

# SUPPLEMENTARY EFFICACY DATA

## Part B

### Section 3

#### **Efficacy Data and Information**

Concise summary

Product code: AG-F8-250 CS

Product name: RACER 250 CS

Chemical active substance:

Active substance: Flurochloridone 250 g/L

Central Zone

Rapporteur Member State: Poland

#### NATIONAL ADDENDUM

Applicant: ADAMA Polska

Submission date: May 2021

MS Finalisation date: June 2021

(re-assessment of the efficacy of 1,5 L/ha dose rate)

### Version history

When	What
May 2021	Supplementary efficacy data submitted by the Applicant.
June 2021	zRMS re-assessment of the efficacy of 1,5 L/ha dose rate, triggered by the negative outcome of the ecotoxicological evaluation at the initially targeted dose rate 2,0 L/ha.

## Table of Contents

<b>3</b>	<b>Efficacy Data and Information (including Value Data) on the Plant Protection Product (KCP 6).....</b>	<b>4</b>
3.1	Summary and conclusions of zRMS on Section 3: Efficacy (KCP 6).....	4
3.2	Efficacy data (KCP 6).....	6
3.2.1	Preliminary tests (KCP 6.1).....	10
3.2.2	Minimum effective dose tests (KCP 6.2) .....	10
3.2.3	Efficacy tests (KCP 6.2) .....	12
3.3	Information on the occurrence or possible occurrence of the development of resistance (KCP 6.3).....	16
3.4	Adverse effects on treated crops (KCP 6.4) .....	16
3.4.1	Phytotoxicity to host crop (KCP 6.4.1) .....	16
3.4.2	Effect on the yield of treated plants or plant product (KCP 6.4.2) .....	17
3.4.3	Effects on the quality of plants or plant products (KCP 6.4.3).....	17
3.4.4	Effects on transformation processes (KCP 6.4.4).....	17
3.4.5	Impact on treated plants or plant products to be used for propagation (KCP 6.4.5).....	17
3.5	Observations on other undesirable or unintended side-effects (KCP 6.5).....	18
3.5.1	Impact on succeeding crops (KCP 6.5.1) .....	18
3.5.2	Impact on other plants including adjacent crops (KCP 6.5.2) .....	18
3.5.3	Effects on beneficial and other non-target organisms (KCP 6.5.3).....	18
3.6	Other/special studies.....	18
3.7	List of test facilities including the corresponding certificates .....	18
<b>Appendix 1</b>	<b>Lists of data considered in support of the evaluation.....</b>	<b>19</b>

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

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

##### Comments of zRMS:

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

No comments after the commenting period.

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

##### Abstract

##### Comments of zRMS:

###### Introduction

The evaluation by the ecotoxicology section, carried out concurrently with initial efficacy assessment (i.e. in October 2020), resulted in the conclusion of unacceptable risk to algae in case the test item is applied at the dose rate of 2,0 L/ha. In response, the applicant had submitted additional data for ecotoxicology section and had applied for authorization of the product use at the lower dose rate, 1,5L/ha, for which, as they have proposed, the ecotoxicological issue can be safely resolved. The outcome of this efficacy re-evaluation can be seen in the MED, Efficacy and Phytotoxicity chapters. Other outcomes of the evaluation remain unaltered.

###### MED

The dose rate of 2.0 L/ha, targeted by the applicant before, had been correctly assumed as the MED rate. Nevertheless, the dose response was observed between the 1,0 L/ha and 1,5 L/ha dose rates either. Hence, once the use of the 2,0 L/ha dose must be abandoned, the dose rate of 1,5 L/ha should be properly considered the actual MED rate of the test item, *in lieu* of the 2,0 L/ha.

###### Efficacy

The efficacy of the 1,5 L/ha dose rate of the test item has been evaluated presently based on the same data selection criteria as those for the 2,0 L/ha dose rate in the previous evaluation (October 2020): 19-53 and 32-60 DAA. The zRMS is inclined to admit, that the test item AG-F8-250CS (Racer 250 CS), when used at the dose rate of 1,5 L/ha, does still represent a decent tool for the control of broadleaved weeds in potato crop.

###### Selectivity

No phytotoxicity symptoms exceeded 5% intensity after the application of the test item, or the preceding formulation, at the targeted dose rate of 1,5 L/ha. All symptoms receded before the last assessment. According to the core dossier, already evaluated, none of the phytotoxicity symptoms observed after the application of 2,0 or 4,0 L/ha (former 1N and 2N dose rates, test item or preceding formulation) had affected yield amount or quality.

As this supplementary dossier does not include any new trial data, the phytotoxicity assessment of the currently relevant 2N dose rate (3,0 L/ha) is not possible directly. The crop safety is therefore inferred from the lack of significant phytotoxicity of the former 2N (4,0 L/ha) dose rate.

**Table 3.1-1: Acceptability of intended uses (and respective fall-back GAPs, if applicable)**

Table 01-1: Acceptability of intended uses (and respective risk-benefit GRS, if applicable)														
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Use- No. *	Member state(s)	Crop and/ or situation  (crop destination / purpose of crop)	F, Fn, Fnp G, Gn, Gnp or I **	Pests or Group of pests controlled  (additionally: develop- mental stages of the pest or pest group)	Application				Application rate			PHI (days)	Remarks:  e.g. g safener/ synergist per ha, other dose rate expression, dose range (min-max)	zRMS Conclusion (efficacy)
					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			
Zonal uses (field or outdoor uses, certain types of protected crops)														
1	PL	Solanum tu- berosum/SOLTU	F	Dicotyledonous weed plants and Echinochloa crus-galli	Spray	BBCH 00-08; pre- emergence	a) 1 b) 1	n.a	a) 1,5 l/ha b) 1,5 l/ha	a) 375 b) 375	200-250	n.a.		A

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

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

Column 15: zRMS conclusion.

A	Acceptable
R	Acceptable with further restriction
C	To be confirmed by cMS
N	Not acceptable / evaluation not possible
n.r.	Not relevant for section 3

## 3.2 Efficacy data (KCP 6)

### Introduction

This is additional supporting document for already submitted and evaluated (October 2020) dossier of plant protection product AG-F8-250 CS (Racer 250 CS), capsule suspension, contain 250 g/L flurochloridone.

Evaluation was performed for the product to be used at max dose rate : 2,0 l/ha, however in the course of evaluation of ecotoxicological section of the dossier, it turned out that available data were not sufficient to demonstrate acceptable risk to algae in D4 and D6 scenarios. Additional modelling performed with consideration of wider buffer zones would not address the risk in D scenarios, where the exposure is driven by drainage and currently there are no efficient mitigation measures enabling reduction of the exposure. The only option would be reduction of the application rate.

