein content (%)	11.300	11.133	11.967	11.767
Hagberg falling number (sec)	408.667	408.000	366.000	357.667
Cracked grain (%)	0.853	0.700	0.707*	1.123*
Impurities (%)	2.713	2.767	2.927	3.017
Germinated grain (%)	0.063	0.190	0.000	0.000
IMP (%)	0.670	0.700	0.337	0.347
Thousand grain weight (g)	43.967	44.367	44.167	43.667
Flour and dough quality parameters				
Physicochemical analysis				
Zeleny (ml)	36	36	34	34
Chopin alveograph				
P/L (mmH ₂ O)	1.24	1.51	0.70	0.86
W (10-4 J)	219*	196*	192	179
G	18.6*	17.1*	21.4*	19*
P	87	89	64	67
L	70	59	92	78
Index of elasticity (%)	54.0	53.0	53.0	52.9
Baking test quality parameters				
Hydration (%)	61.5	61.7	60.5	60.5
Dough mark (/100)	99	99	97	97
Bread mark (/100)	74	74	78	80
Crumbs mark (/100)	100	100	100	100
Total grade (/100)	273	273	273	273

A summary of the triangle taint test results is given in Table

Table 3.4-25: Triangle taint test results on bread produced from grain sampled following a single application of AG-PM1-72 OD at 1.0 L product/ha

Trial No.	Variety	Pre-harvest interval	Taint test comparison	No. of assessors	No. of correct answers	Significant difference at 95% confidence interval
FR18HPTRZAW551A	Alixan	91	AG-PM1-72 OD to Axial One	18	6	no
FR18HPTRZAW551B	Fructidor	97	AG-PM1-72 OD to Axial One	18	5	no

Summary and conclusions

Processing (milling, bread making), with subsequent taint testing of the bread, has been carried out on grain sampled from 2 trials carried out within the Maritime (France) EPPO climatic zone in 2018 on winter wheat.

Whilst both trials have been carried out in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone, it is reasonable to consider that the potential for a product to impact on processing procedures or to cause taints of the processed commodity is sufficiently similar under different climatic conditions for the data generated in trials carried out in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone to be fully supportive of demonstrating that ADM.06001.H.2.B has no adverse impact on processing and causes no taints under conditions in the North-east and South-east EPPO climatic zones.

A single application of AG-PM1-72 OD was made at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha on both trials, when crop growth stages were within the range of 30-31 (BBCH) and with pre-harvest intervals between the final application and sampling of 91 and 97 days. Although application on both of these trials was at earlier timings than the latest crop growth stage in the range of 13-39 (BBCH) proposed for ADM.06001.H.2.B in cereals, the data from both trials is considered supportive of demonstrating absence of adverse effects on processing procedures.

On both trials, the quality of the grain and parameters of the bread making processes following the application of AG-PM1-72 OD was compared to those following application of a standard reference product (Axial One) applied at the authorised rate and according to label recommendations.

Compared to a standard reference product applied at the authorised label rate, a single application of AG-PM1-72 OD at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha had no significant adverse impact on grain, flour, dough or bread quality or key quality parameter measurements in the processing procedures (milling, bread making) and caused no significant taints of bread produced from grain sampled from either of these 2 trials.

AG-PM1-72 OD and ADM.06001.H.2.B are the same formulation type (OD) and contain the same amounts of both pinoxaden (60 g/L) and mesosulfuron-methyl (12 g/L), differing only in the content of co-formulants. It is considered to be the active substances, rather than the formulation, that have potential to affect processing and therefore data generated with AG-PM1-72 OD on these trials are fully supportive of demonstrating that ADM.06001.H.2.B has no adverse effects on transformation processes.

Based on the absence of adverse effects on bread making processes and taints of the bread produced from grain on either of these trials, it is therefore reasonable to conclude that a single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at up to the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and when applied according to other label recommendations in wheat has no adverse effects on processing procedures and causes no taints of processed commodity.

Considering the close comparability between agronomic practices and the physiological similarities between cereal crop types, it is considered possible to extrapolate potential for ADM.06001.H.2.B to impact on relevant transformation processes on wheat to other cereal crop types and conclude that ADM.06001.H.2.B also has no adverse effects on baking and other processing procedures that are applicable to other cereal crop types (durum wheat, triticale, rye).

**Comments of zRMS on:
Effects on transformation processes (3.4.4)**

The effect of AG-PM1-72 OD applied at recommended dose rate of 1.0 L/ha on processing (milling, bread making) and taint testing of the bread were carried out on the wheat grain sampled from two trials conducted in France in 2018. In both trials, the previous formulation AG-PM1-72 OD was tested. If ADM.06001.H.2.B and AG-PM1-72 OD contain the same amount of active substances and differ only in the content of some co-formulants, results from trials with AG-PM1-72 OD can be used for the evaluation of possible impact of ADM.06001.H.2.B on transformation processes. Detailed trial results have been presented in BAD document (tables: 3.4.4-1 and 3.4.4-5). Results from both trials demonstrated no significant adverse impact of AG-PM1-72 OD on grain quality (hectolitre weight, cracked grain, impurities, germinated grain, IMP, thousand grain weight, protein content, Hagberg falling number), flour and dough quality (Zeleny indices, Chopin alveograph values) and baking tests quality parameters (hydration, dough mark, bread mark, crumbs mark, total grade). Based on the results from sensory analysis, AG-PM1-72 OD caused also no significant taints of bread produced from grain sampled from both trials. Based on the submitted trial results, it can be concluded that no adverse effects on transformation processes (bread making) is to be expected after application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at recommended dose rate of 1.0 L/ha in cereal crops.

3.4.5 Impact on treated plants or plant parts to be used for propagation (KCP 6.4.5)

Germination testing has been carried out on seed sampled at commercial harvest following a single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, and also at twice this rate (2.0 L product/ha) to simulate sprayer overlap, from 62 of the crop selectivity trials carried out between 2018 and 2020 on cereals.

Of these 62 trials, 22 were carried out within the Maritime climatic zone, 19 were carried out within the North-east climatic zone and 21 were carried out within the South-east climatic zone, with 21 generated data on winter wheat, 6 generated data on spring wheat, 15 generated data on triticale and 20 generated data on rye.

Based on data presented in Section 3.2.1.4 that demonstrates comparability between the crop safety of ADM.06001.H.2.B and that of AG-PM1-72 OD, containing the same amounts of both active substances and applied at the same rate, data on the viability of progeny seed for AG-PM1-72 OD from trials in 2018 are summarised together with that for ADM.06001.H.2.B from trials in 2020, as fully supportive of demonstrating the absence of adverse impact on the viability of the progeny seed of ADM.06001.H.2.B in cereal crops.

A summary of the numbers of crop selectivity trials that generated data on the viability of progeny seed following the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) on cereals are listed in Table 3.4-24.

Table 3.4-24: A summary of the numbers of crop selectivity trials that generated data on the viability of the progeny seed following single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) on cereal crops

Trial number	Crop	Crop stage (BBCH) at application	EPPO climatic zone	Year trial conducted	Country
CZ18HSTRZAW078A	TRZAW	26-27	Maritime	2018	Czech Republic
CZ18HSTRZAW078B	TRZAW	25-27	Maritime	2018	Czech Republic
DE18HSTRZAW189F	TRZAW	30	Maritime	2018	Germany
DE18HSTRZAW189G	TRZAW	37-39	Maritime	2018	Germany
DE18HSTRZAW189H	TRZAW	27-29	Maritime	2018	Germany
DE20HSTRZAW175A	TRZAW	33	Maritime	2020	Germany
FR20HSTRZAW554D	TRZAW	32-33	Maritime	2020	France
FR20HSTRZAW554E	TRZAW	32	Maritime	2020	France
HU18HSTRZAW121A	TRZAW	29-31	South-east	2018	Hungary
HU18HSTRZAW121B	TRZAW	37-39	South-east	2018	Hungary
HU20HSTRZAW201A	TRZAW	30-31	South-east	2020	Hungary
HU20HSTRZAW201B	TRZAW	31	South-east	2020	Hungary
HU20HSTRZAW201C	TRZAW	31-33	South-east	2020	Hungary
PL18HSTRZAW016A	TRZAW	35-37	North-east	2018	Poland
PL18HSTRZAW016B	TRZAW	33-37	North-east	2018	Poland
PL18HSTRZAW016C	TRZAW	35-39	North-east	2018	Poland
PL18HSTRZAW016D	TRZAW	33-35	North-east	2018	Poland
PL20HSTRZAW011C	TRZAW	31-32	North-east	2020	Poland
PL20HSTRZAW011D	TRZAW	31-32	North-east	2020	Poland
RO20HSTRZAW239B	TRZAW	31-32	South-east	2020	Romania
RO20HSTRZAW239C	TRZAW	36-37	South-east	2020	Romania
DE18HSTRZAS189E	TRZAS	25-26	Maritime	2018	Germany
FR20HSTRZAS556A	TRZAS	37-39	Maritime	2020	France
HU18HSTRZAS121A	TRZAS	14-16	South-east	2018	Hungary
HU18HSTRZAS121B	TRZAS	31-33	South-east	2018	Hungary
PL20HSTRZAS012A	TRZAS	29-30	North-east	2020	Poland
RO20HSTRZAS238B	TRZAS	30-32	South-east	2020	Romania
CZ18HSTTLWI081A	TTLWI	27-29	Maritime	2018	Czech Republic
CZ20HSTTLWI014A	TTLWI	31-32	Maritime	2020	Czech Republic
DE18HSTTLWI189I	TTLWI	32	Maritime	2018	Germany
DE18HSTTLWI189J	TTLWI	35-37	Maritime	2018	Germany
DE18HSTTLWI189K	TTLWI	23-24	Maritime	2018	Germany
DE20HSTTLWI178A	TTLWI	32-33	Maritime	2020	Germany
HU18HSTTLWI121B	TTLWI	30-32	South-east	2018	Hungary
HU20HSTTLWI201A	TTLWI	23-30	South-east	2020	Hungary
HU20HSTTLWI201B	TTLWI	31-33	South-east	2020	Hungary
PL18HSTTLSS018A	TTLWI	28-30	North-east	2018	Poland
PL18HSTTLSS018B	TTLWI	35-39	North-east	2018	Poland
PL18HSTTLSS018C	TTLWI	35-39	North-east	2018	Poland
PL18HSTTLSS018D	TTLWI	34-37	North-east	2018	Poland
PL20HSTTLSS014A	TTLWI	31-33	North-east	2020	Poland
RO20HSTTLSS240B	TTLWI	33-34	South-east	2020	Romania
CZ18HSSECCW080A	SECCW	26-31	Maritime	2018	Czech Republic
CZ20HSSECCW013A	SECCW	32-33	Maritime	2020	Czech Republic
DE18HSSECCW189A	SECCW	33	Maritime	2018	Germany
DE18HSSECCW189B	SECCW	27-29	Maritime	2018	Germany
DE18HSSECCW189C	SECCW	31-33	Maritime	2018	Germany
DE20HSSECCW177A	SECCW	30-31	Maritime	2020	Germany
HU18HSSECCW121A	SECCW	30-31	South-east	2018	Hungary
HU18HSSECCW121B	SECCW	31-32	South-east	2018	Hungary
HU20HSSECCW201A	SECCW	26-31	South-east	2020	Hungary
HU20HSSECCW201B	SECCW	31-33	South-east	2020	Hungary
PL18HSSECCS019A	SECCW	32-34	North-east	2018	Poland
PL18HSSECCS019B	SECCW	35-39	North-east	2018	Poland
PL18HSSECCS019C	SECCW	39	North-east	2018	Poland
PL18HSSECCS019D	SECCW	39	North-east	2018	Poland
PL20HSSECCS013A	SECCW	31	North-east	2020	Poland
PL20HSSECCS013B	SECCW	30-31	North-east	2020	Poland
PL20HSSECCS013C	SECCW	34-37	North-east	2020	Poland
RO20HSSECCS237A	SECCW	21-23	South-east	2020	Romania
RO20HSSECCS237B	SECCW	30-32	South-east	2020	Romania
RO20HSSECCS237C	SECCW	34-35	South-east	2020	Romania

The materials and methods used in the crop selectivity trials from which data are summarised to demonstrate no adverse effects on the viability of progeny seed in cereals are given in Section 3.4.1.

The harvested seed from these 62 crop selectivity trials were tested for any adverse effects of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) on germination. Standard germination tests were carried out on seed sampled from plots in all trials according to ISTA rules (ref: International rules for seed testing, 1993 in Seed Science and technology, supplementary, Rules 1993).

Results from germination tests are presented below in the tables 3.4-25-3.4-30.

Table 3.4-25: Overall summary of mean % of healthy germinated seed from germination tests carried out on seed sampled at harvest following a single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) across 21 trials carried out on winter wheat

EPPO climatic zone (total number of trials)	No. of trials	Untreated	Mean % healthy germinated seed													
			ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)		Axial Pratic / Axial 50 EC / Axial Plus / Axial Pronto 60 (g pinoxaden/ha)						Atlantis Flex		Atlantis OD		Atlantis OD (+ Mero)	
			1.0 L/ha	2.0 L/ha	45 g/ha	90 g/ha	50 g/ha	100 g/ha	60 g/ha	120 g/ha	0.33 Kg/ha	0.66 Kg/ha	1.0 L/ha	2.0 L/ha	1.0 L/ha	2.0 L/ha
Maritime (8)	2	Mean	94.8	95.0	94.3	94.5	94.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Min-Max	91.5-98.0	93.0-97.0	91.5-97.0	93.0-96.0	94.0-95.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	6	Mean	84.4	85.9	85.8	-	-	-	-	83.6	82.8	-	-	-	-	-
		Min-Max	50.8-98.0	52.5-97.0	52.5-99.0	-	-	-	-	50.8-99.0	45.3-96.5	-	-	-	-	-
North-east (6)	6	Mean	91.4	91.8	92.3	-	-	-	-	91.8	91.7	-	-	-	-	-
		Min-Max	86.3-96.3	88.3-97.3	87.3-97.0	-	-	-	-	84.5-96.8	84.8-97.3	-	-	-	-	-
South-east (7)	2	Mean	76.4	77.6	80.5	-	-	77.9	78.4	-	-	-	-	-	81.1	78.1
		Min-Max	61.8-91.0	64.3-91.0	70.5-90.5	-	-	64.0-91.8	65.3-91.5	-	-	-	-	-	70.5-91.8	66.5-89.8
	5	Mean	97.4	97.0	97.7	-	-	-	-	97.4	97.6	-	-	-	-	-
		Min-Max	94.8-99.0	94.8-98.3	95.5-99.3	-	-	-	-	96.3-98.5	96.0-98.8	-	-	-	-	-
	2	Mean	98.3	98.1	98.6	-	-	-	-	-	98.4	98.6	-	-	-	-
		Min-Max	97.5-99.0	98.0-98.3	98.0-99.3	-	-	-	-	-	98.3-98.5	98.3-99.0	-	-	-	-
	3	Mean	96.8	96.2	97.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	96.3	96.9	-	-
		Min-Max	94.8-97.8	94.8-97.0	95.5-98.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	94.5-97.5	95.0-99.0	-	-

Table 3.4-26: Overall summary of germination test data on progeny seed sampled at harvest following a single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B in 1 trial carried out on winter wheat

EPPO climatic zone	No. of trials	Treatment	Rate (L/ha)	Mean % seed in each classification category		
				Germinated - normal	Germinated - abnormal	Ungerminated - healthy
				Mean	Mean	Mean
Maritime	1	Untreated	-	50.8	0.5	0.8
		ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	52.5	0.0	0.5
			2.0	52.5	0.0	0.3
		Axial Pratic	1.2	50.8	0.0	0.3
			2.4	45.3	0.0	1.0

Table 3.4-27: Overall summary of mean % of healthy germinated seed from germination tests carried out on seed sampled at harvest following a single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) across 6 trials carried out on spring wheat

EPPO climatic zone (total number of trials)	No. of trials		Mean % healthy germinated seed								
			Untreated	ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)		Axial 50 EC		Axial Pratic / Axial 50 EC		Atlantis Flex	
				1.0 L/ha	2.0 L/ha	1.0 L/ha	2.0 L/ha	1.2 L/ha	2.4 L/ha	0.33 Kg/ha	0.66 Kg/ha
Maritime (2)	2	Mean	95.4	95.1	94.6	-	-	94.1	94.4	-	-
		Min-Max	94.6-96.3	93.1-97.0	94.4-94.8	-	-	92.6-95.5	91.8-97.0	-	-
North-east (1)	1	Mean	96.5	96.8	98.0	-	-	98.3	97.5	-	-
South-east (3)	2	Mean	88.3	90.0	89.3	88.9	88.4	-	-	-	-
		Min-Max	87.3-89.3	87.8-92.3	88.3-90.3	88.5-89.3	87.5-89.3	-	-	-	-
	1	Mean	95.0	95.0	95.0	-	-	95.5	95.0	95.3	95.5

Table 3.4-28: Overall summary of germination test data on progeny seed sampled at harvest following a single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B in 1 trial carried out on spring wheat

EPPO climatic zone	No. of trials	Treatment	Rate (L /ha)	Mean % seed in each classification category		
				Germinated - normal	Germinated - abnormal	Ungerminated - healthy
				Mean	Mean	Mean
Maritime	1	Untreated	-	94.6	0.4	5.0
		ADM.06001.H.2.B	1.0	93.1	0.4	6.5
			2.0	94.4	0.8	4.9
		Axial Pratic	1.2	92.6	0.3	7.1
			2.4	91.8	0.4	7.9

Table 3.4-29: Overall summary of mean % of healthy germinated seed from germination tests carried out on seed sampled at harvest following a single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) across 15 trials carried out on triticale

EPPO climatic zone (total number of trials)	No. of trials		Mean % healthy germinated seed														
			Untreated	ADM.06001.H.2. B (or AG-PM1-72 OD)		Axial 50 EC / Axial Pronto 60 (g pinoxaden/ha)						Atlantis Flex		Atlantis OD		Zenith Gold	
				1.0 L/ha	2.0 L/ha	45 g/ha	90 g/ha	50 g/ha	100 g/ha	60 g/ha	120 g/ha	0.33 Kg/ha	0.66 Kg/ha	1.0 L/ha	2.0 L/ha	0.15 L/ha	0.3 L/ha
Maritime (6)	1	Mean	89.0	90.8	89.8	89.3	94.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	4	Mean	93.0	94.2	94.6	-	-	-	-	93.8	95.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Min-Max	82.0-97.3	87.3-98.0	88.5-97.3	-	-	-	-	90.8-97.8	92.8-98.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2	Mean	90.4	92.7	92.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	91.7	92.5	-	-
		Min-Max	89.0-91.8	90.8-94.5	89.8-95.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	90.3-93.0	89.8-95.3	-	-
North-east (5)	1	Mean	87.8	90.3	92.8	90.3	91.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	4	Mean	90.4	90.9	89.2	-	-	-	-	89.9	90.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Min-Max	88.3-93.5	86.8-95.5	83.3-93.3	-	-	-	-	85.3-93.8	86.8-93.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
South-east (4)	3	Mean	93.5	92.7	93.8	96.4	96.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Min-Max	89.5-97.0	86.5-97.5	90.8-96.5	94.5-97.8	94.0-97.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1	Mean	94.5	93.8	94.9	-	-	93.8	94.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1	Mean	94.0	94.0	94.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	94.3	93.8	-	-	-	-
	2	Mean	93.3	92.0	93.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	96.7	95.5	-	-
		Min-Max	89.5-97.0	86.5-97.5	90.8-96.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	95.8-97.5	93.0-98.0	-	-

Table 3.4-30: Overall summary of mean % of healthy germinated seed from germination tests carried out on seed sampled at harvest following a single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) across 20 trials carried out on rye

EPPO climatic zone (total number of trials)	No. of trials		Mean % healthy germinated seed																
			Untreated	ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72.0D)		Axial Pratic / Axial 50 EC / Axial Pronto 60 (g pinoxaden/ha)						Atlantis Flex		Atlantis OD				Zenith Gold	
				1.0 L/ha	2.0 L/ha	45 g/ha	90 g/ha	50 g/ha	100 g/ha	60 g/ha	120 g/ha	0.33 Kg/ha	0.66 Kg/ha	0.6 L/ha	1.2 L/ha	1.0 L/ha	2.0 L/ha	0.15 L/ha	0.3 L/ha
Maritime (6)	1	Mean	97.0	98.0	96.0	98.0	98.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	4	Mean	94.2	94.5	96.1	-	-	-	-	95.1	95.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Min - Max	88.3-98.0	89.5-97.0	92.3-97.8	-	-	-	-	90.5-97.5	90.8-99.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2	Mean	97.3	97.8	96.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	97.3	98.0	-	-	-	-
		Min - Max	97.0-97.5	97.5-98.0	96.0-97.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	96.0-98.5	97.5-98.5	-	-	-	-
	North-east (7)	7	Mean	93.1	93.5	93.1	93.4	93.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Min - Max			86.5-98.7	85.8-99.1	86.8-98.9	88.0-98.9	87.0-98.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
South-east (7)	5	Mean	89.1	90.3	90.2	89.6	88.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Min - Max	81.0-98.0	85.5-97.3	86.5-98.0	85.5-97.5	80.0-96.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2	Mean	86.4	86.5	86.5	-	-	86.8	87.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Min - Max	84.8-88.0	86.0-87.0	85.3-87.8	-	-	84.8-88.8	86.8-87.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2	Mean	89.5	93.8	92.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	93.4	90.0	-	-
		Min - Max	81.0-98.0	90.3-97.3	87.8-98.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	89.0-97.8	82.5-97.5	-	-
	3	Mean	88.8	88.0	88.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	88.3	88.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Min - Max	86.8-92.0	85.5-93.0	86.5-92.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	85.8-93.0	86.3-92.8	-	-	-	-	-	-

Summary and conclusions

Germination tests have been carried out on progeny seed sampled at commercial harvest from a total of 62 crop selectivity trials carried out on cereals in the Maritime (6 in Czech Republic, 3 in France, 13 in Germany), North-east (19 in Poland) and South-east (14 in Hungary, 7 in Romania) EPPO climatic zones between 2018 and 2020.

Of these 62 trials, 21 generated data on winter wheat, 6 generated data on spring wheat, 15 generated data on winter triticale and 20 generated data on winter rye.

Single post-emergence applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) were made in the spring on all trials, when crop growth stages were in the range of 14-39 (BBCH) and with the majority being within the range of 30-39 (BBCH). This represents the worst case scenario with respect to the potential to affect the viability of the progeny seed.

Whilst no data has been generated in support of demonstrating the absence of adverse impact on the viability of the progeny seed in spring triticale, plant physiology, agronomic practices and susceptibility to phytotoxicity caused by herbicides can be considered to be very similar between winter and spring triticale. Data from trials carried out in winter triticale are therefore considered to be supportive of demonstrating the absence of adverse impact on the viability of the progeny seed of spring applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha in spring triticale.

Whilst no data has been generated in support of demonstrating the absence of adverse impact on the viability of the progeny seed in spring rye, plant physiology, agronomic practices and susceptibility to phytotoxicity caused by herbicides can be considered to be very similar between winter and spring rye.

Data from trials carried out in winter rye are therefore considered to be supportive of demonstrating the absence of adverse impact on the viability of the progeny seed of spring applications of ADM.06001.H.2.B at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha in spring rye.

A single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, had no consistent or significant adverse effects on the germination of progeny seed and had no significant effects on percentage of abnormal seedlings or ungerminated seed (where evaluated in 2 of the trials), compared to either the untreated control or standard reference products, for progeny seed sampled at commercial harvest from 62 trials on cereal crops (21 on winter wheat, 6 on spring wheat, 15 on triticale, 20 on rye).

Detailed trial results on the impact of ADM.06001.H.2.B (or AG-PM1-72 OD) on germinations of seed have been presented in BAD document.

Based on the absence of ~~effects~~ adverse effects on germination of progeny seed sampled from trials, it is therefore reasonable to conclude that a single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha, and applied according to other label recommendations, has no adverse impact on progeny seed in cereals crops (winter wheat, spring wheat, triticale, rye) and no restrictions are necessary regarding use on crops grown for seed production.

Comments of zRMS on:

Impact on treated plants or plant parts to be used for propagation (3.4.5)

Based on the trial results, it can be concluded that ADM.06001.H.2.B applied once at the maximum recommended dose rate of 1.0 L/ha has no adverse effects on seed germination of winter wheat, spring wheat, winter triticale and winter rye.

According to the GAP table and explanation given by the applicant during evaluation process, spring rye and spring triticale are not a claimed crops. Therefore, the extrapolation of trial results from winter rye to spring rye and from winter triticale to spring triticale is not a subject of the evaluation.

3.5 Observations on other undesirable or unintended side-effects (KCP 6.5)

Information on trials submitted (3.5 Observations on other undesirable or unintended side-effects)

Table 3.5-1: Presentation of trials (succeeding crops trials, adjacent crops trials)

Type of trial	Crop(s)	Country	Years	Number of trials (number of valid trials)			GEP, non-GEP, GLP official**	Comments (any other relevant information)
				Greenhouse	Maritime	Mediterranean		
OECD 208 study	TRZAW, HORVS, LOLPE, ZEAMX, SORVU, BRSNW, BEAVA, GLXMA, PIBSX, HELAN, SOLTU	DE	2020-21	1 (1)			GLP	
OECD 227 study	ZEAMX, AVESA, ALLCE, LOLPE, BEAVX, BRSNW, RAPS, HELAN, GLXMA, LYPES	DE	2020-21	1 (1)			GLP	
Succeeding crop trials	BEAVA, PIBSS, ZEAMX	FR	2018		1 (1)		GEP	
	GLXMA, SORVU	FR	2018			1 (1)	GEP	
	HORVS, SOLTU, BEAVA	FR	2018		1 (1)		GEP	
	ZEAMX, HELAN	FR	2018			1 (1)	GEP	
Adjacent crop trials	BRSNW	FR	2018		1 (1)		GEP	
	BRSNW, ZEAMX, BEAVA	FR	2018		1 (1)		GEP	
	BRSNW, ZEAMX, HELAN	FR	2018			1 (1)	GEP	
	HELAN	FR	2018			1 (1)	GEP	
	PIBSA, BEAVA	FR	2018		1 (1)		GEP	
	SOLTU	FR	2018			1 (1)	GEP	

	ZEAMX	FR	2018			1 (1)	GEP	
	Grand Total			2 (2)	5 (5)	6 (6)		

3.5.1 Impact on succeeding crops (KCP 6.5.1)

ADM.06001.H.2.B is an oil dispersion formulation (OD) containing 60 g/L pinoxaden, 12 g/L mesosulfuron-methyl and 35 g/L mefenpyr-diethyl. The proposed use is for a single post-emergence application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at up to a maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha in the spring for control of grass and broad-leaved weeds in winter and spring cereals, when the winter cereal crops are within the growth stage range of 13-20-39 (BBCH) and spring wheat is within the growth stage range of 13-39.

Mefenpyr-diethyl is included in the formulation as a safener, which having no herbicidal activity does not contribute to potential impact of ADM.06001.H.2.B on succeeding crops.

Pinoxaden is a foliar acting herbicide with very limited residual soil activity or uptake by plants via the roots and rapidly degrades in the soil (DT₅₀ maximum of 1.05 days). Mesosulfuron-methyl, although taken up primarily via the leaves and to a lesser extent by the roots, has relatively high persistence in the soil (DT₅₀ maximum of 155 days). The potential risk of adverse impact of ADM.06001.H.2.B on succeeding crops is therefore principally that of mesosulfuron-methyl.

One greenhouse pot study carried out in 2020-21 in Germany generated data on the potential impact of ADM.06001.H.2.B on a representative range of monocotyledonous and dicotyledonous crop species sown or planted following application to the soil at a range of concentrations in the range of 0.0156 L-2.0 L/ha (0.97-124.6 g pinoxaden/ha + 0.19-24.4 g mesosulfuron-methyl/ha).

Potential adverse effects on seedling emergence and seedling growth of ADM.06001.H.2.B applied to soil prior to sowing has been evaluated on a wide range of representative monocotyledonous and dicotyledonous crop species, as listed in Table 3.5-2.

