

Berlin, 15 October 2019

## Minutes (09/2019)

### 21<sup>st</sup> HBM4EU Management Board Meeting

*Thursday, 05<sup>th</sup> September 2019, from 12:30 to 19:10,  
EEA, Kongens Nytorv 6, 1050 Copenhagen, Fontana Room  
until  
Friday, 06<sup>th</sup> September 2019, from 09:00 to 17:00,  
EEA, Kongens Nytorv 6, 1050 Copenhagen, Fontana Room*

#### Thursday, 05 September 2019

Time	Item No.	Topic
12:45 – 12:55	--	<p><b>Welcome by Martin Adams (Head of Programme on Health and Sustainable Resource Use), EEA</b></p> <p>Martin Adams welcomed the MB and pointed out that the agency, as a knowledge and networking organisation has a large overlap with HBM4EU in efforts of linking science to policy.</p> <p>For any follow-up activities, the EEA is interested in participating in discussions and, if conditions are favourable, would be open to join future activities.</p>
12:55 – 13:05	1	<p><b>Organisational Issues (Marike Kolossa-Gehring)</b></p> <p><b>Decision proposal:</b> The MB is asked to adopt the proposed agenda.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> The agenda was adopted by the MB unanimously<sup>1</sup>.</p> <p>Date and location of the next meeting:  <b>MB meeting in November in Berlin</b>            starting 13:00 on Thursday 14 November 2019            to 17:00 on Friday 15 November 2019</p> <p><b>Content Meeting next MB meeting in November</b></p> <p>As subject of discussion of the Content Meeting during the next MB meeting on 14 and 15 November 2019 communication activities have been suggested. The Coordinator proposed a joint organisation by WP2, WP5 and WP6 to take into account joint</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
		<p>activities on communication and dissemination, science-to-policy transfer and sustainability respectively.</p> <p><b>Coordinator informs about the 4<sup>th</sup> amendment and gives a rough overview on the included topics</b></p> <p>The Coordinator informed about the 4<sup>th</sup> amendment, which is foreseen to include the inclusion of two new partner countries (Estonia and North Macedonia), a new LTP, some subcontracts and other small changes, e.g. deliverable due dates.</p> <p>The Coordinator informed that this amendment is a prerequisite to continue the work and therefore has to be submitted before the Annual Work Plan 2020 is uploaded.</p>
13:05 – 13:20	2	<p><b>Budget Overview (Kim Pack, Lena Reiber)</b></p> <p><u>Please note:</u> The presented budget overview was roughly calculated by a subcontractor to allow for discussion in the MB. The official budget calculation will be provided by UBA on 16 September 2019.</p> <p>UBA thanked all WPL for the excellent work and timely input of their AWP descriptions including budget.</p> <p>On basis of the input collected until 27 August 2019, UBA's subcontractor calculated a current leftover of 3.5 Million €. This value includes a rough estimation of all needs for resources known until that day (incl. those that could not be allocated so far). UBA proposed to keep 500,000 € of this as a Coordinator's reserve for the last two years in case of emergency risks.</p> <p>UBA pointed out the short deadline for the decision on the official budget calculation provided by UBA on 16 September 2019 which will have to be decided upon by the MB until 19 September 2019, which is when it will be sent to the Governing Board.</p>
13:20 - 13:28	3	<p><b>Inclusion of Estonia (Marike Kolossa-Gehring)</b></p> <p><b>Decision proposal:</b> The MB is asked to approve the integration of Estonia – represented by the Estonian Health Board (Health Board HB) – as a partner into the HBM4EU programme.</p> <p>The participation of Estonia as NHCP was discussed. WPL16 pointed out that generally the role and activities of the NHCPs need to be defined more clearly. This was suggested to be taken up for the next content meeting.</p>

