



Berlin, 19 February 2019

## Minutes (01/2019)

### 17<sup>th</sup> HBM4EU Management Board Meeting

*Thursday, 24 January 2019, from 09:30 to 17:00,  
Room No. 5, Corrensplatz 1, 14195 Berlin, optional: joint dinner  
Friday, 25 January 2019, from 09:00 to 17:00,  
Room No. 5, Corrensplatz 1, 14195 Berlin*

#### Thursday, 24 January 2019

Time	Item No.	Topic
09:30 – 10:00	--	Meeting of the Pillar Leaders and the Coordinator
10:00 – 10:35	1	<p><b>Welcome and Organisational Issues (Marike Kolossa-Gehring)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Organisational issues of the meeting</li> <li>- Date and location of the next meeting: <b>MB meeting in March in Berlin</b> starting 13:00 on Monday 04 March 2019 to 17:00 on Tuesday 05 March 2019</li> <li>- MB Meeting in September 2019 in Copenhagen: <b>change the meeting days from 02/03 September to 05/06 September 2019 (Thursday/Friday)?</b></li> <li>- Adoption of the agenda</li> </ul> <p><b>Decision proposal:</b> The MB is asked to adopt the proposed agenda. <b>Decision:</b> The MB agreed unanimously to change the meeting dates for September 2019. The MB adopted the revised agenda. WPL5 announced a change for the agenda of the content meeting.</p> <p>Proposed MB meeting dates for 2020: 23 and 24 January 2020, 12 and 13 March 2020, 07 and 08 May 2020, 24 - 26 June 2020, (eventually 20 August 2020 – TelCo), 03 and 04 September 2020 and 12 and 13 November 2020.</p> <p><b>Decision proposal:</b> The MB is asked to decide on the proposed dates. <b>Decision:</b> The MB agreed unanimously<sup>1</sup> on the following dates: 30 and 31 January 2020, Berlin 12 and 13 March 2020, Brno, Czech Republic</p>

<sup>1</sup> Unanimously: All Work Package Leaders (or a fully mandated representative) who are entitled to vote were present and voted „yes“, no objection, no abstention.



Time	Item No.	Topic
		18 and 019 May 2020, Thessaloniki, Greece 24, 25 and 26 June 2020, Berlin (eventually 20 August 2020 – TelCo) 10 and 11 September 2020, Berlin 12 and 13 November 2020, Berlin
10:35 – 11:40	2	<b>Overview reserve (Birgit Puppe)</b> <b>Information:</b> Actual reserve of HBM4EU Birgit Puppe gave an overview on the development of the actual budget left in the reserve (including financial implications of MB decisions after the last MB meeting). This reserve represents the steering reserve, which is needed for the integration of new partner countries. <b>Action Point:</b> A detailed overview on the actual budget will be provided by Birgit Puppe after the Periodic Reporting for 2018 for the MB meeting in March 2019.
11:40 – 11:55	3	<b>Report on the discussions with WHO (Catherine Ganzleben)</b> <b>Information</b> about what we can deliver as HBM4EU in collaboration with WHO. This would help to bridge the science to policy gap, one of the objectives of the HBM4EU project. The MB was informed about the discussions with the WHO at the second meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Minamata Convention on Mercury (COP2), 19 to 23 November 2018, Geneva, Switzerland. Some aspects might be taken into account for the sustainability strategy and for activities on capacity building.
11:55 – 12:30 13:25 – 13:45	4	<b>Internal Calls 2018/2019 (Robert Barouki)</b> A short overview on the process for the Internal Calls 2018 so far and an explanation the background for the two decisions memos provided for this meeting was given. (1) Revised projects for IC2 of IC2018 provided by WP 3: adjusted project description including financial overview, evaluated by the external reviewers, in order to carry out these activities in the Annual Work Plan 2019. <b>Coherence with the DoA:</b> 3 out of the 7 partners involved have more than 10 PM. Obviously the projects goals cannot be achieved without them. The following solution is suggested: In line with the DoA, only partners with less than 10 PM in 2018 can be funded through the Internal Calls. As the contribution of the other partners