Table 3.5-2: List of crop species sown following the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B in OECD 208 seedling emergence and seedling growth test

Plant type	Plants species			
	Common name	Scientific name	EPPO code	Family
Monocotyledonous	Winter wheat	<i>Triticum aestivum</i>	TRZAW	Poaceae
	Spring barley	<i>Hordeum vulgare</i>	HORVS	Poaceae
	Perennial ryegrass	<i>Lolium perenne</i>	LOLPE	Poaceae
	Maize	<i>Zea mays</i>	ZEAMX	Poaceae
	Sorghum	<i>Sorghum bicolor</i>	SORVU	Poaceae
Dicotyledonous	Winter oilseed rape	<i>Brassica napus</i>	BRSNW	Brassicaceae
	Sugar beet	<i>Beta vulgaris var. altissima</i>	BEAVA	Chenopodiaceae
	Soybean	<i>Glycine max</i>	GLXMA	Fabaceae
	Field pea	<i>Pisum sativum</i>	PIBSX	Fabaceae
	Sunflower	<i>Helianthus annuus</i>	HELAN	Asteraceae
	Potato	<i>Solanum tuberosum</i>	SOLTU	Solanaceae

This greenhouse study was conducted in compliance with the OECD Principles of Good Laboratory Practice (as revised in 1997) ‘ENV/MC/CHEM (98)17 Chemikaliengesetz („Chemical Act“) der Bundesrepublik Deutschland (ChemG), Anhang 1 („Annex 1“, 2008’ by an organisation that is included on the national GLP compliance program.

Details from this trial including TER calculations are contained in BAD document, presented below:

Table 3.5.2-a: Effect rates (EC₁₀) determined for ADM.06001.H.2.B based on plant fresh weight data (20 days after 50% emergence in the untreated control) from the OECD 208 seedling emergence and seedling growth test

Non-target plant species (Eppo code)	EC ₁₀ values (based on plant fresh weight)				
	ADM.06001.H.2.B	pinoxaden		mesosulfuron-methyl	
	L product/ha	g a.i./ha	mg/kg soil	g a.i./ha	mg/kg soil
Monocotyledonous plant species					
TRZAW	0.772	0.0481	0.06411	0.00942	0.01255
HORVS	0.222	0.01383	0.01844	0.00271	0.00361
LOLPE	0.0795	0.00495	0.0066	0.00097	0.00129
ZEAMX	>1	0.08753	0.11669	0.01714	0.02283
SORVU	0.249	0.01551	0.02068	0.00304	0.00405
Dicotyledonous plant species					
BRSNW	0.121	0.00754	0.01005	0.00148	0.00197
BEAVA	0.0597	0.00372	0.00496	0.00073	0.00097
GLXMA	0.532	0.03314	0.04418	0.00649	0.00865
PIBSX	0.145	0.00903	0.01204	0.00177	0.00236
HELAN	0.258	0.01607	0.02143	0.00315	0.00419
SOLTU	0.0903	0.00563	0.0075	0.0011	0.00147

For the following risk assessment, PEC_{soil} values (for maximum DT₅₀ values of 1.05 days for pinoxaden and 155 days for mesosulfuron-methyl) are calculated based on a single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha (60 g pinoxaden/ha and 12 g mesosulfuron-methyl/ha) for distribution to a soil depth of 5 cm (representative of minimum cultivation) and to a soil depth of 20 cm (representative of ploughing), with 25% and 50% crop interceptions for the worst case scenario when crops are at the earliest growth stages of BBCH 13-19 and BBCH 20-39 respectively within the proposed range of 13-39 (BBCH) for the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B in cereals.

Following the EPPO guideline Standard PP 1/207(2) 'Effects on succeeding crops', the calculated TER (Toxicity Exposure Ratio) values for all plant species based on Predicted Environmental Concentration in soil (PEC_{soil}) for ADM.06001.H.2.B and effect rates (EC₁₀) on plant fresh weight for ADM.06001.H.2.B in the soil are given in Table (with minimum cultivation to soil depth of 5 cm) and Table (with ploughing to soil depth of 20 cm) for pinoxaden and in Table (applications in March-April with minimum cultivation to soil depth of 5cm, 25% crop interception), Table (applications in March-April with deep cultivation to a soil depth of 20 cm, 25% crop interception), Table (applications in April-June with minimum cultivation to soil depth of 5cm, 50% crop interception) and Table (applications in April-June with deep cultivation to a soil depth of 20 cm, 50% crop interception) for mesosulfuron-methyl.

The risk is acceptable if the PEC_{soil} is below the EC₁₀ (TER > 1).

Table 3.5.2-b: TERs for pinoxaden for representative non-target plant species based on EC₁₀ and PEC_{soil} values for distribution to soil depth of 5 cm (representative of minimum cultivation)

TER=EC ₁₀ /PEC _{soil} to 5 cm soil depth								
DA-A (PEC _{soil} for 5 cm soil depth in mg/kg soil)		0 d (0.060)	1 d (0.031)	2 d (0.016)	4 d (0.004)	7 d (0.001)	14 d (0.00001)	21 d (0.0000001)
Plant species	EC ₁₀ (mg/kg soil)							
Monocotyledonous crop species								
TRZAW	0.0641	1.07	2.07	4.00	14.98	108.55	11028.28	1120403.46
HORVS	0.0184	0.31	0.59	1.15	4.31	31.22	3172.07	322262.36
LOLPE	0.0066	0.11	0.21	0.41	1.54	11.18	1135.34	115343.36
ZEAMX	0.1167	1.94	3.76	7.28	27.27	197.58	20073.16	2039305.56
SORVU	0.0207	0.34	0.67	1.29	4.83	35.02	3557.40	361409.19
Dicotyledonous crop species								
BRSNW	0.0101	0.17	0.32	0.63	2.35	17.02	1728.81	175636.48
BEAVA	0.0050	0.08	0.16	0.31	1.16	8.40	853.23	86682.28
GLXMA	0.0442	0.74	1.42	2.76	10.32	74.81	7599.90	772101.46
PIBSX	0.0120	0.20	0.39	0.75	2.81	20.39	2071.14	210414.25
HELAN	0.0214	0.36	0.69	1.34	5.01	36.29	3686.41	374516.39
SOLTU	0.0075	0.13	0.24	0.47	1.75	12.70	1290.16	131072.00

Table 3.5.2-c: TERs for pinoxaden for representative non-target plant species based on EC₁₀ and PEC_{soil} values for distribution to soil depth of 20 cm (representative of ploughing)

TER=EC ₁₀ /PEC _{soil} to 20 cm soil depth								
DA-A (PEC _{soil} for 20 cm soil depth in mg/kg soil)		0 d (0.015)	1 d (0.008)	2 d (0.004)	4 d (0.001)	7 d (0.0001)	14 d (0.000001)	21 d (0.00000001)
Plant species	EC ₁₀ (mg/kg soil)							
Monocotyledonous crop species								
TRZAW	0.0641	4.27	8.27	16.00	59.93	434.21	44113.12	4481613.82
HORVS	0.0184	1.23	2.38	4.60	17.24	124.89	12688.29	1289049.43
LOLPE	0.0066	0.44	0.85	1.65	6.17	44.70	4541.36	461373.44
ZEAMX	0.1167	7.78	15.05	29.13	109.07	790.33	80292.62	8157222.23
SORVU	0.0207	1.38	2.67	5.16	19.33	140.06	14229.60	1445636.78
Dicotyledonous crop species								
BRSNW	0.0101	0.67	1.30	2.51	9.39	68.07	6915.25	702545.92
BEAVA	0.0050	0.33	0.64	1.24	4.64	33.59	3412.90	346729.13
GLXMA	0.0442	2.95	5.70	11.03	41.30	299.23	30399.59	3088405.85
PIBSX	0.0120	0.80	1.55	3.01	11.25	81.55	8284.54	841657.00
HELAN	0.0214	1.43	2.76	5.35	20.03	145.14	14745.66	1498065.58
SOLTU	0.0075	0.50	0.97	1.87	7.01	50.80	5160.64	524288.00

Table 3.5.2-d: TERs for mesosulfuron-methyl for representative non-target plant species based on EC₁₀ and PEC_{soil} values for distribution to soil depth of 5 cm (representative of minimum cultivation), applications in March-April at growth stages of BBCH 13-19 (25% interception)

PEC and TER calculation at 5 cm soil depth										
PEC _{ini} (mg/kg dry soil) = 0.012										
Time (days) =		0	30	60	90	150	200	250	300	350
PEC _{ti} (mg ai/kg d.s.) =		0.01200	0.01049	0.00918	0.00802	0.00614	0.00491	0.00392	0.00314	0.00251
Crop	EC ₁₀ (mg ai/ kg d.s.)	TER-values								
Winter crops										
TRZAW (wheat)	0.01260	1.0	1.2	1.4	1.6	2.1	2.6	3.2	4.0	5.0
LOLPE (ryegrass)	0.00130	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.5
BRSNW (OSR)	0.00200	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.8
Spring & winter crop types										
HORVS (barley)	0.00360	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.6	0.7	0.9	1.1	1.4
PIBSX (pea)	0.00240	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.8	1.0
Spring crops										
ZEAMX (maize)	0.02280	1.9	2.2	2.5	2.8	3.7	4.6	5.8	7.3	9.1
SORVU (sorghum)	0.00410	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.8	1.0	1.3	1.6
BEAVA (s Beet)	0.00100	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.4
GLXMA (soya)	0.00870	0.7	0.8	0.9	1.1	1.4	1.8	2.2	2.8	3.5
HELAN (sun flower)	0.00420	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.7	0.9	1.1	1.3	1.7
SOLTU (potato)	0.00150	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6

Table 3.5.2-e: TERs for mesosulfuron-methyl for representative non-target plant species based on EC₁₀ and PEC_{soil} values for distribution to soil depth of 20 cm (representative of ploughing), applications in March-April at growth stages of BBCH 13-19 (25% interception)

PEC and TER calculation at 20 cm soil depth										
PEC _{ini} (mg/kg dry soil) = 0.003										
Time (days) =		0	30	60	90	150	200	250	300	350
PEC _{ti} (mg ai/kg d.s.) =		0.00300	0.00262	0.00229	0.00201	0.00153	0.00123	0.00098	0.00078	0.00063
Crop	EC ₁₀ (mg ai/ kg d.s.)	TER-values								
Winter crops										
TRZAW (wheat)	0.01260	4.2	4.8	5.5	6.3	8.2	10.3	12.8	16.1	20.1
LOLPE (ryegrass)	0.00130	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.8	1.1	1.3	1.7	2.1
BRSNW (OSR)	0.00200	0.7	0.8	0.9	1.0	1.3	1.6	2.0	2.6	3.2
Spring & winter crop types										
HORVS (barley)	0.00360	1.2	1.4	1.6	1.8	2.3	2.9	3.7	4.6	5.7
PIBSX (pea)	0.00240	0.8	0.9	1.0	1.2	1.6	2.0	2.4	3.1	3.8
Spring crops										
ZEAMX (maize)	0.02280	7.6	8.7	9.9	11.4	14.9	18.6	23.2	29.1	36.4
SORVU (sorghum)	0.00410	1.4	1.6	1.8	2.0	2.7	3.3	4.2	5.2	6.5
BEAVA (s Beet)	0.00100	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.8	1.0	1.3	1.6
GLXMA (soya)	0.00870	2.9	3.3	3.8	4.3	5.7	7.1	8.9	11.1	13.9
HELAN (sun flower)	0.00420	1.4	1.6	1.8	2.1	2.7	3.4	4.3	5.4	6.7
SOLTU (potato)	0.00150	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.7	1.0	1.2	1.5	1.9	2.4

Table 3.5.2-f: TERs for mesosulfuron-methyl for representative non-target plant species based on EC₁₀ and PEC_{soil} values for distribution to soil depth of 5 cm (representative of minimum cultivation), applications in April-June at growth stages of BBCH 20-39 (50% interception)

PEC and TER calculation at 5 cm soil depth PEC _{ini} (mg/kg dry soil) = 0.008										
Time (days) =		0	30	60	90	150	200	250	300	350
PEC _{ti} (mg ai/kg d.s.) =		0.00800	0.00700	0.00612	0.00535	0.00409	0.00327	0.00262	0.00209	0.00167
Crop	EC ₁₀ (mg ai/ kg d.s.)	TER-values								
Winter crops										
TRZAW (wheat)	0.01260	1.6	1.8	2.1	2.4	3.1	3.9	4.8	6.0	7.5
LOLPE (ryegrass)	0.00130	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.8
BRSNW (OSR)	0.00200	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.8	1.0	1.2
Spring & winter crop types										
HORVS (barley)	0.00360	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.9	1.1	1.4	1.7	2.2
PIBSX (pea)	0.00240	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.6	0.7	0.9	1.1	1.4
Spring crops										
ZEAMX (maize)	0.02280	2.9	3.3	3.7	4.3	5.6	7.0	8.7	10.9	13.6
SORVU (sorghum)	0.00410	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	1.0	1.3	1.6	2.0	2.5
BEAVA (s Beet)	0.00100	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6
GLXMA (soya)	0.00870	1.1	1.2	1.4	1.6	2.1	2.7	3.3	4.2	5.2
HELAN (sun flower)	0.00420	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	1.0	1.3	1.6	2.0	2.5
SOLTU (potato)	0.00150	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.9

Table 3.5.2-g: TERs for mesosulfuron-methyl for representative non-target plant species based on EC₁₀ and PEC_{soil} values for distribution to soil depth of 20 cm (representative of ploughing), applications in April-June at growth stages of BBCH 20-39 (50% interception)

PEC and TER calculation at 20 cm soil depth PEC _{ini} (mg/kg dry soil) = 0.002										
Time (days) =		0	30	60	90	150	200	250	300	350
PEC _{ti} (mg ai/kg d.s.) =		0.00200	0.00175	0.00153	0.00134	0.00102	0.00082	0.00065	0.00052	0.00042
Crop	EC ₁₀ (mg ai/ kg d.s.)	TER-values								
Winter crops										
TRZAW (wheat)	0.01260	6.3	7.2	8.2	9.4	12.3	15.4	19.3	24.1	30.1
LOLPE (ryegrass)	0.00130	0.7	0.7	0.9	1.0	1.3	1.6	2.0	2.5	3.1
BRSNW (OSR)	0.00200	1.0	1.1	1.3	1.5	2.0	2.4	3.1	3.8	4.8
Spring & winter crop types										
HORVS (barley)	0.00360	1.8	2.1	2.4	2.7	3.5	4.4	5.5	6.9	8.6
PIBSX (pea)	0.00240	1.2	1.4	1.6	1.8	2.3	2.9	3.7	4.6	5.7
Spring crops										
ZEAMX (maize)	0.02280	11.4	13.0	14.9	17.0	22.3	27.9	34.9	43.6	54.5
SORVU (sorghum)	0.00410	2.1	2.3	2.7	3.1	4.0	5.0	6.3	7.8	9.8
BEAVA (s Beet)	0.00100	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.7	1.0	1.2	1.5	1.9	2.4
GLXMA (soya)	0.00870	4.4	5.0	5.7	6.5	8.5	10.6	13.3	16.6	20.8
HELAN (sun flower)	0.00420	2.1	2.4	2.7	3.1	4.1	5.1	6.4	8.0	10.0
SOLTU (potato)	0.00150	0.8	0.9	1.0	1.1	1.5	1.8	2.3	2.9	3.6

Calculated from PEC_{soil} values for distribution to soil depths of both 5 cm and 20 cm for pinoxaden and the EC_{10} data for ADM.06001.H.2.B from the OECD 208 seedling emergence and seedling growth test, the TER values following the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha are above the trigger value of 1.0 within 4 days after application for all crop species tested. The risk to succeeding and replacement crops sown or planted following the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha to a cereal crop in the spring is therefore very low and acceptable with respect to pinoxaden.

Calculated from PEC_{soil} values for distribution to soil depth of 5 cm for mesosulfuron-methyl and the EC_{10} data for ADM.06001.H.2.B from the OECD 208 seedling emergence and seedling growth test, the TER values following the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha in March-April when crop growth stages were between 13-19 BBCH (25% interception) are above the trigger value of 1.0 immediately following the application for 2 of the monocotyledonous crop species (TRZAW, ZEAMX), by 90 days after application for 1 dicotyledonous crop species (GLXMA), by 250 days for 1 dicotyledonous crop species (HELAN) and by 300 days after application for 2 monocotyledonous crop species (HORVS and SORVU). For the other 1 monocotyledonous crop species (LOLPE) and 4 dicotyledonous crop species (BRSNW, BEAVA, PIBSX, SOLTU), the TER was still below the trigger value of 1.0 by 300 days after application.

Calculated from PEC_{soil} values for distribution to a soil depth of 20 cm for mesosulfuron-methyl and the EC_{10} data for ADM.06001.H.2.B from the OECD 208 seedling emergence and seedling growth test, the TER values following the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha in March-April when crop growth stages were between 13-19 BBCH (25% interception) are above the trigger value of 1.0 immediately following the application for 4 of the monocotyledonous crop types (TRZAW, HORVS, ZEAMX, SORVU) and 2 of the dicotyledonous crop species (GLXMA, HELAN), by 60 days after application for 1 dicotyledonous crop species (PIBSX), by 90 days for 1 dicotyledonous crop species (BRSNW), by 150 days for 1 dicotyledonous crop species (SOLTU), by 200 days for 1 monocotyledonous crop species (LOLPE) and by 250 days for 1 dicotyledonous crop species (BEAVA).

Calculated from PEC_{soil} values for distribution to soil depth of 5 cm for mesosulfuron-methyl and the EC_{10} data for ADM.06001.H.2.B from the OECD 208 seedling emergence and seedling growth test, the TER values following the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha in April-June when crop growth stages were between 20-39 BBCH (50% interception) are above the trigger value of 1.0 immediately following the application for 2 of the monocotyledonous crop species (TRZAW, ZEAMX) and for 1 of the dicotyledonous crop species (GLXMA), by 150 days after application for 1 monocotyledonous crop species (SORVU) and 1 dicotyledonous crop species (HELAN), by 200 days for 1 monocotyledonous crop species (HORVS) and by 300 days for 1 dicotyledonous crop species (PIBSX). For the other 1 monocotyledonous crop species (LOLPE) and 3 dicotyledonous crop species (BRSNW, BEAVA, SOLTU) the TER was still below the trigger value of 1.0 by 300 days after application.

Calculated from PEC_{soil} values for distribution to a soil depth of 20 cm for mesosulfuron-methyl and the EC_{10} data for ADM.06001.H.2.B from the OECD 208 seedling emergence and seedling growth test, the TER values following the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at the proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha in April-June when crop growth stages were between 20-39 BBCH (50% interception) are above the trigger value of 1.0 immediately following the application for 4 of the monocotyledonous crop types (TRZAW, HORVS, ZEAMX, SORVU) and 4 of the dicotyledonous crop species (GLXMA, HELAN, BRSNW, PIBSX), by 60 days after application for 1 dicotyledonous crop species (SOLTU), by 90 days for 1 monocotyledonous crop species (LOLPE) and by 150 days for 1 dicotyledonous crop species (BEAVA) tested.

Conclusions – OECD 208 seedling emergence and seedling growth test

The sensitivity of a representative range of different monocotyledonous and dicotyledonous plant species sown following the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at a range of rates has been established in an OECD 208 Seedling emergence and seedling growth test. This included representative species of the main families to which the majority of main crop types belong and also indicator species considered to be most sensitive to phytotoxicity and effects of plant protection products on emergence.

TERs have been calculated from PEC_{soil} values and the EC_{10} data to determine the risk of adverse impact on following crops, for each of the active substances contained in ADM.06001.H.2.B and for a single application of the product at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha in a cereal crop.

Having very short persistence in the soil and limited uptake by the plant, the risk of adverse impact on succeeding crops with respect to pinoxaden is very low. The risk for ADM.06001.H.2.B is therefore almost entirely that associated with mesosulfuron-methyl.

Based on the TER values for mesosulfuron-methyl, the crop types for which sowing in the late summer and autumn is relevant, following a cereal crop on which ADM.06001.H.2.B has been applied in spring, the succeeding crops that can safely be sown in autumn (August-September) are wheat after minimum soil cultivation and oilseed rape, peas and barley (all cereals) providing that the soil is first deep cultivated to a depth of 20 cm, observing minimum intervals between application and sowing of ≥ 90 days where application was from crop growth stage 20 (BBCH) and ≥ 60 days where application was up to crop growth stage 20 (BBCH).

Based on the TER values for mesosulfuron-methyl, following a cereal crop on which ADM.06001.H.2.B has been applied in spring, the succeeding crops that can safely be sown/planted in the spring of the following year are wheat, barley (all cereals), maize, sorghum, soya and sunflower after minimum soil cultivation and any crop providing that the soil is first deep cultivated to a depth of 20 cm, observing minimum intervals between application and sowing/planting of ≥ 300 days where application was from crop growth stage 20 (BBCH) and ≥ 250 days where application was up to crop growth stage 20 (BBCH).

Also based on the TER values for mesosulfuron-methyl for the crop types tested in the study, in the event of the failure of a cereal crop on which ADM.06001.H.2.B has been applied in spring, crops that can safely be sown as an immediate replacement within 30 days of application are wheat or maize after minimum cultivation or any cereal crop, oilseed rape, peas, sorghum and sunflower providing that the soil is first deep cultivated to a depth of 20 cm, where application was from crop growth stage 20 (BBCH), or wheat and maize after minimum soil cultivation or any cereal crop, maize, sorghum, soya and sunflower providing that the soil is first deep cultivated to a depth of 20 cm, where application was up to crop growth stage 20 (BBCH).

Additionally, assessments for phytotoxic symptoms and other effects on crop growth and development have been carried out on a total of 4 succeeding crop field trials conducted in 2018 to evaluate crop safety on a range of representative crop species sown or planted at specific intervals following post-emergence applications of AG-PM1-72 OD on winter wheat.

AG-PM1-72 OD and ADM.06001.H.2.B are the same formulation type (OD) and contain the same amounts of both pinoxaden (60 g/L) and mesosulfuron-methyl (12 g/L), differing only in the content of co-formulants. It is considered to be the active substances, rather than the formulation, that have potential to cause adverse effects on following crops and therefore data generated with AG-PM1-72 OD on these trials are fully supportive of demonstrating that ADM.06001.H.2.B has no adverse impact on replacement or succeeding crops.

All field trials were carried out by organisations that are officially recognised as competent to carry out efficacy testing in accordance with Regulation (EU) 284/2013 by the authorities in the relevant countries.

Table 3.5-3: Details on trial methodology (succeeding crops field trials)

Guidelines	General guidelines	EPPO PP 1/152(4), PP 1/181(4), PP 1/135 (4)
	Specific guidelines	EPPO guideline PP 1/207(2) 'Effects on succeeding crops' CEB 96
Experimental design	Plot design	RCBD (4)
	Plot size	50-54 m ²
	Number of replications	2 replicates (4)
Crop	Crops tested	BEAVA (2 trials, sowing 20-49 DA-A), GLXMA (1 trial, sowing 83 DA-A), HELAN (1 trial, sowing 19 DA-A), HORVS (1 trial, sowing 4 DA-A), PIBSS (1 trial, sowing 49 DA-A), SOLTU (1 trial, sowing 11 DA-A), SORVU (1 trial, sowing 48 DA-A), ZEAMX (2 trials, sowing 19-49 DA-A))
Application	Timing Crop stage (BBCH) at application	Post sowing of TRZAW (30-31 BBCH) Pre-sowing of following crops
	Number of applications	1
	Spray volumes	200 L/ha (3), 250 L/ha (1)
Assessments	Assessment types	Phytotoxicity, seedling emergence, crop thinning, growth reductions

Justification for data outside country of submission

Agronomic practices in the cultivation of the crop types tested in the field trials are considered sufficiently similar across EU countries for data generated across all trials to be fully supportive of demonstrating potential impact of AG-PM1-72 OD on replacement or succeeding crops in all relevant countries.

Justification for the use of crop safety data included in this dossier is made according to EPPO PP 1/241(1) "Guidance on comparable climates".

Succeeding crop field trials from which data are summarised in this dossier were carried out in the following EPPO climatic zones:

Maritime: Maritime climatic regions of France

Mediterranean: Mediterranean regions of France

Trials carried out in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (France) are fully supportive towards demonstrating any potential effects of ADM.06001.H.2.B on following crops in the EU Central Registration zone, with respect to relevant countries within this EPPO climatic zone.

Whilst some of the trials were carried out in the Mediterranean EPPO climatic zone, the potential for a product to have effects on following crops is influenced by factors other than climate, most importantly soil type. It is therefore considered that the potential for a product to have effects on following crops is sufficiently similar under different climatic conditions for data generated in trials carried out in the Maritime and Mediterranean EPPO climatic zones to be supportive towards demonstrating the potential impact of ADM.06001.H.2.B under conditions in all relevant EPPO climatic zones.

Trials methodology in relation to EPPO

Applications on all trials were made using small plot sprayers designed to simulate application with commercial sprayers representative of those used to apply herbicides in cereals.

Prior to sowing the succeeding crops, plots in one replicate were minimum cultivated and those in the other were deep cultivated and each plot was then divided into sub-plots, one for each of the different crop types sown or planted following application.

The following crops were sown planted at intervals of between 4 and 49 days after application, preceded by destruction of the wheat crop and minimum (to 5 cm depth) or deep cultivation (to 20 cm deep) soil tillage to produce seedbeds typical of those for the sowing of replacement or succeeding crops. Seed were sown or tubers planted at representative depths for the crop species.

Summary and conclusions on potential impact on succeeding crops

The sensitivity of a representative range of different monocotyledonous and dicotyledonous plant species sown following the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at a range of rates has been established in an OECD 208 Seedling emergence and seedling growth test. This included representative species of the main families to which the majority of main crop types belong.

Furthermore, assessments for phytotoxic symptoms and other effects on crop growth and development have been carried out on a total of 4 succeeding crop field trials conducted in 2018 to evaluate crop safety on a range of representative crop species sown or planted at specific intervals following post-emergence applications of AG-PM1-72 OD on winter wheat crops.

Based on TERs calculated from PEC_{soil} values and the EC_{10} data (for effects on plant fresh weight), for each of the active substances following an application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha on a cereal crop, the intervals after which the TER was first above the threshold of 1.0 for each crop species tested are given in Table 3.5-4.

Table 3.5-4: Intervals following application after which TER values for each active substance when ADM.06001.H.2.B is applied at 1.0 L product/ha were above the acceptable threshold on a range of representative replacement and succeeding crop species, based on soil PEC_{soil} values and the EC_{10} data

Crop (EPPO code)	Safe sowing or planting interval (based on TER ≥ 1.0)					
	Pinoxaden (60 g a.i./ha)		Mesosulfuron-methyl (12 g a.i./ha)			
	Mar-June (BBCH 13-39) 25-50% interception		Mar-April (BBCH 13-19) 25% interception		Apr-June (BBCH 20-39) 50% interception	
	up to 5 cm	up to 20 cm	up to 5 cm	up to 20 cm	up to 5 cm	up to 20 cm
Winter crops						
TRZAW	0 days	0 days	0 days	0 days	0 days	0 days
LOLPE	4 days	2 days	-	≥ 200 days	-	≥ 90 days
BRSNW	4 days	1 day	-	≥ 90 days	-	0 days
Spring & winter crop types						
HORVS	2 days	0 days	≥ 300 days	0 days	≥ 200 days	0 days
PIBSX	4 days	1 day	≥ 350 days	≥ 60 days	≥ 300 days	0 days
Spring crops						
ZEAMX	0 days	0 days	0 days	0 days	0 days	0 days
SORVU	2 days	0 days	≥ 300 days	0 days	≥ 150 days	0 days
BEAVA	4 days	2 days	-	≥ 250 days	-	≥ 150 days
GLXMA	1 day	0 days	≥ 90 days	0 days	0 days	0 days
HELAN	2 days	0 days	≥ 250 days	0 days	≥ 150 days	0 days
SOLTU	4 days	2 days	-	≥ 150 days	-	≥ 60 days

With relatively persistent residual soil activity, mesosulfuron-methyl therefore poses the primary risk to crops sown or planted following the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at the proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha to a cereal crop.

Furthermore, assessments for phytotoxic symptoms and other effects on crop growth and development have been carried out on a total of 4 succeeding crop field trials conducted in 2018 to evaluate crop safety on a range of representative crop species sown or planted at specific intervals following post-emergence applications of AG-PM1-72 OD at the proposed label rate and also at twice this rate winter wheat crops.

A summary of the maximum levels of phytotoxicity occurring on each of the representative replacement and succeeding crop species sown or planted at specific intervals following applications of AG-PM1-72 OD on 4 succeeding crop field trials is given in Table 3.5-5.

