




Interpretation of surface water monitoring results in the authorisation procedure of plant protection products in the Netherlands

Including a draft protocol for causal analysis of surface water quality problems caused by plant protection products

Decision Tree Surface Water - Monitoring working group

Editors: H.A.E. de Werd¹ & R. Kruijne²



© 2010 Wageningen, DLO Foundation

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the DLO Foundation, Praktijkonderzoek Plant & Omgeving (Applied Plant Research), Business Unit Flower bulbs, Nursery stock and Fruits.

The Foundation DLO is not responsible for any damage caused by using the content of this report.

Surface Waters Decision Tree – Monitoring working group:

H.A.E. de Werd (PPO-WUR) (chairman)

R. Kruijne (Alterra-WUR)

G.J. Wingelaar (nVWA)

W.L.M Tamis (CML)

K. Jilderda (Nefyto)

A.M.A. van der Linden (RIVM)

D. Kalf (Waterdienst)

W. van der Hulst (Waterschap Aa en Maas / Platform Landbouwemissies - Unie van Waterschappen)

G.B.M. Heuvelink (Alterra-WUR) (2009)

C. van Griethuysen (Ctgb)

This research was financed by:



Ministerie van Economische Zaken,
Landbouw en Innovatie

and:

Ministerie van Infrastructuur en Milieu

Project no. 32 610 927 11

Applied Plant Research (Praktijkonderzoek Plant & Omgeving),
part of Wageningen UR
Business Unit Flower bulbs, Nursery stock and Fruits

Address : Lingewal 1, 6668 LA Randwijk, The Netherlands
: Postbus 200, 6670 AE Zetten, The Netherlands
Tel. : +31 488 47 37 02
Fax : +31 488 47 37 17
E-mail : infofruit.ppo@wur.nl
Internet : www.ppo.wur.nl

Contents

	page
SUMMARY	5
1 INTRODUCTION AND READING GUIDE.....	11
1.1 A 'Water Framework Directive-proof' authorisation procedure for plant protection products	11
1.1.1 Surface water monitoring data in the authorisation procedure: 3 steps	11
1.1.2 The Water Framework Directive and the Plant Protection Products Directive.....	11
1.2 Reading guide	12
2 IDENTIFICATION AND RANKING OF PROBLEMATIC SUBSTANCES	15
2.1 Procedure for identification and ranking of problematic substances	16
2.1.1 Processing of monitoring data	17
2.1.2 Check on laboratory methods.....	20
2.1.3 Derivation of new quality standards	20
2.2 Water quality standards.....	23
2.3 Substance categories in the Water Framework Directive	23
2.4 Monitoring by Dutch water authorities.....	24
2.5 The Pesticides Atlas.....	26
3 PROTOCOL FOR CAUSAL ANALYSIS AND ITS BACKGROUND.....	29
3.1 Introduction to the Causal Analysis Protocol.....	29
3.2 The protocol manager.....	31
3.3 Phases of the Causal Analysis Protocol	31
3.3.1 Phase 1: Inventory of basic information, national scale	32
3.3.2 Phase 2: Expert consultation and interpretation, national scale.....	33
3.3.3 Phase 3: Inventory of extra data, regional scale or particular topics.....	39
3.3.4 Phase 4: Expert consultation, regional scale or particular topics	39
3.3.5 Phase 5: Final conclusions and recommendations	40
3.4 The Crop Protection Sharepoint (CPS).....	42
3.5 The Dutch Environmental Indicator for Pesticides (NMI)	43
3.6 Application of the Pesticides Atlas.....	44
4 FEEDBACK PROCEDURE.....	45
4.1.1 Causal Analysis and ERP in the draft registration report	46
4.1.2 Emission reduction plan: set up	48
4.1.3 Authorisation decision	49
4.1.4 Effectiveness of the emission reduction plan.....	49
REFERENCES	51
APPENDIX I: GLOSSARY	53
APPENDIX II: RATING QUALITY STANDARD EXCEEDANCES: BACKGROUND	57
APPENDIX III: PROTOCOL FOR CAUSAL ANALYSIS OF QUALITY STANDARD EXCEEDANCE.....	63
APPENDIX IV: CROP DEFINITIONS.....	75
APPENDIX V: CLASSIFICATION OF SUBSTANCE PROPERTIES	77
APPENDIX VI CONSULTATION OF EXPERTS.....	81

APPENDIX VII CROP PROTECTION SHAREPOINT	85
APPENDIX VIII COMPARING DISTRIBUTIONS OF MEASURED AND PREDICTED CONCENTRATIONS	87

Summary


As part of the 'Surface Waters Decision Tree' project a new authorisation procedure for plant protection products (PPPs) has been developed. One element is a procedure for feedback of monitoring data to the authorisation holder and the PPP authorisation authority. This report describes the methodology to be adopted for this procedure.

The feedback of monitoring results in the authorisation procedure consists of 3 main steps:

1. Identification and ranking of problematic substances
2. Analysis of plausible causes
3. Feedback procedure

In this report, a methodology for all three steps is described. For step 2, a more detailed protocol has been developed, based on three realistic test cases.

The procedure is applicable to active ingredients and metabolites of PPP, not to biocides, pharmaceuticals and (chemical) substances with other types of use.



The use of surface water monitoring results in the authorisation procedure of plant protection products. Dotted lines indicate optional steps. The design of monitoring is not part of the procedure described in this report.

1. Identification and ranking of 'problematic' substances

Water quality is monitored by regional and national water authorities in the Netherlands. All monitoring results are in principle processed annually and are input into the Pesticides Atlas ('Bestrijdingsmiddelenatlas', or BMA). Following each update of the BMA, a list of 'problematic substances' in surface waters is then derived from these data and the substances in question ranked according to substance category and frequency, location and level of exceedance.

In this report a 'problematic substance' is defined as a plant protection product (PPP) that exceeds the relevant quality standard (MAC-EQS, AA-EQS or MPC; see glossary) in one or more Dutch surface water bodies falling under the European Water Framework Directive (WFD) according to the monitoring data in the Pesticides Atlas.

The Effects working group lays down how water quality standards are to be applied for calculating the risk the substance poses to aquatic organisms prior to authorisation of a PPP.

2. Causal analysis

The 'causal analysis' and 'feedback procedure' set out in this report do not need to be automatically initiated for all substances identified as problematic. The so-called 'analysis of plausible causes' need only be applied for problematic substances that are in the process of regular re-authorisation after a standard authorisation period. A review of the authorisation will take place independently of the regular authorisation period for substances with the highest score in exceeding the quality standard. The causal analysis will also be requested as part of authorisation procedures other than regular re-authorisations for these most problematic substances.

The goal of the causal analysis is to identify a plausible relation between authorisation of a PPP and exceedance of water quality standards, by way of a detailed analysis of the relation between application of the substance to a crop or group of crops, relevant emission pathways and the quality standard exceedances observed. This causal analysis is carried out according to an established protocol that combines fact-finding and expert consultation in a transparent manner. The protocol covers a wide range of topics, including 1) substance properties, 2) authorisation, 3) agricultural usage, 4) emission pathways, and 5) the monitoring results.

If and when possible, emission pathways resulting from Good Agricultural Practice (GAP) are distinguished from those resulting from illegal or improper use (non-GAP). The distinction between GAP and non-GAP is relevant for determining whether or not the cause of the water quality problem relates to authorisation. It will depend on the substance concerned and the information available from enforcement agencies (regional water authorities and/or the inspection agency of the Ministry of Economy, Agriculture and Innovation, (in Dutch: 'EL&I') and other experts whether the role of non-GAP can be adequately assessed. Identification of relevant emission pathways provides the basis for determining appropriate mitigation measures.

For the analysis of plausible causes, two sources of predicted emissions and one main source of PPP monitoring data can be used. Predicted emission risks are derived from the Dutch Environmental Indicator for Pesticides ('Nationale Milieu Indicator'). If and when available, these are complemented with emission calculations made in the pre-authorisation process. Monitoring data are taken from the Pesticides Atlas (BMA). These 'standard information sources' can be augmented with additional data on particular regions and/or topics. Before conclusions are drawn, the information gathered is checked by experts to assess its validity and whether there is any need for improvement.

3. Feedback procedure

The authorisation holder implements the results of the causal analysis in an emission reduction plan (ERP). The relevant type of action is highly dependent on the emission pathway(s) involved and the contribution of non-GAP. An emission reduction plan may, for example, comprise actions with which the authorisation holder endeavours to change users' behaviour, whether directly or via other stakeholders. Alternatively, it may consist of a request to the registration authority (Ctgb), to add a restriction to the product label, in cases where GAP application is responsible for exceedance of quality standards. A combination of different types of actions is also possible. If no plausible relation with the authorisation(s) of a substance is found, an ERP may consist of research activities to further analyse the cause of the exceedances.

The Ctgb assesses whether the emission reduction plan is likely to lead to sufficient improvement of water quality within an acceptable period of time and then decide on (re-)authorisation of the product(s). Measures may be product-specific, since usage and predicted emissions may vary across products with the same active ingredient.

WFD (Water Framework Directive) mitigation measures

If no plausible relation between exceedances and authorisation is established, the Ctgb can not make the autonomic decision to reject a (re-)authorisation based on the monitoring data, as part of the Dutch authorisation procedure. However, if exceedances at WFD-reporting locations are not sufficiently reduced, the EU will demand that measures are taken anyway. If no acceptable alternatives are proposed, this may result in mandatory authorisation adjustment none-the-less, as part of a package of mitigation measures to be reported to the EU. This 'WFD route' is not part of the feedback procedure described in this report.

Feedback to monitoring


The use of monitoring results in the authorisation procedure may lead to recommendations on future water quality monitoring. This is illustrated by two examples:

- a. If no plausible cause for quality standard exceedances is found, more detailed or adjusted monitoring may be initiated by the water authorities: research monitoring.
- b. An authorisation holder may, as a part of an emission reduction plan, request or initiate more intensive monitoring in a certain period or area, to be able to analyse the effect of this action at an early stage or to gain more insight into emission pathways.

The causal analysis may also lead to more general recommendations on the design of monitoring programmes. Feedback to monitoring is indicated in the figure above by the dotted line from the Feedback procedure (Step 3) to Monitoring.

Regulation enforcement

In cases where non-GAP application is part of the cause of quality standard exceedance, law enforcement agencies will be informed by the publication of the Ctgb authorisation decision.



Main steps and responsibilities in the in the procedure for using monitoring results for authorisation.

1 Introduction and reading guide

1.1 A 'Water Framework Directive-proof' authorisation procedure for plant protection products

1.1.1 Surface water monitoring data in the authorisation procedure: 3 steps

The use of surface water monitoring data in the authorisation procedure for plant protection products (PPP) requires transparent and unambiguous methodologies. These are described in this report in the following three steps:

1. A procedure for the **identification of 'problematic substances'** based on surface water monitoring results.
2. A protocol for **causal analysis** of exceedance of quality standards in surface water.
3. A procedure for **feedback** of the outcomes of the causal analysis to the authorisation holder(s) and the authorisation.

1.1.2 The Water Framework Directive and the Plant Protection Products Directive

In the context of implementing the European Water Framework Directive (WFD; 2000/60/EC) in the Netherlands, responsible officers of three Dutch ministries (Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment; Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality; Ministry of Transport, Public Works and Water Management) concluded that the requirements laid down in this Directive must be compatible with Regulation 1107/2009/EC and its predecessor Directive 91/414/EEC. As this was not yet the case, the project 'Surface Waters Decision Tree' (in Dutch, 'Beslisboom Water') was initiated to develop a new decision tree for aquatic organisms for use in the Dutch authorisation procedure for plant protection products. The procedures and products emerging from this project are not in themselves WFD instruments, but will support achievement of the water quality standards defined in the WFD.

In cases where post-authorisation monitoring data reveal quality standard exceedance, the obligation arises to take corrective measures. The responsible ministries have decided that if there is a plausible relation between PPP authorisation and quality standard exceedance, it is legitimate to implement, among other things, a review of the current authorisation.

Organisation of the Surface Waters Decision Tree

Within the Surface Waters Decision Tree project, a Monitoring working group was set up to further develop a post-authorisation procedure for interpreting the results of chemical monitoring of PPPs in Dutch surface waters with respect to possible consequences for the authorisation of PPPs. The result is described in this report.

The structure of the Decision Tree project is shown in Figure 1.1. This project was originally initiated and coordinated by three ministries, but as of October 2010 several Dutch ministries were reorganised and the project became the responsibility of the new Ministry of Economic Affairs, Agriculture and Innovation ('EL&I') and the Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment ('I&M'). The Project group is the delegated principal towards the working groups. It prepares policy decisions for the Steering group in consultation with the working groups. The policy decisions are made by the Steering group.




Figure 1.1. Organisation of the 'Surface Waters Decision Tree' project.

1.2 Reading guide

In this report the Monitoring working group proposes a procedure for the use of monitoring results in the authorisation procedure.

The three main steps of the procedure are described in the following chapters:

1. Chapter 2: Identification and ranking of problematic substances.
2. Chapter 3: Protocol for Causal Analysis and its background.
3. Chapter 4: Feedback procedure

The protocol for the analysis of causes of quality standard exceedances is described in detail. This document also visualises the main principles and policy choices underlying the described procedures and protocol.

In developing the Causal Analysis Protocol, the Monitoring working group took as its point of departure a 'prototype' (de Werd and Merkelbach, 2006), which was then iteratively elaborated while working through three realistic cases. The results of these case studies are reported in separate documents. Besides this 'prototype', the methodology was further developed within a framework set by policy decisions, communicated by the Surface waters decision tree Project group. Policy decisions, applied as prior conditions, are specified as such in the following chapters. The main principles communicated by the project group as prior conditions to be applied are given below.

Prior conditions for the methodology as a whole:

- *Transparency*
- *Optimal support of the involved stakeholders*
- *Authorisation holders are given the opportunity to solve water quality problems*

Appendix I provides an explanation of the abbreviations in the main text and a glossary of specialist terms.

2 Identification and ranking of problematic substances

This chapter describes the proposed procedure for identifying and ranking 'problematic' substances based on monitoring data. Section 2.1 describes the procedure itself. Sections 2.2 (Water quality standards), 2.3 (Substance categories in the WFD) and 2.4 (Monitoring by Dutch water authorities) provide the background information necessary. Section 2.5 describes the Pesticides Atlas: the instrument used for processing, analysing and visualising monitoring results, which is also used for the identification of problematic substances.

For most PPPs several water quality standards have been derived. The outcome of the procedure for identifying problematic substances strongly depends on which of these standards are used and how and where they are applied. Exceedance of water quality standards in WFD water bodies may lead to a review of the authorisation by the Ctgb and in the worst case a negative authorisation decision.

2.1 Procedure for identification and ranking of problematic substances




Figure 2.1. Identification of problematic substances and feedback to *monitoring*, as part of the procedure for the use of monitoring results in the authorisation procedure. The grey box represents the procedure for feedback of monitoring results to the authorisation holder and registration authority. The white box represents the Dutch national context and the connection to the EU and Water Framework Directive (WFD). Dotted arrows indicate optional steps.

Figure 2.1 shows the main steps of the identification of problematic substances within the procedure for feedback of monitoring results in the authorisation procedure. All the types of monitoring described in the WFD Monitoring guidance document (Rijkswaterstaat, 2009) are applied in the identification and ranking of problematic substances. In a later phase of the feedback procedure the need may arise for more, or adjusted, monitoring. This may imply feedback to the monitoring itself: 'Research Monitoring'. Quality standard exceedances may sometimes be resolved by adjusting the quality standard based on new or supplementary information on the effects of the substance. The procedure for feedback of monitoring results provides scope for adjusting the quality standard. For this reason the figure includes a loop to derivation of a new standard, with a link back to the process of problematic substance identification.