Time	Item No.	Topic
		<p>is critical for the success of these peer-reviewed projects, it is proposed (see (2)) that the MB decides to provide the requested budget to those partners via a specific decision (on the basis of 50% co-funding from the partners).</p> <p><b>Decision proposal:</b> The MB is asked to approve the two revised project proposals (R. Stierum and coll.; A. Alimonti and coll.), including their updated budget outlines and the part of that budget that will be provided by the internal call procedure.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> The MB agreed (12 yes, 1 abstention) under the condition that only the budget given in the proposals will be claimed.</p> <p>(2) Additional funding to complete the total budgets of the revised projects for IC2 of IC2018. This decision proposal complements the Decision Memo of WP3 requesting approval of the two projects of the IC2 (2018) under (1). Its aim is to provide funds to complete the funding received by the two projects recommended through the Internal Call procedure.</p> <p>In order to allow the IC2 projects to be successfully conducted, and because the partners with more than 10 PM have no or very little implication in task 13.1, it is proposed that the funding of these partners takes place through a specific decision of the MB. The funding will be on the basis of 50% contribution from HBM4EU. The total funding of all partners related to these projects will not exceed the 400.000 € budget that was agreed upon for IC2.</p> <p><b>Decision proposal:</b> The MB is asked to approve the funding of the IC2 partners that could not be funded through the internal call procedure.</p> <p><b>Decisions:</b> The MB agreed (12 yes, 1 abstention) under the condition that only the budget given in the proposals will be claimed.</p> <p><b>The MB agreed (12 yes, 1 abstention) that the overall budget of 400.000 Euro must not be exceeded. Therefore, only the budget calculated for the proposals can be claimed.</b></p>
12:30 – 13:15		<i>Lunch Break</i>
13:45 – 14:30	10	<p><b>Potential for uptake of the second set priority substances in the aligned studies (Greet Schoeters)</b></p> <p>Within Task 8.1 (ongoing) HBM studies are being aligned to result</p>



Time	Item No.	Topic						
		<p>in comparable chemical exposure data with EU wide coverage. Currently, this analysis is only planned and budgeted for the first set of priority chemicals. Given budgetary restrictions and the scattered interests of partners, it is not feasible to implement analysis of all second set priority chemicals, too. Therefore, the second set of priority chemicals was prioritised - taking into account the advice/interest from the EU Policy Board and the Management Board for obtaining data with EU wide coverage, and the possibility to link results to the pesticide mixture survey carried out in WP16.</p> <p>In the decision memo WP8 presents 3 proposals which are feasible to implement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal 1: Implementing analysis of pesticides (Glyphosate, Pyrethroids, Chlorpyrifos and Dimethoate) in children</li> <li>• Proposal 2: Implementing analysis of Arsenic species in teenagers</li> <li>• Proposal 3: Implementing analysis of UV-filters in teenagers</li> </ul> <p><b>Decision proposal:</b> The MB is asked to discuss the implementation of the second set of priority chemicals in the aligned studies.</p> <p><b>Budget implications:</b> Rough estimate of analytical costs, Costs for implementing the additional analysis should be 50% co-funded.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="544 1216 1430 1323"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="544 1216 841 1272">Proposal 1</th> <th data-bbox="841 1216 1134 1272">Proposal 2</th> <th data-bbox="1134 1216 1430 1272">Proposal 3</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="544 1272 841 1323">± 200.928 €</td> <td data-bbox="841 1272 1134 1323">± 18.680 €</td> <td data-bbox="1134 1272 1430 1323">±€ 228.360 €</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Task leader 8.1 gave an overview on the background of the proposed decision memo, which is based on an inventory held amongst partners in Task 8.1.</p> <p>Information on available data and/or samples was collected via the NHCPs. The information is available in D7.5.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> The decision was postponed.</p> <p>Additional information on available budget, planned interaction between Work Packages, timeline and how to be in line with QA is needed. The WPs 7, 9, 12, 13, 15, 16 and task 8.3 need to be coordinated in this respect. The same coordinated approach should be reflected in AD15.7 (Joint Survey of pesticides: details of approach and contributions), due in M28 (April 2019).</p> <p>The National Hubs should be asked what they would like to have analysed. It should also be asked who would be able to provide these services (with 50% funding).</p> <p>Discussion should be continued after the MB has an overview on the actual budget for the last 2 years (after the Periodic Reporting).</p>	Proposal 1	Proposal 2	Proposal 3	± 200.928 €	± 18.680 €	±€ 228.360 €
Proposal 1	Proposal 2	Proposal 3						
± 200.928 €	± 18.680 €	±€ 228.360 €						