Table 3.5-5: Maximum percentage phytotoxicity on a range of representative crop species sown or planted at specific intervals following the application of AG-PM1-72 OD at 1.0 L and 2.0 product/ha across succeeding crop field trials

Crop EPPO code	EPPO climatic zone	Soil type	Application to sowing or planting interval	Maximum % phytotoxicity (total of all effects)			
				AG-PM1-72 OD			
				Minimum cultivation (to 5 cm)		Deep cultivation (to 20 cm)	
				1.0 L product/ha	2.0 L product/ha	1.0 L product/ha	2.0 L product/ha
Representative intervals for replacement crops (1 trial per crop)							
BEAVA	Maritime	L	20 days	40	60	0	0
HORVS	Maritime	L	4 days	10	60	0	0
SOLTU	Maritime	L	22 days	5	10	0	0
HELAN	Mediterranean	S	19 days	0	0	0	0
ZEAMX	Mediterranean	S	19 days	0	0	0	0
Representative intervals for succeeding crops (1 trial per crop)							
BEAVA	Maritime	LC	49 days	20	60	0	0
PIBSS	Maritime	LC	49 days	30	70	0	0
ZEAMX	Maritime	LC	49 days	5	20	0	0
GLXMA	Mediterranean	SCL	48 days	0	0	0	0
SORVU	Mediterranean	SCL	83 days	0	0	0	0

ADM.06001.H.2.B is the same formulation type and contains the same amounts of both active substances to AG-PM1-72 OD, differing only in content of co-formulants. Furthermore, the residual soil activity of a herbicide can be considered to be directly related to the amount of active ingredient applied, with the effect of formulation being minimal. It is therefore reasonable to assume that any potential effects on crops sown or planted following the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B will be very similar to those of AG-PM1-72 OD. Data generated with AG-PM1-72 OD is therefore considered fully valid towards establishing safe sowing intervals for replacement and succeeding crops following an application of ADM.06001.H.2.B.

The data from these trials carried out in the field demonstrates that on the soil types and under conditions in the trials indicate that the crops listed below can be safely sown or planted as replacement or succeeding crops following the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at the proposed maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha on a cereal crop in the spring.

Replacement crops

Following minimum cultivation: HELAN and ZEAMX from a minimum of 19 days after application.

Following deep cultivation: HORVS from a minimum of 4 days after application, BEAVA from a minimum of 20 days after application and SOLTU from a minimum of 22 days after application.

Succeeding crops

Following minimum cultivation: GLXMA from a minimum of 48 days after application and SORVU from a minimum of 83 days after application.

Following deep cultivation: BEAVA, PIBSS and ZEAMX from a minimum of 49 days after application.

Based on TER values calculated from PEC_{soil} values and EC_{10} data from the greenhouse seedling emergence study, and further reinforced by crop safety demonstrated in the succeeding crops field trials, the following label recommendations and restrictions on the sowing or planting of replacement and succeeding crops following an application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at up to the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha on a cereal crop in the spring are supported.

Application in March-April (BBCH 13-19) - 25% crop interception

Autumn crops, planting August-September - min interval 3 months (90 days):

Following minimum cultivation: Wheat

Following deep cultivation: Oilseed rape, peas, barley (all cereals)

Spring crops: Planted at least 300 days after application

Following minimum cultivation: Wheat, barley (all cereals), maize, sorghum, soya, sunflower

Following deep cultivation: All crops

Crop failure: Planted within 30 days of an application

Following minimum cultivation: Wheat, maize

Following deep cultivation: All cereals, maize, sorghum, soya and sunflower

Application in April-June (BBCH 20-39) - 50% crop interception

Autumn crops, planting August-September - min interval 2 months (60 days)

Following minimum cultivation: Wheat

Following deep cultivation: Oilseed rape, peas, barley (all cereals)

Spring crops: Planted at least 250 days after application

Following minimum cultivation: Wheat, barley (all cereals), maize, sorghum, soya, sunflower

Following deep cultivation: All crops

Crop failure: Planted within 30 days of an application

Following minimum cultivation: Wheat, maize, soya

Following deep cultivation: All cereals, oilseed rape, peas, maize, sorghum and sunflower

The risk of adverse impact on succeeding and replacement crops sown or planted following a single application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at up to the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha on a cereal crop is minimal and therefore acceptable, when the proposed label recommendations and restrictions are observed.

Comments of zRMS on:

Impact on succeeding crops (3.5.1)

The applicant submitted five trials: one greenhouse OECD study carried out in Germany in 2020-2021 and four field succeeding crops trials conducted in France in 2018, to assess the risk of possible adverse effect of ADM.06001.H.2.B on succeeding crops. In the field trials, the previous formulation AG-PM1-72 OD was tested. If ADM.06001.H.2.B and AG-PM1-72 OD contain the same amount of active substances and differ only in the content of some co-formulants, results from trials with AG-PM1-72 OD can be used for the evaluation of possible impact of ADM.06001.H.2.B on succeeding crops. Five monocotyledonous crops (winter wheat, spring barley, perennial ryegrass, maize, sorghum) and six dicotyledonous crops (winter oilseed rape, sugar beet, soybean, field pea, sunflower, potato) were tested in seedling emergence and seedling growth OECD 208 study. ADM.06001.H.2.B was applied to the soil at a range of dose rates: 0.0156 L-2.0 L/ha. Results from greenhouse study demonstrate phytotoxicity of ADM.06001.H.2.B at higher rates on each of the tested plant species. Winter wheat, spring barley, perennial ryegrass, sorghum, winter oilseed rape, sugar beet, soybean, field pea, sunflower, potato were reduced in plant fresh weight already below the field application rate of 1.0 L/ha. Maize was only affected at an increased dose rate of 2.0 L/ha. Winter wheat, rye grass and sorghum were also affected in seedling emergence. Additionally, impact of AG-PM1-72 OD on eight representative succeeding crops (sugar beet - 2 trials, soybean - 1 trial, sunflower - 1 trial, spring barley - 1 trial, field pea - 1 trial, potato - 1 trial, sorghum - 1 trial, maize - 2 trials) was assessed in four field trials. Crop species were sown or planted at specific intervals following post-emergence applications of AG-PM1-72 OD on winter wheat at dose rate of 1.0 L/ha and 2.0 L/ha. Based on TER values calculated from PEC_{soil} values and EC_{10} data from the greenhouse seedling emergence study, specific label recommendations/restrictions have been proposed by the applicant and verified by zRMS for the possible and safe sowing/planting of rotational crops and succeeding crops after application of

ADM.06001.H.2.B at the maximum rate of 1.0 L/ha, for 2 scenarios, depending on the time of application and % of crop interception:

Application in March-April (BBCH 13-19) - 25% crop interception

Autumn crops, planting August-September - min interval 3 months (90 days):

Following minimum cultivation: Wheat

Following deep cultivation: Oilseed rape, peas, barley (all cereals)

Spring crops: Planted at least 300 days after application

Following minimum cultivation: Wheat, barley (all cereals), maize, sorghum, soya, sunflower

Following deep cultivation: All crops

Crop failure: Planted within 30 days of an application

Following minimum cultivation: Wheat, maize

Following deep cultivation: All cereals, maize, sorghum, soya and sunflower

Application in April-June (BBCH 20-39) – 50% crop interception

Autumn crops, planting August-September - min interval 2 months (60 days)

Following minimum cultivation: Wheat

Following deep cultivation: Oilseed rape, peas, barley (all cereals)

Spring crops: Planted at least 250 days after application

Following minimum cultivation: Wheat, barley (all cereals), maize, sorghum, soya, sunflower

Following deep cultivation: All crops

Crop failure: Planted within 30 days of an application

Following minimum cultivation: Wheat, maize, soya

Following deep cultivation: All cereals, oilseed rape, peas, maize, sorghum and sunflower

Based on the crop safety demonstrated in the succeeding crops field trials and considering greenhouse study results, additional restrictions should be considered to include in the label of ADM.06001.H.2.B: “In case of crop failure, after deep cultivation (to 20 cm) spring barley can be sown from a min. 4 days after application and sunflower can be sown from a min. 19 days after application. After minimum cultivation (to 5 cm) maize can be sown from a min. 19 days after application”.

The proposed recommendations including additional restrictions are acceptable.

3.5.2 Impact on other plants including adjacent crops (KCP 6.5.2)

Pinoxaden and mesosulfuron-methyl, as the active substances in ADM.06001.H.2.B, are herbicides and therefore pose a potential risk with regard to adverse impact on other plants, including adjacent crops.

Mefenpyr-diethyl is included in the formulation as a safener, which having no herbicidal activity does not contribute to potential impact of ADM.06001.H.2.B on adjacent crops.

Direct spray drift and vapour drift following volatisation are the two sources of potential damage to other plants including adjacent crops.

Spray drift

Two greenhouse pot studies carried out in 2020-21 in Germany generated data on the potential impact of ADM.06001.H.2.B, applied at a range of rates, either pre-emergence (OECD 208, seedling emergence and seedling growth test) or early post-emergence (OECD 227, Vegetative vigour test) on a representative range of monocotyledonous and dicotyledonous crop types.

Potential adverse effects on seedling emergence and seedling growth and vegetative vigour of ADM.06001.H.2.B has been evaluated on a range of representative monocotyledonous and dicotyledonous crop types, as listed in Table 3.5-6.

Table 3.5-6: List of crop types on which the safety of ADM.06001.H.2.B has been tested in OECD 208 seedling emergence and seedling growth test and OECD 227 vegetative vigour test

Study type	Plant type	Plants species			
		Common name	Scientific name	EPPO code	Family
OECD 208 seedling emergence and seedling growth test (Study number: AS626)	Monocotyledonous	Winter wheat	<i>Triticum aestivum</i>	TRZAW	Poaceae
		Spring barley	<i>Hordeum vulgare</i>	HORVS	Poaceae
		Perennial ryegrass	<i>Lolium perenne</i>	LOLPE	Poaceae
		Maize	<i>Zea mays</i>	ZEAMX	Poaceae
		Sorghum	<i>Sorghum bicolor</i>	SORVU	Poaceae
	Dicotyledonous	Winter oilseed rape	<i>Brassica napus</i>	BRSNW	Brassicaceae
		Sugar beet	<i>Beta vulgaris</i>	BEAVA	Chenopodiaceae
		Soybean	<i>Glycine max</i>	GLXMA	Fabaceae
		Field pea	<i>Pisum sativum</i>	PIBSX	Fabaceae
		Sunflower	<i>Helianthus annuus</i>	HELAN	Asteraceae
OECD 227 vegetative vigour test (Study number: 140711087)	Monocotyledonous	Potato	<i>Solanum tuberosum</i>	SOLTU	Solanaceae
		Maize	<i>Zea mays</i>	ZEAMX	Poaceae
		Oats	<i>Avena sativa</i>	AVESA	Poaceae
		Onion	<i>Allium cepa</i>	ALLCE	Poaceae
	Dicotyledonous	Perennial ryegrass	<i>Lolium perenne</i>	LOLPE	Poaceae
		Sugar beet	<i>Beta vulgaris</i>	BEAVX	Amaranthaceae
		Winter oilseed rape	<i>Brassica napus</i>	BRSNW	Brassicaceae
		Radish	<i>Raphanus sativus</i>	RAPSR	Brassicaceae
		Sunflower	<i>Helianthus annuus</i>	HELAN	Asteraceae
		Soybean	<i>Glycine max</i>	GLXMA	Fabaceae
		Tomato	<i>Solanum lycopersicum</i>	LYPES	Solanaceae

Both studies were conducted in compliance with the OECD Principles of Good Laboratory Practice (as revised in 1997) ‘ENV/MC/CHEM (98)17 Chemikaliengesetz („Chemical Act“) der Bundesrepublik Deutschland (ChemG), Anhang 1 („Annex 1“), 2008’ by an organisation that is included on the national GLP compliance program.

Additionally, assessments for phytotoxic symptoms and other effects on crop growth and development have been carried out on a total of 7 crop selectivity trials conducted in the field in 2018 to evaluate crop safety and potential risk of adverse effects on other plants, including adjacent crops, from spray drift when AG-PM1-72 OD is applied post-emergence at the highest proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha in cereals.

On all of these trials, AG-PM1-72 OD was applied directly on one or more different crop type at rates of 0.04 L, 0.01 L, 0.006 L, 0.004/0.003 L and 0.002 L product/ha at single pre-emergence and/or post-emergence application timings. These rates were calculated according to the Ganzelmeier simplified table, where the rates matched the predicted spray drift amounts (4%, 1%, 0.6%, 0.4/0.3% and 0.2%) at respective distances away the area of application of 1, 3, 5, 10 and 15 m when AG-PM1-72 OD is applied

at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha. A further rate of 0.08 L product/ha was also tested in all of the trials, which corresponds to 4% drift to a distance of 1m away from the area of application for AG-PM1-72 OD at twice the maximum proposed label rate (2.0 L product/ha) and representative of sprayer overlap.

AG-PM1-72 OD and ADM.06001.H.2.B are the same formulation type (OD) and contain the same amounts of both pinoxaden (60 g/L) and mesosulfuron-methyl (12 g/L), differing only in content of co-formulants. It is considered to be primarily the active substances, rather than the formulation, that have potential to cause adverse effects on non-target crops including adjacent crops. Furthermore, the crop safety of both formulations were shown to be comparable where phytotoxicity occurred in greenhouse studies and efficacy and crop selectivity trials carried out on cereal crops (as summarised in Section 3.2.1.3). Therefore, data generated with AG-PM1-72 OD on the trials summarized here are considered to be fully supportive of demonstrating potential adverse effects on adjacent crops from spray drift when ADM.06001.H.2.B is applied at the maximum proposed label rate on cereals.

All field trials were carried out by organisations that are officially recognised as competent to carry out efficacy testing in accordance with Regulation (EU) 284/2013 by the authorities in the relevant countries.

Table 3.5-7: Details on trials methodology (adjacent crops field trials)

Guidelines	General guidelines	EPPO PP 1/152(4), PP 1/181(4), PP 1/135 (3/4)
	Specific guidelines	EPPO guideline PP 1/256(1) Effects on adjacent crop CED 212
Experimental design	Plot design	RCBD (7)
	Plot size	21-28.8 m ²
	Number of replications	1 replicate (7)
Crop	Crops tested	Adjacent crop field trials (BEAVA (2), BRSNW (3), HELAN (2), PIBSA (1), SOLTU (1), ZEAMX (3))
Application	Timing Crop stage (BBCH) at application	BEAVA (2): 03-10 BBCH BRSNW (2): 60-69 BBCH HELAN (2): 00-05 BBCH PIBSA (1): 03-05 BBCH SOLTU (1): 05-07 BBCH ZEAMX (3): 00-12 BBCH
	Number of applications	1 (7)
	Spray volumes	150 L/ha (4), 200 L/ha (3)
Assessments	Assessment types	Plant emergence, phytotoxicity

Justification for data outside country of submission

Agronomic practices in the cultivation of all crop types tested are considered to be sufficiently similar across countries for data generated across all trials to be fully supportive of demonstrating the crop safety of AG-PM1-72 OD in all countries.

Justification for the use of crop safety data included in this dossier is made according to EPPO PP 1/241(1) “Guidance on comparable climates”.

Crop selectivity trials to establish potential impact on adjacent crops from which data are summarised in this dossier were carried out in the following EPPO climatic zones:

Maritime: Maritime climatic regions of France

Mediterranean: Mediterranean climatic regions of France

Trials carried out in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone (France) are fully supportive towards demonstrating any potential effects of ADM.06001.H.2.B on adjacent crops in the EU Central Registration zone, with respect to relevant countries within this EPPO climatic zone/.

Whilst some of the trials were carried out in the Mediterranean EPPO climatic zone, the potential for a product to have adverse impact on adjacent crops resulting from spray drift and the sensitivity of the crops to phytotoxicity are considered to be sufficiently similar under different climatic conditions for

data generated in trials carried out in either the Maritime or Mediterranean EPPO climatic zone to be supportive towards demonstrating the potential impact of ADM.06001.H.2.B under conditions in all relevant EPPO climatic zones.

Applications on all trials were made using small plot sprayers designed to simulate application using commercial sprayers representative of those used to apply herbicides in relevant adjacent crops.

Vapour drift

After spray application the active ingredients will be present initially as a deposit in an essentially aqueous environment on the foliage surface. As the water volatilizes the deposit will contain the active ingredients in a mixture of non-volatile components of the formulation. From this deposit there is the potential for the active ingredients to volatilize and with air movement affect other plants, including adjacent crops, away from the area of application.

Both pinoxaden and mesosulfuron-methyl have very low volatility as demonstrated by the vapour pressure and Henry's Law constant for pure materials given in Table 3.5-8.

Table 3.5-8: Vapour pressure and Henry's Law constant

Active ingredient	Vapour Pressure (mPa) at 25°C	Henry's Law Constant (Pa.m ³ .mol ⁻¹)
pinoxaden ¹	2.0x10 ⁻⁰⁴ (low volatility)	9.2 x 10 ⁻⁷ at 25°C (non-volatile)
mesosulfuron-methyl ²	1.1x10 ⁻⁰⁵ (low volatility)	3.65x10 ⁻¹² at 20°C (non-volatile)

So whilst the transfer of pinoxaden and mesosulfuron-methyl is theoretically possible, and indeed there will be very low concentrations of the active substances above the spray deposit, in practice the actual concentrations will be negligible. What little active component present as vapour above the treated crop that does exist will be diluted in the air space reducing the concentration further to a point where it becomes insignificant.

Summary and conclusions on potential impact on adjacent crops

The sensitivity of a representative range of different monocotyledonous and dicotyledonous plant species sown following the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B or preceding the application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at a range of rates has been established in an OECD 208 Seedling emergence and seedling growth test and OECD 227, Vegetative vigour test. This included representative species of the main families to which the majority of main crop types belong.

Based on the lowest endpoints with respect to ED₅₀ values for the most sensitive crop species included in the tests, for pre-emergence effects (on BEAVA) and post-emergence effects (on BRSNW), are compared to the off-field Predicted Environmental Rates (PER) resulting from application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and the distance at which the TER was above the threshold of 1.0 or 5.0 for each crop species tested, with the exception of post-emergence effects on BRSNW, for which the TER was above a trigger of 5.0 for a distance of 3 m.

Therefore for a TER trigger of 5.0, the risk of adverse impact on all plant species tested is shown to be acceptable with respect to spray drift away from the area of application when ADM.06001.H.2.B is applied post-emergence at the proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha in cereals when a 3 m buffer distance between the edge of the area of application and non-target plants is observed. The use of ≥50% drift reduction nozzles reduces the risk to an acceptable level without the need for a buffer zone.

Furthermore, assessments for phytotoxic symptoms and other effects on crop growth and development have been carried out on a total of 7 adjacent crop field trials conducted in 2018 to evaluate crop safety and potential risk of adverse impact on other plants including adjacent crops from spray drift following post-emergence applications of AG-PM1-72 OD at the maximum proposed label rate on winter wheat crops.

¹ <http://sitem.herts.ac.uk/aeru/ppdb/en/Reports/528.htm>

² <http://sitem.herts.ac.uk/aeru/iupac/Reports/441.htm>

All of these trials were carried out in France, with 3 in the Maritime EPPO climatic zone and 4 in the Mediterranean EPPO climatic zone.

On all of these trials, AG-PM1-72 OD was applied directly on one or more different crop type at rates based on the Ganzelmeier simplified table of predicted spray drift amounts (4%, 1%, 0.6%, 0.4/0.3% and 0.2%) at respective distances away the area of application of 1, 3, 5, 10 and 15 m when AG-PM1-72 OD is applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha. A further rate of 0.08 L product/ha was also tested in all of the trials, which corresponds to 4% drift to a distance of 1m away from the area of application for AG-PM1-72 OD at twice the maximum proposed label rate (2.0 L product/ha) and representative of sprayer overlap.

Applied pre-emergence of the crop on BEAVA (1 trial), HELAN (1 trial), PIBSA (1 trial), SOLTU (1 trial) and ZEAMX (2 trials), AG-PM1-72 OD applied at rates of up to 0.08 L product/ha caused no consistent or pronounced delays or reductions in crop emergence and no phytotoxicity following emergence on any of the crops.

Applied post-emergence of the crop on BEAVA (1 trial), BRSNW (3 trials) and ZEAMX (1 trial), AG-PM1-72 OD applied at rates of up to 0.04 L product/ha caused no phytotoxicity on ZEAMX or on two of the trials on BRSNW and caused only very low levels of phytotoxic symptoms (3-8%) on BEAVA and the other trial on BRSNW. All phytotoxicity occurring on the crops was transient and no longer apparent at later assessments.

Applied post-emergence on these crops, AG-PM1-72 OD applied at rates of up to 0.08 L product/ha caused no phytotoxicity on ZEAMX and only relatively low levels of phytotoxic symptoms (5-12%) on BEAVA and two of the trials on BRSNW and no phytotoxicity on the other trials on BRSNW. All phytotoxicity occurring on the crops was transient and no longer apparent at later assessments.

Based on predicted drift values the 0.04 L product/ha rate represents that up to 1m away from the area of application when ADM.06001.H.2.B is applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and the 0.08 L product/ha rate represents that to 1m away for application at twice the proposed label rate (2.0 L product/ha), representative of the risk when sprayer overlap occurs.

In the absence of phytotoxicity or occurrence of only very low and transient levels at these rates, the data from these field trials indicates the risk of adverse impact outside the area of application on the range of representative major crop types tested is low and acceptable when ADM.06001.H.2.B is applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha on a cereal crop.

Based on TER values calculated from Predicted Environmental Rates (PER) values and EC₅₀ data from the greenhouse seedling emergence and vegetative vigour studies, and further reinforced by crop safety demonstrated in the adjacent crops field trials, ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at up to the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha on a cereal crop poses a low risk for adverse impact on other plants, including adjacent crops, resulting from spray drift outside the area of application. However, it is recommended to use risk mitigation measures by using low drift nozzles to further reduce the risk.

Furthermore, based on low volatility of the two active substances contained in ADM.06001.H.2.B, the risk of adverse impact related to volatility is very low and acceptable.

Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that the likelihood of adverse impact on other plants, including adjacent crops, resulting from a post-emergence application of ADM.06001.H.2.B at the maximum label rate of 1.0 L product/ha and according to label recommendations in cereals is minimal and poses no unacceptable risk.

Details from these trials including TER calculations are contained in BAD document.

Tank cleaning

Tests have been carried out to determine the effectiveness of the tank cleaning procedure for ADM.06001.H.2.B as summarised in in Part B Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the submission for approval of ADM.06001.H.2.B.

Procedures for cleaning application equipment

The following standard procedures for cleaning the application equipment according to Good Agricultural Practice are recommended following the use of ADM.06001.H.2.B.

All equipment and contaminated clothing should be thoroughly washed/cleaned with water diluted detergent solution, and rinsed with clean water three times. After each step of washing the drain sprayer, spray out completely. Ensure all liquid is removed from the sprayer tank, pump and hoses. Remove nozzles, open tank and drain pump to allow free access of air to all parts of the system.

Care should be taken not to rinse the contaminated washings from application equipment into waste water channels. Contaminated cleaning liquids should be disposed of safely according to local regulations. Operators should read the sprayer manufacturer's instructions before beginning to wash out sprayers.

Effectiveness of the cleaning procedure

At the time of completing this dossier no specific study has been conducted for ADM.06001.H.2.B to investigate the effectiveness of the cleaning procedure detailed above.

Nevertheless, the efficacy of cleaning application equipment with regard to impact on crops can be estimated on the basis of EPPO guideline PP1/292(1): *Cleaning pesticide application equipment (PAE)-efficacy aspects. Appendix 4-4. Example calculation for estimation of residues within PAE based on ISO 16119*. It should be noted that the calculation only assumes 2 rinses rather than the 3 rinses of GAP.

The maximum proposed label rate for use of ADM.06001.H.2.B on cereals is 1.0 L product/ha (60 g/ha pinoxaden + 12 g/ha mesosulfuron-methyl) for spraying in a water volume of 80-300 L/ha. Lowest water volume of 80 L/ha will give the highest concentration of product, so the risk assessment calculation is based on this volume as the worst case scenario for ADM.06001.H.2.B in the initial spray operation.

Cleaning step	Calculations	pinoxaden	mesosulfuron-methyl
Amount of product in 1000 L sprayer (assuming 80 L/ha water volume)	$1000/80 = 12.5$ $12.5 \times 1.0 \text{ L/ha} = 12.5 \text{ L ADM.06001.H.2.B/ha}$	= 750 g a.s./ha	= 150 g a.s./ha
Amount left after spraying (2.6%)	x 2.6%	= 19.5 g a.s. /ha	= 3.9 g a.s. /ha
Amount left after 1 wash procedure (2.6%)	x 2.6%	= 0.4875 g a.s./ha	= 0.0975 g a.s. /ha
Amount left after 2 wash procedures (2.6%)	x 2.6%	= 0.012188 g a.s./ha	= 0.002438 g a.s./ha
Amount after re-filling sprayer (1000 L)	/1000	= 0.0000122 g a.s./L	= 0.0000024 g a.s./L

Assuming a spray volume of 200L/ha (worst case) to be applied to the next crops, 2.44 mg/ha of pinoxaden + 0.49 mg/ha mesosulfuron-methyl (the equivalent of 0.00004 L product/ha of ADM.06001.H.2.B) would be applied to the crop by re-use of the application equipment.

Seedling emergence and vegetative vigour tests (as summarised in Sections 3.5.1 and 3.5.2) have shown post-emergence effects (EC_{50}) at 0.13 L product/ha for BRSNW. The amount of active ingredients remaining after a standard washing procedure with 2 rinses is significantly lower than the EC_{50} value. It is therefore possible to demonstrate that a standard tank washing procedure comprising three thorough rinses with water will result in negligible amounts of pinoxaden and mesosulfuron-methyl in a subsequent spray operation that will have no harmful effects on non-target crops.

**Comments of zRMS on:
Impact on adjacent crops (3.5.2)**

Nine trials were submitted for the evaluation of the risk of possible adverse effects of ADM.06001.H.2.B on adjacent crops, including two GLP greenhouse studies carried out in 2020-2021 in Germany and 7 GEP selectivity field trials conducted in 2018 in France. In the field trials, the previous formulation AG-PM1-72 OD was tested. If ADM.06001.H.2.B and AG-PM1-72 OD contain the same amount of active substances and differ only in the content of some co-formulants, results from trials with AG-PM1-72 OD can be used for the evaluation of possible impact of ADM.06001.H.2.B on adjacent crops. Greenhouse studies present data on sensitivity of representative monocotyledonous and dicotyledonous crop species to ADM.06001.H.2.B applied at various dose rates, pre-sowing/planting (seedling emergence and seedling growth test, OECD 208 with eleven tested plant species: winter wheat, spring barley, perennial ryegrass, maize, sorghum, winter oilseed rape, sugar beet, soybean, field pea, sunflower, potato) or post-emergence (vegetative vigour test, OECD 227 with ten tested plant species: maize, oats, onion, perennial ryegrass, sugar beet, winter oilseed rape, radish, sunflower, soybean, tomato). Plant emergence, phytotoxicity and plant fresh weight were assessed in OECD 208 seedling emergence and seedling growth test. Crop safety was assessed in OECD 227 vegetative vigour test. If the most sensitive endpoints from both greenhouse studies were shoot fresh and dry weight, effects rates (ED₅₀ values) were calculated for ADM.06001.H.2.B based on these two parameters on a range of tested crop species. The most sensitive crop species, due to the lowest ED₅₀ values were sugar beet (pre-emergence effect) and winter oilseed rape (post-emergence effect). Considering TER > 5 (threshold used for higher safety margin) the risk of adverse impact on all plant species tested has been shown to be acceptable when ADM.06001.H.2.B is applied post-emergence at the proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha in cereals when a 3 m buffer distance between the edge of the area of application and non-target plants is observed. If ≥50% drift reduction nozzles is used, the risk is reduced to an acceptable level.

Phytotoxic symptoms and other possible adverse effects on crop growth and development of various adjacent crops, due to spray drift when AG-PM1-72 OD was applied at dose rate of 1.0 L/ha, were assessed in additional 7 selectivity field trials. Range of dose rates: 0.04 L, 0.01 L, 0.006 L, 0.004/0.003 L and 0.002 L, was calculated according to the Ganzelmeier simplified table, where the rates matched the predicted spray drift amounts (4%, 1%, 0.6%, 0.4/0.3% and 0.2%) at respective distances away the area of application of 1, 3, 5, 10 and 15 m when AG-PM1-72 OD is applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha. Dose rate of 0.08 L/ha was also tested, which corresponds to 4% drift, considering distance 1m away from the area of AG-PM1-72 OD application at double recommended dose rate. No phytotoxicity or occurrence of only low and transient levels of phytotoxicity was noted in selectivity trials, when AG-PM1-72 OD was applied pre or post-emergence of adjacent crops. Additionally, due to low volatility of pinoxaden and mesosulfuron-methyl contained in ADM.06001.H.2.B, the risk of adverse impact related to volatility can be considered as low and acceptable.