2.1.1 Processing of monitoring data

Based on monitoring data, problematic substances in surface water are identified and listed in a ranking based on several characteristics of the exceedance. This ranking can be used to support objective prioritising of follow-up actions (chapter 4).

The frequency of identification of problematic substances is contingent on the frequency with which the Pesticide Atlas is updated to incorporate new monitoring results. This is generally once a year.

Prior conditions and policy decisions for identifying and ranking problematic substances:

Choice of water quality standards

- For substances for which no EQSs have been derived, the MPC applies.

Consequences in relation to measuring location

- Only EQS exceedance in WFD water bodies, including edge of field ditches in WFD water bodies, may have consequences for authorisation.
- Quality standard exceedance at WFD reporting locations has a higher priority than exceedance at other locations.
- Quality standard exceedance in WFD water bodies has a higher priority than outside WFD water bodies.
- Quality standard exceedance outside WFD water bodies should be taken into account in the feedback to the authorisation holder and the registration authority Ctgb. On their own, such exceedances cannot lead to mandatory adjustment of authorisations.
- Monitoring results from edge of field ditches outside WFD water bodies are not included in the ranking procedure.

Consequences in relation to substance categories

- Quality standard exceedance by WFD priority substances has the highest priority.
- AA-EQS exceedance and MAC-EQS exceedances are weighed equally.

1. First, all substances exceeding quality standard in WFD water bodies are selected as being 'problematic'. This is done once a year, based on the most recent three years available in the Pesticides Atlas. This also holds for substances for which a causal analysis, emission reduction plan or authorisation review is ongoing. For these substances no new causal analysis can be requested for the same authorisation(s).

2. Substances defined as WFD priority (hazardous) substances by the EU are then marked as such and placed at the top of the list. For the EU these substances have the highest priority with respect to emission reduction, and any exceedance of standards must be reported to the EU accordingly. For these substances, EQSs have been defined that are valid for all water bodies. These quality standards are included in the so called 'Besluit kwaliteitseisen en monitoring water' (BKMW). The BKMW describes the Dutch implementation of the WFD, amongst other aspects, with regard to the chemical water quality standards. As of August 2010, isoproturon was the only priority substance registered as a PPP in the Netherlands.

3. All other substances are awarded points, based on:

- a) *location*
- b) *degree of exceedance*
- c) *number of locations with exceedance*
- d) *percentage of locations with exceedance.*

Each of these will now be discussed. More background on the scoring method is provided in Appendix II.

a) *Location*

For each monitoring location: determine whether an EQS (or MPC if no EQS is available) has been exceeded during the period concerned. At each location, points are awarded based on the type of location according to Table 2.1. If both the AA-EQS and MAC-EQS have been exceeded at a particular location, points are awarded only once.

Table 2.1. Points given for quality standard exceedance according to type of monitoring location.

	WFD reporting locations in WFD water bodies	Remaining locations in WFD water bodies	Locations outside WFD water bodies, except edge of field ditches
EQS (AA and/or MAC) or MPC	4	2	1

WFD reporting locations are scored highest because the water quality at these locations is reported to the EU. For water bodies not defined as WFD water bodies the same quality standards apply. The frequency and degree of exceedance at these latter locations is generally somewhat higher than in WFD water bodies. The WFD quality standards (MPC and EQSs) are not used for feedback to PPP authorisation of water quality in edge of field ditches outside WFD water bodies. The monitoring data from these locations can be used in the causal analysis of exceedance and to help prioritise observed problematic substances.

b) *Degree of exceedance*

At locations where quality standards are exceeded, the degree of exceedance may lead to extra points being given.

Table 2.2. Extra points given for degree of exceedance.

<i>Degree of exceedance</i>	<i>extra points</i>
$1 \leq x \leq 2$	0
$2 < x \leq 4$	1
$4 < x \leq 13$	2
$x > 13$	3

If both the AA and MAC EQS have been exceeded, only the highest degree of exceedance is taken into account. The classes of exceedance are based on quartiles: for example, 25% of the quality standard exceedances >13x.

At each location the points awarded for location type and degree of exceedance are now combined, as is done in Table 2.3

Table 2.3. Score derived from combining scores for location type (1-4 points) and degree of exceedance (0-3 points).

Location type (points)	Degree of exceedance of EQS or MPC (points)			
	1≤x≤2 (0)	2<x≤4 (1)	4<x≤13 (2)	x>13 (3)
WFD water body, Reporting location (4)	4	5	6	7
WFD water body, remaining locations (2)	2	3	4	5
Remaining locations outside WFD water bodies, except edge of field ditches (1)	1	2	3	4

c) *Number of locations with exceedance*

For each substance, the scores emerging from the previous step are then summed for all monitoring locations with exceedances, to reflect the number of locations in exceedance in the overall ranking.

d) *Percentage of locations with exceedance*

Finally, each of these summed scores is multiplied by the percentage of locations in exceedance, in order to reduce the influence of the relative number of monitoring locations of one substance compared with another on the outcome of the ranking.

4. All substances awarded at least one point are now ranked in tabular form according to the score to emerge from the previous step. This table also visualises:

- the number of locations in exceedance relative to the number of monitoring locations
- the quality standard(s) applied
- the percentage and number of quality standard exceedances per quality standard relative to the number of monitoring locations.

Table 2.4. Example of a table showing water quality standard exceedances for plant protection products. *n* = number of monitoring locations with exceedance; *n-tot* = total number of monitoring locations for this substance in WFD water bodies.

Substance	Points awarded	AA-EQS and/or MAC-EQS exceedances % (n/n-tot)	AA-EQS		MAC-EQS	
			Quality standard (ug/L)	Exceedances % (n/n-tot)	Quality standard (ug/L)	Exceedances % (n/n-tot)
A ^p	112	40 (41 / 102)	0.023	38 (29 / 102)	0.11	40 (41 / 102)
B	108	27 (21 / 79)	n.a.		0.053 ^{MPC}	27 (21 / 79)
C	87	26 (36 / 140)	0.30	11 (16 / 140)	0.30	20 (28 / 140)
D	73	21 (28 / 132)	0.61	21 (28 / 132)	1.21	6 (8 / 132)
etc.						

^p WFD Priority substance; ^{MPC} Maximum Permissible Concentration; no EQS available for this substance.

In the procedure only monitoring data are used that can be sensibly compared with water quality standards: 1) measured concentrations are higher than the detection limit or 2) measured concentrations are equal (or lower) than the detection limit and the detection limit is lower than the relevant water quality standards.

Exceptions

If quality standards are exceeded as a result of reported accidents, this does not constitute a reason for a mandatory review of authorisation. The final step in the identification of problematic substances is therefore to check with the inspection authorities and with regional water authorities whether any serious accidents have been reported that may have led to one or more of the quality standard exceedances extracted from the Pesticides Atlas. If such is the case, this is reported along with the table showing the problematic substances identified.

2.1.2 Check on laboratory methods

Before the list of problematic substances is finalised, it must be checked whether it contains any substances for which there is a realistic chance that the concentrations reported in the Pesticides Atlas are not due (solely) to the parent substance of concern. This is particularly relevant for isomers and esters. Moreover, it is not always clear whether metabolites have been distinguished from parent substance or competing parent substances. This may depend on the applied conservation and analysis methods, which may vary across laboratories.

A table of substances for which the above considerations apply will be incorporated in the Pesticides Atlas and will be updated on a yearly basis before the list of substances exceeding quality standard is renewed. If a problematic substance appears in this table, an assessment is made of whether it can be ascertained that only the parent substance has been reported. If this is not feasible, it is described what this implies for the picture of quality standard exceedances for the substance in question. This check is carried out under the direction of the Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment, in consultation with the authorisation holder. No causal analysis can be requested before this check on the conservation and analytical methods employed has been carried out and reported.

2.1.3 Derivation of new quality standards

As new scientific information becomes available, this can be used to reassess current water quality standards. If such reassessment leads to a numerically higher quality standard that eliminates the problematic quality standard exceedances, the substance may no longer be considered problematic for aquatic systems. In such cases the derivation of a new quality standard can be interpreted as a measure to meet the WFD goals.

A rule of thumb is applied to check whether there is a realistic chance of a new environmental quality standard being derived. This may be the case when the quality standard used for risk assessment has been established using a safety factor. The rule of thumb evaluates whether the EQS is more than a factor 10 lower than the regulatory acceptable concentration (RAC) for chronic exposure for the most sensitive aquatic organism: $AA-EQS < 0.1 RAC$ or $MAC-EQS < 0.1 RAC$ (Figure 2.2). Registration holders are informed when this condition holds for their PPP(s) on the list of problematic substances. The Ctgb needs to verify whether they intend to request derivation of a new quality standard before the authorisation holders can be asked for a causal analysis. If this is indeed the intention, the Ctgb consults the authorisation holder on the type of additional data to be delivered and the time required to have this data available. Based on this information, the Ctgb then establishes a deadline for supplying this data and filing the request for quality standard review. If by that date no request has been filed, the feedback of monitoring results to the authorisation holder(s) and to authority can be continued by starting Part 2 of the procedure: the Causal Analysis.

Besides the situation described above, an authorisation holder can always request a review of a quality standard based on additional information. However, if the quality standard for risk assessment is not at least 10 times higher than the AA-EQS or MAC-EQS, the process of feedback to the authorisation may be continued with the Causal Analysis during the process of quality standard review.

It is possible that a new quality standard is derived after the initiation of a causal analysis for the substance. A quality standard based on new file information or new scientific insight can overrule the quality standards on which the identification of problematic substances is normally based. The authorisation holder can check whether the substance still constitutes a problematic substance based on the new quality standard(s). The authorisation holder informs the Ctgb of the outcome. The Ctgb checks the information and decides whether or not the need for a causal analysis is to be cancelled. A causal analysis can be canceled if the substance can no longer be defined as a problematic substance, or if it is assigned a lower priority due to a new, numerically higher water quality standard.

If a causal analysis is initiated or continued, it is directed towards the exceedances based on the most recent quality standards.

If a substance is in the process of quality standard review, it is marked as such in the list of problematic substances. In addition, substances for which a causal analysis or emission reduction plan is ongoing, or has been carried out, are recognisable as such in this list.




Figure 2.2. Schematic representation of the procedure for identifying substances for which quality standard review may be relevant, as part of Step 1.

2.2 Water quality standards

With implementation of the WFD, European water quality standards came into force for a series of priority substances. For non-priority substances, new quality standards have been derived to meet the demands of the WFD. These new standards, the Environmental Quality Standards (EQS), replace the current surface water quality standard MPC ('MTR'), used by Dutch water authorities. The EQS consists of two components: the AA-EQS (Annual Average) and the MAC-EQS (Maximum Allowable Concentration).

The Environmental Quality Standards are defined as follows:

The **AA-EQS** is the average concentration over a year (or relevant period within a year) required to protect the aquatic ecosystem against long-term exposure. The AA-EQS is compared with the average concentration at a given location in the course of a year (or relevant period within a year). This is an important difference compared to application of the MPC, where the comparison is with the 90 percentile concentration.

The **MAC-EQS** is the maximum peak concentration required to protect against possible effects of short-term exposure. The MAC-EQS is compared with the maximum of all individual measurements at a given location within a year.

Since not all MPCs can be replaced by the new EQS standards instantly, in the period up to 2015 the MPC will be applied for those substances for which no EQS standards have yet been derived.

For identification of problematic substances, the water quality standards laid down in two regulations apply: the Decree on Quality Standards for Water Monitoring, 2009 (In Dutch: *Besluit kwaliteitseisen monitoring water*, 2009) and the underlying Ministerial Regulation on WFD monitoring. These are described further in Section 2.3 and will be referred to as the 'BKMW' and the 'WFD Monitoring Regulation'. For the substances in the BKMW, EQS standards have been derived. If the substance is not in the BKMW, the quality standard to be applied (EQS or MPC) is derived from the water quality standard database at www.helpdeskwater.nl. It is plausible that for future identification of nationally relevant substances and river basin district relevant substances (Section 2.3) the same water quality standards (EQS) will apply as for identification of problematic substances in the context of authorisation. An overlap between the WFD substance categories and the problematic substances for authorisation can thus be anticipated.

More information on the water quality standards and their application in line with the WFD can be found in Appendix 1 and the instruction 'Richtlijn Monitoring Oppervlaktewater en Protocol Toetsen & Beoordelen' (Rijkswaterstaat, 2009), the 'BKMW' and the 'Regeling monitoring KRW' via www.helpdeskwater.nl (all in the Dutch language). The derivation of EQS standards in the BKMW and the 'WFD Monitoring Regulation' are part of the implementation of WFD and have no direct relation with individual decisions on such issues as permits or PPP authorisations. For the feedback of monitoring results to the authorisation holder and registration authority, the Monitoring working group uses only the numerical values from these documents.

2.3 Substance categories in the Water Framework Directive

With the method described in Section 2.1 a new category of problematic substances emerges. Under the WFD three main categories of substances in surface water are already defined:

1. Priority substances / Priority hazardous substances
2. River basin district relevant substances
3. Nationally relevant substances

The ranking of substances according to Section 2.1 takes into account whether a substance is a WFD priority substance. In this section the WFD substance categories are defined.

The substances in question and their respective quality standards are listed in the BKMW and the WFD Monitoring Regulation. The first of these is anchored in the legal provisions for implementation of the WFD in the Netherlands. The substances and quality standards in the WFD Monitoring Regulation can be updated up to twice a year. More information on these regulations is available at www.helpdeskwater.nl.

1. Priority substances have been defined at the EU level. Within this category only isoproturon is registered for use as a PPP in the Netherlands (2010). Priority substances and their quality standards are included in the BKMW.
2. River basin district relevant substances are substances that are not expected to meet the water quality standard of the WFD within that district in 2015 (2021, 2027, etc.). These substances and their water quality standards are included in the WFD Monitoring Regulation. In April 2010 this category overlaps with the substances listed in 2005 (76/464-EC (Directive on dangerous substances in surface waters, 2005), except for chlorotoluron.
3. The category 'Nationally relevant substances' is elaborated by individual EU member states and is based mainly on presence in national surface waters, not necessarily on quality standard exceedances. In the Netherlands this category comprises the substances listed in 76/464-EC (around 50 plant protection products), augmented with the active ingredients of PPPs derived from the Midterm Evaluation of the Plant Protection Policy of the Netherlands (Van der Linden *et al.*, 2006) and the substance selection made in the multi-stakeholder project 'Schone Bronnen'. The water quality standards of these substances are described in the WFD Monitoring Regulation.

2.4 Monitoring by Dutch water authorities

Types of monitoring

The WFD sets minimum requirements for the monitoring of surface water quality. Based on these, national guidelines have been drawn up for water quality monitoring programmes (Rijkswaterstaat, 2009). These cover monitoring locations, monitoring frequency, (categories of) substances to be monitored and the quality standards to be applied. They also state which monitoring results must be reported to the EU. In 2009 the monitoring practices of none of the Netherlands' regional water authorities satisfied the minimum requirements of the WFD. On the other hand, various water authorities monitored more frequently or at more locations than required under WFD guidelines.

The WFD distinguishes three types of monitoring. The minimum monitoring frequency depends on the type of monitoring and the substance category concerned (Table 2.5):

Table 2.5. Minimum monitoring frequency in the WFD guidelines for PPPs in surface water.

