Summary of PPDC Workgroup Activities

1) 21st CENTURY TOXICOLOGY WORKGROUP

Original WG Charge (2008):

Focus on communication & transition issues as EPA phases in new molecular and computational tools to improve the quality of OPP's risk assessments and make OPP's risk assessments and testing program more efficient and beneficial. Key transition activities include:

- Identifying other internal and external applications of this 'new' science (e.g., improving agency decision-making capability by harnessing new data streams and developing new diagnostic tools and biomarkers); and
- Providing process recommendations to transition to the new testing paradigm.

21st Century Toxicology WG Recommendations	EPA Response
Hold workshops to communicate state of the science and OPP's progress in implementing 21st Century approaches and to address stakeholder identified barriers and issues.	Workshops held: December 2010 – OPP's Strategic Vision: Integrated Testing and Assessment Strategies: Transitioning Research to Regulatory Practice. October 2011 - Diagnostic Tools & Biomarkers in Pesticide Medical Management, Exposure Surveillance, and Epidemiologic Research: State-of-the-Science, Challenges, and Opportunities. July 2013 – Where Vision Meets Action: Practical Application of 21st Century Methods.
Examine the importance of surveillance as identified in the 2007 NRC report.	Developed biomarker definitions. Working with stakeholders to develop a publication on the need for pesticide biomarker tools.
Develop OPP Goals and Metrics for Progress on Alternative Approaches for Acute Studies Used for Hazard Labeling • General Goal: Phase out animal testing for acute "6-pack" endpoints (acute oral, dermal, inhalation; dermal and eye irritation; dermal sensitization). • Specific near-term goals for acceptance of OECD *in vitro* studies and establishing waiver policies in 2015 and 2016.	Announced OPP goal to significantly reduce the use of animals in acute effects testing. Completed guidance document on the process for evaluating alternative approaches in March 2016. Draft waiver guidance to eliminate acute dermal testing for formulations released for public comment in March 2016. Issued updated guidance in 2015 on Use of an Alternate Testing Framework for Classification of Eye Irritation Potential of EPA

	Pesticide Products. Co-Leading (with Canada) development of OECD guidance on Considerations for Waiving or Bridging Acute Mammalian Toxicity Tests. Developing an OPP process for measuring and reporting progress (metrics) towards 21st Century goals. Pilot project initiated in spring 2016 to evaluate the reliability of the GHS mixtures equation in categorization of oral and inhalation acute toxicity. Close collaborations with NIEHS-NICEATM and other US agencies through ICCVAM and with international organizations such as OECD and ICATM to collect and evaluate acute lethality data. Stakeholder collaborations to collect and evaluate *in vitro* data on eye irritation and skin sensitization.

2) COMPARATIVE SAFETY STATEMENTS WORKGROUP

Original WG Charge (2010):

- Explore the possibility of allowing a distinction on pesticide labels with respect to a product's greenness; and
- Explore the types of information that would be allowable on pesticide product labels to assist consumers in understanding or selecting pesticide products that interest them and serve their needs.

Comparative Safety WG Recommendations	EPA Response
Partner with OPPT's DFE program for antimicrobial pesticide products. The DFE program involves a screen of all ingredients in a product by a third party screener. If the product passes the screen, the product is then reviewed by OPP and if appropriate, the DFE logo is allowed on the product label.	Seven antimicrobial active ingredients and 10 products have been approved for the logo to date.
Include biopesticides in the DFE program.	No biopesticide active ingredient registrant has pursued the screening process to date.
Extend the pilot for the DFE logo use for another year, and work with states to resolve any misunderstandings or apprehensions that they have about the use of the logo.	Working with SFIREG's POM committee to resolve misunderstandings so that states will register the pesticides with DFE logos on the labels.

Launch factual statement pilot program, regarding statements on pesticide labels for fragrances and dyes; and referencing websites on the label that demonstrate corporate commitment to the environment.	Launched factual statement pilot program to allow "fragrance-free" and "dye-free" on appropriate pesticide labels, in accordance with past practice as well. Approximately 30 product labels are approved for corporate commitment website references.
Allow "biodegradability" statements on the label in 2 situations: 1) if all of the ingredients in the pesticide products are biodegradable; and 2) If the surfactants in the product formulation are biodegradable.	To date, no products have been pursued to have the complete biodegradability statement, and two products were approved to have "biodegradable surfactants" put on their labels.
Partner with USDA's bio-based mark program to allow the bio-based mark on pesticide labels once the product is certified by USDA, with a disclaimer that the mark is in no way reflective of the product's safety.	To date, no pesticide products have pursued the bio-based mark.
Revisit OPP's position on allowing statements on labels as to the safety of a product for use on a particular surface (e.g. toilets, countertops, formica, etc.)	OPP will initiate the process to allow use of this type of statement on labels.
Discuss whether OPP should be involved in reviewing and approving comparative efficacy statements on pesticide labels.	OPP is considering PPDC's input and will discuss this further internally.