Time	Item No.	Topic
		<b>Decision:</b> The MB agreed unanimously to take up Estonia as a partner (NHCP) in HBM4EU. <sup>2</sup>
13:29 – 13:50	5	<p><b>Inclusion of North Macedonia (Marika Kolossa-Gehring)</b></p> <p><b>Decision proposal:</b> The MB is asked to approve the integration of the Republic of North Macedonia – represented by the Institute of Public Health of the Republic of North Macedonia (IJZRM) – as a partner into the HBM4EU programme by agreeing on one of the following options:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Inclusion of IJZRM as NHCP in the AWP 2020/21.</li> <li>2. Inclusion of IJZRM partner as NHCP and in Task 12.1 in the AWP 2020/21.</li> <li>3. Inclusion of IJZRM partner as NHCP and in Task 12.1 including the requested subcontract (16.000 €) for the tasks and roles listed in the DM.</li> </ol> <p>It was discussed if the proposed subcontractor and the foreseen tasks are required for the integration of North Macedonia into WP12.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> After discussion, the Management Board voted to exclude option 3 with 12 votes in favour of exclusion and 1 against exclusion.</p> <p>In a follow-up vote between Option 1 and Option 2, the Management Board decided in favour of Option 2 unanimously.</p>
14:00 – 16:30	4	<p><b>Videoconference with the EU Policy Board</b></p> <p>The EC Project officer welcomed all participants and pointed out the critical points for the upcoming two years. The draft AWP's will be shared with the EU Policy Board (EPB). It will be particularly important to discuss how policy wishes, demands and needs can be linked to the activities of the two last project years.</p> <p>14.10 – 14.20 Cu rapid request – results and next steps (<i>Information point, HBM4EU</i>)</p> <p>WPL5 briefly gave an overview of the history and current steps of the Cu rapid request. 22 datasets from 6 countries were received. These datasets were not included in IPCHEM up to now because Cu is not a prioritised substance.</p>

<sup>2</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
		<p>WPL12 informed that as far as possible with regard to the low availability of toxikokinetic data, state-of-the-art internal dose modelling approaches are being tested to be applied.</p> <p>The collection of HBM data on the one hand and the modelling approach on the other hand constitute two ways to potentially answer the rapid response request.</p> <p>It is foreseen that a finalised response document will be available at the end of the year.</p> <p>14.20 – 14.45      Presentation of expected results for HBM4EU by 2021 (HBM4EU)</p> <p>WP2 gave an overview of methods and new approaches to dissemination and communication planned in the Knowledge Hub.</p> <p>The Pillar Leaders presented the main HBM4EU results to be expected in each Work Package by 2021.</p> <p>The EPB (ECHA and EFSA) would like to have the opportunity to comment on early draft proposals for HBM-GVs.</p> <p>The Coordinator pointed out that HBM4EU is an independent research project which develops scientifically sound concepts. Agencies like EFSA and ECHA are invited to consider these concepts and decide to use them further or choose a different approach. A close collaboration is important, but roles need to be clear.</p> <p>Input to the HBGVs is very much appreciated, HBM4EU will organise a workshop in the second half of 2020 to further develop derivation of the HBM-GVs.</p> <p>The 3rd round of prioritisation was briefly discussed as an input and preparation for HBM4EU follow-up activities.</p> <p>The EC project officer invited the EPB to a tour-de-table to provide recommendations for improvement in the future to the MB.</p> <p>The key points are listed in the following :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Importance of securing a smooth continuation into a future partnership (making use of HBM4EU results)</li> <li>• Emphasis on common understanding about roles (agencies, project)</li> <li>• Delivery of results aimed at policy making in a condensed, easily accessible, 'ready-to-use' format (e.g. targeted specifically at agencies)</li> <li>• Solutions for GDPR issues in the future (data protection issues), long-term approach</li> </ul>

Time	Item No.	Topic
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focus on stories for priority chemicals to engage policy makers</li> <li>• Research on non-invasive sampling methods and further comparability of results</li> <li>• Acceptability of biomonitoring as a tool (present HBM in a better light)</li> <li>• Strengthening of non-targeted screening aspect</li> </ul> <p>Task 5.5 (UAntwerpen; Ilse Loots &amp; team) gave a rapid overview of the further approach to identify windows of opportunity for dissemination of results. The diversity of HBM4EU results were taken into account when mapping policy timelines and chances for input. Different approaches to results communication were presented. WP2 added a very short summary of the efforts, mainly that between September and December 2019 mapping to understand legislation processes of priority substances will be undertaken (by a subcontractor). There will be interviews between consultant and respective agencies with the aim to produce documents in December for each prioritised substance. These documents will include an overview of the respective processes, such as legislative status, processes and Gantt-charts mapping potential entry points into policy processes where HBM4EU can feed in data.</p> <p>It was discussed that the interview and consultation process of the agencies could be facilitated by collecting input in a table that can be filled out by several involved people within an institution.</p> <p><b>There was also the request for the information coming from HBM4EU to be concise and visually appealing in order to make the way easier for policy makers.</b></p> <p>15.45 – 15.55      Short information point about new partnership (RTD)</p> <p>The EC project officer gave a brief overview of the next steps towards the new partnership.</p> <p>A first workshop is foreseen on 23 September 2019 to which decision makers from the respective countries have been invited. The MB was invited to inform the respective representatives in their countries again and if necessary, give them the EC project officer's contact details. It is important that as many Member States and their representatives as possible are present.</p>
16:45 – 16:50	6	<p><b>Addition of a new LTP for MU-CZ (Ludek Blaha)</b></p> <p>Within the AWP 2020 and 2021 Task 10.5 Integration of data into IPCHEM aims to bring in and integrate metadata and existing HBM</p>