Taking into the consideration above we provide in this document the overview of the efficacy data for the lower 1,5 l/ha dose to prove its efficacy and to conclude the possibility of the registration in Poland.

Data included in this document are based on trial reports already submitted and evaluated.

All detailed data and information (BAD) about trials submitted previously for evaluation of the product AG-F8-250 CS remains valid for this document.

No additional trials have been performed for the purposes of this document.

### Description of active substances

Flurochloridone is approved under Regulation EC No 1107/2009, inclusive Directive 2011/34/EU, inclusion date 01/06/2011, RMS Spain.

### Mode of action

Mode of action

Flurochloridone is a selective herbicide belonging to the HRAC F1 group. It belongs to the pyrrolidone chemical group. This substance is not systemic since its migration in the plant is low. It inhibits the phytoene desaturase, PDS enzyme, and thus the synthesis of carotenoids which leads to the loss of the protective pigments of the chlorophyll molecules.

Flurochloridone penetrates in the plant by the underground plant parts between germination and seedling emergence.

**Table 3.2-1: Details of the active substances**

Active substance	Active substance
Concentration (Unit: g/L)	250 g/l
Chemical group	Pyrolidone
Mode of action	Inhibitor of the phytoene desaturase (MoA Group 12, HRAC 2020)
Biological action	Inhibition of the phytoene desaturase impairs the synthesis of carotenoids, that in healthy plants protect chlorophyll molecules from oxidative damage
Time of application / type of use	Pre-emergence

### Description of the plant protection product

Product AG-F8-250CS (Racer 250 CS), capsule suspension, contain 250 g/L flurochloridone.

**Table 3.2-2: Simplified table of requested uses for the product code**

Uses		Member State	Requested rate	Comments / Other relevant details on GAPs
Crop(s)	Target(s)			
SOLTU Solanum tuberosum Pre-emergence	Dicotyledonous weed plants and Echinochloa crus-galli	PL	1,5 l/ha, single application per use and per season	Pre-emergence application

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

### Description of the target pests

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

EPPO code	Scientific name
AMARE	<i>Amaranthus retroflexus</i>
ECHCG	<i>Echinochloa crus-galli</i>
BRSNW	<i>Brassica napus</i>
SOLNI	<i>Solanum nigrum</i>
CHEAL	<i>Chenopodium album</i>
POLCO	<i>Polygonum convolvulus</i>
POLPE	<i>Persicaria maculosa</i>
VIOAR	<i>Viola arvensis</i>
SPRAR	<i>Spergula arvensis</i>
GERPU	<i>Geranium pusillum</i>
EROCI	<i>Erodium cicutarium</i>
MATIN	<i>Matricaria inodora</i>
STEME	<i>Stellaria media</i>
GALAP	<i>Galium aparine</i>
VERPU	<i>Veronica pulvinaris</i>
CAPBP	<i>Capsella bursa-pastoris</i>
THLAR	<i>Thlapsi arvense</i>
GASPA	<i>Galinsoga parviflora</i>
VIOTR	<i>Viola tricolor</i> <sup>*</sup>
CONAR	<i>Convolvulus arvensis</i>
PAPRH	<i>Papaver rhoeas</i>

\*—optional

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

Crop and/or situation	Crop status		Pests or group of pests controlled	Pest status	
	Major	minor		Major	minor
SOLTU /potato	PL	-	Dicotyledonopus weed plants and Echinochloa crus-galli	PL	-

### Compliance with the Uniform Principles

Trials were carried out by testing organisations, all of which followed the available EPPO guidelines and are officially recognized by the competent authorities to carry out field registration trials in accordance

with the principles of Good Experimental Practice (GEP). The design and analysis of results and reporting of the studies were carried out in compliance with the general EPPO Guidelines PP 1/49(3), PP 1/135(4), PP 1/181(4), PP 1/152(4)

### Information on trials submitted (3.1 Efficacy data)

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

Crop(s) *	Target(s)*	Country	Years	Type of trial**	Number of trials (number of valid trials)		GEP, non-GEP, official***	Comments (any other relevant information)
					North-East zone	-		
SOLTU pre – emergence)	Amaranthus retroflexus (AMARE)	Poland	2019	E	1(1)	-	GEP	
	TOTAL	-	2019	-	1(1)	-	-	
SOLTU pre – emergence)	Solanum nigrum (SOLNI)	Poland	2018 2019	E	1(1) 1(1)	-	GEP	
	TOTAL	-	2018- 2019	-	2(2)	-	-	
SOLTU pre – emergence)	Brassica napus (BRSNW)	Poland	2018 2019	E E	1(1) 3(3)	-	GEP	
	TOTAL	-	2018- 2019	-	4(4)	-	-	
SOLTU pre – emergence)	Echinochloa crus galli (ECHCG)	Poland	2018 2019	E E	2(2) 6(6)	-	GEP	
	TOTAL	-	2018- 2019	-	8(8)	-	-	
SOLTU pre – emergence)	Chenopodium Album (CHEAL)	Poland	2018 2019	E	3(3) 6(6)	-	GEP	
	TOTAL	-	2018- 2019	-	9(9)	-	-	
SOLTU pre – emergence)	Polygonum convolvulus (POLCO)	Poland	2018 2019	E	2(2) 2(2)	-	GEP	
	TOTAL	-	2018- 2019	-	4(4)	-	-	
SOLTU pre – emergence)	Persicaria maculosa (POLPE )	Poland	2019	E	3(3)		GEP	
	TOTAL	-	2019	-	3(3)	-	-	
SOLTU pre – emergence)	Viola arvensis (VIOAR )	Poland	2018 2019	E	2(2) 3(3)	-	GEP	
	TOTAL	-	2018- 2019	-	5(5)	-	-	
SOLTU pre – emergence)	Spergula arvensis (SPRAR)	Poland	2018	E	1(1)	-	GEP	
	TOTAL	-	2018	-	1(1)	-	-	
SOLTU pre – emergence)	Geranium pusillum (GERPU)	Poland	2018	E	2(2)	-	GEP	
	TOTAL	-	2018	-	2(2)	-	-	
SOLTU pre – emergence)	Erodium cicutarium (EROCI)	Poland	2018 2019	E	1(1) 1(1)	-	GEP	



