

REGISTRATION REPORT

Part A

Risk Management

Product code: CA3573

Product name(s): Carnadine/Kestrel

Chemical active substance:

Acetamiprid, 200 g/L

Central Zone

Zonal Rapporteur Member State: Poland

NATIONAL ASSESSMENT Poland

(Re-authorisation acc. to Art. 43)

Applicant: Nufarm Europe GmbH

Submission date: July 2020

MS Finalisation date: May 2021 (initial National Assessment)

November 2021, January 2022, March 2022 (final National Assessment)

Version history

When	What
July 2020	Version 1.0 (application)
October 2020	zRMS request: update Analytical Methods
November 2020	Reference list completed with 5.1.1/01
May 2021	Evaluation by the zRMS (re-authorization) In order to facilitate tracking of changes of the intended uses of the product due to the performed evaluation, amendments of the GAP table and the product label are highlighted in grey, while not agreed use pattern is struck through and shaded.
November 2021	Final report (National Assessment updated following the commenting period) Additional information/assessments included by the zRMS in the report in response to comments recieved from the cMS and the Applicant are highlighted in yellow. Information no longer relevant is struck through and shaded.
January 2022	Final report (National Assessment after additional round of the commenting period) No additional information or assessments after the commenting period.
March 2022	Updated version at the request of the Polish Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development with regard to the removal of confidential data regarding the specifications of the proposed packaging.

Table of Contents

1	Details of the application.....	5
1.1	Application background	5
1.2	Letters of Access	5
1.3	Justification for submission of tests and studies.....	5
1.4	Data protection claims	5
2	Details of the authorization decision.....	5
2.1	Product identity	5
2.2	Conclusion.....	6
2.3	Substances of concern for national monitoring	6
2.4	Classification and labelling	6
2.4.1	Classification and labelling under Regulation (EC) No 1272/2008	6
2.4.2	Standard phrases under Regulation (EU) No 547/2011	7
2.4.3	Other phrases (according to Article 65 (3) of the Regulation (EU) No 1107/2009)	7
2.5	Risk management	7
2.5.1	Restrictions linked to the PPP	7
2.5.2	Specific restrictions linked to the intended uses.....	8
2.6	Intended uses (only NATIONAL GAP).....	9
3	Background of authorization decision and risk management.....	13
3.1	Physical and chemical properties (Part B, Section 2).....	13
3.2	Efficacy (Part B, Section 3).....	13
3.3	Efficacy data.....	13
3.3.1	Information on the occurrence or possible occurrence of the development of resistance	14
3.3.2	Adverse effects on treated crops.....	15
3.3.3	Observations on other undesirable or unintended side-effects	15
3.4	Methods of analysis (Part B, Section 5)	15
3.4.1	Analytical method for the formulation	15
3.4.2	Analytical methods for residues	15
3.5	Mammalian toxicology (Part B, Section 6)	15
3.5.1	Acute toxicity	16
3.5.2	Operator exposure	16
3.5.3	Worker exposure	16
3.5.4	Bystander and Resident Exposure	17
3.6	Residues and consumer exposure (Part B, Section 7)	17
3.6.1	Residues.....	17
3.6.2	Consumer exposure	17
3.7	Environmental fate and behaviour (Part B, Section 8)	18
3.7.1	Predicted environmental concentrations in soil (PEC _{soil})	18
3.7.2	Predicted environmental concentrations in groundwater (PEC _{gw})	18
3.7.3	Predicted environmental concentrations in surface water (PEC _{sw}).....	18
3.7.4	Predicted environmental concentrations in air (PEC _{air}).....	19
3.8	Ecotoxicology (Part B, Section 9)	19
3.8.1	Effects on terrestrial vertebrates	19
3.8.2	Effects on aquatic species.....	19
3.8.3	Effects on bees.....	20
3.8.4	Effects on other arthropod species other than bees	20
3.8.5	Effects on soil organisms.....	21

3.8.6	Effects on non-target terrestrial plants.....	21
3.8.7	Effects on other terrestrial organisms (Flora and Fauna)	22
3.9	Relevance of metabolites (Part B, Section 10)	22
4	Conclusion of the national comparative assessment (Art. 50 of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009).....	22
5	Further information to permit a decision to be made or to support a review of the conditions and restrictions associated with the authorization	22
Appendix 1	Copy of the product authorization.....	23
Appendix 2	Copy of the product label.....	26
Appendix 3	Letter of Access.....	34
Appendix 4	Lists of data considered for national authorization.....	40

PART A

RISK MANAGEMENT

1 Details of the application

1.1 Application background

This application is submitted for the re-authorization of the product CA3573, formulated as a soluble concentrate (SL) containing 200 g/L Acetamiprid, for the use as an insecticide for apple, potato, oilseed rape.

This application is submitted to Poland acting as the zRMS for the Central zone (Registration holder in Poland: Nufarm Polska). The concerned member beside Poland in Central Zone is Slovakia (Registration holder in Slovakia: Nufarm GmbH & Co. KG).

CA3573 was approved by Poland as Carnadine 200 SL (authorization no. R-157/2018) and Kestrel 200 SL (authorization no. R-106/2018). All studies highlighted in yellow are new studies compared to the original dossier for first approval.

1.2 Letters of Access

The product was originally applied by ADAMA Makhteshim Ltd. under the product code MCW-2222 and registered by Nufarm Polska Sp. z o.o.. Poland was zRMS for this registration.

The two products MCW-2222 and CA3573 are identical. Therefore, all studies conducted with MCW-2222 can be used for CA3573, without any restrictions.

Letters of access covering all data of concern of this application are submitted with this application (please refer to Appendix 3).

1.3 Justification for submission of tests and studies

This application is submitted for the re-authorization of the product CA3573. The list of data submitted by the applicant and relied on is presented in Appendix 4

1.4 Data protection claims

Data protection is claimed in accordance with Article 59 of Regulation (EC) No. 1107/2009 as provided for in the list of references in Appendix 4.

2 Details of the authorization decision

2.1 Product identity

Product code	CA3573
Product name in MS	Carnadine 200 SL Kestrel 200 SL
Authorization number	R-157/2018 R-106/2018
Function	Insecticide
Applicant	Nufarm Europe GmbH & Affiliates
Active substance(s) (incl. content)	Acetamiprid 200 g/L
Formulation type	Soluble concentrate [Code: SL]

Packaging	100 mL, 125 mL, 150 mL, 250 mL, 500 mL, 600 ml and 1 L HDPE bottles; 5 L, 10 L, 640 L, 1000 L HDPE containers; 20 L HDPE jerrican; 220L HDPE drum.
Coformulants of concern for national authorizations	Not applicable
Restrictions related to identity	No relevant impurities have been identified
Mandatory tank mixtures	No mandatory tank mixtures are required
Recommended tank mixtures	No tank mixtures are recommended

2.2 Conclusion

The evaluation of the application for product Kestrel 200 SL / Carnadine 200 SL resulted in the decision to grant the authorisation for application **in all intended crops** (to apples, potatoes **and oilseed rape**). ~~In order to grant the authorisation for uses to oilseed rape, further data enabling refinement of the long term risk to small herbivorous mammals are necessary.~~

2.3 Substances of concern for national monitoring

No further information is required.

2.4 Classification and labelling

2.4.1 Classification and labelling under Regulation (EC) No 1272/2008

The following classification is proposed in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 1272/2008:

Hazard class(es), categories:	Acute Tox. 4 (Oral) - Aquatic Acute 1 - Aquatic Chronic 1
-------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------

The following labelling information is derived from the classification and to be mentioned in the safety data sheet. The information which is determined for the **label is formatted bold**:

Hazard pictograms:	GHS07, GHS09
Signal word:	Warning
Hazard statement(s):	H302 – Harmful if swallowed H400 – Very toxic to aquatic life H410 – Very toxic to aquatic life with long lasting effects
Precautionary statement(s):	P102 – Keep out of reach of children P264 – Wash thoroughly after handling P270 – Do not eat, drink or smoke when using this product P301+P312 – If swallowed: Call a poison centre/doctor/if you feel unwell P330 – Rinse mouth P391 – Collect spillage P501 – Dispose of contents and container to hazardous or special waste collection point, in accordance with local, regional, national and/or international regulation
Additional labelling phrases:	To avoid risks to man and the environment, comply with the instructions for use. [EUH401]

Special rule for labelling of plant protection product (PPP):	
EUH401	To avoid risks to man and the environment, comply with the instructions for use.
Further labelling statements under Regulation (EC) No 1272/2008:	
-	-

See Part C for justifications of the classification and labelling proposals.

2.4.2 Standard phrases under Regulation (EU) No 547/2011

SP 1	Do not contaminate water with the product or its container (Do not clean application equipment near surface water/Avoid contamination via drains from farmyards and roads).
------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

2.4.3 Other phrases (according to Article 65 (3) of the Regulation (EU) No 1107/2009)

none	-
------	---

2.5 Risk management

2.5.1 Restrictions linked to the PPP

The authorization of the PPP is linked to the following conditions (mandatory labelling):

Operator protection:	
respective code if available	Oilseed rape: Gloves during mixing/loading and application (with application rate: 1 x 0.060 kg a.s./ha and an interval of 365 days and dermal absorption of 31%) Apples: Gloves during mixing/loading and application (with application rate: 1 x 0.050 kg a.s./ha and an interval of 365 days and dermal absorption of 31%)
Worker protection:	
respective code if available	Oilseed rape: None Apples: None
Integrated pest management (IPM)/sustainable use:	
respective code if available	n.a.
Environmental protection	
SP 1	Do not contaminate water with the product or its container (Do not clean application equipment near surface water/Avoid contamination via drains from farmyards and roads).
Other specific restrictions	
-	-

The authorization of the PPP is linked to the following conditions (voluntary labelling):

Integrated pest management (IPM)/sustainable use:	
respective code if available	n.a.

2.5.2 Specific restrictions linked to the intended uses

Some of the authorised uses are linked to the following conditions in addition to those listed under point 2.5.1 (mandatory labelling):

Integrated pest management (IPM)/sustainable use:		Relevant for use no.
respective code if available	n.a.	use number from GAP table in 2.6
Environmental protection:		Relevant for use no.
SPe 3	<p><u>In order to protect aquatic organisms</u> respect an unsprayed buffer zone of 15 m to surface water bodies or buffer zone of 10 m to surface water bodies combined with 50% drift reduction or reduce the spray drift by 75% using relevant drift reducing techniques.</p> <p><u>In order to protect non-target arthropods</u> respect an unsprayed buffer zone of 5 m to non-agricultural land or reduce the spray drift by 75% using relevant drift reducing techniques.</p>	1 (apples at 0.125 L/ha)
SPe 3	<p><u>In order to protect aquatic organisms</u> respect an unsprayed buffer zone of 20 m to surface water bodies or buffer zone of 15 m to surface water bodies combined with 50% drift reduction or buffer zone of 10 m to surface water bodies combined with 75% drift reduction or reduce the spray drift by 90% using relevant drift reducing techniques.</p> <p><u>In order to protect non-target arthropods</u> respect an unsprayed buffer zone of 10 m to non-agricultural land or buffer zone of 5 m to non-agricultural land combined with 50% drift reduction or reduce the spray drift by 75% using relevant drift reducing techniques.</p>	2 (apples at 0.250 L/ha)
SPe 3	<u>In order to protect aquatic organisms</u> respect an unsprayed vegetated filter strip of 10 m to surface water bodies.	4-7 (winter oilseed rape at 0.250 L/ha)
SPe 8	<u>In order to protect bees and other pollinating insects</u> apply in the evening, after the bee flight.	
SPe 8	<u>In order to protect bees and other pollinating insects</u> apply in the evening, after the bee flight.	8-10 (spring oilseed rape at 0.250 L/ha)

2.6 Intended uses (only NATIONAL GAP)

GAP rev. 1, date: 2021-11

PPP (product name/code): Carnadine/Kestrel / CA3573
Active substance 1: Acetamiprid
Safener: none
Synergist: none
Applicant: Nufarm Europe GmbH
Zone(s): central ^(d)
Verified by MS: yes
Field of use: insecticide

Formulation type: SL ^(a, b)
Conc. of as 1: 200 g/L ^(c)
Conc. of safener: - ^(c)
Conc. of synergist: - ^(c)
Professional use: ☒
Non professional use: ☐

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15*							
Use- No. (e)	Member state(s)	Crop and/ or situation (crop destination / purpose of crop)	F, Fpn G, Gn, Gpn 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 (f)	Overall conclusions							
					Method / Kind	Timing / Growth stage of crop & season	Max. number a) per use b) per crop/ season	Min. interval between applications (days)	kg or L product / ha a) max. rate per appl. b) max. total rate per crop/season	g or kg as/ha a) max. rate per appl. b) max. total rate per crop/season	Water L/ha min / max			Phys-chem	Analytical methods	Toxicology	Residues	Fate & behaviour	Ecotoxicology	Relevance of metabolites in the environment	Efficacy
Zonal uses (field or outdoor uses, certain types of protected crops)																					
1	PL	Apple (MABSD)	F	<i>Aphis</i> sp. (APHISP)	Foliar spraying overall	May-Oct/ BBCH 70-PHI	a) 1 b) 1	--	a) 0.125 b) 0.125	a) 25 b) 25	500- 900	14	Do not apply during flowering (application from BBCH 70); max dose rate 0,077 L/ha LWA^A ; Max dose rate 0,046 L/ha/m CH^B	A	A	R Gloves during mixM/L&A	A	A	R Aquatics, bees, NTTA	A	A
																		A Remaining groups of non-target species			
2	PL	Apple (MABSD)	F	<i>Cydia pomonella</i> (CARPPO)	Foliar spraying overall	May-Oct/ BBCH 70-PHI	a) 1 b) 1	--	a) 0.25 b) 0.25	a) 50 b) 50	500- 900	14		A	A	R Gloves during mixM/L&A	A	A	R Aquatics, bees, NTTA	A	A

													Do not apply during flowering (application from BBCH 70); max dose rate 0,154 L/ha LWA^A ; Max dose rate 0,093 L/ha/m CH^B						A Remaining groups of non-target species		
3	PL	Potato (SOLTU)	F	<i>Leptinotarsa decemlineata</i> (LPTNDE)	foliar spraying, overall	Jun-Sep/ BBCH 20-79	a) 1 b) 1	--	a) 0.18 b) 0.18	a) 36 b) 36	200-400	7	In label 0.12 – 0.18 L/ha Restriction of the application period due to unacceptable risk to soil organisms at BBCH 12-19	A	A	R Gloves during mixM/L&A	A	A	R Soil macro- and meso-fauna A Remaining groups of non-target species	A	A
4	PL	Winter oilseed rape (BRSNN)	F	<i>Meligethes aeneus</i> <i>Brassicogethes aeneus</i> (MELIAE)	foliar spraying, overall	May-Jun/ BBCH 50-60	a) 1 b) 1	--	a) 0.25 ⁰⁻³ b) 0.25 ⁰⁻³	a) 50 ⁶⁰ b) 50 ⁶⁰	200-400	28	In label 0.18 – 0.25 ⁰⁻³ L/ha Application in the evening, after the bee flight	A	A	R Gloves during mixM/L&A	A	A	A mammals R Aquatics, bees A Remaining groups of non-target species	A	A
5	PL	Winter oilseed rape (BRSNN)	F	<i>Dasineura brassicae</i> (DASYBR) <i>Ceutorhynchus obstrictus</i> (syn <i>C. assimilis</i>) (CEUTAS)	foliar spraying, overall	May-Jun/ BBCH 61-71	a) 1 b) 1	--	a) 0.25 ⁰⁻³ b) 0.25 ⁰⁻³	a) 50 ⁶⁰ b) 50 ⁶⁰	200-400	28	In label 0.15 – 0.25 ⁰⁻³ L/ha Application in the evening, after the bee flight	A	A	R Gloves during mixM/L&A	A	A	A mammals R Aquatics, bees A Remaining groups of non-target species	A	A
6	PL	Winter oilseed rape (BRSNN)	F	<i>Ceutorhynchus napi</i> (CEUTNA)	foliar spraying, overall	Mar-Jun/ BBCH 31-39	a) 1 b) 1	--	a) 0.25 ⁰⁻³ b) 0.25 ⁰⁻³	a) 50 ⁶⁰ b) 50 ⁶⁰	200-400	28	In label 0.15 – 0.25 ⁰⁻³ L/ha Application in the evening,	A	A	R Gloves during mixM/L&A	A	A	A mammals R Aquatics, bees	A	A

													after the bee flight						A Remaining groups of non-target species		
7	PL	Winter oilseed rape (BRSNN)	F	<i>Ceutorhynchus pallidactylus</i> (C. quadridens) (CEUTQU)	foliar spraying, overall	Mar-Jun/ BBCH 31-59	a) 1 b) 1	--	a) 0.25 0.3 b) 0.25 0.3	a) 50 60 b) 50 60	200-400	28	In label 0.15 – 0.25 0.3 L/ha Application in the evening, after the bee flight	A	A	R Gloves during mixM/L&A	A	A	A mammals	A	A
																			R Aquatics, bees		
																			A Remaining groups of non-target species		
8	PL	Spring oilseed rape (BRSNN)	F	<i>Ceutorhynchus pallidactylus</i> (C. quadridens) (CEUTQU)	foliar spraying, overall	Mar-Jun/ BBCH 31-59	a) 1 b) 1	--	a) 0.25 0.3 b) 0.25 0.3	a) 50 60 b) 50 60	200-400	28	In label: 0.15- 0.25 0.3 L/ha Application in the evening, after the bee flight	A	A	R Gloves during mixM/L&A	A	A	A mammals	A	A
																			R Bees		
																			A Remaining groups of non-target species		
9	PL	Spring oilseed rape (BRSNN)	F	<i>Brassicogethes aeneus</i> (MELIAE)	foliar spraying, overall	Apr-Jun/ BBCH 50-60	a) 1 b) 1	--	a) 0.25 0.3 b) 0.25 0.3	a) 50 60 b) 50 60	200-400	28	In label: 0.18- 0.25 0.3 L/ha Application in the evening, after the bee flight	A	A	R Gloves during mixM/L&A	A	A	A mammals	A	A
																			R Bees		
																			A Remaining groups of non-target species		
10	PL	Spring oilseed rape (BRSNN)	F	<i>Ceutorhynchus assimilis</i> (CEUTAS) <i>Dasineura brassicae</i> (DASYBR)	foliar spraying, overall	BBCH 61-71	a) 1 b) 1	--	a) 0.25 0.3 b) 0.25 0.3	a) 50 60 b) 50 60	200-400	28	In label: 0.2- 0.25 0.3 L/ha Application in the evening, after the bee flight	A	A	R Gloves during mixM/L&A	A	A	A mammals	A	A
																			R Bees		
																			A Remaining groups of non-target species		

Remarks table heading:	(a)	e.g. wettable powder (WP), emulsifiable concentrate (EC), granule (GR)	(d)	Select relevant
	(b)	Catalogue of pesticide formulation types and international coding system CropLife International Technical Monograph n°2, 6th Edition Revised May 2008	(e)	Use number(s) in accordance with the list of all intended GAPs in Part B, Section 0 should be given in column 1
	(c)	g/kg or g/l	(f)	No authorization possible for uses where the line is highlighted in grey, Use should be crossed out when the notifier no longer supports this use.
Remarks columns:	1	Numeration necessary to allow references	7	Growth stage at first and last treatment (BBCH Monograph, Growth Stages of Plants, 1997, Blackwell, ISBN 3-8263-3152-4), including where relevant, information on season at time of application
	2	Use official codes/nomenclatures of EU Member States	8	The maximum number of application possible under practical conditions of use must be provided.
	3	For crops, the EU and Codex classifications (both) should be used; when relevant, the use situation should be described (e.g. fumigation of a structure)	9	Minimum interval (in days) between applications of the same product
	4	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	10	For specific uses other specifications might be possible, e.g.: g/m³ in case of fumigation of empty rooms. See also EPPO-Guideline PP 1/239 Dose expression for plant protection products.
	5	Scientific names and EPPO-Codes of target pests/diseases/ weeds or, when relevant, the common names of the pest groups (e.g. biting and sucking insects, soil born insects, foliar fungi, weeds) and the developmental stages of the pests and pest groups at the moment of application must be named.	11	The dimension (g, kg) must be clearly specified. (Maximum) dose of a.s. per treatment (usually g, kg or L product / ha).
	6	Method, e.g. high volume spraying, low volume spraying, spreading, dusting, drench	12	If water volume range depends on application equipments (e.g. ULVA or LVA) it should be mentioned under “application: method/kind”.
		Kind, e.g. overall, broadcast, aerial spraying, row, individual plant, between the plants - type of equipment used must be indicated.	13	PHI - minimum pre-harvest interval
			14	Remarks may include: Extent of use/economic importance/restrictions
			15	Overall conclusions - explanation for the column 15 is below *
			^{A, B}	Column 14 (Remarks) in uses 1 and 2: ^A LWA – Leaf Wall Area, ^B CH – Crown Height

* Explanation for column 15 “Overall conclusions”

A	Acceptable, Safe use
R	Further refinement and/or risk mitigation measures required
C	To be confirmed by cMS
N	No safe use

3 Background of authorization decision and risk management

3.1 Physical and chemical properties (Part B, Section 2)

The product CA3573 is a clear, yellow-orange to brown liquid with a characteristic odour. It is not explosive and has no oxidising properties. Its auto-ignition temperature accounts for 285 °C. Aqueous solutions of the product have pH values between 6.31 and 7.36.

There is no effect of high temperature on the stability of the formulation, since after 56 days at 40°C, neither the active ingredient content nor the technical properties were changed. The stability data indicate a shelf life of at least 2 years at ambient temperature when stored in HDPE bottles. The product is sensitive to low temperatures.

Its technical characteristics are acceptable for a SL formulation.

The intended concentration of use is 0.025 g a.s./L to 0.3 g a.s./L which for the product corresponds to 0.0125% to 0.15% (v/v).

The product is not intended to be mixed in the tank together with other formulations.

3.2 Efficacy (Part B, Section 3)

Efficacy data has been submitted for the re-authorization of the product CA3573 for the use as an insecticide for apple, potato, oilseed rape and maize.

Due to changes in endpoints triggered by a Category 4 study (mesocosm study), number of applications and / or dose rates have to be reduced for some uses. In this context, the intended uses have changed and an updated version of the Biological Assessment Dossier was necessary.

In pome fruit there is a reduction in the maximum dose rate for application against *Cydia pomonella* in Poland and Slovakia. Additionally, the number of applications is reduced from 2 to 1 application against *C. pomonella* and against *Aphis* sp. in Poland.

For the use in winter and spring oilseed rape the number of applications is reduced in Poland and Slovakia from 2 to 1 applications. For Slovakia there is also a reduction in the number of applications from 2 to 1 applications in potato.

For the other uses outlined in the GAP table (e.g. the use in potato in Poland, the use in maize in Slovakia as well as the use in pome fruit against *Aphis* sp. in Slovakia) there are no amendments to the previously registered rates.

3.3 Efficacy data

The data from 224 efficacy trials plus 4 trials used only for the yield assessment have proved good efficacy and crop safety / selectivity of CA3573, and sufficiently justify the uses and the dose rates proposed in the updated GAP (Part B, Section 0). Trials have been conducted between 2010 and 2015 in Czech Republic, Germany, Poland, Hungary, Romania and Slovakia representing the Maritime, North-Eastern and South-Eastern EPPO climatic zone. For the use in spring oilseed rape extrapolation is considered to be possible from the comprehensive data package submitted for the same pests in winter oilseed rape, as the crops are comparable and target rates as well as application number and timing are identical.

For preliminary tests, please refer to the information submitted for the first registration of the product in December 2015 (dossier of 2015, submitted in autumn 2017, finalized in May 2018). A total of 148 out of the 250 efficacy trial results (numerous trials including more than one pest) carried out in apple, maize, potato, and winter and spring oilseed rape include at least one reduced application rate. Data demonstrated that the efficacy of CA3573 at the proposed label rates is superior to the reduced application rates. Subsuming the efficacy results in all crops and against all pests, the efficacy of CA3573 was always at least on a similar level compared to the reference products. By the single trial data, it was demonstrated that the proposed dose range of CA3573 for some of the target pests is reasonable and takes into account the different infestation levels. It allows the farmer to adapt the rate according to the current conditions.

For apple as high growing crop, a conversion table was prepared presenting the calculations of the treated leaf wall area (LWA) for each of the trials used for the efficacy evaluation in the updated dossier. The LWA

and CH – based dose rate expression in orchard trials was absent from the 2015 dossier and it makes a new part in 2020 dossier, addressing the requirements in force since 2020. The dose rates in L/ha LWA and in L/ha/m CH proposed in the GAP table are the average values derived, for the PL and SK labels, from the LWA and CH reported by a limited set of 17 PL trials for Poland and 5 SK trials for Slovakia. The LWA and CH dose rates were assumed separately for PL and for SK, following the notion that orchard parameters vary considerably between these two member states and as such should not be averaged:

target	MS, use no.	L/ha ground	average LWA assumed, m ² (min-max)	average CH assumed, m (min-max)	no. of trials	L/ha LWA*	L/ha/m CH**
APHISP	PL, 1	0.125	16 240 (11 429 – 20 000)	2.7 (1.50 – 3.40)	17	0.077	0.046
CARPPO	PL, 2	0.250	16 240 (11 429 – 20 000)	2.7 (1.50 – 3.40)	17	0.154	0.093
APHISP	SK, 11	0.125	8 640 (8 000 – 9 200)	2.16 (2.00 – 2.30)	5	0.145	0.058
CARPPO	SK, 12	0.250	8 640 (8 000 – 9 200)	2.16 (2.00 – 2.30)	5	0.289	0.116

* (ground dose rate tested / average LWA)*10000 = L/ha LWA

** (ground dose rate tested / average CH = L/ha/mCH

The above LWA and CH dose rates are assumed as maximum dose rates. They correspond to the maximum of 0.125 or 0.250 L/ha ground rate only at the LWA and CH assumed as average. At the actual LWA or CH lower or higher than this average, using the maximum LWA or CH – based dose rate is either equivalent to the ground rate lower than the maximum of 0.125 or 0.250 L/ha or to the maximum ground rate being exceeded, respectively. As the latter must be avoided for ecotoxicology reasons, in orchards with higher than average LWA or CH only the ground dose rate measure should be used, with the resulting actual dose rates per 1 ha LWA or per 1m CH inevitably reduced, compared to the “average” orchard.

3.3.1 Information on the occurrence or possible occurrence of the development of resistance

The analysis of resistance risk development to the active ingredient acetamiprid is conducted according to the EPPO guideline PP1/213(2-4) in addition to the overall analysis of the recommended IRAC groups.

Acetamiprid is a broad-spectrum insecticide, belonging to the IRAC group 4A (Nicotinic acetylcholine receptor (nAChR) competitive modulators).

124 resistance cases were reported for the active ingredient acetamiprid, among which 5 cases occurred in Spain. No case of resistance against acetamiprid was reported in other European countries. Although resistance is easily inducible in some pest groups by a stubborn, repeated application of acetamiprid, in many cases the susceptibility may be restored in a couple of generations, should the selection pressure be re-moved. Therefore permanent reduction of sensitivity is considered unlikely to occur, provided the product is applied according to the label instruction.

Application should be made according to the recommendations of the GAP table and the product label. Only a single application of CA3573 per crop and growth season is intended in each use claimed in the present GAP table. No special restrictions are needed in the product label except for the stipulation to alter MoA each time the application is repeated within the same crop and growth season.

General principles of good agricultural practice should be considered to delay insecticide resistance:

- Avoid exclusive repeated use of insecticides from the same insecticide group code. Alternate or tank-mix with products from different insecticide groups.
- Integrate the control methods (chemical, cultural, biological) into insect control programs.
- Rotate the use of Acetamiprid Insecticide with different groups that control the same pests in a field.

- Use products at the recommended label rates and spray intervals with the appropriate application equipment
- Use tank mixtures with insecticides from a different group when such use is permitted.
- Insecticide use should be based on an integrated pest management (IPM) program that includes scouting, record keeping and considers cultural, biological and other chemical control practices.
- Monitor treated pest populations for resistance development.
- Contact your local extension specialist or certified crop advisors for any additional pesticide resistance-management and/or IPM recommendations for the specific site and pest problems in your area.

3.3.2 Adverse effects on treated crops

Not relevant; the data had not been re-evaluated (art. 43 submission).

3.3.3 Observations on other undesirable or unintended side-effects

Not relevant; the data had not been re-evaluated (art. 43 submission).

3.4 Methods of analysis (Part B, Section 5)

3.4.1 Analytical method for the formulation

An analytical method for the determination of acetamiprid in an SL product MCW-2222 (equals CA 3573) was provided and considered acceptable according to SANCO/3030/99 rev. 4. The active ingredient was analysed by HPLC-DAD. For the analysis of the active ingredient in the formulation, a commonly known CIPAC-Method is available (649/SL/M).

The formulation contains no relevant impurities and therefore no methods for the determination currently exists.

3.4.2 Analytical methods for residues

New analytical methods to determine residues of acetamiprid for crop matrices, water, arthropods and honey related products were implemented. The methods have been conducted in accordance with SANCO/3029/99 rev. 4 guidelines and therefore considered to be adequate. Standard analytical methods for the determination of acetamiprid residues are based on HPLC-MS/MS and HPLC-DAD methods. These methods are highly specific and therefore considered acceptable. References were made to existing and EU approved active substance studies from the notifier Nippon from RAR, 2015. Matched studies were provided in a separate data-matching renewal.

References were made to the existing and EU approved analytical methods provided in RAR 2015 for all monitoring enforcements methods for all matrices. No new active substance data will be submitted in this application since the new monitoring studies have been matched during a separate data-matching list process in 2020 from the rapporteur member state of the active substance, the Netherlands.

3.5 Mammalian toxicology (Part B, Section 6)

Acute toxicity studies for CA3573 containing 200 g/L acetamiprid were not evaluated as part of the EU review of acetamiprid. The product is formerly known under the product code MCW-2222. The two products are identical. The acute toxicity studies for MCW-2222, such as skin irritation (*in vitro* EPISKIN test and *in vivo* rabbit), eye irritation (ICET Assay), acute oral (rat), dermal (rat) and inhalation (rat) toxicity and dermal sensitization (LLNA) were already evaluated during first notification and were considered adequate. Since studies were conducted after 14th of June 2011, also calculation of acute toxicity was provided.