Time	Item No.	Topic
		<p>data (aggregated/individual) into IPCHEM. The Czech Republic is one of the EU countries with the longest history of HBM, and National Institute of Public Health (Státní zdravotní ústav, SZU-CZ) is a responsible institution willing to share metadata and harmonised aggregated/individual data from the Czech HBM data collections. Masaryk University as the Czech national hub coordinator therefore wishes to add SZU-CZ to the HBM4EU consortium as a Linked Third Party.</p> <p><b>Budget implications:</b> No additional costs. MU proposes to transfer EUR 32,000 from the subcontract chapter of the MU budget to the budget of SZU-CZ as a new member of the consortium. This budget will be used for personnel costs (12.8 PM) in WP10 for preparation of metadata and data sets from the Czech HBM programmes and making them available for future analysis within the project.</p> <p><b>Decision proposal:</b> The MB is asked to approve the addition of a new LTP to MU and the transfer of the subcontract amount to PMs for SZU-CZ.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> The MB agreed unanimously.</p>
16:50 – 17:37	7	<p><b>Second occupational study under HBM4EU (Ovnair Sepai)</b></p> <p>This item was previously to be decided upon in a written procedure, but due to difficulties in the voting mechanism for two options and due to the suggestion of some MB members, the proposal is now to be discussed during this meeting again.</p> <p>To give a brief overview, two proposals are discussed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) study focusing only on diisocyanates, and</li> <li>2) study divided into two parts, the first one focusing on diisocyanates and the second one on waste management/recycling sector with possible exposure to phthalates but also to some other priority compounds (depending on the collected materials/re-uses; possibly some metals, bisphenols, flame retardants, PAHs).</li> </ol> <p><b>Decision proposal:</b> The Management Board is asked to advise and take a final decision on the planning of the second occupational study (Task 8.5). In a written decision procedure, it was decided to carry out a second occupational study. Option 1 and option 2 were for decision in another written procedure. Please see mail sent by HBM4EU@uba.de on 21 August 2019. The MB still needs to finally decide whether it is in favour of option 1 or option 2.</p> <p>During discussion, several issues were identified. Main concerns of the MB were the inclusion of interested countries across all partners, the analytical setup of the study as well as the resource</p>

Time	Item No.	Topic
		<p>allocation (as some resources appeared to be foreseen in the AWP proposals for 2020 and 2021 already).</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> The MB voted for Option 1 (2 votes) and for Option 2 (10 votes), WPL14 was absent during the vote. Option 2 was therefore accepted, but only under the following conditions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other partner countries are to be asked if they would be interested in participating in this study.</li> <li>Refinement of the analytical parts of the presented Decision Memo (in collaboration with WP9).</li> <li>It has to be checked how many resources still need to come from the reserve for the implementation of this study and how many are already planned in for in the current AWP2020/21 versions.</li> </ol>
17:37 – 18:39	9	<p><b>EEA briefings on PFAS (Catherine Ganzleben)</b></p> <p><b>Information/discussion:</b> Presentation and discussion of the EEA briefings on PFAS.</p> <p>A web briefing on PFAS targeted at policy makers as well as citizens was created by the EEA. Key messages, the exposure in different countries taken from the harmonised data in the HBM4EU repository (on the basis of data available in April 2019), a short introduction to HBM4EU, information for consumers to reduce exposure by PFAS, European policy and research activities and a future outlook were included and presented to the MB.</p> <p>The inclusion of the three data sets available at the time was discussed critically in the MB, as this was not seen as reflective of the entire consortium and might provide a difficult context for the included as well as for the excluded countries.</p> <p>It was suggested to work with aggregated data or list the minimum/maximum values and the median, taking out specific countries' names or at least indicate that data are part of HBM4EU (activity in progress) and were identified in an exemplary manner.</p> <p>The EEA will reflect how to proceed and inform the MB about further steps. The EEA further proposed to send the text of the briefing around for comments.</p>
18:40 – 18:50	8	<p><b>Publications from WP12 and WP14</b></p> <p>Proposed publications related to the work of <u>WP12</u> (the work is based on the deliverables AD12.3, AD12.5 and D12.4):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Internal and external exposure to major phthalates and DINCH in EU starting from human biomonitoring data</li> </ol>