Crop(s) *	Target(s)*	Country	Years	Type of Trial**	Number of trials		GEP, non- GEP***	Comments
	TOTAL	-	2018- 2019	-	2(2)	-	-	
SOLTU pre – emergence)	Matricaria inodora (MATIN)	Poland	2019	E	4(4)	-	GEP	
	TOTAL	-	2019	-	4(4)	-	-	
SOLTU pre – emergence)	Stellaria media (STEME)	Poland	2019	E	5(5)	-	GEP	
	TOTAL	-	2019	-	5(5)	-	-	
SOLTU pre – emergence)	Galium aparine (GALAP)	Poland	2019	E	2(2)	-	GEP	
	TOTAL	-	2019	-	2(2)	-	-	
SOLTU pre – emergence)	Veronica pulvi (VERPU)	Poland	2019	E	1(1)	-	GEP	
	TOTAL	-	2019	-	1(1)	-	-	
SOLTU pre – emergence)	Capsella bursa- pastoris (CAPBP)	Poland	2019	E	3(3)	-	GEP	
	TOTAL	-	2019	-	3(3)	-	-	
SOLTU pre – emergence)	Thlapsi arvense (THLAR)	Poland	2019	E	2(2)	-	GEP	
	TOTAL	-	2019	-	2(2)	-	-	
SOLTU pre – emergence)	Galinsoga parvi- flora (GASPA)	Poland	2019	E	2(2)	-	GEP	
	TOTAL	-	2019	-	2(2)	-	-	
SOLTU pre – emergence)	Viola tricolora (VIOTR)	Poland	2019	E	2(2)	-	GEP	
	TOTAL	-	2019	-	2(2)	-	-	
SOLTU pre – emergence)	Convolvulus arvensis (CONAR)	Poland	2019	E	1(1)	-	GEP	
	TOTAL	-	2019	-	1(1)	-	-	
SOLTU pre – emergence)	Papaver rhoeas (PAPRH)	Poland	2019	E	1(1)	-	GEP	
	TOTAL	-	2019	-	1(1)	-	-	
1	21	-	2018- 2019	-	11(11)	-	-	

\* According to the GAP table. Timing of the application(s) can be added if relevant (e.g. Pre-emergence vs post-emergence, spring vs autumn).

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

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

**Table 3.2-6: Presentation of reference standards used in trials (efficacy trials)**

Crop	Reference stand- ard	Country(ies) where the product is registered <sup>(1)</sup>	Authoriza- tion num- ber	Active sub- stance(s)	Formulation		Regis- tered applica- tion rate <sup>(3)</sup>	Applica- tion rate in trials (per treat- ment)	Re- mark <sup>(4)</sup>
					Type <sup>(2)</sup>	Concentra- tion of a.s.			
SOL- TU/potato	Racer 250 EC	PL	R-8/2003	Flurochlori- done	EC	250 g/L	2,0 – 3,0 l/ha	2,0 – 3,0 l/ha	

(1) only on use(s) applied for (with the test product)

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

### 3.2.1 Preliminary tests (KCP 6.1)

Product contain flurochloridone 250 g/L as Racer (EC) is already registered since several years in Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania and Slovakia. Its mode of action as well as the range of effective rates is well known. Therefore, no preliminary range-finding tests have been carried out.

### 3.2.2 Minimum effective dose tests (KCP 6.2)

No additional efficacy trials were conducted. All 11 efficacy trials including MED are already evaluated. Due to the need to lower the target dose, one of the tested, lower dose rates: 1,5 l/ha becomes the target dose rate.

Results are presented in 2 assessments' intervals: BBCH of the crop 19-39 and BBCH 39 for target weed species which appear on at least 2 trial locations at weed density at least 4 plants/m<sup>2</sup>.

Table 3.2-9 presents efficacy results for target dose rate: 1,5 l/ha and 1,0 l/ha which is 66,6% of the target dose rate.

**Table 3.2-7: Minimum effective dose. Efficacy of AGF-F8-250 CS at proposed label rate and 66,6 % of the target. BBCH of the crop: 19-39, DAA 25-53**

Weed code	Weed density UNCK (PLA/m <sup>2</sup> )			DAA	BBCH	AGF-F8-250 CS 1,0 l/ha			AGF-F8-250 CS 1,5 l/ha		
	mean	min	max			mean	min	max	mean	min	max
<b>BRSNW</b>	6,63	5,75	8,00	25-53	19-39	83,70	63,75	99,80	90,40	82,50	99,80
<b>n</b>	4			25-53	19-39	4			4		
<b>CAPBP</b>	6,75	5,50	9,25	25-53	19-39	79,61	75,00	86,33	86,51	75,00	98,28
<b>n</b>	3			25-53	19-39	3			3		
<b>CHEAL</b>	12,32	6,30	27,80	25-53	19-39	82,73	42,50	100,00	87,51	46,30	100,00
<b>n</b>	9			25-53	19-39	9			9		
<b>ECHCG</b>	8,96	4,80	15,30	25-53	19-39	57,04	30,00	90,00	65,13	42,50	93,80
<b>n</b>	8			25-53	19-39	8			8		
<b>EROCI</b>	5,50	5,00	6,00	25-53	19-39	99,50	99,00	100,00	99,00	98,00	100,00
<b>n</b>	2			25-53	19-39	2			2		
<b>GALAP</b>	10,25	9,00	11,50	25-53	19-39	58,13	56,25	60,00	71,88	71,25	72,50
<b>n</b>	2			25-53	19-39	2			2		
<b>GASPA</b>	14,00	14,00	14,00	25-53	19-39	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00
<b>n</b>	1			25-53	19-39	1			1		
<b>GERPU</b>	7,00	5,00	9,00	25-53	19-39	84,90	70,00	99,80	90,00	80,00	100,00
<b>n</b>	2			25-53	19-39	2			2		
<b>MATIN</b>	6,44	6,00	7,50	25-53	19-39	90,93	63,73	100,00	96,25	85,00	100,00
<b>n</b>	4			25-53	19-39	4			4		
<b>POLCO</b>	8,88	5,50	12,00	25-53	19-39	74,56	53,75	92,50	83,88	67,50	95,00
<b>n</b>	4			25-53	19-39	4			4		
<b>POLPE</b>	12,70	6,00	23,80	25-53	19-39	65,00	20,00	100,00	74,17	25,00	100,00
<b>n</b>	3			25-53	19-39	3			3		
<b>SOLNI</b>	5,50	5,00	6,00	25-53	19-39	78,05	56,30	99,80	84,65	69,50	99,80
<b>n</b>	2			25-53	19-39	2			2		
<b>STEME</b>	6,55	1,00	11,25	25-53	19-39	72,75	45,00	100,00	80,75	50,00	100,00
<b>n</b>	5			25-53	19-39	5			5		

<b>THLAR</b>	7,75	6,00	9,50	25-53	19-39	88,13	76,25	100,00	92,63	85,25	100,00
<b>n</b>	2			25-53	19-39	2			2		
<b>VIOAR</b>	10,81	5,75	19,75	25-53	19-39	62,90	51,25	78,00	75,45	66,25	81,00
<b>n</b>	5			25-53	19-39	5			5		
<b>VIOTR</b>	4,75	2,00	7,50	25-53	19-39	74,00	48,00	100,00	76,00	52,00	100,00
<b>n</b>	2			25-53	19-39	2			2		