3.5.1 Acute toxicity

The product studies indicate no irritating effect to the skin and low dermal and inhalation toxicity. It does not induce dermal sensitization and showed a slightly eye irritating effect in the ICET assay, but no eye irritation in the *in vivo* study conducted with rabbits. Based on the oral acute toxicity study, acetamiprid is classified as oral acute tox 4 with acute toxicity range from > 300 and ≤ 2000 mg/kg bw (acute toxicity point estimate 500 mg/kg bw). Since the studies were conducted after June 2011, acute endpoints are also calculated. Outcome of calculation compared to results of the study did not show any differences. For oral acute toxicity calculations, point estimate of 301 mg/kg bw (lower limit of the specified range) was used for classification of product toxicity since acute oral toxicity study with the product itself resulted in a similar classification.

Implications for labelling: According to the Commission Regulation (EC) NO. 1272/2008, the proposed toxicological classification for CA3573 is:

Hazard classes (s), categories	Acute oral toxicity 4
GHS Pictogram:	GHS07
Signal Word:	Warning
Hazard Statement:	H302 Harmful if swallowed
Precautionary Statement:	P264, P270, P301+P312, P330, P501
Supplemental Hazard Information:	To avoid risks to man and the environment, comply with the instructions for use. [EUH401]

3.5.2 Operator exposure

Operator exposure to CA3573 was not evaluated as part of the EU review of acetamiprid. The intended use pattern for national re-registration is within the use pattern considered for product renewal. Therefore, all relevant data and risk assessments are provided here and are considered adequate. Operator exposure was assessed against the AOEL and AAOEL agreed in the active substance renewal (0.025 mg/kg bw per day, respectively). Data on dermal absorption of CA3573 was provided within the 1st product registration and was considered acceptable. Since, however, EFSA Guidance on Dermal Absorption was updated since the 1st submission, dermal absorption was recalculated according to the current guideline. Re-calculation ended up in 4% for the concentrate and 31% for dilutions > 0.035 g/L. Pro-rata correction was not needed. Operator exposure was modelled using latest version of the EFSA model (30 Mar 2015). According to the model calculations, the application on oilseed rape (low) or apples (high crop) with gloves during mixing/loading and application would result in acute systemic operator exposure to be 86.74 % and 90.74 % of the AOEL, respectively. Thus, according to EFSA model, wearing personal protective equipment for operators is recommended when using CA3573 on oilseed rape or apples.

Implications for labelling resulting from operator assessment: Gloves during mixing/loading and application.

3.5.3 Worker exposure

Worker exposure to CA3573 was not evaluated as part of the EU review of acetamiprid. All relevant data and risk assessments are provided here and are considered adequate. For the application on oilseed rape (low crops) according to the EFSA model, the systemic exposure is 10.42 % of the AOEL for the unprotected worker. It is concluded that for oilseed rape, there is no unacceptable risk anticipated for the worker wearing adequate work clothing (but no PPE), when re-entering crops treated with CA3573. As a standard rule, it should be mentioned on the label that treated crops should not be re-entered before spray deposits on leaf surfaces have completely dried. For the application on apples (high crops), according to EFSA model, the systemic exposure to acetamiprid is 111.6 % of the AOEL for the unprotected worker and 55.8 % of the AOEL for the protected worker regarding the worst-case application on apples (1 x 0.050 kg a.s./ha and an interval of 365 days). Since in some countries, it is not allowed to register a use where worker need to use gloves, refined calculations considering outcome of a DFR study in apples were performed. The DFR and DT₅₀ of 1.813 µg/cm²/kg a.s./ha and 3.72 days were used for refinement of worker exposure, respectively. The refinement resulted in systemic exposure of 67.44 % of the AOEL for the

unprotected worker and 33.72 % of the AOEL for the protected worker. Hence, it was concluded that worker exposure in apples would pass the exposure assessment when workers wear adequate work clothing (but no PPE).

Implications for labelling resulting from worker assessments: None (Treated crops should not be re-entered before spray deposits on leaf surfaces have completely dried).

3.5.4 Bystander and Resident Exposure

Bystander and resident exposure to CA3573 was not evaluated as part of the EU review of acetamiprid. Therefore, all relevant data and risk assessments have been provided and are considered adequate. For the application on oilseed rape (low crops), the systemic exposure of bystanders to CA3573 was 6.98 % of the AAOEL for adults and 12.56 % of the AAOEL for children. The resident exposure was estimated as 7.99 % of the AOEL for adults and 20.74 % of the AOEL for children. For the application on apples (high crops), the systemic exposure of bystanders to CA3573 was 5.81 % of the AAOEL for adults and 10.46 % of the AAOEL for children. The resident exposure was estimated as 12.08 % of the AOEL for adults and 24.67 % of the AOEL for children. Thus, according to the EFSA model the application of CA3573 on oilseed rape or apples results in no risk to any bystander or resident after accidental short-term or long-term exposure.

Implications for labelling resulting from bystander and resident assessments: None.

3.6 Residues and consumer exposure (Part B, Section 7)

3.6.1 Residues

The MRLs for acetamiprid are published in Commission Regulation (EU) No 2019/88, including the crops (apple, potato, oilseed rape and maize) applied for in this submission. An exceedance of the current MRL of 0.4 mg/kg (oilseed rape); 0.4 mg/kg (apples) 0.01 mg/kg (potatoes), 0.01 mg/kg (maize/corn) for Acetamiprid as laid down in Commission Regulation (EU) 2019/88 is not expected. For the dietary risk assessment, the EFSA Primo model rev. 3.1 was used.

The effects of processing on the nature of acetamiprid residues have been investigated. Data on effects of processing on the amount of residue have been submitted. These data were considered for risk assessment.

Residues in succeeding crops have been sufficiently investigated taking into account the specific circumstances of the cGAP uses being considered here. It is unlikely that residues will be present in succeeding crops.

Considering dietary burden and based on the intended uses, no significant modification of the intake was calculated for livestock. Further investigation of residues as well as the modification of MRLs in commodities of animal origin is therefore not necessary.

The proposed use of the product CA 3573 (Carnadine/Kestrel) is within those supported for the EU MRL assessment, except for honey. However, as indicated by EU monitoring data only 0.26% of the total number of analysed honey samples for acetamiprid during 2012 and 2018 exceeded the EU MRL in honey above the level of quantification (0.05 mg/kg). Therefore, it can be concluded, that the results of the EU monitoring programmes show that no residues of acetamiprid are present in the vast majority of samples. No further evaluation is required for national authorisation.

3.6.2 Consumer exposure

The summary of the calculation using the EFSA model rev 3.1 is presented. The TMDI estimation for acetamiprid varies between 6% and 123% of the ADI. The results of the TMDI calculations with the EFSA model show that the ADI is >100% for the unrefined chronic risk assessment. Therefore, a refined chronic risk assessment (IEDI) was performed.

The results of the IEDI calculations with the EFSA model show that there is no chronic risk for consumer for the active substance. The IEDI estimation for acetamiprid varies between 2% and 33% of the ADI. The IESTI estimation for acetamiprid varies between 2% and 172% of the ARfD. The results of the IESTI calculations with the EFSA model show that the ARfD is >100% for the unrefined acute risk assessment. The results of the refined IESTI calculations with the EFSA model show that there is no acute risk for the consumer for the active substance. The refined IESTI estimation for acetamiprid varies between 0.3% and 91% of the ARfD.

Based on the IEDI and IESTI calculations made to estimate the risk for consumer through diet and other mean it can be concluded that the use of the product CA 3573 (Carnadine/Kestrel) does not lead to an unacceptable risk for consumers when applied according to the recommendations.

3.7 Environmental fate and behaviour (Part B, Section 8)

No new laboratory or field studies are presented; all data were evaluated in the EU review (**EFSA Journal 2016;14(11):4610**). The endpoints from the EU review were used to calculate PECs in soil, surface water and groundwater for the intended use patterns.

3.7.1 Predicted environmental concentrations in soil (PEC_{soil})

The PEC in soil of acetamiprid and its soil metabolite IM-1-5 have been assessed according to guidance given by FOCUS together with the FOCUS groundwater interception values. According to the proposed GAP, the maximum application rates with minimum interception were taken into account representing the worst-case conditions.

Metabolites IM-1-2, IM-1-4 and IC-0 were not included in exposure assessment as ecotoxicologically relevant. For these compounds the risk is covered from evaluation performed for the parent.

The PEC values for the active substance and its relevant metabolite were used for the ecotoxicological risk assessment.

3.7.2 Predicted environmental concentrations in groundwater (PEC_{gw})

The PEC of acetamiprid and its soil metabolites IM-1-2, IM-1-4, IC-0 and IM-1-5 in groundwater (PEC_{gw}) have been assessed with the models FOCUS PEARL 4.4.4 and FOCUS PELMO 5.5.3. Calculations with FOCUS MACRO 5.5.4. were only performed for acetamiprid and the metabolite IM-1-5. Maximum application rates with minimum interception values were used in the modelling.

For all intended uses, PEC_{gw} far below the threshold concentration of 0.1 µg/L were obtained at Tier 1 for acetamiprid and metabolites IM-1-2, IM-1-4 and IC-0. Metabolite IM-1-5 showed some leaching potential, but in neither crop its PEC_{gw} exceeded 0.1 µg/L in scenarios relevant for Poland (i.e. Châteaudun, Hamburg and Kremsmünster).

Overall, based on performed modelling it may be concluded that no unacceptable contamination of groundwater is expected following intended uses of CA3573 in Poland.

3.7.3 Predicted environmental concentrations in surface water (PEC_{sw})

The PEC of acetamiprid and its metabolites in surface water (PEC_{sw}) have been assessed with the FOCUS surface water models (Steps 1 and 2 in FOCUS, FOCUS SWASH v5.3, FOCUS PRZM v4.3.1, FOCUS MACRO v5.5.4, FOCUS TOXSWA v5.5.3) with consideration of the intended uses of CA3574 in the Central Zone. For some uses also Step 4 simulations were deemed necessary and were performed using SWAN v5.0 with consideration of unsprayed buffer zones, vegetated filter strips and spray drift reduction.

The results for PEC surface water for the active substance and its metabolites were used for the ecotoxicological risk assessment.

3.7.4 Predicted environmental concentrations in air (PEC_{air})

The fate and behaviour of acetamiprid in air was evaluated during the EU review. No additional studies were conducted. As the vapour pressure of acetamiprid is very low ($< 10^{-5}$ Pa at 20°C), it is regarded as non-volatile. Its volatilisation from plant and soil surfaces is regarded to be very low. Additionally, it is rapidly degraded in air (DT₅₀ = 0.14 days). Therefore, long-range transport in the atmosphere is not considered relevant.

3.8 Ecotoxicology (Part B, Section 9)

3.8.1 Effects on terrestrial vertebrates

Birds

The acute and long-term risks of CA3573 (a.s. acetamiprid) to birds were assessed from toxicity exposure ratios between toxicity endpoints, estimated from studies with acetamiprid, and maximum residues occurring on food items following applications according to the proposed use pattern. Risk of secondary poisoning and risk to birds from exposure via drinking water was considered to be low.

The TER values, calculated for recommended scenarios, all exceed the trigger values of 10 for acute risk and 5 for long-term risk, indicating that the risk to birds is acceptable following use of CA3573 according to the proposed use pattern.

Mammals

The acute and long-term risks of CA3573 (a.s. acetamiprid) to mammals were assessed from toxicity exposure ratios between toxicity endpoints, estimated from studies with acetamiprid, and maximum residues occurring on food items following applications according to the proposed use pattern. The long-term risk to small herbivorous mammals was addressed in a higher tier risk assessment, including data on diet (PD). Risk of secondary poisoning and risk to mammals from exposure via drinking water was considered to be low.

The TER values, calculated for recommended scenarios, all exceed the trigger values of 10 for acute risk, indicating that the acute risk to mammals is acceptable following use of CA3573 according to the proposed use pattern.

Based on the Tier 1 evaluation acceptable long-term risk could be concluded for intended application in orchards at 25 g a.s./ha, and potatoes at 36 g a.s./ha and oilseed rape at 50 g a.s./ha. For applications in orchards at 50 g a.s./ha and oilseed rape at 60 g a.s./ha potentially unacceptable long-term risk was concluded for small herbivorous mammals and frugivorous mammals (orchards only).

Refinement of the risk to small herbivores has been performed with consideration of the data on the diet composition of the common vole. Based on the performed evaluation acceptable risk could be concluded for application to orchards at 50 g a.s./ha. The risk to small herbivorous mammals from intended uses in oilseed rape remained unresolved.

In order to address the risk in oilseed rape and to remove restriction regarding the maximum application rate in maize the Applicant has to clarify the data protection status of the residue decline studies used at the EU level to refine the FTWA value in dicotyledonous plants.

The risk to frugivorous mammals from application of acetamiprid in orchards at 50 g a.s./ha has been refined with consideration of the RUD value in large fruits. Acceptable risk could be concluded.

Overall it is concluded that acetamiprid will not pose unacceptable risk to mammals following intended application to oilseed rape, potatoes and orchards. Further data are necessary to address the long-term risk in oilseed rape.

3.8.2 Effects on aquatic species

The risks to aquatic organisms from the intended uses of CA3573 were evaluated on the basis of the available ecotoxicity studies on the active substance, its metabolites and the formulation. The risks from the metabolites are low and were acceptable on FOCUS Step-1 level. Regarding the formulation and the active substance, the risks to aquatic invertebrates had to be refined by using a mesocosm study. Following this, acceptable risks were demonstrated on FOCUS Step-3 level for the intended uses in spring oil seed rape (1 x 60 g a.s./ha) and potatoes (1 x 36 g a.s./ha). Regarding the other intended uses, the following mitigating measures need to be considered (FOCUS Step 4):

1. Apples at 25 g a.s./ha:
 - unsprayed buffer zone of 15 m to surface water bodies, **or**
 - buffer zone of 10 m to surface water bodies combined with 50% drift reduction, **or**
 - reduction of the spray drift by 75% using relevant drift reducing techniques.
2. Apples at 50 g a.s./ha:
 - unsprayed buffer zone of 20 m to surface water bodies, **or**
 - buffer zone of 15 m to surface water bodies combined with 50% drift reduction, **or**
 - buffer zone of 10 m to surface water bodies combined with 75% drift reduction, **or**
 - reduction of the spray drift by 90% using relevant drift reducing techniques.

3.8.3 Effects on bees

The risk assessment performed in line with SANCO/1039/2002 demonstrated acceptable risk to bees following application of CA3573 to all crops intended in Poland.

However, as acetamiprid is an insecticide with the specific mode of action, evaluation of the chronic risk to adult bees and bee larvae was also deemed necessary. In absence of the chronic and larvae risk assessment scheme, the zRMS concluded that the risk assessment as provided in EFSA (2013) will be most relevant to cover the risk to all bee stages and all exposure patterns, even though the guidance is not noted yet at the EU level.

Evaluation based on indications of EFSA (2013) demonstrated acceptable acute and chronic risk to adult bees and larvae exposed following intended uses of CA3573 in potatoes.

For apples acceptable acute and chronic risk could be concluded for applications performed after flowering (from BBCH 70 onwards) for all routes of exposure, while for application carried out at BBCH 62-69 unacceptable chronic risk was concluded for adult bees and larvae exposed in the treated crop scenario. For oilseed rape acceptable risk could be concluded for weeds, field margin, adjacent crop and next crop scenarios, but unacceptable risk was concluded for chronic risk was concluded for adult bees and larvae exposed in the treated crop scenario.

Refinement of the risk based on sugar content in nectar of apples and oilseed rape confirmed unacceptable risk following application to apples and acceptable risk following application to oilseed rape. However, these calculations were considered by the zRMS to be not fully reliable and were thus concluded to be illustrative only.

Available higher tier studies (tunnel, semi-field and field trials) were sufficient to demonstrate acceptable risk to bees from application of CA3573 to flowering oilseed rape, provided that application is carried out in the evening, after the bee flight.

Field studies were not sufficient to address the risk to bees following application of CA3573 to flowering apples and for this reason the intended uses in this crop are restricted to the post-flowering period (BBCH 70-PHI).

3.8.4 Effects on other arthropod species other than bees

Regarding non-target arthropods in in-field habitats, the available data from aged residue studies clearly

demonstrate that recovery within an ecologically relevant timeframe can be expected.

Regarding non-target arthropods in off-field habitats, the data from the available field study show that no unacceptable risks are to be expected when CA3573 is applied according to good agricultural practice, except for the intended use in pome fruit at an application rates of 1 x 50 g a.s./ha and 1 x 25 g a.s./ha.

The risk to off-field non-target arthropods is acceptable following use of CA3573 in pome fruit (1 x 25 g a.s./ha), provided the following risk mitigation measures are applied:

- 50% drift reduction or
- 5 m buffer

The risk to off-field non-target arthropods is acceptable following use of CA3573 in pome fruit (1 x 50 g a.s./ha), provided the following risk mitigation measures are applied:

- 75% drift reduction or
- 5 m buffer combined with 50% drift reduction or
- 10 m buffer

In conclusion, no unacceptable risks for non-target arthropods are expected when CA3573 is applied according to good agricultural practice and considering risk mitigation measures as specified above for the uses in pome fruit (1 x 50 g a.s./ha and 1 x 25 g a.s./ha).

3.8.5 Effects on soil organisms

Soil macro- and meso-fauna

The risk of CA3573 to earthworms and other non-target soil macro-organisms, was assessed from long-term toxicity exposure ratios (TERs) between the selected no-effect concentrations, derived from laboratory tests on CA3573, acetamiprid, its relevant soil metabolites, and the maximum PEC_{soil}.

Acceptable risk could be concluded for earthworms and *Hypoaspis aculeifer* from all relevant compounds and *Folsomia candida* exposed to metabolite IM-1-5. However, unacceptable risk was concluded for *Folsomia candida* exposed to acetamiprid in CA3573 following intended early uses in potatoes, resulting with the highest exposure. Therefore additional risk assessment has been performed for *Folsomia candida* following each intended use as well as later uses in potatoes at BBCH 20-79. Acceptable risk could be concluded and CA3573 may be thus authorised for intended uses in apples, oilseed rape (spring and winter) and potatoes at BBCH 20-79. No authorisation for application to potatoes at BBCH 12-19 may be granted until additional data enabling refinement of the risk to *Folsomia candida* are provided.

Risk from metabolites IM-1-2, IM-1-4 and IC-0 is considered to be covered by evaluation performed for the parent compound.

Soil micro-organisms

The risk of CA3573 to soil microorganisms was evaluated by comparison of the maximum concentrations with effects <25% derived from laboratory tests, with maximum PEC_{soil}. For metabolite IM-1-5 the evaluation was performed with consideration of the maximum agreed accumulated PEC_{soil} and assumption that metabolite is 10 times more toxic for the parent.

No effects > 25% occurred at tested rates exceeding the relevant PEC_{soil} values, indicating that the risk to soil microorganisms is acceptable following the use of CA3573 according to the proposed use patterns.

Risk from metabolites IM-1-2, IM-1-4 and IC-0 is considered to be covered by evaluation performed for the parent compound.

3.8.6 Effects on non-target terrestrial plants

The application of CA3573 according to the proposed use pattern will pose an acceptable risk to non-target

terrestrial plants.

3.8.7 Effects on other terrestrial organisms (Flora and Fauna)

Not relevant.

3.9 Relevance of metabolites (Part B, Section 10)

PEC_{gw} of all metabolites are $\leq 0.1 \mu\text{g/L}$. Therefore, no relevance assessment is required.

4 Conclusion of the national comparative assessment (Art. 50 of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009)

The product CA3573 does not contain any active substances which are considered as candidates for substitution.

5 Further information to permit a decision to be made or to support a review of the conditions and restrictions associated with the authorization

~~In order to support authorisation of CA3573 for uses in winter and spring oilseed rape the Applicant must clarify the data protection status of the residue decline studies used at the EU level in area of ecotoxicology to refine the FTWA value in dicotyledonous plants forming a part of the small herbivorous diet.~~

Additional data to address the risk to bees in orchards must be submitted in order to remove restriction of use of CA3573 to the post-flowering period (BBCH 70-PHI).

Additional data to address the risk to *Folsomia candida* must be submitted in order to remove restriction of use of CA3573 in potatoes to BBCH 20-79.

Appendix 1 Copy of the product authorization

3. Zezwolenie na wprowadzanie do obrotu środka ochrony roślin Kestrel 200 SL jest ważne do dnia 30.04.2019 r.
4. Po upływie w/w terminu ważności zezwolenia okres na zużycie istniejących zapasów środka jest ograniczony:
 - do dnia 31.10.2019 r. w odniesieniu do sprzedaży i dystrybucji środka ochrony roślin Kestrel 200 SL wprowadzonego do obrotu przed dniem upływu ważności zezwolenia,
 - do dnia 31.10.2020 r. w odniesieniu do jego umieszkodliwiania, przechowywania i stosowania.

Uzasadnienie

Wnioskiem z dnia 28 grudnia 2015 r. spółka Adama Polska Sp. z o.o., ul. Sienna 39, 00-121 Warszawa wystąpiła o wydanie zezwolenia na wprowadzanie do obrotu środka ochrony roślin Kestrel 200 SL

W toku prowadzonego postępowania administracyjnego strona oświadczeniem z dnia 9 maja 2018 r. poinformowała, że na mocy porozumienia handlowego pomiędzy spółką Adama Polska Sp. z o.o. a Nufarm Polska Sp. z o.o. prawa i obowiązki związane z postępowaniem administracyjnym dotyczącym wydania zezwolenia na wprowadzanie do obrotu środka ochrony roślin Kestrel 200 SL zostały przeniesione na spółkę Nufarm Polska Sp. z o.o. oraz przedłożyła korektę wniosku z dnia 10 maja 2018 r., w której jako wnioskodawca widnieje spółka Nufarm Polska Sp. z o.o. Powyższa zmiana została zaakceptowana.

Dodatkowo, strona wnioskiem z dnia 23 maja 2018 r. wystąpiła o uwzględnienie w zezwoleniu zastosowań małoobszarowych (zastosowanie w rzepaku jarym), zgodnie z art. 51 rozporządzenia Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady (WE) nr 1107/2009, co zostało dokonane niniejszą decyzją.

Na mocy art. 9 ust. 1 pkt. 1 ustawy o *środkach ochrony roślin* minister właściwy do spraw rolnictwa przekazał przedłożoną wraz z wnioskiem dokumentację dotyczącą wnioskowanego środka ochrony roślin podmiotowi upoważnionemu, o którym mowa w art. 10 ust. 1 wyżej wskazanej ustawy – spółce E-V-A Sp. z o.o. w Warszawie.

Mając na uwadze art. 29 ust. 1 rozporządzenia Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady (WE) nr 1107/2009 oraz oceny i raporty opracowane przez spółkę E-V-A Sp. z o.o. w Warszawie stwierdzono co następuje:

1. W skład przedmiotowego środka ochrony roślin wchodzi substancja czynna acetamipryd dopuszczona do stosowania w środkach ochrony roślin przez Komisję Europejską i spełniające warunki związane z jej użyciem określone w rozporządzeniu wykonawczym Komisji (UE) nr 540/2011 z dnia 25 maja 2011 r. w sprawie wykonania rozporządzenia Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady (WE) nr 1107/2009 w odniesieniu do wykazu zatwierdzonych substancji czynnych (Dz. Urz. UE L 153 z 11.06.2011, str. 1, z późn. zm.).
2. Określono właściwości fizyczne i chemiczne środka ochrony roślin oraz potwierdzono, że są one odpowiednie do zakresu stosowania, przechowywania i transportu, określono rodzaj i zawartość substancji czynnej oraz innych substancji środka ochrony roślin, w tym zanieczyszczeń o znaczeniu toksykologicznym i ekotoksykologicznym.
3. Określono właściwy dla przedmiotowego środka rodzaj opakowań, z uwzględnieniem materiału, z których są one wykonane, sposobu ich wykonania oraz ich wymiarów i pojemności, wymiaru otworu, w tym zamknięcia i sposobu uszczelnienia.
4. Środek ochrony roślin stosowany zgodnie z przeznaczeniem nie wykazuje zagrożenia dla zdrowia człowieka, zwierząt lub środowiska, a w szczególności wód powierzchniowych i podziemnych, w tym wody przeznaczonej do spożycia oraz nie wykazuje niepożądanego oddziaływania na organizmy nie będące celem jego zastosowania.
5. Ustalony został najwyższy dopuszczalny poziom pozostałości w środkach spożywczych, który obejmuje zakres stosowania środka, zgodny z wartościami określonymi w rozporządzeniu (WE) nr 396/2005 Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady z dnia 23 lutego 2005 r. w odniesieniu do najwyższych dopuszczalnych poziomów pozostałości pestycydów w żywności i paszy pochodzenia roślinnego i zwierzęcego (Dz. Urz. UE L 70 z 16.03.2005 r., str. 1, z późn. zm.).
6. Potwierdzono skuteczność działania środka w zakresie określonym w etykiecie stanowiącej załącznik do niniejszego zezwolenia oraz nie wykazano niepożądanego działania na rośliny i produkty roślinne.

Komisja do spraw Środków Ochrony Roślin uchwala nr 113/2018 w dniu 22 maja 2018 r. pozytywnie zaopiniowała wniosek w sprawie wydania zezwolenia na wprowadzanie do obrotu środka ochrony roślin Kestrel 200 SL.

Przy określaniu terminu ważności zezwolenia uwzględniono przepisy art. 32 rozporządzenia Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady (WE) nr 1107/2009, zgodnie z którymi ważność zezwolenia ustala się na okres nieprzekraczający roku od daty wygaśnięcia ważności zatwierdzenia substancji czynnej zawartej w danym środku ochrony roślin. W związku z powyższym, uwzględniając terminy zatwierdzenia substancji czynnej zawartej w przedmiotowym środku, określone w rozporządzeniu

wykonawczym Komisji (UE) nr 540/2011, termin ważności zezwolenia środka ochrony roślin Kestrel 200 SL upływa z dniem 30 kwietnia 2019 r.

Mając na uwadze powyższe, postanowiono jak w rozstrzygnięciu.

Od decyzji nie służy odwołanie. Strona niezadowolona z decyzji może jednak zwrócić się do Ministra Rolnictwa i Rozwoju Wsi z wnioskiem o ponowne rozpatrzenie sprawy w terminie 14 dni od dnia doręczenia decyzji. Jeżeli strona nie chce skorzystać z prawa zwrócenia się z wnioskiem o ponowne rozpatrzenie sprawy może wnieść do Wojewódzkiego Sądu Administracyjnego w Warszawie skargę na decyzję w terminie 30 dni od dnia doręczenia tej decyzji. Skargę wnosi się za pośrednictwem Ministra Rolnictwa i Rozwoju Wsi.

Czynności związane z wydaniem przedmiotowego zezwolenia podlegają opłacie na podstawie art. 15 ust.1 ustawy *o środkach ochrony roślin*. W związku z powyższym, wydanie stosownej decyzji nie podlega obowiązkowi uiszczenia opłaty skarbowej, zgodnie z art. 3 ustawy z dnia 16 listopada 2006 r. *o opłacie skarbowej* (Dz. U. z 2016 r. poz.1827 z późn. zm).

Z up. Ministra
Bogusław Rzeźnicki

Dyrektor

Otrzymuje:

(za zwrotnym dowodem doręczenia)



Pełnomocnik spółki Nufarm Polska Sp. z o.o.

Do wiadomości (wyłącznie pocztą elektroniczną):

1. Główny Inspektorat Ochrony Roślin i Nasiennictwa
al. Jana Pawła II 11; 00 - 828 Warszawa
(wo@piorin.gov.pl)
2. Instytut Ochrony Roślin – PIB
ul. Władysława Węgorka 20; 60-318 Poznań
(decyzje.sor@iorpiib.poznan.pl)
3. Instytut Ogrodnictwa
ul. Konstytucji 3 Maja 1/3; 96-100 Skierniewice
(ochrona.roslin@inhort.pl)

Appendix 2 Copy of the product label

Komentarz oceniających:

Etykieta została sprawdzona w zakresie fizykochemii, metod analitycznych, toksykologii i istotności toksykologicznej metabolitów, pozostałości, losu i zachowania, ekotoksykologii oraz skuteczności działania środka ochrony roślin. Zmiany wynikające z oceny wprowadzono do poniższej etykiety w widoczny sposób, poprzez zaznaczenie ich szarym podświetleniem tekstu (fragmenty dodane) lub ~~przekreśleniem i jasnoszarą czerwonką~~ (fragmenty usunięte).

Zakres zmian jest następujący:

Sekcja właściwości fizykochemiczne i metody analityczne:

1. Środek nie wykazuje właściwości wybuchowych i utleniających, znakowanie środka wynikające z wyżej wymienionych właściwości fizykochemicznych zgodnie z zapisami Rozporządzenia Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady (WE) NR 1272/2008 z dnia 16 grudnia 2008r. nie jest wymagane.
2. Okres ważności: 2 lata w opakowaniach wykonanych z HDPE na podstawie wyników 2-letnich badań stabilności. W związku z powyższym, wszystkie opakowania wymienione, w punkcie 4.1 Sekcji 1 można uznać za odpowiednie do celów transportu i magazynowania środka ochrony roślin.
3. Brak uwag do punktów dotyczących warunków przechowywania i bezpiecznego usuwania środka ochrony roślin i opakowania oraz sporządzania cieczy użytkowej.
4. Brak uwag do zapisu nazwy grupy chemicznej, do której przyporządkowano substancję czynną. Zawartość substancji czynnej wyrażona w procentach została obliczona w oparciu o gęstość produktu 1.1361 g/mL zgodnie z punktem 2.6.1 Sekcji 1).

Sekcja toksykologia i istotność toksykologiczna metabolitów:

1. W części dotyczącej zasad bezpiecznego stosowania śor. (*Środki ostrożności dla osób stosujących środek*) zmodyfikowano zapis wynikający z szacowania narażenia OPEX zgodnie z wymaganiami harmonizacyjnymi.

Sekcja pozostałości:

1. Skorygowano w etykiecie maksymalną liczbę zabiegów w uprawie jabłoni oraz rzepaku ozimego i jarego w sezonie wegetacyjnym z dwóch do jednego (zgodnie z ocenioną tabelą GAP).
2. Wprowadzono zapis do etykiety dotyczący roślin następczych: „Okres od ostatniego zastosowania środka na rośliny do dnia, w którym można siać lub sadzić rośliny uprawiane następnie: nie ma ograniczeń co do okresu od ostatniego zastosowania środka do dnia, w którym można siać lub sadzić rośliny uprawiane następnie.”
3. W przypadku wcześniejszej likwidacji plantacji można siać lub uprawiać rośliny po 30 dniach od ostatniego zabiegu środkiem zawierającym acetamiprid.