<i>Type of WFD monitoring</i>	<i>Cycle: measured per ... year(s)</i>	<i>Substance group</i>	<i>Frequency in a measuring year</i>	<i>Number of measuring points (2007-2009)</i>
State & Trend	6	Priority substances	≥12	105
		Other relevant substances	≥4	
Operational	1	Priority substances	≥12	303
		Other relevant substances	≥4	
Research Monitoring	-	<i>As relevant</i>	<i>Not specified</i>	<i>Not specified</i>

State & Trend Monitoring is used to monitor the status and trends of surface water quality over periods of several years. For this purpose 105 monitoring sites are employed in the period 2007-2009. Operational Monitoring for the WFD is applied at 303 locations in the period 2007-2009 to gain more insight into water quality trends in water bodies that are at risk with respect to WFD targets. Not all locations are used in every year. The second goal of Operational Monitoring is to assess the effect of water quality improvement measures. Operational Monitoring over shorter periods can provide a more detailed picture of water quality at a regional or local level compared to State & Trend Monitoring, which has a lower frequency and intensity and is used to inform the EU.

Measurements made as part of Research Monitoring can improve insight into the applications and emission pathways giving rise to exceedance of quality standards. Schomaker & Knobben (2007) provide guidance on application of Research Monitoring to plant protection products. Key elements of this type of monitoring include measurement timing and location in relation to land use patterns and application periods.

Monitoring locations

In the process of implementing the WFD, 724 so-called 'WFD water bodies' have been defined. Within these, measuring locations have been assigned which are used for the purpose of EU-reporting of water quality. The Netherlands has 100-120 of these WFD reporting locations. These represent a minority of Dutch water bodies. If water quality at EU-reporting locations fails to comply with WFD standards, remedial action needs to be taken.

WFD water bodies are generally larger water bodies, not including edge of field ditches. Water authorities monitored PPPs at 713 measuring points in 2009, of which 314 were in WFD water bodies. This means that not all measuring points in WFD water bodies are WFD reporting points. These numbers also show that a relevant part of the monitoring takes place outside WFD water bodies. In the monitoring programmes of regional water authorities, edge of field ditches are not commonly monitored.

Table 2.6. Number of measuring points in surface water in the period 2007-2009 categorised by type of waterbody (topographical, 1-23) and the categories: a) WFD reporting points in a WFD waterbody, b) other measuring points in a WFD waterbody and c) measuring points outside WFD waterbodies. WFD = Water framework directive. The table is in Dutch. WFD waterbody = KRW waterlichaam (KRW WL).

no	watertype	a	b	c	total
		KRW- meetpunten binnen KRW-WL	overige meetpunten binnen KRW-WL	overige meetpunten buiten KRW-WL	
1	Noordzee	1	0	0	1
2	Beschermd kustwater	3	9	0	12
3	Overgangswater	7	8	1	16
4	Brakke wateren	28	38	2	68
5	Grote meren	19	25	4	48
6	Matig grote diepe meren	8	3	0	11
7	Matig grote ondiepe meren	7	6	0	13
9	Kleine ondiepe plassen	1	2	19	22
10	Kleine ondiepe veenplassen	2	1	2	5
11	Snel stromende rivier	1	1	0	2
12	Rivier	12	11	1	24
13	Kanalen en vaarten	83	62	2	147
14	Middenloop of benedenloop	16	11	0	27
15	Snel stromende wateren (beken)	10	4	4	18
16	Langzaam stromende wateren (beken)	78	50	9	137
17	Water in rivierengebied	2	2	0	4
18	Vennen	0	0	3	3
	subtotal 1-18	278	233	47	558
21	Sloten_TOP10_smal*	19	2	275	296
22	Sloten_TOP10_breed*	4	3	92	99
23	Greppels_TOP10*	7		37	44
	subtotal 21-23	30	5	404	439
	total	308	238	451	997

*no. 21: small ditch = < 3 m (code 601 TCN), no. 22 wide ditch 3-6 m (code 602) and no. 23: 'greppel' (ditch which does not contain water the whole year, code 600)

2.5 The Pesticides Atlas

Water authorities (such as water boards) apply a range of strategies for monitoring PPPs in surface water. Some regions select the substances and monitoring points partly on the basis of expected use and emission risks in their region, whilst in other regions broad packages of substances are measured regularly at numerous locations. The monitoring frequency, number of monitoring points and analysis techniques employed vary across regions and measuring points.

Water authorities pass on their raw monitoring data to the Pesticides Atlas. The quality of these data is then thoroughly checked for input errors, handling of detection limits and unknown codes (e.g. new substances) before they are integrated in the Pesticide Atlas. The most recent protocol used for the data check is available through CML in Leiden. Next the data are converted to maps and graphs and finally presented on the website www.bestrijdingsmiddelenatlas.nl. This website contains the (downloadable) converted data of pesticide concentrations for individual years as well as the metadata (number of measurements, number of substances monitored, etc.). The maps provide a visualisation of the exceedance of different types of quality standards. Information on exact locations and dates of quality standard exceedances of pesticides can be extracted from the Atlas and be used as input for the analysis of plausible causes of exceedances. Once a year a list of 'problematic' substances with the greatest number of quality standard exceedances at all measuring points is drawn up., A list of quality standard exceeding substances at measuring points in WFD water bodies is then added, as described in Section 2.1, for the purpose of feedback of monitoring results to the authorisation holder and registration authority.

3 Protocol for Causal Analysis and its background

This chapter describes the design and background of the procedure for analysing plausible causes of quality standard exceedances and how to apply it. The question when (for which substance and in which authorisation procedures) to apply it, is answered in chapter 4.

In developing this procedure the Monitoring working group took as its point of departure a 'prototype' (De Werd and Merkelbach, 2006), which was then iteratively elaborated while working through three realistic cases. The results of these case studies are reported in separate case documents.

An introduction and broad overview of the methodology is provided in Section 3.1, along with the most relevant background information. In Sections 3.2 to 3.5 the design and background of the procedure itself are described in more detail. Appendix III contains a detailed protocol for the Causal Analysis, including a framework showing the respective phases and topics covered.

In 3.2 the 'protocol manager' is introduced, and in 3.3 the phases and main principles of the Protocol are explained. The most relevant instruments employed in the analysis are described in Sections 3.4 to 3.5. These instruments are the Crop Protection Sharepoint (CPS), Dutch Environmental Indicator for Pesticides 'NMI' and the Pesticides Atlas (BMA).

Prior conditions and policy decisions for identifying and ranking problematic substances:

Choice of water quality standards

- For substances for which no EQSs have been derived, the MPC applies.

Consequences in relation to measuring location

- Only EQS exceedance in WFD water bodies, including edge of field ditches in WFD water bodies, may have consequences for authorisation.
- Quality standard exceedance at WFD reporting locations has a higher priority than exceedance at other locations.
- Quality standard exceedance in WFD water bodies has a higher priority than outside WFD water bodies.
- Quality standard exceedance outside WFD water bodies should be taken into account in the feedback to the authorisation holder and the registration authority Ctgb. On their own, such exceedances cannot lead to mandatory adjustment of authorisations.
- Edge of field ditch not included in ranking.

Consequences in relation to substance categories

- Quality standard exceedance by WFD priority substances has the highest priority.
- AA-EQS exceedance and MAC-EQS exceedances are weighed equally.

3.1 Introduction to the Causal Analysis Protocol

The Causal Analysis Protocol is used to identify plausible causes of exceedance of quality standards for the active substances of PPPs in surface water in a thorough and transparent manner. Plausible causes of quality standard exceedance are determined by answering the following questions.

1. Substance properties:

- Based on substance properties, which emission pathways to surface water are most relevant for the substance?

2. Dutch authorisation:

- Based on authorisation and Good Agricultural Practice (GAP), what applications and emission pathways are likely to play a role in emissions to surface water?
- Are there product-specific restrictions that influence the risk of a certain emission pathway?

3. Agricultural use data:

- What are relevant product applications, application methods, application periods and regions with relatively intensive use?
- What are the implications for emission risks?

4. Emission pathways:

- Are there emission pathways that are likely to be relevant but are not included in the calculated emissions (NMI)?
- According to the expected emissions (calculated emissions + interpretation of expert information), what are the most relevant emission pathways to surface water?
- What are the consequences of the relevant emission pathways for the course of substance concentrations within a year?
- Are the relevant emission pathways a consequence of an application that does not comply with GAP?

5. Surface water monitoring results:

- How does the temporal pattern of water quality standard exceedance over a year compare with application periods in relevant crops?
- Do the spatial distribution and temporal pattern of exceedances imply a correlation with certain crops, application methods and/or emission pathways?
- How does the spatial distribution of exceedance of quality standards compare with the spatial distribution of calculated emissions? What does this imply for the relevance of the various applications and emission pathways?

6. Visual comparison of calculated emissions (NMI) and monitoring data:

- How does the spatial distribution of exceedance of quality standards in monitoring data compare with the calculated emissions? What does this imply for the relevance of the various applications and emission routes?

The final step of the Causal Analysis is to interpret the answers and arrive at an overall conclusion regarding plausible causes and non-application of Good Agricultural Practice.




Figure 3.1. Step 2: the Causal Analysis.

3.2 The protocol manager

The protocol manager is responsible for the process, documentation and reporting of the Causal Analysis. He or she is also responsible for interpreting the data and arranging expert input, as well as for formulating conclusions and recommendations. It is the protocol manager's responsibility to ensure appropriate experts and expertise are used throughout the process.

The protocol manager is appointed by the authorisation holder, who in all cases bears ultimate responsibility for execution of the Causal Analysis. The protocol manager may come from within or outside the company. If several authorisation holders cooperate in the analysis, they may appoint a joint protocol manager. The Causal Analysis will comprise part of the information filed with the Ctgb for authorisation. The Ctgb will execute a check on the process and outcome of the analysis.

3.3 Phases of the Causal Analysis Protocol

Before the analysis of plausible causes is started, the history of the substance is checked. If a Causal Analysis or formal emission reduction plan is already ongoing (as recorded in the list of problematic substances), no further action is taken. If mitigation measures have been taken and their effects should be visible in the monitoring data, the trend in exceedances is analysed. Based on the observed progress, further actions are defined. This procedure is specified in further detail in the feedback procedure described in Chapter 4.

The Causal Analysis Protocol guides the protocol manager through a maximum of five phases, shown in Figure 3.2 along with the document(s) to be delivered after each phase. The protocol combines fact-finding (Phases 1 and 3) with expert consultation. The aim here is to make optimum use of available knowledge, not only from national databases and models, but also from regional expertise and expertise that has not (yet) been incorporated in national models and instruments. The analysis starts on a national, more general scale (Phases 1 and 2), covering all regions and crops, and may go into more detail at a later stage (Phases 3 and 4) if this is expected to yield relevant additional information.

The protocol manager may decide to combine several of the documents listed in Figure 3.2 into a single document. This is acceptable as long as it is clear from the documents which phases have been completed and what the individual phases have delivered in the process of causal analysis.

3.3.1 Phase 1: Inventory of basic information, national scale

In Phase 1 a factsheet is prepared, based on readily available, high-quality, standard information sources. In Phase 1 the fact-finding is carried out on a national scale: the information sources cover a wide variety of PPPs and crops and encompass the whole country. At this stage, however, there is no need for a detailed investigation of authorisation dossiers and information on the backgrounds of national-scale datasets. The use of high-quality, standard sources results in a standardised factsheet. The result of Phase 1 serves as input for Phase 2.


In Phase 1 of the Causal Analysis, product authorisations are checked for any recent changes in restrictions on the label that influence emissions. Extra restrictions are an indication as to which emission pathways might play an important role.

The procedure is applicable to active ingredients and metabolites of PPPs, not to biocides, pharmaceuticals and (chemical) substances with other type of use. Even though the Causal Analysis focuses on the use of substances as PPPs, information on relevant non-agricultural use and other possible sources of surface water contamination should be mentioned in the factsheet. Although these are not analysed any further under the Causal Analysis Protocol, they may be relevant for establishing specific mitigation measures.

If it can be concluded that it is implausible that agricultural use of the substance as a PPP (Ctgb category 'L' = 'Gewasbeschermingsmiddelen') is responsible for the majority of quality standard exceedances, the Causal Analysis can continue with Phase 5 of the Protocol, the final conclusions.

Phase 1 is concluded by ascertaining whether all the requested data have indeed been collected and whether they contain any contradictions. Missing data and contradictions are specified in the conclusions of the factsheet.

Causal Analysis Protocol: design



**This document is replaced in the next phase but remains available in the case archive.*

Figure 3.2. Phases and documents in the Causal Analysis Protocol for exceedance of quality standards.

3.3.2 Phase 2: Expert consultation and interpretation, national scale

A phase of fact-finding (Phases 1 and 3) is always followed by expert consultation. Phase 1 is followed by expert consultation in Phase 2, and Phase 3 is followed by Phase 4. The goal of Phases 2 and 4 is to interpret the facts collected and reported in the previous phase and to establish whether these factsheet data require any adjustment or amendment by experts.

The expert consultation in Phases 2 and 4 consists of interaction with a potentially large number of experts working for a variety of research organisations and other stakeholders. The protocol manager decides which organisations are contacted for which question(s). For each combination of question and expertise, at least one, and if possible more organisations are contacted. For each organisation a contact person selects one or more experts within their organisation. These are approached by the contact person within that organisation to respond to the questions. If possible, the contacted organisations should represent a balance between governmental and independent research organisations on the one hand, and agribusiness on the other. The listings of organisations and contact persons in Appendix VI can be updated by the protocol manager.

Questions for experts are categorised per topic (Figure 3.2). To ensure the entire Phase 1 Factsheet is duly studied by experts in Phase 2, and all the predefined questions (as described below) are used in all cases. Each of these questions is labelled with specific expertises (Table 3.1). Questions, expertises and organisations with their expertises and contact persons are listed in Appendix VI. If further analysis is required in Phases 3 and 4, the protocol manager may define new questions.

An expert is always asked to support his or her answers with references or other information source(s). This may be expert knowledge/expert judgement, but preferably the expert refers to publicly accessible documents. The expert is asked to respond to predefined questions selected by the protocol manager. Although experts may not respond to other predefined questions, they do have access to the contributions of the other experts. In this way the Crop Protection Sharepoint serves as a platform for discussion among experts. The protocol manager uses the results of the expert consultation to improve the factsheet and for the purpose of Phase 2 interpretation and conclusions.

Table 3.1. Fields of expertise relevant for expert consultation in the Causal Analysis.

- | | |
|-----|---|
| 1. | Available PPPs and crop protection |
| 2. | Crop protection advice |
| 3. | Environmental risks of PPPs |
| 4. | Surface water quality research and analysis methods |
| 5. | Surface water quantity research and water management |
| 6. | Authorisation |
| 7. | Fulfilment of restrictions on application of PPPs (enforcement) |
| 8. | Processing of monitoring results |
| 9. | Data collection and horticultural and agricultural analysis |
| 10. | (Geo)statistics |

Background to the predefined questions per topic

Substance characteristics

For mobile substances in particular, new data on substance characteristics may become available in the near future. These may imply increased leaching potential and/or different distributions of emission pathways. For calculating predicted emissions, the first choice should be to adopt the most recent methods, parameters and data on substance characteristics, as used by the Ctgb. However, experts may also present new relevant information that has not yet been integrated into the Ctgb methodology. The protocol manager may decide to use this new information to calculate emissions using alternative scenarios.

Dutch authorisation

Authorised use can be derived from the product labels and the extra information in the Good Agricultural Practice (GAP) table applied by the Ctgb and integrated into the Phase 1 Factsheet. Exact information on authorised use in the past can be difficult to locate. Especially when it concerns special and older authorisations.

Agricultural use data

In practice, agricultural use may differ from the use that has been authorised. This may entail a different application frequency or spray interval, but more relevant still are deviations from authorised use, involving application in crops without authorisation (illegal use) or use of application methods that are not part of authorised use. Such practices may lead to unexpected emission patterns. In addition, the expert consultation may yield information on the market share of different products, which may vary in authorised use and application advice and therefore vary in anticipated emission risks. In expert consultation on this topic, it is not only deviations from authorised use that are noted. On the basis of the experts' response a more detailed and robustly supported overview of actual use in practice is made. This leads to estimations or calculations of predicted emissions that are more detailed and/or better supported.