**Table 3.2-10: Minimum effective dose. Efficacy of AGF-F8-250 CS at proposed label rate and 66,6 % of the target dose rate BBCH of the crop: 39, DAA 36-60**

Weed code	Weed density UNCK (PLA/m2)			DAA	BBCH	AGF-F8-250 CS 1,0 l/ha			AGF-F8-250 CS 1,5 l/ha		
	mean	min	max			mean	min	max	mean	min	max
<b>BRSNW</b>	6,50	4,00	8,00	36-60	39	78,43	63,75	87,80	87,93	82,50	92,50
<b>n</b>	3			36-60	39	3			3		
<b>CAPBP</b>	6,75	5,50	9,25	36-60	39	87,94	77,50	100,00	94,84	86,25	100,00
<b>n</b>	3			36-60	39	3			3		
<b>CHEAL</b>	11,17	6,50	27,80	36-60	39	80,33	46,30	100,00	85,70	51,30	100,00
<b>n</b>	8			36-60	39	8			8		
<b>ECHCG</b>	9,21	5,30	15,30	36-60	39	51,26	30,00	90,00	65,51	42,50	93,80
<b>n</b>	8			36-60	39	8			8		
<b>EROCI</b>	5,40	5,00	5,80	36-60	39	98,75	97,50	100,00	99,00	98,00	100,00
<b>n</b>	2			36-60	39	2			2		
<b>GALAP</b>	10,63	9,00	12,25	36-60	39	59,38	56,25	62,50	71,25	68,75	73,75
<b>n</b>	2			36-60	39	2			2		
<b>GASPA</b>	8,90	5,80	12,00	36-60	39	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00
<b>n</b>	2			36-60	39	2			2		
<b>GERPU</b>	11,00	11,00	11,00	36-60	39	64,00	64,00	64,00	75,00	75,00	75,00
<b>n</b>	1			36-60	39	1			1		
<b>MATIN</b>	6,75	5,00	7,75	36-60	39	88,33	65,00	100,00	94,17	82,50	100,00
<b>n</b>	3			36-60	39	3			3		
<b>POLCO</b>	10,44	6,75	16,00	36-60	39	70,38	52,50	90,00	82,26	73,00	93,80
<b>n</b>	4			36-60	39	4			4		
<b>POLPE</b>	12,77	6,00	23,80	36-60	39	61,67	20,00	100,00	73,33	30,00	100,00
<b>n</b>	3			36-60	39	3			3		
<b>SOLNI</b>	6,00	6,00	6,00	36-60	39	58,80	58,80	58,80	73,30	73,30	73,30
<b>n</b>	1			36-60	39	1			1		
<b>STEME</b>	7,06	1,00	11,25	36-60	39	68,15	48,80	78,75	76,59	50,00	87,61
<b>n</b>	4			36-60	39	4			4		
<b>THLAR</b>	7,75	6,00	9,50	36-60	39	88,13	76,25	100,00	92,63	85,25	100,00
<b>n</b>	2			36-60	39	2			2		
<b>VIOAR</b>	11,56	7,00	20,25	36-60	39	61,00	53,75	70,00	75,55	73,75	80,00
<b>n</b>	5			36-60	39	5			5		
<b>VIOTR</b>	4,65	2,00	7,30	36-60	39	79,15	58,30	100,00	80,75	61,50	100,00
<b>n</b>	2			36-60	39	2			2		

### Summary and conclusions on the minimum effective dose

According to the presented results, the recommended target dose rate 1,5 l/ha provided the best control and should be considered most effective against mono- and dicotyledonous weed plants in potato (SOL-TU) , for which the activity of AG-F8-250CS (Racer 250 CS) is claimed.

#### Comments of zRMS:

In the original core dossier, submitted in October 2020 and presently already evaluated, the applicant provided indication of neither the assessment dates (DAA) nor the data points` selection criteria for the MED summary presented. Consequently, at that time the zRMS had summarized efficacy data alternatively, and as much as possible in accordance with the EPPO PP 1/51 (3) guidance: *Weeds in potato*. The intervals chosen for the summary, out of the available assessment dates and according to BBCH stipulated by the guidance, were 9-39 DAA and 19-53 DAA for the MED assessment, and 19-53 DAA and 32-60 DAA for the Efficacy assessment.

In the present dossier the applicant has presented their MED summary for the 25-53 DAA and 36-60 DAA intervals, similarly giving no rationale behind their selection, and in many cases **underestimating** the test product efficacy, which is in fact surprising.

It is the zRMS opinion that the necessity, brought about by one negative aspect of the ecotox assessment, of reconsidering the robustness of efficacy data, **should not alter the criteria of data inclusion** for the assessment of the lower dose rate, when this assessment is based on the same data set.

The dose rate of 2.0 L/ha, targeted by the applicant before, had been correctly assumed as the MED rate. Nevertheless, as was concluded before from the complete data set, the dose response was observed between the 1,0 L/ha and 1,5 L/ha dose rates either. Hence, once the use of the 2,0 L/ha dose must be abandoned, the dose rate of 1,5 L/ha should be properly considered the actual MED rate of the test item, *in lieu* of the 2,0 L/ha.

The alternative data compilation presented by the applicant in the current document does not affect this conclusion in any way.

### 3.2.3 Efficacy tests (KCP 6.2)

No additional efficacy trials were conducted. All 11 efficacy trials are already evaluated.

Due to the need to lower the target dose, one of the tested, lower dose rate: 1,5 l/ha become a target dose rate.

All information regarding conducting efficacy trials presented in this document like: Details on trial methodology, materials, methods of assessment and all the other experimental details did not change and are included in already evaluated dossier (October 2020).

#### Mono – and dicotyledonous weed plants in potato (SOLTU)

Total of 11 efficacy trials were carried out in 2018-2019, to determine efficacy of product: AG-F8-250CS (Racer 250 CS) in controlling mono and dicotyledonous weed plants in potato (SOLTU). The trials were conducted in 2018 and 2019 in Poland (North East Zone).

Efficacy data are presented in Tables 3.2-12 and 3.2-13

Results are presented in 2 assessments' intervals: BBCH of the crop 19-39 and BBCH 39 for target weed species which appear on at least 2 trial locations at weed density at least 4 plants/m<sup>2</sup>.