Time	Item No.	Topic
14:30 - 14:50	5	<p><b>Collaboration with CGLs (Greet Schoeters)</b></p> <p>At the last MB meeting in November 2018 a proposal was discussed to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) better coordinate the interaction between chemical substance group leaders (CGLs) and work package leaders (WPL); and</li> <li>(2) provide guidance to CGLs for interaction with EU Policy Board members and stakeholders and to improve transparency of the interactions.</li> </ul> <p><b>Decision proposal:</b> The MB is asked to agree with the proposed procedures for</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) improving and facilitating the interaction with chemical substance group leaders (CGL) within the consortium</li> <li>2) responding to EU Policy Board members and stakeholders.</li> </ul> <p><b>Budget implications:</b> None</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> The MB agreed unanimously that the name of the contact persons per substance group will be sent to Greet Schoeters by 31 January 2019 (see list included in the decision memo sent on 16 January 2019).</p> <p>The MB agreed unanimously to the general procedure but with one change: the HBM4EU secretariat will <u>not</u> have an active role, instead EEA will establish an e-mail address for requests from the EU Policy Board and stakeholders and will distribute the requests received.</p> <p>In all cases when a response is sent to the EU Policy Board member, the science/policy pillar lead, WP4 lead and HBM4EU secretariat will be put in cc. In cases where fruitful dialogue is already established between CGLs and EU Policy Board members, then the relevant individuals will be asked to include the HBM4EU secretariat, the science-policy pillar lead and the WP4 lead in cc in future exchanges.</p>
14:50		<i>Change of room and connecting with the EC via video-conference</i>
15:25 – 17:10	6	<p><b>Discussion with the European Commission (Marika Kolossa-Gehring, Sofie Nørager, Maria Pilar Fernandez Aguar)</b></p> <p>(1) <b>Mid-Term review</b></p> <p>The EC gave an overview on the upcoming Mid-Term review that will take place in May. The main objective is to evaluate what has been achieved so far, the promised impact on the</p>



Time	Item No.	Topic
		<p>political level, if the project will deliver what is contractually laid down, how the project is managed and sustainability options. GB and AB were asked to give their opinion on HBM4EU.</p> <p>The MB is asked to highlight important (additional) deliverables and to propose an agenda in early March.</p> <p>The reviewers will get access to all documents once the Periodic Reporting was approved. Therefore, the Periodic Reporting needs to be finalised by end of March.</p> <p>Result of the review will be distributed by end of May.</p> <p>As reviewers were selected: Katherine von Stackelberg, Jochen Mueller, Michael McLachlan, Frank De Vocht, Bette Meek.</p> <p>Additional information (provided by the EC via e-mail):        “Each WPL should produce a ‘priority list’ – which deliverables do they think are the most important for their WP and give the best insight into work done. At the joint meeting in May we will have some presentations at the beginning and then we need to go through the work by WP or pillar or chemical. I will think of an agenda, but if the MB has a good suggestion it is more than welcome. The experts will at that time have done their reading and should be familiar with the project but will have questions and the purpose of the day is to address these. So we can go by WP but it might also be good to present results per substance. A suggested agenda is welcomed – timing is from 09.00 – 17.00 with two coffee breaks and 45 min lunch.        The location is in CDMA – for the MB room -1/044, for the meeting with reviewers SDR1&amp;SDR2.”</p> <p><b>(2) Status of the rapid response to copper</b></p> <p>The MB gave an update on the current state of the rapid response to the copper request:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• January to March 2019: Collecting available HBM data on copper from the HBM4EU consortium participating countries through the National Hubs, as well as information on planned HBM studies. Guidance of data owners/providers through the process of data preparation/harmonization and the data transfer to the HBM4EU repository.</li> <li>• March to April 2019: HBM data quality control and statistical processing of the existing evidence.</li> <li>• April to June 2019: Comparison of the gathered HBM concentration levels to the internal level consistent with the reference values set by the EFSA.</li> <li>• July to September 2019: Production of a short document outlining the results (available HBM data, possible conclusion from the modelling exercise).</li> </ul> <p><b>(3) Internal calls way forward</b></p> <p>The coordinator informed the EC about the outcome of the MB</p>