Emissions to surface water

Based on expert input, the protocol manager may specify and apply additional or refined emission scenarios, for example using adjusted substance characteristics, product application variables and/or emission factors. Another possibility is a national scenario that excludes a specific area or application from the calculations.

Surface water monitoring results

Depending on the outcome of Phase 1, additional information on the monitoring results may be relevant. This may relate to:

- more detailed information on e.g. the temporal course of substance concentrations
- differences between regions in number of measurements and exceedances.

If an expert brings up monitoring results which are not in the Pesticides Atlas, this expert is requested to provide due information on the origin of the new data.

Phase 2 interpretation and conclusions of the Causal Analysis Protocol

The protocol manager makes transparent how the expert responses are to be used in the further process. He or she may decide to discuss the findings obtained up to and including Phase 2 with one or more experts, in order to arrive at robust interpretation and conclusions. In this case the authorisation holder(s) of the substance are invited to be represented at this discussion.

As a follow-up, the protocol manager may opt to take the following actions:

Regarding the source information in the factsheet:

- Adjust or add to the source information in the factsheet.
- Add qualitative remarks to specific topics in the factsheet.
- Recalculate the predicted emissions using adjusted input data.

Regarding interpretation of the collected information:

- Use the information to interpret the data in the factsheet, draw conclusions and make recommendations for the next phase of the Protocol.

Regarding the Protocol:

- If relevant, the protocol manager may make a recommendation to modify the Protocol for use in subsequent cases.

Conflicting information

In the event of conflicting information, missing information or striking regional differences in variables of influence on expected emission levels, the protocol manager may opt to add pertinent remarks.

Information from different experts may be mutually conflicting or conflict with the information in the Phase 1 Factsheet. If the protocol manager is able to judge and duly support which information is most valuable or best-supported, the rest of the Protocol is run using this superior information.

If the protocol manager cannot establish which information is best, all the information sources should be used in the further process of Causal Analysis. If the conflicting information concerns variables that are used to calculate emissions, the Causal Analysis is continued with more scenarios. If the uncertainty concerns multiple variables, the protocol manager may decide to continue the process with a minimum, maximum and average scenario for certain emissions. To gain an indication of which scenario is most realistic, the protocol manager can compare the calculated emissions with monitoring data.

The interpretation and the conclusions of Phase 2 are documented in a new document: '*Substance name*: Phase 2 Interpretation and Conclusion of Causal Analysis Protocol.

For each topic (Figure 3.2) the most relevant findings are described, followed by the conclusions on that topic in relation to establishing relevant applications and emission pathways. Based on these conclusions per topic, the protocol manager then draws the main conclusions for Phase 2 with respect to the applications and emission pathways that are to be deemed the most plausible cause of the water quality problem.

The protocol manager does not need to prove a causal relationship, but if possible he or she should seek to answer the following questions concerning the regions and/or seasons of concern;

- What product application(s) have a plausible relation with the exceedance of quality standards?
- What emission pathway(s) have a plausible relation with the exceedance of quality standards?
- Is it possible to rank emission pathways according to their contribution to the exceedance of quality standards?
- What sources and applications can be excluded from the list of possible causes of quality standard exceedance?

Protocol continuation after Phase 2

It is not always necessary to work through all the phases of the Protocol. If a more detailed analysis is not considered necessary or not expected to add relevant information after Phase 2, for example, then Phases 3 and 4 can be skipped. Figure 3.4, showing the Protocol phases and topics, indicates this optional short-cut.

The protocol manager uses the following decision tree to decide whether Phases 3 and 4 are to be included in the Causal Analysis (cf. Figure 3.3):

A: Are there unexplained striking differences between the distribution of the expected emissions and the measured exceedance of quality standards between regions? Yes?: -> D. No? -> B

B: Are there unexplained striking differences between the distribution in time of the expected emissions and the measured exceedances of quality standards? Yes?: -> D. No? -> C

C: Is there a plausible relation between applications in certain crops, related emission pathways and the measured exceedances of quality standards? Yes?: -> Phase 5. No? -> D

D: Is it anticipated that further analysis of one or more of the topics studied in Phase 2 will improve insight into the cause of the exceedance of quality standards? Yes?: Continue with Phases 3 & 4. No: continue with Phase 5.




Figure 3.3. Decision tree for Protocol continuation after Phase 2.

Phases and topics in the Protocol for Causal Analysis	
Protocol Phase	
1.	Inventory of available data at national scale
2.	Expert consultation (national scale)
3.	Inventory of additional data (regional scale or particular topics)
4.	Expert consultations (regional scale or particular topics)
5.	Interpretation and conclusions
Topics treated	
1.	Substance properties
2.	Dutch Registration
3.	Agricultural use data
4.	Emissions to surface water
5.	Surface water monitoring results

Dashed line: Shortcut Phase 2 → 5 (see text)




Figure 3.4. Phases and topics of the Causal Analysis Protocol.

3.3.3 Phase 3: Inventory of extra data, regional scale or particular topics

The aim of Phase 3 of the Protocol is to gather more information on topics of interest emerging from Phases 1 and 2. This additional step is only carried out if relevant extra or superior information is expected to be available. Superior information should substantiate the plausible causes of exceedance of quality standards.

In contrast to Phase 1, the topics and sources to be consulted in Phase 3 are selected on a case-by-case basis (per substance). The results of Phase 3 are documented in a 'Phase 3 Factsheet'. Phase 3 is always followed by Phase 4.

In Phase 1 standard sources were consulted on the following topics:

1. Substance properties
2. Dutch authorisation
3. Agricultural use data
4. Emissions to surface water
5. Surface water monitoring results

Now, in Phase 3, the protocol manager decides which of these topics require more in-depth analysis, for example:

- an analysis of the relevance of a certain emission route in a particular water board district
- an analysis of a particular physico-chemical characteristic of the substance
- a further analysis of the application technique in practice
- an analysis of the monitoring results in a water board district
- a more detailed analysis of the agricultural use in a certain crop and/or area (dosage, time of application, etc.).

The protocol manager makes use of public available information like databases and literature, but may also consult organisations or experts for specific supplementary information in the context of Phase 3. All information gathered in this phase is presented to experts in Phase 4.

As in earlier phases, the complete process of fact-finding and expert consultation is documented and made visible for experts and (other) stakeholders through the Crop Protection Sharepoint (CPS). The information gathered in Phase 3 is documented in the Phase 3 Factsheet.

3.3.4 Phase 4: Expert consultation, regional scale or particular topics

Phase 4 is similar to Phase 2. In Phase 3 the protocol manager may already have consulted one or more experts to acquire more detailed information on particular topics. In Phase 4 the findings of Phase 3 are none-the-less presented to a wider range of experts in order to broaden the basis and optimise the quality of analysis.

The protocol manager decides which questions are to be presented to which organisations. For the more specific or area-bound questions characterising Phase 4, contact persons may well opt to contact or refer to other experts compared with Phase 2.

To the extent that the list of experts and organisations permits, the same constraints apply as in Phase 2:

- Per question, at least two experts are contacted and have replied. If, in Phase 3, information has been retrieved from one or more experts, the two experts just mentioned must differ from these if, and as available.
- Per question, at least one governmental or independent research organisation and one commercial organisation (e.g. authorisation holder) are contacted and have replied. This is not necessary for questions on monitoring results.

The protocol manager can decide during this process to continue fact-finding and further expert consultation depending on what information is still lacking and the time available until the Causal Analysis needs to be filed with the Ctgb.

3.3.5 Phase 5: Final conclusions and recommendations

In Phase 5 the overall conclusion is drawn. In this conclusion the applications and emission pathways that have a plausible relation with the exceedance of quality standards are as far as possible specified. The conclusion may also be that no plausible causes have been found, or that only part of the quality standard exceedance can be explained.

The conclusions are summarised in tabular form. These conclusions are based on the emission per surface unit treated crop or field and thus not directly influenced by differences in the total amount applied in specific crops.

Conclusions are drawn with respect to the following questions:

There is **a plausible relation** between **the application of substance in crop(s)** and the exceedance of quality standards in the period in the surface water in the area(s) / in The Netherlands.

There is **no plausible relation** between **the application of substance in crop(s)** and the exceedance of quality standards in the period in the surface water in the area(s) / in The Netherlands.

There is **a plausible relation** between specific **emission routes** following the application of substance in crop(s) and the exceedance of quality standards in the period in the surface water in the area(s) / in The Netherlands.

These conclusions are presented in a table showing, per crop and, if possible, emission route, whether there is a plausible relation with the observed quality standard exceedances. An example is given in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2. Example of an overview of plausible causes of quality standard exceedances in the time frame 2003-2006 for a herbicide. The plausible causes are based on the emission per surface unit on which the substance is applied. Consequently, the conclusions are independent of the total area treated.

Time frame: 2003-2006			Emission route					
Crop on which the substance is applied*	Authorisation	Percentage of national use of metribuzin*	Diffuse sources				Point sources (from farmyards and buildings, from greenhouses)	
			spray drift	atmospheric deposition	lateral leaching***	run-off	open field crops	covered crops
Table / crisp potatoes	Yes	71	Plausible cause main cause of exceedances in spring and summer	Not a plausible cause	plausible cause main cause of exceedances in autumn and winter	not investigated	Cannot be excluded Sprayer cleaning (internal and external) possibly relevant in application period and autumn	No applications
Starch potatoes	Yes	22	Plausible cause exceedances in spring and summer		Plausible cause exceedances in autumn and winter			
Seed potatoes	No	1	Plausible cause		Plausible cause			
Asparagus	Yes	4	Plausible cause		Plausible cause Multi-annual crop: increases the risk			
Grass seed	No	-**	Plausible cause		Plausible cause Application in autumn increases the risk			
Carrots	No	-	Application in this time frame is negligible (information from authorisation holder)					
Grassland	No	-	Not plausible that this application occurs in practice; no further analysis carried out					
Strawberries	No	-	Not plausible that this application occurs in practice; no further analysis carried out					

* Sources: 'CBS pesticides questionnaire 2004' and LEI ('Bedrijveninformatienet')

** Supplementary information from authorisation holder: approx. 1% of use is in grass seed cultivation.

*** Preferential flow and discharge through pipe drains have not been analysed

If no plausible relation is established, a distinction is made between two situations:

- The investigations led to the conclusion that there is no plausible relation, or a plausible relation can neither be confirmed nor denied.
- The relation was not investigated

The conclusions table also specifies distribution of use of the substance of concern over the various different crops.

GAP – Non-GAP

During the Causal Analysis information is collected on the role of incorrect or illegal (non-GAP) application of the substance of concern. If this information is well-supported, a short paragraph is added to the conclusions concerning the expected contribution of non-GAP to the quality standard exceedances.

Recommendations

Based on the outcome so far, the protocol manager may draw up recommendations:

- for reducing exceedance of quality standards, based on the outcome of the Protocol
- for improving the Protocol for subsequent cases.

Checklist

To validate that the Causal Analysis Protocol has been correctly and fully applied, the protocol manager uses the protocol (Appendix III) as a checklist and checks all bullets that have been completed. This checklist can also be used by the Ctgb to check on the correct application of the protocol.

3.4 The Crop Protection Sharepoint (CPS)

Based on the tables in Appendix III, more than 50 different combinations of organisations and expertise may be relevant in Phase 2 of the Causal Analysis. This large number of potential expert contributions and the interaction with and between experts needs to be managed in a way that ensures a standardised and transparent process. To this end the Crop Protection Sharepoint (CPS) has been developed. This is an online location where documents and other files can be stored and interaction with and among experts can be managed in a transparent manner. The Crop Protection Sharepoint (in the Dutch language), can be accessed at www.gewasbeschermingsplatform.nl.

The Sharepoint can be used to:

- organise and process the interaction with and between experts in an efficient manner
- file and retrieve data, from current and closed cases (using a digital library)
- ensure transparency of the procedure and conclusion of each case for experts and optionally also for stakeholders involved

The CPS User Manual is available as a separate appendix (VII).

Transparency

The transparency required of the Causal Analysis process means that only non-confidential information can be used. All the information used in the course of the analysis will be accessible to all the organisations and experts involved in the analysis, and use of non-public information is only possible if the provider of that information grants permission for use in the case documentation. The protocol manager should ensure that the organisations contacted for expert consultation are made aware of this need for transparency.

Case archive

The documents 'Phase 1 Factsheet' and 'Phase 3 Factsheet' (Figure 1) are replaced during the process by a 'Phase 1&2 Factsheet' and a 'Phase 3&4 Factsheet'. However, all the case documents remain accessible for the organisations who contributed to the factsheets of the case in the Crop Protection Sharepoint archive.

3.5 The Dutch Environmental Indicator for Pesticides (NMI)

The Dutch Environmental Indicator for Pesticides (NMI; <http://www.nmi.alterra.nl/>) calculates indicators for emissions and environmental risks resulting from the agricultural use of pesticides (excluding wet soil fumigants). Based on farm surveys conducted by Statistics Netherlands (CBS 1998, 2004, 2008), annual sales data in terms of active ingredient are allocated across the main Dutch agricultural crops. Each application is defined by the rate of active substance applied (kg/ha), the object treated (crop, soil, or plant material), the application technique, the application time (month), frequency and time interval. These farm based use data from Statistics Netherlands are a source of information in Phase 1.

The third version of this instrument, NMI 3, is currently under development to support the evaluation of the Dutch policy programme on sustainable plant protection (EDG-2010). NMI 3 calculates indicators for emissions to surface water (field ditch) resulting from spray drift, atmospheric deposition, drainage flow and discharge from greenhouses. In addition, indicators for point source emissions to surface water resulting from treatment of plant materials are calculated. The indicators for emission (kg a.i. ha⁻¹) are converted to short-term and long-term exposure concentrations in a field ditch (Figure 3.5). Next, the risk indicator relates the exposure concentration to a target concentration (ecotoxicologically relevant concentration, e.g. an EQS) that corresponds with the exposure regime and the species of concern. The risk indicators can be expressed by the exposure toxicity ratio and by the distance to target. For example, the risk indicator used for the EDG-2010 is the ratio of the Time Weighted Average exposure (c_{TWA}) and the Maximum Allowable Concentration (MTR, which is comparable to the AA-EQS).




Figure 3.5. Example of exposure concentrations in a field ditch due to spray drift resulting from a multiple application. The short-term exposure concentration is the highest peak concentration. The NMI accounts for dissipation from the water body by degradation and by volatilisation assuming standing water. The long-term exposure concentration is the maximum time-weighted average (time frame 21 days).

The NMI 3 uses a compound database filled with physico-chemical and toxicological endpoints based on Ctgbase (in preparation) for all substances approved on the Dutch market in 1998, 2004 and/or 2008.

The NMI 3 can also be used with alternative use data, to investigate the influence of uncertainty in these compound properties on predicted emission levels, or to investigate the differences between measured and predicted concentrations in Dutch surface water.

3.6 Application of the Pesticides Atlas

In Chapter 2 the Pesticides Atlas (www.bestrijdingsmiddelenatlas.nl) was briefly characterised. All the monitoring data registered in this Atlas can be used as input in the Causal Analysis. The following products are available:

- List of problematic substances (Chapter 2).
- Maps per year for the period under investigation showing observed exceedances of water quality standard(s). This enables identification not only of regions with no, or, frequent exceedances, but also of regions in which the pesticide under investigation has been measured and those in which there has been insufficient monitoring.
- Diagrams per year for the period under investigation showing the frequencies of classes of exceedances.
- Diagrams per year for the period under investigation showing the frequencies of quality standard exceedances per month; this comprises absolute as well relative (%) frequencies.
- Tables per two years for the period under investigation showing significant correlations between land use type and concentration or quality standard exceedances.