**Table 3.2-12: Efficacy of product AG-F8-250CS (Racer 250 CS) calculated at 25-53 DAA, BBCH of the crop: 19-39**

Weed code	Weed density UNCK (PLA/m <sup>2</sup> )			DAA	BBCH	AGF-F8-250 CS 1,5 l/ha			Racer 250 EC 1,5 l/ha		
	mean	min	max			mean	min	max	mean	min	max
<b>BRSNW</b>	6,63	5,75	8,00	25-53	19-39	90,40	82,50	99,80	87,95	82,50	99,80
<b>n</b>	4			25-53	19-39	4			4		
<b>CAPBP</b>	6,75	5,50	9,25	25-53	19-39	86,51	75,00	98,28	83,78	75,00	88,83
<b>n</b>	3			25-53	19-39	3			3		
<b>CHEAL</b>	12,32	6,30	27,80	25-53	19-39	87,51	46,30	100,00	90,94	72,50	100,00

<b>n</b>	9			25-53	19-39	9			9		
<b>ECHCG</b>	8,96	4,80	15,30	25-53	19-39	65,13	42,50	93,80	69,60	47,50	100,00
<b>n</b>	8			25-53	19-39	8			8		
<b>EROCI</b>	5,50	5,00	6,00	25-53	19-39	99,00	98,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00
<b>n</b>	2			25-53	19-39	2			2		
<b>GALAP</b>	10,25	9,00	11,50	25-53	19-39	71,88	71,25	72,50	73,75	72,50	75,00
<b>n</b>	2			25-53	19-39	2			2		
<b>GASPA</b>	14,00	14,00	14,00	25-53	19-39	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00
<b>n</b>	1			25-53	19-39	1			1		
<b>GERPU</b>	7,00	5,00	9,00	25-53	19-39	90,00	80,00	100,00	91,40	83,00	99,80
<b>n</b>	2			25-53	19-39	2			2		
<b>MATIN</b>	6,44	6,00	7,50	25-53	19-39	96,25	85,00	100,00	93,44	83,74	100,00
<b>n</b>	4			25-53	19-39	4			4		
<b>POLCO</b>	8,88	5,50	12,00	25-53	19-39	83,88	67,50	95,00	82,75	72,50	97,50
<b>n</b>	4			25-53	19-39	4			4		
<b>POLPE</b>	12,70	6,00	23,80	25-53	19-39	74,17	25,00	100,00	77,10	56,30	100,00
<b>n</b>	3			25-53	19-39	3			3		
<b>SOLNI</b>	5,50	5,00	6,00	25-53	19-39	84,65	69,50	99,80	90,40	80,80	100,00
<b>n</b>	2			25-53	19-39	2			2		
<b>STEME</b>	6,55	1,00	11,25	25-53	19-39	80,75	50,00	100,00	84,45	67,50	100,00
<b>n</b>	5			25-53	19-39	5			5		
<b>THLAR</b>	7,75	6,00	9,50	25-53	19-39	92,63	85,25	100,00	92,75	85,50	100,00
<b>n</b>	2			25-53	19-39	2			2		
<b>VIOAR</b>	10,81	5,75	19,75	25-53	19-39	75,45	66,25	81,00	78,05	71,25	85,00
<b>n</b>	5			25-53	19-39	5			5		
<b>VIOTR</b>	4,75	2,00	7,50	25-53	19-39	76,00	52,00	100,00	84,75	69,50	100,00
<b>n</b>	2			25-53	19-39	2			2		

**Table 3.2-13: Efficacy of product AG-F8-250CS (Racer 250 CS) calculated at 36-60 DAA, BBCH of the crop: 39**

Weed code	weed density UNCK (PLA/m <sup>2</sup> )			DAA	BBCH	AGF-F8-250 CS 1,5 l/ha			Racer 250 EC 1,5 l/ha		
	mean	min	max			mean	min	max	mean	min	max
BRSNW	6,50	4,00	8,00	36-60	39	87,93	82,50	92,50	81,33	71,50	87,50
<b>n</b>	3			36-60	39	3			3		
CAPBP	6,75	5,50	9,25	36-60	39	94,84	86,25	100,00	92,11	87,50	100,00
<b>n</b>	3			36-60	39	3			3		
CHEAL	11,17	6,50	27,80	36-60	39	85,70	51,30	100,00	91,04	78,75	100,00
<b>n</b>	8			36-60	39	8			8		
ECHCG	9,21	5,30	15,30	36-60	39	65,51	42,50	93,80	68,08	49,00	97,50
<b>n</b>	8			36-60	39	8			8		
EROCI	5,40	5,00	5,80	36-60	39	99,00	98,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00
<b>n</b>	2			36-60	39	2			2		
GALAP	10,63	9,00	12,25	36-60	39	71,25	68,75	73,75	74,38	72,50	76,25
<b>n</b>	2			36-60	39	2			2		
GASPA	8,90	5,80	12,00	36-60	39	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00
<b>n</b>	2			36-60	39	2			2		

GERPU	11,00	11,00	11,00	36-60	39	75,00	75,00	75,00	79,00	79,00	79,00
n	1			36-60	39	1			1		
MATIN	6,75	5,00	7,75	36-60	39	94,17	82,50	100,00	94,17	82,50	100,00
n	3			36-60	39	3			3		
POLCO	10,44	6,75	16,00	36-60	39	82,26	73,00	93,80	82,00	72,50	97,50
n	4			36-60	39	4			4		
POLPE	12,77	6,00	23,80	36-60	39	73,33	30,00	100,00	80,00	60,00	100,00
n	3			36-60	39	3			3		
SOLNI	6,00	6,00	6,00	36-60	39	73,30	73,30	73,30	82,50	82,50	82,50
n	1			36-60	39	1			1		
STEME	7,06	1,00	11,25	36-60	39	76,59	50,00	87,61	76,27	43,00	92,08
n	4			36-60	39	4			4		
THLAR	7,75	6,00	9,50	36-60	39	92,63	85,25	100,00	92,63	85,25	100,00
n	2			36-60	39	2			2		
VIOAR	11,56	7,00	20,25	36-60	39	75,55	73,75	80,00	76,50	73,75	85,00
n	5			36-60	39	5			5		
VIOTR	4,65	2,00	7,30	36-60	39	80,75	61,50	100,00	78,90	67,80	90,00
n	2			36-60	39	2			2		

### Summary

The submitted efficacy data (reports from field trials) and additional information fulfil requirements and conditions determined in the following EPPO guidelines:

PP 1/135 (4) Phytotoxicity assessment;

PP 1/152 (4) Design and analysis of efficacy evaluation trials;

PP 1/181 (4) Conduct and reporting of efficacy evaluation trials including good experimental practice.

PP 1/50 (3) Weeds in potato

The studies fulfil also requirements of the Commission Regulation (EU) No 540/2011 of 25 May 2011 implementing Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards the data requirements for plant protection products.