Time	Item No.	Topic
		<p>discussions on the Internal Calls 2018 earlier that day. WPL3 gave a brief overview on the actual discussion and the decision taken by the MB (see decision under item 4).</p> <p>The EC proposed that the partners with more than 10 PM should use their existing PM from other WPs first and get some more PM in the following years. PL3 doubts that this is feasible as most partners are involved in other WPs as stated in the AWP2019, and might not be able to reduce their engagement in already assigned tasks without consequences. The EC asked PL3 (in collaboration with the coordinator) to communicate the decision taken transparently to all partners.</p> <p>The coordinator informed the EC that it is planned to have a very thorough look at all partners PMs for the remaining 2 years and adjust the allocation of resources wherever necessary.</p> <p>Internal Calls 2019: PL3 informed the EC that the MB did not decide on topics for the ICs 2019. With regard to the timeline, it might be too late to launch another round of Internal Calls. Furthermore, there might be no budget available.</p> <p>The EC is welcoming an evaluation of the remaining budget with regard to activities to be delivered by the end of the project in 2021 and would like to be updated on future decisions.</p> <p><b>(4) Aligned studies and second set of substances</b></p> <p>The EC is strongly supporting this approach and pointed out that remaining budget should be spent on getting data on the second set of substances and substance groups. The coordinator informed the EC on what was discussed by the MB so far (see item 10). More detailed discussions on how to proceed will take place on the MB meeting in March 2019.</p> <p><b>(5) AOB</b></p> <p>The EC highlighted that publications <u>must</u> be published as open access publications; this is a legal obligation set in the GA. In addition, all HBM4EU publications must be labelled with the H2020 funding disclaimer.</p> <p>The EC proposed to feed the issue of high costs for open access publications into the Programme Committee (via national representatives).</p> <p>The MB and the EC discussed some financial topics and how to deal with certain recurring issues (e.g. budget shifts). The EC informed that budget changes always need to be justified in detail, as financial claims always need to be backed up by justifications, e.g. explanation for increase of personnel costs.</p> <p>The EC explained that the current system (PMs <u>and</u> budget) is reflected in the IT-system, especially for the automated check. WPL4 pointed out that the MB needs to find a modus operandi with more flexibility that also allows the WPLs to carry out their role at “gatekeeper”. The EC informed that the partners are responsible about their budget/PMs and they need to inform</p>



Time	Item No.	Topic
		<p>the WPL in advance if any issues/changes occur. Birgit Puppe informed the MB that she needs to be informed about <u>all</u> changes and issues as soon as they appear.</p> <p>The EC highlighted that the Periodic Technical Report needs to reflect clearly the work done in 2018 by task and which partners contributed to these activities.</p> <p><u>Please note:</u> Partners need to report their financial statements in alignment with the content in the technical report.</p> <p>The EC informed that none of the budget distributed to the partners is fixed; it's just an estimate. For the AWP2020 and AWP2021 there is flexibility to revise the distribution of PM/budget.</p> <p>The MB highlighted that the reporting obligations for the EJPs are very time consuming, time that is missing for scientific work. The MB would like to provide feedback to the EC for future EJPs. The EC informed that the rules cannot be changed/influenced for current projects. Simplifications are currently discussed for future programmes; it was recommended that everyone contact their national representative to feed in comments in the currently ongoing discussions.</p> <p>Funding of laboratories: the laboratory has to declare all the costs and will get 50% reimbursed, the remaining 50% need to be covered by the partner (from national funds and not within the context of the actual project) who sent the samples to the laboratory. Overall, this will be a case by case decision depending on negotiations/agreements between the owner of the samples and the laboratory.</p> <p>The EC informed that there is positive progress on IPCHEM and information that is more detailed will be sent by e-mail to the MB as soon as possible.</p>
17:10 – 17:25		<i>Coffee break</i>
17:25 – 17:55	7	<p><b>Composition of the Stakeholder Forum (Marike Kolossa-Gehring)</b></p> <p>Experience has shown that stakeholder attendance at the annual meetings of the Stakeholder Forum is not satisfying and should be improved. In November 2018 the MB decided to extend the Stakeholder Forum. The MB is now asked to decide on the suggested extended composition of the Stakeholder Forum.</p> <p>Proposal to include additional stakeholders, but in a balanced manner, meaning that similar numbers of NGOs and industry</p>