Sekcja los i zachowanie w środowisku:

1. Wykreślono zapis wskazujący na możliwość stosowania środka CA3573 w sadach tylko co dwa lata ze względu na ochronę wód podziemnych (w oparciu o przeprowadzoną ocenę środek w proponowanych dawkach może być stosowany co roku).

Sekcja ekotoksykologia:

1. Dodano zwrot P501.
2. Zmieniono fazy BBCH, w których można stosować środek do ochrony ziemniaka (BBCH 20-79).
3. **Przywrócono zastosowania w rzepaku, jednak w zredukowanej dawce 0,25 l środka/ha.** ~~Wykreślono zastosowania w rzepaku ze względu na stwierdzone niedopuszczalne ryzyko dla małych ssaków roślinożernych.~~
4. Zmieniono fazy BBCH, w których można stosować środek do ochrony jabłoni (BBCH 70-PHI).
5. Wykreślono część zapisów dotyczących ochrony pszczół (w ziemniakach ocena wykazała dopuszczalne ryzyko dla wszystkich scenariuszy: kwitnącej uprawy, kwitnących chwastów w polu i poza polem oraz sąsiadujących kwitnących roślin; w rzepaku środek nie może być stosowany w ogóle, zaś w sadach może być stosowany wyłącznie po okresie kwitnienia). Niemniej ze względów bezpieczeństwa utrzymano zapis o konieczności unikania znosu z chmurą oprysku na sąsiadujące uprawy będące w fazie kwitnienia.
6. **Przywrócono i poprawiono** ~~Wykreślone~~ zapisy dotyczące narzędzi zarządzania ryzykiem dla zastosowań w rzepaku ozimym i jarym ~~(w chwili obecnej środka nie można zarejestrować w tych uprawach).~~
7. Poprawiono zapisy dotyczące narzędzi zarządzania ryzykiem dla zastosowań w ziemniaku i jabłoniach.

Sekcja skuteczność:

1. Zgodnie z tabelą GAP oraz zgodnie z zapisem samego wnioskodawcy, dotyczącym rotacji mechanizmów działania, skorygowano maksymalną liczbę zabiegów w rzepaku ozimym, w jabłoni, i w rzepaku jarym.

2. Uzupełniono, skorygowano i rozszerzono treści dotyczące strategii antyodpornościowej w rozdziale „ŚRODKI OSTROŻNOŚCI, OKRESY KARENCJI I SZCZEGÓLNE WARUNKI STOSOWANIA”, zgodnie z informacjami zawartymi przez wnioskodawcę w dRR, lecz nie uwzględnionymi przez niego w treści projektu etykiety.

Posiadacz zezwolenia:

Nufarm Polska Sp. z o.o., ul. Grójecka 1/3, 02-019 Warszawa, tel.: 22 620 32 52, fax: 22 654 07 97, www.nufarm.pl

Podmiot odpowiedzialny za końcowe pakowanie i etykietowanie środka ochrony roślin:

Podmiot odpowiedzialny za końcowe etykietowanie środka ochrony roślin:

KESTREL 200 SL


Środek przeznaczony do stosowania przez użytkowników profesjonalnych

Zawartość substancji czynnej:

acetamipryd (związek z grupy neonikotynoidów) 200 g/l (17,6%)

~~W celu ochrony wód gruntowych środków zawierających substancję czynną acetamipryd zastosowanych w uprawie jabłoni w dawce 0,4 l/ha, nie stosować częściej niż co drugi sezon na tym samym obszarze.~~

**Zezwolenie MRiRW Nr R-106/2018 z dnia 28.05.2018 r.
ostatnio zmienione decyzją MRiRW nr R – 325/2020d z dnia 30.04.2020 r.**

	
Uwaga	
H302	Działa szkodliwie po połknięciu.
H410	Działa bardzo toksycznie na organizmy wodne, powodując długotrwałe skutki.
EUH 401	W celu uniknięcia zagrożeń dla zdrowia ludzi i środowiska, należy postępować zgodnie z instrukcją użycia.
P264	Dokładnie umyć ręce po użyciu.
P301 + P312	W PRZYPADKU POŁKNIECIA: w przypadku złego samopoczucia skontaktować się z OŚRODKIEM ZATRUĆ/lekarzem.
P391	Zebrać wyciek.
P501	Zawartość/pojemnik usuwać do recyklingu bądź składowania na składowiskach odpowiednich dla pestycydów lub spalania w odpowiednich instalacjach

OPIS DZIAŁANIA

INSEKTYCYD w formie koncentratu rozpuszczalnego w wodzie (SL), o działaniu kontaktowym i żołądkowym. Na roślinie działa powierzchniowo, wglębnie i układowo.

Zgodnie z klasyfikacją IRAC substancja czynna acetamipryd zaliczana jest do grupy neonikotynoidów (grupa 4A).

STOSOWANIE ŚRODKA

Środek przeznaczony do stosowania przy użyciu samobieżnych lub ciągnikowych opryskiwaczy polowych lub sadowniczych.

Ziemniak

stonka ziemniaczana (larwy i chrząszcze)

Maksymalna dawka dla jednorazowego zastosowania: 0,18 l/ha

Zalecana dawka dla jednorazowego zastosowania: 0,12-0,18 l/ha

Wyższą z zalecanych dawek należy zastosować w przypadku bujnie rozwiniętej naci ziemniaczanej lub dużej liczebności stonki ziemniaczanej.

Termin stosowania:

zabieg wykonać w momencie składania jaj i masowego wylęgu larw, od początku fazy tworzenia bocznych odgałęzień, gdy drugi liść właściwy jest rozwinięty na pędzie głównym (min. 4 cm) do końca fazy rozwoju owoców (BBCH 20-79 12-79).

Zalecana ilość wody: 200-400 l/ha

Zalecane opryskiwanie: średniokropliste

Maksymalna liczba zabiegów w sezonie wegetacyjnym: 1

Rzepak ozimy

chowacz brukwiacek

Maksymalna dawka dla jednorazowego zastosowania: 0,25 l/ha 0,3-1 l/ha

Zalecana dawka dla jednorazowego zastosowania: 0,15-0,25 l/ha 0,3-1 l/ha

Liczba zabiegów: 1

Termin stosowania:

Stosować po wystąpieniu chrząszczy na plantacji, zgodnie z sygnalizacją. Zabieg wykonać w fazie wydłużania pędu, od momentu, gdy widoczne jest pierwsze międzywęźle do fazy 9 międzywęźli (BBCH 31-39).

Zalecana ilość wody: 200-400 L/ha

Zalecane opryskiwanie: średniokropliste

chowacz czterozębny

Maksymalna dawka dla jednorazowego zastosowania: 0,25 l/ha 0,3-1 l/ha

Zalecana dawka dla jednorazowego zastosowania: 0,15-0,25 l/ha 0,3-1 l/ha

Liczba zabiegów: 1

Termin stosowania:

Stosować monitoring w postaci żółtych naczyń z wodą.

Zabieg wykonać na początku nalotu na plantację, przed złożeniem jaj przez szkodniki, od fazy, gdy widoczne jest pierwsze międzywęźle do fazy „żółtego pąka”, gdy widoczne są pierwsze płatki, a pąki kwiatowe są nadal zamknięte (BBCH 31-59).

Zalecana ilość wody: 200-400 l/ha

Zalecane opryskiwanie: średniokropliste

ślodyszek rzepakowy

Maksymalna dawka dla jednorazowego zastosowania: 0,25 l/ha 0,3-1 l/ha

Zalecana dawka dla jednorazowego zastosowania: 0,18-0,25 l/ha 0,3-1 l/ha

Liczba zabiegów: 1

Termin stosowania:

Stosować po wystąpieniu chrząszczy na plantacji, zgodnie z sygnalizacją. Zabieg wykonać od fazy, gdy pąki kwiatowe zamknięte są w liściach do otwarcia pierwszych kwiatów (BBCH 50-60).

Zalecana ilość wody: 200-400 l/ha

Zalecane opryskiwanie: średniokropliste

chowacz podobnik, przyszczarek kapustnik

Maksymalna dawka dla jednorazowego zastosowania: 0,25 l/ha 0,3-1 l/ha

Zalecana dawka dla jednorazowego zastosowania: 0,15-0,25 l/ha 0,3-1 l/ha

Liczba zabiegów: 1

Termin stosowania:

Zabieg wykonać od początku fazy kwitnienia, gdy jest co najmniej 10% otwartych kwiatów na głównym kwiatostanie (faza początku kwitnienia) do początku fazy rozwoju owoców, gdy 10% łuszczyn osiągnęło typową wielkość (BBCH 61-71).

Zalecana ilość wody: 200-400 l/ha

Zalecane opryskiwanie: średniokropliste

Maksymalna liczba zabiegów w rzepaku ozimym w sezonie wegetacyjnym: 1 2

Odstęp między zabiegami: co najmniej 7 dni

Jabłoń

owocówka jabłkowieczka

Zalecana/maksymalna dawka dla jednorazowego zastosowania: 0,25 l/ha (max dawka 0,093 L/ha m wysokości korony; max dawka 0,154 L/ha LWA)

Liczba zabiegów: 1

Termin stosowania:

Opryskiwać na początku lotu motyli i masowego składania jaj, zgodnie z sygnalizacją, lub w fazie rozwojowej jaja szkodnika zwanej "czarną główką" stadium czarnej główki. Środek stosować od początku fazy tworzenia owoców (BBCH 70) okresu kwitnienia, gdy jest otwartych jest około 20% kwiatów (BBCH 62) do początku okresu karencji, najpóźniej 14 dni przed zbiorem owoców.

Zalecana ilość wody: 500-900 l/ha

~~W przypadku tego zastosowania środków zawierających acetamipryd nie wolno stosować w kolejnym roku, niezależnie od dawki.~~

mszyca jabłoniowa

Zalecana/maksymalna dawka środka dla jednorazowego zastosowania: 0,125 l/ha (max dawka 0,046 L/ha m wysokości korony; max dawka 0,077 L/ha LWA)

Liczba zabiegów: 1

Termin stosowania:

Środek stosować od początku fazy tworzenia owoców (BBCH 70) okresu kwitnienia, gdy jest otwartych jest około 20% kwiatów (BBCH 62) do początku okresu karencji, tj. najpóźniej 14 dni przed zbiorem owoców.

Zalecana ilość wody: 500-900 l/ha

Zalecane opryskiwanie: średniokropliste

Maksymalna liczba zabiegów w uprawie jabłoni w sezonie wegetacyjnym: 2 1

Odstęp między zabiegami: co najmniej 8 dni

Uwaga:

~~Środków zawierających substancję czynną acetamipryd zastosowanych w uprawie jabłoni w dawce 0,4 l/ha, nie stosować częściej niż co drugi sezon na tym samym obszarze.~~

STOSOWANIE ŚRODKA OCHRONY ROŚLIN W UPRAWACH I ZASTOSOWANIACH MAŁOObszarowych

*Odpowiedzialność za skuteczność działania i fitotoksyczność
środka ochrony roślin stosowanego w uprawach małoobszarowych
ponosi wyłącznie jego użytkownik.*

Rzepak jary

chowacz czterozębny

Maksymalna dawka dla jednorazowego zastosowania: 0,25 l/ha 0,3-1 l/ha

Zalecana dawka dla jednorazowego zastosowania: 0,15-0,25 l/ha 0,3-1 l/ha

Liczba zabiegów: 1

Termin stosowania:

Zabieg wykonać zgodnie z sygnalizacją od fazy, gdy widoczne jest pierwsze międzywęźle do fazy „żółtego pąka”, gdy widoczne są pierwsze płatki, a pąki kwiatowe są nadal zamknięte (BBCH 31-59).

Zalecana ilość wody: 200-400 l/ha

Zalecane opryskiwanie: średniokropliste

ślodyszek rzepakowy

Maksymalna dawka dla jednorazowego zastosowania: 0,25 l/ha 0,3-1 l/ha

Zalecana dawka dla jednorazowego zastosowania: 0,18-0,25 l/ha 0,3-1 l/ha

Liczba zabiegów: 1

Termin stosowania:

Zabieg wykonać zgodnie z sygnalizacją od fazy, gdy pąki kwiatowe zamknięte są w liściach do otwarcia pierwszych kwiatów (BBCH 50-60).

Zalecana ilość wody: 200-400 l/ha

Zalecane opryskiwanie: średniokropliste

chowacz podobnik, pryszczarek kapustnik,

Maksymalna dawka dla jednorazowego zastosowania: 0,25 l/ha 0,3-1 l/ha

Zalecana dawka dla jednorazowego zastosowania: 0,2-0,25 l/ha 0,3-1 l/ha

Liczba zabiegów: 1

Termin stosowania:

Zabieg wykonać od fazy, gdy jest co najmniej 10% otwartych kwiatów na głównym kwiatostanie (początek fazy kwitnienia) do momentu gdy 10% łuszczyn osiągnęło typową wielkość (BBCH 61-71).

Zalecana ilość wody: 200-400 l/ha

Zalecane opryskiwanie: średniokropliste

Maksymalna liczba zabiegów w uprawie rzepaku jarego w sezonie wegetacyjnym: 1

Odstęp między zabiegami: co najmniej 7 dni

ŚRODKI OSTROŻNOŚCI, OKRESY KARENCJI I SZCZEGÓLNE WARUNKI STOSOWANIA

Okres od ostatniego zastosowania środka do dnia zbioru rośliny uprawnej (okres karencji):

Jabłoń- 14 dni

Ziemniaki- 7 dni

Rzepak- 28 dni

1. Podczas stosowania środka nie dopuścić do:

- znoszenia cieczy użytkowej na sąsiednie rośliny uprawne,
- nakładania się cieczy użytkowej na stykach pasów zabiegowych i uwrociach.

3. Środek Kestrel zawiera acetamipryd, substancję owadobójczą z grupy neonikotynoidów (grupa 4A w klasyfikacji IRAC). W celu zminimalizowania ryzyka uodparniania się zwalczanych szkodników na acetamipryd nie należy w danym sezonie wegetacyjnym powtarzać zabiegów za pomocą środków należących do tej samej grupy mechanizmów działania. W przypadku konieczności powtórzenia zabiegu, zamiast środka zawierającego acetamipryd (grupa IRAC 4A) ~~zaleca się~~ należy zastosować insektycyd zawierający substancję czynną z innej grupy IRAC, ~~chemicznej~~, tj. o innym mechanizmie działania. ~~wg klasyfikacji IRAC~~. Alternatywnie, można stosować środek zawierający acetamipryd w mieszaninie zbiornikowej z preparatem substancji aktywnej z innej grupy, o ile takie mieszaniny są dozwolone.

4. Środek należy używać w dawkach zalecanych w etykiecie dla poszczególnych gatunków zwalczanych szkodników.

3. Termin zabiegu wyznaczyć za pomocą dostępnych metod sygnalizacji pojawu szkodników.

4. Opryskiwanie przeciwko szkodnikom (zwłaszcza ssącym) wykonać dokładnie, pokrywając wszystkie części roślin cieczą użytkową.

NASTĘPSTWO ROŚLIN

Środek nie stanowi zagrożenia dla roślin uprawianych następczo.

Okres od ostatniego zastosowania środka na rośliny do dnia, w którym można siać lub sadzić rośliny uprawiane następczo:

nie ma ograniczeń, co do okresu od ostatniego zastosowania środka do dnia, w którym można siać lub sadzić rośliny uprawiane następczo.

SPORZĄDZANIE CIECZY UŻYTKOWEJ

Przed przystąpieniem do sporządzania cieczy użytkowej dokładnie ustalić potrzebną jej objętość oraz ilość środka. Zawartością opakowania przed użyciem wstrząsnąć.

Napełniając opryskiwacz postępować zgodnie z instrukcją producenta opryskiwacza. W wypadku braku instrukcji odmierzoną ilość środka podać do zbiornika opryskiwacza napełnionego częściowo wodą (z włączonym mieszałem)

Opróżnione opakowania przepłukać trzykrotnie wodą, a popłuczyny wlać do zbiornika opryskiwacza z cieczą użytkową.

W przypadku przerw w opryskiwaniu przed ponownym przystąpieniem do pracy, dokładnie wymieszać ciecz użytkową w zbiorniku opryskiwacza.

POSTĘPOWANIE Z RESZTKAMI CIECZY UŻYTKOWEJ I MYCIE APARATURY

Resztki cieczy użytkowej należy:

- jeżeli jest to możliwe, po uprzednim rozcieńczeniu zużyć na powierzchni, na której przeprowadzono zabieg, lub
- unieszkodliwić z wykorzystaniem rozwiązań technicznych zapewniających biologiczną degradację substancji czynnych środków ochrony roślin, lub
- unieszkodliwić w inny sposób, zgodny z przepisami o odpadach.

Po pracy aparaturę dokładnie wymyć.

Z wodą użytą do mycia aparatury postąpić tak, jak z resztkami cieczy użytkowej, stosując te same środki ochrony osobistej.

ŚRODKI OSTROŻNOŚCI DLA OSÓB STOSUJĄCYCH ŚRODEK, PRACOWNIKÓW ORAZ OSÓB POSTRONNYCH

Przed zastosowaniem środka należy poinformować o tym fakcie wszystkie zainteresowane strony, które mogą być narażone na znoszenie cieczy użytkowej i które zwróciły się o taką informację.

Nie jeść, nie pić, ani nie palić podczas używania produktu.

~~Stosować rękawice ochronne i odzież roboczą w trakcie przygotowywania cieczy użytkowej oraz w trakcie wykonywania zabiegu.~~

Stosować rękawice ochronne i odzież roboczą (kombinezon), w trakcie przygotowywania cieczy użytkowej oraz w trakcie wykonywania zabiegu.

Okres od zastosowania środka do dnia, w którym na obszar, na którym zastosowano środek mogą wejść ludzie oraz zostać wprowadzone zwierzęta (okres prewencji):

nie wchodzić do czasu całkowitego wyschnięcia cieczy użytkowej na powierzchni roślin.

ŚRODKI OSTROŻNOŚCI ZWIĄZANE Z OCHRONĄ ŚRODOWISKA NATURALNEGO

Nie zanieczyszczać wód środkiem ochrony roślin lub jego opakowaniem. Nie myć aparatury w pobliżu wód powierzchniowych. Unikać zanieczyszczania wód poprzez rowy odwadniające z gospodarstw i dróg.

W przypadku stosowania środka w formie oprysku w celu ochrony pszczół i innych owadów zapylających:

- ~~nie stosować na rośliny uprawne w czasie kwitnienia,~~
- ~~nie używać w miejscach gdzie pszczoły mają pożytek,~~
- ~~nie stosować kiedy występują kwitnące chwasty,~~
- ~~usuwać chwasty przed kwitnieniem,~~
- unikać znoszenia na uprawy sąsiednie, szczególnie z kwitnącymi roślinami.

Ziemniak

W celu ochrony organizmów wodnych konieczne jest **określenie** ~~wyznaczenie~~ strefy ochronnej o szerokości 1 m od zbiorników i cieków wodnych.

W celu ochrony roślin oraz stawonogów niebędących celem działania środka konieczne jest **określenie** ~~wyznaczenie~~ strefy ochronnej o szerokości 1 m od terenów nieużytkowanych rolniczo.

Rzepak ozimy

W celu ochrony organizmów wodnych konieczne jest **określenie** ~~wyznaczenie~~ zadarnionej strefy ochronnej o szerokości 10 m od zbiorników i cieków wodnych.

W celu ochrony roślin oraz stawonogów niebędących celem działania środka konieczne jest **określenie** ~~wyznaczenie~~ strefy ochronnej o szerokości 1 m od terenów nieużytkowanych rolniczo.

Środek stosować wieczorem, po zakończeniu oblotu przez pszczoły i inne owady zapylające.

Rzepak jary

W celu ochrony organizmów wodnych konieczne jest **określenie** ~~wyznaczenie~~ zadarnionej strefy ochronnej o szerokości 1 m ~~20 m~~ od zbiorników i cieków wodnych.

W celu ochrony roślin oraz stawonogów niebędących celem działania środka konieczne jest **wyznaczenie** strefy ochronnej o szerokości 1 m od terenów nieużytkowanych rolniczo.

Środek stosować wieczorem, po zakończeniu oblotu przez pszczoły i inne owady zapylające.

Jabłoń

W przypadku dawki 0,25 L/ha niezbędne są następujące narzędzia zarządzania ryzykiem:

1. W celu ochrony organizmów wodnych konieczne jest:
 - określenie strefy ochronnej o szerokości 20 m od zbiorników i cieków wodnych, **lub**
 - określenie strefy ochronnej o szerokości 15 m od zbiorników i cieków wodnych z jednoczesną redukcją znosu z chmurą oprysku o 50% za pomocą odpowiednich końcówek rozpylaczy, **lub**
 - określenie strefy ochronnej o szerokości 10 m od zbiorników i cieków wodnych z jednoczesną redukcją znosu z chmurą oprysku o 75% za pomocą odpowiednich końcówek rozpylaczy, **lub**
 - określenie strefy ochronnej o szerokości 3 m od zbiorników i cieków wodnych z jednoczesną redukcją znosu z chmurą oprysku o 90% za pomocą odpowiednich końcówek rozpylaczy.
2. W celu ochrony owadów niebędących celem zwalczania konieczne jest:
 - określenie strefy ochronnej o szerokości 10 m od terenów nieużytkowanych rolniczo, **lub**
 - określenie strefy ochronnej o szerokości 5 m od terenów nieużytkowanych rolniczo z jednoczesną redukcją znosu z chmurą oprysku o 50% za pomocą odpowiednich końcówek rozpylaczy, **lub**
 - określenie strefy ochronnej o szerokości 3 m od terenów nieużytkowanych rolniczo z jednoczesną redukcją znosu z chmurą oprysku o 75% za pomocą odpowiednich końcówek rozpylaczy.

W przypadku dawki 0,125 L/ha niezbędne są następujące narzędzia zarządzania ryzykiem:

1. W celu ochrony organizmów wodnych konieczne jest:
 - określenie strefy ochronnej o szerokości 15 m od zbiorników i cieków wodnych, **lub**
 - określenie strefy ochronnej o szerokości 10 m od zbiorników i cieków wodnych z jednoczesną redukcją znosu z chmurą oprysku o 50% za pomocą odpowiednich końcówek rozpylaczy, **lub**
 - określenie strefy ochronnej o szerokości 3 m od zbiorników i cieków wodnych z jednoczesną redukcją znosu z chmurą oprysku o 75% za pomocą odpowiednich końcówek rozpylaczy.
2. W celu ochrony owadów niebędących celem zwalczania konieczne jest:
 - określenie strefy ochronnej o szerokości 5 m od terenów nieużytkowanych rolniczo, **lub**
 - określenie strefy ochronnej o szerokości 3 m od terenów nieużytkowanych rolniczo z jednoczesną redukcją znosu z chmurą oprysku o 75% za pomocą odpowiednich końcówek rozpylaczy.

~~W celu ochrony organizmów wodnych konieczne jest wyznaczenie od zbiorników i cieków wodnych strefy ochronnej o szerokości:~~

- ~~– 20-m zadarnionej, przy zastosowaniu jednokrotnej dawki 0,4 l/ha lub~~
- ~~– 10-m zadarnionej przy zastosowaniu dwukrotnej dawki 0,125 l/ha lub~~
- ~~– 1-m z równoczesnym zastosowaniem technik redukujących znoszenie cieczy użytkowej podczas zabiegu o 50%, przy zastosowaniu dwukrotnej dawki 0,125 l/ha.~~

~~W celu ochrony roślin oraz stawonogów niebędących celem działania środka konieczne jest wyznaczenie strefy ochronnej od terenów nieużytkowanych rolnie o szerokości:~~

- ~~– 15-m, przy zastosowaniu jednokrotnej dawki 0,4 l/ha lub~~
- ~~– 10-m z równoczesnym zastosowaniem technik redukujących znoszenie cieczy użytkowej podczas zabiegu o 50%, przy zastosowaniu jednokrotnej dawki 0,4 l/ha lub~~
- ~~– 5-m z równoczesnym zastosowaniem technik redukujących znoszenie cieczy użytkowej podczas zabiegu o 75%, przy zastosowaniu jednokrotnej dawki 0,4 l/ha lub~~
- ~~– 1-m z równoczesnym zastosowaniem technik redukujących znoszenie cieczy użytkowej podczas zabiegu o 90%, przy zastosowaniu jednokrotnej dawki 0,4 l/ha~~
- ~~– 5-m przy zastosowaniu dwukrotnej dawki 0,125 l/ha lub~~
- ~~– 1-m z równoczesnym zastosowaniem technik redukujących znoszenie cieczy użytkowej podczas zabiegu o 75%, przy zastosowaniu dwukrotnej dawki 0,125 l/ha~~

WARUNKI PRZECHOWYWANIA I BEZPIECZNEGO USUWANIA ŚRODKA OCHRONY ROŚLIN I OPAKOWANIA

Chronić przed dziećmi.

Środek ochrony roślin przechowywać:

- w oryginalnych opakowaniach,
- w sposób uniemożliwiający kontakt z żywnością, napojami lub paszą, skażenie środowiska oraz dostęp osób trzecich,
- w temperaturze w zakresie 5°C - 25°C.

Chronić przed zamarzaniem.

Zabrania się wykorzystywania opróżnionych opakowań po środkach ochrony roślin do innych celów.

Niewykorzystany środek przekazać do podmiotu uprawnionego do odbierania odpadów niebezpiecznych.

Opróżnione opakowania po środku zwrócić do sprzedawcy środków ochrony roślin będących środkami niebezpiecznymi.

PIERWSZA POMOC

Antidotum brak, stosować leczenie objawowe.

W razie konieczności zasięgnięcia porady lekarza, należy pokazać opakowanie lub etykietę.

Okres ważności - 2 lata

Data produkcji -

Zawartość netto -

Nr partii -

Appendix 3 Letter of Access

Letter of Access to Annex III Adama data

Appendix 4 Lists of data considered for national authorization

List of data submitted by the applicant and relied on

Data point	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 2.1/01	Walter, D.	2014a	Physical and chemical properties of MCW-2222 before and after Accelerated Storage at 40° C for 8 Weeks Report No.: R-33406 / S13-03100 Eurofins Agrosience Services , EcoChem GmbH, Germany GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 2.1/02	Walter, D.	2015	Physical and chemical properties of MCW-2222 over 2 years at 20°C Report No.: R-33408 / S13-03102 Eurofins Agrosience Services, EcoChem GmbH, Germany GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 2.2.1/01	Krack, M.	2013a	MCW-2222, Explosive Properties A.14. Report No.: R-33398 / 20130274.01 SIEMENS, Prozess-Sicherheit, Germany GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 2.2.2/01	Walter, D.	2014b	Statement about Oxidizing Properties of MCW-2222 Report No.: R-33400 / S13-03094 Eurofins Agrosience Services, EcoChem GmbH, Germany Non GLP Unpublished Study contains confidential information – filed as confidential K-Document in Part C	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 2.3.1/01	Walter, D.	2014c	Flash Point of MCW-2222 Report No.: R-33401 / S13-03095 Eurofins Agrosience Services, EcoChem GmbH, Germany GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*

Data point	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 2.3.3/01	Krack, M.	2013b	MCW-2222, Auto-Ignition Temperature (Liquids and Gases) A.15. Report No.: R-33399 / 20130274.02 SIEMENS, Prozess-Sicherheit, Germany GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 2.4.1/01	Walter, D.	2015	Physical and chemical properties of MCW-2222 over 2 years at 20°C Report No.: R-33408 / S13-03102 Eurofins Agroscience Services, EcoChem GmbH, Germany GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 2.4.2/01	Walter, D.	2014a	Physical and chemical properties of MCW-2222 before and after Accelerated Storage at 40° C for 8 Weeks Report No.: R-33406 / S13-03100 Eurofins Agroscience Services , EcoChem GmbH, Germany GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 2.4.2/02	Walter, D.	2015	Physical and chemical properties of MCW-2222 over 2 years at 20°C Report No.: R-33408 / S13-03102 Eurofins Agroscience Services, EcoChem GmbH, Germany GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 2.5.2/01	Walter, D.	2014d	Viscosity of MCW Report No.: R-33402 / S13-03096 Eurofins Agroscience Services, EcoChem GmbH, Germany GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 2.5.3/01	Walter, D.	2014e	Surface tension of MCW-2222 Report No.: R-33403 / S13-03097 Eurofins Agroscience Services, EcoChem GmbH, Germany GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 2.6.1/01	Walter, D.	2014f	Relative Density of MCW-2222 Report No.: R-33404 / S13-03098 Eurofins Agroscience Services, EcoChem GmbH, Germany GLP	N	Y	Data protection started with:	Adama*

Data point	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
			Unpublished			R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	
KCP 2.7.2/01	Walter, D.	2014a	Physical and chemical properties of MCW-2222 before and after Accelerated Storage at 40° C for 8 Weeks Report No.: R-33406 / S13-03100 Eurofins Agrosience Services , EcoChem GmbH, Germany GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 2.7.4/01	Deierling, T. & Herrmann, S.	2014	Determination of the Low Temperature Stability of MCW-2222 Report No.: R-34771 / 91841204 IBACON GmbH, Germany GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 2.7.5/01	Walter, D.	2015	Physical and chemical properties of MCW-2222 over 2 years at 20°C Report No.: R-33408 / S13-03102 Eurofins Agrosience Services, EcoChem GmbH, Germany GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 2.8.2/01	Walter, D.	2014a	Physical and chemical properties of MCW-2222 before and after Accelerated Storage at 40° C for 8 Weeks Report No.: R-33406 / S13-03100 Eurofins Agrosience Services , EcoChem GmbH, Germany GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 2.8.2/02	Walter, D.	2015	Physical and chemical properties of MCW-2222 over 2 years at 20°C Report No.: R-33408 / S13-03102 Eurofins Agrosience Services, EcoChem GmbH, Germany GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 2.8.4/01	Walter, D.	2014a	Physical and chemical properties of MCW-2222 before and after Accelerated Storage at 40° C for 8 Weeks Report No.: R-33406 / S13-03100 Eurofins Agrosience Services , EcoChem GmbH, Germany GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*