The applicant submitted 11 reports (in total) showing the results in research into product efficacy carried out in 2018 and 2019 in potato (SOLTU). The obtained data in performed trials show that AG-F8-250CS (Racer 250 CS) applied at dose rate: 1,5 l/ha provide benefits against the most important weeds in potato, as shown in the table 3.2-14 below.

Weeds' susceptibility is classified according to SANCO /10055/2013 Rev.4 from 3 October 2013.

HS (Highly susceptible)	95-100%
S (Susceptible)	85-94,9%
MS (Moderately Susceptible)	70-84,9%
MT (Moderately Tolerant )	50-69,9%
T (Tolerant)	0-49,9%

Results are presented in 2 assessments intervals: BBCH of the crop 19-39 and BBCH 39 for target weed species which appear on at least 2 trial locations at weed density at least 4 plants/m<sup>2</sup>.

### Susceptibility classification of weeds in potato (SOLTU) for AG-F8-250CS (Racer 250 CS) at 1,5 l/ha, in 2 assessment' intervals

Classification	BBCH 19-39	BBCH 39
<b>HS</b>	GASPA, MATIN	GASPA
<b>S</b>	BRSNW, CAPBP, CHEAL, THLAR	CAPBP, BRSNW, CHEAL, MATIN, THLAR

<b>MS</b>	GALAP, POLCO, SOLNI, STEME, VIOAR	GALAP, POLCO, SOLNI, STEME, VIOAR
<b>MT</b>	ECHCG	ECHCG
<b>T</b>	no weeds classified as tolerant	no weeds classified as tolerant

#### Comments of zRMS:

The efficacy of the 1,5 L/ha dose rate of the test item has been evaluated presently based on the same data selection criteria as those for the 2,0 L/ha dose rate in the previous evaluation (October 2020): 19-53 and 32-60 DAA.

The weed inclusion and exclusion criteria remained unchanged since the previous evaluation, yet they are explained below for the sake of completeness, as quoted from the commenting box following Efficacy chapter in the final RR (March 2021):

*“Weeds that had occurred in a single trial cannot be classified and listed in the product label as susceptible targets, and species of economical importance cannot be reliably classified if recorded from less than 4 trials. The applicant has not provided justification for submitting the limited set of trials for a number of important weeds. However, the Table 3.2-15 a includes also those species, which appeared in at least two, but still less than four trials (CAPBP, GASPA, SOLNI, THLAR and POLPE). As CAPBP, GASPA, SOLNI and THLAR have been listed in the label of the preceding formulation (RACER 250 EC) and classified as vulnerable, they are considered as previously evaluated and may be included in the label of the test item. Only POLPE, though important in potato cultures, did not appear in the label of preceding formulation and has occurred in only 3 trials in the present submission. POLPE cannot be classified.”*

Some species, e.g. EROCI, have appeared in the present classification even though they had been not included in the preceding document. This is because contrary to the 2,0 L/ha treatment, they were observed in the plots treated with 1,5 L/ha dose rate.

#### Susceptibility classification of weeds in potato (SOLTU) for AG-F8-250CS (Racer 250 CS) at 1,5 l/ha after excluding the species recorded from single trials.

Classification	19-53 DAA (11 trials)	32-60 DAA (11 trials)
<b>HS</b>	EROCI (2), GASPA (2), MATIN (4)	GASPA (2), MATIN (4)
<b>S</b>	BRSNW (4), CAPBP (3), CHEAL (9), GERPU (2), STEME (4), THLAR (2)	BRSNW (4), CAPBP (3), CHEAL (9), GERPU (2), SOLNI (2), THLAR (2)
<b>MS</b>	GALAP (2), POLCO (4), SOLNI (2), VIOAR (5)	GALAP (2), POLCO (4), STEME (5), VIOAR (5)
<b>MT</b>	ECHCG (8)	ECHCG (8)
<b>T</b>	no weeds classified as tolerant	no weeds classified as tolerant

The zRMS is inclined to admit, that the test item AG-F8-250CS (Racer 250 CS), when used at the dose rate of 1,5 L/ha, does still represent a decent tool for the control of broadleaved weeds in potato crop.

#### Minor use

n.a.

#### Yield (and relevant quality indicators), from efficacy trials (in the presence of challenging pest populations)

No yield data from efficacy trials have been submitted. Please refer to core dossier.

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

Please refer to core dossier.

### 3.4 Adverse effects on treated crops (KCP 6.4)

Please refer to core dossier. No additional selectivity trials were conducted

#### 3.4.1 Phytotoxicity to host crop (KCP 6.4.1)

No additional selectivity trials were conducted.

All information regarding conducting selectivity trials presented in this document like: Details on trial methodology, materials, methods of assessment and all the other experimental details did not change and are included in already evaluated dossier (October 2020).

Due to the need to lower the target dose, one of the tested, lower dose rate: 1,5 l/ha become a target dose rate.

Table 3.4-3 present updated data concerning the phytotoxicity of product AG-F8-250 CS at target dose rate – 1,5 l/ha.

**Table 3.4-1: Phytotoxicity of product**

Number of trials with...		Selectivity trials (8 trials)		Efficacy trials (11 trials)			
		AG-F8-250 CS (Racer 250 CS)		Racer 250 EC		AG-F8-250 CS (Racer 250 CS)	Racer 250 EC
		2,0 l/ha	4,0 l/ha	2,0 l/ha	4,0 l/ha	1,5 l/ha	1,5 l/ha
Maximum of phytotoxicity recorded during the trials	>0% to 5%	2	3	2	3	<del>5</del> 4	<del>2</del> 3
	>5% to 10%	0	<del>3</del> 2	1	<del>3</del> 2	<del>1 (&lt;5%)</del> 0	<del>3</del> 0
	>10% to 15%	0	0	0	0	0	0
	>15 %	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level of symptoms at the last assessments	>0% to 5%	0	1	0	1	0	0
	>5% to 10%	0	0	0	0	0	0
	>10% to 15%	0	0	0	0	0	0
	>15 %	0	0	0	0	0	0

#### Phytotoxic effects in efficacy trials

Within 11 efficacy trials conducted in years: 2018-2019 phytotoxic effects were observed in 6 trials.

In 5 out of 6 trials symptoms like chlorosis or bleaching did not exceed level of 5% phytotoxicity.

In 1 trial (PL19HESOLTU031C) phytotoxic symptoms reached level of 5% of maximum recorded phytotoxicity (variety: TOMENSA).

In 2 trials phytotoxic effects were noted also at second assessment (PL19HESOLTU031E and PL18HESOLTU070D)

In general phytotoxic symptoms observed on efficacy trials for target dose rate: 1,5 l/ha were insignificant.