Time	Item No.	Topic
		<p>2) Internal and external exposure to PAHs in EU starting from human biomonitoring data</p> <p>3) Internal and external exposure to cadmium in EU starting from human biomonitoring data</p> <p>4) Internal and external exposure to PFAs in EU starting from human biomonitoring data</p> <p>Proposed publication related to the work of <u>WP14</u>:</p> <p>1) Human biomonitoring of occupational exposure to PAHs: a systematic review of the literature</p> <p><b>Decision proposal:</b> The MB is asked to approve the proposed publications related to the work of WP12 and WP14.</p> <p>WP12 informed briefly about the background of the papers. Information about specific compounds is already included in HBM4EU deliverables.</p> <p>WP14 informed briefly about the background of the paper.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> The MB agreed unanimously to the proposed papers.</p>
18:50 – 19:10	10	<p><b>Meeting Week (Lena Reiber)</b></p> <p><b>Information:</b> Open questions and issues</p> <p>UBA presented an overview of all meetings during the meeting week and for which meetings the MB's presence is foreseen.</p> <p>A separate table with the overview will be provided to the MB (see mail from <a href="mailto:hbm4eu@uba.de">hbm4eu@uba.de</a> from September 10<sup>th</sup>)</p> <p><u>Advisory Board Meeting 2019:</u></p> <p>It was addressed by PL2 that it is difficult for the PL to be in AB and SF meetings at the same time, therefore the attendance will have to be delegated.</p> <p>The MB had no objections to the proposal by the Coordinator that their voices will be recorded during the AB meeting to facilitate composition of the meeting minutes.</p> <p>Coordination informed about the AB's interest in written feedback about the implementation of their advice 2018 and asked for any documents that could be sent to the AB.</p> <p>The MB proposed to send existing information about the strategy to align HBM4EU results with policy cycles from WP4 and WP5. The most current version of the Pillar 3 document could be also shared with the AB again.</p>



Time	Item No.	Topic
		<p>The AB was also interested in the results from the Mid-term review. It was agreed in the MB that the MTR report will be sent to the AB. During the AB meeting, the Coordinator will give a short overview presentation and each PL will include comments from the MTR specific for their Pillar as well as possible responses into their Pillar presentations.</p> <p><u>Meeting Week 2020:</u></p> <p>Save the date: 28 September – 2 October 2020</p> <p>An international HBM conference under German EU council presidency ('Presidency Event') is foreseen for 2 October 2020.</p> <p>A decision whether there will be a 1 day Consortium Meeting and 1 day for overarching meetings or a 1.5 day Consortium Meeting will be taken during the MB meeting in November 2019.</p>

## Friday, 06 September 2019

Time	Item No.	Topic
09:00 – 09:05	--	<b>Welcome (Marike Kolossa-Gehring)</b>
09:05 – 11:00	11	<p><b>Changes in the AWP2019 (Ludek Blaha)</b></p> <p><b>Discussion:</b> Several shifts from/to WPs are now being done. Some include also this year - 2019.</p> <p>Will there be any possibility to update AWP2019? [What if partners claim costs for 2019 within WPs but were not listed as partners originally?]</p> <p>The Coordinator informed that as a general rule, costs can only be claimed if they are included in the AWP. However, the AWP2019 will not be amended.</p> <p>It is possible to list necessary changes in the PFR <u>and</u> PTR (justification for this change has to be included). The respective WPL will have to agree to the resources spent per partner at the end of the year in preparation for the periodic reporting.</p> <p><b>Annual Work Plan 2020/2021 (Kim Pack)</b></p> <p>UBA presented the timeline for AWP preparation and informed that the MB is asked to approve the Annual Work Plan 2020 and the draft Annual Work Plan 2021, both including the respective resources (PM and ODCs), today.</p> <p>Due to the time windows for all WPL for implementation of feedback from various sources, the consolidated budget calculation done by UBA for both AWPs could only be started on the basis of the versions that reached UBA before 27 August 2019 and will be finished by 16 September 2019.</p> <p>The MB will then be asked to accept until 19 September 2019 noon the consolidated budget plans to be sent to the Governing Board. The shortened decision period is necessary in order to keep the deadlines laid down in the contracts.</p> <p>UBA further explained that the current version of the AWP2020 and the draft AWP2021 will be sent to the GB (status: 27 August 2019) on 19 September 2019 alongside with the consolidated budget.</p> <p>It was discussed and agreed in the MB that the Decision Proposal accompanying these AWP documents will include a working list of topics that still require integration into the AWPs2020/21 for the GB's information.</p>