More detailed information can be extracted from the Pesticides Atlas on request, for example tables of frequencies of quality standard exceedances per month in different regions (e.g. water board districts), or more detailed information about the measurements.

4 Feedback procedure




Fig. 4.1 Feedback procedure. Dotted arrows indicate actions that are not necessary in all cases. The feedback to regulation enforcement may take place via the authorisation holder(s) or based on the authorisation decision published by the Ctgb. The causal analysis does not always result in an authorisation decision.

This chapter, Feedback procedure, describes the role of the causal analysis and Emission Reduction Plan (ERP) in authorisation procedures and which feedback takes place between the stakeholders involved. The set up of the causal analysis has been explained in the previous chapter. The prior conditions set by the Project group are described separately in the textbox below.

Policy decisions / prior conditions

Consequences for authorisations

The possible consequences of the outcome of the causal analysis for a specific authorisation depend on whether a plausible relation has been found between an authorisation (application according to GAP) and the standard exceedances. In case of a plausible relation, the Ctgb may decide not to prolongate an existing authorisation or decide negative on a new authorisation request if the authorisation holder does not submit a thorough emission reduction plan (ERP).

If there is no such a plausible relation, the Ctgb can not make an autonomic negative authorisation decision in consequence of monitoring data.

Problematic substances

The number of substances for which a causal analysis is requested is a political choice. The project group has decided to work with a non-limitative list of problematic substances. If a regular re-authorisation request concerns a substance on this list, a causal analysis and emission reduction plan are required. For the problematic substances with the highest ranking a causal analysis and emission reduction plan are requested independent of the regular authorisation period.

The Monitoring working group proposes that the conditions for requesting such an analysis are reconsidered as soon as a better empirical picture of the workload for the Ctgb and the authorisation holder(s) is obtained. One option is to request a Causal Analysis in situation A (4.1.1.) only for those substances scoring a minimum number of points according to the ranking method described in Section 2.1.

Duration ERP

The duration of an emission reduction plan is maximal 2 years. After 2 years it may be followed up by a new plan of no longer then 2 years under 2 conditions:

- *The water quality problems are reduced after the first emission reduction plan.*
- *It is made plausible by experts that a second emission reduction plan will be effective to reduce the standard exceedances sufficiently.*

4.1.1 Causal Analysis and ERP in the draft registration report

For substances identified as problematic, the Ctgb may decide that a Causal Analysis is required. The outcome of the causal analysis is always used by the authorisation holder(s) to formulate an emission reduction plan (ERP).

The Causal Analysis Protocol is applicable for substances with (expected) relevant use as a PPP. Such an analysis may be requested in two types of situation:

Situation A:

Regular re-authorisation: an authorisation holder files for a prolongation of an existing authorisation. The request for a Causal Analysis applies for all substances identified as problematic substances.

Situation B:

For the most problematic substances:

- I. Interim review of existing authorisations, independent of the regular authorisation period.
- II. New registration requests (table 4.1) of substances already on the market as a PPP

Situation B applies for the most problematic substances: the 25% highest ranking substances, with a maximum of 10 substances per year.

The need to execute the causal analysis in situation B-II, for new registrations (table 4.1) depends on

- 1) The estimated risk of breaching the quality standard

2) The availability of a causal analysis and ERP for this substance

- ad 1) If the risk is estimated to be lower than for the existing registrations, the use of this protocol is not needed. Ctgb assesses this estimation of the applicant with the decision scheme in Figure 4.2. If the risk is estimated to be comparable or higher, step 2 applies:
- ad 2) Since situation B applies, a causal analysis and ERP are requested for existing authorisations. If the causal analysis and ERP are available, they need to be integrated in the draft registration report for new authorisation requests of this substance. Under the PPP Directive 1107/2009 it is foreseen (personal communication Ctgb and Nefyto, see also EU/1141/2010), that a pre-submission meeting with the registration authority of the zonal reporting member state (zRMS) is held before submitting the draft registration report. During this meeting the completeness of the dossier is assessed. If this meeting is held and no causal analysis and ERP are available at this particular moment, the authorisation request will be submitted and the procedure will be followed without these documents. If later, at the time of the authorisation decision, the causal analysis and ERP have become available, the integration of these documents in the draft registration report will be requested as an additional question for information by the registration authority. In case no pre-submission meeting takes place, the availability of a causal analysis and ERP will be checked by the registration authority at the time of the authorisation decision.




Figure 4.2. Decision scheme for the application of the protocol for Causal analysis for authorisation requests for substances in 'Situation B'. This does not include the regular re-authorisation.

* not authorised as a PPP

** comparable crop and application method

*** at the time of filing the request. If available later (at latest at the moment of the authorisation decision, an additional request to apply the outcomes may be filed by the registration authority.

The above scheme applies for the registration requests that can be found in table 3.1. For a so called 'Dringend Vereiste Toelating (DVT) the protocol will not be applied, as this implies a registration with urgency only for one season.

Code)	Beschrijving type aanvraag
TG	Toelatingsaanvraag (nieuw middel, kan van bestaande stof zijn maar kan ook een nieuwe stof zijn)
TVG	Aanvraag voorlopige toelating (stof nog niet geplaatst in EU)
UG	Uitbreidingsaanvraag van reeds toegelaten middel
VUG	Vereenvoudigde uitbreiding (= uitbreiding naar vergelijkbaar gebruik)
WGGAG	Aanvraag tot wijziging gebruiksvoorschrift
WERG	wederzijdse erkenning (hierbij dient Ctgb de beoordeling van andere lidstaat over te nemen, wel mogen een aantal aspecten waaronder risico aquatische organismen NL specifiek worden beoordeeld)

Table 4.1 Categories of authorisation requests (in Dutch)

Update problematic substances

The authorisation holders of substances for which situation B-I applies, are requested by the registration authority to submit a causal analysis and ERP. In case of (re-)authorisation requests (situation A and B-II) it is the applicant's responsibility to verify with the list of problematic substances whether a causal analysis and ERP need to be included in the draft registration report.

As described in chapter 2, the list of problematic substances is updated once a year and valid starting January 1st of every year. To determine the necessity of a causal analysis and ERP for regular re-authorisations (situation A) and new authorisation requests of already registered substances (situation B-II) the list of problematic substances valid at the date of the pre-submission meeting applies. In case there is no pre-submission meeting, the list valid at the date of submission applies.

PPP only

The Protocol is not used for analysis when use of the substance as a plant protection product (Ctgb substance category 'L' = 'Gewasbeschermingsmiddelen') is not permitted and/or clearly not responsible for quality standard exceedances. If use as a PPP is not relevant, but the authorisation holder has information on the use and emission risks of the substance anyway, this information is reported to the Ctgb.

4.1.2 Emission reduction plan: set up

The execution of an ERP covers maximal two years. The ERP can consist of different types of measures and involve several stakeholders. In case the causal analysis shows that it is plausible that application according to GAP resulted in exceedances of the water quality standards, there will be a proposal for a change in the GAP. This means that the authorisation holder suggests an adjustment of the authorisation.

If it is plausible that non-GAP use resulted in these exceedances, other so called Product Stewardship measures will be proposed. If there is no plausible cause found, further research to reveal the causes of the standard exceedances can be proposed. In case the water quality standards are not reached in the following years, emission reduction will be necessary to prevent measures obliged by the EU based on WFD reports.

4.1.3 Authorisation decision

The registration authority, Ctgb, has to assess the completeness and quality of the causal analysis and justification of the proposed actions described in the ERP. The Ctgb may decide negatively on the authorisation request in case the absence of a causal analysis and/or ERP is not accepted as justified in consideration of the causal analysis. In case of a plausible relation with an authorisation (application according to GAP), the expected effectiveness of the ERP has consequences for the authorisation decision. If the Ctgb judges that the ERP can not be expected to reduce the quality standard exceedances sufficiently, the Ctgb can decide negatively on a re-authorisation request (situation A) or a request for a new authorisation for a problematic substance (situation B-II).

If applicable, the main conclusions of the causal analysis and the essence of the ERP will be used to fundament the authorisation decision as part of the formal publication of the authorisation decision on the Ctgb website. This will be the information source for all involved parties, ministries, agricultural inspection services (nieuwe Voedsel en Warenautoriteit, nVWA), water authorities, non governmental organizations (NGOs), etc.

No authorisation decision

If a causal analysis and ERP concern an existing authorisation they do not always result in an authorisation decision: if there is no plausible relation with a specific authorisation for which situation B-1 applies, this authorisation can remain unchanged without a formal authorisation decision.

4.1.4 Effectiveness of the emission reduction plan

The effectiveness of an emission reduction plan is judged based on the water quality monitoring data and the yearly update of the list of problematic substances. The Ctgb can derive from the substance labelling in the list of problematic substances what the status of the substance is in case situation A or B applies for the same substance in a later year. Has a causal analysis been carried out and has an ERP been initiated and if so, what are the starting and end date? Based on this information the Ctgb determines whether the effect of the ERP should be visible in the monitoring results yet and if the possibility of a second ERP applies (see 'prior conditions' for more details).

5 References

Kempenaar, C., R. Kruijne and J. Spijker, 2009. Niet-landbouwkundig gebruik van Gewasbeschermingsmiddelen - Schatting van terreintypen en verbruik voor de eindevaluatie van de Nota Duurzame gewasbescherming. Wageningen University and Research Centre, Plant Research International, Report 637.

Rijkswaterstaat, 2009. Richtlijn Monitoring Oppervlaktewater en Protocol Toetsen & Beoordelen. http://www.kaderrichtlijnwater.nl/publicaties/item_5778/?Actltmltdt=22702, Nov. 2009.

Schomaker, A.H.H.M. and R.A.E. Knoben, 2007. Leidraad Monitoring Gewasbeschermingsmiddelen. Definitief rapport. Projectnummer 9S9390. Haskoning BV, 's Hertogenbosch, Netherlands.

Van der Linden, A.M.A., P. van Beelen, G.A. van den Berg, M. de Boer, D.J. van der Gaag, J.G. Groenwold, J.F.M. Huijsmans, D.F. Kalf, S.A.M. de Kool, R. Kruijne, R.C.M. Merkelbach, G.R. de Snoo, R.A.N. Vijftigschild, M.G. Vijver, A.J. van der Wal, 2006. Evaluatie duurzame gewasbescherming 2006: milieu. RIVM, Bilthoven, Rapport 607016001.

Werd, H.A.E. de and R.C.M. Merkelbach, 2006. Bepaling herkomst van bestrijdingsmiddelen in oppervlaktewater - Ontwikkeling van een protocol - Prototype december 2006, Wageningen Universiteit and Research Centre, Praktijkonderzoek Plant & Omgeving, PPO, Report 3234035800.

Milieukwaliteitsnormen voor oppervlaktewater: www.wateremissies.nl

Bestrijdingsmiddelenatlas: www.bestrijdingsmiddelenatlas.nl

red. L-1 publicaties over BMA toevoegen of naar verwijzen via BMA site?

Nationale Milieuindicator: www.nmi.alterra.nl

Normen

- http://www.helpdeskwater.nl/emissiebeheer/normen_voor_het/normen_zoeksysteem/
- <http://www.rivm.nl/rvs/normen/>

Besluit kwaliteitseisen monitoring water, Regeling monitoring KRW:

- <http://www.helpdeskwater.nl/>
- <http://www.wetten.nl>

Appendix I: Abbreviations and Glossary

Abbreviations

AA-EQS: Annual Average - Environmental Quality Standard
BMA: Bestrijdingsmiddelenatlas
BKMW: Besluit kwaliteitseisen en monitoring water 2009
CBS: Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek
CML: Centrum Milieuwetenschappen Leiden
CPS: Crop Protection Sharepoint
Ctgb: College voor de toelating van gewasbeschermingsmiddelen en biociden
DVT: Dringend vereiste toelating
EDG: Evaluatie Duurzame Gewasbeschermings
EL&I: Economie, Landbouw & Innovatie
EQS: Environmental Quality Standard (NL: MKN)
ERP: Emission reduction plan
GAP: Good Agricultural Practice
I&M: Infrastructuur en milieu
KRW: Kaderrichtlijn Water (EN: WFD)
KRW-WL: Kaderrichtlijn Water – Waterlichaam (EN: WFD waterbody)
LEI: Landbouw Economisch Instituut
MAC-EQS: Maximum Acceptable Concentration – Environmental Quality Standard
MKN: Milieukwaliteitsnorm (EN: EQS)
MPC: Maximum Permissible Concentration (NL: MTR)
MTR: Maximaal Toelaatbaar Risico (EN: MPC)
NGO's: Non Governmental organizations
NMI: Nationale Milieu-indicator
nVWA: nieuwe Voedsel en Warenautoriteit
PPP: Plant protection product
RAC: Regulatory Acceptable Concentration
WFD: Water Framework Directive (NL: KRW)
INS: (Inter-)nationale Normen Stoffen
zRMS: zonal reporting member state

Glossary

Term	Definition	Source
Environmental Quality Standard (EQS)	the concentration of a particular pollutant or group of pollutants in water, sediment or biota which should not be exceeded in order to protect human health and the environment.	EN: WFD 2000/60/EC, Art. 2(35) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/water/water-framework/index_en.html
AA-EQS	annual average concentration (AA-EQS) to protect against the occurrence of prolonged exposure	EN: draft EQS guidance NL: Nota van toelichting bij het ontwerp-Besluit Kwaliteitseisen en monitoring water http://www.kaderrichtlijnwater.nl/publicaties/juridische/?ActItdt=18374
MAC-EQS	maximum acceptable concentration (MAC-EQS) to protect against possible effects from short-term concentration peaks	EN: draft EQS guidance NL: Nota van toelichting bij het ontwerp-Besluit Kwaliteitseisen en monitoring water http://www.kaderrichtlijnwater.nl/publicaties/juridische/?ActItdt=18374
Maximum Permissible Concentration (MPC)	In Dutch pollutant policy (VROM, 2004) the MPC is defined as the scientifically-based standard indicating the concentration in an environmental compartment at which no effect to be rated as negative is to be expected for ecosystems;	Brochure (Inter)nationale normen stoffen (VROM, 2004): http://www.vrom.nl/pagina.html?id=2706&sp=2&dn=w015 KRW-guidance Lepper, 2005
Regulatory Acceptable Concentration (RAC).	The Regulatory Acceptable Concentration (RAC) is the effects assessment endpoint, expressed in terms of a permissible concentration in the environment, which is used directly in the risk assessment by comparing it with the appropriate field exposure estimate (e.g. PEC_{max}).	ELINK
assessment factor	Numerical adjustment used to extrapolate from experimentally determined (dose-response) relationships to estimate the agent exposure at which an adverse effect is unlikely to occur. See also: safety factor and uncertainty factor	Risk assessment of chemicals: an introduction. 2nd edition 2007. C.J. Van Leeuwen and T. Vermeire, eds. Dordrecht, Netherlands, Springer.

Monitoring site (*Meetpunt*)

A single site of which the geographical coordinates have been documented and on which monitoring of pesticides is taken place regularly.

Measurement (*meting*)

Carried out at one monitoring site (meetpunt) at one date/time.

Measured (*gemeten*)

Results of measurements may be below, above or equal to the detection limit.

Observed or above the detection limit (*aangehouden*)

Result of measurement is positive; the pesticide has been found in a measurable amount.

Below detection limit (*niet aangetoond*)

A pesticide has been measured, but since results are below the detection limit, it is uncertain whether the pesticide is present and, if present, at what concentration.

Detection limit (*rapportagegrens*)

The lowest concentration of a pesticide that can be measured with a certain physicochemical technique.