3) INTEGRATED PEST MANAGEMENT WORKGROUP

Original WG Charge (2011):

- Develop metrics to assess the effectiveness of the new School IPM initiative;
- Propose appropriate ways to assess quantitatively the benefits of IPM in agriculture, public health settings, and schools; and
- Provide advice on other issues relating to the promotion and use of IPM that the Agency brings to the workgroup.

IPM WG Recommendations	EPA Response
Metrics: • Adopt metrics to judge initiative impacts - how to measure, sources, and rationales • Define the components of verifiable IPM • Utilize existing surveys of IPM implementation in Schools – National School IPM Working Group – Association of State Pest Control Regulatory Officials – CDC School Health Policies and Practices Study	**Metrics:** EPA will use, as appropriate, the metrics used by school IPM experts as well as the National IPM Evaluation Group logic models brought forward by the WG as rationales to assess IPM impacts. **Verifiable IPM**: The components of verifiable IPM are now on EPA's School IPM website. **Surveys**: EPA will make use of National School IPM Working Group surveys, the 2014 Association of State Pest Control Regulatory Officials member survey, recurring CDC School Health Policies and Practices Study on IPM, and information provided by EPA School IPM grantees to gauge School IPM implementation.
Benefits: • Utilize tools to assess benefits	**Tools to Assess Benefits**: EPA will make use of the available logic models, case studies, BMPs, and reports to assess various aspects of

– Logic models, case studies, BMPs, reports • Develop a business case for School IPM • Assess the economics of School IPM • Develop a health case for School IPM	the health, economic, and environmental benefits school IPM provides. **Business Case for School IPM**: In 2015, EPA published Saving Dollars and Making Sense: Keeping Bugs Out of the Classroom. **Economics of School IPM**: In March 2016, EPA awarded a cooperative agreement to assess the economics of school IPM. **Health Case for School IPM**: In late 2015, EPA began an effort to publish an assessment of the health benefits of IPM in terms of reduction of pest-borne ailments like asthma that confront students; to be completed by April 2016.
Other: • Focus efforts on School IPM • Conduct a state-focused (Washington) School IPM pilot • Convene a School IPM roundtable • Develop a School IPM strategic plan • Develop national School IPM award program • Conduct monthly School IPM webinars	**Focus on School IPM**: Through FY2016, EPA will remain committed at the national and regional levels to School IPM. EPA may explore expansion of IPM efforts into other sensitive environments in the future, depending on Agency priorities. **State-Focused School IPM Pilot**: Beginning in 2014, EPA supported an 18-month School IPM pilot project in Washington State to draw on good programs that are working and establish a mentor/mentee program between school systems to support those with fledgling IPM programs. A 2015 webinar shared outcomes and lessons learned. **School IPM Roundtable**: In spring 2016, EPA will host a School IPM Roundtable that will secure the endorsement of IPM as the preferred approach for managing pests in schools by national organizations with influence in the school community and a plan and commitment to disseminate the endorsement and related information. **School IPM Strategic Plan**: In Jan. 2016, EPA published its Strategic Plan for School Integrated Pest Management: Federal Fiscal Years 2016-2017 that focuses on: increasing demand for IPM; supplying what schools need; and rewarding results.

	National School IPM awards program: EPA is developing a 5-tiered School IPM awards/incentive program to recognize milestones as school districts begin, grow, and sustain their IPM programs. The program should launch in late 2016. **School IPM webinars**: Since 2014, EPA has hosted a monthly webinar series featuring IPM experts from across the country to provide practical IPM information to the school community. Over 5,000 attendees representing 26 million students. **Other Activities**: EPA is developing a backpack of technical assistance materials to help schools that includes: an online repository of school IPM resources; school IPM training; contract guidance to ensure schools are procuring IPM-based services; and School IPM video series (by CA DPR and EPA Region 9).

4) POLLINATOR WORKGROUP

Original WG Charge (2011):

- Explore initial, science-based risk management approaches including appropriate label restrictions and training;
- Develop information on State approaches and different authorities;
- Transfer of lesson learned by various stakeholders in order to improve existing management practices [across multiple factors affecting pollinator declines];
- Continue international communication; and,
- Consider other issues the WG wishes to bring to the PPDC's attention.