Based on the submitted data and trial results, it can be concluded that, the risk of adverse effects of ADM.06001.H.2.B on adjacent crops is low, when ADM.06001.H.2.B is applied at the maximum proposed label rate of 1.0 L product/ha on a cereal crop. According to the rules of good agricultural practice it would be advisable to include, in the product label, the following remark, in order to avoid the risk of adverse effects on adjacent crops.:

“When using ADM.06001.H.2.B:

- Do not allow spray drift to the neighbouring crop plantations.
- Use ≥50% low drift nozzles to reduce the risk of spray drift to the neighbouring crop plantations

Tank cleaning

The proposed procedure for cleaning application equipment is sufficient to remove active substances residues after application of ADM.06001.H.2.B to the safe level, to avoid potential risk of damage for the plants during a subsequent application. Cleaning of application equipment should be done directly after use, according to the common agricultural practice.

3.5.3 Effects on beneficial and other non-target organisms (KCP 6.5.3)

Detailed studies on the possible adverse effects to beneficial organisms are submitted and summarised in Part B, Section 9 (Ecotoxicology).

Comments of zRMS on:

Effects on beneficial and other non-target organisms (3.5.3)

Adverse effects on non-target organisms were not observed in a part of efficacy and selectivity trials. In other trials no observations on beneficial or non-target organisms have been reported. Detailed studies are contained in Part B, Section 9 (Ecotoxicology).

3.6 Other/special studies

No additional studies are summarised.

3.7 List of test facilities including the corresponding certificates

Table 3.7-1: List of test facilities

Test facility	Country	Certificate (Yes or No)
Agrartest GmbH	Germany	Yes
Agreco Sp. z o.o.	Poland	Yes
Agricola	Germany	Yes
AGRITEC výzkum šlechtění a služby s.r.o. (Agritec, Research, Breeding and Services Ltd)	Czech Republic	Yes
Agro Research Consulting	Poland	Yes
agro-check	Germany	Yes
AGROTEST FRANCE	France	Yes
ANADIAG FRANCE	France	Yes
ANTEDIS	France	Yes
BioChem agrar GmbH	Germany	Yes
BIOTEK Agriculture	France	Yes
BIOTransfer	France	No
CentrExpé	France	Yes
CPR Europe Kft.	Hungary	Yes
Czech University of Life Sciences (Ceska zemedelska univerzita v Praze)	Czech Republic	Yes
EPHYDIA	France	Yes
ESSAIS +	France	Yes
Eurofins Agrosience Services GmbH / Agrartest GmbH	Germany	Yes
Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L.	Romania	Yes
Fertico Sp. z o.o.	Poland	Yes
Field Research Support	Germany	Yes
Fructika Kft.	Hungary	Yes

Test facility	Country	Certificate (Yes or No)
Hetterich Fieldwork GbR	Germany	Yes
InTec Agro Trials, s.r.o.	Czech Republic	Yes
Martin Feldversuchswesen	Germany	Yes
NAT SERVICE PLUS	France	Yes
Növénypathyka Kft.	Hungary	Yes
plantus-GbR	Germany	Yes
Poznań University of Life Sciences	Poland	Yes
QUALIPHYT	France	Yes
Rheinland-Pfalz (RLP) AgroScience GmbH	Germany	Yes (GLP)
SAGEA Centro di Saggio s.r.l.	Italy	Yes
STAPHYT	France	Yes
STAPHYT Sp. z o.o.	Poland	Yes
SynTech Research Hungary Kft.	Hungary	Yes
Trial-Tec GmbH	Germany	Yes
U.A.S. Umwelt- und Agrarstudien GmbH	Germany	Yes
Zemservis ZS Domaninek s.r.o.	Czech Republic	Yes
Zkušební stanice Nechanice s.r.o.	Czech Republic	Yes
ZKUŠEBNÍ STANICE Trutnov s.r.o.	Czech Republic	Yes
ibacon GmbH	Germany	Yes (GLP)