Significant (*idem*)

In relation to statistics, used for an association between variables or difference between groups that cannot be ascribed to chance alone given an accepted level of error (often 5%).

Correlation (*correlatie*)

A statistical measure of association between two variables, e.g. soil use and concentration of a pesticide in surface waters.

Appendix II: Rating quality standard exceedances: background

Dit is een achtergronddocument bij de procedure voor de identificatie van probleemstoffen, onderdeel 1 in de methodiek voor terugkoppeling van monitoringsresultaten naar de toelating.

Ter onderbouwing van deze procedure zijn de normoverschrijdingen in de bestrijdingsmiddelenatlas van 2003 t/m 2008 geanalyseerd, zie tabel 1, wat betreft het aantal en percentage normoverschrijdende stoffen, het aantal en percentage normoverschrijdende meetpunten en metingen, de verdeling, gemiddelde en maximum van de normoverschrijdingen. Hierbij is de MTR als norm gehanteerd. De normoverschrijding NO is hierbij berekend als: $NO = \text{concentratie/norm}$. Berekeningen van de normoverschrijdingen zijn alleen uitvoerbaar op toetsbare waarnemingen.¹

Binnen de procedure zijn er drie criteria die bijdragen aan de score voor een stof:

- Per meetpunt:
 - o Type water/meetpunt (A)
 - o Mate van normoverschrijding (B)
- % van normoverschrijdende meetpunten (C)

De score van een stof wordt uiteindelijk berekend als $C * \Sigma(A+B)$.

Voor de criteria B en C zijn verder de klassegrenzen (Tabel 2 en 4) en de gewichten per klasse (Tabel 3 en 5) uitgewerkt.

Voor de klassegrenzen zijn vele keuzen mogelijk: indeling in klassen of continu van waarden, wel of niet transformatie. Ook het oorspronkelijke voorstel van Van der Hulst en Kalf is in de tabellen verwerkt. Op basis van hun voorstel is een eindvoorstel gemaakt (zie laatste regel in de tabellen, 2, 3, 4 en 5), die hieronder worden samengevat en die zo dicht als mogelijk bij het oorspronkelijke voorstel komt. Hierbij is de weging zoveel mogelijk versimpeld. De laagste score wordt daarmee gelijk aan 1.

Er zijn vele (goede) keuzes mogelijk. De werkgroep heeft de volgende keuzes gemaakt.

A.Type water (weging)	B.Mate van overschrijding X en (weging) van EQS of MTR			
	$1 \leq x \leq 2$ (0)	$2 < x \leq 4$ (1)	$4 < x \leq 13$ (2)	$x > 13$ (3)
Overige wateren (1)	1	2	3	4
KRW-waterlichaam Overige punten (2)	2	3	4	5
KRW-waterlichaam Rapportagepunten (4)	4	5	6	7

N.B. Meetpunten in kavelsloten worden vooralsnog uitgesloten.

Voor criterium C is gekozen voor het percentage normoverschrijdende meetpunten.

¹ Een toetsbare waarneming is een meting boven de rapportagegrens, of als de rapportagegrens lager is dan de norm. Bij een niet-toetsbare waarneming is een meting gelijk aan de rapportagegrens en de rapportagegrens boven de norm.

Voorbeeldberekening:

	Mate van overschrijding MAC	Mate van overschrijding AA	Aantal punten
Locatie 1 KRW meetpunt alleen in 2009	4 en 2 en 1	3	6
Locatie 2 niet-water- lichaam alleen in 2009	20 en 2 en 1.5	2	4
Locatie 3 KRW wate- rlichaam, niet KRW meetpunt in 2007	1.3 en 1.1	1.8	2
Locatie 3 in 2009	12	4	4

De EDG-procedure

Binnen de EDG wordt een berekeningswijze gebruikt die de SNO wordt genoemd, om de som (S) van de normoverschrijdingen (NO) over alle stoffen te bepalen. De bepaling van de normoverschrijding is enigszins afwijkend: $NO = (\text{concentratie/norm}) - 1$.

Bij een concentratie van precies gelijk aan de norm is de NO gelijk aan 0. De op deze wijze berekende normoverschrijdingen worden gesommeerd over alle meetpunten over alle stoffen. Een ander verschil is dat wordt uitgegaan van de 90% percentielwaarde en dat uit wordt gegaan van de VR (verwaarloosbaar risico) en de MTR.

Tabel 1. Algemene informatie voor de jaren 2003-2008 over aantal en percentage normoverschrijdende stoffen, -meetpunten, -metingen en over mate van normoverschrijding (inclusief de logaritmisches getransformeerde normoverschrijding, gepresenteerde waarden zijn teruggetransformeerd na berekening). Toegepaste norm = MTR. De informatie is uitgesplitst per jaar en per normoverschrijdende stof (gemiddelde en maximum). no of normoverschrijd. = normoverschrijdend; normover. = normoverschrijding; mtpntn = meetpunten; # = aantal; gemid. = gemiddelde; max. = maximum; perc. = percentage.


	'03	'04	'05	'06	'07	'08	'03-'08
Aantal normoverschrijd. stoffen	85	59	77	77	99	92	166
Aantal toetsbare stoffen	211	233	255	339	390	386	433
Totaal aantal stoffen	226	265	291	427	484	477	509
Percentage normoverschrijd. stoffen	40.3	25.3	30.2	22.7	25.4	23.8	38.3
Aantal normoverschrijd. mtpntn	283	186	258	235	378	334	783
Aantal toetsbare meetpunten	592	448	567	575	618	678	1356
Perc. normoverschrijd. mtpntn	47.8	41.5	45.5	40.9	61.2	49.3	57.7
Gemid. # normoverschrijd. mtpntn/no stof	11.1	7.7	6.5	6.8	9.6	8.6	8.5
Max. # normoverschrijd. mtpntn/no stof	72	76	84	123	208	172	208
Gemid. % normoverschrijd. mtpntn/no stof	43.7	32.1	39.8	22.9	28.1	28.7	32.4
Max % normoverschrijd. mtpntn/no stof	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Aantal normoverschrijd. metingen	1971	886	890	1012	1709	1589	8057
Aantal toetsbare metingen	113998	79164	122355	157816	207350	212687	893370
Perc. normoverschrijd. metingen	1.73	1.12	0.73	0.64	0.82	0.75	0.90
Gemid. van normoverschrijding	36.1	119.1	248.2	32.6	40.3	66.4	76.7
Maximum van normoverschrijding	1660	11250	37500	2923	4154	11571	37500
Gemid. van log normoverschrijding	7.5	8.1	6.0	5.5	5.5	5.7	6.3
Gemid. van gemid. normoverschr./no stof	32.5	121.9	458.2	41.0	77.4	65.4	126.9
Max. van gemid. normoverschr./no stof	333	2625	26125	1500	3300	1348	26125
Gemid. van gemid. log normover./no stof	7.0	7.2	8.7	5.2	5.4	6.8	6.5
Max. van gemid.log normover./no stof	333	1361	23519	1500	3300	1096	23519
Gemid. van max. normoverschr./no stof	107	434	1162	117	175	302	365
Gemid. van max. log normover./no stof	21.1	23.4	21.9	12.7	15.1	17.7	17.9

Tabel 2. Opties voor klassegrenzen van normoverschrijdingen. Toegepaste norm = MTR. Kwartiel deelt de waarnemingen in groepen van (ca.) 25%. Bij een kwartange, wordt de kwarten van een range als klassegrenzen gebruikt.

	klasse 1	klasse 2	klasse 3	klasse 4
Normoverschrijding				
(1)Kwartiel	1-1,9 25%	1.9-4,0 25%	4.0-13,1 25%	>13,1 25%
(2)Kwartrange	1-9.000 99,85%	9.000-19.000 0,11%	19.000-28.000 0,02%	>28.000 0,02%
Hulst-Kalf	1-2 26,5	2-3 14,0	3-5 15,6	>5 43,9
Logaritme van normoverschrijding				
(3)Kwartrange	1-30 84,0	30-1.000 15,0	1.000-30.000 1,04	>30.000 0,02
(4)Simpel A	1-100 92,3	100-1.000 6,64	1.000-10.000 0,92	>10.000 0,14
(5)Simpel B	1-10 69,3	10-100 23,0	100-1.000 6,64	>1.000 1,06
Geen klassegrenzen (6)				
Voorstel	1-2	2-4	4-13	>13

Tabel 3. Opties voor gewichten van normoverschrijdingen. Toegepaste norm = MTR. De gewogen gewichten zijn bepaald op basis van de gemiddelde klassewaarde ten opzichte van de gemiddelde waarde van de eerste klasse, die hier op 1 is gesteld.

	klasse 1	klasse 2	klasse 3	klasse 4
Simpel	1	2	3	4
Gewogen	(1) 1	2	6	1300
	(2) 1	3	5	7
	(3) 1	70	2000	2200
	(4) 1	11	110	1100
	(5) 1	11	110	1100
Hulst-Kalf	1	3	5	7
Log (3 e.v.)	1	2	3	4
Geen klassegr.	(6) x NO of x log(NO)			
Voorstel	0	1	2	3




Tabel 4. Opties voor klassegrenzen voor aantal of percentage normoverschrijdende meetpunten. Norm = MTR. Zie ook tabel 2.

		klasse 1	klasse 2	klasse 3	klasse 4
Aantal					
	(1)Kwartiel	1 32%	2-3 21%	4-9 22%	>9 25%
	(2)Kwartrange	1-50 98%	50-100 1%	100-150 <1%	>150 <1%
	(3)log ¼ range	1-3 53%	4-15 32%	15-55 13%	>55 2%
Percentage					
	(4)Kwartiel0-	1,6 25%	1,6-5,7 25%	5,7-100 21%	100 27%
	(5)Kwartrange	0-25 69%	25-50 1,6%	50-75 2,2%	75-100 28%
	(6)log % range	0-3 35,7%	3-10 33,1%	10-30 11,2%	>30 31%
	Hulst-Kalf	0-1 17%	1-2 12%	2-4 14%	>4 64%
Geen	(7) klassegrens				
Voorstel percentage %		0-2 29%	2-6 23%	6-100 22%	100 27%


Tabel 5. Opties voor gewichten voor aantal of percentage normoverschrijdende meetpunten. Norm = MTR. Zie ook tabel 3.

		Klasse 1	klasse 2	klasse 3	klasse 4
Simpel		1	2	3	4
Gewogen	(1)	1	3	7	109
	(2)	1	3	5	7
	(3)	1	4	15	66
	(4)	1	5	66	125
	(5)	1	3	5	7
	(6)	1	4	13	43
	Hulst-Kalf	1	3	5	7
Geen klassegrens	(7)	1) geen weging of 2) x aantal of 3) x percentage (0-100%)			
Voorstel		1	2	3	4

normoverschrijdende meetpunten per stof per jr 2003-2008 (n=489)



% normoverschrijdende meetpunten per stof jr (n=489) 2003-2008



Appendix III: Protocol for Causal Analysis of quality standard exceedance

Introduction

This appendix describes the protocol to be used when a Causal Analysis is requested by the Ctgb as part of the information required for (re-)authorisation or interim review of an existing authorisation. The background of this Protocol is described in more detail in Chapter 3 of this report.




Figure III-1. Phases and documents in the Causal Analysis Protocol for exceedance of quality standards.

It is not always necessary to work through all the phases of the Protocol. For example, if a more detailed analysis proves unnecessary or is not expected to add any relevant information after Phase 2, then Phases 3 and 4 are skipped. Figure III-1 shows the phases and delivered products. Figure III-2 shows the optional shortcut.




Figure III-2. Phases and subjects of the for Causal Analysis Protocol.

Protocol initiation

A Causal Analysis may be carried out in co-operation with other authorisation holders that have authorisations for the same substance. In the case of regular re-authorisation or interim review of a substance, all authorisation holders may have had a request for a Causal Analysis.

- When applicable, decide on co-operation with other authorisation holders.**
- Identify a protocol manager: one person with overall responsibility for the Causal Analysis.**
- If it is the first Causal Analysis, request an account to login at the Crop Protection Sharepoint (CPS, www.gewasbeschermingsplatform.nl)**
- Start a 'case' for this new Causal Analysis at the CPS using the 'wizard'. Include the substance and authorisation holder in the title.**

Phase 1: Inventory of basic information, national scale

Phase 1 of the Causal Analysis is based on readily available, standard information sources. At this stage, however, there is no need for a detailed investigation of authorisation dossiers and information on the backgrounds of national-scale datasets. The result of Phase 1 serves as input for Phase 2. To prepare a standardised factsheet it is necessary to use only the sources listed below. Better or additional information can be added in Phase 2.

- Prepare the Phase 1 Factsheet**

Composition of the Phase 1 Factsheet

1. Substance properties

Summary

Data:

1. Substance properties that determine the environmental behaviour and fate:
 - a. average K_{om} , geometric mean DegT50;
 - b. the lowest value of the toxicity for acute exposure (EC50) for fish, algae and daphnia.

The values defining the substance properties are classified as high, average or low (as compared to the bulk of PPPs). To standardise this classification, the definitions given in Appendix V are used (extracted from RIVM report 679101022 (1995)): Manual for summarising and evaluating the environmental aspects of pesticides.

2. The MPC* as a quality standard for chronic exposure and its legal status.
3. If available: The Environmental Quality Standards (EQS): the Annual Average (AA-EQS) and the Maximum Allowable Concentration (MAC-EQS)

The most recent legal environmental quality standard is marked and made recognisable as such. New quality standards that have been derived but do not yet have legal status are also included.

4. The water quality standard that has been applied in the risk assessment for authorisation.
5. Derivation of the surface water quality standards (methodology and assessment factors).
6. The difference between the water quality standard (EQS; MPC if no EQS is available) and the quality standard for chronic and peak exposure used in the risk assessment.

*Definitions of the various water quality standards are provided in Appendix I.

Sources:

- 1: NMI database according to EDG-2006 (Alterra) or newer NMI database if available.
- 2,3: BKMW and MR Monitoring (www.overheid.nl); if not listed in BKMW or MR Monitoring: 'normen zoekstelsel' via www.helpdeskwater.nl
- 4, 5: Ctgb (Ctgb)

2. Dutch authorisation

Summary

Data:

1. Overview of which products with the substance of interest as active ingredient have and have had an authorisation or exemption and for which crops. Data are given from the present, back to five years before the first year of the monitoring that led to inclusion in the most recent list of problematic substances.

Include:

2. Authorisation number, license owner and expiry date.
3. Per product: restrictions of influence on the expected emission.

Extra note:

- Latest restrictions indicate emission pathways**
If the most recent authorisations contain extra emission-reducing measures compared with older versions, this should be specified in an extra note. Extra restrictions provide an indication of emission pathways that may play a key role.
4. Outcome of the authorisation procedure:
Specifically:
 - Calculated concentrations of the substance in the field ditch adjacent to the crop. This calculation is now based on spray drift. In the future more emission pathways will be included in the calculation (e.g. drainage flow).
 - Calculated concentrations in soil as a result of leaching at 1 m below soil surface.
 5. Users' guide and information from the Good Agricultural Practices table concerning period of application, number of applications, etc.

Sources:

The Board for the Authorisation of Plant Protection Products and Biocides (Ctgb) is the standard source of information on this subject:

- 1, 2, 3: Public online Ctgb database and check www.overheid.nl (search for exemptions, 'vrijstellingen' in Dutch) if data from 2007 and earlier are needed.
- 4: Ctgb or authorisation holder.
- 5: Ctgb database (GAP tables).