#### Phytotoxic effects in efficacy trials

No additional selectivity trials were conducted to test double dose rate of new target dose of product AG-F8-250 CS – 1,5 l/ha. The phytotoxicity symptoms that occurred in the selectivity tests for the dose of



2,0 l/ha and 4,0 l/ha of the product AG-F8-250 CS were assessed as infrequent and without influence on the quality and quantity of the crop, thus it can be concluded that the product AG-F8-250 CS used at a lower dose: 1,5 l/ha even applied at 2N dose rate : 3,0 l/ha, will not cause phytotoxic effects to a greater extent and will not adversely affect the quality and quantity of the crop.

**Comments of zRMS:**

No phytotoxicity symptoms exceeded 5% intensity after the application of the test item, or the preceding formulation, at the targeted dose rate of 1,5 L/ha. All symptoms receded before the last assessment.

According to the core dossier, already evaluated, none of the phytotoxicity symptoms observed after the application of 2,0 or 4,0 L/ha (former 1N and 2N dose rates, test item or preceding formulation) had affected yield amount or quality.

As this supplementary dossier does not include any new trial data, the phytotoxicity assessment of the currently relevant 2N dose rate (3,0 L/ha) is not possible directly. The crop safety is therefore inferred from the lack of significant phytotoxicity of the former 2N (4,0 L/ha) dose rate.

**3.4.2 Effect on the yield of treated plants or plant product (KCP 6.4.2)**

No additional selectivity to test double dose rate of target dose rate of products AG-F8-250 CS: 1,5 l/ha trials were conducted.

All information regarding effect on yield of treated plants were already evaluated.

**3.4.3 Effects on the quality of plants or plant products (KCP 6.4.3)**

No additional selectivity to test double dose rate of target dose rate of products AG-F8-250 CS: 1,5 l/ha trials were conducted.

All information regarding effect on yield quality parameters of treated plants were already evaluated.

**3.4.4 Effects on transformation processes (KCP 6.4.4)**

Please refer to core dossier.

**3.4.5 Impact on treated plants or plant products to be used for propagation (KCP 6.4.5)**

No additional, specific studies/trials conducted

**Summary and conclusion**

No additional selectivity trials were conducted.

All information regarding conducting selectivity trials presented in this document like: Details on trial methodology, materials, methods of assessment and all the other experimental details did not change and are included in already evaluated dossier (October 2020).

Due to the need to lower the target dose, one of the tested, lower dose rate: 1,5 l/ha become a target dose rate.

Phytotoxic effects observed at efficacy trials were slight and transient.

The phytotoxicity symptoms that occurred in the selectivity tests for the dose of 2,0 l/ha and 4,0 l/ha of the product AG-F8-250 CS were assessed as infrequent and without influence on the quality and quantity of the crop, thus it can be concluded that the product AG-F8-250 CS used at a lower dose: 1,5 l/ha even applied at 2N dose rate : 3,0 l/ha, will not cause phytotoxic effects to a greater extent and will not adversely affect the quality and quantity of the crop.

### **3.5 Observations on other undesirable or unintended side-effects (KCP 6.5)**

#### **3.5.1 Impact on succeeding crops (KCP 6.5.1)**

No additional studies were performed.

#### **3.5.2 Impact on other plants including adjacent crops (KCP 6.5.2)**

No additional studies were performed.

#### **Tank cleaning**

n.a.

#### **3.5.3 Effects on beneficial and other non-target organisms (KCP 6.5.3)**

Detailed studies on the possible adverse effects to beneficial organisms are submitted and summarised in Part B, Section 9 (Ecotoxicology).

#### **Compatibility with current management practices including IPM**

n.a

### **3.6 Other/special studies**

Not performed.

### **3.7 List of test facilities including the corresponding certificates**

**Table 3.7-1: List of test facilities**

<b>Test facility</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Certificate (Yes or No)</b>
Agreco Sp z o.o.	al. Lipowa 21, lok. 1, 53-124 Wrocław, Oddział: Gać 64A, 55-200 Oława, Poland	Y
Fertico Sp z o.o.	Goliany 43, 05-620 Błędów, Poland	Y
Uniwersytet Przyrodniczy im. Augusta Cieszkowskiego Centrum Badań i Edukacyjnych Gorzyń	ul. Wojska Polskiego 28; 60-637 Poznań, Poland	Y
Eurofins Agrosience Services Sp. z o.o.	ul. Parkowa 6 ; 64-530 Kaźmierz, Poland	Y
Staphyt Sp z o.o.	ul. Ziebiecka 2, 60-164 Poznań , Poland	Y
Agreco Sp z o.o.	al. Lipowa 21, lok. 1, 53-124 Wrocław, Oddział: Gać 64A, 55-200 Oława, Poland	Y

## Appendix 1 Lists of data considered in support of the evaluation

### 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	Owner
KCP 6	Daniel Słomka	2018	Określenie skuteczności działania preparatu Racer 25 CS (AG-F8-250 CS; flurochloridon 250 g/l) zastosowanego przedwzchodowo w zwalczaniu chwastów dwuliściennych w uprawie ziemniaka. Polska, 2018. Efficacy evaluation of a pre-emergence application of Racer 25 CS (AG-F8-250 CS; flurochloridon 250 g/l) against broad-leaved weeds in potato. Poland, 2018. GEP Not Published Trial sponsor code: PL18HESOLTU070A Final report nr: S18-02668-01	N	ADAMA Polska
KCP 6	Monika Brodała-Jabłońska	2018	Określenie skuteczności działania preparatu Racer 25 CS (AG-F8-250 CS; flurochloridon 250 g/l) zastosowanego przedwzchodowo w zwalczaniu chwastów dwuliściennych w uprawie ziemniaka. Polska, 2018. Efficacy evaluation of a pre-emergence application of Racer 25 CS (AG-F8-250 CS; flurochloridon 250 g/l) against broad-leaved weeds in potato. Poland, 2018. GEP Not published Trial sponsor code: PL18HESOLTU070B Final report no S18-02668-02	N	ADAMA Polska
KCP 6	dr inż. Agnieszka Kukuła, PhD	2018	Ocena skuteczności preparatu AG-F8-250 CS w zwalczaniu chwastów w uprawie ziemniaka (The evaluation of efficacy of AG-F8-250 CS for the control of weeds on potato) GEP Not published sponsor's code: PL18HESOLTU070D final report nr: 18ADA0409-2	N	ADAMA Polska
KCP 6	dr inż. Agnieszka Kukuła, PhD	2019	Ocena skuteczności i selektywności preparatu AG-F8-250 CS w zwalczaniu chwastów w uprawie ziemniaka (The evaluation of efficacy and selectivity of AG-F8-250 CS for the control of weeds on potato) “Efficacy and selectivity of AG-F8-250 CS in potato in Poland in 2019” GEP Not published Sponsor's code: PL19HESOLTU031A	N	ADAMA Polska