Appendix 1: List of data submitted in support of the evaluation

List of data submitted and relied on

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
KCP 6.0/01	-	2021	BIOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT DOSSIER for EDAPTIS/ADM.06001.H.2.B (Core Assessment) Report no. – Adama Agan Limited Report date 16/07/2021 Non-GEP, unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.1/001	Johannes Rohr	2016	Efficacy screening post emergence on ALOMY, APESV, LOLSS and dicot. weeds in cereals, Germany 2016 Agrartest GmbH, Germany Report no. DE16HENNNGW091A Report date 28/11/2016 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.1/002	Thomas Martin	2016	Efficacy screening post emergence on ALOMY, APESV, LOLSS and dicot. weeds in cereals, Germany 2016 Martin Feldversuchswesen, Germany Report no. DE16HENNNGW091C Report date 06/09/2016 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.1/003	Dr Jörg Perner	2016	Herbicide efficacy screening at post emergence of ALOMY, APESV, LOLSS and dicotyledonous weeds in cereals. Germany 2016 U.A.S. Umwelt- und Agrarstudien GmbH, Germany Report no. DE16HENNNGW091D Report date 15/11/2016 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.1/004	Thomas Martin	2020	An efficacy evaluation of various ratios of Axial and Atlantis OD Selective herbicide on ALOMY (Germany), 2020 Martin Feldversuchswesen, Germany Report no. DE20HJNNNGW179A Report date 23/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
KCP 6.1/005	Thomas Kunze	2020	An efficacy evaluation of various ratios of Axial and Atlantis OD Selective herbicide on APESV (Germany), 2020 agro-check, Germany Report no. DE20HJNNNGW180A Report date 10/11/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.1/006	Tjard Ommen	2020	An efficacy evaluation of various ratios of Axial and Atlantis OD Selective herbicide on APESV (Germany), 2020 plantus-GbR, Germany Report no. DE20HJNNNGW180B Report date 11/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.1/007	Aur�lie Bersegeay	2016	An evaluation of various ratios of AG-M7-030 OD + AXIAL PRATIC for the control of LOLMU and broadleaved weeds in wheat, 2016, in France QUALIPHYT, France Report no. FR16HETRZAW501A Report date not available GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.1/008	Christophe Marie, Jean-Luc Barou	2016	An evaluation of various ratios of AG-M7-030 OD + Axial Pratic for the control of grass weeds in wheat, 2016 in France AGROTEST FRANCE, France Report no. FR16HETRZAW501B Report date not available GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.1/009	Micka�l Lorphelin	2016	An evaluation of various ratios of AG-M7-030 OD + Axial 50 EC for the control of grassweeds in wheat, 2016 in France NAT SERVICE PLUS, France Report no. FR16HETRZAW501C Report date 16/12/2016 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.1/010	Jean-Pierre Rivet	2016	An evaluation of various ratios of AG-M7-030 OD + Axial Pratic for the control of grassweeds in wheat in France, 2016	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Verte- brate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
			ESSAIS +, France Report no. FR16HETRZAW501D Report date not available GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.1/011	David Crepin	2021	An efficacy evaluation of various ratios of Axial and Atlantis OD Selective herbicide on LOLMU in winter wheat in France, 2020 ESSAIS +, France Report no. FR20HJYCERE559A Report date 02/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.1/012	Mickaël Lorphelin	2020	An efficacy evaluation of various ratios of Axial and Atlantis OD Selective herbicide on ALOMY France, 2020 NAT SERVICE PLUS, France Report no. FR20HJYCERE559B Report date 15/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.1/013	Dr Attila Labant	2020	An efficacy evaluation of various ratios of Axial and Atlantis OD Selective herbicide on LOLSS in Hungary, 2020 Növénypathyka Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HETRZAW215A Report date 25/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.1/014	Gregory Castella	2020	An efficacy evaluation of various ratios of Axial and Atlantis OD Selective herbicide on various grassweeds in the glasshouse in Italy, 2020 SAGEA Centro di Saggio s.r.l., Italy Report no. IT20HJNOPLA054A Report date 29/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.1/015	B. Dumont, R. Maggiore, P. Dunon, Dr V. Calaora	2021	Biological efficacy evaluation of mesosulfuron, pinoxaden or their mixture in varying ratios on different weeds populations BIOtransfer, France Report no. 21743820 Report date 03/2021	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
			non-GEP, Unpublished				
KCP 6.1/016	Udo Zickart	2021	An efficacy evaluation of various ratios of Axial and Atlantis OD Selective herbicide on various grassweeds in the glasshouse, Germany, 2020 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE20HJNOPLA183A Report date 26/03/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.1/017	Calin Costea, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of Efficacy evaluation of various ratios of Axial and Atlantis OD Selective herbicide on ALOMY ROMANIA, 2020 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HJTRZAW241A Report date 09/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.1/018	Udo Zickart	2021	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B compared to AG-PM1-072 OD for the control of grassweeds in the greenhouse in Germany, 2020 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE20HENOPLA182A Report date 17/03/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.1/019	Gregory Castella	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B compared to AG-PM1-072 OD for the control of grassweeds in the greenhouse in Italy, 2020 SAGEA Centro di Saggio s.r.l., Italy Report no. IT20HENOPLA055A Report date 29/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.1/020	Peter Wolf	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on ALOMY (blackgrass) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals, Germany Agricola, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW170A Report date 03/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.1/021	Dr Karl-Wilhelm Maßmann	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on ALOMY (blackgrass) and broad-leaved weeds in	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
			cereals (Germany), spring 2020 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW170B Report date 21/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.1/022	Johannes Rohr	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on ALOMY (blackgrass) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020 Trial-Tec GmbH, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW170D Report date 22/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.1/023	Johannes Rohr	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on AVESS (wild oats) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020 Trial-Tec GmbH, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW172D Report date 20/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.1/024	Viktória Magyaróvári	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on BROSS (Bromus spp) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020 Agrartest GmbH, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW173B Report date 03/11/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.1/025	Johannes Rohr	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on BROSS (Bromus spp) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020 Trial-Tec GmbH, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW173C Report date 22/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.1/026	Johannes Rohr	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on POAAN, POATR and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020 Trial-Tec GmbH, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW174D	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
			Report date 20/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished				
KCP 6.1/027	Sergej Buchet, Viviane Calaora	2021	Evaluation of the selectivity of different herbicide products on wheat, rye and triticale BIOtransfer, France Report no. 21744020 Report date 18/05/2021 non-GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.1/028	Udo Zickart	2021	Selectivity evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B compared to AG-PM1-072 OD on cereal crops in the greenhouse in Germany, 2020 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE20HSYCERE181A Report date 26/04/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.1/029	Gregory Castella	2020	Selectivity evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B compared to AG-PM1-072 OD on cereal crops in the greenhouse in Italy, 2020 SAGEA Centro di Saggio s.r.l., Italy Report no. IT20HSCERE056A Report date 30/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.1/030	Andreas Hetterich	2021	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on rye (Germany), spring 2020 Hetterich Fieldwork GbR, Germany Report no. DE20HSSECCW177A Report date 28/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.1/031	Andreas Hetterich	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on spring wheat (Germany), spring 2020 Hetterich Fieldwork GbR, Germany Report no. DE20HSTRZAS176A Report date 16/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.1/032	Andreas Hetterich	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat (Germany), spring 2020 Hetterich Fieldwork GbR, Germany	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
			Report no. DE20HSTRZAW175A Report date 27/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.1/033	Andreas Hetterich	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat (Germany), spring 2020 Hetterich Fieldwork GbR, Germany Report no. DE20HSTRZAW175B Report date 22/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.1/034	Andreas Hetterich	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on triticale (Germany), spring 2020 Hetterich Fielwork GbR, Germany Report no. DE20HSTTLWI178A Report date 27/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/001	Jirí Stancel	2018	Post-emergence control of APESV and broad-leaved weeds with AG-PM1-72 OD in cereals, Czech republic, spring 2018 Zkušební stanice Nechanice s.r.o., Czech Republic Report no. CZ18HETRZAW070A Report date 06/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/002	Josef Soukup	2018	Post-emergence control of BROSS and broad-leaved weeds with AG-PM1-72 OD in cereals Czech Republic, spring 2018 Czech University of Life Sciences, Czech Republic Report no. CZ18HETRZAW074A Report date 09/08/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/003	Petra Kopecká	2018	Post-emergence control of Poa sp and broad-leaved weeds with AG-PM1-72 OD in cereals, Czech Republic, spring 2018 ZKUŠEBNÍ STANICE Trutnov s.r.o., Czech Republic Report no. CZ18HETRZAW076A Report date 09/08/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
KCP 6.2/004	Josef Soukup	2019	To demonstrate the efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD programs when applied in the spring following an autumn residual herbicide for the control of BROSS in the Czech Republic 2018/19 Czech University of Life Sciences, Czech Republic Report no. CZ18HETRZAW113A Report date 18/07/2019 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/005	Zdenek Trojan	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on LOLSS (Lolium spp) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals, in the Czech Republic, spring 2020 Zemservis ZS Domaninek s.r.o, Czech Republic Report no. CZ20HETRZAS002B Report date 30/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/006	Jana Reiszova	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on LOLSS (Lolium spp) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals, in the Czech Republic, spring 2020 Zkušební stanice Nechanice s.r.o., Czech Republic Report no. CZ20HETRZAS002C Report date 06/11/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/007	Jana Reiszova	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on LOLSS (Lolium spp) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals, in the Czech Republic, spring 2020 Zkušební stanice Nechanice s.r.o., Czech Republic Report no. CZ20HETRZAW002A Report date 05/11/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/008	Prokop Šmirous	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on LOLSS (Lolium spp) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals, in the Czech Republic, spring 2020 AGRITEC výzkum šlechtění a služby s.r.o., Czech Republic Report no. CZ20HETRZAW002D Report date 13/11/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
KCP 6.2/009	Josef Soukup	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on APESV and broad-leaved weeds in cereals, in the Czech Republic, spring 2020 Czech University of Life Sciences, Czech Republic Report no. CZ20HETRZAW003A Report date 17/07/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/010	Jana Reiszova	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on APESV and broad-leaved weeds in cereals, in the Czech Republic, spring 2020 Zkušební stanice Nechanice s.r.o., Czech Republic Report no. CZ20HETRZAW003B Report date 24/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/011	Josef Soukup	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on APESV and broad-leaved weeds in cereals, in the Czech Republic, spring 2020 Czech University of Life Sciences, Czech Republic Report no. CZ20HETRZAW003C Report date 17/07/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/012	Thomas Bauer	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on AVESS (wild oats) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals in the Czech Republic, spring 2020 InTec Agro Trials, s.r.o., Czech Republic Report no. CZ20HETRZAW004A Report date 07/12/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/013	Josef Soukup	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on AVESS (wild oats) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals in the Czech Republic, spring 2020 Czech University of Life Sciences, Czech Republic Report no. CZ20HETRZAW004B Report date 21/07/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/014	Thomas Bauer	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on BROSS (Bromus spp) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals in the Czech Republic, spring 2020	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
			InTec Agro Trials, s.r.o., Czech Republic Report no. CZ20HETRZAW005A Report date 07/12/2020 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.2/015	Josef Soukup	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on BROSS (Bromus spp) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals in the Czech Republic, spring 2020 Czech University of Life Sciences, Czech Republic Report no. CZ20HETRZAW005B Report date 22/06/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/016	Jiří Hruška	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on POAAN, POATR and broad-leaved weeds in cereals in the Czech Republic, spring 2020 ZKUŠEBNÍ STANICE Trutnov s.r.o., Czech Republic Report no. CZ20HETRZAW007A Report date 29/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/017	Johannes Rohr	2018	Post-emergence control of ALOMY and broad-leaved weeds with AG-PM1-72 OD in cereals Germany, spring 2018 Agrartest GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HENNNGG183A Report date 09/10/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/018	Bastian Lorenz	2018	Post-emergence control of ALOMY and broad-leaved weeds with AG-PM1-72 OD in cereals Germany, spring 2018 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HENNNGG183B Report date 20/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/019	Thomas Kunze	2018	Post-emergence control of APESV and broad-leaved weeds with AG-PM1-72 OD in cereals Germany, spring 2018 agro-check, Germany Report no. DE18HENNNGG185G	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
			Report date 31/08/2018 GEP, Unpublished				
KCP 6.2/020	Helmut Zöllner	2018	Post-emergence control of APESV and broad-leaved weeds with AG-PM1-72 OD in cereals Germany, spring 2018 Field Research Support, Germany Report no. DE18HENNNGG185H Report date 09/10/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/021	Dr Jörg Perner	2018	Post-emergence control of APESV and broad-leaved weeds with AG-PM1-72 OD in cereals. Germany, spring 2018 U.A.S. Umwelt- und Agrarstudien GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HENNNGG185I Report date 03/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/022	Johannes Rohr	2018	Post-emergence control of AVESS (wild oats) and broad-leaved weeds with AG-PM1-72 OD in cereals Germany, spring 2018 Agrartest GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HENNNGG187L Report date 09/10/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/023	Johannes Rohr	2018	Post-emergence control of BROSS and broad-leaved weeds with AG-PM1-72 OD in cereals Germany, spring 2018 Agrartest GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HENNNGG191P Report date 09/10/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/024	Johannes Rohr	2018	Post-emergence control of BROSS and broad-leaved weeds with AG-PM1-72 OD in cereals Germany, spring 2018 Agrartest GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HENNNGG191Q Report date 09/10/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
KCP 6.2/025	Helmut Zöllner	2018	Post-emergence control of BROSS and broad-leaved weeds with AG-PM1-72 OD in cereals Germany, spring 2018 Field Research Support, Germany Report no. DE18HENNNGG191R Report date 09/10/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/026	Dr Jörg Perner	2018	Post-emergence control of poa sp and broad-leaved weeds with AG-PM1-72 OD in cereals. Germany, spring 2018 U.A.S. Umwelt- und Agrarstudien GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HENNNGG193V Report date 03/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/027	Dr Jörg Perner	2018	Post-emergence control of poa sp and broad-leaved weeds with AG-PM1-72 OD in cereals. Germany, spring 2018 U.A.S. Umwelt- und Agrarstudien GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HENNNGG193W Report date 03/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/028	Viktória Magyaróvári	2019	To demonstrate the efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD programs when applied in the spring following an autumn residual herbicide for the control of ALOMY in Germany 2018/19 Agrartest GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HETRZAW195A Report date 12/12/2019 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/029	Helmut Zöllner	2019	To demonstrate the efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD programs when applied in the spring following an autumn residual herbicide for the control of ALOMY in Germany 2018/19 Field Research Support, Germany Report no. DE18HETRZAW195B Report date 31/07/2019 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
KCP 6.2/030 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.1/020</i>	Peter Wolf	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on ALOMY (blackgrass) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals, Germany Agricola, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW170A Report date 03/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/031 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.1/021</i>	Dr Karl-Wilhelm Maßmann	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on ALOMY (blackgrass) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW170B Report date 21/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/032	Thomas Martin	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on ALOMY (blackgrass) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020 Martin Feldversuchswesen, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW170C Report date 23/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/033 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.1/022</i>	Johannes Rohr	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on ALOMY (blackgrass) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020 Trial-Tec GmbH, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW170D Report date 22/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/034	Dr Jörg Perner	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on ALOMY (blackgrass) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020 U.A.S. Umwelt- und Agrarstudien GmbH, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW170E Report date 30/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/035	Thomas Kunze	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on APESV and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
			agro-check, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW171A Report date 29/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.2/036	Dr Karl-Wilhelm Maßmann	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on APESV and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW171B Report date 21/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/037	Tjard Ommen	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on APESV and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020 plantus-GbR, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW171C Report date 11/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/038	Thomas Martin	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on APESV and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020 Martin Feldversuchswesen, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW171D Report date 23/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/039	Johannes Rohr	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on APESV and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020 Trial-Tec GmbH, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW171E Report date 22/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/040	Thomas Kunze	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on AVESS (wild oats) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020 agro-check, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW172A Report date 10/11/2020	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
			GEP, Unpublished				
KCP 6.2/041	Johannes Rohr	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on AVESS (wild oats) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020 Trial-Tec GmbH, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW172B Report date 20/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/042 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.1/023</i>	Johannes Rohr	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on AVESS (wild oats) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020 Trial-Tec GmbH, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW172D Report date 20/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/043	Dr Jörg Perner	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on BROSS (Bromus spp) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020 U.A.S. Umwelt- und Agrarstudien GmbH, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW172E Report date 30/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/044	Viktória Magyaróvári	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on BROSS (Bromus spp) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020 Eurofins Agrosience Services GmbH / Agrartest GmbH, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW173A Report date 03/11/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/045 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.1/024</i>	Viktória Magyaróvári	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on BROSS (Bromus spp) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020 Agrartest GmbH, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW173B Report date 03/11/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
KCP 6.2/046 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.1/025</i>	Johannes Rohr	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on BROSS (Bromus spp) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020 Trial-Tec GmbH, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW173C Report date 22/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/047	Dr Jörg Perner	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on BROSS (Bromus spp) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020 U.A.S. Umwelt- und Agrarstudien GmbH, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW173D Report date 30/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/048	Helmut Zöllner	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on POAAN, POATR and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020 Field Research Support, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW174A Report date 02/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/049	Tjard Ommen	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on POAAN, POATR and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020 plantus-GbR, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW174B Report date 11/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/050	Johannes Rohr	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on POAAN, POATR and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020 Trial-Tec GmbH, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW174C Report date 22/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/051 <i>Submitted</i>	Johannes Rohr	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on POAAN, POATR and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
<i>under KCP 6.1/026</i>			Trial-Tec GmbH, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW174D Report date 20/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.2/052	Jean-Pierre Rivet	2019	Post-emergence control of LOLSS and broad-leaved weeds with AG-PM1-72 OD in cereals (FRANCE), spring 2018 ESSAIS +, France Report no. FR18HEYCERE568B Report date 25/01/2019 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/053	Frédéric Wallart	2018	Efficacy AG-PM1-72 OD in post-emergence against ALOMY and broad-leaved weeds without and with adjuvant, in wheat in France, spring 2018. EPHYDIA, France Report no. FR18HEYCERW551C Report date 07/12/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/054	Mickaël Lorphelin	2018	Efficacy AG-PM1-72 OD in post-emergence against ALOMY and broad-leaved weeds without and with adjuvant, in wheat, in France, spring 2018 NAT SERVICE PLUS, France Report no. FR18HEYCERW551D Report date 07/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/055	Jean Pierre Bernon	2018	Efficacy AG-PM1-72 OD in post-emergence against ALOMY and broadleaves, without and with adjuvant, in wheat in France, in spring 2018 CentrExpé, France Report no. FR18HEYCERW551E Report date not available GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/056	Mélanie Gressard-Biaunier	2021	Efficacy AG-PM1-72 OD in post-emergence against LOLSS and broad-leaved weeds without and with adjuvant, in wheat (France), spring 2018 QUALIPHYT, France Report no. FR18HEYCERW552F Report date 22/04/2021	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
			GEP, Unpublished				
KCP 6.2/057	Jean Pierre Bernon	2018	Efficacy AG-PM1-72 OD in post-emergence against POAAN and broadleaves, without and with adjuvant, in wheat in France, in spring 2018 CentrExpé, France Report no. FR18HEYCERW553B Report date not available GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/058	Julien Rivet	2019	Efficacy AG-PM1-72 OD in post-emergence against AVEFA and broad-leaved weeds without and with adjuvant, in wheat (France), spring 2018 ESSAIS +, France Report no. FR18HEYCERW554A Report date 28/03/2019 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/059	Jean Pierre Bernon	2018	Efficacy AG-PM1-72 OD in post-emergence against ALOMY and broadleaves in wheat in France, in Spring 2018 CentrExpé, France Report no. FR18HEYCERW555B Report date not available GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/060	Mickaël Lorphelin	2018	Efficacy AG-PM1-72 OD in post-emergence against ALOMY and broad-leaved weeds in wheat with different adjuvants (France), spring 2018 NAT SERVICE PLUS, France Report no. FR18HEYCERW556B Report date 21/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/061	Frédérique Varret	2019	Efficacy AG-PM1-72 OD applied in post-emergence in spring against LOLMU and ALOMY in wheat, in France 2018 STAPHYT, France Report no. FR18HEYCERW557B Report date 14/03/2019 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/062	Christophe Marie, Jean-Luc Barou	2018	Efficacy AG-PM1-72 OD in post-emergence against LOLSS and broad-leaved weeds in wheat	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
			(FRANCE), spring 2018 AGROTEST FRANCE, France Report no. FR18HEYCERW557D Report date not available GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.2/063	Julien Rivet	2019	Efficacy AG-PM1-72 OD in post-emergence against LOLSS and broad-leaved weeds in wheat with different adjuvants (FRANCE), spring 2018 ESSAIS +, France Report no. FR18HEYCERW558A Report date 28/03/2019 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/064	Philippe NEGRINI	2019	To demonstrate the efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD programs when applied in the spring following an autumn residual herbicide for the control of ALOMY in France. 2018/19 ANTEDIS, France Report no. FR18HEYCERW561A Report date 20/12/2019 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/065	Wilfried Rouane	2019	To demonstrate the efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD programs when applied in the spring following an autumn residual herbicide for the control of ALOMY in France 2018/19 ANADIAG FRANCE, France Report no. FR18HEYCERW561F Report date 25/11/2019 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/066	Mélanie Biaunier	2021	To demonstrate the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B programs when applied in the spring following an autumn residual herbicide for the control of ALOMY in France 2019/20 QUALIPHYT, France Report no. FR19HEYCERW561A Report date 14/01/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/067	Mickaël Lorphelin	2021	To demonstrate the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B programs when applied in the spring following an	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
			autumn residual herbicide for the control of ALOMY in France 2019/20 NAT SERVICE PLUS, France Report no. FR19HEYCERW561C Report date 24/03/2021 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.2/068	Christophe Marie, Jean-Luc Barou	2020	To demonstrate the efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD programs when applied in the spring following an autumn residual herbicide for the control of LOLSS in France 2019/20 AGROTEST FRANCE, France Report no. FR19HEYCERW562D Report date not available GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/069	Philippe NEGRINI	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on ALOMY (blackgrass) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals in France, spring 2020 ANTEDIS, France Report no. FR20HETRZAW551A Report date 16/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/070	M. Kieffer	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on ALOMY (blackgrass) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (France), spring 2020 CentrExpé, France Report no. FR20HETRZAW551B Report date Report date not available GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/071	Mickaël Lorphelin	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on ALOMY (Blackgrass) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals France, spring 2020 NAT SERVICE PLUS, France Report no. FR20HETRZAW551C Report date 30/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/072	David Crepin	2021	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on ALOMY (blackgrass) and broad-leaved weeds in winter wheat in France, spring 2020	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
			ESSAIS +, France Report no. FR20HETRZAW551D Report date 01/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.2/073	Mélanie Biaunier	2021	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on LOLSS (Lolium spp) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (France), spring 2020 QUALIPHYT, France Report no. FR20HETRZAW552E Report date 14/01/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/074	Mélanie Biaunier	2021	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on LOLSS (Lolium spp) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (France), spring 2020 QUALIPHYT, France Report no. FR20HETRZAW552F Report date 14/01/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/075	Wilfried Rouane	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on POAAN and broad-leaved weeds in winter wheat in France, spring 2020 ANADIAG FRANCE, France Report no. FR20HETRZAW553A Report date 18/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/076	Wilfried Rouane	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on POAAN and broad-leaved weeds in winter wheat in France, spring 2020 ANADIAG FRANCE, France Report no. FR20HETRZAW553B Report date 18/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/077	Christophe Marie, Jean-Luc Barou	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on POAAN, POATR and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (France), spring 2020 AGROTEST FRANCE, France Report no. FR20HETRZAW553C Report date not available	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
			GEP, Unpublished				
KCP 6.2/078	Tibor Barasits, Dr László Hódi	2019	To demonstrate the efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD programs when applied in the spring following an autumn residual herbicide for the control of ALOMY in (Hungary) 2018/19 SynTech Research Hungary Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HETRZAW800A Report date 06/09/2019 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/079	Tibor Barasits, Ferenc Molnár	2019	To demonstrate the efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD programs when applied in the spring following an autumn residual herbicide for the control of ALOMY in (Hungary) 2018/19 SynTech Research Hungary Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HETRZAW800B Report date 05/09/2019 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/080	Hoffmanné Pathy Zsuzsanna	2019	To demonstrate the efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD programs when applied in the spring following an autumn residual herbicide for the control of LOLSS in (Hungary) 2018/19 Növénypathyka Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HETRZAW801A Report date 30/10/2019 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/081	Hoffmanné Pathy Zsuzsanna	2019	To demonstrate the efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD programs when applied in the spring following an autumn residual herbicide for the control of LOLSS in (Hungary) 2018/19 Növénypathyka Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HETRZAW801B Report date 30/10/2019 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/082	Tibor Barasits, Gábor Bese	2018	Post-emergence control of ALOMY and broad-leaved weeds with AG-PM1-72 OD in cereals (Hungary), spring 2018 SynTech Research Hungary Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HEYCERE111A	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
			Report date 28/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished				
KCP 6.2/083	Tibor Barasits, Dr László Hódi	2018	Post-emergence control of ALOMY and broad-leaved weeds with AG-PM1-72 OD in cereals (Hungary), spring 2018 SynTech Research Hungary Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HEYCERE111B Report date 27/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/084	Hoffmanné Pathy Zsuzsanna	2018	Post-emergence control of AVESS (wild oats) and broad-leaved weeds with AG-PM1-72 OD in cereals (Hungary), spring 2018 Növénypathy Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HEYCERE113A Report date 31/08/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/085	Tibor Barasits, Dr László Hódi	2018	Post-emergence control of AVESS (wild oats) and broad-leaved weeds with AG-PM1-72 OD in cereals (Hungary), spring 2018 SynTech Research Hungary Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HEYCERE113B Report date 27/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/086	Tibor Barasits, Dr László Hódi	2018	Post-emergence control of BROSS and broad-leaved weeds with AG-PM1-72 OD in cereals (Hungary), spring 2018 SynTech Research Hungary Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HEYCERE114A Report date 28/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/087	Hoffmanné Pathy Zsuzsanna	2018	Post-emergence control of LOLSS and broad-leaved weeds with AG-PM1-72 OD in cereals (Hungary), spring 2018 Növénypathy Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HEYCERE115A Report date 31/10/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
KCP 6.2/088	Hoffmanné Pathy Zsuzsanna	2018	Post-emergence control of LOLSS and broad-leaved weeds with AG-PM1-72 OD in cereals (Hungary), spring 2018 Növénypathyka Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HEYCERE115B Report date 31/10/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/089	Tibor Barasits, Gábor Wágner	2018	Post-emergence control of LOLSS and broad-leaved weeds with AG-PM1-72 OD in cereals (Hungary), spring 2018 SynTech Research Hungary Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HEYCERE115C Report date 01/10/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/090	Hoffmanné Pathy Zsuzsanna	2018	Post-emergence control of Poa sp and broad-leaved weeds with AG-PM1-72 OD in cereals (Hungary), spring 2018 Növénypathyka Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HEYCERE116A Report date 31/08/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/091	Tibor Barasits, József Ritecz	2018	Post-emergence control of Poa sp and broad-leaved weeds with AG-PM1-72 OD in cereals (Hungary), spring 2018 SynTech Research Hungary Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HEYCERE116B Report date 12/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/092	Tibor Barasits, Gábor Bese	2020	To demonstrate the efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD programs when applied in the spring following an autumn residual herbicide for the control of ALOMY in Hungary 2019/20 CPR Europe Kft., Hungary Report no. HU19HETRZAW006A Report date 17/07/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/093	Tibor Barasits, Gábor Wágner	2020	To demonstrate the efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD programs when applied in the spring following an	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Verte- brate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
			autumn residual herbicide for the control of LOLSS in Hungary 2019/20 SynTech Research Hungary Kft. / CPR Europe Kft., Hungary Report no. HU19HETRZAW007A Report date 13/08/2020 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.2/094	Tibor Barasits, Gábor Wágner	2020	To demonstrate the efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD programs when applied in the spring following an autumn residual herbicide for the control of LOLSS in Hungary 2019/20 SynTech Research Hungary Kft. / CPR Europe Kft., Hungary Report no. HU19HETRZAW007B Report date 14/08/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/095	Tibor Barasits, József Ritecz	2020	To demonstrate the efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD programs when applied in the spring following an autumn residual herbicide for the control of APESV in Hungary 2019/20 CPR Europe Kft., Hungary Report no. HU19HETRZAW008A Report date 17/07/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/096	Tibor Barasits, Gábor Bese	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on ALOMY (blackgrass) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals Hungary, spring 2020 CPR Europe Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HETRZAW201A Report date 10/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/097	Tibor Barasits, Gábor Bese	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on ALOMY (blackgrass) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals Hungary, spring 2020 CPR Europe Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HETRZAW201B Report date 10/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
KCP 6.2/098	Tibor Barasits, Gábor Bese	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on ALOMY (blackgrass) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals Hungary, spring 2020 CPR Europe Kft., Hungary HU20HETRZAW201C Report date 24/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/099	Tibor Barasits, József Ritecz	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on APESV and broad-leaved weeds in cereals in Hungary, spring 2020 CPR Europe Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HETRZAW202A Report date 25/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/100	Tibor Barasits, Andrea Rábai	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on APESV and broad-leaved weeds in cereals in Hungary, spring 2020 CPR Europe Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HETRZAW202B Report date 30/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/101	Bálint Magyar	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on APESV and broad-leaved weeds in cereals in Naszály, Hungary, spring 2020 Fructika Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HETRZAW202C Report date 09/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/102	Tibor Barasits, Gábor Bese	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on AVESS (wild oats) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals in Hungary, spring 2020 CPR Europe Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HETRZAW203A Report date 24/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/103	Tibor Barasits, Gábor Bese	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on AVESS (wild oats) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals in Hungary, spring 2020	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
			CPR Europe Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HETRZAW203B Report date 24/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.2/104	Tibor Barasits, Gábor Bese	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on AVESS (wild oats) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals in Hungary, spring 2020 CPR Europe Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HETRZAW203C Report date 24/09/2020 GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/105	Tibor Barasits, Gábor Bese	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on BROSS (Bromus spp) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals in Hungary, spring 2020 CPR Europe Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HETRZAW204A Report date 24/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/106	Tibor Barasits, Gábor Bese	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on BROSS (Bromus spp) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals in Hungary, spring 2020 CPR Europe Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HETRZAW204B Report date 24/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/107	Dr Attila Labant	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on LOLSS (Lolium spp) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals Hungary, spring 2020 Növénypathyka Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HETRZAW205A Report date 30/07/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/108	Dr Attila Labant	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on LOLSS (Lolium spp) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals Hungary, spring 2020 Növénypathyka Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HETRZAW205B	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
			Report date 28/07/2020 GEP, Unpublished				
KCP 6.2/109	Dr Attila Labant	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on LOLSS (Lolium spp) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals Hungary, spring 2020 Növénypathyka Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HETRZAW205C Report date 25/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/110	Dr Attila Labant	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on POAAN, POATR and broad-leaved weeds in cereals in Hungary, spring 2020 Növénypathyka Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HETRZAW206A Report date 25/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/111	Dr Attila Labant	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on POAAN, POATR and broad-leaved weeds in cereals in Hungary, spring 2020 Növénypathyka Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HETRZAW206B Report date 28/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/112	Dr Attila Labant	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on POAAN, POATR and broad-leaved weeds in cereals in Hungary, spring 2020 Növénypathyka Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HETRZAW206C Report date 25/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/113	Łukasz Sobiech	2018	Efficacy of AG-PM1-72OD in the control of weeds in the cultivation of spring wheat Poznań University of Life Sciences, Poland Report no. PL18HETRZAS010A Report date 30/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/114	Łukasz Sobiech	2018	Efficacy of AG-PM1-72OD in the control of weeds in the cultivation of spring wheat	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
			Poznań University of Life Sciences, Poland Report no. PL18HETRZAS010B Report date 30/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.2/115	Łukasz Sobiech	2018	Efficacy of AG-PM1-72OD in post-emergence treatment in the control of weeds in the cultivation of winter wheat Poznań University of Life Sciences, Poland Report no. PL18HETRZAW008A Report date 30/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/116	Łukasz Sobiech	2018	Efficacy of AG-PM1-72OD in post-emergence treatment in the control of weeds in the cultivation of winter wheat Poznań University of Life Sciences, Poland Report no. PL18HETRZAW008B Report date 30/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/117	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Efficacy of AG-PM1-72OD in control of weeds in winter wheat, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HETRZAW008C Report date 21/08/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/118	Krzysztof Rusek Łukasz Sobiech	2018	Efficacy of AG-PM1-72OD in post-emergence treatment in the control of weeds in the cultivation of winter wheat Poznań University of Life Sciences, Poland Report no. PL18HETRZAW009A Report date 30/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/119	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Efficacy of AG-PM1-72OD in control of weeds in winter wheat, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HETRZAW009B Report date 11/08/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
KCP 6.2/120	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Efficacy of AG-PM1-72OD in control of weeds in winter wheat, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HETRZAW009C Report date 11/08/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/121	Dr Agnieszka Kukuła	2018	The evaluation of efficacy of product AG-PM1-72OD for the control of weeds on winter wheat Agreco Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HETRZAW011A Report date 27/08/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/122	Dr Agnieszka Kukuła	2018	The evaluation of efficacy of product AG-PM1-72OD for the control of weeds on winter wheat Agreco Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HETRZAW014A Report date 27/08/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/123	Dr Agnieszka Kukuła	2018	The evaluation of efficacy of product AG-PM1-72OD for the control of weeds on winter wheat Agreco Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HETRZAW014B Report date 27/08/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/124	Dr Agnieszka Kukuła	2020	To demonstrate the efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD programs when applied in the spring following an autumn residual herbicide for the control of ALOMY in Poland 2019/20 AGRECO sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL19HETRZAW501A Report date 28/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/125	Adam Pawlak	2020	To demonstrate the efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD programs when applied in the spring following an autumn residual herbicide for the control of APESV in Poland 2019/20 STAPHYT Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL19HETRZAW501B	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
			Report date 08/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished				
KCP 6.2/126	Łukasz Sobiech	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on ALOMY (blackgrass) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals Poland, spring 2020 Poznań University of Life Sciences, Poland Report no. PL20HETRZAW007A Report date 30/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/127	Adam Szemendera	2020	Efficacy of AG-PM1-72OD (ADM.06001.H.2.B) in control of weeds in winter wheat, Poland 2020 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HETRZAW007B Report date 03/08/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/128	Dr Agnieszka Kukuła	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on ALOMY (blackgrass) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals Poland, spring 2020 Agreco Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HETRZAW007C Report date 03/08/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/129	Dr Agnieszka Kukuła	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on ALOMY (blackgrass) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals Poland, spring 2020 Agreco Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HETRZAW007D Report 01/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/130	Łukasz Sobiech	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on APESV and broad-leaved weeds in cereals POLAND, spring 2020 Poznań University of Life Sciences, Poland Report no. PL20HETRZAW008A Report date 30/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/131	Adam Szemendera	2020	Efficacy of AG-PM1-72OD (ADM.06001.H.2.B) in control of weeds in winter wheat, Poland 2020	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
			Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HETRZAW008B Report date 03/08/2020 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.2/132	Adam Pawlak	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on APESV and broad-leaved weeds in cereals POLAND, spring 2020 STAPHYT Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HETRZAW008C Report date 19/08/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/133	Adam Pawlak	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on APESV and broad-leaved weeds in cereals POLAND, spring 2020 STAPHYT Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HETRZAW008D Report date 19/08/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/134	Łukasz Sobiech	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on AVESS (wild oats) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals Poland spring 2020 Poznań University of Life Sciences, Poland Report no. PL20HETRZAW009A Report date 30/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/135	Adam Szemendera	2020	Efficacy of AG-PM1-72OD (ADM.06001.H.2.B) in control of weeds in winter wheat, Poland 2020 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HETRZAW009B Report date 03/0/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/136	Adam Pawlak	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on AVESS (wild oats) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals Poland spring 2020 STAPHYT Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HETRZAW009C Report date 26/08/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
KCP 6.2/137	Adam Pawlak	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on AVESS (wild oats) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals Poland spring 2020 STAPHYT Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HETRZAW009D Report date 26/08/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/138	Adam Pawlak	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on POAAN and broad-leaved weeds in cereals Poland, spring 2020 STAPHYT Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HETRZAW010A Report date 26/08/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/139	Łukasz Sobiech	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on POAAN, POATR and broad-leaved weeds in cereals Poland, spring 2020 Poznań University of Life Sciences, Poland Report no. PL20HETRZAW010B Report date 30/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/140	Dr Agnieszka Kukuła	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on POAAN, POATR and broad-leaved weeds in cereals Poland, spring 2020 Agreco Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HETRZAW010C Report date 01/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/141	Adam Szemendera	2020	Efficacy of AG-PM1-72OD (ADM.06001.H.2.B) in control of weeds in winter wheat, Poland 2020 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HETRZAW010D Report date 03/08/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/142	Łukasz Sobiech	2020	Check the control of A21481B to control grasses and BLW comparing with standard products in Winter Wheat, in POLAND 2020 Poznań University of Life Sciences, Poland	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
			Report no. PL20HETRZAX015A Report date 30/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.2/143	Anca Avram, Calin Costea	2018	Determination of Efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD against ALOMY and broadleaved weeds in cereals, outdoor 2018 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO18HEYCERW057A Report date 07/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/144	Anca Avram, Calin Costea	2018	Determination of Efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD against ALOMY and broad-leaved weeds in cereals, outdoor 2018 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO18HEYCERW057B Report date 07/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/145	Anca Avram, Calin Costea	2018	Determination of Efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD against APESV and broad-leaved weeds in cereals, outdoor 2018 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO18HEYCERW059A Report date 07/11/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/146	Anca Avram, Calin Costea	2018	Determination of Efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD against APESV and broad-leaved weeds in cereals, outdoor 2018 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO18HEYCERW059B Report date 07/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/147	Anca Avram, Calin Costea	2018	Determination of Efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD against AVESA and broad-leaved weeds in cereals, outdoor 2018 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO18HEYCERW061A Report date 07/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
KCP 6.2/148	Anca Avram, Calin Costea	2018	Determination of Efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD against AVESA and broad-leaved weeds in cereals, outdoor 2018 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO18HEYCERW061B Report date 07/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/149	Anca Avram, Calin Costea	2018	Determination of Efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD against BROSS and broad-leaved weeds in cereals, outdoor 2018 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO18HEYCERW063A Report date 20/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/150	Anca Avram, Calin Costea	2018	Determination of Efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD against BROSS and broad-leaved weeds in cereals, outdoor 2018 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO18HEYCERW063B Report date 20/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/151	Anca Avram, Venetius Dragosin	2018	Determination of Efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD against POASS and broad-leaved weeds in cereals, outdoor 2018 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO18HEYCERW065A Report date 20/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/152	Anca Avram, Venetius Dragosin	2018	Determination of Efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD with a range of adjuvants against POASS and broad-leaved weeds in cereals, outdoor 2018 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO18HEYCERW066A Report date 20/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/153	Calin Costea, Valentina Tuna	2021	To demonstrate the efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD programs when applied in the spring following an autumn residual herbicide for the control of BROSS	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
			in Romania 2019/20 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO19HETRZAW208A Report date 11/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.2/154	Calin Costea, Valentina Tuna	2021	To demonstrate the efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD programs when applied in the spring following an autumn residual herbicide for the control of BROSS in Romania 2019/20 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO19HETRZAW208B Report date 11/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/155	Venetius Dragosin, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of Efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B on ALOMY (blackgrass) and broad-leaved weeds in winter wheat, ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HETRZAW227A Report date 09/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/156	Venetius Dragosin, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of Efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B on ALOMY (blackgrass) and broad-leaved weeds in winter wheat, ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HETRZAW227B Report date 09/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/157	Venetius Dragosin, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of Efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B on LOLSS (Lolium spp) and broadleaved weeds in winter wheat ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HETRZAW228A Report date 09/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/158	Venetius Dragosin, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of Efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B on LOLSS (Lolium spp) and broad-leaved weeds in winter wheat ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Romania	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
			Report no. RO20HETRZAW228B Report date 09/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.2/159	Calin Costea, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of Efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B on APESV and broad-leaved weeds in winter wheat in ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HETRZAW230A Report date 09/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/160	Calin Costea, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of Efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B on APESV and broad-leaved weeds in winter wheat in ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HETRZAW230B Report date 09/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/161	Calin Costea, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of Efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B on APESV and broad-leaved weeds in winter wheat in ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HETRZAW230C Report date 09/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/162	Venetius Dragosin, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of Efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B on AVESS (wild oats) and broad-leaved weeds in winter wheat, ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HETRZAW234A Report date 09/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/163	Venetius Dragosin, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of Efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B on AVESS (wild oats) and broad-leaved weeds in winter wheat, ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HETRZAW234B Report date 09/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
KCP 6.2/164	Venetius Dragosin, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of Efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B on AVESS (wild oats) and broad-leaved weeds in winter wheat, ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HETRZAW234C Report date 09/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/165	Venetius Dragosin, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of Efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B on BROSS (Bromus spp) and broad-leaved weeds in winter wheat, ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HETRZAW235A Report date 09/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/166	Venetius Dragosin, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of Efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B on BROSS (Bromus spp) and broad-leaved weeds in winter wheat, ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HETRZAW235B Report date 09/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/167	Venetius Dragosin, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of Efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B on BROSS (Bromus spp) and broad-leaved weeds in winter wheat, ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HETRZAW235C Report date 09/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/168	Calin Costea, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of Efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B on POAAN, POATR and broad-leaved weeds in wheat, ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HETRZAW236A Report date 09/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/169	Calin Costea, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of Efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B on POAAN, POATR and broad-leaved weeds in wheat, ROMANIA, spring 2020	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
			Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HETRZAW236B Report date 09/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.2/170	Calin Costea, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of Efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B on POAAN, POATR and broad-leaved weeds in wheat, ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HETRZAW236C Report date 09/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/171	Johannes Rohr	2018	To evaluate the efficacy of a range of adjuvants with AG-PM1-72 OD for the control of AVESS (wild oats) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals Germany, spring 2018 Agrartest GmbH Trial ID: DE18HENNNGG188N Report date: 09/10/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.2/172	Łukasz Sobiech	2018	Efficacy of AG-PM1-72OD with adjuvants in the control of weeds in the cultivation of winter and spring wheat Poznań University of Life Sciences, Poland Trial code: AH/18/PJ/34/Ra/013B Trial ID: PL18HETRZAS013B GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.3/001	B. Dumont, R. Maggiore, P. Dunon, Dr V. Calaora	2019	Herbicide Sensibility Monitoring 2020 BIOTransfer, France Report no. 201119 Report date 30/11/2019 non-GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.3/002	B. Dumont, R. Maggiore, P. Dunon, Dr V. Calaora	2021	Herbicide Sensibility Monitoring 2020 BIOTransfer, France Report no. 210519 Report date 30/05/2021 non-GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
KCP 6.3/003 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.1/015</i>	B. Dumont, R. Maggiore, P. Dunon, Dr V. Calaora	2021	Biological efficacy evaluation of mesosulfuron, pinoxaden or their mixture in varying ratios on different weeds populations BIOtransfer, France Report no. 21743820 Report date /03/2021 non-GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.3/004 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.1/016</i>	Udo Zickart	2021	An efficacy evaluation of various ratios of Axial and Atlantis OD Selective herbicide on various grassweeds in the glasshouse, Germany, 2020 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE20HJNOPLA183A Report date 26/03/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/001 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/001</i>	Jirí Stancel	2018	Post-emergence control of APESV and broad-leaved weeds with AG-PM1-72 OD in cereals, Czech republic, spring 2018 Zkušební stanice Nechanice s.r.o., Czech Republic Report no. CZ18HETRZAW070A Report date 06/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/002 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/002</i>	Josef Soukup	2018	Post-emergence control of BROSS and broad-leaved weeds with AG-PM1-72 OD in cereals Czech Republic, spring 2018 Czech University of Life Sciences, Czech Republic Report no. CZ18HETRZAW074A Report date 09/08/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/003 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/003</i>	Petra Kopecká	2018	Post-emergence control of Poa sp and broad-leaved weeds with AG-PM1-72 OD in cereals, Czech Republic, spring 2018 ZKUŠEBNÍ STANICE Trutnov s.r.o., Czech Republic Report no. CZ18HETRZAW076A Report date 09/08/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/004	Josef Soukup	2019	To demonstrate the efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD programs when applied in the spring following an	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
<i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/004</i>			autumn residual herbicide for the control of BROSS in the Czech Republic 2018/19 Czech University of Life Sciences, Czech Republic Report no. CZ18HETRZAW113A Report date 18/07/2019 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.4.1/005	Josef Soukup	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter rye in the spring, Czech republic, 2018 Czech University of Life Sciences, Czech Republic Report no. CZ18HSSECSS080A Report date 07/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/006	Josef Soukup	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter wheat in the spring, Czech republic, 2018 Czech University of Life Sciences, Czech Republic Report no. CZ18HSTRZAW078A Report date 10/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/007	Jana Reiszova	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter wheat in the spring, Czech republic, 2018 Zkusebni stanice Nechanice s.r.o., Czech Republic Report no. CZ18HSTRZAW078B Report date 07/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/008	Jana Reiszova	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter triticale in the spring, Czech republic, 2018 Zkusebni stanice Nechanice s.r.o., Czech Republic Report no. CZ18HSTTLSS081A Report date 08/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/009 <i>Submitted</i>	Zdenek Trojan	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on LOLSS (Lolium spp) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals, in the Czech Republic, spring 2020 Zemservis ZS Domaninek s.r.o, Czech Republic	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
<i>under KCP 6.2/005</i>			Report no. CZ20HETRZAS002B Report date 30/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.4.1/010 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/006</i>	Jana Reiszova	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on LOLSS (Lolium spp) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals, in the Czech Republic, spring 2020 Zkušební stanice Nechanice s.r.o., Czech Republic Report no. CZ20HETRZAS002C Report date 06/11/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/011 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/007</i>	Jana Reiszova	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on LOLSS (Lolium spp) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals, in the Czech Republic, spring 2020 Zkušební stanice Nechanice s.r.o., Czech Republic Report no. CZ20HETRZAW002A Report date 05/11/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/012 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/008</i>	Prokop Šmirous	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on LOLSS (Lolium spp) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals, in the Czech Republic, spring 2020 AGRITEC výzkum šlechtění a služby s.r.o., Czech Republic Report no. CZ20HETRZAW002D Report date 13/11/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/013 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/009</i>	Josef Soukup	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on APESV and broad-leaved weeds in cereals, in the Czech Republic, spring 2020 Czech University of Life Sciences, Czech Republic Report no. CZ20HETRZAW003A Report date 17/07/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/014 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/010</i>	Jana Reiszova	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on APESV and broad-leaved weeds in cereals, in the Czech Republic, spring 2020 Zkušební stanice Nechanice s.r.o., Czech Republic Report no. CZ20HETRZAW003B Report date 24/09/2020	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
			GEP, Unpublished				
KCP 6.4.1/015 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/011</i>	Josef Soukup	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on APESV and broad-leaved weeds in cereals, in the Czech Republic, spring 2020 Czech University of Life Sciences, Czech Republic Report no. CZ20HETRZAW003C Report date 17/07/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/016 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/012</i>	Thomas Bauer	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on AVESS (wild oats) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals in the Czech Republic, spring 2020 InTec Agro Trials, s.r.o., Czech Republic Report no. CZ20HETRZAW004A Report date 07/12/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/017 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/013</i>	Josef Soukup	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on AVESS (wild oats) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals in the Czech Republic, spring 2020 Czech University of Life Sciences, Czech Republic Report no. CZ20HETRZAW004B Report date 21/07/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/018 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/014</i>	Thomas Bauer	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on BROSS (Bromus spp) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals in the Czech Republic, spring 2020 InTec Agro Trials, s.r.o., Czech Republic Report no. CZ20HETRZAW005A Report date 07/12/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/019 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/015</i>	Josef Soukup	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on BROSS (Bromus spp) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals in the Czech Republic, spring 2020 Czech University of Life Sciences, Czech Republic Report no. CZ20HETRZAW005B Report date 22/06/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/020	Jiří Hruška	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on POAAN, POATR and broad-leaved weeds in cereals	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
<i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/016</i>			in the Czech Republic, spring 2020 ZKUŠEBNÍ STANICE Trutnov s.r.o., Czech Republic Report no. CZ20HETRZAW007A Report date 29/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.4.1/021	Josef Soukup	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on rye in the Czech republic, spring 2020 Czech University of Life Sciences, Czech Republic Report no. CZ20HSSECCW013A Report date 26/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/022	Josef Soukup	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat in the Czech republic, spring 2020 Czech University of Life Sciences, Czech Republic Report no. CZ20HSTRZAW010A Report date 26/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/023	Jana Reiszova	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on triticale in the Czech republic, spring 2020 Zkusebni stanice Nechanice s.r.o., Czech Republic Report no. CZ20HSTTLWI014A Report date 09/11/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/024 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/017</i>	Johannes Rohr	2018	Post-emergence control of ALOMY and broad-leaved weeds with AG-PM1-72 OD in cereals Germany, spring 2018 Agrartest GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HENNNGG183A Report date 09/10/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/025 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/018</i>	Bastian Lorenz	2018	Post-emergence control of ALOMY and broad-leaved weeds with AG-PM1-72 OD in cereals Germany, spring 2018 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HENNNGG183B Report date 20/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
KCP 6.4.1/026 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/019</i>	Thomas Kunze	2018	Post-emergence control of APESV and broad-leaved weeds with AG-PM1-72 OD in cereals Germany, spring 2018 agro-check, Germany Report no. DE18HENNNGG185G Report date 31/08/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/027 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/020</i>	Helmut Zöllner	2018	Post-emergence control of APESV and broad-leaved weeds with AG-PM1-72 OD in cereals Germany, spring 2018 Field Research Support, Germany Report no. DE18HENNNGG185H Report date 09/10/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/028 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/021</i>	Dr Jörg Perner	2018	Post-emergence control of APESV and broad-leaved weeds with AG-PM1-72 OD in cereals. Germany, spring 2018 U.A.S. Umwelt- und Agrarstudien GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HENNNGG185I Report date 03/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/029 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/023</i>	Johannes Rohr	2018	Post-emergence control of BROSS and broad-leaved weeds with AG-PM1-72 OD in cereals Germany, spring 2018 Agrartest GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HENNNGG191P Report date 09/10/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/030 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/024</i>	Johannes Rohr	2018	Post-emergence control of BROSS and broad-leaved weeds with AG-PM1-72 OD in cereals Germany, spring 2018 Agrartest GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HENNNGG191Q Report date 09/10/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/031	Dr Jörg Perner	2018	Post-emergence control of poa sp and broad-leaved weeds with AG-PM1-72 OD in cereals. Germany, spring 2018	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
<i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/026</i>			U.A.S. Umwelt- und Agrarstudien GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HENNNGG193V Report date 03/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.4.1/032 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/027</i>	Dr Jörg Perner	2018	Post-emergence control of poa sp and broad-leaved weeds with AG-PM1-72 OD in cereals. Germany, spring 2018 U.A.S. Umwelt- und Agrarstudien GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HENNNGG193W Report date 03/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/033 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/028</i>	Viktória Magyaróvári	2019	To demonstrate the efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD programs when applied in the spring following an autumn residual herbicide for the control of ALOMY in Germany 2018/19 Agrartest GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HETRZAW195A Report date 12/12/2019 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/034 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/029</i>	Helmut Zöllner	2019	To demonstrate the efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD programs when applied in the spring following an autumn residual herbicide for the control of ALOMY in Germany 2018/19 Field Research Support, Germany Report no. DE18HETRZAW195B Report date 31/07/2019 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/035	Dr Ute Labusch	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter rye in the spring Germany 2018 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HSSECCW189A Report date 16/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/036	Udo Zickart	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter rye in the spring Germany 2018 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HSSECCW189B Report date 19/11/2018	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