3. Agricultural use data

Summary of the main applications (crop and application method)

1. Usage according to farm survey statistics (Statistics Netherlands / CBS) and LEI (grassland):
 - a. Usage per crop group (total amount applied).
 - b. Usage per crop (total amount applied).
 - c. Time distribution of usage per crop (per month)
 - d. Sample statistics (number of growers applying the substance, and sample size).
 - e. Average dosage per ha per year at farms where the active ingredient is applied.

2. Mention relevant, non-agricultural use and other possible sources of surface water contamination if information is available.
 - **Short-cut:** Is the major use agricultural or non-agricultural? If it can be concluded that it is implausible that agricultural use of the substance as a PPP (Ctgb category 'L' = 'Gewasbeschermingsmiddelen') is responsible for the majority of the quality standard exceedances, continue with the final conclusions (Phase 5).
 - **Check data for consistency:** data from different sources (e.g. LEI and CBS) should be checked for any significant differences. State in the factsheet whether significant differences occur.
 - Include the following standard note in the Phase 1 Factsheet: 'Illegal use may not be shown in the CBS or LEI data'. Illegal use is a topic addressed in Phase 2 of the Causal Analysis.

Sources:

1, 2: Statistics Netherlands (CBS) questionnaires (2004, 2008: dataset(s) closest in time to the relevant monitoring period) and LEI-Wageningen UR; Company Information Network (BIN). In contrast to the CBS databases, BIN contains annual use data in agricultural crops, including grassland. Both BIN and CBS data are based on farm surveys and thus give an indication of substance usage.

3: Kempenaar et al., 2009.

4. Emissions to surface water

Summary of calculated emissions to surface water.

Data:

1. total emission per crop (group) to environmental compartments surface water, groundwater, and air (kg a.i. a⁻¹).
2. total emission to surface water per crop (group) and per emission pathway (kg a.i. a⁻¹).
3. Crop maps.
4. Maps showing emission to surface water (per emission pathway and total, for all crops together).

Sources:

1, 2, 3, 4: Nationale Milieu Indicator (NMI) (Alterra, RIVM).

5. Surface water monitoring results

Summary of presence, spatial and temporal distribution of exceedances of the water quality standard for the period under investigation. This information is based on the water quality standards used for the most recent update of the list of problematic substances. If new quality standards have since been derived, these can be applied if agreed on by the Ctgb.

Data:

- Map: exceedances of the water quality standard in different classes in Dutch surface waters.
- Figure: histogram with frequencies of classes of exceedances.
- Figure: histogram with frequencies of exceedances per month for the whole of the Netherlands.
- Figure: number of measurements with exceedance of the quality standard per month.

- Correlation between land use (crop) and concentrations.
- Correlation between land use (crop) and exceedances of the quality standard.

Sources: Pesticides Atlas (BMA). Consultation with the Institute of Environmental Sciences (CML) or the Waterdienst (part of Rijkswaterstaat).

Phase 1 conclusions

- Include the following conclusions:
 - The information required for Phase 1 of the Causal Analysis Protocol has / has not been fully collected.
If not complete: list what is missing, and why.
 - Significant contradictions in the delivered data have / have not been observed.
If contradictions have been observed: list the contradictions.
- Start Phase 1 at the Crop Protection Sharepoint ('Basisinformatie')**
- Upload Phase 1 Factsheet to the Crop Protection Sharepoint**

Irrespective of completeness or presence of contradictions, Phase 1 is always followed by Phase 2.

Phase 2: Expert consultation and interpretation, national scale

Start Phase 2 at the Crop Protection Sharepoint ('Nationaal expertpanel')

- Close Phase 1 at the CPS**
- Start Phase 2 at the CPS**
- Upload relevant documents**
- Select all predefined questions** (use the questions listed in Appendix VI)
- Select organisations** (use the list in Appendix VI)
 - For each question, at least one and if possible two experts (one per organisation) are contacted and have replied.
 - For each question, at least one governmental or independent research organisation and one commercial organisation (e.g. authorisation holder) are contacted and have replied. This is not necessary for questions on monitoring results.
- Contact organisations and experts**

During this period experts can respond to the questions and to each other:

- Check frequently (at least once a week) whether experts have been assigned by the contact persons and whether the former have answered the questions.**
- Check the expert responses: if unclear or incomplete, request additional information.**
- Document the expert responses.**
- Define and document what actions should follow on from the expert responses, e.g.:**

With respect to the factsheet:

- Correct the facts presented in the factsheet.
- Add a qualitative remark to specific information in the factsheet.

With respect to the conclusions of Phase 2:

- Apply in interpretations and conclusions.
- Further analysis (may be) necessary in next phase.

With respect to the Causal Analysis Protocol:

- Recommend improvements.

- Process expert response to the document, if applicable.**
- Upgrade the Phase 1 Factsheet to a Phase 2 Factsheet.**
- Prepare the document '*substance name* - Interpretation and conclusions of Causal Analysis, Phase 2'. If necessary, undertake additional expert consultation.**
 - For each topic treated in the factsheet, describe what can be concluded from the information in the Phase 2 Factsheet and expert responses with respect to relevant applications and emission pathways:
 1. Substance properties:
 - Based on substance properties, which emission pathways to surface water are most relevant for the substance?
 2. Dutch authorisation:
 - Based on the authorisation and Good Agricultural Practice, what applications and emission pathways are likely to play a relevant role in the emission to surface water?
 - Are there product-specific restrictions that influence the risk of a certain emission pathway?
 3. Agricultural use data:
 - What are relevant product applications, application methods, application periods and regions with relatively intensive use?
 - What are the consequences for emission risks?
 4. Emission pathways:
 - Are there emission pathways that are likely to be relevant, but are not included in the calculated emissions (NMI)?
 - According to the expected emissions (calculated emissions + interpretation of expert information), what are the most relevant emission pathways to surface water?
 - What are the consequences of the relevant emission pathways for the course of substance concentrations within a year?
 - Are the relevant emission pathways a consequence of an application that does not comply with Good Agricultural Practice (GAP)?
 5. Surface water monitoring results:
 - How is the course of exceedances of the water quality standard within a year, compared with application periods in the relevant crops?
 - Do the spatial distribution and time course of the exceedances imply a correlation with certain crops, application methods and/or emission pathways?

6. Comparison of calculated emissions (NMI) and monitoring data:

- How does the spatial and (if possible) temporal distribution of exceedance of quality standards in monitoring data compare with calculated emissions? What does this imply for the relevance of the different applications and emission routes?

Conflicting information

In the event of conflicting information, missing information or striking regional differences in variables of influence on expected emission levels, this should be duly noted by the protocol manager. Information from different experts may be mutually conflicting or conflict with the information in the Phase 1 Factsheet. If the protocol manager is able to judge and duly support which information is most valuable or best-supported, the rest of the protocol is run using this superior information. If the protocol manager cannot establish which information is best, all the information sources should be used in the further Causal Analysis process. If the conflicting information concerns variables that are used to calculate emissions, the Causal Analysis can be continued with two or more scenarios. If the uncertainty concerns multiple variables, the protocol manager may decide to continue the process with a minimum, maximum and average scenario for certain emissions. To gain an indication of which scenario is most realistic, the protocol manager can compare the calculated emissions with monitoring data.

- **Draw an overall conclusion based on the gathered information and add this to the draft document.** Undertake additional consultation with experts if necessary.

Answer, as far as possible, the following questions:

- What product application(s) have a plausible relation with the exceedance of quality standards?
- What emission pathway(s) have a plausible relation with the exceedance of quality standards?
- Is it possible to rank the emission pathways by contribution to the exceedance of quality standards?

- **Conclude whether it is useful to gather more information on one or more topics in a Phase 3 & 4.**

Use the following decision tree:

A: Are there unexplained striking differences between the distribution of the expected emissions and the measured exceedance of quality standards between regions? Yes?: -> D. No? -> B

B: Are there unexplained striking differences between the distribution in time of the expected emissions and the measured exceedances of quality standards? Yes?: -> D. No? -> C

C: Is there a plausible relation between applications in certain crops, related emission pathways and the measured exceedances of quality standards? Yes?: -> Phase 5. No? -> D

D: Is it anticipated that further analysis of one or more of the topics studied in Phase 2 will improve insight into the cause of the exceedance of quality standards? Yes?: Continue with Phase 3 & 4. No: continue with Phase 5.

- Upload Factsheet Fase 2 and the document ‘Interpretation and conclusions, phase 2’ to the CPS.**
- Notify experts that they can respond** (suggestion: within one week).
- Document and upload the responses**
- Process the responses if relevant**
- Upload the final version of ‘Interpretation and conclusions, phase 2’ to the CPS and notify the organisations and experts involved.**

If relevant: Phase 3 and Phase 4

Phase 3: Inventory of extra data, regional scale or particular topic

Phase 3 can be implemented in cases where it is deemed relevant to gather or create more detailed or region-specific information on one or more of the topics analysed in Phases 1 and 2. The result of Phase 3 is always checked by expert consultation in Phase 4. In contrast to Phase 1, the topics and sources to be consulted in Phase 3 are selected on a case-by-case basis (per substance) and are not standardised within this protocol. The results of Phase 3 are documented in a ‘Phase 3 Factsheet’.

- Start Phase 3/4 at the CPS (‘Nadere analyse’)**
- Compose Phase 3 Factsheet**
 - Specify the questions to be answered in Phases 3 & 4 (based on the conclusions of Phase 2).
 - Consult the relevant sources and/or experts.
 - Add the information gathered to the additional factsheet: the Phase 3 Factsheet.
 - Conclude:
 - The necessary information for Phase 3 of the Causal Analysis Protocol has / has not been fully collected.
 - If not: specify the missing information.
 - Significant contradictions in the delivered data have / have not been observed
 - If so, list the contradictions.
- Upload the Phase 3 Factsheet and (optional) supporting documents to the CPS.**

Phase 4: Expert Consultation

- Upload relevant documents.**
- Select predefined questions (used in Phase 2) and/or compose new questions in the CPS.**
- Select organisations:**
 - For each question, at least two experts (one per organisation) are contacted and have replied.
 - For each question, at least one governmental or independent research organisation and one commercial organisation (e.g. authorisation holder) are contacted and have replied. This is not necessary for questions on monitoring results.
- Contact organisations and experts.**

During this period experts can respond to the questions and to each other:

- Check frequently (at least once per week) whether experts have been assigned by the contact persons and whether these have been answered the questions.**
 - Check the expert responses: if unclear or incomplete, request additional information.**
 - Document the expert responses.**
 - Define and document what actions should follow on from the expert responses.**
 - Upload the document with expert responses and follow-up actions to the CPS.**
 - Notify experts that they can check (suggestion: within one week) whether their input has been properly interpreted.**
 - Process expert response to the document, if applicable.**
 - Upgrade the Phase 3 Factsheet into a Phase 4 Factsheet.**
 - Prepare the document '*substance name* - Interpretation and conclusions of Causal Analysis, Phase 4'. If necessary, undertake additional expert consultation.**
 - For each topic treated in the factsheet, describe what can be concluded from the information in the Phase 4 Factsheet and the expert responses with respect to relevant applications and emission pathways.
 - Draw an overall conclusion based on the extra information in Phases 3 and 4 and add this to the draft document. Undertake additional expert consultation if necessary.
Answer, as far possible, the following questions:
 - What product application(s) have a plausible relation with the exceedance of quality standards?
 - What emission pathway(s) have a plausible relation with the exceedance of quality standards?
 - Is it possible to rank the emission pathways by contribution to the exceedance of quality standards?
-
- Upload Factsheet Fase 4 and the new document 'Interpretation and conclusions, phase 4' to the CPS.**
 - Notify experts that they can respond (suggestion: within one week).**
 - Document and upload the responses**
 - Process the responses if relevant**
 - Upload the final version of 'Phase 4 Interpretation and conclusions' to the CPS and notify the organisations and experts involved.**

Phase 4 is always followed by Phase 5: the final phase of the Protocol.

Phase 5: Conclusions and recommendations

- Initiate Phase 5 at the Crop Protection Sharepoint ('Conclusies')**
- Prepare a new document: *substance name* – 'Final Conclusions, Phase 5'**
- Draw the main final conclusions.**

The conclusions are specified per area, region, crop, etc., to the extent that this is feasible and likely to be relevant for mitigation measures. These conclusions take the following form:

There is a **plausible relation** between **the application of substance in crop(s)** and the exceedance of quality standards in the period in the surface water in the area(s) / in The Netherlands.

There is **no plausible relation** between **the application of substance in crop(s)** and the exceedance of quality standards in the period in the surface water in the area(s) / in The Netherlands.

There is a **plausible relation** between specific **emission routes** following the application of substance in crop(s) and the exceedance of quality standards in the period in the surface water in the area(s) / in The Netherlands.

- Present the main conclusions in a table**

This table shows for each crop and, if possible, emission route, whether a plausible relation with the observed quality standard exceedance has been found. An example of this standardised table is included below. All crops for which the substance has an authorisation are included. In the case of usage in crops without authorisation, these crops are also included in the table.

If no plausible relation has been found, a distinction is made between 'relevance unknown / not investigated' and 'plausibly non-relevant'. The table also specifies distribution substance usage over the various different crops.

- Report what can be concluded regarding the contribution of applications not according to Good Agricultural Practice (non-GAP) to the quality standard exceedance.**
- Optional: **Define recommendations:**
 - on mitigation measures;**
 - on improving the Causal Analysis Protocol.**
- Upload the document with the final conclusions to the CPS.**
- Conclude Phase 5 at the CPS.**
- Notify the experts and organisations involved.**

All the documents relating to a specific case remain on the Crop Protection Sharepoint as a 'recent case' for 4 weeks after completion of Phase 5. After this period the documents are moved to the 'case archive', from where they can still be uploaded and used as information sources for new cases by the experts and organisations involved in the case in question.

Example of an overview of plausible causes of quality standard exceedances in the time frame 2003-2006 for a herbicide. The plausible causes are based on the emission per surface unit on which the substance is applied. Consequently, the conclusions are independent of the total area treated.

Time frame: 2003-2006			Emission route					
Crop on which the substance is applied*	Authorisation	Percentage of national use of metribuzin*	Diffuse sources				Point sources (from farmyards and buildings, from greenhouses)	
			spray drift	atmospheric deposition	lateral leaching***	run-off	open field crops	covered crops
Table / crisp potatoes	Yes	71	Plausible cause main cause of exceedances in spring and summer	Not a plausible cause	plausible cause main cause of exceedances in autumn and winter	not investigated	Cannot be excluded Sprayer cleaning (internal and external) possibly relevant in application period and autumn	No applications
Starch potatoes	Yes	22	Plausible cause exceedances in spring and summer		Plausible cause exceedances in autumn and winter			
Seed potatoes	No	1	Plausible cause		Plausible cause			
Asparagus	Yes	4	Plausible cause		Plausible cause Multi-annual crop: increases the risk			
Grass seed	No	-**	Plausible cause		Plausible cause Application in autumn increases the risk			
Carrots	No	-	Application in this time frame is negligible (information from authorisation holder)					
Grassland	No	-	Not plausible that this application occurs in practice; no further analysis carried out					
Strawberries	No	-	Not plausible that this application occurs in practice; no further analysis carried out					

* Sources: 'CBS pesticides questionnaire 2004' and LEI ('Bedrijveninformatienet')

** Supplementary information from authorisation holder: approx. 1% of use is in grass seed cultivation.

*** Preferential flow and discharge through pipe drains have not been analysed

Appendix IV: Crop definitions

Seperate document

Appendix V: Classification of substance properties

Classification of data on physico-chemical properties, environmental behaviour and ecotoxicology

Remarks:

The tables in this Appendix contain indicative qualifications, derived for typically Dutch conditions. These qualifications are used in want of internationally agreed qualifications. For several aspects qualifications are lacking. It was out of the remit of the working group to establish such missing qualifications.