Data point	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 2.8.4/02	Walter, D.	2015	Physical and chemical properties of MCW-2222 over 2 years at 20°C Report No.: R-33408 / S13-03102 Eurofins Agrosience Services, EcoChem GmbH, Germany GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 12	Anonymous	2019	Carnadine 200 SL: Safety Data Sheet Pl-en Version 1.0 Non-GLP Published	N	N	-	-
KCP 4.4/01	Anonymous	2014	Packing Material Specification Bottle, PE, 100 mL Non-GLP Published	N	N	-	-
KCP 4.4/02	Anonymous	2011	Packing Material Specification Bottle, HDPE, 100 mL Non-GLP Published	N	N	-	-
KCP 4.4/03	Anonymous	2017	Packing Material Specification Bottle, HDPE, 125 mL Non-GLP Published	N	N	-	-
KCP 4.4/04	Anonymous	2011	Packing Material Specification Bottle, HDPE, 125 mL Non-GLP Published	N	N	-	-
KCP 4.4/05	Anonymous	2018	Packing Material Specification Bottle, HDPE, 150 mL Non-GLP Published	N	N	-	-
KCP 4.4/06	Anonymous	2009	Technical Drawing Bottle, HDPE, 250 mL Non-GLP Published	N	N	-	-
KCP 4.4/07	Anonymous	2015	Technical Drawing Bottle, HDPE, 250 mL Non-GLP Published	N	N	-	-

Data point	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 4.4/08	Anonymous	2009	Technical Drawing Bottle, HDPE, 500 mL Non-GLP Published	N	N	-	-
KCP 4.4/09	Anonymous	2013	Technical Drawing Bottle, HDPE, 600 mL Non-GLP Published	N	N	-	-
KCP 4.4/10	Anonymous	2018	Technical Drawing Bottle, HDPE, 1000 mL Non-GLP Published	N	N	-	-
KCP 4.4/11	Anonymous	2018	Technical Drawing Canister, HDPE, 5 L Non-GLP Published	N	N	-	-
KCP 4.4/12	Anonymous	2018	Technical Drawing Canister, HDPE, 10 L Non-GLP Published	N	N	-	-
KCP 4.4/13	Anonymous	2012	Technical Specification of Screw Closure Z38/B 35/45 mm Non-GLP Published	N	N	-	-
KCP 4.4/14	Anonymous	2008	Technical Specification of Screw Closure Z18/PZ 20.9/18.2 mm Non-GLP Published	N	N	-	-
KCP 4.4/15	Anonymous	2011	Technical Drawing of Screw Closure Z38/B Non-GLP Published	N	N	-	-
KCP 4.4/16	Anonymous	-	Technical Drawing of Screw Closure K50 Non-GLP Published	N	N	-	-
KCP 4.4/17	Anonymous	2008-2018	Certificat d'agrement de type d'emballage Non-GLP Published	N	N	-	-
KCP 4.4/18	Anonymous	2013	Technical Drawing Canister, HDPE, 20 L Ipackchem Limited	N	N	-	-

Data point	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-GLP Published				
KCP 4.4/19	Anonymous	2020	Artikelspezifikation (Packing Material Specification) Canister, HDPE, 20 L Non-GLP Published	N	N	-	-
KCP 4.4/20	Spies, S.	2007	Technisches Datenblatt (Packing Material Specification) Drum, 220 L Non-GLP Published	N	N	-	-
KCP 4.4/21	Anonymous	2009	Packaging Specification Canister 640 L Non-GLP Published	N	N	-	-
KCP 4.4/22	Anonymous	-	Technical data sheet Canister, 1000 L Non-GLP Published	N	N	-	-
KCP 4.4/23	Anonymous	2012	Packaging Specification Canister 1000 L Non-GLP Published	N	N	-	-
KCP 5.1.1/01	Walter,D.	2014	Development and validation of an analytical method for the determination of acetamiprid in MCW-2222, Study No. S13-03099 Eurofins GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 5.1.2/01	Lefresne,S.	2014	Freezing storage stability of acetamiprid in 4 plant matrices: Dry (dry bean seed and straw, water (apple), fat (olive whole fruit) and acid (orange peel and pulp) at/below -18°C during 1 year (0,3,6 and 12 months) Report No. B13-M1-A-02 GIRPA GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama
KCP 5.1.2/02	Chevallier, E.	2014	Magnitude of the residue of acetamiprid in wheat (Raw Agricultural Commodity) after two applications of MCW-2222	N	Y	Data/study report never	Adama

Data point	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
			- four decline curve trials and four harvest trials in Northern Europe (Northern France, Poland, Germany, Hungary and Austria) – 2014 Report No. B14C-S1-A-01 GIRPA GLP Unpublished			submitted before to Poland	
KCP 5.1.2/03	Chevallier, E.	2014	Magnitude of the residue of acetamiprid in barley (Raw Agricultural Commodity) after two applications of MCW-2222 – four decline curve trials and four harvest trials in Northern Europe (Northern France, Poland, Germany, Hungary and Austria) – 2014 GIRPA GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data/study report never submitted before to Poland	Adama
KCP 5.1.2/04	Barbier, G.	2018	Freezing storage stability of acetamiprid in wheat (grain) at/ below -18°C during 15 months (0 and 15 months) Report No. B17G-A4-A-02 GIRPA GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data/study report never submitted before to Poland	Adama
KCP 5.1.2/05	Méric, D.	2013	Magnitude of the residues of acetamiprid in peaches (RAC fruits) following two applications of MCW-2222 in three trials (1DC + 2 HS), Southern Europe (Southern France and Italy) – 2013 Study Report. DMC-13-16126 Staphyt (France) GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data/study report never submitted before to Poland	Adama
KCP 5.1.2/06	Méric, D.	2014	Magnitude of the residues of acetamiprid in apples (RAC fruits) following two applications of MCW-2222 in two trials (1DC + 1 HS), Northern Europe (Northern France) – 2013 Study Report DMC-13-16134 Staphyt (France) GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama
KCP 5.1.2/07	Roussel, Ch. H.	2014	Magnitude of the residues of acetmiprid in apple (RAC fruit and processed fractions), following one or two applications of	N	Y	Data protection	Adama

Data point	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
			MCW-2222 in six trials (3 DCS + 3 HS), Northern Europe (Northern France, Germany, Poland and Belgium) – 2014 Study No. ChR-14-17311 Staphyt (France) GLP Unpublished			started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	
KCP 5.1.2/08	Méric, D.	2014	Magnitude of the residues of acetamiprid in oilseed rape (RAC whole plants, pods, and seeds) Following one or two applications of MCW-2222 in two trials (1 DC + 1 HS), Northern Europe (Germany and Northern France) – 2013 Study no. DMC-16129 GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama
KCP 5.1.2/09	Chevallier, E.	2014	Magnitude of the residue of acetamiprid in winter oil seed rape (Raw Agricultural Commodity) after one or two applications of MCW-2222 – three decline curve trials and three harvest trials in Northern Europe (Northern France, Poland, Germany, Czech Republic and Hungary) – 2014 Study No. 14SGS035 SGS France GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama
KCP 5.1.2/10	Bousquet, C.	2014	Magnitude of the Residue of acetamiprid in potato Raw Agricultural Commodity after two applications of MCW-2222 in three decline curve trials (Poland, United Kingdom and Northern France) and in one harvest trial (Poland) in Northern Europe – 2013 Study No. 13SGS102 SGS France GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama
KCP 5.1.2/11 filed under KCP 5.2/01	Semrau, J.	2017	Determination of residues of acetamiprid and its metabolites IM 1-4 and IM 1-5 after one application of MCW-2222 to bare soil in rotational crops (radish, spinach and wheat) at 1 site in Northern Europe and 1 site in southern Europe 2016/2017 Study no. S15-02364 Eurofins GLP	N	Y	Data/study report never submitted before to Poland	Adama

Data point	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
			Unpublished				
KCP 5.1.2/ 12	Hecht-Ross, S.	2020	Semi-field study for determining the magnitude of residues of Carnadine (CA3573) (a.s. acetamiprid) in honey GLP Study No. 467, Report No. R1940050 RIFCON GmbH GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data/study report never submitted before to Poland	Nufarm
KCP 5.1.2/13	Müller, S.	2020	Determination of the Storage Stability of Acetamiprid in Honey for a period of 8 months at $\leq -18^{\circ}\text{C}$ Study No. 20N08133-01-SSH (protocol and draft report) CIP GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data/study report never submitted before to Poland	Nufarm
KCP 5.1.2/14	Wilson, A.	2016	Acetamiprid – foliar dislodgeable residues dissipation on pome fruit in southern and northern Europe (Spain, Italy and chzech republic), 2016 Study No. ACI16- 010 Agrochemex International Ltd. UK GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data/study report never submitted before to Poland	Adama
KCP 5.1.2/15	xxxx.	2014	Acute toxicity of MCW-2222 to the rainbow trout <i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i> in a 96-hour static test Study No. 141048005 W xxxx GLP Unpublished	Y	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama
KCP 5.1.2/16	Juckeland, D.	2015	Acute toxicity of MCW-2222 to <i>Daphnia magna</i> in a 48-hour static test Study No. 141048006 W BioChemAgrar GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama
KCP 5.1.2/17	Juckeland, D.	2015	Acute toxicity of MCW-2222 to <i>Chironomus riparius</i> in a 48-hour static test Study No. 141048057W BioChemAgrar GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama

Data point	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 5.1.2/18	Juckeland, D.	2014	Effects of MCW-2222 on <i>Desmodesmus subspicatus</i> in an algal growth inhibition test Study No. 141048007 W BioChemAgrar GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama
KCP 5.1.2/19	Molitor, C.	2014	Field Study to Evaluate Potential Side Effects of the product MCW-2222 (acetamiprid 200 g/L) on Brood Development, Foraging Activity, Mortality and Behaviour of Adult Honeybees <i>Apis mellifera</i> L. (Hymenoptera: Apidae) Following Application after Bee-Flight on <i>Phacelia tanacetifolia</i> Study No. 215-2014 TESTAPI France GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama
KCP 5.1.2/20	Molitor, C.	2014	Field Study to Evaluate Potential Side Effects of MCW-2222 on Brood Development, Foraging Activity, Mortality and Behaviour of Adult Honeybees (<i>Apis mellifera</i>) on Oilseed Rape Study No. 230 – 2015 TESTAPI France GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama
KCP 5.1.2./21	Aucejo, S.	2015	Effects and Determination of Residues of Acetamiprid 200 SL on the Honeybee (<i>Apis mellifera</i> L.) Brood in Apple, under Field Conditions, in Italy 2015 Study No. 307SRE15C01 GIRPA GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama
KCP 5.1.2/22	Kleebaum, K.	2015	Chronic toxicity of MCW-2222 to honey bee larvae (<i>Apis mellifera</i> L.) under laboratory conditions (in vitro) Study No. 141048078B BioChem agrar GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018 Study not relied upon	Adama

Data point	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
						during Art. 43 re-evaluation	
KCP 5.12/23	Friedirsch, S.	2014	Terrestrial plant test with MCW-2222: Vegetative vigour test Study No. 141048002 W BioChemagrar GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama
KCP 5.1.2./24	Aucejo, S.	2015	Effects and Determination of Residues of Acetamiprid 200 SL on the Honeybee (<i>Apis mellifera</i> L.) Brood in Citrus, under Field Conditions, in Spain 2015. Study No. 307SRE15C02 SynTECH research center Spain GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data/study report never submitted before to Poland Study not submitted for purposes of Art. 43 re-evaluation	Adama
KCP 5.1.2/25	Hecht-Rost, S.; Mayer, O.	2018 2017	Semi-field brood study to evaluate potential effects of MCW-2222 on brood development of honeybees (<i>Apis mellifera</i> L.) Study No. R1640035 Eurofins GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data/study report never submitted before to Poland	Adama
KCP 5.1.2/26	Dressler, K.	2019	Chronic oral toxicity of CA3573 Acetamiprid 200 SL (Carnadine) to the honey bee <i>Apis mellifera</i> L. under laboratory conditions. Study No. 1948 BAC0028 BioChem agrar GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data/study report never submitted before to Poland	Nufarm
KCP 5.1.2/27	Scheller, K.	2020	CA3573 Acetamiprid 200 SL (Carnadine)- repeated exposure of honey bee larvae (<i>Apis mellifera</i> L.) under laboratory conditions. Study No. 19 48 BLC 0033 BioChem agrar GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data/study report never submitted before to Poland	Nufarm

Data point	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 5.1.2/28	Hennecke, S. .	2020	Carnadine – Outdoor mesocosm study Study number: NFM-001/7-52 Fraunhofer IME GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data/study report never submitted before to Poland	Nufarm
KCP 5.1.2/29	Hennecke, S. .	2020	Metod validation of the analytical method for water and sediment Study number: NFM-002/6-22 Fraunhofer IME Non GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data/study report never submitted before to Poland	Nufarm
KCP 5.2/ 01	Semrau,J.	2017	Determination of residues of acetamiprid and its metabolites IM 1-4 and IM 1-5 after one application of MCW-2222 to bare soil in rotational crops (radish, spinach and wheat) at 1 site in Northern Europe and 1 site in Southern Europe 2016/2017 Study No. S15-02364 Eurofins GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data/study report never submitted before to Poland	Adama
KCP 6/01	Anonymous	2015	Biological Assessment Dossier - MCW-2222 - Central EU Zone KIIIA 6.0/01 Not GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 6/02	Anonymous	2015	Biological Assessment Dossier - MCW-2222 - Central EU Zone – Appendices 3-8 KIIA 6.0/02 Not GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 6/03	Anonymous	2020	Biological Assessment Dossier – CA3573 - Central EU Zone Not GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Nufarm
KCP 6/04	Anonymous	2020	Biological Assessment Dossier – CA3573 - Central EU Zone – Appendices 2-6 Not GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with:	Nufarm

Data point	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
						R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Hornik, P.	2014	Efficacy of MCW-2222 SL on <i>Aphis pomi</i> in apple in the Czech republic in 2014 ZS Nechanice, Nechanice, Czech Republic Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: CZ14IEMABSD010A KIIIA 6.1.3/003 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Agrovita (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Hornik, P.	2014	Efficacy of MCW-2222 SL on <i>Aphis pomi</i> in apple in the Czech republic in 2014 ZS Nechanice, Nechanice, Czech Republic Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: CZ14IEMABSD010B KIIIA 6.1.3/004 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Agrovita (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Heryán, J.	2014	Efficacy of MCW-2222 SL on <i>Aphis pomi</i> in apple in the Czech Republic in 2014 VŠÚO Holovousy s.r.o., Hořice, Czech Republic Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: CZ14IEMABSD010C KIIIA 6.1.3/005 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Agrovita (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Kloutvoro vá, J.	2014	Efficacy of MCW-2222 SL on <i>Aphis pomi</i> in apple in the Czech Republic in 2014 VŠÚO Holovousy s.r.o., Hořice, Czech Republic Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: CZ14IEMABSD010D KIIIA 6.1.3/006 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Agrovita (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Richter, T.	2014	Efficacy of MCW-2222 SL on <i>Aphis pomi</i> in apple in the Czech Republic in 2014 PP Trial s.r.o., Brno, Czech Republic	N	Y	Data protection started with:	MCW (Adama)

Data point	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.: not stated Sponsor No.: CZ14IEMABSD010E KIIIA 6.1.3/007 GLP / GEP Unpublished			R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Hornik, P.	2014	Efficacy of MCW-2222 SL on <i>Cydia pomonella</i> in apple in the Czech republic in 2014 ZS Nechanice, Nechanice, Czech Republic Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: CZ14IEMABSD011A KIIIA 6.1.3/008 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Agrovita (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Hornik, P.	2014	Efficacy of MCW-2222 SL on <i>Cydia pomonella</i> in apple in the Czech republic in 2014. ZS Nechanice, Nechanice, Czech Republic Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: CZ14IEMABSD011B KIIIA 6.1.3/009 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Agrovita (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Kloutvoro vá, J.	2014	Efficacy of MCW-2222 SL on <i>Cydia pomonella</i> in apple in the Czech Republic in 2014 VŠÚO Holovousy s.r.o., Hořice, Czech Republic Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: CZ14IEMABSD011C KIIIA 6.1.3/010 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Agrovita (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Tvaruzek, L.	2014	Efficacy of MCW 2222 SL on <i>Cydia pomonella</i> in apple in the Czech Republic in 2014. Zemelsky vyzkumny ustav Kromeriz, s.r.o., Havlickova, Czech Republic Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: CZ14IEMABSD011D KIIIA 6.1.3/011 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Agrovita (Adama)

Data point	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, KCP 6.4.1	Tvaruzek, L.	2014	Efficacy of MCW 2222 SL on <i>Cydia pomonella</i> in apple in the Czech Republic in 2014. Zemedelsky vyzkumny ustav Kromeriz, s.r.o., Havlickova, Czech Republic Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: CZ14IEMABSD011E KIIIA 6.1.3/012 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Agrovita (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Richter, T.	2014	Efficacy of MCW-2222 SL on <i>Cydia pomonella</i> in apple in the Czech Republic in 2014 PP Trial s.r.o., Brno, Czech Republic Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: CZ14IEMABSD011F KIIIA 6.1.3/013 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	MCW (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Richter, T.	2014	Efficacy of MCW-2222 SL on <i>Cydia pomonella</i> in apple in the Czech Republic in 2014 PP Trial s.r.o., Brno, Czech Republic Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: CZ14IEMABSD011G KIIIA 6.1.3/014 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	MCW (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Hornik, P.	2014	Efficacy of MCW-2222 SL on green apple aphid in apple in the Czech republic 2015 ZS Nechanice, Nechanice, Czech Republic Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: CZ15IEMABSD001A KIIIA 6.1.3/018 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* CZ
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Richter, T.	2015	Efficacy of MCW-2222 SL on green apple aphid in apple in the Czech republic 2015 PP Trial s.r.o., Brno, Czech Republic Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: CZ15IEMABSD001B	N	Y		ADAMA*

Data point	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
			KIIIA 6.1.3/019 GLP / GEP Unpublished				
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Kukula-Mlynarcz yk, A.	2010	The evaluation of efficacy and selectivity of Acetamiprid 200 SL on apple trees against pests BIOTEK Agriculture Polska Sp. z o o., Oława, Poland Report No.: DPE10/322/IOW-01 Sponsor No.: 322/1/1/1 KIIIA 6.1.3/026 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	MCW (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Kukula-Mlynarcz yk, A.	2010	The evaluation of efficacy and selectivity of Acetamiprid 200 SL on apple trees against pests BIOTEK Agriculture Polska Sp. z o o., Oława, Poland Report No.: DPE10/322/IOW-02 Sponsor No.: not stated KIIIA 6.1.3/027 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	MCW (Adama)
KCP 6.2	Gramza, H.	2012	The evaluation of efficacy and selectivity of MCW- 2222 SL (Acetamiprid 200 SL) for the control of <i>Cydia pomonella</i> on apple AGRECO Sp. z o.o., Oława, Poland Report No.: 11MAP0004-1 Sponsor No.: not stated KIIIA 6.1.3/028 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	MCW (Adama)
KCP 6.2	Gramza, H.	2012	The evaluation of efficacy and selectivity of MCW- 2222 SL (Acetamiprid 200 SL) for the control of <i>Cydia pomonella</i> on apple AGRECO Sp. z o.o., Oława, Poland Report No.: 11MAP0004-2 Sponsor No.: not stated KIIIA 6.1.3/029 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	MCW (Adama)

Data point	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	Gramza, H.	2012	The evaluation of efficacy and selectivity of MCW- 2222 SL (Acetamiprid 200 SL) for the control of <i>Cydia pomonella</i> on apple AGRECO Sp. z o.o., Oława, Poland Report No.: 11MAP0005-1 Sponsor No.: not stated KIIIA 6.1.3/030 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	MCW (Adama)
KCP 6.2	Gramza, H.	2012	The evaluation of efficacy and selectivity of MCW- 2222 SL (Acetamiprid 200 SL) for the control of <i>Cydia pomonella</i> on apple AGRECO Sp. z o.o., Oława, Poland Report No.: 11MAP0005-2 Sponsor No.: not stated KIIIA 6.1.3/031 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	MCW (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Gajek, D.	2012	Efficacy of MCW 2222 SL in the control of green apple aphid <i>Aphis pomi</i> on apple, Poland 2012 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Błędów Poland Report No.: 072_01_F12_134 Sponsor No.: not stated KIIIA 6.1.3/032 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	AGAN PL (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Gajek, D.	2012	Efficacy of MCW 2222 SL in the control of green apple aphid <i>Aphis pomi</i> on apple, Poland 2012 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Błędów Poland Report No.: 072_01_F12_135 Sponsor No.: not stated KIIIA 6.1.3/033 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	AGAN PL (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Meronka, K.	2013	Efficacy of MCW-2222 SL on codling moth (<i>Cydia pomonella</i>) in apple in Poland Fertico Sp. z o.o., Błędów, Poland	N	Y	Data protection started with:	MCW (Adama)

Data point	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.: 13_01_F13_025 Sponsor No.: PL13IEMABSD206A KIIIA 6.1.3/034 GLP / GEP Unpublished			R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Meronka, K.	2013	Efficacy of MCW-2222 SL on codling moth (<i>Cydia pomonella</i>) in apple in Poland Fertico Sp. z o o., Błędów, Poland Report No.: 13_02_F13_026 Sponsor No.: PL13IEMABSD206B GLP / GEP KIIIA 6.1.3/035 Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	MCW (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Meronka, K.	2013	Efficacy of MCW-2222 SL on codling moth (<i>Cydia pomonella</i>) in apple in Poland Fertico Sp. z o o., Błędów, Poland Report No.: 13_03_F13_027 Sponsor No.: PL13IEMABSD206C KIIIA 6.1.3/036 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	MCW (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Meronka, K.	2013	Efficacy of MCW-2222 SL on codling moth (<i>Cydia pomonella</i>) in apple in Poland Fertico Sp. z o o., Błędów, Poland Report No.: 13_04_F13_028 Sponsor No.: PL13IEMABSD206D KIIIA 6.1.3/037 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	MCW (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Meronka, K.	2013	Efficacy of MCW-2222 SL against aphids (and other insects) in apple trees in Poland Fertico Sp. z o o., Błędów, Poland Report No.: 14_01_F13_029 Sponsor No.: PL13IEMABSD207A KIIIA 6.1.3/038 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	AGAN PL (Adama)

Data point	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, KCP 6.4.1	Meronka, K.	2013	Efficacy of MCW-2222 SL against aphids (and other insects) in apple trees in Poland Fertico Sp. z o o., Błędów, Poland Report No.: 14_02_F13_030 Sponsor No.: PL13IEMABSD207B KIIIA 6.1.3/039 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	AGAN PL (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Meronka, K.	2013	Efficacy of MCW-2222 SL against aphids (and other insects) in apple trees in Poland Fertico Sp. z o o., Błędów, Poland Report No.: 14_03_F13_031 Sponsor No.: PL13IEMABSD207C KIIIA 6.1.3/040 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	AGAN PL (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Meronka, K.	2013	Efficacy of MCW-2222 SL on aphids (and other insects) in apple tree in Poland Fertico Sp. z o o., Błędów, Poland Report No.: 14_04_F13_032 Sponsor No.: PL13IEMABSD207D KIIIA 6.1.3/041 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	AGAN PL (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Ogrodnicz ek, A.	2014	Efficacy of MCW-2222 in control of <i>Aphis pomi</i> and other pests in case of their occurrence in apple orchard, Poland 2014 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Błędów Poland Report No.: 15_01_F14_029 Sponsor No.: PL14IEMABSD109A KIIIA 6.1.3/042 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA*

Data point	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, KCP 6.4.1	Ogrodnicz ek, A.	2014	Efficacy of MCW-2222 in control of <i>Aphis pomi</i> and other pests in case of their occurrence in apple orchard, Poland 2014 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Błędów Poland Report No.: 15_02_F14_030 Sponsor No.: PL14IEMABSD109B KIIIA 6.1.3/043 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA*
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Ogrodnicz ek, A.	2014	Efficacy of MCW-2222 in control of <i>Aphis pomi</i> and other pests in case of their occurrence in apple orchard, Poland 2014 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Błędów Poland Report No.: 15_03_F14_031 Sponsor No.: PL14IEMABSD109C KIIIA 6.1.3/044 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA*
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Ogrodnicz ek, A.	2014	Efficacy of MCW-2222 in control of <i>Aphis pomi</i> and other pests in case of their occurrence in apple orchard, Poland 2014 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Błędów Poland Report No.: 15_04_F14_032 Sponsor No.: PL14IEMABSD109D KIIIA 6.1.3/045 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA*
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Ogrodnicz ek, A.	2014	Efficacy of MCW-2222 in control of <i>Aphis pomi</i> and other pests in case of their occurrence in apple orchard, Poland 2014 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Błędów Poland Report No.: 15_05_F14_033 Sponsor No.: PL14IEMABSD109E KIIIA 6.1.3/046 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA*
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Felczak, K.	2015	Efficacy of MCW-2222 in control of green apple aphid <i>Aphis pomi</i> in apple orchard, Poland 2015 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Błędów Poland Report No.: 55_PROT_F15_113 Sponsor No.: PL15IEMABSD127A KIIIA 6.1.3/047	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA*

Data point	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
			GLP / GEP Unpublished				
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Felczak, K.	2015	Efficacy of MCW-2222 in control of green apple aphid <i>Aphis pomi</i> in apple orchard, Poland 2015 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Błędów Poland Report No.: 55_PROT_F15_114 Sponsor No.: PL15IEMABSD127B KIIIA 6.1.3/048 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA*
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Hargitai, C.	2013	Efficacy of MCW-2222 SL on aphids in apple in Hungary in 2013 Government Office of Somogy County, Kaposvár, Hungary Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: HU13IEMABSD632A KIIIA 6.1.3/052 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	AGAN HU (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Coman, M.	2014	Efficacy of MCW 2222 SL on apple codling moth <i>Cydia pomonella</i> - Location 2 ICDP, Pitesti-Maracineni, Romania Report No.: 2593, 2210 2014 Sponsor No.: RO14IEMABSD045B KIIIA 6.1.3/059 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	MAROM(Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Coman, M.	2014	Efficacy of MCW 2222 SL on green aphid <i>Aphis pomi</i> ICDP, Pitesti-Maracineni, Romania Report No.: 2590, 2210 2014 Sponsor No.: RO14IEMABSD046A KIIIA 6.1.3/060 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	MAROM (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Toth, F.	2013	Efficacy of MCW-2222 SL against aphids on apple - Slovakia - Valice 2013 Gemerprodukt Valice OVD, Rimavská Sobota, Slovakia Report No.: not stated	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Agrovita (Adama)

Data point	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
			Sponsor No.: SK13IEMABSD001A KIIIA 6.1.3/069 GLP / GEP Unpublished				
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Toth, F.	2013	Efficacy of MCW-2222 SL against aphids on apple - Slovakia - Camovec 2013 Gemerprodukt Valice OVD, Rimavská Sobota, Slovakia Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: SK13IEMABSD001B KIIIA 6.1.3/070 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Agrovita (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Tóth, F.	2015	Efficacy of MCW-2222 SL on Aphids in apple, Slovakia 2014 Efficacy of MCW-2222 SL on aphids in apple, Slovakia 2014 Gemerprodukt Valice OVD, Rimavská Sobota, Slovakia Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: SK14IEMABSD001A KIIIA 6.1.3/073 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* SK
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Tóth, F.	2015	Efficacy of MCW-2222 SL on green apple aphid in apple in Slovakia 2015 Gemerprodukt Valice OVD, Rimavská Sobota, Slovakia Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: SK15IEMABSD001A KIIIA 6.1.3/080 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* SK
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Tóth, F.	2015	Efficacy of MCW-2222 SL on green apple aphid in apple in Čamovce- Slovakia 2015 Gemerprodukt Valice OVD, Rimavská Sobota, Slovakia Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: SK15IEMABSD001B KIIIA 6.1.3/081 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* SK
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Baratis, T.	2013	Efficacy of MCW-2222 on <i>Diabrotica virgifera virgifera</i> in maize in Hungary 2013	N	Y	Data protection	AGAN HU (Adama)

Data point	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
			SynTech Research Hungary Kft, Szombathely, Hungary Report No.: SRHU13-065-135IE Sponsor No.: HU13IEZEAMX131A KIIIA 6.1.3/085 GLP / GEP Unpublished			started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Ripka, G.	2013	Efficacy of MCW-2222 on <i>Diabrotica virgifera virgifera</i> in maize in Hungary 2013 Government Office of Vas Country, Szombathely, Hungary Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: HU13IEZEAMX131B KIIIA 6.1.3/086 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	AGAN HU (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Gabi, G.	2013	Efficacy of MCW-2222 on <i>Diabrotica virgifera virgifera</i> in maize in Hungary 2013 Government Office of Tolna Conunty, Szekszárd, Hungary Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: HU13IEZEAMX131C KIIIA 6.1.3/087 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	AGAN HU (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Blaskó, D.	2014	Efficacy of MCW-2222 on <i>Diabrotica virgifera virgifera</i> in maize in Hungary in 2014 ANADIAG Hungary Kft., Komárom, Hungary Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: HU14IEZEAMX001A KIIIA 6.1.3/088 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* HU
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Hoffmann é, P.Z.	2015	Efficacy of MCW-2222 on <i>Diabrotica virgifera virgifera</i> in maize in Hungary in 2014 Növénypathyka Kft., Kaposvár, Hungary Report No.: NP63 2014 Sponsor No.: HU14IEZEAMX001B KIIIA 6.1.3/089 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* HU

Data point	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, KCP 6.4.1	Varga, A.	2015	Efficacy of MCW-2222 on <i>Ostrinia nubilalis</i> in maize in Hungary in 2015 SynTech Research Hungary Kft, Szombathely, Hungary Report No.: SRHU15-220-135IE Sponsor No.: HU15IEZEAMX102A KIIIA 6.1.3/090 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* HU
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Magyar, B.	2015	Efficacy of MCW-2222 on <i>Ostrinia nubilalis</i> in maize in Hungary in 2015 Fructika Kft, Tiszakanyár, Hungary Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: HU15IEZEAMX102B KIIIA 6.1.3/091 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* HU
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Eberhart, A.	2014	Determination of efficacy of MCW-2222 SL against <i>Diabrotica virgifera virgifera</i> in maize, 1 site in Romania 2014 Eurofins Agrosience Services SRL, Timisoara, Romania Report No.: S14-02549-01 Sponsor No.: RO14IEZEAMX043A KIIIA 6.1.3/092 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	MAROM (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Eberhart, A.	2014	Determination of efficacy of MCW-2222 SL against <i>Diabrotica virgifera virginifera</i> in maize, 1 site in Romania 2014 Eurofins Agrosience Services SRL, Timisoara, Romania Report No.: S14-02549-02 Sponsor No.: RO14IEZEAMX043B KIIIA 6.1.3/093 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	MAROM (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Eberhart, A.	2014	Determination of efficacy of MCW-2222 SL against <i>Diabrotica virgifera virginifera</i> in maize, 1 site in Romania 2014 Eurofins Agrosience Services SRL, Timisoara, Romania Report No.: S14-02549-03 Sponsor No.: RO14IEZEAMX043C KIIIA 6.1.3/094	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	MAROM (Adama)