			GEP, Unpublished				
KCP 6.4.1/037	Udo Zickart	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter rye in the spring Germany 2018 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HSSECCW189C Report date 19/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/038	Dr Ute Labusch, Bastian Lorenz	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to spring wheat Germany 2018 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HSTRZAS189D Report date 16/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/039	Udo Zickart	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to spring wheat Germany 2018 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HSTRZAS189E Report date 19/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/040	Bastian Lorenz	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter wheat in the spring, Germany 2018 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HSTRZAW189F Report date 16/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/041	Bastian Lorenz	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter wheat in the spring, Germany 2018 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HSTRZAW189G Report date 16/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/042	Udo Zickart	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter wheat in the spring, Germany 2018 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HSTRZAW189H Report date 19/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
KCP 6.4.1/043	Bastian Lorenz	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter triticale in the spring Germany 2018 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HSTTLWI189I Report date 16/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/044	Udo Zickart	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter triticale in the spring Germany 2018 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HSTTLWI189J Report date 19/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/045	Udo Zickart	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter triticale in the spring Germany 2018 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HSTTLWI189K Report date 19/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/046 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.1/020</i>	Peter Wolf	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on ALOMY (blackgrass) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals, Germany Agricola, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW170A Report date 03/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/047 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.1/021</i>	Dr Karl-Wilhelm Maßmann	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on ALOMY (blackgrass) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW170B Report date 21/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/048 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/032</i>	Thomas Martin	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on ALOMY (blackgrass) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020 Martin Feldversuchswesen, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW170C Report date 23/10/2020	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
			GEP, Unpublished				
KCP 6.4.1/049 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.1/022</i>	Johannes Rohr	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on ALOMY (blackgrass) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020 Trial-Tec GmbH, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW170D Report date 22/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/050 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/034</i>	Dr Jörg Perner	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on ALOMY (blackgrass) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020 U.A.S. Umwelt- und Agrarstudien GmbH, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW170E Report date 30/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/051 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/035</i>	Thomas Kunze	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on APESV and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020 agro-check, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW171A Report date 29/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/052 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/036</i>	Dr Karl-Wilhelm Maßmann	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on APESV and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW171B Report date 21/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/053 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/037</i>	Tjard Ommen	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on APESV and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020 plantus-GbR, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW171C Report date 11/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/054	Thomas Martin	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on APESV and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
<i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/038</i>			2020 Martin Feldversuchswesen, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW171D Report date 23/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.4.1/055 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/039</i>	Johannes Rohr	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on APESV and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020 Trial-Tec GmbH, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW171E Report date 22/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/056 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/040</i>	Thomas Kunze	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on AVESS (wild oats) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020 agro-check, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW172A Report date 10/11/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/057 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/041</i>	Johannes Rohr	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on AVESS (wild oats) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020 Trial-Tec GmbH, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW172B Report date 20/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/058 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.1/023</i>	Johannes Rohr	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on AVESS (wild oats) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020 Trial-Tec GmbH, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW172D Report date 20/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/059 <i>Submitted under KCP</i>	Dr Jörg Perner	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on BROSS (Bromus spp) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020 U.A.S. Umwelt- und Agrarstudien GmbH, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW172E	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
6.2/043			Report date 30/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished				
KCP 6.4.1/060 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.2/044	Viktória Magyaróvári	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on BROSS (Bromus spp) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020 Eurofins Agrosience Services GmbH / Agrartest GmbH, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW173A Report date 03/11/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/061 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.1/024	Viktória Magyaróvári	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on BROSS (Bromus spp) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020 Agrartest GmbH, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW173B Report date 03/11/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/062 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.1/025	Johannes Rohr	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on BROSS (Bromus spp) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020 Trial-Tec GmbH, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW173C Report date 22/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/063 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.2/047	Dr Jörg Perner	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on BROSS (Bromus spp) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020 U.A.S. Umwelt- und Agrarstudien GmbH, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW173D Report date 30/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/064 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.2/048	Helmut Zöllner	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on POAAN, POATR and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020 Field Research Support, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW174A Report date 02/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
KCP 6.4.1/065 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/049</i>	Tjard Ommen	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on POAAN, POATR and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020 plantus-GbR, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW174B Report date 11/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/066 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/050</i>	Johannes Rohr	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on POAAN, POATR and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020 Trial-Tec GmbH, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW174C Report date 22/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/067 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.1/026</i>	Johannes Rohr	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on POAAN, POATR and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (Germany), spring 2020 Trial-Tec GmbH, Germany Report no. DE20HENNNGW174D Report date 20/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/068 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.1/030</i>	Andreas Hetterich	2021	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on rye (Germany), spring 2020 Hetterich Fieldwork GbR, Germany Report no. DE20HSSECCW177A Report date 28/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/069 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.1/031</i>	Andreas Hetterich	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on spring wheat (Germany), spring 2020 Hetterich Fieldwork GbR, Germany Report no. DE20HSTRZAS176A Report date 16/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/070 <i>Submitted under KCP</i>	Andreas Hetterich	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat (Germany), spring 2020 Hetterich Fieldwork GbR, Germany Report no. DE20HSTRZAW175A Report date 27/10/2020	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
6.1/032			GEP, Unpublished				
KCP 6.4.1/071 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.1/033</i>	Andreas Hetterich	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat (Germany), spring 2020 Hetterich Fieldwork GbR, Germany Report no. DE20HSTRZAW175B Report date 22/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/072 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.1/034</i>	Andreas Hetterich	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on triticale (Germany), spring 2020 Hetterich Fielwork GbR, Germany Report no. DE20HSTTLWI178A Report date 27/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/073 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/052</i>	Jean-Pierre Rivet	2019	Post-emergence control of LOLSS and broad-leaved weeds with AG-PM1-72 OD in cereals (FRANCE), spring 2018 ESSAIS +, France Report no. FR18HEYCERE568B Report date 25/01/2019 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/074 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/053</i>	Frédéric Wallart	2018	Efficacy AG-PM1-72 OD in post-emergence against ALOMY and broad-leaved weeds without and with adjuvant, in wheat in France, spring 2018. EPHYDIA, France Report no. FR18HEYCERW551C Report date 07/12/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/075 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/054</i>	Mickaël Lorphelin	2018	Efficacy AG-PM1-72 OD in post-emergence against ALOMY and broad-leaved weeds without and with adjuvant, in wheat, in France, spring 2018 NAT SERVICE PLUS, France Report no. FR18HEYCERW551D Report date 07/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/076 <i>Submitted</i>	Jean Pierre Bernon	2018	Efficacy AG-PM1-72 OD in post-emergence against ALOMY and broadleaves, without and with adjuvant, in wheat in France, in spring 2018 CentrExpé, France	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
<i>under KCP 6.2/055</i>			Report no. FR18HEYCERW551E Report date not available GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.4.1/077 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/056</i>	Mélanie Gressard-Biaunier	2021	Efficacy AG-PM1-72 OD in post-emergence against LOLSS and broad-leaved weeds without and with adjuvant, in wheat (France), spring 2018 QUALIPHYT, France Report no. FR18HEYCERW552F Report date 22/04/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/078 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/057</i>	Jean Pierre Bernon	2018	Efficacy AG-PM1-72 OD in post-emergence against POAAN and broadleaves, without and with adjuvant, in wheat in France, in spring 2018 CentrExpé, France Report no. FR18HEYCERW553B Report date not available GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/079 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/058</i>	Julien Rivet	2019	Efficacy AG-PM1-72 OD in post-emergence against AVEFA and broad-leaved weeds without and with adjuvant, in wheat (France), spring 2018 ESSAIS +, France Report no. FR18HEYCERW554A Report date 28/03/2019 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/080 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/059</i>	Jean Pierre Bernon	2018	Efficacy AG-PM1-72 OD in post-emergence against ALOMY and broadleaves in wheat in France, in Spring 2018 CentrExpé, France Report no. FR18HEYCERW555B Report date not available GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/081 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/060</i>	Mickaël Lorphelin	2018	Efficacy AG-PM1-72 OD in post-emergence against ALOMY and broad-leaved weeds in wheat with different adjuvants (France), spring 2018 NAT SERVICE PLUS, France Report no. FR18HEYCERW556B Report date 21/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
KCP 6.4.1/082 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/061</i>	Frédérique Varret	2019	Efficacy AG-PM1-72 OD applied in post-emergence in spring against LOLMU and ALOMY in wheat, in France 2018 STAPHYT, France Report no. FR18HEYCERW557B Report date 14/03/2019 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/083 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/062</i>	Christophe Marie, Jean-Luc Barou	2018	Efficacy AG-PM1-72 OD in post-emergence against LOLSS and broad-leaved weeds in wheat (FRANCE), spring 2018 AGROTEST FRANCE, France Report no. FR18HEYCERW557D Report date not available GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/084 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/063</i>	Julien Rivet	2019	Efficacy AG-PM1-72 OD in post-emergence against LOLSS and broad-leaved weeds in wheat with different adjuvants (FRANCE), spring 2018 ESSAIS +, France Report no. FR18HEYCERW558A Report date 28/03/2019 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/085 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/064</i>	Philippe NEGRINI	2019	To demonstrate the efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD programs when applied in the spring following an autumn residual herbicide for the control of ALOMY in France. 2018/19 ANTEDIS, France Report no. FR18HEYCERW561A Report date 20/12/2019 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/086 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/065</i>	Wilfried Rouane	2019	To demonstrate the efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD programs when applied in the spring following an autumn residual herbicide for the control of ALOMY in France 2018/19 ANADIAG FRANCE, France Report no. FR18HEYCERW561F Report date 25/11/2019 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
KCP 6.4.1/087	Wilfried Rouane	2018	Selectivity evaluation of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in post-emergence in rye in France in 2018 ANADIAG FRANCE, France Report no. FR18HSSECSS551A Report date not available GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/088	Wilfried Rouane	2018	Selectivity evaluation of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in post-emergence in rye in France in 2018 ANADIAG FRANCE, France Report no. FR18HSSECSS551B Report date not available GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/089	Christophe Marie, Jean-Luc Barou	2018	Selectivity evaluation of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in post-emergence in rye in France in 2018 AGROTEST FRANCE, France Report no. FR18HSSECSS551C Report date not available GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/090	Christophe Marie, Jean-Luc Barou	2018	Selectivity evaluation of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in post-emergence in rye in France in 2018 AGROTEST FRANCE, France Report no. FR18HSSECSS551D Report date not available GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/091	Jean-Pierre Rivet	2018	Selectivity evaluation of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in post-emergence in (cereal) in FRANCE in 2018 ESSAIS +, France Report no. FR18HSTRZAS551A Report date 24/01/2019 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/092	Jean-Pierre Rivet	2018	Selectivity evaluation of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in post-emergence in (cereal) in FRANCE in 2018 ESSAIS +, France Report no. FR18HSTRZAS551B Report date 24/01/2019 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/093	Frédéric Wallart	2018	Selectivity evaluation of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in post-emergence in winter wheat in France in 2018	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
			EPHYDIA, France Report no. FR18HSTRZAW551A Report date 19/07/2018 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.4.1/094	Frédéric Wallart	2018	Selectivity evaluation of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in post-emergence in winter wheat in France in 2018 EPHYDIA, France Report no. FR18HSTRZAW551B Report date 25/07/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/095	Mickaël Lorphelin	2018	Selectivity evaluation of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in post-emergence in wheat in France in 2018 NAT SERVICE PLUS, France Report no. FR18HSTRZAW551E Report date 18/10/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/096	Mickaël Lorphelin	2018	Selectivity evaluation of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in post-emergence in wheat in France in 2018 NAT SERVICE PLUS, France Report no. FR18HSTRZAW551F Report date 13/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/097	Frédérique Varret	2019	Selectivity evaluation of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in post-emergence on triticale, in France 2018 STAPHYT, France Report no. FR18HSTTLSS551A Report date 15/03/2019 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/098	Christophe Marie, Jean-Luc Barou	2018	Selectivity evaluation of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in post-emergence in triticale in FRANCE in 2018 AGROTEST FRANCE, France Report no. FR18HSTTLSS551C Report date not available GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/099	Christophe Marie, Jean-Luc Barou	2018	Selectivity evaluation of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in post-emergence in triticale in FRANCE in 2018 AGROTEST FRANCE, France Report no. FR18HSTTLSS551D	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
			Report date not available GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.4.1/100 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/066</i>	Mélanie Biaunier	2021	To demonstrate the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B programs when applied in the spring following an autumn residual herbicide for the control of ALOMY in France 2019/20 QUALIPHYT, France Report no. FR19HEYCERW561A Report date 14/01/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/101 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/067</i>	Mickaël Lorphelin	2021	To demonstrate the efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B programs when applied in the spring following an autumn residual herbicide for the control of ALOMY in France 2019/20 NAT SERVICE PLUS, France Report no. FR19HEYCERW561C Report date 24/03/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/102 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/068</i>	Christophe Marie, Jean-Luc Barou	2020	To demonstrate the efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD programs when applied in the spring following an autumn residual herbicide for the control of LOLSS in France 2019/20 AGROTEST FRANCE, France Report no. FR19HEYCERW562D Report date not available GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/103 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/069</i>	Philippe NEGRINI	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on ALOMY (blackgrass) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals in France, spring 2020 ANTEDIS, France Report no. FR20HETRZAW551A Report date 16/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/104 <i>Submitted</i>	M. Kieffer	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on ALOMY (blackgrass) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (France), spring 2020 CentrExpé, France	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
<i>under KCP 6.2/070</i>			Report no. FR20HETRZAW551B Report date Report date not available GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.4.1/105 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/071</i>	Mickaël Lorphelin	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on ALOMY (Blackgrass) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals France, spring 2020 NAT SERVICE PLUS, France Report no. FR20HETRZAW551C Report date 30/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/106 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/072</i>	David Crepin	2021	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on ALOMY (blackgrass) and broad-leaved weeds in winter wheat in France, spring 2020 ESSAIS +, France Report no. FR20HETRZAW551D Report date 01/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/107 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/073</i>	Mélanie Biaunier	2021	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on LOLSS (Lolium spp) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (France), spring 2020 QUALIPHYT, France Report no. FR20HETRZAW552E Report date 14/01/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/108 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/074</i>	Mélanie Biaunier	2021	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on LOLSS (Lolium spp) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (France), spring 2020 QUALIPHYT, France Report no. FR20HETRZAW552F Report date 14/01/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/109 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/075</i>	Wilfried Rouane	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on POAAN and broad-leaved weeds in winter wheat in France, spring 2020 ANADIAG FRANCE, France Report no. FR20HETRZAW553A Report date 18/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
KCP 6.4.1/110 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/076</i>	Wilfried Rouane	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on POAAN and broad-leaved weeds in winter wheat in France, spring 2020 ANADIAG FRANCE, France Report no. FR20HETRZAW553B Report date 18/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/111 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/077</i>	Christophe Marie, Jean-Luc Barou	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on POAAN, POATR and broad-leaved weeds in cereals (France), spring 2020 AGROTEST FRANCE, France Report no. FR20HETRZAW553C Report date not available GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/112	Wilfried Rouane	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on rye in France, spring 2020 ANADIAG FRANCE, France Report no. FR20HSSECS557A Report date 07/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/113	Jean-Charles Cloix	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on Spring Wheat in France, Spring 2020 ANTEDIS, France Report no. FR20HSTRZAS556A Report date 18/12/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/114	Philippe NEGRINI	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on Spring Wheat in France, Spring 2020 ANTEDIS, France Report no. FR20HSTRZAS556B Report date 18/12/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/115	David Crepin	2021	Selectivity evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat in France, spring 2020 ESSAIS +, France Report no. FR20HSTRZAW554C Report date 01/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
KCP 6.4.1/116	David Crepin	2021	Selectivity evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat in France, spring 2020 ESSAIS+, France Report no. FR20HSTRZAW554D Report date 01/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/117	Jérôme Flahaut	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat in France in spring 2020 STAPHYT, France Report no. FR20HSTRZAW554E Report date 11/12/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/118	Philippe NEGRINI	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on triticale in France, spring 2020 ANTEDIS, France Report no. FR20HSTTLSS558B Report date 18/12/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/119 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/078</i>	Tibor Barasits, Dr László Hódi	2019	To demonstrate the efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD programs when applied in the spring following an autumn residual herbicide for the control of ALOMY in (Hungary) 2018/19 SynTech Research Hungary Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HETRZAW800A Report date 06/09/2019 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/120 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/079</i>	Tibor Barasits, Ferenc Molnár	2019	To demonstrate the efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD programs when applied in the spring following an autumn residual herbicide for the control of ALOMY in (Hungary) 2018/19 SynTech Research Hungary Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HETRZAW800B Report date 05/09/2019 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/121 <i>Submitted</i>	Hoffmanné Pathy Zsuzsanna	2019	To demonstrate the efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD programs when applied in the spring following an autumn residual herbicide for the control of LOLSS in (Hungary) 2018/19	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
<i>under KCP 6.2/080</i>			Növénypathyka Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HETRZAW801A Report date 30/10/2019 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.4.1/122 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/081</i>	Hoffmanné Pathy Zsuzsanna	2019	To demonstrate the efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD programs when applied in the spring following an autumn residual herbicide for the control of LOLSS in (Hungary) 2018/19 Növénypathyka Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HETRZAW801B Report date 30/10/2019 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/123 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/083</i>	Tibor Barasits, Dr László Hódi	2018	Post-emergence control of ALOMY and broad-leaved weeds with AG-PM1-72 OD in cereals (Hungary), spring 2018 SynTech Research Hungary Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HEYCERE111B Report date 27/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/124 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/086</i>	Tibor Barasits, Dr László Hódi	2018	Post-emergence control of BROSS and broad-leaved weeds with AG-PM1-72 OD in cereals (Hungary), spring 2018 SynTech Research Hungary Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HEYCERE114A Report date 28/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/125 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/087</i>	Hoffmanné Pathy Zsuzsanna	2018	Post-emergence control of LOLSS and broad-leaved weeds with AG-PM1-72 OD in cereals (Hungary), spring 2018 Növénypathyka Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HEYCERE115A Report date 31/10/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/126 <i>Submitted under KCP</i>	Hoffmanné Pathy Zsuzsanna	2018	Post-emergence control of LOLSS and broad-leaved weeds with AG-PM1-72 OD in cereals (Hungary), spring 2018 Növénypathyka Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HEYCERE115B	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
6.2/088			Report date 31/10/2018 GEP, Unpublished				
KCP 6.4.1/127 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/089</i>	Tibor Barasits, Gábor Wágner	2018	Post-emergence control of LOLSS and broad-leaved weeds with AG-PM1-72 OD in cereals (Hungary), spring 2018 SynTech Research Hungary Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HEYCERE115C Report date 01/10/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/129 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/090</i>	Hoffmanné Pathy Zsuzsanna	2018	Post-emergence control of Poa sp and broad-leaved weeds with AG-PM1-72 OD in cereals (Hungary), spring 2018 Növénypathyka Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HEYCERE116A Report date 31/08/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/130 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/091</i>	Tibor Barasits, József Ritecz	2018	Post-emergence control of Poa sp and broad-leaved weeds with AG-PM1-72 OD in cereals (Hungary), spring 2018 SynTech Research Hungary Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HEYCERE116B Report date 12/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/131	Hoffmanné Pathy Zsuzsanna	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter rye in the spring (Hungary) 2018 Növénypathyka Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HSSECCW121A Report date 31/10/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/132	Tibor Barasits, Ferenc Molnár	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter rye in the spring (Hungary) 2018 SynTech Research Hungary Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HSSECCW121B Report date 19/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/133	Bálint Magyar	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to spring wheat in Hungary 2018 Fructika Kft., Hungary	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
			Report no. HU18HSTRZAS121A Report date 28/08/2018 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.4.1/134	Tibor Barasits, Imre Botos	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to spring wheat (Hungary) 2018 SynTech Research Hungary Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HSTRZAS121B Report date 09/10/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/135	Zsuzsanna Hoffmanné Pathy	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter wheat in the spring (Hungary) 2018 Növénypathy Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HSTRZAW121A Report date 31/10/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/136	Tibor Barasits, Ferenc Molnár	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter wheat in the spring (Hungary) 2018 SynTech Research Hungary Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HSTRZAW121B Report date 19/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/137	Hoffmanné Pathy Zsuzsanna	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter triticale in the spring (Hungary) 2018 Növénypathy Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HSTTLWI121A Report date 31/10/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/138	Tibor Barasits, Gábor Bese	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter triticale in the spring (Hungary) 2018 Syntech Research Hungary Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HSTTLWI121B Report date 24/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/139	Tibor Barasits, Gábor Bese	2020	To demonstrate the efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD programs when applied in the spring following an autumn residual herbicide for the control of ALOMY	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
<i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/092</i>			in Hungary 2019/20 CPR Europe Kft., Hungary Report no. HU19HETRZAW006A Report date 17/07/2020 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.4.1/140 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/093</i>	Tibor Barasits, Gábor Wágner	2020	To demonstrate the efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD programs when applied in the spring following an autumn residual herbicide for the control of LOLSS in Hungary 2019/20 SynTech Research Hungary Kft. / CPR Europe Kft., Hungary Report no. HU19HETRZAW007A Report date 13/08/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/141 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/094</i>	Tibor Barasits, Gábor Wágner	2020	To demonstrate the efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD programs when applied in the spring following an autumn residual herbicide for the control of LOLSS in Hungary 2019/20 SynTech Research Hungary Kft. / CPR Europe Kft., Hungary Report no. HU19HETRZAW007B Report date 14/08/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/142 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/095</i>	Tibor Barasits, József Ritecz	2020	To demonstrate the efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD programs when applied in the spring following an autumn residual herbicide for the control of APESV in Hungary 2019/20 CPR Europe Kft., Hungary Report no. HU19HETRZAW008A Report date 17/07/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/143 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/096</i>	Tibor Barasits, Gábor Bese	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on ALOMY (blackgrass) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals Hungary, spring 2020 CPR Europe Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HETRZAW201A Report date 10/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
KCP 6.4.1/144 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/097</i>	Tibor Barasits, Gábor Bese	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on ALOMY (blackgrass) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals Hungary, spring 2020 CPR Europe Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HETRZAW201B Report date 10/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/145 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/098</i>	Tibor Barasits, Gábor Bese	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on ALOMY (blackgrass) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals Hungary, spring 2020 CPR Europe Kft., Hungary HU20HETRZAW201C Report date 24/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/146 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/099</i>	Tibor Barasits, József Ritecz	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on APESV and broad-leaved weeds in cereals in Hungary, spring 2020 CPR Europe Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HETRZAW202A Report date 25/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/147 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/100</i>	Tibor Barasits, Andrea Rábai	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on APESV and broad-leaved weeds in cereals in Hungary, spring 2020 CPR Europe Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HETRZAW202B Report date 30/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/148 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/101</i>	Bálint Magyar	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on APESV and broad-leaved weeds in cereals in Naszály, Hungary, spring 2020 Fructika Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HETRZAW202C Report date 09/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/149	Tibor Barasits, Gábor Bese	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on AVESS (wild oats) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals in Hungary, spring 2020	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
<i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/102</i>			CPR Europe Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HETRZAW203A Report date 24/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.4.1/150 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/103</i>	Tibor Barasits, Gábor Bese	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on AVESS (wild oats) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals in Hungary, spring 2020 CPR Europe Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HETRZAW203B Report date 24/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/151 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/104</i>	Tibor Barasits, Gábor Bese	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on AVESS (wild oats) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals in Hungary, spring 2020 CPR Europe Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HETRZAW203C Report date 24/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/152 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/105</i>	Tibor Barasits, Gábor Bese	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on BROSS (Bromus spp) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals in Hungary, spring 2020 CPR Europe Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HETRZAW204A Report date 24/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/153 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/106</i>	Tibor Barasits, Gábor Bese	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on BROSS (Bromus spp) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals in Hungary, spring 2020 CPR Europe Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HETRZAW204B Report date 24/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/154 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/108</i>	Dr Attila Labant	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on LOLSS (Lolium spp) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals Hungary, spring 2020 Növénypathyka Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HETRZAW205B Report date 28/07/2020	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
			GEP, Unpublished				
KCP 6.4.1/155 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/109</i>	Dr Attila Labant	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on LOLSS (Lolium spp) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals Hungary, spring 2020 Növénypathyka Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HETRZAW205C Report date 25/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/156 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/110</i>	Dr Attila Labant	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on POAAN, POATR and broad-leaved weeds in cereals in Hungary, spring 2020 Növénypathyka Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HETRZAW206A Report date 25/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/157 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/111</i>	Dr Attila Labant	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on POAAN, POATR and broad-leaved weeds in cereals in Hungary, spring 2020 Növénypathyka Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HETRZAW206B Report date 28/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/158 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/112</i>	Dr Attila Labant	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on POAAN, POATR and broad-leaved weeds in cereals in Hungary, spring 2020 Növénypathyka Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HETRZAW206C Report date 25/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/159	Dr Attila Labant	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on rye in Hungary, spring 2020 Növénypathyka Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HSSECCW201A Report date 05/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/160	Bálint Magyar	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on rye in Tiszakanyár, Hungary, spring 2020 Fructika Kft., Hungary	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
			Report no. HU20HSSECCW201B Report date 09/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.4.1/161	Tibor Barasits, Ferenc Molnár	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on spring wheat in Hungary, spring 2020 CPR Europe Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HSTRZAS201A Report date 22/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/162	Bálint Magyar	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on spring wheat in Naszály, Hungary, spring 2020 Fructika Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HSTRZAS201B Report date 09/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/163	Tibor Barasits, József Ritecz	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat in Hungary, spring 2020 CPR Europe Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HSTRZAW201A Report date 25/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/164	Dr Attila Labant	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat in Hungary, spring 2020 Növénypathyka Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HSTRZAW201B Report date 25/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/165	Bálint Magyar	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat in Naszály, Hungary, spring 2020 Fructika Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HSTRZAW201C Report date 09/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/166	Dr Attila Labant	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on triticale in Hungary, spring 2020 Növénypathyka Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HSTTLWI201A Report date 05/10/2020	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
			GEP, Unpublished				
KCP 6.4.1/167	Bálint Magyar	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on triticale in Naszály, Hungary, spring 2020 Fructika Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HSTTLWI201B Report date 09/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/168 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/113</i>	Łukasz Sobiech	2018	Efficacy of AG-PM1-72OD in the control of weeds in the cultivation of spring wheat Poznań University of Life Sciences, Poland Report no. PL18HETRZAS010A Report date 30/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/169 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/114</i>	Łukasz Sobiech	2018	Efficacy of AG-PM1-72OD in the control of weeds in the cultivation of spring wheat Poznań University of Life Sciences, Poland Report no. PL18HETRZAS010B Report date 30/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/170 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/115</i>	Łukasz Sobiech	2018	Efficacy of AG-PM1-72OD in post-emergence treatment in the control of weeds in the cultivation of winter wheat Poznań University of Life Sciences, Poland Report no. PL18HETRZAW008A Report date 30/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/171 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/116</i>	Łukasz Sobiech	2018	Efficacy of AG-PM1-72OD in post-emergence treatment in the control of weeds in the cultivation of winter wheat Poznań University of Life Sciences, Poland Report no. PL18HETRZAW008B Report date 30/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/172 <i>Submitted under KCP</i>	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Efficacy of AG-PM1-72OD in control of weeds in winter wheat, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HETRZAW008C Report date 21/08/2018	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
6.2/117			GEP, Unpublished				
KCP 6.4.1/173 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.2/118	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Efficacy of AG-PM1-72OD in post-emergence treatment in the control of weeds in the cultivation of winter wheat Poznań University of Life Sciences, Poland Report no. PL18HETRZAW009A Report date 30/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/174 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.2/119	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Efficacy of AG-PM1-72OD in control of weeds in winter wheat, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HETRZAW009B Report date 11/08/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/175 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.2/120	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Efficacy of AG-PM1-72OD in control of weeds in winter wheat, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HETRZAW009C Report date 11/08/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/176 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.2/121	Dr Agnieszka Kukuła	2018	The evaluation of efficacy of product AG-PM1-72OD for the control of weeds on winter wheat Agreco Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HETRZAW011A Report date 27/08/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/177 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.2/122	Dr Agnieszka Kukuła	2018	The evaluation of efficacy of product AG-PM1-72OD for the control of weeds on winter wheat Agreco Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HETRZAW014A Report date 27/08/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/178 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.2/123	Dr Agnieszka Kukuła	2018	The evaluation of efficacy of product AG-PM1-72OD for the control of weeds on winter wheat Agreco Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HETRZAW014B Report date 27/08/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
KCP 6.4.1/179	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD in control of weeds in winter rye, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSSECSS019A Report date 03/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/180	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD in control of weeds in winter rye, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSSECSS019B Report date 03/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/181	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD in control of weeds in winter rye, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSSECSS019C Report date 03/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/182	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD in control of weeds in winter rye, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSSECSS019D Report date 03/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/183	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD preparation used in spring wheat, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSTRZAS017A Report date 04/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/184	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD preparation used in spring wheat, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSTRZAS017B Report date 04/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/185	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in control of weeds in winter wheat, Poland 2018	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
			Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSTRZAW016A Report date 03/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.4.1/186	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in control of weeds in winter wheat, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSTRZAW016B Report date 03/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/187	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in control of weeds in winter wheat, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSTRZAW016C Report date 03/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/188	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in control of weeds in winter wheat, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSTRZAW016D Report date 03/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/189	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied in control of weeds in winter triticale, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSTTLSS018A Report date 05/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/190	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied in control of weeds in winter triticale, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSTTLSS018B Report date 05/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/191	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied in control of weeds in winter triticale, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSTTLSS018C	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
			Report date 05/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.4.1/192	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied in control of weeds in winter triticale, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSTTLSS018D Report date 05/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/193 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/124</i>	Dr Agnieszka Kukuła	2020	To demonstrate the efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD programs when applied in the spring following an autumn residual herbicide for the control of ALOMY in Poland 2019/20 AGRECO sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL19HETRZAW501A Report date 28/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/194 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/125</i>	Adam Pawlak	2020	To demonstrate the efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD programs when applied in the spring following an autumn residual herbicide for the control of APESV in Poland 2019/20 STAPHYT Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL19HETRZAW501B Report date 08/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/195 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/126</i>	Łukasz Sobiech	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on ALOMY (blackgrass) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals Poland, spring 2020 Poznań University of Life Sciences, Poland Report no. PL20HETRZAW007A Report date 30/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/196 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/127</i>	Adam Szemendera	2020	Efficacy of AG-PM1-72OD (ADM.06001.H.2.B) in control of weeds in winter wheat, Poland 2020 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HETRZAW007B Report date 03/08/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
KCP 6.4.1/197 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/128</i>	Dr Agnieszka Kukuła	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on ALOMY (blackgrass) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals Poland, spring 2020 Agreco Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HETRZAW007C Report date 03/08/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/198 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/129</i>	Dr Agnieszka Kukuła	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on ALOMY (blackgrass) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals Poland, spring 2020 Agreco Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HETRZAW007D Report 01/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/199 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/130</i>	Łukasz Sobiech	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on APESV and broad-leaved weeds in cereals POLAND, spring 2020 Poznań University of Life Sciences, Poland Report no. PL20HETRZAW008A Report date 30/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/200 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/131</i>	Adam Szemendera	2020	Efficacy of AG-PM1-72OD (ADM.06001.H.2.B) in control of weeds in winter wheat, Poland 2020 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HETRZAW008B Report date 03/08/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/201 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/132</i>	Adam Pawlak	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on APESV and broad-leaved weeds in cereals POLAND, spring 2020 STAPHYT Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HETRZAW008C Report date 19/08/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/202 <i>Submitted</i>	Adam Pawlak	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on APESV and broad-leaved weeds in cereals POLAND, spring 2020 STAPHYT Sp. z o.o., Poland	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
<i>under KCP 6.2/133</i>			Report no. PL20HETRZAW008D Report date 19/08/2020 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.4.1/203 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/134</i>	Łukasz Sobiech	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on AVESS (wild oats) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals Poland spring 2020 Poznań University of Life Sciences, Poland Report no. PL20HETRZAW009A Report date 30/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/204 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/135</i>	Adam Szemendera	2020	Efficacy of AG-PM1-72OD (ADM.06001.H.2.B) in control of weeds in winter wheat, Poland 2020 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HETRZAW009B Report date 03/0/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/205 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/136</i>	Adam Pawlak	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on AVESS (wild oats) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals Poland spring 2020 STAPHYT Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HETRZAW009C Report date 26/08/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/206 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/137</i>	Adam Pawlak	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on AVESS (wild oats) and broad-leaved weeds in cereals Poland spring 2020 STAPHYT Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HETRZAW009D Report date 26/08/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/207 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/138</i>	Adam Pawlak	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on POAAN and broad-leaved weeds in cereals Poland, spring 2020 STAPHYT Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HETRZAW010A Report date 26/08/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
KCP 6.4.1/208 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/139</i>	Łukasz Sobiech	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on POAAN, POATR and broad-leaved weeds in cereals Poland, spring 2020 Poznań University of Life Sciences, Poland Report no. PL20HETRZAW010B Report date 30/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/209 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/140</i>	Dr Agnieszka Kukuła	2020	Efficacy evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on POAAN, POATR and broad-leaved weeds in cereals Poland, spring 2020 Agreco Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HETRZAW010C Report date 01/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/210 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/141</i>	Adam Szemendera	2020	Efficacy of AG-PM1-72OD (ADM.06001.H.2.B) in control of weeds in winter wheat, Poland 2020 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HETRZAW010D Report date 03/08/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/211 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/142</i>	Łukasz Sobiech	2020	Check the control of A21481B to control grasses and BLW comparing with standard products in Winter Wheat, in POLAND 2020 Poznań University of Life Sciences, Poland Report no. PL20HETRZAX015A Report date 30/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/212	Dr Agnieszka Kukuła	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B (AG-PM1-72 OD) on rye POLAND, spring 2020 Agreco Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HSSECSS013A Report date 10/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/213	Adam Pawlak	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on rye POLAND, spring 2020 STAPHYT Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HSSECSS013B Report date 09/09/2020	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
			GEP, Unpublished				
KCP 6.4.1/214	Adam Pawlak	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on rye POLAND, spring 2020 STAPHYT Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HSSECSS013C Report date 09/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/215	Łukasz Sobiech	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on spring wheat Poland, spring 2020 Poznań University of Life Sciences, Poland Report no. PL20HSTRZAS012A Report date 30/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/216	Adam Szemendera	2020	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD (ADM.06001.H.2.B) applied in control of weeds in winter wheat, Poland 2020 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HSTRZAW011A Report date 07/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/217	Adam Szemendera	2020	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD (ADM.06001.H.2.B) applied in control of weeds in winter wheat, Poland 2020 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HSTRZAW011B Report date 07/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/218	Dr Dariusz Gajek	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat Poland, spring 2020 Agro Research Consulting, Poland Report no. PL20HSTRZAW011C Report date 24/08/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/219	Łukasz Sobiech	2020	Selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B in spring and winter wheat cultivation Poznań University of Life Sciences, Poland Report no. PL20HSTRZAW011D Report date 30/09/2020	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
			GEP, Unpublished				
KCP 6.4.1/220	Dr Dariusz Gajek	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on triticale, Poland, spring 2020 Agro Research Consulting, Poland Report no. PL20HSTTLSS014A Report date 26/08/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/221	Adam Szemendera	2020	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD (ADM.06001.H.2.B) when applied in control of weeds in winter triticale, Poland 2020 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HSTTLSS014B Report date 07/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/222	Adam Szemendera	2020	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD (ADM.06001.H.2.B) when applied in control of weeds in winter triticale, Poland 2020 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HSTTLSS014C Report date 07/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/223 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/143</i>	Anca Avram, Calin Costea	2018	Determination of Efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD against ALOMY and broadleaved weeds in cereals, outdoor 2018 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO18HEYCERW057A Report date 07/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/224 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/144</i>	Anca Avram, Calin Costea	2018	Determination of Efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD against ALOMY and broad-leaved weeds in cereals, outdoor 2018 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO18HEYCERW057B Report date 07/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/225	Anca Avram, Calin Costea	2018	Determination of Efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD against APESV and broad-leaved weeds in cereals, outdoor 2018	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
<i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/145</i>			Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO18HEYCERW059A Report date 07/11/2021 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.4.1/226 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/146</i>	Anca Avram, Calin Costea	2018	Determination of Efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD against APESV and broad-leaved weeds in cereals, outdoor 2018 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO18HEYCERW059B Report date 07/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/227 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/147</i>	Anca Avram, Calin Costea	2018	Determination of Efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD against AVESA and broad-leaved weeds in cereals, outdoor 2018 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO18HEYCERW061A Report date 07/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/228 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/148</i>	Anca Avram, Calin Costea	2018	Determination of Efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD against AVESA and broad-leaved weeds in cereals, outdoor 2018 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO18HEYCERW061B Report date 07/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/229 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/149</i>	Anca Avram, Calin Costea	2018	Determination of Efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD against BROSS and broad-leaved weeds in cereals, outdoor 2018 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO18HEYCERW063A Report date 20/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/230 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/150</i>	Anca Avram, Calin Costea	2018	Determination of Efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD against BROSS and broad-leaved weeds in cereals, outdoor 2018 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO18HEYCERW063B Report date 20/11/201	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
			GEP, Unpublished				
KCP 6.4.1/231 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/151</i>	Anca Avram, Venetius Dragosin	2018	Determination of Efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD against POASS and broad-leaved weeds in cereals, outdoor 2018 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO18HEYCERW065A Report date 20/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/232 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/152</i>	Anca Avram, Venetius Dragosin	2018	Determination of Efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD with a range of adjuvants against POASS and broad-leaved weeds in cereals, outdoor 2018 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO18HEYCERW066A Report date 20/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/233	Mihai Lunca, Anca Avram	2018	Determination of Crop Safety of AG-PM1-72 applied on Winter Wheat in sping, outdoor 2018 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO18HSTRZAW067A Report date 20/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/234	Mihai Lunca, Anca Avram	2018	Determination of Crop Safety of AG-PM1-72 applied on Winter Wheat in spring, outdoor 2018 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L. Report no. RO18HSTTLSS068A Report date 20/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/235 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/153</i>	Calin Costea, Valentina Tuna	2021	To demonstrate the efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD programs when applied in the spring following an autumn residual herbicide for the control of BROSS in Romania 2019/20 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO19HETRZAW208A Report date 11/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/236	Calin Costea, Valentina Tuna	2021	To demonstrate the efficacy of AG-PM1-72 OD programs when applied in the spring following an autumn residual herbicide for the control of BROSS	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
<i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/154</i>			in Romania 2019/20 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO19HETRZAW208B Report date 11/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.4.1/237 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/155</i>	Venetius Dragosin, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of Efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B on ALOMY (blackgrass) and broad-leaved weeds in winter wheat, ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HETRZAW227A Report date 09/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/238 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/156</i>	Venetius Dragosin, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of Efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B on ALOMY (blackgrass) and broad-leaved weeds in winter wheat, ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HETRZAW227B Report date 09/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/239 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/157</i>	Venetius Dragosin, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of Efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B on LOLSS (Lolium spp) and broadleaved weeds in winter wheat ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HETRZAW228A Report date 09/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/240 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/158</i>	Venetius Dragosin, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of Efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B on LOLSS (Lolium spp) and broad-leaved weeds in winter wheat ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HETRZAW228B Report date 09/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/241 <i>Submitted under KCP</i>	Calin Costea, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of Efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B on APESV and broad-leaved weeds in winter wheat in ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HETRZAW230A	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
6.2/159			Report date 09/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished				
KCP 6.4.1/242 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/160</i>	Calin Costea, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of Efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B on APESV and broad-leaved weeds in winter wheat in ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HETRZAW230B Report date 09/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/243 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/161</i>	Calin Costea, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of Efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B on APESV and broad-leaved weeds in winter wheat in ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HETRZAW230C Report date 09/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/244 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/162</i>	Venetius Dragosin, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of Efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B on AVESS (wild oats) and broad-leaved weeds in winter wheat, ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HETRZAW234A Report date 09/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/245 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/163</i>	Venetius Dragosin, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of Efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B on AVESS (wild oats) and broad-leaved weeds in winter wheat, ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HETRZAW234B Report date 09/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/246 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/164</i>	Venetius Dragosin, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of Efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B on AVESS (wild oats) and broad-leaved weeds in winter wheat, ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HETRZAW234C Report date 09/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
KCP 6.4.1/247 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/165</i>	Venetius Dragosin, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of Efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B on BROSS (Bromus spp) and broad-leaved weeds in winter wheat, ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HETRZAW235A Report date 09/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/248 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/166</i>	Venetius Dragosin, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of Efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B on BROSS (Bromus spp) and broad-leaved weeds in winter wheat, ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HETRZAW235B Report date 09/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/249 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/167</i>	Venetius Dragosin, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of Efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B on BROSS (Bromus spp) and broad-leaved weeds in winter wheat, ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HETRZAW235C Report date 09/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/250 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/168</i>	Calin Costea, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of Efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B on POAAN, POATR and broad-leaved weeds in wheat, ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HETRZAW236A Report date 09/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/251 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/169</i>	Calin Costea, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of Efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B on POAAN, POATR and broad-leaved weeds in wheat, ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HETRZAW236B Report date 09/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/252	Calin Costea, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of Efficacy of ADM.06001.H.2.B on POAAN, POATR and broad-leaved weeds in wheat, ROMANIA, spring 2020	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
<i>Submitted under KCP 6.2/170</i>			Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HETRZAW236C Report date 09/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.4.1/253	Maksim Constantin, Valentina Tuna	2020	Determination of Selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on rye ROMANIA Spring 2020 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HSSECSS237A Report date 09/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/254	Maksim Constantin, Valentina Tuna	2020	Determination of Selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on rye ROMANIA, Spring 2020 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HSSECSS237B Report date 09/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/255	Mihai Lunca, Valentina Tuna	2020	Determination of Selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on rye ROMANIA, Spring 2020 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HSSECSS237C Report date 10/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/256	Ana-Maria Lunca, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on spring wheat ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HSTRZAS238A Report date 11/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/257	Ana-Maria Lunca, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on spring wheat ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HSTRZAS238B Report date 11/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/258	Mihai Lunca, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HSTRZAW239A	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
			Report date 10/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.4.1/259	Mihai Lunca, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HSTRZAW239B Report date 10/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/260	Mihai Lunca, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HSTRZAW239C Report date 10/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/261	Maksim Constantin, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on triticale ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L. Report no. RO20HSTTLSS240A Report date 09/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.1/262	Mihai Lunca, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on triticale ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L. Report no. RO20HSTTLSS240B Report date 10/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/001 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/005</i>	Josef Soukup	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter rye in the spring, Czech republic, 2018 Czech University of Life Sciences, Czech Republic Report no. CZ18HSSECSS080A Report date 07/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/002 <i>Submitted</i>	Josef Soukup	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter wheat in the spring, Czech republic, 2018 Czech University of Life Sciences, Czech Republic	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
<i>under KCP</i> 6.4.1/006			Report no. CZ18HSTRZAW078A Report date 10/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.4.2/003 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/007	Jana Reiszova	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter wheat in the spring, Czech republic, 2018 Zkusebni stanice Nechanice s.r.o., Czech Republic Report no. CZ18HSTRZAW078B Report date 07/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/004 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/008	Jana Reiszova	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter triticale in the spring, Czech republic, 2018 Zkusebni stanice Nechanice s.r.o., Czech Republic Report no. CZ18HSTTLSS081A Report date 08/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/005 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/021	Josef Soukup	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on rye in the Czech republic, spring 2020 Czech University of Life Sciences, Czech Republic Report no. CZ20HSSECCW013A Report date 26/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/006 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/022	Josef Soukup	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat in the Czech republic, spring 2020 Czech University of Life Sciences, Czech Republic Report no. CZ20HSTRZAW010A Report date 26/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/007 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/023	Jana Reiszova	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on triticale in the Czech republic, spring 2020 Zkusebni stanice Nechanice s.r.o., Czech Republic Report no. CZ20HSTTLWI014A Report date 09/11/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/008	Dr Ute Labusch	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter rye in the spring Germany 2018 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
<i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/035</i>			Report no. DE18HSSECCW189A Report date 16/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.4.2/009 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/036</i>	Udo Zickart	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter rye in the spring Germany 2018 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HSSECCW189B Report date 19/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/010 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/037</i>	Udo Zickart	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter rye in the spring Germany 2018 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HSSECCW189C Report date 19/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/011 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/038</i>	Dr Ute Labusch, Bastian Lorenz	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to spring wheat Germany 2018 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HSTRZAS189D Report date 16/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/012 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/039</i>	Udo Zickart	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to spring wheat Germany 2018 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HSTRZAS189E Report date 19/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/013 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/040</i>	Bastian Lorenz	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter wheat in the spring, Germany 2018 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HSTRZAW189F Report date 16/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/014 <i>Submitted under KCP</i>	Bastian Lorenz	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter wheat in the spring, Germany 2018 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HSTRZAW189G Report date 16/11/2018	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