Time	Item No.	Topic
		<p>associations are represented:</p> <p><b>NGO:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) European Academy for Environmental Medicine Or Doctors for the Environment</li> <li>(2) PAN (Pesticide Action Network)- Europe</li> </ul> <p><b>Non Industry Stakeholders:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) International Life Science Institute</li> </ul> <p><b>Industry:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Business Europe</li> <li>(2) Plastics Europe</li> </ul> <p><u>Optional:</u> Food-Drink Europe or FEICA (Association of the European Adhesive Sealant Industry)</p> <p><b>Decision proposal:</b> The MB is asked to decide if the proposed Stakeholders shall be invited to the next meeting.</p> <p>The MB discussed that the Stakeholder Forum composition should stay balanced. Furthermore, the criteria used for the selection on the current Stakeholder Forum need to be applied for any selection of new members. The MB would disagree with the nomination of the proposed International Life Science Institute. WPL15 suggested that the MB should develop a strategy to increase the participation in case the MB decides not to extend the Stakeholder Forum.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> The MB agreed that the coordinator should go back to Maria Uhl and ask her if the proposed candidates are already on the candidate list established in 2017 (if not, the new candidates need to be evaluated against the defined criteria) and prepare updated information to be shared with the MB.</p>
18:30		<p><b>Self-paid Dinner (optional)</b></p> <p>At Restaurant „Trattoria Romana“, Unter den Eichen 84a, 14195 Berlin (<a href="http://www.trattoriaromana-berlin.de/">http://www.trattoriaromana-berlin.de/</a>)</p>



## Friday, 25 January 2019

Time	Item No.	Topic
09:00 – 09:10	--	<p><b>Welcome (Marike Kolossa-Gehring)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Organisation of the content meeting in March 2019: WPL5 Phthalates, WP12 platform &amp; results</li> </ul>
09:10 – 09:35	8	<p><b>HBM4EU video 2019 (Joana Lobo Vicente)</b></p> <p><b>Information:</b> Presentation of a first draft of the storyline provided by WPL2.</p> <p>Joana Lobo Vicente gave a presentation on the first storyline of the second video of HBM4EU “How the body takes up chemicals”.</p> <p><b>Action Point:</b> WPL2 to send the handout of the first draft of the text to the MB for comments. The MB agreed to send their comments to WPL2 within one week.</p> <p>If possible, a first version of the video will be presented during the MB meeting in March 2019.</p>
09:35 – 10:40	9	<p><b>Publication of work related to WP12 (Dimosthenis Sarigiannis)</b></p> <p>The MB is asked to decide about the publication of a paper “Phthalate pharmacokinetics in the adult human and rat: influence of phthalate hydrophobicity, exposure route and other factors: a review of experimental and mechanistic data”.</p> <p><b>Decision proposal:</b> The MB is asked to approve to the publication of the proposed manuscript.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> The MB agreed unanimously to approve the publication.</p> <p>The MB discussed how the networking within HBM4EU can be reflected in publications to embed as many partners/countries and views as possible. The MB agreed to add some additional information in the abstract how this work will feed into HBM4EU for future publications.</p> <p><b>Publications of work related to WP13 and WP14 (Jana Klanova, Ludek Blaha)</b></p> <p>(1) The MB was asked to decide about the publication of a paper “Past uses of legacy SVOCs influence today’s indoor levels and human exposure”.</p> <p>This was sent for decision in a written procedure originally. As some</p>



Time	Item No.	Topic
		<p>questions arose that need to be discussed in more detail, the MB decided to postpone the decision to this meeting.</p> <p>WPL13 explained the background and purpose of the publication, and how it is related to HBM4EU (aligned studies). The MB discussed how to deal with publications strategically. Shall only publications developed within the Work Packages (mentioned in the AWP) be published, or can also publications affiliated to HBM4EU be published. WPL2 clarified that here are 2 options in the publication strategy:</p> <p>1) funded by HBM4EU and 2) reference to HBM4EU.</p> <p><b>Decision proposal:</b> The MB is asked to agree to the proposed publication.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> The MB agreed unanimously to the publication of the proposed paper with a reference to HBM4EU (without HBM4EU funding).</p> <p>The MB agreed that publications to be published with a reference to funding by HBM4EU (e.g. using HBM4EU data) a decision memo must be provided. If a planned publication only contains a reference to HBM4EU (e.g. not using HBM4EU data) it is sufficient to inform WPL2 and the MB about the publication (no MB approval needed).</p> <p>(2) A publication related to the work performed in WP13 and WP14 is in preparation. As part of the activities, biomarkers for reproductive effects of phthalate exposure were obtained from published human observational studies and linked to experimental information and existing AOPs. This strategy and the resulting selection of biomarkers substantiated by experimental and mechanistic information are of use for other parties dealing with selection of biomarkers of effect for implementation in epidemiological studies. Working title: "A strategy to validate the selection of human effect biomarkers using adverse outcome pathways: proof of concept for phthalates".</p> <p><b>Decision proposal:</b> The MB is asked to approve to the publication of the proposed manuscript.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> The MB agreed unanimously to the publication of the proposed paper.</p> <p><b>In General:</b></p> <p><b>Decision:</b> The MB agreed unanimously that the CGLs should be involved in the development of publications if possible. At least they should be acknowledged if the publication is using information developed by the respective CGL.</p>