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	Owner
			Final report nr: 19ADA0581-1		
KCP 6	Mgr inż. Adam Szemendera	2019	Skuteczność preparatu AG-F8-250 CS w zwalczaniu chwastów w uprawie ziemniaka. Polska 2019 Efficacy of AG-F8-250 CS in control of weeds in potato, Poland 2019 GEP Not published Sponsor's code: PL19HESOLTU031B Final report nr: 212_01_F19_362	N	ADAMA Polska
KCP 6	Mgr inż. Adam Szemendera	2019	Skuteczność preparatu AG-F8-250 CS w zwalczaniu chwastów w uprawie ziemniaka, Polska 2019 Efficacy of AG-F8-250 CS in control of weeds in potato, Poland 2019 GEP Not published Sponsor's code: PL19HESOLTU031C Final report nr: 1_01_F19_01	N	ADAMA Polska
KCP 6	Mgr inż. Adam Szemendera	2019	Skuteczność preparatu AG-F8-250 CS w zwalczaniu chwastów w uprawie ziemniaka, Polska 2019 Efficacy of AG-F8-250 CS in control of weeds in potato, Poland 2019 GEP Not published Sponsor's code: PL19HESOLTU031D Final report nr: 1_02_F19_02	N	ADAMA Polska
KCP 6	Adam Pawlak	2019	Skuteczność i selektywność AG-F8-250 CS stosowanego przeciwko chwastom w ziemniakach, Polska 2019 Efficacy and selectivity of AG-F8-250 CS in potato in Poland 2019. GEP Not published Sponsor's code: PL19HESOLTU031E Final report nr: APK-19-39012-PL01	N	ADAMA Polska
KCP 6	Adam Pawlak	2019	Skuteczność i selektywność AG-F8-250 CS stosowanego przeciwko chwastom w ziemniakach, Polska 2019 Efficacy and selectivity of AG-F8-250 CS in potato in Poland 2019. GEP Not published Sponsor's code: PL19HESOLTU031F Final report nr: APK-19-39012-PL02	N	ADAMA Polska
KCP 6	Beata Szymańska	2019	Badanie skuteczności produktu AG-F8-250 CS w zwalczaniu chwastów w uprawie ziemniaka Efficacy of product AG-F8-250 CS against herbs in potatoes cultivation. GEP	N	ADAMA Polska

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	Owner
			Not published Sponsor's code: PL19HESOLTU031G Trial code: AF/19/Z/13/Gr/031G		
KCP 6	Beata Szymańska	2019	Badanie skuteczności produktu AG-F8-250 CS w zwalczaniu chwastów w uprawie ziemniaka Efficacy of product AG-F8-250 CS against herbs in potatoes GEP Not published Sponsor's code: PL19HESOLTU031H Trial code: AF/19/Z/13/ZŁ/031H	N	ADAMA Polska
KCP 6.4	Mgr Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selektywność preparatu AG-F8-250 CS stosowanego w terminie zwalczania chwastów w uprawie ziemniaka, Polska 2018 Selectivity of AG-F8-250 CS in control of weeds in potato, Poland 2018 GEP Not published Sponsor' code: PL18HSSOLTU071A Final report nr: 123_01_F18_256	N	ADAMA Polska
KCP 6.4	Mgr Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selektywność preparatu AG-F8-250 CS stosowanego w terminie zwalczania chwastów w uprawie ziemniaka, Polska 2018 Selectivity of AG-F8-250 CS in control of weeds in potato, Poland 2018 GEP Not published Sponsor' code: PL18HSSOLTU071B Final report nr: 123_02_F18_257	N	ADAMA Polska
KCP 6.4	Mgr Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selektywność preparatu AG-F8-250 CS stosowanego w terminie zwalczania chwastów w uprawie ziemniaka, Polska 2018 Selectivity of AG-F8-250 CS in control of weeds in potato, Poland 2018 GEP Not published Sponsor' code: PL18HSSOLTU071C Final report nr: 123_03_F18_258	N	ADAMA Polska
KCP 6.4	Mgr Krzysztof Rusek	2018	Selektywność preparatu AG-F8-250 CS stosowanego w terminie zwalczania chwastów w uprawie ziemniaka, Polska 2018 Selectivity of AG-F8-250 CS in control of weeds in potato, Poland 2018 GEP Not published	N	ADAMA Polska

<b>Data point</b>	<b>Author(s)</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Title Company Report No. Source (where different from company) GLP or GEP status Published or not</b>	<b>Vertebrate study Y/N</b>	<b>Owner</b>
			Sponsor' code: PL18HSSOLTU071D Final report nr: 123_03_F18_259		
KCP 6.4	dr inż. Agnieszka Kukuła, PhD	2019	Ocena selektywności preparatu AG-F8-250 CS w uprawie ziemniaka (The evaluation of selectivity of AG-F8-250 CS on potato) “Selectivity of AG-F8-250 CS on potato in Poland in 2019” GEP Not published Sponsor' code: PL19HSSOLTU032A Final report nr: 19ADA0580-1	N	ADAMA Polska
KCP 6.4	dr inż. Agnieszka Kukuła, PhD	2019	Ocena selektywności preparatu AG-F8-250 CS w uprawie ziemniaka (The evaluation of selectivity of AG-F8-250 CS on potato) “Selectivity of AG-F8-250 CS on potato in Poland in 2019” GEP Not published Sponsor' code: PL19HSSOLTU032B Final report nr: 19ADA0580-2	N	ADAMA Polska
KCP 6.4	Mgr inż. Adam Szemendera	2019	Selektywność preparatu AG-F8-250 CS stosowanego w zwalczaniu chwastów w uprawie ziemniaka, Polska 2019 Selectivity of AG-F8-250 CS in control of weeds in potato, Poland 2019 GEP Not published Sponsor' code: PL19HSSOLTU032C Final report nr: 2_01_F19_03	N	ADAMA Polska
KCP 6.4	Mgr inż. Adam Szemendera	2019	Selektywność preparatu AG-F8-250 CS stosowanego w zwalczaniu chwastów w uprawie ziemniaka, Polska 2019 Selectivity of AG-F8-250 CS in control of weeds in potato, Poland 2019 GEP Not published Sponsor' code: PL19HSSOLTU032D Final report nr: 2_02_F19_04	N	ADAMA Polska

**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	Owner
-	-	-	-	-	-

**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	Vertebrate study Y/N	Owner
-	-	-	-	-	-

**List of data relied on 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	Vertebrate study Y/N	Owner
-	-	-	-	-	-