Data point	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
			GLP / GEP Unpublished				
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Eberhart, A.	2015	Determination of Efficacy of MCW-2222 SL against <i>Ostrinia nubilalis</i> in Maize, 1 Site in Romania 2015 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Timișoara, Romania Report No.: S15-03090-01 Sponsor No.: RO15IEZEAMX031A KIIIA 6.1.3/095 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* RO
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Eberhart, A.	2015	Determination of Efficacy of MCW-2222 SL against <i>Ostrinia nubilalis</i> in Maize, 1 Site in Romania 2015 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Timișoara, Romania Report No.: S15-03090-02 Sponsor No.: RO15IEZEAMX031B KIIIA 6.1.3/096 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* RO
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Eberhart, A.	2015	Determination of Efficacy of MCW-2222 SL against <i>Ostrinia nubilalis</i> in Maize, 1 Site in Romania 2015 Eurofins Agroscience Services S.R.L., Timișoara, Romania Report No.: S15-03090-03 Sponsor No.: RO15IEZEAMX031C KIIIA 6.1.3/097 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* RO
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Soltesz, J.	2015	Efficacy of MCW-2222 on <i>Diabrotica virgifera virgifera</i> in maize, Slovakia 2014 Fyse, s.r.o. AgroLab, Kolare, Slovakia Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: SK14IEZEAMX001A KIIIA 6.1.3/098 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Agrovita(Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Soltesz, J.	2015	Efficacy of MCW-2222 on <i>Diabrotica virgifera virgifera</i> in maize, Slovakia 2014 Fyse, s.r.o. AgroLab, Kolare, Slovakia Report No.: not stated	N	Y	Data protection started with:	Agrovita (Adama)

Data point	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
			Sponsor No.: SK14IEZEAMX001B KIIIA 6.1.3/099 GLP / GEP Unpublished			R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Tóth, F.	2015	Efficacy of MCW-2222 on <i>Diabrotica virgifera virgifera</i> in maize, Slovakia 2014 Gemerprodukt Valice OVD, Rimavská Sobota, Slovakia Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: SK14IEZEAMX001C KIIIA 6.1.3/100 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* SK
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Hornik, P.	2013	Analysis of efficacy to MCW-2222 SL on Colorado Beetle in potato in the Czech republic in 2013 ZS Nechanice, s.r.o., Nechanice, Czech Republic Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: CZ13IESOLTU026A KIIIA 6.1.3/101 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Agrovita (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Spurova, R.	2013	Efficacy of MCW-2222 in potato ZS Trutnov s.r.o., Trutnov, Czech Republic Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: CZ13IESOLTU026B KIIIA 6.1.3/102 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Agrovita (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Heryán, J.	2013	Analysis of efficacy to MCW-2222 SL on aphids and Colorado beetle in potato Zemedelska ZS Kujavy, s.r.o., Kujavy, Czech Republic Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: CZ13IESOLTU026C KIIIA 6.1.3/103 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Agrovita (Adama)

Data point	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, KCP 6.4.1	Hornik, P.	2014	Analysis of efficacy to MCW-2222 sl on colorado beetle in potato in the Czech ZS Nechanice, Nechanice, Czech Republic Republic in 2014 Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: CZ14IESOLTU009A KIIIA 6.1.3/104 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Agrovita (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Daňa, P.	2014	Analysis of Efficacy to MCW-2222 SL on Colorado Beetle in Potato in the Czech Republic in 2014 Zemedelska ZS Kujavy, s.r.o., Kujavy, Czech Republic Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: CZ14IESOLTU009B KIIIA 6.1.3/105 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Agrovita (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Spurova, R.	2014	Analysis of efficacy to MCW-2222 SL on Colorado beetle in potato in the Czech Republic in 2014 Zkusebni stanice Trutnov s.r.o., Trutnov, Czech Republic Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: CZ14IESOLTU009C KIIIA 6.1.3/106 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	MCW (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Zickart, U.	2014	Analysis of efficacy to MCW-2222 SL on Colorado beetle in potato, Germany 2014 BioChem agrar GmbH, Machern, Germany Report No.: 14 1061 1738 Sponsor No.: DE14IESOLTU320M KIIIA 6.1.3/107 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* DE
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Zickart, U.	2015	Analysis of Efficacy to MCW-2222 SL on Colorado beetle in potato, Germany 2015 BioChem agrar GmbH, Machern, Germany Report No.: 14 1062 1762	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* DE

Data point	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
			Sponsor No.: DE15IESOLTU320A KIIIA 6.1.3/108 GLP / GEP Unpublished				
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Zickart, U.	2015	Analysis of Efficacy to MCW-2222 SL on Colorado beetle in potato, Germany 2015 BioChem agrar GmbH, Machern, Germany Report No.: 14 1047 1763 Sponsor No.: DE15IESOLTU320B KIIIA 6.1.3/109 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* DE
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Zickart, U.	2015	Analysis of Efficacy to MCW-2222 SL on Colorado beetle in potato, Germany 2015 BioChem agrar GmbH NL Agroplan, Uedem, Germany Report No.: 14 1069 5061 Sponsor No.: DE15IESOLTU320C KIIIA 6.1.3/110 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* DE
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Kukula-Mlynarcz yk, A.	2010	The evaluation of efficacy and selectivity of Acetamiprid 200 SL for the control of <i>Leptinotarsa decemlineata</i> on potato BIOTEK Agriculture Polska Sp. z o o., Oława, Poland Report No.: DPE 10/321/IOK-01 Sponsor No.: not stated KIIIA 6.1.3/111 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	MCW (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Kukula-Mlynarcz yk, A.	2010	The evaluation of efficacy and selectivity of Acetamiprid 200 SL for the control of <i>Leptinotarsa decemlineata</i> on potato BIOTEK Agriculture Polska Sp. z o o., Oława, Poland Report No.: DPE 10/321/IOK-02 Sponsor No.: not stated KIIIA 6.1.3/112 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	MCW (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Furman-Fratczak, K.	2014	The evaluation of efficacy and selectivity of MCW- 2222 (Acetamiprid 200 SI) for the control of <i>Leptinotarsa</i>	N	Y	Data protection	MCW (Adama)

Data point	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>decemlineata</i> on potato BIOTEK Agriculture Polska Sp. z o o., Oława, Poland Report No.: DPE 13/632/IOK-01 Sponsor No.: PL13IESOLTU204A KIIIA 6.1.3/113 GLP / GEP Unpublished			started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Furman-Fratczak, K.	2014	The evaluation of efficacy and selectivity of MCW- 2222 (Acetamiprid 200 SL) for the control of <i>Leptinotarsa decemlineata</i> on potato BIOTEK Agriculture Polska Sp. z o o., Oława, Poland Report No.: DPE 13/632/IOK-02 Sponsor No.: PL13IESOLTU204B KIIIA 6.1.3/114 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	MCW (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Plawusze wski, M.	2013	Determination of efficacy of MCW-2222 against Colorado potato beetle in potato Eurofins Agrosience Services Sp. z o. o. Szamotuły, Poland Report No.: S13-02850-01 Sponsor No.: PL13IESOLTU204C KIIIA 6.1.3/115 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	MCW (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Plawusze wski, M.	2013	Determination of efficacy of MCW-2222 against Colorado potato beetle on potato Eurofins Agrosience Services Sp. z o. o., Szamotuły, Poland Report No.: S13-02850-02 Sponsor No.: PL13IESOLTU204D KIIIA 6.1.3/116 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	MCW (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Meronka, K.	2015	Efficacy of MCW-2222 SL applied in the control of Colorado beetle <i>Leptinotarsa decemlineata</i> in potato, Poland 2014 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Błędów Poland Report No.: 13_01_F14_025	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA*

Data point	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
			Sponsor No.: PL14IESOLTU108A KIIIA 6.1.3/118 GLP / GEP Unpublished				
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Szemende ra, A.	2014	Efficacy of MCW-2222 SL applied in the control of Colorado beetle <i>Leptinotarsa decemlineata</i> in potato, Poland 2014 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Błędów Poland Report No.: 13_PROT_F14 Sponsor No.: PL14IESOLTU108B KIIIA 6.1.3/119 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* PL
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Kukuła, A.	2014	The evaluation of efficacy and selectivity of MCW- 2222 (Acetamipryd 200 SL) for the control of pests on potato AGRECO Sp. z o.o., Oława, Poland Report No.: 14ADA0117-1 Sponsor No.: PL14IESOLTU108C KIIIA 6.1.3/120 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA*
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Kukuła, A.	2014	The evaluation of efficacy and selectivity of MCW- 2222 (Acetamipryd 200 SL) for the control of pests on potato AGRECO Sp. z o.o., Oława, Poland Report No.: 14ADA0117-2 Sponsor No.: PL14IESOLTU108D KIIIA 6.1.3/121 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA*
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Głowacki, G.	2014	Determination of efficacy of MCW-2222 against Colorado potato beetle (<i>Leptinotarsa decemlineata</i>) in potato Eurofins Agrosience Services Sp. z o.o., Kaźmierz, Poland Report No.: S14-02126-01 Sponsor No.: PL14IESOLTU108E KIIIA 6.1.3/122 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* PL

Data point	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, KCP 6.4.1	Głowacki, G.	2014	Determination of efficacy of MCW-2222 against Colorado potato beetle potato Eurofins Agrosience Services Sp. z o.o., Kaźmierz, Poland Report No.: S13-02126-02 Sponsor No.: PL14IESOLTU108F KIIIA 6.1.3/123 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* PL
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Furman-Frączak, K.	2015	The evaluation of efficacy and selectivity of MCW- 2222 (Acetamiprid 200 SL) for the control of <i>Leptinotarsa decemlineata</i> on potato BIOTEK Agriculture Polska Sp. Z o.o., Oława, Polska Report No.: 711/1/1/1 Sponsor No.: PL14IESOLTU108G KIIIA 6.1.3/124 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* PL
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Eberhart, A.	2014	Determination of Efficacy of MCW-2222 SL against Colorado Beetle and/or Aphids in Potatoes, 5 Sites in Romania 2014 Eurofins Agrosience Service GmbH, Stade, Germany Report No.: S14-02548-01 Sponsor No.: RO14IESOLTU044A KIIIA 6.1.3/125 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* RO
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Eberhart, A.	2014	Determination of Efficacy of MCW-2222 SL against Colorado Beetle and/or Aphids in Potatoes, 1 Site in Romania 2014 Eurofins Agrosience Service GmbH, Stade, Germany Report No.: S14-02548-02 Sponsor No.: RO14IESOLTU044B KIIIA 6.1.3/126 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* RO
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Eberhart, A.	2014	Determination of Efficacy of MCW-2222 SL against Colorado Beetle and/or Aphids in Potatoes, 1 Site in Romania 2014 Eurofins Agrosience Service GmbH, Stade, Germany Report No.: S14-02548-03	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* RO

Data point	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
			Sponsor No.: RO14IESOLTU044C KIIIA 6.1.3/127 GLP / GEP Unpublished				
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Hermezui, M.	2014	Report on biological evaluation of Product: MCW- 2222 SL National Institute of Research and Development for Potato and Sugar Beet, Braşov, Romania Report No.: 2035/05.11.2014 Sponsor No.: RO14IESOLTU044D Not KIIIA 6.1.3/128 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA*
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Hermezui, M.	2014	Report on biological evaluation of Product: MCW- 2222 SL National Institute of Research and Development for Potato and Sugar Beet, Braşov, Romania Report No.: 2036/05.11.2014 Sponsor No.: RO14IESOLTU044E Not KIIIA 6.1.3/129 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA*
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Eberhart, A.	2015	Determination of Efficacy of MCW-2222 SL against Colorado Potato Beetles in Potato, 1 Site in Romania 2015 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Timişoara, Romania Report No.: S15-03079-01 Sponsor No.: RO15IESOLTU012A KIIIA 6.1.3/130 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* RO
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Eberhart, A.	2015	Determination of Efficacy of MCW-2222 SL against Colorado Potato Beetles in Potato, 1 Site in Romania 2015 Eurofins Agrosience Services S.R.L., Timişoara, Romania Report No.: S15-03079-02 Sponsor No.: RO15IESOLTU012B KIIIA 6.1.3/131 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* RO
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Forgacova , L.	2013	Analysis of efficacy of MCW-2222 SL against Colorado beetle on potato, Slovakia 2013	N	Y	Data protection	Agrovita (Adama)

Data point	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
			Ing. L'ubica Forgáčová, Boliarov, Slovakia Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: SK13IESOLTU001A KIIIA 6.1.3/132 GLP / GEP Unpublished			started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Schenke, E.	2013	Analysis of efficacy of MCW-2222 SL against Colorado beetle on potato, Slovakia 2013 Fyse, s.r.o. AgroLab Kolare, Slovakia Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: SK13IESOLTU001B KIIIA 6.1.3/133 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Agrovita (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Forgacova , L.	2014	Analysis of efficacy to MCW-2222 SL against Colorado beetle on potato Ing. Lubica Forgacova, Boliarov, Slovakia Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: SK14IESOLTU001A KIIIA 6.1.3/134 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA*
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Forgacova , L.	2014	Analysis of efficacy to MCW-2222 SL against Colorado beetle on potato Ing. Lubica Forgacova, Boliarov, Slovakia Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: SK14IESOLTU001B KIIIA 6.1.3/135 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA*
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Ceri, L.	2015	Analysis of efficacy to MCW-2222 SL on Colorado beetle in potato, Slovakia 2014 Fyse, s.r.o. AgroLab, Kolare, Slovakia Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: SK14IESOLTU001C KIIIA 6.1.3/136 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA*

Data point	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, KCP 6.4.1	Vendula, H.	2011	Pollen beetle, cabbage seed weevil and pod midge on rape Zemservis ZS Domaninek s.r.o., Bystrice nad Pernštejnem, Czech Republic Report No.: EZ-DOM-I-11/12 Sponsor No.: not stated KIIIA 6.1.3/169 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA*
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Fiala, T.	2011	Determination of efficacy MCW-2222 against pollen beetle, cabbage seed weevil and pod midge on winter rape ZS Kluky, spol. s.r.o., Kluky, Czech Republic Report No.: EZ-KLU-I-11/13 Sponsor No.: not stated KIIIA 6.1.3/170 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA*
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Spurova, R.	2011	Pollen beetle, cabbage seed weevil and pod midge on rape ZS Trutnov s.r.o., Trutnov, Czech Republic Report No.: EZ-TRU-I-11/17 Sponsor No.: not stated KIIIA 6.1.3/171 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA*
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Fiala, T.	2012	Analysis of efficacy of MCW-2222 SL on biting insects and in oil seed rape ZS Kluky, spol. s.r.o., Kluky, Czech Republic Report No.: EZ-KLU-I-12/01 Sponsor No.: not stated KIIIA 6.1.3/172 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA*
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Trnka, M.	2012	Analysis of efficacy of MCW-2222 SL on biting insects and oil seed rape Zemservis ZS Domaninek s.r.o., Bystrice nad Pernštejnem, Czech Republic Report No.: EZ-DOM-I-12/04 Sponsor No.: not stated KIIIA 6.1.3/173	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA*

Data point	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
			GLP / GEP Unpublished				
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Spurova, R.	2012	Analysis of efficacy to Mavrik, Pyrinex CS, further insecticides and combinations on pyrethroid-resistant pollen beetle (<i>Meligethes aeneus</i>) ZS Trutnov s.r.o., Trutnov, Czech Republic Report No.: EZ-TRU-I-12/07 Sponsor No.: not stated KIIIA 6.1.3/174 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Agrovita (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Cáp, J.	2012	Analysis of efficacy of MCW-2222 SL on biting insects and in oil seed rape ZS Nechanice, s.r.o., Nechanice, Czech Republic Report No.: EZ-NEC-I-12/16 Sponsor No.: not stated KIIIA 6.1.3/175 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA*
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Cáp, J.	2013	Efficacy evaluation of MCW-2222 against biting insects on oil seed rape in the Czech Republic in 2013 ZS Nechanice, s.r.o., Nechanice, Czech Republic Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: CZ13IEBRNN023A KIIIA 6.1.3/176 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Agrovita (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Trnka, M.	2013	Efficacy evaluation of MCW-2222 against biting insects on oil seed rape in the Czech Republic in 2013 Zemservis ZS Domaninek s.r.o., Bystrice nad Pernštejnem, Czech Republic Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: CZ13IEBRNN023D KIIIA 6.1.3/178 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Agrovita (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Cáp, J.	2013	Efficacy evaluation of MCW-2222 against pollen beetle on oil seed rape in the Czech Republic in 2013	N	Y	Data protection	Agrovita (Adama)

Data point	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
			ZS Nechanice, s.r.o., Nechanice, Czech Republic Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: CZ13IEBRNN023F KIIIA 6.1.3/180 GLP / GEP Unpublished			started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Trnka, M.	2013	Evaluation of MCW-2222 against pollen beetle on oil seed rape in the Czech Republic in 2013 Zemservis ZS Domaninek s.r.o., Bystrice nad Pernštejnem, Czech Republic Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: CZ13IEBRNN023I KIIIA 6.1.3/181 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Agrovita (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Cáp, J.	2014	Efficacy evaluation of MCW-2222 against biting insects on oil seed rape in the Czech Republic in 2014 ZS Nechanice, s.r.o., Nechanice, Czech Republic Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: CZ14IEBRSNW005A KIIIA 6.1.3/182 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Agrovita (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Subr, J.	2014	Analysis of Efficacy to MCW-2222 SL on biting insects in oil seed rape in the Czech Republic in 2014 Zkusebni stanice Trutnov s.r.o., Trutnov, Czech Republic Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: CZ14IEBRSNW005B KIIIA 6.1.3/183 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Agrovita (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Cáp, J.	2014	Efficacy evaluation of MCW-2222 against pollen beetle on oil seed rape in the Czech Republic in 2014 ZS Nechanice, s.r.o., Nechanice, Czech Republic Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: CZ14IEBRSNW006A KIIIA 6.1.3/184 GLP / GEP	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Agrovita (Adama)

Data point	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
			Unpublished				
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Spurova, R.	2014	Efficacy of MCW-2222 SL on MELIAE in oil seed rape. ZS Trutnov s.r.o., Trutnov, Czech Republic Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: CZ14IEBRSNW006B KIIIA 6.1.3/185 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Agrovita (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Čáp, J.	2014	Efficacy evaluation of MCW-2222 on <i>Ceutorhynchus assimilis</i> and <i>Dasineura brassicae</i> on oil seed rape in the Czech Republic in 2014 ZS Nechanice, s.r.o., Nechanice, Czech Republic Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: CZ14IEBRSNW007A KIIIA 6.1.3/186 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Agrovita (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Subr, J.	2015	Analysis of Efficacy to MCW-2222 SL on <i>Ceutorhynchus assimilis</i> and <i>Dasineura brassicae</i> in oil seed rape in the Czech Republic in 2014 Zkusebni stanice Trutnov s.r.o., Trutnov, Czech Republic Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: CZ14IEBRSNW007B KIIIA 6.1.3/187 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Agrovita (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Čáp, J.	2015	Analysis of Efficacy to MCW-2222 SL on biting insects in oil seed rape, Czech Republic 2015 ZS Nechanice, Nechanice, Czech Republic Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: CZ15IEBRSNW001A KIIIA 6.1.3/188 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* CZ
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Subr, J.	2015	Analysis of Efficacy to MCW-2222 SL on biting insects in oil seed rape, Czech Republic 2015 Zkusebni stanice Trutnov s.r.o., Trutnov, Czech Republic Report No.: not stated	N	Y	Data protection started with:	ADAMA* CZ

Data point	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
			Sponsor No.: CZ15IEBRSNW001B KIIIA 6.1.3/189 GLP / GEP Unpublished			R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Čáp, J.	2015	Analysis of Efficacy to MCW-2222 SL on biting insects in oil seed rape, Czech Republic2015 ZS Nechanice, Nechanice, Czech Republic Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: CZ15IEBRSNW001D KIIIA 6.1.3/190 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* CZ
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Subr, J.	2015	Analysis of Efficacy to MCW-2222 SL on biting insects in oil seed rape, Czech Republic2015 Zkusebni stanice Trutnov s.r.o., Trutnov, Czech Republic Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: CZ15IEBRSNW001E KIIIA 6.1.3/191 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* CZ
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Čáp, J.	2015	Analysis of Efficacy to MCW-2222 SL on biting insects in oil seed rape, Czech Republic2015 ZS Nechanice, Nechanice, Czech Republic Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: CZ15IEBRSNW001G KIIIA 6.1.3/192 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* CZ
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Subr, J.	2015	Analysis of Efficacy to MCW-2222 SL on biting insects in oil seed rape, Czech Republic 2015 SL ON BITING INSECTS IN OIL SEED RAPE, CZECH REPUBLIC 2015 Zkusebni stanice Trutnov s.r.o., Trutnov, Czech Republic Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: CZ15IEBRSNW001H KIIIA 6.1.3/193 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* CZ

Data point	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, KCP 6.4.1	Čáp, J.	2015	Analysis of Efficacy to MCW-2222 SL on biting insects in oil seed rape, Czech Republic 2015 ZS Nechanice, Nechanice, Czech Republic Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: CZ15IEBRSNW001I KIIIA 6.1.3/194 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* CZ
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Zickart, U.	2011	Efficacy of Mavrik, Pyrinex 25 CS, and MCW-2222 on pyrethroid resistant blossom beetles (<i>Meligethes aeneus</i>) on winter oil seed rape BioChem agrar GmbH, Machern OT Gerichshain, Germany Report No.: 11 1067 482 Sponsor No.: FCS11-3026-E03 KIIIA 6.1.3/195 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	FCS (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Rohr, J.	2013	Analysis of efficacy of MCW-2222 SL on biting insects and <i>Dasineura brassicae</i> in oil seed rape Agrartest GmbH, Aarbergen-Panrod, Germany Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: FCS12-3101-E02 KIIIA 6.1.3/196 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	FCS (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Rohr, J.	2014	Analysis of efficacy to MCW-2222 SL on <i>Ceutorhynchus napi/quadridentis</i> in winter oil seed rape Agrartest GmbH, Aarbergen-Panrod, Germany Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: DE14IEBRSNW320A KIIIA 6.1.3/197 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	FCS (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Rohr, J.	2014	Analysis of efficacy to MCW-2222 SL on <i>Meligethes aeneus</i> in oil seed rape Agrartest GmbH, Aarbergen-Panrod, Germany Report No.: not stated	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	FCS (Adama)

Data point	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
			Sponsor No.: DE14IEBRSNW320C KIIIA 6.1.3/198 GLP / GEP Unpublished				
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Zickart, U.	2014	Analysis of efficacy to MCW-2222 SL on brassica pod midge (DASYBR) in oil seed rape, Germany 2014 BioChem agrar GmbH, Goch-Nierswalde, Germany Report No.: 14 1064 1669 Sponsor No.: DE14IEBRSNW320H KIIIA 6.1.3/199 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* DE
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Rohr, J.	2015	Analysis of Efficacy to MCW-2222 SL on stem weevil in oil seed rape, Germany 2015 Agrartest GmbH, Aarbergen-Panrod, Germany Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: DE15IEBRSNW320A KIIIA 6.1.3/200 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* DE
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Rohr, J.	2015	Analysis of Efficacy to MCW-2222 SL on pollen beetle in oil seed rape, Germany 2015 Agrartest GmbH, Aarbergen-Panrod, Germany Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: DE15IEBRSNW320E KIIIA 6.1.3/201 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* DE
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Perner, J.	2015	Efficacy analysis of MCW-2222 SL against pollen beetles (<i>Meligethes aeneus</i>) in oil seed rape - Germany, 2015 U.A.S. GmbH, Jena, Germany Report No.: 077_15_Z Sponsor No.: DE15IEBRSNW320G KIIIA 6.1.3/202 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* DE

Data point	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, KCP 6.4.1	von Hörster, D.	2015	Analysis of the Efficacy of MCW-2222 SL on Pollen Beetle in oil seed rape Fiel Research Support, Wunstorf, Germany Report No.: FRS034/15 Sponsor No.: DE15IEBRSNW320H KIIIA 6.1.3/203 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* DE
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	von Hörster, D.	2015	Analysis of the Efficacy of MCW-2222 SL on Cabbage Seed Weevil and Blossom Beetle in oil seed rape Field Research Support, Wunstorf, Germany Report No.: FRS035/15 Sponsor No.: DE15IEBRSNW320K KIIIA 6.1.3/204 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* DE
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Gajek, D.	2012	Efficacy of MCW-2222 in the control of <i>Meligethes aeneus</i> on winter rape, Poland 2012 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Błędów Poland Report No.: 036_01_F12_079 Sponsor No.: not stated KIIIA 6.1.3/212 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	MCW (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Gajek, D.	2012	Efficacy of MCW-2222 in the control of <i>Meligethes aeneus</i> on winter rape, Poland 2012 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Błędów Poland Report No.: 036_02_F12_080 Sponsor No.: not stated KIIIA 6.1.3/213 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	MCW (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Gajek, D.	2012	Efficacy of MCW-2222 in the control of <i>Meligethes aeneus</i> on winter rape, Poland 2012 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Błędów Poland Report No.: 036_03_F12_081 Sponsor No.: not stated KIIIA 6.1.3/214	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	MCW (Adama)

Data point	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
			GLP / GEP Unpublished				
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Gajek, D.	2012	Efficacy of MCW-2222 in the control of <i>Meligethes aeneus</i> on winter rape, Poland 2012 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Błędów Poland Report No.: 036_04_F12_082 Sponsor No.: not stated KIIIA 6.1.3/215 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	MCW (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Szemende ra, A.	2013	Efficacy of MCW-2222 in the control of <i>Ceutorhynchus napi</i> and <i>Ceutorhynchus quadridens</i> in winter rape, Poland 2013 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Błędów, Poland Report No.: 10_01_F13_019 Sponsor No.: PL13IEBRSNW201A KIIIA 6.1.3/216 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	MCW (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Szemende ra, A.	2013	Efficacy of MCW-2222 in the control of <i>Ceutorhynchus napi</i> and <i>Ceutorhynchus quadridens</i> in winter rape, Poland 2013 Fertico Sp. z o.o., Błędów, Poland Report No.: 10_02_F13_020 Sponsor No.: PL13IEBRSNW201B KIIIA 6.1.3/217 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	MCW (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Furman-Fratczak, K.	2014	The evaluation of efficacy and selectivity of MCW- 2222 (Acetamiprid 200 SL) for the control of <i>Ceutorhynchus napi</i> and <i>Ceutorhynchus quadridens</i> on winter oilseed rape BIOTEK Agriculture Polska Sp. z o.o., Oława, Poland Report No.: DPE 13/630/IOL-01 Sponsor No.: PL13IEBRSNW201C KIIIA 6.1.3/218 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	MCW (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Furman-Fratczak, K.	2014	The evaluation of efficacy and selectivity of MCW- 2222 (Acetamiprid 200 SL) for the control of <i>Ceutorhynchus napi</i> and <i>Ceutorhynchus quadridens</i> on winter oilseed rape	N	Y	Data protection started with:	MCW (Adama)

Data point	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 Polska Sp. z o o., Oława, Poland Report No.: DPE 13/630/IOL-02 Sponsor No.: PL13IEBRSNW201D KIIIA 6.1.3/219 GLP / GEP Unpublished			R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Furman-Fratczak, K.	2013	The evaluation of efficacy and selectivity of MCW- 2222 (Acetamiprid 200 SL) for the control of <i>Ceutorhynchus napi</i> and <i>Ceutorhynchus quadridens</i> on winter oilseed rape BIOTEK Agriculture Polska Sp. z o o., Oława, Poland Report No.: DPE 13/631/IOL-01 Sponsor No.: PL13IEBRSNW202A KIIIA 6.1.3/220 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	MCW (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Furman-Fratczak, K.	2013	The evaluation of efficacy and selectivity of MCW- 2222 (Acetamiprid 200 SL) for the control of <i>Ceutorhynchus napi</i> and <i>Ceutorhynchus quadridens</i> on winter oilseed rape BIOTEK Agriculture Polska Sp. z o o., Oława, Poland Report No.: DPE 13/631/IOL-02 Sponsor No.: PL13IEBRSNW202B KIIIA 6.1.3/221 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	MCW (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Chermuła, L.	2014	Determination of efficacy of MCW-2222 used singly against blossom beetle on winter rape Eurofins Agrosience Services Sp. z o o., Szamotuły, Poland Report No.: S13-02601-02 Sponsor No.: PL13IEBRSNW202C KIIIA 6.1.3/222 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	AGAN PL (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Chermuła, L.	2014	Determination of efficacy of MCW-2222 used singly against Blossom beetle on winter rape. Eurofins Agrosience Services Sp. z o o., Szamotuły, Poland Report No.: S13-02601-03 Sponsor No.: PL13IEBRSNW202D KIIIA 6.1.3/223	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	AGAN PL (Adama)

Data point	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
			GLP / GEP Unpublished				
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Chermuła, L.	2013	Determination of efficacy of MCW-2222 used singly and in mixture against cabbage seed weevil and Brassica pod midge on winter rape Eurofins Agrosience Services Sp. z o o., Szamotuły, Poland Report No.: S13-02602-01 Sponsor No.: PL13IEBRSNW203A KIIIA 6.1.3/224 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	AGAN PL (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Chermuła, L.	2014	Determination of efficacy of MCW-2222 used singly and in mixture with Mavrik 240 EW against cabbage seed weevil and Brassica pod midge in winter rape Eurofins Agrosience Services Sp. z o o., Szamotuły, Poland Report No.: S13-02602-02 Sponsor No.: PL13IEBRSNW203B KIIIA 6.1.3/225 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	AGAN PL (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Szemende ra, A.	2013	Efficacy of MCW-2222 in the control of <i>Ceutorhynchus assimilis</i> and <i>Dasineura brassicae</i> on winter oil seed rape, Poland 2013 Fertico Sp. z o o., Błędów, Poland Report No.: 11_01_F13_021 Sponsor No.: PL13IEBRSNW203C KIIIA 6.1.3/226 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	MCW (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Szemende ra, A.	2013	Efficacy of MCW-2222 in the control of <i>Ceutorhynchus assimilis</i> and <i>Dasineura brassicae</i> on winter oil seed rape, Poland 2013 Fertico Sp. z o o., Błędów, Poland Report No.: 11_02_F13_022 Sponsor No.: PL13IEBRSNW203D KIIIA 6.1.3/227 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	MCW (Adama)