Time	Item No.	Topic
		<p><b>Action Point:</b> WPL11 and WPL2 were asked to prepare a proposal for the next MB meeting about how a HBM4EU product/deliverable might become an official publication that is indexed (e.g. scoping documents).</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> The MB agreed unanimously that proposed publications (draft manuscript) should be send to the Pillar Leaders at the same time when sending the decision memo to the MB (earlier if feasible).</p>
10:40 – 11:10		<i>Coffee Break</i>
11:10 – 11:45	11	<p><b>Ethics – Third Ethics Report (Lisbeth E. Knudsen, Ulrike Doyle)</b></p> <p><b>Information:</b> Background information for data collection is needed</p> <p>Lisbeth E. Knudsen gave a presentation on the current state and content of the Third Ethics Report (D1.9) and open issues.</p> <p>Lisbeth E. Knudsen also informed about the requirements formulated by the EC.</p> <p><b>Action Point:</b> The latest version of D1.9 has been sent to the MB Monday 28 January 2019 at 10:46. <b>All WPL</b> are asked to go through the document and provide their input by <b>05 February 2019</b>.</p> <p><b>Action Point:</b> The coordinator will put the SOP for the AWP including the 'ethics requirements' that the project must comply with are included as deliverables in the Work Package 17 on the SharePoint in the folder for this meeting.</p>
11:45 – 12:30	12	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How to deal with urgent requests that are taken up on behalf of HBM4EU (e.g. ECHA public consultation or similar)</li> </ul> <p><b>Decision:</b> The MB agreed unanimously that these kind of requests should be send to WPL4 who will distribute the request to the MB and the respective CGL(s). The CGL(s) will have the responsibility to draft and provide an answer under their name(s).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Calendar of events/conferences for 2019 (EEA) Abstracts for ISES and ISEE have been submitted. WPL5 also circulated information on the 11th International Symposium on Biological Monitoring in Occupational and Environmental Health (ISBM-11) that will be held on 28-30 of August 2019 in Leuven (Belgium).</li> <li>• Conferences: Representation of HBM4EU on the <b>14th</b></li> </ul>



Time	Item No.	Topic
		<p><b>International Conference on Mercury as a Global Pollutant</b> (ICMGP), 08-13 September 2019, Krakow, Poland?</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> The MB agreed unanimously that WPL9 will present HBM4EU.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conferences: Representation of HBM4EU on the <b>Eurotox Conference</b>, 08-11 September 2019, Helsinki, Finland?</li> </ul> <p><b>Decision:</b> The MB agreed unanimously that WPL12 will present HBM4EU.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finnish EU council presidency in the second half of 2019: WPL11 informed the MB on planned events, more details will be provided soon. Tiina Santonen informed about a workshop that will take place under the Finnish Presidency as well.</li> <li>• WPL2 informed that the EEA director will present HBM4EU during an EPA network meeting and suggested that the MB members contact their national EPA contact points to ask them to prepare short statements to support HBM4EU.</li> <li>• The coordinator informed the MB about a visit from Taiwan and their interest in HBM4EU.</li> <li>• The coordinator informed the MB that the Japanese Environmental Children Study (JECS) invited her to become a member of the Advisory Board</li> <li>• The events page will be updated accordingly by WP2.</li> <li>• Meeting week 2019: The WPLs are asked to think about useful overarching meetings. These kind of meetings should be preferred over Work Package meetings.</li> <li>• <u>Mid-Term Review</u>: The coordinator will provide a recommendation for the agenda for the joined meeting of the Management Board with the reviewers on Tuesday 7 May 2019 in Brussels; to be discussed on the next MB meeting in March in Berlin (see item 6).</li> </ul>
12:30 – 13:15		<i>Lunch Break</i>
13:15	--	<b>Beginning of the content meeting</b>



