

AMEG Advisory group meeting report

1. Opening (Gertie Arts)

The new steering committee is composed as follows:

Academia:

Gertie Arts, Alterra WUR, NL (**Chair**)

Mark Hanson, University of Manitoba, CA (**Co-Chair**)

Udo Hommen, Fraunhofer IME, DE

Chris Wilson, University of Florida, US

Business:

Jo Davies, Syngenta, UK

Stefania Loutseti, DuPont, GR

Margit Dollinger, Bayer CropScience, DE

Jeff Giddings, Compliance Services International, US

Government:

Véronique Poulsen, ANSES, FR

Katja Knauer, BLW, CH

Silvia Mohr, UBA, DE

For details on AMEG activities, see ppt:



AMEG activities

2. Presentation of the SSD working group + first conclusions (Jo Davies)



SSD working group

Discussion

Only for one of the studied compounds, the endpoint has been chosen in accordance with its mode of action. This has not been done for all the studied compounds as it needs a lot of work. For most compounds (except for the one mentioned earlier), a similar approach has been used to identify the endpoints to be included in the SSD.

3. Presentation of the first results of the Myriophyllum ring test (Peter Dohmen)



Myriophyllum ring
test

The method has been submitted to OECD in order to have a guideline in the coming years.

Two methods are proposed: one in spiked water system, and one with spiked sediment system. In this second method, the equilibrium prior to testing has to be taken into account.

The most sensitive and relevant endpoint will have to be identified after the final results, in order to have a relevant endpoint to be used in the risk assessment and limit the number of measurements. From the preliminary results, the total biomass seems to be the most relevant endpoint. However, the variability among control replicates has to be taken into account.

Discussions

The problem with *Myriophyllum spicatum* is that this species is only seasonally available. A method in sterile conditions exists that allows providing plants all over the year. Peter Ebke indicated that, if needed, he could develop the culture of this species and provide it to labs that would need it.

UBA indicated that the sensitivity of the test they developed without sediment seems to have the same level of sensitivity. The advantage of this method is that the need of space for the test system is lower compared to the other method with sediment. However, it was a requirement from the AMRAP workshop to develop a test with sediment. Moreover, this method presents several advantages as it does not need to have sterile conditions, it is more realistic especially for systemic compounds that adsorb to the sediment, and it allows conducting multi-species tests and is closer to higher tier studies.

In the test without sediment, the root development is higher when the nutrient concentration in the medium is low, because the root development depends on the need of the plant. It may therefore not be a sensitive endpoint to be considered relevant for the risk assessment in test systems without sediment. There is no information concerning the potential difference of root growth observed in the two test systems (with vs without sediment).

4. Future plans

1. Mark Hanson would like to take the lead of a working group that will summarise the ongoing work on risk assessment for aquatic macrophytes, and compare approaches applied in US and Europe. The objective is to have a publication in the IEM journal. People interested to participate should contact Mark .
2. The question was raised on the need for further development of a test design using *Glyceria*. A preliminary work on the sensitivity of *Glyceria* has to be done before developing a standard test on this species.
3. For the next year SETAC meeting in Berlin, a macrophyte platform session will be proposed.