Data point	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, KCP 6.4.1	Furman-Fratczak, K.	2015	The evaluation of efficacy and selectivity of MCW- 2222 (Acetamiprid 200 SL) for the control of <i>Ceutorhynchus napi</i> and <i>Ceutorhynchus quadriens</i> on winter oil seed rape BIOTEK Agriculture Polska Sp. z o o., Oława, Poland Report No.: DPE 14/682/IOL-01 Sponsor No.: PL14IEBRSNW301A KIIIA 6.1.3/228 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA*
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Furman-Fratczak, K.	2015	The evaluation of efficacy and selectivity of MCW- 2222 (Acetamiprid 200 SL) for the control of <i>Ceutorhynchus napi</i> and <i>Ceutorhynchus quadriens</i> on winter oil seed rape BIOTEK Agriculture Polska Sp. z o o., Oława, Poland Report No.: DPE 14/682/IOL-02 Sponsor No.: PL14IEBRSNW301B KIIIA 6.1.3/229 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA*
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Głowacki, G.	2014	Determination of the efficacy of MCW-2222 (Acetamiprid 200 g/L) against cabbage stem weevil (<i>Ceutorhynchus napi</i>) on the winter rape Eurofins Agrosience Services Sp. z o.o., Kaźmierz, Poland Report No.: S14-01801-01 Sponsor No.: PL14IEBRSNW301C KIIIA 6.1.3/230 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* PL
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Głowacki, G.	2014	Determination of efficacy of MCW-2222 (Acetamiprid 200 g/l) used against cabbage seed weevil and cabbage seedstalk curculio in winter rape Eurofins Agrosience Services Sp. z o.o., Kaźmierz, Poland Report No.: S14-01801-02 Sponsor No.: PL14IEBRSNW301D KIIIA 6.1.3/231 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* PL
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Furman-Fratczak, K.	2015	The evaluation of efficacy and selectivity of MCW- 2222 (Acetamiprid 200 SL) for the control of <i>Meligethes aeneus</i> on	N	Y	Data protection	ADAMA*

Data point	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
			winter oil seed rape BIOTEK Agriculture Polska Sp. z o o., Oława, Poland Report No.: DPE 14/684/IOL-01 Sponsor No.: PL14IEBRSNW302A KIIIA 6.1.3/232 GLP / GEP Unpublished			started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Furman-Fratczak, K.	2015	The evaluation of efficacy and selectivity of MCW- 2222 (Acetamiprid 200 SL) for the control of <i>Meligethes aeneus</i> on winter oil seed rape BIOTEK Agriculture Polska Sp. z o o., Oława, Poland Report No.: DPE 14/684/IOL-02 Sponsor No.: PL14IEBRSNW302B KIIIA 6.1.3/233 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA*
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Pawlak, A.	2014	Analysis of the Efficacy of MCW-2222 SL on <i>Meligethes aeneus</i> in oil seed rape Staphyt Sp. Z o.o., Poznań, Poland Report No.: APK-14-18723-PL01 Sponsor No.: PL14IEBRSNW302C KIIIA 6.1.3/234 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* PL
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Pawlak, A.	2014	Analysis of the Efficacy of MCW-2222 SL on <i>Meligethes aeneus</i> in oil seed rape Staphyt Sp. Z o.o., Poznań, Poland Report No.: APK-14-18723-PL02 Sponsor No.: PL14IEBRSNW302D KIIIA 6.1.3/235 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* PL
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Głowacki, G.	2014	Determination of efficacy of MCW-2222 used singly against blossom beetle on winter rape Eurofins Agrosience Services Sp. z o.o., Kaźmierz, Poland Report No.: S14-01850-01 Sponsor No.: PL14IEBRSNW302E KIIIA 6.1.3/236	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* PL

Data point	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
			GLP / GEP Unpublished				
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Głowacki, G.	2014	Determination of the efficacy of MCW-2222 (Acetamiprid 200 g/L) against blossom beetle (<i>Meligethes aeneus</i>) on the winter rape Eurofins Agrosience Services Sp. z o.o., Kaźmierz, Poland Report No.: S14-01850-02 Sponsor No.: PL14IEBRSNW302F KIIIA 6.1.3/237 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* PL
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Furman-Fratczak, K.	2015	The evaluation of efficacy and selectivity of MCW- 2222 (Acetamiprid 200 SL) for the control of <i>Ceutorhynchus assimilis</i> and <i>Dasineura brassicae</i> on winter oil seed rape BIOTEK Agriculture Polska Sp. z o o., Oława, Poland Report No.: DPE 14/683/IOL-01 Sponsor No.: PL14IEBRSNW303A KIIIA 6.1.3/238 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA*
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Furman-Fratczak, K.	2015	The evaluation of efficacy and selectivity of MCW- 2222 (Acetamiprid 200 SL) for the control of <i>Ceutorhynchus assimilis</i> and <i>Dasineura brassicae</i> on winter oil seed rape BIOTEK Agriculture Polska Sp. z o o., Oława, Poland Report No.: DPE 14/683/IOL-02 Sponsor No.: PL14IEBRSNW303B KIIIA 6.1.3/239 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA*
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Głowacki, G.	2014	Determination of efficacy of MCW-2222 used against cabbage seed weevil and Brassica pod midge on winter rape Eurofins Agrosience Services Sp. z o.o., Kaźmierz, Poland Report No.: S14-01851-01 Sponsor No.: PL14IEBRSNW303C KIIIA 6.1.3/240 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* PL

Data point	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, KCP 6.4.1	Głowacki, G.	2014	Determination of efficacy of MCW-2222 used against cabbage seed weevil and Brassica pod midge on winter rape Eurofins Agrosience Services Sp. z o.o., Kaźmierz, Poland Report No.: S14-01851-02 Sponsor No.: PL14IEBRSNW303D KIIIA 6.1.3/241 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* PL
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Furman-Frątczak, K.	2015	The evaluation of efficacy and selectivity of MCW- 2222 (acetamipryd 200 SL) for the control of <i>Ceutorhynchus napi</i> and <i>Ceutorhynchus quadridens</i> on winter oilseed rape BIOTEK Agriculture Polska Sp. Z o.o., Oława, Polska Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: PL15IEBRSNW301A KIIIA 6.1.3/242 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* PL
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Furman-Frątczak, K.	2015	The evaluation of efficacy and selectivity of MCW- 2222 (Acetamipryd 200 SL) for the control of <i>Ceutorhynchus napi</i> and <i>Ceutorhynchus quadridens</i> on winter oilseed rape BIOTEK Agriculture Polska Sp. Z o.o., Oława, Polska Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: PL15IEBRSNW301B KIIIA 6.1.3/243 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* PL
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Furman-Frątczak, K.	2015	The evaluation of efficacy and selectivity of MCW- 2222 (Acetamipryd 200 SL) for the control of <i>Ceutorhynchus napi</i> and <i>Ceutorhynchus quadridens</i> on winter oilseed rape BIOTEK Agriculture Polska Sp. Z o.o., Oława, Polska Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: PL15IEBRSNW301C KIIIA 6.1.3/244 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* PL
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Pawlak, A.	2015	Analysis of the Efficacy to MCW-222 on <i>Ceutorhynchus napi</i> in oil seed rape, Poland 2015 Staphyt Sp. z o.o., Poznań, Poland	N	Y	Data protection started with:	ADAMA* PL

Data point	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.: APK-15-21973-PL01 Sponsor No.: PL15IEBRSNW301D KIIIA 6.1.3/245 GLP / GEP Unpublished			R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Pawlak, A.	2015	Analysis of the Efficacy to MCW-222 on <i>Ceutorhynchus napi</i> in oil seed rape, Poland 2015 Staphyt Sp. z o.o., Poznań, Poland Report No.: APK-15-21973-PL02 Sponsor No.: PL15IEBRSNW301E KIIIA 6.1.3/246 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* PL
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Furman- Frączak, K.	2015	The evaluation of efficacy and selectivity of MCW- 2222 (acetamipryd 200 SL) for the control of <i>Ceutorhynchus napi</i> and <i>Ceutorhynchus quadridens</i> on winter oilseed rape BIOTEK Agriculture Polska Sp. Z o.o., Oława, Polska Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: PL15IEBRSNW302A KIIIA 6.1.3/247 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA*PL
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Pawlak, A.	2015	Analysis of the Efficacy to MCW-222 on <i>Ceutorhynchus quadridens</i> in oil seed rape, Poland 2015 Staphyt Sp. z o.o., Poznań, Poland Report No.: APK-15-22199-PL01 Sponsor No.: PL15IEBRSNW302B KIIIA 6.1.3/248 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA*PL
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Pawlak, A.	2015	Analysis of the Efficacy to MCW-222 on <i>Ceutorhynchus quadridens</i> in oil seed rape, Poland 2015 Staphyt Sp. z o.o., Poznań, Poland Report No.: APK-15-22199-PL02 Sponsor No.: PL15IEBRSNW302C KIIIA 6.1.3/249 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA*PL

Data point	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, KCP 6.4.1	Szemende ra, A.	2015	Efficacy of MCW - 2222 in the control of cabbage seed weevil <i>Ceutorhynchus assimilis</i> on winter oilseed rape, Poland 2015 Fertico Sp. z o o., Błędów, Poland Report No.: 035_01_F15_077 Sponsor No.: PL15IEBRSNW303A KIIIA 6.1.3/250 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* PL
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Szemende ra, A.	2015	Efficacy of MCW - 2222 in the control of cabbage seed weevil <i>Ceutorhynchus assimilis</i> on winter oilseed rape, Poland 2015 Fertico Sp. z o o., Błędów, Poland Report No.: 035_01_F15_078 Sponsor No.: PL15IEBRSNW303B KIIIA 6.1.3/251 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* PL
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Chermuła, Ł.	2015	Determination of efficacy of MCW-2222 used against cabbage seed weevil and Brassica pod midge on winter rape. Eurofins Agrosience Services Sp. z o. o., Kaźmierz, Poland Report No.: S15-02387-02 Sponsor No.: PL15IEBRSNW304B KIIIA 6.1.3/253 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* PL
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Ferenc, S.	2011	Control on rape blossom beetle and cabbage seed weevil in oilseed rape by foliar spraying Government Office of Nógrád County, Balassagyarmat, Hungary Report No.: Z 11/1/2011 Sponsor No.: not stated Not KIIIA 6.1.3/254 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* PL

Data point	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, KCP 6.4.1	Barasits, T.	2011	Efficacy and selectivity of MCW-2222 on insects of winter oilseed rape SynTech Research Hungary Kft, Táplánszentkereszt, Hungary Report No.: SRHU11-097-135IE Sponsor No.: not stated KIIIA 6.1.3/256 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	AGAN HU (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Barasits, T.	2011	Efficacy and selectivity of MCW-2222 on insects of winter oilseed rape SynTech Research Hungary Kft, Táplánszentkereszt, Hungary Report No.: SRHU11-098-135IE Sponsor No.: not stated KIIIA 6.1.3/257 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	AGAN HU (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	István, F.	2012	Analysis of the efficacy of MCW-2222 SL on biting insects and in oil seed rape Government Office of Vas Country, Szombathely, Hungary Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: HU12IE-MCW2222-BRSNW_Vas KIIIA 6.1.3/258 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	AGAN HU (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Ripka, G.	2012	Efficacy of insecticides against pollen beetle in oilseed-rape at flowering time Government Office of Nógrád County, Balassagyarmat, Hungary Report No.: HU12-IE-Mavrik-Mon-BRSNW Nóg Sponsor No.: not stated Not KIIIA 6.1.3/259 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	AGAN HU (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Barasits, T.	2012	Efficacy of insecticides against pollen beetle in oil seed rape at flowering time SynTech Research Hungary Kft, Táplánszentkereszt, Hungary Report No.: SRHU12-173-135IE	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* HU

Data point	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
			Sponsor No.: HU12-IE-Mavrik-Mon-BRSNW-173 KIIIA 6.1.3/260 GLP / GEP Unpublished				
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Barasits, T.	2012	Efficacy of insecticides against pollen beetle in oil seed rape at flowering time SynTech Research Hungary Kft, Táplánszentkereszt, Hungary Report No.: SRHU12-174-135IE Sponsor No.: HU12-IE-Mavrik-Mon-BRSNW-174 KIIIA 6.1.3/261 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	AGAN HU (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Barasits, T.	2012	Analysis of efficacy of MCW-2222 SL on biting insects in oil seed rape SynTech Research Hungary Kft, Táplánszentkereszt, Hungary Report No.: SRHU12-175-135IE Sponsor No.: HU12IE-MCW2222-BRSNW-175 KIIIA 6.1.3/262 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	AGAN HU (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Barasits, T.	2012	Analysis of efficacy of MCW-2222 SL on biting insects in oil seed rape SynTech Research Hungary Kft, Táplánszentkereszt, Hungary Report No.: SRHU12-176-135IE Sponsor No.: HU12IE-MCW2222-BRSNW-176 KIIIA 6.1.3/263 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	AGAN HU (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Barasits, T.	2013	Analysis of efficacy to MCW-2222 SL on biting insects in oilseed rape SynTech Research Hungary Kft, Szombathely, Hungary Report No.: SRHU13-068-135IE Sponsor No.: HU13IEBRSNW431A KIIIA 6.1.3/264 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	AGAN HU (Adama)

Data point	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, KCP 6.4.1	Ripka, G.	2013	Analysis of efficacy to MCW-2222 SL on biting insects in oil seed rape in Hungary 2013 Government Office of Vas County, Szombathely, Hungary Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: HU13IEBRSNW431B KIIIA 6.1.3/265 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	AGAN HU (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Ripka, G.	2013	Analysis of efficacy to MCW-2222 SL on biting insects in oil seed rape in Hungary 2013 Government Office of Nógrád County, Salgótarján, Hungary Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: HU13IEBRSNW431C Not KIIIA 6.1.3/266 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	AGAN HU (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Barasits, T.	2013	Analysis of efficacy to MCW-2222 SL on biting insects in oilseed rape SynTech Research Hungary Kft, Szombathely, Hungary Report No.: SRHU13-069-135IE Sponsor No.: HU13IEBRSNW432A KIIIA 6.1.3/267 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	AGAN HU (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Ripka, G.	2013	Analysis of efficacy to MCW-2222 SL on biting insects in oil seed rape in Hungary 2013 Government Office of Vas County, Szombathely, Hungary Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: HU13IEBRSNW432B KIIIA 6.1.3/268 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	AGAN HU (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Ripka, G.	2013	Analysis of efficacy to MCW-2222 SL on biting insects in oil seed rape in Hungary 2013 Government Office of Nógrád County, Salgótarján, Hungary Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: HU13IEBRSNW432C Not KIIIA 6.1.3/269	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	AGAN HU (Adama)

Data point	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
			GLP / GEP Unpublished				
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Ripka, G.	2013	Analysis of efficacy to MCW-2222 SL on biting insects in oil seed rape in Hungary 2013 Government Office of Vas County, Szombathely, Hungary Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: HU13IEBRSNW433B KIIIA 6.1.3/270 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	AGAN HU (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Ripka, G.	2013	Analysis of efficacy to MCW-2222 SL on biting insects in oil seed rape in Hungary 2013 Government Office of Nógrád County, Salgótarján, Hungary Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: HU13IEBRSNW433C Not KIIIA 6.1.3/271 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	AGAN HU (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Barasits, T.	2013	Efficacy of insecticides against pollen beetle in oilseed rape at flowering time SynTech Research Hungary Kft, Szombathely, Hungary Report No.: SRHU13-071-135IE Sponsor No.: HU13IEBRSNW434A KIIIA 6.1.3/272 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	AGAN HU (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Barasits, T.	2013	Efficacy of insecticides against pollen beetle in oilseed rape at flowering time SynTech Research Hungary Kft, Szombathely, Hungary Report No.: SRHU13-072-135IE Sponsor No.: HU13IEBRSNW434B KIIIA 6.1.3/273 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	AGAN HU (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Ripka, G.	2013	Efficacy of insecticides against pollen beetle in oilseed-rape at flowering time in Hungary 2013 Government Office of Vas Country, Szombathely, Hungary Report No.: not stated	N	Y	Data protection started with:	AGAN HU (Adama)

Data point	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
			Sponsor No.: HU13IEBRSNW434C KIIIA 6.1.3/274 GLP / GEP Unpublished			R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Ripka, G.	2013	Efficacy of insecticides against pollen beetle in oilseed-rape at flowering time in Hungary 2013 Government Office of Nógrád County, Salgótarján, Hungary Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: HU13IEBRSNW434D Not KIIIA 6.1.3/275 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	AGAN HU (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Liposits, V.	2013	Efficacy of insecticides against pollen beetle in oilseed-rape at flowering time in Hungary 2013 Government Office of County Zala, Zalaegerszeg, Hungary Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: HU13IEBRSNW434E KIIIA 6.1.3/276 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	AGAN HU (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Ripka, G.	2013	Efficacy of insecticides against pollen beetle in oilseed-rape at flowering time in Hungary 2013 Government Office of Somogy County, Kaposvár, Hungary Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: HU13IEBRSNW434F KIIIA 6.1.3/277 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	AGAN HU (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	István, F.	2014	Analysis of efficacy to MCW-2222 SL on biting insects in oil seed rape in Hungary 2014 Government Office of Vas Country, Szombathely, Hungary Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: HU14IEBRSNW011A KIIIA 6.1.3/278 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	AGAN HU (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Ripka, G.	2014	Analysis of efficacy to MCW-2222 SL on biting insects in oil seed rape in Hungary 2014	N	Y	Data protection	AGAN HU (Adama)

Data point	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
			Government Office of Nógrád County, Salgótarján, Hungary Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: HU14IEBRSNW011B KIIIA 6.1.3/279 GLP / GEP Unpublished			started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Barasits, T.	2014	Analysis of efficacy to MCW-2222 SL on biting insects in oil seed rape in Hungary 2014 SynTech Research Hungary Kft, Szombathely, Hungary Report No.: SRHU14-040-135IE Sponsor No.: HU14IEBRSNW012A KIIIA 6.1.3/280 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* HU
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Barasits, T.	2014	Analysis of efficacy to MCW-2222 SL on biting insects in oil seed rape in Hungary 2014 SynTech Research Hungary Kft, Szombathely, Hungary Report No.: SRHU14-041-135IE Sponsor No.: HU14IEBRSNW012B KIIIA 6.1.3/281 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* HU
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Barasits, T.	2014	Analysis of efficacy to MCW-2222 SL on biting insects in oil seed rape SynTech Research Hungary Kft, Szombathely, Hungary Report No.: SRHU14-042-135IE Sponsor No.: HU14IEBRSNW013A KIIIA 6.1.3/282 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* HU
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Barasits, T.	2014	Analysis of efficacy to MCW-2222 SL on biting insects in oil seed rape SynTech Research Hungary Kft, Szombathely, Hungary Report No.: SRHU14-043-135IE Sponsor No.: HU14IEBRSNW013B KIIIA 6.1.3/283 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* HU

Data point	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, KCP 6.4.1	István, F.	2015	Analysis of the efficacy of MCW-2222 SL on biting insects and in oil seed rape in Hungary 2015 Government Office of Vas Country, Szombathely, Hungary Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: HU15IEBRSNW101A KIIIA 6.1.3/284 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* HU
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Szántóné Veszélka, M.	2015	Analysis of the efficacy of MCW-2222 SL on biting insects and in oil seed rape in Hungary 2015 Government Office of Nógrád County, Balassagyarmat, Hungary Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: HU15IEBRSNW101B KIIIA 6.1.3/285 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* HU
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	István, F.	2015	Analysis of the efficacy of MCW-2222 SL on biting insects and in oil seed rape in Hungary 2015 Government Office of Vas Country, Szombathely, Hungary Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: HU15IEBRSNW102A KIIIA 6.1.3/286 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* HU
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Hoffmann é, P.Z.	2015	Analysis of the efficacy of MCW-2222 SL on biting insects and in oil seed rape in Hungary 2015 Növénypathyka Kft., Kaposvár, Hungary Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: HU15IEBRSNW103A KIIIA 6.1.3/287 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* HU

Data point	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, KCP 6.4.1	Barasits, T.	2015	Analysis of the efficacy of MCW-2222 SL on biting insects and in oil seed rape in Hungary 2015 SynTech Research Hungay, Táplánszentkereszt, Hungary Report No.: SRHU15-217-135IE Sponsor No.: HU15IEBRSNW103B KIIIA 6.1.3/288 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* HU
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Barasits, T.	2015	Analysis of the efficacy of MCW-2222 SL on biting insects and in oil seed rape in Hungary 2015 SynTech Research Hungay, Táplánszentkereszt, Hungary Report No.: SRHU15-218-135IE Sponsor No.: HU15IEBRSNW103C KIIIA 6.1.3/289 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* HU
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Ritecz, J.	2015	Analysis of the efficacy of MCW-2222 SL on biting insects and in oil seed rape in Hungary 2015 SynTech Research Hungay, Táplánszentkereszt, Hungary Report No.: SRHU15-219-135IE Sponsor No.: HU15IEBRSNW103D KIIIA 6.1.3/290 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* HU
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Barasits, T.	2015	Analysis of the efficacy of MCW-2222 SL on biting insects and in oil seed rape in Hungary 2015 SynTech Research Hungay, Táplánszentkereszt, Hungary Report No.: SRHU15-215-135IE Sponsor No.: HU15IEBRSNW104A KIIIA 6.1.3/291 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* HU
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Hoffmann é, P.Z.	2015	Analysis of the efficacy of MCW-2222 SL on biting insects and in oil seed rape in Hungary 2015 Növénypathyka Kft., Kaposvár, Hungary Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: HU15IEBRSNW104B KIIIA 6.1.3/292	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* HU

Data point	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
			GLP / GEP Unpublished				
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Ripka, G.	2015	Analysis of the efficacy of MCW-2222 SL on biting insects and in oil seed rape in Hungary 2015 Government Office of Vas Country, Szombathely, Hungary Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: HU15IEBRSNW104C KIIIA 6.1.3/293 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* HU
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Szántóné Veszélka, M.	2015	Analysis of the efficacy of MCW-2222 SL on biting insects and in oil seed rape in Hungary 2015 Government Office of Nógrád County, Balassagyarmat, Hungary Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: HU15IEBRSNW104D KIIIA 6.1.3/294 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* HU
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Jozefiak, D.	2013	Analysis of the efficacy of MCW-2222 SL against <i>Ceutorhynchus napi</i> , on oil seed rape, Slovakia 2013 UKSUP Bratislava branch office Kosice, Kosice, Slovakia Report No.: KE/4-13 Sponsor No.: SK13IEBRSNW001A KIIIA 6.1.3/295 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* HU
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Toth, F.	2013	Analysis of the Efficacy of MCW-2222 SL against <i>Ceutorhynchus napi</i> , <i>quadridens</i> on oil seed rape, Slovakia 2013 Gemerprodukt Valice OVD, Rimavská Sobota, Slovakia Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: SK13IEBRSNW001B KIIIA 6.1.3/296 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* HU
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Jozefiak, D.	2013	Analysis of efficacy of MCW-2222 SL against <i>Meligethes aeneus</i> on oil seed rape, Slovakia 2013	N	Y	Data protection	Agrovita (Adama)

Data point	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
			UKSUP, Košice, Slovakia Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: SK13IEBRSNW002A KIIIA 6.1.3/297 GLP / GEP Unpublished			started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Toth, F.	2013	Analysis of efficacy of MCW-2222 SL against <i>Meligethes aeneus</i> on oil seed rape, Slovakia 2013 Gemerprodukt Valice OVD, Rimavská Sobota, Slovakia Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: SK13IEBRSNW002B KIIIA 6.1.3/298 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Agrovita (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Toth, F.	2013	Analysis of efficacy of MCW-2222 SL against <i>Dasineura brassicae</i> , <i>Ceutorhynchus assimilis</i> on oil seed rape, Slovakia 2013 Gemerprodukt Valice OVD, Rimavská Sobota, Slovakia Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: SK13IEBRSNW003B KIIIA 6.1.3/299 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Agrovita (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Jozefiak, D.	2014	Analysis of efficacy to MCW-2222 SL on Ceuta, Ceutqu in oil seed rape, Slovakia 2014 UKSUP, Košice, Slovakia Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: SK14IEBRSNW001A KIIIA 6.1.3/300 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Agrovita (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Tóth, F.	2015	Analysis of efficacy to MCW-2222 SL on Ceuta, Ceutq in oil seed rape, Slovakia 2014 Gemerprodukt Valice OVD, Rimavská Sobota, Slovakia Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: SK14IEBRSNW001B KIIIA 6.1.3/301 GLP / GEP	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Agrovita (Adama)

Data point	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, KCP 6.4.1	Tóth, F.	2015	Unpublished Analysis of efficacy to MCW-2222 SL on Ceuta, Ceutq in oil seed rape, Slovakia 2014 Gemerprodukt Valice OVD, Rimavská Sobota, Slovakia Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: SK14IEBRSNW001C KIIIA 6.1.3/302 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Agrovita SK (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Soltesz, J.	2015	Analysis of efficacy to MCW-2222 SL on Ceuta, Ceutq in oil seed rape, Slovakia 2014 Fyse, s.r.o. AgroLab, Kolare, Slovakia Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: SK14IEBRSNW001D KIIIA 6.1.3/303 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* SK
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Jozefiak, D.	2014	Analysis of efficacy to MCW-2222 SL on Melia in oil seed rape, Slovakia 2014 UKSUP, Košice, Slovakia Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: SK14IEBRSNW002A KIIIA 6.1.3/304 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* SK
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Tóth, F.	2015	Analysis of efficacy to MCW-2222 SL on Melia in oil seed rape, Slovakia 2014 Gemerprodukt Valice OVD, Rimavská Sobota, Slovakia Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: SK14IEBRSNW002B KIIIA 6.1.3/305 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Agrovita SK (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Jozefiak, D.	2015	Analysis of the efficacy of MCW-2222 SL against <i>Ceutorhynchus napi</i> , on oil seed rape, Slovakia 2015 UKSUP Bratislava branch office Kosice, Kosice, Slovakia Report No.: not stated	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Agrovita SK (Adama)

Data point	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
			Sponsor No.: SK15IEBRSNW001A KIIIA 6.1.3/306 GLP / GEP Unpublished				
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Forgáčová , L.	2015	Analysis of the efficacy of MCW-2222 SL against <i>Ceutorhynchus napi</i> , on oil seed rape, Slovakia 2015 Ing. L'ubica Foráčová, Boliarov, Slovakia Report No.: LF/01/in/15 Sponsor No.: SK15IEBRSNW001B KIIIA 6.1.3/307 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Agrovita SK (Adama)
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Jozefiak, D.	2015	Analysis of the efficacy of MCW-2222 SL against <i>Ceutorhynchus assimilis</i> , <i>Dasineura bassicae</i> on oil seed rape, Slovakia 2015 UKSUP Bratislava branch office Kosice, Kosice, Slovakia Report No.: KE/I/06-15 Sponsor No.: SK15IEBRSNW001D KIIIA 6.1.3/308 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* SK
KCP 6.2, KCP 6.4.1	Jozefiak, D.	2015	Analysis of the efficacy to MCW-2222 SL against <i>Ceuthorhynchus napi</i> in oil seed rape, Slovakia 2015 UKSUP Bratislava branch office Kosice, Kosice, Slovakia Report No.: KE/I/04-15 Sponsor No.: SK15IEBRSNW001I KIIIA 6.1.3/309 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* SK
KCP 6.3/01	Thieme, Thomas	2013	Relative susceptibility of field populations of the oilseed rape pollen beetle (<i>Meligethes aeneus</i>) collected 2013 in Austria, the Czech Republic, France, Germany, Hungary, Poland and GB to the insecticides Biscaya, chlorpyrifosethyl, tau-fluvalinate and acetamiprid, in comparison to Iambda-cyhalothrin BTL Bio-Test Labor GmbH Sagerheide GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* SK

Data point	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 6.3/02	Thieme, Thomas	2014	Relative susceptibility of field populations of the oilseed rape pollen beetle (<i>Meligethes aeneus</i>) collected 2014 in Austria, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Hungary, Poland and UK to the insecticides Biscaya, chlorpyrifosethyl, tau-fluvalinate and acetamiprid, in comparison to Iambda-cyhalothrin BTL Bio-Test Labor GmbH Sagerheide, GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA* SK
KCP 6.3/03	Bielza, Pablo	2015	Resistance monitoring of samples treated with the Insecticide “MCW-2222” in <i>Myzus persicae</i> Universidad Politécnica de Cartagena report n° 31005814 GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data/study report never submitted before to Poland	ADAMA*
KCP 6.4.4	Kukuła, A.	2014	Sensory evaluation - the influence of the plant protection product MCW-2222 (Acetamipryd 200 SL) on taint of processing potatoes AGRECO Sp. z o.o., Oława, Poland Report No.: not stated Sponsor No.: 15ADA0139-6 KIIIA 6.1.4/001 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA*
KCP 6.4.4	Kukuła, A.	2015	Sensory evaluation - the influence of the plant protection product MCW-222 (Acetamiprid 200 SL) on taint of processing potatoes AGRECO Sp. z o.o., Oława, Poland Report No.: 15ADA0188-2 Sponsor No.: DE15IESOLTU320C KIIIA 6.1.4/002 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA*
KCP 6.4.4	Kukuła, A.	2015	Sensory evaluation - the influence of the plant protection product MCW-222 (Acetamiprid 200 SL) on taint of processing potatoes AGRECO Sp. z o.o., Oława, Poland Report No.: 15ADA0188-3 Sponsor No.: DE15IESOLTU320A KIIIA 6.1.4/003	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA*