Time	Item No.	Topic
13:15 – 13:40		<b>Presentation of the leaflets on indicators (Joana Lobo Vicente)</b>
13:40 – 17:00	--	<b>Discussion on effect markers (Greet Schoeters)</b> <b>Occupational studies (Tiina Santonen)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Results</li> <li>○ Ongoing studies</li> <li>○ Planned activities</li> </ul> <b>Laboratories and analysis (Argelia Castaño)</b>
17:00	--	<b>End of the content meeting</b>

### Upcoming Deliverables until March 2019

D15.1	Report information needs from policy makers translated in terms of functionality of HBM mixture information	WP15	28 – RIVM	Revision
AD14.3	Delineation of Adverse Outcomes Pathways (AOPs) for ex-vivo cell-based and in vivo functional assays	WP14	14.3 - UGR	Revision
D13.4	Report on AOPs of priority substances	WP13	12 - AUTH	In QC
D5.4	1st Phased Action Plan for translation of HBM results into policy advise, measures and suggestions for further research at general level	WP5	4 - VITO	In QC
D8.5	Initial report on occupational studies	WP8	16 - FIOH	Revision
	<b>Periodic Report</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>1 - UBA</b>	<b>Submitted</b>
MS13	Agreement on data gaps and research needs for the second prioritised substances	WP7	1 - UBA	Mar19
D7.7	2nd material for communication to participants, including informed consent	WP7	6 – MOH-CY	Mar19
D9.6	Databases of candidate laboratories for the 2nd prioritization round of substances (ULPGC)	WP9	14 - ISCIII	Mar19

**Attendees: 24.01.2019**

<b>WP</b>	<b>Partner</b>	<b>First Name</b>	<b>Name</b>
01	UBA	Marike	Kolossa-Gehring
02, 04	EEA	Catherine	Ganzleben
05, 10	VITO	Greet	Schoeters
06	INSERM	Robert	Barouki
07	UBA	Ulrike	Fiddicke
08	DH	Ovnair	Sepai
09	ISCI3	Argelia	Castaño
11	THL	Hanna	Tolonen
12	AUTH	Spyros	Karakitsios
13	MU	Jana	Klánová
14	UGR	Nicolas	Olea
15	RIVM	Mirjam	Luijten
16	INRA	Jean-Philippe	Antignac
	MU	Ludek	Blaha
	EEA	Joana	Lobo Vicente
	INSERM	Elena	Tarroja
	ISCI3	Marta	Esteban
	UBA	Ulrike	Doyle
	UBA	Nicole	Kobosil
	UBA	Birgit	Puppe
	UBA	Philipp	Weise
	UBA	Kim	Pack, <b>15:25 – 17:10</b>

**Attendees: 25.01.2019**

<b>WP</b>	<b>Partner</b>	<b>First Name</b>	<b>Name</b>
01	UBA	Marike	Kolossa-Gehring
02, 04	EEA	Catherine	Ganzleben, <i>left at 16:50</i>
05, 10	VITO	Greet	Schoeters, <i>left at 16:50</i>
06	INSERM	Robert	Barouki
07	UBA	Ulrike	Fiddicke
08	DH	Ovnair	Sepai
09	ISCI3	Argelia	Castaño
11	THL	Hanna	Tolonen, <i>left at 16:50</i>
12	AUTH	Spyros	Karakitsios
13	MU	Jana	Klánová
14	UGR	Nicolas	Olea
15	RIVM	Mirjam	Luijten, <i>left at 16:30</i>
16	INRA	Jean-Philippe	Antignac
	MU	Ludek	Blaha, <i>left at 16:50</i>
	EEA	Joana	Lobo Vicente, <i>left at 16:30</i>
	INSERM	Elena	Tarroja
	ISCI3	Marta	Esteban
	UCPH	Lisbeth E.	Knudsen, <i>from 11:00</i>
	UBA	Ulrike	Doyle, <i>left at 14:00</i>
	UBA	Nicole	Kobosil, <i>left at 13:00</i>
	UBA	Kim	Pack, <i>left at 13:00</i>
	UBA	Philipp	Weise, <i>from 12:00</i>
	FIOH	Tiina	Santonen, , <i>from 11:00</i>