6.4.1/041			GEP, Unpublished				
KCP 6.4.2/015 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/042	Udo Zickart	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter wheat in the spring, Germany 2018 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HSTRZAW189H Report date 19/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/016 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/043	Bastian Lorenz	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter triticale in the spring Germany 2018 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HSTTLWI189I Report date 16/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/017 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/044	Udo Zickart	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter triticale in the spring Germany 2018 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HSTTLWI189J Report date 19/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/018 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/045	Udo Zickart	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter triticale in the spring Germany 2018 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HSTTLWI189K Report date 19/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/019 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.1/030	Andreas Hetterich	2021	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on rye (Germany), spring 2020 Hetterich Fieldwork GbR, Germany Report no. DE20HSSECCW177A Report date 28/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/020 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.1/031	Andreas Hetterich	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on spring wheat (Germany), spring 2020 Hetterich Fieldwork GbR, Germany Report no. DE20HSTRZAS176A Report date 16/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
KCP 6.4.2/021 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.1/032</i>	Andreas Hetterich	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat (Germany), spring 2020 Hetterich Fieldwork GbR, Germany Report no. DE20HSTRZAW175A Report date 27/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/022 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.1/033</i>	Andreas Hetterich	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat (Germany), spring 2020 Hetterich Fieldwork GbR, Germany Report no. DE20HSTRZAW175B Report date 22/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/023 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.1/034</i>	Andreas Hetterich	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on triticale (Germany), spring 2020 Hetterich Fielwork GbR, Germany Report no. DE20HSTTLWI178A Report date 27/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/024 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/087</i>	Wilfried Rouane	2018	Selectivity evaluation of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in post-emergence in rye in France in 2018 ANADIAG FRANCE, France Report no. FR18HSSECSS551A Report date not available GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/025 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/088</i>	Wilfried Rouane	2018	Selectivity evaluation of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in post-emergence in rye in France in 2018 ANADIAG FRANCE, France Report no. FR18HSSECSS551B Report date not available GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/026 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/089</i>	Christophe Marie, Jean-Luc Barou	2018	Selectivity evaluation of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in post-emergence in rye in France in 2018 AGROTEST FRANCE, France Report no. FR18HSSECSS551C Report date not available GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/027	Jean-Pierre Rivet	2018	Selectivity evaluation of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in post-emergence in (cereal) in FRANCE in 2018	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
<i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/091</i>			ESSAIS +, France Report no. FR18HSTRZAS551A Report date 24/01/2019 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.4.2/028 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/092</i>	Jean-Pierre Rivet	2018	Selectivity evaluation of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in post-emergence in (cereal) in FRANCE in 2018 ESSAIS +, France Report no. FR18HSTRZAS551B Report date 24/01/2019 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/029 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/093</i>	Frédéric Wallart	2018	Selectivity evaluation of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in post-emergence in winter wheat in France in 2018 EPHYDIA, France Report no. FR18HSTRZAW551A Report date 19/07/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/030 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/094</i>	Frédéric Wallart	2018	Selectivity evaluation of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in post-emergence in winter wheat in France in 2018 EPHYDIA, France Report no. FR18HSTRZAW551B Report date 25/07/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/031 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/095</i>	Mickaël Lorphelin	2018	Selectivity evaluation of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in post-emergence in wheat in France in 2018 NAT SERVICE PLUS, France Report no. FR18HSTRZAW551E Report date 18/10/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/032 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/096</i>	Mickaël Lorphelin	2018	Selectivity evaluation of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in post-emergence in wheat in France in 2018 NAT SERVICE PLUS, France Report no. FR18HSTRZAW551F Report date 13/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/033 <i>Submitted</i>	Frédérique Varret	2019	Selectivity evaluation of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in post-emergence on triticale, in France 2018 STAPHYT, France Report no. FR18HSTTLSS551A	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
<i>under KCP 6.4.1/097</i>			Report date 15/03/2019 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.4.2/034 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/098</i>	Christophe Marie, Jean-Luc Barou	2018	Selectivity evaluation of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in post-emergence in triticale in FRANCE in 2018 AGROTEST FRANCE, France Report no. FR18HSTTLSS551C Report date not available GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/035 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/099</i>	Christophe Marie, Jean-Luc Barou	2018	Selectivity evaluation of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in post-emergence in triticale in FRANCE in 2018 AGROTEST FRANCE, France Report no. FR18HSTTLSS551D Report date not available GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/036 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/112</i>	Wilfried Rouane	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on rye in France, spring 2020 ANADIAG FRANCE, France Report no. FR20HSSECSS557A Report date 07/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/037 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/113</i>	Philippe NEGRINI	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on Spring Wheat in France, Spring 2020 ANTEDIS, France Report no. FR20HSTRZAS556A Report date 18/12/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/038 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/114</i>	Philippe NEGRINI	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on Spring Wheat in France, Spring 2020 ANTEDIS, France Report no. FR20HSTRZAS556B Report date 18/12/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/039 <i>Submitted under KCP</i>	David Crepin	2021	Selectivity evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat in France, spring 2020 ESSAIS +, France Report no. FR20HSTRZAW554C Report date 01/02/2021	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
6.4.1/115			GEP, Unpublished				
KCP 6.4.2/040 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/116	David Crepin	2021	Selectivity evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat in France, spring 2020 ESSAIS+, France Report no. FR20HSTRZAW554D Report date 01/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/041 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/117	Jérôme Flahaut	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat in France in spring 2020 STAPHYT, France Report no. FR20HSTRZAW554E Report date 11/12/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/042 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/118	Philippe NEGRINI	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on triticale in France, spring 2020 ANTEDIS, France Report no. FR20HSTTLSS558B Report date 18/12/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/043 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/132	Tibor Barasits, Ferenc Molnár	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter rye in the spring (Hungary) 2018 SynTech Research Hungary Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HSSECCW121B Report date 19/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/044 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/133	Bálint Magyar	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to spring wheat in Hungary 2018 Fructika Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HSTRZAS121A Report date 28/08/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/045 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/134	Tibor Barasits, Imre Botos	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to spring wheat (Hungary) 2018 SynTech Research Hungary Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HSTRZAS121B Report date 09/10/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
KCP 6.4.2/046 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/135</i>	Zsuzsanna Hoffmanné Pathy	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter wheat in the spring (Hungary) 2018 Növénypathyka Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HSTRZAW121A Report date 31/10/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/047 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/136</i>	Tibor Barasits, Ferenc Molnár	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter wheat in the spring (Hungary) 2018 SynTech Research Hungary Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HSTRZAW121B Report date 19/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/048 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/137</i>	Hoffmanné Pathy Zsuzsanna	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter triticale in the spring (Hungary) 2018 Növénypathyka Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HSTTLWI121A Report date 31/10/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/049 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/138</i>	Tibor Barasits, Gábor Bese	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter triticale in the spring (Hungary) 2018 Syntech Research Hungary Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HSTTLWI121B Report date 24/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/050 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/159</i>	Dr Attila Labant	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on rye in Hungary, spring 2020 Növénypathyka Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HSSECCW201A Report date 05/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/051 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/160</i>	Bálint Magyar	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on rye in Tiszakanyár, Hungary, spring 2020 Fructika Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HSSECCW201B Report date 09/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
KCP 6.4.2/052 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/161</i>	Tibor Barasits, Ferenc Molnár	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on spring wheat in Hungary, spring 2020 CPR Europe Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HSTRZAS201A Report date 22/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/053 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/162</i>	Bálint Magyar	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on spring wheat in Naszály, Hungary, spring 2020 Fructika Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HSTRZAS201B Report date 09/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/054 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/163</i>	Tibor Barasits, József Ritecz	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat in Hungary, spring 2020 CPR Europe Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HSTRZAW201A Report date 25/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/055 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/164</i>	Dr Attila Labant	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat in Hungary, spring 2020 Növénypathyka Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HSTRZAW201B Report date 25/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/056 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/165</i>	Bálint Magyar	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat in Naszály, Hungary, spring 2020 Fructika Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HSTRZAW201C Report date 09/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/057 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/166</i>	Dr Attila Labant	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on triticale in Hungary, spring 2020 Növénypathyka Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HSTTLWI201A Report date 05/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/058	Bálint Magyar	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on triticale in Naszály, Hungary, spring 2020	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
<i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/167			Fructika Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HSTTLWI201B Report date 09/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.4.2/059 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/179	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD in control of weeds in winter rye, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSSECSS019A Report date 03/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/060 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/180	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD in control of weeds in winter rye, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSSECSS019B Report date 03/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/061 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/181	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD in control of weeds in winter rye, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSSECSS019C Report date 03/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/062 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/182	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD in control of weeds in winter rye, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSSECSS019D Report date 03/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/063 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/183	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD preparation used in spring wheat, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSTRZAS017A Report date 04/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/064 <i>Submitted</i>	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD preparation used in spring wheat, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSTRZAS017B	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
<i>under KCP 6.4.1/184</i>			Report date 04/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.4.2/065 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/185</i>	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in control of weeds in winter wheat, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSTRZAW016A Report date 03/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/066 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/186</i>	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in control of weeds in winter wheat, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSTRZAW016B Report date 03/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/067 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/187</i>	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in control of weeds in winter wheat, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSTRZAW016C Report date 03/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/068 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/188</i>	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in control of weeds in winter wheat, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSTRZAW016D Report date 03/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/069 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/189</i>	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied in control of weeds in winter triticales, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSTTLSS018A Report date 05/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/070 <i>Submitted under KCP</i>	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied in control of weeds in winter triticales, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSTTLSS018B Report date 05/09/2018	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
6.4.1/190			GEP, Unpublished				
KCP 6.4.2/071 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/191	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied in control of weeds in winter triticale, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSTTLSS018C Report date 05/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/072 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/192	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied in control of weeds in winter triticale, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSTTLSS018D Report date 05/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/073 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/212	Dr Agnieszka Kukuła	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B (AG-PM1-72 OD) on rye POLAND, spring 2020 Agreco Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HSSECSS013A Report date 10/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/074 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/213	Adam Pawlak	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on rye POLAND, spring 2020 STAPHYT Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HSSECSS013B Report date 09/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/075 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/214	Adam Pawlak	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on rye POLAND, spring 2020 STAPHYT Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HSSECSS013C Report date 09/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/076 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/215	Łukasz Sobiech	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on spring wheat Poland, spring 2020 Poznań University of Life Sciences, Poland Report no. PL20HSTRZAS012A Report date 30/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
KCP 6.4.2/077 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/216	Adam Szemendera	2020	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD (ADM.06001.H.2.B) applied in control of weeds in winter wheat, Poland 2020 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HSTRZAW011A Report date 07/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/078 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/217	Adam Szemendera	2020	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD (ADM.06001.H.2.B) applied in control of weeds in winter wheat, Poland 2020 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HSTRZAW011B Report date 07/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/079 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/218	Dr Dariusz Gajek	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat Poland, spring 2020 Agro Research Consulting, Poland Report no. PL20HSTRZAW011C Report date 24/08/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/080 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/219	Łukasz Sobiech	2020	Selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B in spring and winter wheat cultivation Poznań University of Life Sciences, Poland Report no. PL20HSTRZAW011D Report date 30/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/081 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/220	Dr Dariusz Gajek	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on triticale, Poland, spring 2020 Agro Research Consulting, Poland Report no. PL20HSTTLSS014A Report date 26/08/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/082 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/221	Adam Szemendera	2020	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD (ADM.06001.H.2.B) when applied in control of weeds in winter triticale, Poland 2020 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HSTTLSS014B Report date 07/09/2020	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
			GEP, Unpublished				
KCP 6.4.2/083 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/222	Adam Szemendera	2020	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD (ADM.06001.H.2.B) when applied in control of weeds in winter triticale, Poland 2020 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HSTTLSS014C Report date 07/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/084 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/233	Mihai Lunca, Anca Avram	2018	Determination of Crop Safety of AG-PM1-72 applied on Winter Wheat in sping, outdoor 2018 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO18HSTRZAW067A Report date 20/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/085 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/234	Mihai Lunca, Anca Avram	2018	Determination of Crop Safety of AG-PM1-72 applied on Winter Wheat in spring, outdoor 2018 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L. Report no. RO18HSTTLSS068A Report date 20/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/086 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/253	Maksim Constantin, Valentina Tuna	2020	Determination of Selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on rye ROMANIA Spring 2020 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HSSECSS237A Report date 09/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/087 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/254	Maksim Constantin, Valentina Tuna	2020	Determination of Selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on rye ROMANIA, Spring 2020 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HSSECSS237B Report date 09/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/088 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/255	Mihai Lunca, Valentina Tuna	2020	Determination of Selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on rye ROMANIA, Spring 2020 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HSSECSS237C Report date 10/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
KCP 6.4.2/089 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/256	Ana-Maria Lunca, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on spring wheat ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HSTRZAS238A Report date 11/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/090 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/257	Ana-Maria Lunca, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on spring wheat ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HSTRZAS238B Report date 11/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/091 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/258	Mihai Lunca, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HSTRZAW239A Report date 10/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/092 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/259	Mihai Lunca, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HSTRZAW239B Report date 10/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/093 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/260	Mihai Lunca, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HSTRZAW239C Report date 10/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/094 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/261	Maksim Constantin, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on triticale ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L. Report no. RO20HSTTLSS240A Report date 09/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.2/095	Mihai Lunca, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on triticale ROMANIA, spring 2020	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
<i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/262</i>			Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L. Report no. RO20HSTTLSS240B Report date 10/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.4.3/001 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/005</i>	Josef Soukup	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter rye in the spring, Czech republic, 2018 Czech University of Life Sciences, Czech Republic Report no. CZ18HSSECCS080A Report date 07/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/002 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/006</i>	Josef Soukup	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter wheat in the spring, Czech republic, 2018 Czech University of Life Sciences, Czech Republic Report no. CZ18HSTRZAW078A Report date 10/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/003 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/007</i>	Jana Reiszova	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter wheat in the spring, Czech republic, 2018 Zkusebni stanice Nechanice s.r.o., Czech Republic Report no. CZ18HSTRZAW078B Report date 07/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/004 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/008</i>	Jana Reiszova	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter triticale in the spring, Czech republic, 2018 Zkusebni stanice Nechanice s.r.o., Czech Republic Report no. CZ18HSTTLSS081A Report date 08/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/005 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/021</i>	Josef Soukup	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on rye in the Czech republic, spring 2020 Czech University of Life Sciences, Czech Republic Report no. CZ20HSSECCW013A Report date 26/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
KCP 6.4.3/006 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/022	Josef Soukup	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat in the Czech republic, spring 2020 Czech University of Life Sciences, Czech Republic Report no. CZ20HSTRZAW010A Report date 26/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/007 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/023	Jana Reiszova	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on triticale in the Czech republic, spring 2020 Zkusebni stanice Nechanice s.r.o., Czech Republic Report no. CZ20HSTTLWI014A Report date 09/11/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/008 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/035	Dr Ute Labusch	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter rye in the spring Germany 2018 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HSSECCW189A Report date 16/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/009 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/036	Udo Zickart	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter rye in the spring Germany 2018 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HSSECCW189B Report date 19/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/010 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/037	Udo Zickart	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter rye in the spring Germany 2018 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HSSECCW189C Report date 19/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/011 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/038	Dr Ute Labusch, Bastian Lorenz	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to spring wheat Germany 2018 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HSTRZAS189D Report date 16/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/012	Udo Zickart	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to spring wheat Germany 2018	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
<i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/039</i>			BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HSTRZAS189E Report date 19/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.4.3/013 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/040</i>	Bastian Lorenz	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter wheat in the spring, Germany 2018 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HSTRZAW189F Report date 16/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/014 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/041</i>	Bastian Lorenz	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter wheat in the spring, Germany 2018 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HSTRZAW189G Report date 16/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/015 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/042</i>	Udo Zickart	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter wheat in the spring, Germany 2018 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HSTRZAW189H Report date 19/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/016 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/043</i>	Bastian Lorenz	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter triticale in the spring Germany 2018 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HSTTLWI189I Report date 16/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/017 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/044</i>	Udo Zickart	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter triticale in the spring Germany 2018 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HSTTLWI189J Report date 19/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/018 <i>Submitted</i>	Udo Zickart	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter triticale in the spring Germany 2018 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HSTTLWI189K	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
<i>under KCP 6.4.1/045</i>			Report date 19/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.4.3/019 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.1/030</i>	Andreas Hetterich	2021	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on rye (Germany), spring 2020 Hetterich Fieldwork GbR, Germany Report no. DE20HSSECCW177A Report date 28/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/020 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.1/031</i>	Andreas Hetterich	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on spring wheat (Germany), spring 2020 Hetterich Fieldwork GbR, Germany Report no. DE20HSTRZAS176A Report date 16/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/021 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.1/032</i>	Andreas Hetterich	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat (Germany), spring 2020 Hetterich Fieldwork GbR, Germany Report no. DE20HSTRZAW175A Report date 27/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/022 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.1/033</i>	Andreas Hetterich	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat (Germany), spring 2020 Hetterich Fieldwork GbR, Germany Report no. DE20HSTRZAW175B Report date 22/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/023 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.1/034</i>	Andreas Hetterich	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on triticale (Germany), spring 2020 Hetterich Fieldwork GbR, Germany Report no. DE20HSTTLWI178A Report date 27/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/024 <i>Submitted under KCP</i>	Christophe Marie, Jean-Luc Barou	2018	Selectivity evaluation of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in post-emergence in rye in France in 2018 AGROTEST FRANCE, France Report no. FR18HSSECCSS551C Report date not available	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
6.4.1/089			GEP, Unpublished				
KCP 6.4.3/025 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/091	Jean-Pierre Rivet	2018	Selectivity evaluation of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in post-emergence in (cereal) in FRANCE in 2018 ESSAIS +, France Report no. FR18HSTRZAS551A Report date 24/01/2019 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/026 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/092	Jean-Pierre Rivet	2018	Selectivity evaluation of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in post-emergence in (cereal) in FRANCE in 2018 ESSAIS +, France Report no. FR18HSTRZAS551B Report date 24/01/2019 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/027 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/095	Mickaël Lorphelin	2018	Selectivity evaluation of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in post-emergence in wheat in France in 2018 NAT SERVICE PLUS, France Report no. FR18HSTRZAW551E Report date 18/10/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/028 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/096	Mickaël Lorphelin	2018	Selectivity evaluation of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in post-emergence in wheat in France in 2018 NAT SERVICE PLUS, France Report no. FR18HSTRZAW551F Report date 13/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/029 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/097	Frédérique Varret	2019	Selectivity evaluation of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in post-emergence on triticales, in France 2018 STAPHYT, France Report no. FR18HSTTLSS551A Report date 15/03/2019 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/030 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/099	Christophe Marie, Jean-Luc Barou	2018	Selectivity evaluation of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in post-emergence in triticales in FRANCE in 2018 AGROTEST FRANCE, France Report no. FR18HSTTLSS551D Report date not available GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
KCP 6.4.3/031 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/112</i>	Wilfried Rouane	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on rye in France, spring 2020 ANADIAG FRANCE, France Report no. FR20HSSECSS557A Report date 07/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/032 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/113</i>	Philippe NEGRINI	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on Spring Wheat in France, Spring 2020 ANTEDIS, France Report no. FR20HSTRZAS556A Report date 18/12/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/033 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/114</i>	Philippe NEGRINI	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on Spring Wheat in France, Spring 2020 ANTEDIS, France Report no. FR20HSTRZAS556B Report date 18/12/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/034 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/115</i>	David Crepin	2021	Selectivity evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat in France, spring 2020 ESSAIS +, France Report no. FR20HSTRZAW554C Report date 01/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/035 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/116</i>	David Crepin	2021	Selectivity evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat in France, spring 2020 ESSAIS+, France Report no. FR20HSTRZAW554D Report date 01/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/036 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/117</i>	Jérôme Flahaut	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat in France in spring 2020 STAPHYT, France Report no. FR20HSTRZAW554E Report date 11/12/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/037	Philippe NEGRINI	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on triticale in France, spring 2020	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
<i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/118			ANTEDIS, France Report no. FR20HSTTLSS558B Report date 18/12/2020 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.4.3/038 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/132	Tibor Barasits, Ferenc Molnár	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter rye in the spring (Hungary) 2018 SynTech Research Hungary Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HSSECCW121B Report date 19/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/039 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/133	Bálint Magyar	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to spring wheat in Hungary 2018 Fructika Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HSTRZAS121A Report date 28/08/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/040 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/134	Tibor Barasits, Imre Botos	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to spring wheat (Hungary) 2018 SynTech Research Hungary Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HSTRZAS121B Report date 09/10/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/041 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/135	Zsuzsanna Hoffmanné Pathy	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter wheat in the spring (Hungary) 2018 Növénypathyka Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HSTRZAW121A Report date 31/10/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/042 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/136	Tibor Barasits, Ferenc Molnár	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter wheat in the spring (Hungary) 2018 SynTech Research Hungary Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HSTRZAW121B Report date 19/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/043 <i>Submitted</i>	Hoffmanné Pathy Zsuzsanna	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter triticale in the spring (Hungary) 2018 Növénypathyka Kft., Hungary	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
<i>under KCP 6.4.1/137</i>			Report no. HU18HSTTLWI121A Report date 31/10/2018 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.4.3/044 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/138</i>	Tibor Barasits, Gábor Bese	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter triticale in the spring (Hungary) 2018 Syntech Research Hungary Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HSTTLWI121B Report date 24/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/045 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/159</i>	Dr Attila Labant	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on rye in Hungary, spring 2020 Növénypathyka Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HSSECCW201A Report date 05/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/046 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/160</i>	Bálint Magyar	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on rye in Tiszakanyár, Hungary, spring 2020 Fructika Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HSSECCW201B Report date 09/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/047 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/161</i>	Tibor Barasits, Ferenc Molnár	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on spring wheat in Hungary, spring 2020 CPR Europe Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HSTRZAS201A Report date 22/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/048 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/162</i>	Bálint Magyar	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on spring wheat in Naszály, Hungary, spring 2020 Fructika Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HSTRZAS201B Report date 09/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/049 <i>Submitted</i>	Tibor Barasits, József Ritecz	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat in Hungary, spring 2020 CPR Europe Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HSTRZAW201A	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
<i>under KCP 6.4.1/163</i>			Report date 25/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.4.3/050 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/164</i>	Dr Attila Labant	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat in Hungary, spring 2020 Növénypathyka Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HSTRZAW201B Report date 25/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/051 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/165</i>	Bálint Magyar	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat in Naszály, Hungary, spring 2020 Fructika Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HSTRZAW201C Report date 09/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/052 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/166</i>	Dr Attila Labant	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on triticale in Hungary, spring 2020 Növénypathyka Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HSTTLWI201A Report date 05/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/053 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/167</i>	Bálint Magyar	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on triticale in Naszály, Hungary, spring 2020 Fructika Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HSTTLWI201B Report date 09/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/054 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/179</i>	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD in control of weeds in winter rye, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSSECSS019A Report date 03/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/055 <i>Submitted under KCP</i>	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD in control of weeds in winter rye, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSSECSS019B Report date 03/09/2018	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
6.4.1/180			GEP, Unpublished				
KCP 6.4.3/056 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/181	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD in control of weeds in winter rye, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSSECSS019C Report date 03/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/057 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/182	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD in control of weeds in winter rye, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSSECSS019D Report date 03/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/058 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/183	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD preparation used in spring wheat, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSTRZAS017A Report date 04/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/059 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/184	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD preparation used in spring wheat, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSTRZAS017B Report date 04/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/060 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/185	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in control of weeds in winter wheat, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSTRZAW016A Report date 03/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/061 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/186	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in control of weeds in winter wheat, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSTRZAW016B Report date 03/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
KCP 6.4.3/062 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/187	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in control of weeds in winter wheat, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSTRZAW016C Report date 03/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/063 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/188	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in control of weeds in winter wheat, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSTRZAW016D Report date 03/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/064 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/189	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied in control of weeds in winter triticale, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSTTLSS018A Report date 05/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/065 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/190	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied in control of weeds in winter triticale, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSTTLSS018B Report date 05/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/066 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/191	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied in control of weeds in winter triticale, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSTTLSS018C Report date 05/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/067 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/192	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied in control of weeds in winter triticale, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSTTLSS018D Report date 05/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/068	Dr Agnieszka Kukuła	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B (AG-PM1-72 OD) on rye POLAND, spring 2020	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
<i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/212			Agreco Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HSSECSS013A Report date 10/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.4.3/069 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/213	Adam Pawlak	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on rye POLAND, spring 2020 STAPHYT Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HSSECSS013B Report date 09/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/070 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/214	Adam Pawlak	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on rye POLAND, spring 2020 STAPHYT Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HSSECSS013C Report date 09/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/071 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/215	Łukasz Sobiech	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on spring wheat Poland, spring 2020 Poznań University of Life Sciences, Poland Report no. PL20HSTRZAS012A Report date 30/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/072 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/216	Adam Szemendera	2020	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD (ADM.06001.H.2.B) applied in control of weeds in winter wheat, Poland 2020 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HSTRZAW011A Report date 07/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/073 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/217	Adam Szemendera	2020	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD (ADM.06001.H.2.B) applied in control of weeds in winter wheat, Poland 2020 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HSTRZAW011B Report date 07/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/074	Dr Dariusz Gajek	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat Poland, spring 2020	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
<i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/218</i>			Agro Research Consulting, Poland Report no. PL20HSTRZAW011C Report date 24/08/2020 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.4.3/075 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/219</i>	Łukasz Sobiech	2020	Selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B in spring and winter wheat cultivation Poznań University of Life Sciences, Poland Report no. PL20HSTRZAW011D Report date 30/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/076 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/220</i>	Dr Dariusz Gajek	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on triticale, Poland, spring 2020 Agro Research Consulting, Poland Report no. PL20HSTTLSS014A Report date 26/08/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/077 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/221</i>	Adam Szemendera	2020	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD (ADM.06001.H.2.B) when applied in control of weeds in winter triticale, Poland 2020 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HSTTLSS014B Report date 07/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/078 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/222</i>	Adam Szemendera	2020	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD (ADM.06001.H.2.B) when applied in control of weeds in winter triticale, Poland 2020 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HSTTLSS014C Report date 07/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/079 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/233</i>	Mihai Lunca, Anca Avram	2018	Determination of Crop Safety of AG-PM1-72 applied on Winter Wheat in spring, outdoor 2018 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO18HSTRZAW067A Report date 20/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/080	Mihai Lunca, Anca Avram	2018	Determination of Crop Safety of AG-PM1-72 applied on Winter Wheat in spring, outdoor 2018	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
<i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/234			Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L. Report no. RO18HSTTLSS068A Report date 20/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.4.3/081 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/253	Maksim Constantin, Valentina Tuna	2020	Determination of Selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on rye ROMANIA Spring 2020 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HSSECSS237A Report date 09/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/082 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/254	Maksim Constantin, Valentina Tuna	2020	Determination of Selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on rye ROMANIA, Spring 2020 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HSSECSS237B Report date 09/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/083 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/255	Mihai Lunca, Valentina Tuna	2020	Determination of Selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on rye ROMANIA, Spring 2020 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HSSECSS237C Report date 10/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/084 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/256	Ana-Maria Lunca, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on spring wheat ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HSTRZAS238A Report date 11/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/085 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/257	Ana-Maria Lunca, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on spring wheat ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HSTRZAS238B Report date 11/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/086 <i>Submitted</i>	Mihai Lunca, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HSTRZAW239A	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
<i>under KCP 6.4.1/258</i>			Report date 10/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.4.3/087 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/259</i>	Mihai Lunca, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HSTRZAW239B Report date 10/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/088 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/260</i>	Mihai Lunca, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HSTRZAW239C Report date 10/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/089 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/261</i>	Maksim Constantin, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on triticale ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L. Report no. RO20HSTTLSS240A Report date 09/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.3/090 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/262</i>	Mihai Lunca, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on triticale ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L. Report no. RO20HSTTLSS240B Report date 10/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.4/001	Frédérique Varret	2019	Evaluation of the incidence of an herbicide product AG-PMI-072 OD on the quality of bread making on winter wheat, in France 2018 STAPHYT, France Report no. FR18HPTRZAW551A Report date 09/07/2019 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.4/002	Stephan Celestin	2019	Evaluation of unintentional effects of experimental product AG-PMI-072 OD on bread qualities following EPPO method (<i>Processing part</i>) STAPHYT, France	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
			Report no. FR18HPTRZAW551A Report date 10/07/2019 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.4.4/003	Frédérique Varret	2019	Evaluation of the incidence of an herbicide product AG-PMI-072 OD on the quality of bread making on winter wheat, in France 2018 STAPHYT, France Report no. FR18HPTRZAW551B Report date 09/07/2019 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.4/004	Stephan Celestin	2019	Evaluation of unintentional effects of experimental product AG-PMI-072 OD on bread qualities following EPPO method (<i>Processing part</i>) STAPHYT, France Report no. FR18HPTRZAW551B Report date 10/07/2019 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/001 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/005</i>	Josef Soukup	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PMI-72 OD when applied to winter rye in the spring, Czech republic, 2018 Czech University of Life Sciences, Czech Republic Report no. CZ18HSSECSS080A Report date 07/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/002 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/006</i>	Josef Soukup	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PMI-72 OD when applied to winter wheat in the spring, Czech republic, 2018 Czech University of Life Sciences, Czech Republic Report no. CZ18HSTRZAW078A Report date 10/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/003 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/007</i>	Jana Reiszova	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PMI-72 OD when applied to winter wheat in the spring, Czech republic, 2018 Zkusebni stanice Nechanice s.r.o., Czech Republic Report no. CZ18HSTRZAW078B Report date 07/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
KCP 6.4.5/004 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/008</i>	Jana Reiszova	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter triticale in the spring, Czech republic, 2018 Zkusebni stanice Nechanice s.r.o., Czech Republic Report no. CZ18HSTTLSS081A Report date 08/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/005 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/021</i>	Josef Soukup	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on rye in the Czech republic, spring 2020 Czech University of Life Sciences, Czech Republic Report no. CZ20HSSECCW013A Report date 26/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/006 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/023</i>	Jana Reiszova	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on triticale in the Czech republic, spring 2020 Zkusebni stanice Nechanice s.r.o., Czech Republic Report no. CZ20HSTTLWI014A Report date 09/11/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/007 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/035</i>	Dr Ute Labusch	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter rye in the spring Germany 2018 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HSSECCW189A Report date 16/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/008 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/036</i>	Udo Zickart	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter rye in the spring Germany 2018 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HSSECCW189B Report date 19/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/009 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/037</i>	Udo Zickart	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter rye in the spring Germany 2018 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HSSECCW189C Report date 19/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
KCP 6.4.5/010 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/039</i>	Udo Zickart	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to spring wheat Germany 2018 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HSTRZAS189E Report date 19/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/011 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/040</i>	Bastian Lorenz	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter wheat in the spring, Germany 2018 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HSTRZAW189F Report date 16/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/012 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/041</i>	Bastian Lorenz	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter wheat in the spring, Germany 2018 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HSTRZAW189G Report date 16/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/013 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/042</i>	Udo Zickart	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter wheat in the spring, Germany 2018 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HSTRZAW189H Report date 19/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/014 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/043</i>	Bastian Lorenz	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter triticale in the spring Germany 2018 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HSTTLWI189I Report date 16/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/015 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/044</i>	Udo Zickart	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter triticale in the spring Germany 2018 BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HSTTLWI189J Report date 19/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/016	Udo Zickart	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter triticale in the spring Germany 2018	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
<i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/045</i>			BioChem agrar GmbH, Germany Report no. DE18HSTTLWI189K Report date 19/11/2018 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.4.5/017 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.1/030</i>	Andreas Hetterich	2021	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on rye (Germany), spring 2020 Hetterich Fieldwork GbR, Germany Report no. DE20HSSECCW177A Report date 28/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/018 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.1/032</i>	Andreas Hetterich	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat (Germany), spring 2020 Hetterich Fieldwork GbR, Germany Report no. DE20HSTRZAW175A Report date 27/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/019 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.1/034</i>	Andreas Hetterich	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on triticale (Germany), spring 2020 Hetterich Fieldwork GbR, Germany Report no. DE20HSTTLWI178A Report date 27/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/020 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/113</i>	Jean-Charles Cloix	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on Spring Wheat in France, Spring 2020 ANTEDIS, France Report no. FR20HSTRZAS556A Report date 18/12/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/021 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/116</i>	David Crepin	2021	Selectivity evaluation of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat in France, spring 2020 ESSAIS+, France Report no. FR20HSTRZAW554D Report date 01/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/022 <i>Submitted</i>	Jérôme Flahaut	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat in France in spring 2020 STAPHYT, France Report no. FR20HSTRZAW554E	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
<i>under KCP 6.4.1/117</i>			Report date 11/12/2020 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.4.5/023 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/131</i>	Hoffmanné Pathy Zsuzsanna	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter rye in the spring (Hungary) 2018 Növénypathyka Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HSSECCW121A Report date 31/10/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/024 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/132</i>	Tibor Barasits, Ferenc Molnár	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter rye in the spring (Hungary) 2018 SynTech Research Hungary Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HSSECCW121B Report date 19/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/025 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/133</i>	Bálint Magyar	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to spring wheat in Hungary 2018 Fructika Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HSTRZAS121A Report date 28/08/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/026 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/134</i>	Tibor Barasits, Imre Botos	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to spring wheat (Hungary) 2018 SynTech Research Hungary Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HSTRZAS121B Report date 09/10/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/027 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/135</i>	Zsuzsanna Hoffmanné Pathy	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter wheat in the spring (Hungary) 2018 Növénypathyka Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HSTRZAW121A Report date 31/10/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/028 <i>Submitted under KCP</i>	Tibor Barasits, Ferenc Molnár	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter wheat in the spring (Hungary) 2018 SynTech Research Hungary Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HSTRZAW121B Report date 19/09/2018	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
6.4.1/136			GEP, Unpublished				
KCP 6.4.5/029 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/138	Tibor Barasits, Gábor Bese	2018	To evaluate the selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied to winter triticale in the spring (Hungary) 2018 Syntech Research Hungary Kft., Hungary Report no. HU18HSTTLWI121B Report date 24/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/030 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/159	Dr Attila Labant	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on rye in Hungary, spring 2020 Növénypathyka Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HSSECCW201A Report date 05/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/031 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/160	Bálint Magyar	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on rye in Tiszakanyár, Hungary, spring 2020 Fructika Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HSSECCW201B Report date 09/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/032 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/163	Tibor Barasits, József Ritecz	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat in Hungary, spring 2020 CPR Europe Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HSTRZAW201A Report date 25/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/033 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/164	Dr Attila Labant	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat in Hungary, spring 2020 Növénypathyka Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HSTRZAW201B Report date 25/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/034 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/165	Bálint Magyar	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat in Naszály, Hungary, spring 2020 Fructika Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HSTRZAW201C Report date 09/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
KCP 6.4.5/035 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/166	Dr Attila Labant	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on triticale in Hungary, spring 2020 Növénypathyka Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HSTTLWI201A Report date 05/10/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/036 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/167	Bálint Magyar	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on triticale in Naszály, Hungary, spring 2020 Fructika Kft., Hungary Report no. HU20HSTTLWI201B Report date 09/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/037 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/179	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD in control of weeds in winter rye, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSSECSS019A Report date 03/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/038 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/180	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD in control of weeds in winter rye, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSSECSS019B Report date 03/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/039 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/181	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD in control of weeds in winter rye, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSSECSS019C Report date 03/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/040 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/182	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD in control of weeds in winter rye, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSSECSS019D Report date 03/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/041	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in control of weeds in winter wheat, Poland 2018	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
<i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/185</i>			Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSTRZAW016A Report date 03/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.4.5/042 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/187</i>	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in control of weeds in winter wheat, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSTRZAW016C Report date 03/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/043 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/188</i>	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in control of weeds in winter wheat, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSTRZAW016D Report date 03/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/044 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/189</i>	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied in control of weeds in winter triticales, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSTTLSS018A Report date 05/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/045 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/190</i>	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied in control of weeds in winter triticales, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSTTLSS018B Report date 05/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/046 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/191</i>	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied in control of weeds in winter triticales, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSTTLSS018C Report date 05/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/047 <i>Submitted</i>	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD when applied in control of weeds in winter triticales, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSTTLSS018D	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
<i>under KCP 6.4.1/192</i>			Report date 05/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.4.5/048 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/212</i>	Dr Agnieszka Kukuła	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B (AG-PM1-72 OD) on rye POLAND, spring 2020 Agreco Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HSSECSS013A Report date 10/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/049 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/213</i>	Adam Pawlak	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on rye POLAND, spring 2020 STAPHYT Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HSSECSS013B Report date 09/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/050 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/214</i>	Adam Pawlak	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on rye POLAND, spring 2020 STAPHYT Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL20HSSECSS013C Report date 09/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/051 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/215</i>	Łukasz Sobiech	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on spring wheat Poland, spring 2020 Poznań University of Life Sciences, Poland Report no. PL20HSTRZAS012A Report date 30/09/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/052 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/218</i>	Dr Dariusz Gajek	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat Poland, spring 2020 Agro Research Consulting, Poland Report no. PL20HSTRZAW011C Report date 24/08/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/053 <i>Submitted under KCP</i>	Łukasz Sobiech	2020	Selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B in spring and winter wheat cultivation Poznań University of Life Sciences, Poland Report no. PL20HSTRZAW011D Report date 30/09/2020	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
6.4.1/219			GEP, Unpublished				
KCP 6.4.5/054 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/220	Dr Dariusz Gajek	2020	An evaluation of the selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on triticale, Poland, spring 2020 Agro Research Consulting, Poland Report no. PL20HSTTLSS014A Report date 26/08/2020 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/055 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/253	Maksim Constantin, Valentina Tuna	2020	Determination of Selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on rye ROMANIA Spring 2020 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HSSECSS237A Report date 09/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/056 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/254	Maksim Constantin, Valentina Tuna	2020	Determination of Selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on rye ROMANIA, Spring 2020 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HSSECSS237B Report date 09/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/057 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/255	Mihai Lunca, Valentina Tuna	2020	Determination of Selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on rye ROMANIA, Spring 2020 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HSSECSS237C Report date 10/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/058 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/257	Ana-Maria Lunca, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on spring wheat ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HSTRZAS238B Report date 11/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/059 <i>Submitted under KCP</i> 6.4.1/259	Mihai Lunca, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HSTRZAW239B Report date 10/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
KCP 6.4.5/060 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/260</i>	Mihai Lunca, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on winter wheat ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Romania Report no. RO20HSTRZAW239C Report date 10/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/061 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/262</i>	Mihai Lunca, Valentina Tuna	2021	Determination of selectivity of ADM.06001.H.2.B on triticale ROMANIA, spring 2020 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L. Report no. RO20HSTTLSS240B Report date 10/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.4.5/062 <i>Submitted under KCP 6.4.1/186'</i>	Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selectivity of AG-PM1-72 OD applied in control of weeds in winter wheat, Poland 2018 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Poland Report no. PL18HSTRZAW016B Report date 03/09/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.5.1/001	Sandra Siemoneit-Gast	2021	ADM.06001.H.2.B - Standardized Bioassay for the Determination of EC ₁₀ - (NOEL) and EC ₅₀ values for Herbicides and Selected Following Crops in Soil Rheinland-Pfalz (RLP) AgroScience GmbH, Germany Report no. AS626 Report date 20/04/2021 GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.5.1/002	Frédéric Wallart	2018	Crop safety evaluation of AG-PM1-72 OD in succeeding crops (maize, sugarbeet, and pea) of cereals in France in 2018 EPHYDIA, France Report no. FR18HUYCERW551A Report date 13/12/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.5.1/003	Frédéric Wallart	2018	Crop safety evaluation of AG-PM1-72 OD in succeeding crops (sugar beet, spring barley and potato) of cereals in France in 2018 EPHYDIA, France	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
			Report no. FR18HUYCERW551B Report date 07/12/2018 GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.5.1/004	Wilfried Rouane	2018	Crop safety evaluation of AG-PM1-72 OD in succeeding crops in France in 2018 ANADIAG FRANCE, France Report no. FR18HUYCERW551C Report date 14/12/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.5.1/005	Wilfried Rouane	2018	Crop safety evaluation of AG-PM1-72 OD in succeeding crops in France in 2018 ANADIAG FRANCE, France Report no. FR18HUYCERW551D Report date 14/12/2018 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.5.2/001	Frédérique Varret	2018	Crop safety evaluation of AG-PM1-72 OD in adjacent crops (BRSNW, BEAVA and ZEAMX), in France in 2018 STAPHYT, France Report no. FR18HAYCERW551A Report date 10/12/2018 GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.5.2/002	Frédérique Varret	2021	Crop safety evaluation of AG-PM1-72 OD in adjacent crops (BRSNW, ZEAMX and HELAN), in France in 2018. Version 2 STAPHYT, France Report no. FR18HAYCERW551B Report date 11/02/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.5.2/003	Jérémy Tartier	2018	Crop safety evaluation of AG-PM1-72 OD in adjacent crops in France in 2018 BIOTEK Agriculture, France Report no. FR18HAYCERW551C Report date not available GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.5.2/004	Jérémy Tartier	2018	Crop safety evaluation of AG-PM1-72 OD in adjacent crops in France in 2018	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support	ADM