Pollinator WG Recommendations	EPA Response
The workgroup recommended that labels replace "visiting" with "foraging" on labels that have bee warnings. For example: "Do not apply when bees are foraging" is better than "Do not apply when bees are actively visiting"	EPA has begun implementing this recommendation as labels are reviewed through the normal process of label review.
The workgroup recommended that labels be harmonized and protective language should be made clearer.	In 2014, EPA strengthened labeling language to address acute toxicity to bees for products containing neonicotinoids. More restrictive language on existing labels is to be retained while pollinator protection box and additional directions for use have been added. In 2015, EPA issued a proposal to protect bees from acutely toxic pesticides. The proposal had a 3 month comment period and resulted in more than 110,000 comments.

The workgroup recommended that RT_{25} data may be a useful tool to potentially mitigate exposure.	EPA compiled all existing residual toxicity data submitted to the Agency into a database. EPA made these data available on its website in 2014.
The workgroup recommended more research on BMPs and to have them posted on the web in a centralized location.	EPA, North Carolina State University and the Center for Integrated Pest Management (IPM) developed a Pollinator-Crop Production BMP website for pesticide applicators, beekeepers and others. http://pesticidestewardship.org/PollinatorProtection/Pages/default.aspx
The workgroup identified many kinds of pesticide applicator training information around the country that includes pollinator awareness information.	The workgroup compiled pollinator awareness applicator training modules and materials. The educational materials are on the web at: http://pesticidestewardship.org/PollinatorProtection/Pages/default.aspx.
The workgroup recommended more uniform and transparent bee kill investigations.	EPA Region 5 developed enforcement guidance for states conducting investigations of bee incidents by working collaboratively with EPA HQ, states and beekeepers. OPP developed an email box, beekill@epa.gov, designed to receive information on all known or suspected pesticide incidents involving pollinators. EPA has also identified other options for reporting incidents involving pollinators including the National Pesticide Information Center incident reporting portal (http://npic.orst.edu/incidents.html) and contacting the Agency directly by phone. EPA has continued to encourage the public to report incidents to state lead agencies to ensure that the incidents are properly investigated.

5) PUBLIC HEALTH WORKGROUP

Original WG Charge (2010):

- To address issues involving pesticides that control pests that vector disease with a public health component
  - Issues may affect regulatory, policy, programmatic, environmental, technical, economic, or science policy decisions
  - Ongoing workgroup to address issues involving pesticides with public health uses as they arise
- The workgroup defined three critical topics for its interactions with EPA that are addressed in each meeting:
  - Advisory panel for EPA to seek FACA advice or input
  - Portal for stakeholders to bring issues of concern to EPA
  - Forum to discuss items of common interest about public health pests and their control

Public Health WG Recommendations	EPA Response
Past recommendations on: – Repellency graphic	EPA incorporated PPDC feedback into the decision on the repellency graphic. The feedback from the PPDC workgroup allowed EPA to set

– Efficacy guidelines (process and changes) – Communication materials (most recently bed bug strategy, web page revisions) – Regulatory issues (tick IPM, availability of bed bug products, labeling)	up a robust process, though the graphic has not yet been placed on any pesticide product label. The Agency improved communication materials, such as the bed bug strategy and the bed bug web pages, based on input from the workgroup. Workgroup comments were incorporated into the bed bug efficacy guidelines and the product performance revisions. Interagency products, such as the bed bug strategy and the tick white paper, were reviewed and analyzed by the workgroup (with interagency partners participating in the process).
Numerous ongoing/future opportunities: – Communicating risk for products packaged as concentrates – IPM activities for tick control and residential pests – Potentially updating/clarifying role of pest list (PR Notice 2002-1) – Resistance issues/communication (particularly for mosquito control)	Workgroup recommendations will be used to revise the factsheet to communicate risk for products packaged as concentrates. Though progress on this paper has paused for the short-term, these comments will be used to revise the paper. IPM is critical to sustainable control of public health pests and the workgroup provided us with critical expertise and knowledge in this area. EPA plans to work with CDC and USDA to update PR Notice 2002-1 and may seek input from the full PPDC in this endeavor. Resistance issues continue to be a problem for public health pests (particularly mosquito and tick control). EPA is planning to work with WHO and CDC to investigate these issues further. Additional input from the PPDC could be helpful.
6) PESTICIDE INCIDENTS WORKGROUP	
Original WG Charge (2015): Provide recommendations and feedback to EPA on all aspects of information collection and system design for the long-term goal of developing an electronic incident data system that is publically-available and useful to a broad stakeholder group. In near term, the workgroup will focus on developing recommendation on data elements.	