Physical properties

* Solubility (S) at 20-25 °C

Classification		S [mg/l]			
Nederlands	English				
zeer slecht oplosbaar	very slightly soluble	<	0.1		
slecht oplosbaar	slightly soluble		0.1	-	10
matig oplosbaar	moderately soluble		10	-	1000
goed oplosbaar	readily soluble			≥	1000

* Vapour pressure (P) at 20-25 °C

Classification		P [Pa]			
Nederlands	English				
weinig vluchtig	very slightly volatile	<	0.0001		
enigszins vluchtig	slightly volatile		0.0001	-	0.01
matig vluchtig	moderately volatile		0.01	-	1
vluchtig	volatile		1	-	100
zeer vluchtig	highly volatile			≥	100

* Volatility from water (Henry's Law Constant, dimensionless) at 20 °C

Classification (Lyman, 1982)		H [-]			
Nederlands	English				
weinig vluchtig	very slightly volatile	<	0.00001		
matig vluchtig	moderately volatile		0.00001	-	0.03
zeer vluchtig	highly volatile			>	0.03

Transformation and mobility in soil

* DT50 at 20 °C, pF = 2, top soil

Classification		DT50 [d]			
Nederlands	English				
zeer slecht afbreekbaar	very slightly degradable			>	180
slecht afbreekbaar	slightly degradable		60	-	180
redelijk afbreekbaar	fairly degradable		20	-	60
goed afbreekbaar	readily degradable			<	20

* **Mobility at 20 °C**

Classification		R _f			K _{s/l} [dm ³ /kg]			K _{om} [dm ³ /kg]			
Nederlands	English										
zeer weinig mobiel	immobile	0	–	0.09		>	2.6		>	100	
weinig mobiel	slightly mobile	0.10	–	0.34		0.53	–	2.6	20	–	100
matig mobiel	moderately mobile	0.35	–	0.64		0.15	–	0.53	5	–	20
mobiel	mobile	0.65	–	0.89		0.03	–	0.15	1	–	5
zeer mobiel	highly mobile	0.90	–	1.00	<	0.03			<	1	

Transformation in water

* **Transformation water/sediment system DT₅₀sys at 20 °C (whole system)**

Classification		DT ₅₀ [d]			
Nederlands	English				
zeer slecht afbreekbaar	very slightly degradable			>	180
slecht afbreekbaar	slightly degradable		60	–	180
redelijk afbreekbaar	fairly degradable		20	–	60
goed afbreekbaar	readily degradable	<	20		

* **Hydrolysis DT₅₀ at 20 °C, pH 7**

Classification		DT ₅₀ [d]			
Nederlands	English				
slecht hydrolyserend	slightly hydrolysing			>	30 ²
matig hydrolyserend	moderately hydrolysing		10	–	30
redelijk hydrolyserend	fairly hydrolysing		4	–	10
goed hydrolyserend	readily hydrolysing		1	–	4
zeer goed hydrolyserend	very rapidly hydrolysing	<	1		

* **Phototransformation in water DT₅₀ (continuous light regime)**

Classification		DT ₅₀ [d]			
Nederlands	English				
weinig afbreekbaar	slightly degradable			>	30 ³
matig afbreekbaar	moderately degradable		10	–	30
redelijk afbreekbaar	fairly degradable		4	–	10
goed afbreekbaar	readily degradable		1	–	4
zeer goed afbreekbaar	very rapidly degradable	<	1		

² When a preliminary test was performed, in which < 10% of the pesticide was hydrolysed at 50 °C within five days, then the pesticide is considered hydrolytically stable. No main test need to be performed, and the extrapolated DT₅₀ (20 °C) is > 500 days

³ When a preliminary test was performed, in which < 10% of the pesticide was photolysed at 20 - 25 °C within 30 days, then the pesticide is considered photolytically stable

Toxicity

* Aquatic organisms, acute: algae (96-h EC50), Daphnia (48-h LC50) and fish (96-h LC50)

RIVM/SEC-classification		EU-classification	E(L)C ₅₀ [mg/l]			
Nederlands	English					
zeer weinig giftig	very slightly toxic	harmful			>	100
weinig giftig	slightly toxic	harmful		10	–	100
matig giftig	moderately toxic	toxic		1	–	10
zeer giftig	highly toxic	very toxic	<	1		

* Aquatic organisms, chronic

Classification		NOEC [mg/l]			
Nederlands	English				
zeer weinig giftig	very slightly toxic			>	1
weinig giftig	slightly toxic		0.1	–	1
matig giftig	moderately toxic		0.01	–	0.1
zeer giftig	highly toxic	<	0.01		

* Birds, acute oral

Classification		LD ₅₀ [mg/kg bw]			
Nederlands	English				
weinig giftig	slightly toxic			>	500
matig giftig	moderately toxic		50	–	500
giftig	toxic		5	–	50
zeer giftig	highly toxic	<	5		

* Earthworms, soil test

Classification		LC50 [mg/kg dry soil]			
Nederlands	English				
zeer weinig giftig	very slightly toxic			>	1000
weinig giftig	slightly toxic		100	–	1000
matig giftig	moderately toxic		10	–	100
giftig	toxic		1	–	10
zeer giftig	highly toxic	<	1		

* Bees, contact and oral

Classification		LD50 [µg/bee]			
Nederlands	English				
zeer weinig giftig	very slightly toxic			>	100
weinig giftig	slightly toxic		10	–	100
matig giftig	moderately toxic		1	–	10
giftig	toxic		0,1	–	1
zeer giftig	highly toxic	<	0,1		

* **Other beneficial insects, mites, and spiders, laboratory testing (bees excluded)**

Classification		Reduction in beneficial capacity [%]			
Nederlands	English				
onschadelijk	harmless	<	30		
weinig schadelijk	slightly harmful		30	–	79
matig schadelijk	moderately harmful		80	–	99
schadelijk	harmful			>	99

Bioconcentration

Classification		BCF _{wo} *			
Nederlands	English				
weinig concentrerend	slightly concentrating	<	100		
matig concentrerend	moderately concentrating		100	–	1000
sterk concentrerend	highly concentrating			>	1000

* wo = whole organism

Risk for algae (growth inhibition), crustaceans and fish (both chronic effects)

Classification		PEC/NOEC			
Nederlands	English				
verwaarloosbaar	negligible	<	0.1		
aanwezig	present		0.1	–	1
groot	large			>	1

Risk for acute effects for algae, crustaceans and fish (mortality)

Classification		PEC/L(E)C50			
Nederlands	English				
verwaarloosbaar	negligible	<	0.01		
klein	small		0.01	–	0.1
aanwezig	present		0.1	–	1
groot	large		1	–	10
zeer groot	very large			>	10

Reference

B.J.W.G. Mensink, M. Montforts, L. Wijkhuizen-Maslankiewicz, H. Tibosch, J.B.H.J. Linders. Manual for Summarising and Evaluating the Environmental Aspects of Pesticides. RIVM Report no. 679101022, Bilthoven, The Netherlands, July 1995, 135 pp.

J.B.H.J. Linders, J.W. Jansma, B.J.W.G. Mensink, K. Otermann. Pesticides: Benefaction or Pandora's Box? A synopsis of the Environmental Aspects of 243 Pesticides.. RIVM Report no. 679101014, Bilthoven, The Netherlands, March 1994, 214 pp.

Appendix VI Consultation of experts

- 1 Fields of expertise
- 2 Questions for expert consultation and expertise per question
- 3 Organisations and expertises
- 4 Organisations and contacts

Table III-1: Fields of expertise

- | |
|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Available PPPs and crop protection2. Crop protection advice3. Environmental risks of PPPs4. Water quality research and analysis methods5. Water quantity research and water management6. Authorisation7. Fulfilment of restrictions on application of PPPs (enforcement)8. Processing of monitoring results9. Collection and analysis of horti- and agricultural data10. (Geo)statistics |
|--|

Table III-2: Questions and expertise for expert consultation

Questions to be used in Phase 2 and optional for Phase 4

Subject (see also Phase 1)	nr.	Question (in Dutch)	Expertise (Table 1)
1	1	Welke gegevens zijn gebruikt bij het afleiden van de waterkwaliteitsnormen (AA- en MAC-EQS; MTR indien EQS ontbreekt) en is er daarbij een assessment factor gebruikt?	3
1	2	Op welke gegevens over het afbraak- en sorptiegedrag van de werkzame stof is het toelatingsbesluit gebaseerd?	3
1	3	Zijn er sinds het toelatingsbesluit aanvullende inzichten ten aanzien van het afbraak- en sorptiegedrag van de werkzame stof? Ten aanzien van andere stoffeigenschappen?	3
2	1	Zijn er aanvullende gegevens over de toegelaten toepassingen voor deze stof. Welke?	1, 6
3	1	Zijn er betere of aanvullende data beschikbaar over de hoeveelheid verbruik in verschillende gewassen of de verdeling van het gebruik over gewassen? Zo ja, geven die een afwijkend beeld vergeleken met de informatie in de factsheet? In welk opzicht?	1, 2, 9
3	2	Is er betere of aanvullende informatie over de verdeling van het verbruik binnen een jaar beschikbaar? Zo ja, geeft die informatie een afwijkend beeld vergeleken met de informatie in de factsheet? In welk opzicht?	1, 2, 9
3	3	Is er informatie over de verdeling van het verbruik van de actieve stof per teelt over de verschillende producten (merknamen / formuleringen) beschikbaar?	1, 2, 9
3	4	Verschilt de toepassing in de praktijk duidelijk van die volgens de <u>gebruiksaanwijzing</u> op het etiket en de GAP-tabel? Zo ja, op welke aspecten (dosering, tijdstip, frequentie, toedieningswijze)?	1, 2, 9
3	5	(Indien van toepassing) Worden de in het <u>Wettelijk Gebruiksvoorschrift</u> vermelde restricties die invloed hebben op de emissie naar oppervlaktewater in de praktijk toegepast? Is er informatie over de implementatiegraad van de maatregel of restrictie?	1, 2, 7, 9
3	6	Zijn er aanwijzingen voor niet toegelaten toepassingen? Zo ja, welke aanwijzingen en voor welke toepassing?	1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 10
4	1	Zijn er betere gegevens beschikbaar over de emissieroutes die in de factsheet staan? Zo ja, welke? Of zijn er relevante emissieroutes die niet in het factsheet vermeld worden? Zo ja welke routes en wat is er over bekend?	1, 2, 3, 7, 8
4	2	Zijn er mogelijke bronnen/emissies, die niet aan de lokatie van de teelt zijn gebonden (zoals bijvoorbeeld behandeling van plantgoed, bolontsmetting, bewaarruimten, etc.?)	1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9
4	3	Zijn er betere of aanvullende gegevensover het grondgebruik (lokatie van de teelten waarin de stof wordt gebruikt) beschikbaar?	1, 2, 9, 10
5	1	Zijn er verschillen tussen regio's in de spreiding van metingen binnen het jaar? (alle metingen, dan wel de normoverschrijdende metingen) Zo ja, welke?	4, 5, 8, 10
5	2	Zijn er verschillen tussen regio's v.w.b. het type oppervlaktewater waar de stof is gemeten? (alle metingen, dan wel de normoverschrijdende metingen) Zo ja, welke?	4, 5, 8, 10
5	3	Welke manier van monster conservering is gebruikt bij het nemen van de monsters? Welk lab heeft de analyses gedaan? Welke extractiemethode is gebruikt? Welke analysemethode is gebruikt?	4
5	4	Welke analysemethoden worden gebruikt? Zijn er verschillen tussen of bijzonderheden met betrekking tot beschikbare analysemethoden die het landelijke beeld van de overschrijdingen kunnen beïnvloeden? Zo ja, welke verschillen en wat zijn de mogelijke gevolgen?	4

Table III-3: Organisations and their expertise*

Organisatie		Expertise										Opmerking / specialisatie
1	DLV Plant	1	2	3								
2	Gbm leverancier bijv. Agerland / Agrifirm / etc	1	2	3								
3	Toelatinghouder bijv. Bayer Crop Science, BASF	1	2	3	4		6	7				4: water analyse technieken
4	Waterdienst			3	4	5	6		8			8: met name voor rijkswateren
5	KWR Watercycle Research Institute (voorheen onderdeel KIWA)				4							4: water analyse technieken
6	RIVM			3	4		6					
7	Nieuwe VWA (organisatieonderdeel dat voorheen AID was)							7				
8	Waterschappen, Platform Landbouwemissies			3	4	5		7	8			8: lokale en regionale wateren
9	Ctgb			3			6					
10	Centrum voor Milieuwetenschappen (CML)			3	4				8		10	Niet meer data dan in de standaardbronnen toegepast voor de Factsheet Fase 1
11	Alterra			3	4	5					10	Niet meer data dan in de standaardbronnen toegepast voor de Factsheet Fase 1
12	PPO/WUR-Glastuinbouw	1	2	3								3: emissieroutes
13	Centrum voor landbouw en milieu			3								
14	Plant research international (PRI)		2	3								2: toepassingstechnieken, gebruik op verhardingen en in openbare ruimtes 3: emissie routes
15	LEI								9			
16	CBS								9	10		
17	PBL								9	10		
18	LTO / LTO Noord (Land- en Tuinbouw)	1										
19	LTO Groei-service (Tuinbouw)	1										
20	KAVB (Bloembollen en bolbloemen)	1										Verwijst door naar PPO
21	NBVB (Boom-kwekers)	1										Verwijst door naar PPO
22	NFO (Fruittelt)	1										
23	Nieuwe VWA (organisatieonderdeel dat voorheen PD was)	1	2	3			6					

*Momentopname 2010. Deze kan bij gebruik door de protocolhouder ge-update worden

Table III-4: Overview organisations and contacts (2010)

Organisatie	Contact
DLV Plant	Dhr. Jacob Dogterom
Gbm leverancier	Via Agrodīs: Dhr. Conno de Ruijter
Toelatinghouder bijv. Bayer Crop Science, BASF.	Branche or product manager of the authorisation holder
Toelatinghouder bijv. Bayer Crop Science, BASF.	Registration manager of the authorisation holder
Waterdienst	Dhr. Dennis Kalf
KWR Watercycle Research Institute (voorheen onderdeel KIWA)	
RIVM	Dhr. Ton vd Linden
Nieuwe VWA (organisatieonderdeel voorheen AID)	Dhr. Jan Ooijman (Oost-NL) Dhr. Rien van Diessen (West NL, glastuinbouw)
Nieuwe VWA (organisatieonderdeel voorheen PD)	Mevr. Johanneke Wingelaar
Waterschappen, Platform Landbouwemissies	Specialists land- en tuinbouwemissies; (via) Dhr. Wim van der Hulst of Dhr. Rien Klippel
Ctgb	Mevr. Corine van Griethuysen
Centrum voor Milieuwetenschappen (CML)	Dhr. Wil Tamis
Alterra	Dhr. Roel Kruijne
PPO/WUR-Glastuinbouw	Gewas- of gewasbeschermingsspecialisten PPO en WUR Glastuinbouw (via) Dhr. Rik de Werd
CLM	Mevr. Erna van der Wal
PRI	Dhr. Jan van de Zande
LEI	Dhr. Jakob Jager
CBS	Dhr. Rob Vijftigschild
PBL	Dhr. Hans Visser
LTO / LTO Noord (Land- en Tuinbouw)	Dhr. Jaap van Wenum
LTO Groei-service (Tuinbouw)	Dhr. Harmen Hummelen
KAVB (Bloembollen en bolbloemen)	Dhr. Paul Vanderbosch
NBVB (Boom-kwekers)	Dhr. Paul Vanderbosch
NFO (Fruiteelt)	Dhr. Jaco van Bruchem

Appendix VII Crop Protection Sharepoint

Separate document

Appendix VIII Comparing distributions of measured and predicted concentrations

Seperate document