Data point	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
			GLP / GEP Unpublished				
KCP 6.4.4	Kukuła, A.	2015	Sensory evaluation - the influence of the plant protection product MCW-222 (Acetamiprid 200 SL) on taint of processing potatoes AGRECO Sp. z o.o., Oława, Poland Report No.: 15ADA0188-4 Sponsor No.: DE15ISSOLTU320B KIIIA 6.1.4/004 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA*
KCP 6.4.4	Kukuła, A.	2015	Sensory evaluation - the influence of the plant protection product MCW-222 (Acetamiprid 200 SL) on taint of fresh and processing apples AGRECO Sp. z o.o., Oława, Poland Report No.: 15ADA0187-1 Sponsor No.: CZ15IEMABSD001B KIIIA 6.1.4/005 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA*
KCP 6.4.4	Kukuła, A.	2015	Sensory evaluation - the influence of the plant protection product MCW-222 (Acetamiprid 200 SL) on taint of fresh and processing apples AGRECO Sp. z o.o., Oława, Poland Report No.: 15ADA0187-2 Sponsor No.: PL15IEMABSD126A KIIIA 6.1.4/006 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA*
KCP 6.4.4	Kukuła, A.	2015	Sensory evaluation - the influence of the plant protection product MCW-222 (Acetamiprid 200 SL) on taint of fresh and processing apples AGRECO Sp. z o.o., Oława, Poland Report No.: 15ADA0187-3 Sponsor No.: PL15IEMABSD126B KIIIA 6.1.4/007 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA*

Data point	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 6.4.4	Kukuła, A.	2015	Sensory evaluation - the influence of the plant protection product MCW-222 (Acetamiprid 200 SL) on taint of processing potatoes AGRECO Sp. z o.o., Oława, Poland Report No.: 15ADA0188-1 Sponsor No.: RO15IESOLTU012A KIIIA 6.1.4/008 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA*
KCP 6.4.4	Kukuła, A.	2014	Sensory evaluation - the influence of the plant protection product MCW-222 (Acetamiprid 200 SL) on taint of fresh and processing apples AGRECO Sp. z o.o., Oława, Poland Report No.: 15ADA0138-4 Sponsor No.: not stated KIIIA 6.1.4/009 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA*
KCP 6.4.4	Kukuła, A.	2014	Sensory evaluation - the influence of the plant protection product MCW-222 (Acetamiprid 200 SL) on taint of fresh and processing apples AGRECO Sp. z o.o., Oława, Poland Report No.: 15ADA0138-5 Sponsor No.: not stated KIIIA 6.1.4/010 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA*
KCP 6.4.4	Kukuła, A.	2014	Sensory evaluation - the influence of the plant protection product MCW-222 (Acetamiprid 200 SL) on taint of fresh and processing apples AGRECO Sp. z o.o., Oława, Poland Report No.: 15ADA0138-1 Sponsor No.: not stated KIIIA 6.1.4/011 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA*

Data point	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 6.4.4	Kukuła, A	Kukuła,	Sensory evaluation - the influence of the plant protection product MCW-222 (Acetamiprid 200 SL) on taint of fresh and processing apples AGRECO Sp. z o.o., Oława, Poland Report No.: 15ADA0138-2 Sponsor No.: not stated KIIIA 6.1.4/012 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA*
KCP 6.4.4	Kukuła, A.	2014	Sensory evaluation - the influence of the plant protection product MCW-222 (Acetamiprid 200 SL) on taint of fresh and processing apples AGRECO Sp. z o.o., Oława, Poland Report No.: 15ADA0138-3 Sponsor No.: not stated KIIIA 6.1.4/013 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA*
KCP 6.4.4	Kukuła, A.	2014	Sensory evaluation - the influence of the plant protection product MCW-222 (Acetamiprid 200 SL) on taint of processing potatoes AGRECO Sp. z o.o., Oława, Poland Report No.: 15ADA0139-1 Sponsor No.: not stated KIIIA 6.1.4/014 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA*
KCP 6.4.4	Kukuła, A.	2014	Sensory evaluation - the influence of the plant protection product MCW-222 (Acetamiprid 200 SL) on taint of processing potatoes AGRECO Sp. z o.o., Oława, Poland Report No.: 15ADA0139-2 Sponsor No.: not stated KIIIA 6.1.4/015 GLP / GEP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	ADAMA*
KCP 6.4.4	Kukuła, A.	2014	Sensory evaluation - the influence of the plant protection product MCW-222 (Acetamiprid 200 SL) on taint of processing	N	Y	Data protection	ADAMA*

Data point	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
			potatoes AGRECO Sp. z o.o., Oława, Poland Report No.: 15ADA0139-3 Sponsor No.: not stated KIIIA 6.1.4/016 GLP / GEP Unpublished			started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	
KCP 7.1.1/01	xxx.	2013	Acetamiprid 200 SL: Acute oral toxicity study in rats R-31123 xxx GLP Unpublished	Y	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 7.1.2/01	xxx	2013	Acetamiprid 200 SL: Acute dermal toxicity study in rats R-31124 xxx GLP Unpublished	Y	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 7.1.3/01	xxx	2013	Acetamiprid 200 SL: Acute inhalation toxicity study (Nose-only) in the rat R-31125 xxxx GLP Unpublished	Y	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 7.1.4/01	Kiss I.	2013	Acetamiprid 200 SL: <i>In vitro</i> skin irritation test in the EPISKIN model R-31126 Source CiToxLAB Hungary Ltd GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 7.1.4/02	xxx	2013	Acetamiprid 200 SL: Acute skin irritation study in rabbits R-31126A xxxx GLP Unpublished	Y	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 7.1.5/01	Kiss I.	2013	Acetamiprid 200 SL: <i>In vitro</i> eye irritation test in isolated chicken eyes R-31127 Source CiToxLAB Hungary Ltd	N	Y	Data protection started with:	Adama*

Data point	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
			GLP Unpublished			R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	
KCP 7.1.5/02	xxx	2013	Acetamiprid 200 SL: Acute eye irritation study in rabbits R-31127A xxx GLP Unpublished	Y	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 7.1.6/01	xxx	2013	Skin sensitisation test: Local lymph node assay with Acetamiprid 200 SL R-31128 xxx GLP Unpublished	Y	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 7.3/01	Rheus, A.A.	2013	<i>In vitro</i> percutaneous absorption of Acetamiprid, formulated as Acetamiprid 200 SL, through human and rat skin R-31287 Source TNO Triskelion GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 7.2/01	Wilson, A.	2016	Acetamiprid foliar dislodgeable residues dissipation on pome fruit in southern and northern europe (Spain, Italy and Czech republic) R-37353 Source AgroChemex International Ltd GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data/study report never submitted before to Poland and Slovakia	Adama*
KCP 8.1/01	Lefresne S.	2014	Freezing storage stability of acetamiprid in 4 plant matrices: Dry (dry bean seed and straw, water (apple), fat (olive whole fruit) and acid (or-ange peel and pulp) at/below -18°C during 1 year (0, 3, 6 and 12 months) Report No B13-M1-A-02, Sponsor No R-33766 FREDON Pays de la Loire/GIRPA GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 8.1/02	Barbier G.	2018	Freezing storage stability of acetamiprid in wheat (grain) at/below -18°C during 15 months (0 and 15 months) Report No B17G-A4-A-02 FREDON Pays de la Loire/GIRPA	N	Y	Data protection started with:	Adama*

Data point	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
			GLP Unpublished			R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	
KCP 8.1/03	Müller, S.	2020	Determination of the Storage Stability of Acetamiprid in Honey for a period of 12 months at $\leq -18^{\circ}\text{C}$, Müller, S., 2020, Study No. 20N08133-01-SSHN (interim report) Study No. 20N08133-01-SSHN (interim report) CIP GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data/study report never submitted before to Poland	Nufarm
KCP 8.3/01 KCP 8.5.3/01	Roussel, Ch. H.	2014	Magnitude of the residues of acetamiprid in apple (RAC fruits and processed fractions), following one or two applications of MCW-2222 in six trials (3 DCS + 3 HS), Northern Europe (Northern France, Germany, Poland and Belgium) – 2014 Report No ChR-14-17311, Sponsor No R-34915 STAPHYT GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 8.3/02	Méric, D.	2014	Magnitude of the residues of acetamiprid in apples (RAC fruits) follow-ing one or two applications of MCW-2222 in two trials (1 DCS + 1 HS), Northern Europe (Northern France) – 2013 Report No DMC-13-16134, Sponsor No R-33599 STAPHYT GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 8.3/03	Bousquet C.	2014	Magnitude of the Residue of acetamiprid in potato Raw Agricultural Commodity after two applications of MCW-2222 in three decline curve trials (Poland, United Kingdom and Northern France) and in one harvest trial (Poland) in Northern Europe – 2013 Report No 13SGS102, Sponsor No R-33600 SGS AGRI MIN GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 8.3/04	Méric D.	2014	Magnitude of the residues of acetamiprid in oilseed rape (RAC whole plants, pods and seeds) following one or two applications of MCW-2222 in two trials (1 DCS + 1HS), Northern Europe	N	Y	Data protection started with:	Adama*

Data point	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
			(Germany and Northern France) – 2013 Report No DMC-13-16129, Sponsor No R-33598 STAPHYT GLP Unpublished			R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	
KCP 8.3/05	Chevallier E.	2014	Magnitude of the residue of acetamiprid in winter oil seed rape (Raw Agricultural Commodity) after one or two applications of MCW-2222 - three decline curve trials and three harvest trials in Northern Europe (Northern France, Poland, Germany, Czech Republic and Hungary) - 2014 Report No 14SGS035, Sponsor No R-34910 SGS AGRI MIN GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 8.3/06	Lebrun F.	2014	Magnitude of the residue of acetamiprid in maize (Raw Agricultural Commodity) after one application of MCW-2222 – four semi decline curve trials and four decline curve trials in Northern Europe (Northern France, Poland, Germany, Hungary and Austria) – 2014 Report No 14SGS039, Sponsor No R-34912 SGS AGRI MIN Bâtiment ADAMANTIS GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 8.5.3/01 KCP 8.3/01	Roussel Ch. H.	2014	Magnitude of the residues of acetamiprid in apple (RAC fruits and processed fractions), following one or two applications of MCW-2222 in six trials (3 DCS + 3 HS), Northern Europe (Northern France, Germany, Poland and Belgium) – 2014 Report No ChR-14-17311, Sponsor No R-34915 STAPHYT GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 8.6.1/01	Hobbs G.	2017	Uptake and Metabolism in Confined Rotational Crops Using [¹⁴ C]-IM-1-5 Report No 38356, Sponsor No R-37756 Charles River Laboratories Edinburgh Ltd GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data/study report never submitted before to Poland	Adama*

Data point	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 8.6.2/01	Semrau J.	2017	Determination of residues of acetamiprid and its soil metabolites IM-1-4 and IM-1-5 after one application of MCW-2222 to bare soil in rotational crops (radish, spinach and wheat) at 1 site in Northern Europe and 1 site in Southern Europe 2015 / 2016 Report No S15-02364, Sponsor No R-35750 Eurofins Agrosience Services GmbH GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data/study report never submitted before to Poland	Adama*
KCP 8.10.1/01	Hecht-Ross S.	2020	Semi-field study for determining the magnitude of residues of Carnadine (CA3573) (a.s. acetamiprid) in honey GLP Study No. 467, Report No. R1940050 RIFCON GmbH GLP Unpublished	N	Y	Data/study report never submitted before to Poland	Nufarm
KCP 8.10.1/02	Sagner A., Kessler M.	2020	Expert Statement - Possibility to Estimate Residue Levels for Acetamiprid in Honey Report No. R1960175_01 GLP not applicable Unpublished	N	Y	Data/study report never submitted before to Poland	Nufarm
KCP 8.10.1/03	EFSA	2014	Scientific Report of EFSA - The 2012 European Union Report on pesticide residues in food EFSA Journal 2014;12(12):3942 GLP not applicable Published	N	N	-	Publicly available
KCP 8.10.1/04	EFSA	2015	Scientific Report of EFSA – The 2013 European Union report on pesticide residues in food EFSA Journal 2015;13(3):4038 GLP not applicable Published	N	N	-	Publicly available
KCP 8.10.1/05	EFSA	2016c	Scientific Report of EFSA – The 2014 European Union report on pesticide residues in food EFSA Journal 2016;14(10):4611 GLP not applicable Published	N	N	-	Publicly available
KCP 8.10.1/06	EFSA	2017	Scientific Report of EFSA – The 2015 European Union report on pesticide residues in food EFSA Journal 2017;15(4):4791	N	N	-	Publicly available

Data point	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
			GLP not applicable Published				
KCP 8.10.1/07	EFSA	2018b	Scientific Report of EFSA – The 2016 European Union report on pesticide residues in food EFSA Journal 2018;16(7):5348 GLP not applicable Published	N	N	-	Publicly available
KCP 8.10.1/08	EFSA	2019	Scientific report on the 2017 European Union report on pesticide residues in food EFSA Journal 2019;17(6):5743 GLP not applicable Published	N	N	-	Publicly available
KCP 8.10.1/09	EFSA	2020	Scientific Report of EFSA – The 2018 European Union report on pesticide residues in food EFSA Journal 2020;18(4):6057 GLP not applicable Published	N	N	-	Publicly available
KCP 9.2.4/01	Weinfurter, K.H.	2020	Determination of plant Uptake Factor (PUF)/Transpiration Stream-Concentration factor (TSCF) in wheat and oilseed rape plants of Acetamiprid metabolite [¹⁴C] IM-1-5 Report/file: Fraunhofer IME Project NFM-003/5-52 GLP Not published	N	Y	Data/study report never submitted before to Poland Study not relied upon during Art. 43 re-evaluation	Nufarm
KCP 10.1.2.2/01	Jacob, J., Manson, P., Barfknecht, R., Fredricks, T	2013	Common Vole (<i>Microtus Arvalis</i>) Ecology and Management: Implications for Risk Assessment of Plant Protection Products. Pest Management Science 70: 869-878. GLP: no Published: yes	N	N	-	public
KCP 10.1.2.2/02	Rinke, T.	1991	Percentage of volume versus number of species: availability and intake of grasses and forbs in <i>Microtus arvalis</i> . Folia Zoologica, 40(2), 143-151. GLP: no Published: yes	N	N	-	public
KCP 10.1.2.2/03	Leutert, A.	1983	Einfluss der Feldmaus, <i>Microtus arvalis</i> (Pall.), auf die floristische Zusammensetzung von Wiesen-Ökosystemen.	N	N	-	public

Data point	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
			Veröffentlichung des Geobotanischen Institutes der Eidg. Techn. Hochschule, Stiftung Rübel, Zürich. GLP: no Published: yes				
KCP 10.1.2.2/04	Heroldová, M., Zejda, J., Zapletal, M., Obdržálková, D., Jánová, E., Bryja, J., Tkadlec, E.	2004	Importance of winter rape for small rodents. Plant soil and environment, 50(4), 175-181. GLP: no Published: yes	N	N	-	public
KCP 10.1.2.2/05	Delattre, P., Giraudoux, P. et al.	1992	Effects of agriculture development on vole dynamics and conservation of Montagu `s harrier in western French wetlands. Biological Conservation 100: 289-295. GLP: no Published: yes	N	N	-	public
KCP 10.1.2.2/06	Butet, A., Leroux, A.B.A.	2001	Effects of agriculture development on vole dynamics and conservation of Montagu `s harrier in western French wetlands. Biological Conservation 100: 289-295. GLP: no Published: yes	N	N	-	public
KCP 10.1.2.2/07	Jacob, J., Halle, S.	2001	The importance of land management for population parameters and spatial behaviour in common voles (<i>Microtus arvalis</i>). Advances in Vertebrate Pest Management. H.-J. Pelz and C. J. Feare. Fürth, Filander-Verlag. 2: 319-330. GLP: no Published: yes	N	N	-	public
KCP 10.1.2.2/08	Jacob, J.	2003	Short-term effects of farming practices on populations of common voles. Agriculture Ecosystems and Environment 95: 321-325. GLP: no Published: yes	N	N	-	public
KCP 10.1.2.2/09	Adamczewska-Andrzejewska, K.A.	1981	Populations structure of <i>Microtus arvalis</i> (Pall.) against the background of a community of rodents in crop fields. Polish ecological studies 7(2): 193-211. GLP: no Published: yes	N	N	-	public

Data point	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 10.1.2.2/10	Jacob, J., Hempel, N	2003	Effects of farming practices on spatial behaviour of common voles. Journal of Ethology 21: 45-50. GLP: no Published: yes	N	N	-	public
KCP 10.1.2.2/11	Halle, S.	2000	Voles - small graminivores with polyphasic patterns. Activity patterns in small mammals. S. Halle and N. C. Stenseth. Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, Barcelona, Hong Kong, London, Milan, Paris, Singapore, Tokyo, Springer-Verlag: 191-215. GLP: no Published: yes	N	N	-	public
KCP 10.1.2.2/12	Jaworska, K	1996	The cover of herbaceous plants in an IPM apple orchard and its influence on the occurrence of rodents. Acta Horticulturae 422: 431-432. GLP: no Published: yes	N	N	-	public
KCP 10.1.2.2/13	Sullivan, T.P., van Hogue, E.J.	2003	Influence of Orchard Floor Management on Vole and Pocket Gopher Populations and Damage in Apple Orchards. Journal of the American Society for Horticultural Science 112: 972-977. GLP: no Published: yes	N	N	-	public
KCP 10.1.2.2/14	Jacob, J., Brown, J.S	2000	Microhabitat use, giving-up densities and temporal activity as short- and long-term anti-predator behaviors in common voles. Oikos 91: 131-138. GLP: no Published: yes	N	N	-	public
KCP 10.1.2.2/15	Edge, W., Wolff, J. et al.	1995	Density-dependent responses of gray-tailed voles to mowing. Journal of Wildlife Management 59: 245-251. GLP: no Published: yes	N	N	-	public
KCP 10.1.2.2/16	Lauenstein, G.	1979	Zur Problematik der Bekämpfung von Feldmäusen. Zeitschrift für angewandte Zoologie 66: 35-59. GLP: no Published: yes	N	N	-	public

Data point	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 10.1.2.2/17	Braun, M., Dieterlen,	2005	Die Säugetiere Baden-Württembergs Band 2. Stuttgart, Verlag Eugen Ulmer. Pp. 297-311. GLP: no Published: yes	N	N	-	public
KCP 10.1.2.2/18	Pulliam, H.R.	1988	Sources, Sinks, and Population Regulation. The American Naturalist 132(5): 652-661. GLP: no Published: yes	N	N	-	public
KCP 10.1.2.2/19	Dias, P.C.	1996	Sources and sinks in population biology. Tree 11: 326-330. GLP: no Published: yes	N	N	-	public
KCP 10.1.2.2/20	Tattersall, F.H., MacDonald, D.W. et al.	2004	2004: Balanced dispersal or source-sink - do both models describe wood mice in farmed landscapes? Oikos 106: 536-550. GLP: no Published: yes	N	N	-	public
KCP 10.1.2.2/21	Sullivan, T.P., Sullivan, D.S., van Hogue, E.J.	2003	Demography of montane voles in old field and orchard habitats in Southern British Columbia. Northwest Science 77: 228-236. GLP: no Published: yes	N	N	-	public
KCP 10.1.2.2/22	Niethammer, J., and F. Krapp	1982	<i>Microtus arvalis</i> (Pallas, 1779) - Feldmaus. Handbuch der Säugetiere Europas. J. Niethammer and F. Krapp. Wiesbaden, Aula-Verlag. 2/I: 285-318. GLP: no Published: yes	N	N	-	public
KCP 10.1.2.2/23	Mitchell-Jones, A., G. Amori, et al.	1999	The Atlas of European Mammals. London, Academic Press. Pp. 220-257. GLP: no Published: yes	N	N	-	public
KCP 10.1.2.2/24	Stein, G.H.W	1958	Die Feldmaus: <i>Microtus arvalis</i> Pallas. Wittenberg, Lutherstadt, A. Ziemsen Verlag. GLP: no Published: yes	N	N	-	public

Data point	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 10.1.2.2/25	Truszkowski, J.	1982	The impact of the common vole on the vegetation of agroecosystems. Acta Theriologica 27: 305-345. GLP: no Published: yes	N	N	-	public
KCP 10.1.2.2/26	Heise, S., Stubbe, M.	1987	Populationsökologische Untersuchungen zum Massenwechsel der Feldmaus <i>Microtus arvalis</i> (Pallas, 1779). Säugetierkundliche Informationen 2: 403-414 GLP: no Published: yes	N	N	-	public
KCP 10.1.2.2/27	Nolting, H.-G	2010	Bekanntmachung über die Umsetzung des EFSA-Guidance Document zur Risikobewertung für Vögel und Säuger (BVL 10/02/14). Bundesamt für Verbraucherschutz und Lebensmittelsicherheit, Bundesanzeiger. 62: 2228-2229. GLP: no Published: yes	N	N	-	public
KCP 10.1.2.2/28	Hahne, J., Schabacker, J., Foudoulakis, M., Ludwigs, J.-D., Murfitt, R., Ristau, K.	2019	New proposed Residues on Fruits (RUDs) for frugivorous scenarios in EFSA Bird and Mammal Risk Assessment. Poster-Presentation SETAC Helsinki, June 2019. GLP: no Published: yes	N	N	-	public
KCP 10.1.2.2/29	Schabacker, J., Hahne, J., Ludwigs, J.-D., Vallon, M., Foudoulakis, M., Murfitt, R., Ristau, K.	2020	Residue levels of pesticides on fruits for use in wildlife risk assessments. Integrated Environmental Assessment and Management. https://doi.org/10.1002/ieam.4345 ; https://setac.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1002/ieam.4345 GLP: no Published: yes	N	N	-	public
KCP 10.2.1/01	xxx	2014a	Acute toxicity of MCW-2222 to the rainbow trout <i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i> in a 96-hour static test Report No.: R-33831 xxx. GLP: yes Published: no	Y	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 10.2.1/02	Juckeland, D.	2014b	Acute toxicity of MCW-2222 to <i>Daphnia magna</i> in a 48-hour static test	N	Y	Data protection	Adama*

Data point	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.: R-33832 BioChem agrar Labor für biologische und chemische Analytik GmbH. Kupferstraße 6. 04827 Gerichshain, Germany. GLP: yes Published: no			started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	
KCP 10.2.1/03	Juckeland, D.,	2015	Acute toxicity of MCW-2222 to <i>Chironomus riparius</i> in a 48-hour static test Report No.: R-34873 BioChem agrar Labor für biologische und chemische Analytik GmbH. Kupferstraße 6. 04827 Gerichshain, Germany. GLP: yes Published: no	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 10.2.1/04	Juckeland, D.	2014	Effects of MCW-2222 on <i>Desmodesmus subspicatus</i> in an algal growth inhibition test Report No.: R-33833 BioChem agrar Labor für biologische und chemische Analytik GmbH. Kupferstraße 6. 04827 Gerichshain, Germany. GLP: yes Published: no	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 10.2.1/02	Taylor, S. & Joyce, F., D.	2015	Acetamiprid 200 SL – Acute Toxicity to Aquatic Organisms Report no. R-35057 Cambridge Environmental Assessments, Battlegate Road, Boxworth, Cambridgeshire, CB23 4NN, UK GLP: yes Published: no	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 10.2.3/01	Hommen U., Hennecke S., Christmann R	2020	Carnadine – Outdoor mesocosm study Report No.: NFM-001/7-52 Fraunhofer Institute for Molecular Biology and Applied Ecology (IME), Auf dem Aberg 1, 57392 Schmallenberg, Germany GLP: Yes Published: no	N	Y	Data/study report never submitted before to Poland	Nufarm
KCP 10.3.1/01	Rortais A., Arnold G., Halm M. P., Touffet-Briens F.	2005	Modes of honey bee exposure to systemic insecticides: estimated amounts of contaminated pollen and nectar consumed by different categories of bees. Apidologie, 36(1), 71-83. GLP: no Published: yes	N	N	-	public

Data point	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 10.3.1/02	Kim W., Gilet T., Bush J.W.	2011	Optimal concentrations in nectar feeding. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 108(40): 16618-16621. GLP: no Published: yes	N	N	-	public
KCP 10.3.1/03	Pamminger T., Becker R., Himmelreich S., Schneider C. W., Bergtold M.	2019	The nectar report: quantitative review of nectar sugar concentrations offered by bee visited flowers in agricultural and non-agricultural landscapes. PeerJ 7, e6329, 15 pp. GLP: no Published: yes	N	N	-	public
KCP 10.3.1/04	Babendreier D., Kalberer N., Romeis J., Fluri P., Bigler, F.	2004	Pollen consumption in honey bee larvae: a step forward in the risk assessment of transgenic plants. Apidologie 35(3), 293-300. GLP: no Published: yes	N	N	-	public
KCP 10.3.1.1.1/01 & KCP 10.3.1.1.2/01	Franke, M.	2014	Acute toxicity of MCW-2222 to the honeybee <i>Apis mellifera</i> L. under laboratory conditions Report No.: R-33834 BioChem agrar Labor für biologische und chemische Analytik GmbH. Kupferstraße 6. 04827 Gerichshain, Germany. GLP: yes Published: no	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 10.3.1.2/01	Dreßler, K.	2019	Chronic oral toxicity of CA3573 Acetamiprid 200 SL (Carnadine) to the honey bee <i>Apis mellifera</i> L. under laboratory conditions Project No. 19 48 BAC 0028 BioChem agrar Labor für biologische und chemische Analytik GmbH. Kupferstraße 6. 04827 Gerichshain, Germany. GLP: yes Published: no	N	Y	Data/study report never submitted before to Poland	Nufarm
KCP 10.3.1.2/02	Kleebaum, K.	2014a	Chronic toxicity of MCW-2222 to the honeybee <i>Apis mellifera</i> L. under laboratory conditions Report No.: R-33835 BioChem agrar Labor für biologische und chemische Analytik GmbH. Kupferstraße 6. 04827 Gerichshain, Germany. GLP: yes Published: no	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018 Study not relied upon	Adama*

Data point	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
						during Art. 43 re-evaluation	
KCP 10.3.1.3/01	Scheller, K.	2020	CA3573 Acetamiprid 200 SL (Carnadine) - Repeated exposure of honey bee larvae (<i>Apis mellifera</i> L.) under laboratory conditions Project No. 19 48 BLC 0033 BioChem agrar Labor für biologische und chemische Analytik GmbH. Kupferstraße 6. 04827 Gerichshain, Germany. GLP: yes Published: no	N	Y	Data/study report never submitted before to Poland	Nufarm
KCP 10.3.1.3/02	Kleebaum, K.	2014b	Chronic toxicity of MCW-2222 to honeybee larvae (<i>Apis mellifera</i> L.) under laboratory conditions (in vitro) Report No.: R-33836 BioChem agrar Labor für biologische und chemische Analytik GmbH. Kupferstraße 6. 04827 Gerichshain, Germany. GLP: yes Published: no	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018 Study not relied upon during Art. 43 re-evaluation	Adama*
KCP 10.3.1.2.1/01 & KCP 10.3.1.2.2/01	Röhlig, U.	2014	Acute toxicity of MCW-2222 to the bumblebee <i>Bombus terrestris</i> L. under laboratory conditions Report No.: R-33837 BioChem agrar Labor für biologische und chemische Analytik GmbH. Kupferstraße 6. 04827 Gerichshain, Germany. GLP: yes Published: no	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 10.3.1.6/03	Aucejo, S.	2015	Effects and Determination of Residues of Acetamiprid 200 SL on the Honeybee (<i>Apis mellifera</i> L.) Brood in Apple, under Field Conditions, in Italy 2015. Report No.: R-35961 TESTAPI, Sarré, 49350 Gennes, France. GLP: yes Published: no	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 10.3.1.5/07	Hecht-Rost, S. & Mayer, O.	2018	Semi-field brood study to evaluate potential effects of MCW-2222 on brood development of honeybees (<i>Apis mellifera</i> L.) Report No.: R-37336 RIFCON GmbH Goldbeckstr. 13 D-69493 Hirschberg, Germany.	N	Y	Data/study report never submitted before to Poland	Adama*

Data point	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
			GLP: no Published: no				
KCP 10.3.1.5/02	Mamet, O.	2015	Assessment of toxicity on honeybees (<i>Apis mellifera</i>) of MCW-2222 on wheat crop in a tunnel trial in France. Report No.: R-35845 TESTAPI, Sarré, 49350 Gennes, France. GLP: yes Published: no	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018 Study not relied upon during Art. 43 re-evaluation	Adama*
KCP 10.3.1.5/03	Mamet, O.	2015	Assessment of toxicity on honey bees (<i>Apis mellifera</i>) of the product MCW-2222 on cereals in a tunnel trial in France. Report No.: R-35846 TESTAPI, Sarré, 49350 Gennes, France. GLP: yes Published: no	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018 Study not relied upon during Art. 43 re-evaluation	Adama*
KCP 10.3.1.5/01	Mamet, O. & Molitor, C.	2014	Assessment of toxicity on honey bees (<i>Apis mellifera</i>) of the product MCW-2222 (acetamiprid 200 g/L) applied under insect proof tunnels on a cereal crop Report No.: R-34874 TESTAPI, Sarré, 49350 Gennes, France. GLP: yes Published: no	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018 Study not relied upon during Art. 43 re-evaluation	Adama*
KCP 10.3.1.5/04	Mamet, O. & Molitor, C.	2015	Assessment of toxicity on honeybees (<i>Apis mellifera</i>) of the product MCW-2222 (acetamiprid 200 g/L) applied under insect proof tunnels on a phacelia crop in Northern France. Report No.: R-34875 TESTAPI, Sarré, 49350 Gennes, France. GLP: yes Published: no	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 10.3.1.5/05	Mamet, O. & Molitor, C.	2015	Assessment of toxicity on honey bees (<i>Apis mellifera</i>) of the product MCW-2222 (acetamiprid 200 g/L) applied under insect	N	Y	Data protection	Adama*

Data point	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
			proof tunnels on a phacelia crop during summer in France Report No.: R-34876 TESTAPI, Sarré, 49350 Gennes, France. GLP: yes Published: no			started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	
KCP 10.3.1.5/06	Mamet, O. & Molitor, C.	2015	Assessment of toxicity on honey bees (<i>Apis mellifera</i>) of the product MCW-2222 (acetamiprid200 g/L) applied under insect proof tunnels on a phacelia crop during summer in France. Report No.: R-35847 TESTAPI, Sarré, 49350 Gennes, France. GLP: yes Published: no	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 10.3.1.6/01	Molitor, C.	2015	Field Study to Evaluate Potential Side Effects of the product MCW-2222 (acetamiprid200 g/L) on Brood Development, Foraging Activity, Mortality and Behaviour of Adult Honeybees <i>Apis mellifera</i> L. (Hymenoptera: Apidae) Following Application after Bee-Flight on <i>Phacelia tanacetifolia</i> Report No.: R-34877 TESTAPI, Sarré, 49350 Gennes, France. GLP: yes Published: no	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 10.3.1.6/02	Molitor, C.	2015	Field Study to Evaluate Potential Side Effects of MCW-2222 on Brood Development, Foraging Activity, Mortality and Behaviour of Adult Honeybees (<i>Apis mellifera</i>) on Oilseed rape & Final Report Amendment N°1 Study no R-35844 TESTAPI, Sarré, 49350 Gennes, France. GLP: yes Published: no	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 10.3.2.4/01	Appeltauer, A.	2018	A Field Study Assessing the Impact of Drift Rates of Acetamiprid on the Non-Target Arthropod Fauna on a Meadow in Germany Report No.: R-35848 Eurofins Agrosience GmbH, Eutinger Str. 24 D-75223 Niefern-Öschelbronn, Germany GLP: yes Published: no	N	Y	Data/study report never submitted before to Poland	Adama*