Time	Item No.	Topic	
		This working list was put together during the meeting as follows:	
		<b>WP</b>	<b>Topic</b>
		<b>DM needed?</b>	<b>Estimation of Budget</b>
	2	Additional communication products	Yes 200,000 €
	4	CGL work: 0.5 PM for 1st round for 2021 > 4.5 PM 0.5 PM for 2nd round for 2021 > 4.5 PM	Yes 9 PM * 8000 € = 72,000 €
	8	2 <sup>nd</sup> occupational study	Yes n/a (not available)
	8	Samples for substances from the 2 <sup>nd</sup> round of prioritisation <u>Specified during comment phase of these minutes:</u> This topic pertains to mercury in high fish consumption countries like Mediterranean and Nordic (sampling and analysis).	Yes n/a
	8	UV-filters in aligned studies <sup>1</sup>	No (decided during last MB meeting) 20.5 PM * 8,000 € + 105,000 € to 375,000 € = 169,000 € to 593,000 €
	9	New method to be developed for 2 <sup>nd</sup> occ. Study?	Yes n/a
	9	QA/QC Programme for 2 <sup>nd</sup> round of prioritisation	Yes 440,000 €
	10	<u>Specified during comment phase of these minutes:</u> Statistical analysis of effect markers in the aligned study data (evidence for biological impact of exposure)	Yes 6.6 PM * 8,000 € = 52,800 €
	10	<u>Specified during comment phase of these minutes:</u> Integration of co-funded data of effect markers into the data platform for aligned studies	Yes 1.2 PM * 8,000 € = 9,600 €
	10	Data protection and ICT support	Yes < 200 000 €
	11	Sample analysis of feasibility study	Yes n/a
	14	Proper implementation of foreseen budget neutral shifts	No n/a

Time	Item No.	Topic			
		15	Analysis of mixtures in existing data sets (2 more partners) 6 PMs 2020, 1 PM 2021, small amount of ODC	Yes	65,000 €
		15	Joint survey > Possible shift of PMs from 19 to 20	No	n/a
		-	Costs for open access publications?	n/a	n/a
		<p><sup>1</sup> This entry was listed to be added to the working list during the decision on the inclusion of UV-filters into the aligned studies (item 14).</p> <p>UBA informed that if resources cannot be allocated yet, it is also possible to create an Additional Deliverable to be prepared for the beginning of the year which includes the detailed, clearly described activity description and resource allocation to partners. This Additional Deliverable complements the respective Annual Work Plan which means that the work can only start after it has been approved by the EC.</p>			
11:00 – 11:20		Coffee Break			
11:20 – 11:45	11	<p><b>Annual Work Plan 2020/2021 (continued)</b></p> <p>The MB further discussed the requirements raised by partners from Switzerland. WPL10 offered to get into contact to clarify requirements across the involved WPs. This might result in changes to the AWP.</p> <p>With regard to the resources per partner for the analysis of the 2<sup>nd</sup> list of prioritised substances, it was discussed that it is not clear yet which partner will perform analysis (and therefore require the resources) and which one will not. UBA's financial officer stated that the best option would be to keep the resources in the budget for now. If partners that have resources allocated do not perform analysis after all, the resources can be shifted to different partners.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> The MB unanimously approved the current version of the AWP 2020 and the draft AWP 2021 to be sent to the Governing Board, with the conditions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) That the topics on the working list will be integrated as soon as possible, but only after prior MB approval.</li> <li>2) That the consolidated budget calculation that will be provided by UBA on 16 September shows that all activities planned for in the AWP2020 and the draft AWP2021 do not exceed the maximum EU contribution.</li> </ol> <p>The MB also accepted the proposed shortened deadline for the approval of the consolidated budget.</p>			