Data	Author(s)	Year	Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not	Vertebrate study Y/N	Data protection claimed Y/N	Justification if data protection is claimed	Owner*
			BIOTEK Agriculture, France Report no. FR18HAYCERW551D Report date not available GEP, Unpublished			a product authorisation in Poland	
KCP 6.5.2/005	Jérémie Tartier	2018	Crop safety evaluation of AG-PM1-72 OD in adjacent crops in France in 2018 BIOTEK Agriculture, France Report no. FR18HAYCERW551E Report date not available GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.5.2/006	Jérémie Tartier	2018	Crop safety evaluation of AG-PM1-72 OD in adjacent crops in France in 2018 BIOTEK Agriculture, France Report no. FR18HAYCERW551F Report date not available GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.5.2/007	Jérémie Tartier	2018	Crop safety evaluation of AG-PM1-72 OD in adjacent crops in France in 2018 BIOTEK Agriculture, France Report no. FR18HAYCERW551G Report date not available GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM
KCP 6.5.2/008 <i>Also Submitted under KCP 10.6.2-02</i>	Bärbel Spatz, Fabian Kowalczyk	2021	ADM.06001.H.2.B: Effects on Terrestrial (Non-Target) Plants: Vegetative Vigour Test Ibacon, Germany Report no.140711087 Report date 31/05/2021 GEP, Unpublished	N	Y	Data/Study report never submitted before to support a product authorisation in Poland	ADM