Data point	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 10.3.2.3/01	Luna, F.	2016	Aged residue test with the formulation “MCW-2222” (Acetamiprid20% w/v SL) at 45 g a.s./ha on the parasitic wasp <i>Aphidius rhopalosiphi</i> (Hymenoptera: Braconidae) Report No.: TRC15-242BA TRIALCAMP, Poligono Industrial de L’Alter Av. Antic Regne de València, 25, 46290 Alcàsser (Valencia) Spain GLP: Yes Published: no	N	Y	Data/study report never submitted before to Poland	Adama*
KCP 10.3.2.3/02	Luna, F.	2016	Aged residue test with the formulation “MCW-2222” (Acetamiprid20% w/v SL) at 70 g a.s. /ha on the parasitic wasp <i>Aphidius rhopalosiphi</i> (Hymenoptera: Braconidae) Report No.: TRC15-243BA TRIALCAMP, Poligono Industrial de L’Alter Av. Antic Regne de València, 25, 46290 Alcàsser (Valencia) Spain GLP: Yes Published: no	N	Y	Data/study report never submitted before to Poland	Adama*
KCP 10.3.2.3/03	Luna, F.	2016	Aged residue test with the formulation “MCW-2222” (Acetamiprid20% w/v SL) at 102 g a.s. /ha on the parasitic wasp <i>Aphidius rhopalosiphi</i> (Hymenoptera: Braconidae) Report No.: TRC15-244BA TRIALCAMP, Poligono Industrial de L’Alter Av. Antic Regne de València, 25, 46290 Alcàsser (Valencia) Spain GLP: Yes Published: no	N	Y	Data/study report never submitted before to Poland	Adama*
KCP 10.3.2.3/04	Luna, F.	2017a	Aged residue test with the formulation “MCW-2222” at 170 g a.s. /ha on the parasitic wasp <i>Aphidius rhopalosiphi</i> (Hymenoptera: Braconidae) Report No.: TRC16-073BA TRIALCAMP, Poligono Industrial de L’Alter Av. Antic Regne de València, 25, 46290 Alcàsser (Valencia) Spain GLP: Yes Published: no	N	Y	Data/study report never submitted before to Poland	Adama*

Data point	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 10.3.2.3/05	Luna, F.	2017b	Aged residue test with the formulation “MCW-2222” on the predatory mite <i>Typhlodromus pyri</i> (Acari: phytoseiidae) Report No.: R-37335 TRIALCAMP, Poligono Industrial de L’Alter Av. Antic Regne de València, 25, 46290 Alcàsser (Valencia) Spain GLP: Yes Published: no	N	Y	Data/study report never submitted before to Poland	Adama*
KCP 10.3.2.3/06	Luna, F.	2017c	Aged residue test with the formulation “MCW-2222” on <i>Coccinella septempunctata</i> (Coleoptera: coccinellidae) Report No.: TRC16-075BA / R-37334 TRIALCAMP, Poligono Industrial de L’Alter Av. Antic Regne de València, 25, 46290 Alcàsser (Valencia) Spain GLP: Yes Published: no	N	Y	Data/study report never submitted before to Poland	Adama*
KCP 10.3.2.1/01	Röhlig, U.	2014	Effects of MCW-2222 on the predatory mite <i>Typhlodromus pyri</i> SCHEUTEN in a laboratory test - Rate-Response-Test (LR ₅₀) - Report No.: R-33838 BioChem agrar Labor für biologische und chemische Analytik GmbH. Kupferstraße 6. 04827 Gerichshain, Germany. GLP: yes Published: no	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 10.3.2.1/02	Röhlig, U.	2014	Effects of MCW-2222 on the parasitic wasp <i>Aphidius rhopalosiphi</i> (DESTEFANI-PEREZ) in a laboratory test - Rate-Response-Test (LR ₅₀) - Report No.: R-33839 BioChem agrar Labor für biologische und chemische Analytik GmbH. Kupferstraße 6. 04827 Gerichshain, Germany. GLP: yes Published: no	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 10.3.2.2/01	Röhlig, U.	2014	Effects of MCW-2222 on the predatory mite <i>Typhlodromus pyri</i> SCHEUTEN in an extended laboratory test - Rate-Response-Test (LR ₅₀) - Report No.: R-34780 BioChem agrar Labor für biologische und chemische Analytik GmbH. Kupferstraße 6. 04827 Gerichshain, Germany. GLP: yes Published: no	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*

Data point	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 10.3.2.2/04	Röhlig, U.	2014	Effects of MCW-2222 on the green lacewing <i>Chrysoperla carnea</i> STEPH. in an extended laboratory test - Rate-Response-Test (LR ₅₀) - Report No.: R-34781 BioChem agrar Labor für biologische und chemische Analytik GmbH. Kupferstraße 6. 04827 Gerichshain, Germany. GLP: yes Published: no	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 10.3.2.2/03	Röhlig, U.	2014	Effects of MCW-2222 on the parasitic wasp <i>Aphidius rhopalosiphi</i> (DESTEFANI-PEREZ) STEPH. in an extended laboratory test - Rate-Response-Test (LR ₅₀) - Report No.:R-33839A BioChem agrar Labor für biologische und chemische Analytik GmbH. Kupferstraße 6. 04827 Gerichshain, Germany. GLP: yes Published: no	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 10.3.2.2/05	Röhlig, U.	2014	Effects of MCW-2222 on the ladybird <i>Coccinella septempunctata</i> L. in an extended laboratory test - Rate-Response-Test (LR ₅₀) - Report No.: R-34782 BioChem agrar Labor für biologische und chemische Analytik GmbH. Kupferstraße 6. 04827 Gerichshain, Germany. GLP: yes Published: no	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 10.3.2.2/02	Stevens, J.	2015	MCW-2222 – A rate-response extended laboratory bioassay of the effects of fresh residues on the parasitic wasp <i>Aphidius rhopalosiphi</i> (Hymenoptera, Braconidae) Report No.: R-35026 Mambo-Tox Ltd., 2 Venture Road, University Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NP, UK GLP: yes Published: no	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 10.4.1.1/01	Friedrich, S.	2014	MCW-2222 - Sublethal toxicity to the earthworm <i>Eisenia fetida</i> in artificial soil Report No.: R-33840 BioChem agrar Labor für biologische und chemische Analytik GmbH. Kupferstraße 6. 04827 Gerichshain, Germany.	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*

Data point	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
			GLP: yes Published: no				
KCP 10.4.2.1/01	Friedrich, S.	2014	MCW-2222 - Effects on the reproduction of the collembolan <i>Folsomia candida</i> Report No.: R-33841 BioChem agrar Labor für biologische und chemische Analytik GmbH. Kupferstraße 6. 04827 Gerichshain, Germany. GLP: yes Published: no	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 10.4.2.1/02	Schulz, L.	2014	Effects of MCW-2222 on the reproduction of the predatory mite <i>Hypoaspis aculeifer</i> Report No.: R-33842 BioChem agrar Labor für biologische und chemische Analytik GmbH. Kupferstraße 6. 04827 Gerichshain, Germany. GLP: yes Published: no	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 10.5/01	Schulz, L.	2014	MCW-2222 - Effects on the activity of soil microflora (Nitrogen transformation test) Report No.: R-33843 BioChem agrar Labor für biologische und chemische Analytik GmbH. Kupferstraße 6. 04827 Gerichshain, Germany. GLP: yes Published: no	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*
KCP 10.6.2/01	Friedrich, S.	2014	Terrestrial plant test with MCW-2222: Vegetative vigour test Report No.: 14 10 48 002 P BioChem agrar Labor für biologische und chemische Analytik GmbH. Kupferstraße 6. 04827 Gerichshain, Germany. GLP: yes Published: no	N	Y	Data protection started with: R106/2018 on May 28, 2018	Adama*

* For all Adama studies Nufarm has a Letter of access

List of data submitted or referred to by the applicant and relied on, but already evaluated at EU peer review

Data point	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
CP 5.1.2	Netzband, D.	2003	Stability study of Acetamiprid in potatoes during frozen storage, USA, 2002 in freezer at or below -18°C, Report No. RD-00243 Bayer Crop Science GLP Unpublished	N	Y	See Art 60 (list of studies, COM Oct. 2016)	Nippon soda
CP 5.1.2	Goller, G.	1999	Stability Study of NI-25 (Acetamiprid) in apple and tomato samples after storage in freezer at or below -18 °C - Fortification experiments with active ingredient Report No RPA/NI-25/97051 A.D.M.E. - Bioanalyses, France GLP Unpublished	N	N	-	Nippon soda
CP 5.1.2	Jean-Baptiste, C.	2009	Frozen Storage Stability of Residues of Acetamiprid in Fodder Pea Report No A7125 Anadiag Laboratories GLP Unpublished	N	N	-	Nippon soda
CP 5.1.2	Gieseke L.D.	1999	NI-25 (acetamiprid): Freezer storage stability of acetamiprid residues in various raw agricultural commodities and processing fractions (plant matrices) Report No 10201 Horizon Laboratories, Inc. GLP Unpublished	N	N	-	Nippon soda
CP 5.1.2	Raufer, B.	2013	Residue Study on Rotational Crops after one Application of Acetamiprid on Bare Soil at 2 Sites in Europe in 2010 to 2012 Study No. S10-02822 Eurofins GLP Unpublished	N	Y	See Art 60 (list of studies, COM Oct. 2016)	Nippon soda
CP 5.1.2	Mamouni, A.	1997	Adsorption and Desorption of IM-1-4 on five soils GLP Unpubsiehd	N	N	-	Nippon Soda

Data point	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
CP 5.1.2	Liu, A.C.	1997	6-Chloronicotinic Acid (Acetamiprid metabolite) soil adsorption/desorption study GLP Unpublished	N	N	-	Nippon Soda
CP 5.1.2	Sugiyama H.	2010	Adsorption/Desorption Study of IM 1-5 on Soils Study no. RD-02101 GLP Unpublished	N	Y	See Art 60 (list of studies, COM Oct. 2016)	Nippon Soda
CP 5.1.2	Emeric, G.T.	1998	Acetamiprid- Verification of the identity of the photolyte obtained at pH 7 Study No. 96-82 GLP Unpublished	N	N	-	Nippon Soda
CP 5.1.2	Shiotani H.	2003	Photodegradation of IM-1-5 in water Study No. 2-9-16 GLP Unpublished	N	N	-	Nippon soda
CP 5.1.2.	Putt, A. E.	2003b	Acute toxicity to gammarids (<i>Gammarus fasciatus</i>) under static conditions Study No. 12681.6105 Springborn Smithers Laboratories, NC, USA GLP Unpublished	N	Y	See Art 60 (list of studies, COM Oct. 2016)	Nippon soda
CP 5.1.2.	Kley, A. & Wydra, V.	2012	Acute toxicity of IM-1-2 to larvae of <i>Chironomus riparius</i> in a static 48-hours immobilisation test Study No. 67741251 Ibacon GLP Unpublished	N	Y		Nippon soda
CP 5.1.2.	Kley, A. & Wydra, V.	2012	Acute toxicity of IM-1-2 to larvae of <i>Chrironimus riparius</i> in a static 48 hours immobilisation-test Study No. RD-02374 Ibacon GLP Unpublished	N	Y		Nippon soda
CP 5.1.2	Harkin, S.	2014	Acetamiprid – toxicity test for adult honeybees (<i>apis mellifera</i>) Study No. RD- 02928 The food and environment research agency, UK GLP	N	Y		Nippon soda

Data point	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
			Unpublished				
CP 5.1.2	Harkin, S.	2015	Acetamiprid: <i>In vitro</i> chronic toxicity to larval stage honeybee (<i>Apis mellifera L.</i>) Report No: RD-02929 The Food and Environment Research Agency, York, UK. GLP Not published	N	Y		Nippon soda
CP 8.1	Goller G.	1999	Stability Study of NI-25 (Acetamiprid) in apple and tomato samples after storage in freezer at or below -18 °C - Fortification experiments with active ingredient Report No RPA/NI-25/97051 A.D.M.E. - Bioanalyses, France GLP Unpublished	N	N	-	Nippon Soda
CP 8.1	Netzband D.J.	2003	Stability study of Acetamiprid in potatoes during frozen storage, USA, 2002 in freezer at or below -18°C Report No RD-00243 Bayer CropScience GLP Unpublished	N	N	-	Nippon Soda
CP 8.1	Jean-Baptiste C.	2009	Frozen Storage Stability of Residues of Acetamiprid in Fodder Pea Report No A7125 Anadiag Laboratories GLP Unpublished	N	N	-	Nippon Soda
CP 8.1	Gieseke L.D.	1999	NI-25 (acetamiprid): Freezer storage stability of acetamiprid residues in various raw agricultural commodities and processing fractions (plant matrices) Report No 10201 Horizon Laboratories, Inc. GLP Unpublished	N	N	-	Nippon Soda
CP 8.2.1	Saito H.	1997a	NI-25 [Pyridine-2,6-14C] - Nature of the Residue in Eggplants Report No EC-391-3 Nisso Chemical Analysis Service Co, Ltd GLP, GEP Unpublished	N	N	-	Nippon Soda

Data point	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
CP 8.2.1	Saito H.	1997b	NI-25 [Pyridine-2,6- ¹⁴ C] - Nature of the Residue in Apples Report No EC-742-1 Nisso Chemical Analysis Service Co, Ltd GLP, GEP Unpublished	N	N	-	Nippon Soda
CP 8.2.1	Saito H.	1997c	NI-25 [Pyridine-2,6- ¹⁴ C] - Nature of the Residue in Cabbages Plants Report No EC-743-1 Nisso Chemical Analysis Service Co, Ltd GLP, GEP Unpublished	N	N	-	Nippon Soda
CP 8.2.1	Kawai T.	1995	NI-25 [CN- ¹⁴ C] - Nature of the Residue in Cabbages Plants Report No EC-617-1 Nisso Chemical Analysis Service Co, Ltd GLP, GEP Unpublished	N	N	-	Nippon Soda
CP 8.2.1	McMillan-Staff S.L., Austin D.J., Lingwood A.	1997	[¹⁴ C]-NI-25: Metabolism in Carrots. Report No 11253 Rhône-Poulenc Agriculture Ltd GLP, GEP Unpublished	N	N	-	Nippon Soda
CP 8.2.1	Miller N.	1999	Foliarly applied ¹⁴ C-acetamiprid: Metabolic fate and distribution in cotton (Gossypium hirsutum) Report No EC-97-367 Rhône-Poulenc Ag Company GLP Unpublished	N	N	-	Nippon Soda
CP 8.2.2	xxx	1997b	¹⁴ C-NI-25 (Acetamiprid): Absorption, Distribution, Metabolism and Excretion after Repeated Oral Administration to Laying Hens. Report No 628143 xxxx GLP, GEP Unpublished	Y	N	-	Nippon Soda
CP 8.2.3	xxx	1997a	¹⁴ C-NI-25 (Acetamiprid): Absorption, Distribution, Metabolism and Excretion after Repeated Oral Administration to Lactating Goats Report No 628132 xxx GLP, GEP Unpublished	Y	N	-	Nippon Soda

Data point	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
CP 8.4	Author sanitized	1999a	Acetamiprid: Magnitude of Residues in Cairy Cow Milk and Tissues Report No RD-9989 Source sanitized Unpublished	Y	N	-	Nippon Soda
CP 8.4	Author sanitized	1999b	Acetamiprid (Code No.: NI-25) – Magnitude of Residues in Poultry Tissue and Eggs. Report No RD-9988 Source sanitized Unpublished	Y	Y	See Art 60 (list of studies, COM Oct. 2016)	Nippon Soda
CP 8.5.1	McMillan-Staff S.L., Austin D.J.,	1997	[¹⁴ C]-NI-25 Investigation of the Nature of the Potential Residue in the Products of Industrial Processing or Household Preparation. Report No RPAL Study 13442 Rhône-Poulenc Ag Company GLP Unpublished	N	N	-	Nippon Soda
CP 8.5.3	Kowite W.J.	1999	NI-25: Magnitude of Residues in Apple Processed Commodities Resulting from Foliar Applications of EXP 80667A Insecticide Report No 97512650 Rhône- Poulenc Agriculture Ltd GLP, GEP Unpublished	N	N	-	Nippon Soda
CP 8.5.3	Venet C., Barriere I.,	2000	Acetamiprid (NI-25) – Formulation EXP60707A (SP) - Trials France 1999 - Residues in Apple + Processed products Report No R&D/CRLD/AN/mba/0015360 Aventis CropScience GLP, GEP Unpublished	N	N	-	Nippon Soda
CP 8.6.1	Hobbs G., Inns L.	2012	[¹⁴ C]-IM-1-5: Uptake and Metabolism of Soil Residues in Confined Rotational Crops Report No RD-02391 GLP Unpublished	N	Y	See Art 60 (list of studies, COM Oct. 2016)	Nippon Soda
CP 8.6.2	Raufer B.	2013	Residue study on rotational crops after one application of Acetamiprid on bare soil at 2 sites in Europe in 2010 to 2012. Report No RD-02495N2 GLP Unpublished	N	Y		Nippon Soda

Data point	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
CP 8.6.2	Raufer B.	2014	Residue study on rotational crop (turnip) after one application of Acetamiprid on bare soil at 1 site in Europe in 2012 to 2013. Report No RD-02930 GLP Unpublished	N	Y	See Art 60 (list of studies, COM Oct. 2016)	Nippon Soda
CA 5.2.	Schwarz, T.	2008	Acetamiprid: Validation of an Enforcement Method for Plant Materials Study P/B1447G PTRL Europe Nippon-Soda Report No. RD-01937 GLP Unpublished	N	Y		Nippon soda
CA 5.2.	Weber, H.	2013	Validation of a Multiresidue Method (Fillion) with Modified Cleanup and Detection for the Determination of Acetamiprid in Potato Study No. S13-02134, Document ID RD-02603 Eurofins Agroscience Services GLP Unpublished	N	Y		Nippon soda
CA 5.2.	Giesau, A.	2013	Independent laboratory Validation of an Enforcement Method (“QuEChERS”) for the Determination of Residues of Acetamiprid in Crops using LC-MS/MS Study No. S12-02718, Document ID RD-02454 Eurofins Agroscience Services GLP Unpublished	N	Y		Nippon soda
CA 5.2.	Miya, K.	2010	Validation Study of the Analytical Method for the Determination of the Residues of Acetamiprid and Its Metabolite (IM-2-1) in Animal Commodities Report No. NCAS 10-144, Document ID RD-02080 Nisso Chemical Analysis Service Co., Japan GLP Unpublished	N	Y		Nippon soda
CA 5.2.	Knoch, E.	2010	Independent Laboratory Validation: Analytical Method for the Determination of the Residues of Acetamiprid and its Metabolite (IM-2-1) in Animal Commodities Report No. IF-10/01687868, Document ID RD-02156 SGS Institut Fresenius GmbH GLP Unpublished	N	Y		Nippon soda

Data point	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
CA 5.2.	Täufel, A. & Weber H.	2010	Validation of an Analytical Method for the Determination of Residues of Acetamiprid and Acetamiprid Soil Metabolite IM-1-5 in Calcareous Soil using LC-MS/MS Report No. S09-03287, Document ID RD-02062N Eurofins Dr. Specht, Germany GLP Unpublished	N	Y		Nippon soda
CA 5.2.	Miya, K.	2007	Validation Study of the Confirmatory Method for the Determination of Acetamiprid in Water, Report No. NCAS 06-209, Document ID RD-01204 Nisso Chemical Analysis Service Co., Japan GLP Unpublished	N	Y		Nippon soda
CA 5.2.	Senciuc, M.	2014a	Independent Laboratory Validation (ILV) of a Residues Analytical Method for the Determination of Acetamiprid in Drinking Water Report No. P 3244 G, Document ID RD-02951 PTRL Europe GmbH, Germany GLP, Unpublished	N	Y	See Art 60 (list of studies, COM Oct. 2016)	Nippon soda
CA 5.2.	Gieseau, A. & Weber, H.	2012	Validation of an Analytical Method for the Determination of Residues of Acetamiprid Metabolite IM-1-5 in Water using LC-MS/MS, Report No. S12-02719, Document ID RD-02604 Eurofins Agroscience Services, Germany, GLP, not published	N	Y		Nippon soda
CA 5.2.	Senciuc, M.	2014b	Independent Laboratory Validation (ILV) of a Residues Analytical Method for the Determination of Acetamiprid Metabolite IM-1-5 in Drinking Water Report No. P 3245 G, Document ID RD-02952 PTRL Europe GmbH, Germany GLP Unpublished	N	Y		Nippon soda
CA 5.2.	Senciuc, M.	2014c	Development and Validation of an Analytical Method for the Determination of Acetamiprid in Blood Report No. P3208 G, Document ID RD-02943 PTRL Europe, Germany GLP Unpublished	N	Y		Nippon soda
CA 7.1.1.1/01, 7.1.2.1.1/02, 7.1.2.1.2/03	Morgenroth, U.	1997	¹⁴ C-NI-25: Metabolism in One Soil Incubated under Aerobic Conditions Report/file: RCC Project 373994 Amended final report Nippon Soda Doc No. RD-09624N GLP	N	N	-	Nippon soda

Data point	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
			Not published				
CA 7.1.1.1/02	Feung, C.S.	1998	Acetamiprid (NI-25): Metabolism in Collombey Soil Report/file: RPAC Report N° EC-97-406 Nippon Soda Doc No. RD-09961 Non-GLP Not published	N	N	-	Nippon soda
CA 7.1.1.1/03, 7.1.2.1.1/03, 7.1.2.1.2/04	Burr, C.M.	1997	[¹⁴ C]-NI-25: Rate of Aerobic Degradation in Three Soil Types at 20°C and One Soil Type at 10°C Report/file: RPAL Study Report 11256 Nippon Soda Doc No. RD-09962 GLP Not published	N	N	-	Nippon soda
CA 7.1.1.1/04, 7.1.2.1.1/04, 7.1.2.1.2/05	Simmonds, M.B.	2002	[¹⁴ C]-Acetamiprid: Rate of Degradation in Three Calcareous Soils at 20°C Aventis CropScience SA., report C019428 Nippon Soda Doc No. RD-00168 GLP Not published	N	N	-	Nippon soda
CA 7.1.1.2/01, 7.1.2.1.3/02	Burr, C.M., Doble, M.L	1997	[¹⁴ C]-NI-25: Anaerobic Soil Degradation Report/file: RPAL Study Report 11444 Nippon Soda Doc No. RD-09860 GLP Not published	N	N	-	Nippon soda
CA 7.1.1.3/01	Mislankar, S.G.	1998	Acetamiprid (NI-25) Soil Photolysis Report/file: RPAC Study N° EC-97-359 Nippon Soda Doc No. RD-09833 GLP Not published	N	N	-	Nippon soda
CA 7.1.2.1.1/01, 7.1.2.1.2/02	Jarvis, T. & Hilton, M	2014	Re-calculation of laboratory aerobic degradation rates of acetamiprid and its metabolites, according to FOCUS (2006, 2011) guidance Exponent International Ltd., UK Nippon-Soda Report No.: RD-02913 Non-GLP Not published	N	N	-	Nippon soda

Data point	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
CA 7.1.2.1.2/01	Jewkes, Y.	2014	Rate of Degradation of [¹⁴ C]-IM-1-5 in Three Soils at 20°C Nippon-Soda Report No.: RD-02811 GLP Not published	N	Y	See Art 60 (list of studies, COM Oct. 2016)	Nippon soda
CA 7.1.2.1.2/06	Lowden, P., Oddy, A.M., Jones, M.K.	1997	NI-25: Rate of Degradation of the Acid Metabolite, [¹⁴ C]-IC-0 in Three Soils Report/file: RPAL Study Report 11257 Nippon Soda Doc No. RD-9963 GLP Not published	N	N	-	Nippon soda
CA 7.1.2.1.3/01	Jarvis, T. & Montesano, V	2014a	Re-calculation of laboratory anaerobic degradation rate of acetamiprid according to FOCUS (2006, 2011) guidance Exponent International Ltd., UK Nippon-Soda Report No.: RD-02910 Non-GLP Not published	N	N	-	Nippon soda
CA 7.1.3.1.1/01	Flückiger, J.	1997	Adsorption/Desorption of ¹⁴ C-NI-25 on Five Soils Report/file: RCC Project 374016 Nippon Soda Doc No. RD-09564N GLP Not published	N	N	-	Nippon soda
CA 7.1.3.1.2/01	Sugiyama, H.	2010	Adsorption / desorption study of IM-1-5 on soils Nippon Soda Co. Ltd. (NSM), Japan Report No. NSM10-013 Document No. RD-02101 GLP Not published	N	Y	See Art 60 (list of studies, COM Oct. 2016)	Nippon soda
CA 7.1.3.1.2/02	Mamouni, A.	1997	Adsorption/Desorption of IM-1-4 on Five Soils Report/file:RCC Project 383826 Nippon Soda Doc No. RD-09567N GLP Not published	N	N	-	Nippon soda

Data point	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
CA 7.1.3.1.2/03	Liu, A.C.	1997	6-Chloronicotinic Acid (Acetamiprid Metabolite) Soil Adsorption/Desorption Study Report/file: RPAC Study N° EC-97-370 Nippon Soda Doc No. RD-9973 GLP Not published	N	N	-	Nippon soda
CA 7.1.3.1.2/04	Mackenzie E. & Price O.	2003	[¹⁴ C]-IM-1-2 : Adsorption to and Desorption from Four Soils and One Sediment BayerCropScience SA, report C030079 Nippon Soda Doc No. RD-03056 GLP Not published	N	N	-	Nippon soda
CA 7.2.1.2/01	Hausmann, S., & Class, T.	1998	Aqueous Photodegradation of [¹⁴ C]-Acetamiprid at pH 7 and Determination of Quantum Yield Report/file: PTRL Europe Study N° P 196 G, RPA Study N°96-82 Nippon Soda Doc No. RD-00403 GLP Not published	N	N	-	Nippon soda
CA 7.2.2.2/01	Möndel, M.	2014	[Pyridine-2,6- ¹⁴ C]-Acetamiprid: Aerobic Degradation in Natural Water RLP Agrosience, Germany Nippon-Soda Report No.: RD- 02800 GLP Not published	N	Y	See Art 60 (list of studies, COM Oct. 2016)	Nippon soda
CA 7.2.2.3/01	Jarvis, T. & Montesano, V.	2014c	Recalculation of acetamiprid sediment water kinetics according to FOCUS (2006, 2011) guidance Exponent International Ltd., UK Nippon-Soda Report No.: RD-02911 Non-GLP Not published	N	N	-	Nippon soda
CA 7.2.2.3/02	McMillan-Staff, S.L., & Austin, D.J.	1997	[¹⁴ C]-NI-25: Degradation in Two Water/Sediment Systems. Report/file: RPAL Study 11263 Nippon Soda Doc No. RD-9968 GLP Not published	N	N	-	Nippon soda

Data point	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
CP 9.1.1.2/01	Jarvis, T. & Hilton, M	2014	Re-calculation of acetamiprid field dissipation rates from Wicks (1999) according to FOCUS (2006, 2011) guidance Exponent International Ltd., UK Nippon-Soda Report No.: RD-02912 Non-GLP Not published	N	N	-	Nippon soda
CP 9.1.1.2/02	Kellner, T.	2012a	Soil Dissipation study with Acetamiprid and its Soil Metabolite IM-1-5, in or on Soil in Spain in 2010-2011 Eurofins Agroscience Services Nippon Soda Co. Ltd Report No.: RD-02404 GLP Not published	N	Y	See Art 60 (list of studies, COM Oct. 2016)	Nippon soda
CP 9.1.1.2/03	Kellner, T.	2012b	Soil Dissipation study with Acetamiprid and its Soil Metabolite IM-1-5, in or on Soil in Southern France in 2010-2011 Eurofins Agroscience Services Nippon Soda Co. Ltd Report No.: RD-02405 GLP Not published	N	Y	See Art 60 (list of studies, COM Oct. 2016)	Nippon soda
CP 9.1.1.2/04	Kellner, T.	2012c	Soil Dissipation study with Acetamiprid and its Soil Metabolite IM-1-5, in or on Soil in Northern France in 2010-2011 Eurofins Agroscience Services Nippon Soda Co. Ltd Report No.: RD-02406 GLP Not published	N	Y		Nippon soda
CP 9.1.1.2/05	Finger, N.	2013	Soil Dissipation study with Acetamiprid and its Soil Metabolite IM-1-5, in or on Soil in Hungary in 2011-2012 Eurofins Agroscience Services Nippon Soda Co. Ltd Report No.: RD-02599 GLP Not published	N	Y		Nippon soda
CP 9.1.1.2/07	Jarvis, T. & Montesano, V.	2014b	Calculation of Acetamiprid soil DT ₅₀ values from new field dissipation studies in 2010 and 2011 using FOCUS kinetics Non-GLP Not published	N	N	-	Nippon soda

Data point	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
CP 9.1.1.2/08	Wicks, R.J.	1999	Acetamiprid : Field Soil Dissipation Study in Europe RPA Study 11258, Doc 202052 Nippon Soda Doc No. RD-9997 GLP Not published	N	N	-	Nippon soda
CP 10.4.1.1/02	Lühns, U	2003	Effects of IM-1-5 on reproduction and growth of earthworms Eisenia foetida in artificial Soil RD-03058 IBACON GLP: Yes Published: No	N	N	-	Nippon Soda
CP 10.4.2.1/02	Klein, S. & Rosenkraus, B.	2003	Effects of IM -1-5 on Reproduction of the Collembola Folsomia Candida in Artificial Soil C029229 / RD-03096 Aventis CropScience GLP: Yes Published: No	N	N	-	Nippon Soda

List of data submitted by the applicant and not relied on

Data point	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
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

List of data relied on and not submitted by the applicant but necessary for evaluation

Data point	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
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-