Time	Item No.	Topic
11:45 – 11:52	12	<p><b>Distribution of resources related to the joint survey (Mirjam Luijten)</b></p> <p>In order to obtain insight into the exposure of pesticide mixtures across Europe, a joint survey, entitled ‘SPECIMEn’, will be held in six countries (Task 15.2). AD15.7 describes the details of the approach and the methods used, but it does not specify the distribution of resources over the various partners involved. The purpose of the attached decision memo is to provide details on the partners and the budget, to allow for allocation of the resources to the various partners.</p> <p><b>Please note:</b> The MB decided in November 2018 that the maximum amount will be 1 Mio Euro (200.000 per partner). The MB agreed (12 yes, 1 no) that the Joint Survey on pesticides should be carried out with 5 countries as proposed in the decision memo. The financial details need to be specified for the 5 countries involved to be able to include this in the AWP2019 (written decision).</p> <p><b>Budget implications:</b> Please see tables 1-4 in the attached decision memo provided by WPL15.</p> <p><b>Decision proposal:</b> The MB is asked to decide on the distribution of resources needed for the joint survey of exposure to pesticide mixtures.</p> <p>WPL15 gave an overview of the joint survey. The details of the survey are described in AD15.7. The foreseen budget will be 1 Mio. €.</p> <p>There were differences between the budget estimations provided by WP15 and UBA. This was explained by WP15 calculating with the exact costs per person and UBA with the average values per institution.</p> <p>The Coordinator emphasised that the participating partners have made the self-binding decision to stay within the foreseen 200,000 € per partner institution.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> The MB approved the proposed DM unanimously.</p>
11:53 – 12:22	13	<p><b>Implementation of Mycotoxins analysis in the aligned studies of task 8.1 (Liese Gilles)</b></p> <p>During the MB meeting in January 2019 the MB concluded that there was not enough interest from the aligned studies to make a proposal for the implementation of mycotoxin analysis. This was due to a lack of interest from Northern European countries. The CGLs’ of Mycotoxins found out that there is interest in Northern Europe from Iceland to analyse the Mycotoxins. Therefore, WPL8 presents a</p>

Time	Item No.	Topic
		<p>proposal for the implementation of Mycotoxins in the aligned studies in adults.</p> <p><b>Budget implications:</b> 149.500 - 282.900 Euro</p> <p><b>Decision proposal:</b> The MB is asked to discuss the implementation of Mycotoxin analysis in the aligned studies.</p> <p>VITO as Task Leader of 8.1 gave an overview including the proposal to analyse DON in adults within the aligned studies.</p> <p>The MB discussed the requirements for QA/QC for these substances and the respective biomarkers to be analysed, the inclusion of countries and European representativeness of the proposal and the age group to be targeted.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> The MB agreed unanimously to the proposed DM under the following conditions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) That there is at least 1 country from each of the four geographic regions agreeing to analyse samples or share data with regard to the analysis of Mycotoxins in the aligned studies (Task Lead 8.1 checks which countries will participate)</li> <li>2) That Task Lead 8.1 will ask CGL and WP9 experts to check the feasibility again to include Fumonisin as a biomarker as well.</li> </ol>
12:22 – 13:20		<i>Lunch Break</i>
13:20 – 13:50	14	<p><b>Implementation of UV-filters in aligned studies or SPECIMEn study of WP15 (Ovnair Sepai/Liese Gilles)</b></p> <p>The MB discussed the implementation of analysis of second set priority chemicals in the aligned studies in January when a proposal for the implementation of analysis of UV-filters in the aligned studies targeting teenagers was presented. The MB asked the WPL to “add scientific justification for the selection of age groups. Exposure to UV filters may be more relevant for children (scientific background? Cfr. A. Calafat).”</p> <p>During the MB in May a revised proposal was presented including the possibilities in all 3 age groups based on the input we received from the aligned studies and information we received from the chemical group leader (Tamar Berman).</p> <p>Feedback from the MB on this proposal was to check for the available data which metabolites are available, gather more details about the needs/interest of the regulatory agencies (ECHA/EFSA) and/or other stakeholders in terms of UV-filter exposure data, check</p>

Time	Item No.	Topic																																																																
		<p>the seasonal coverage of the available samples, and revise the cost estimation (supported by WP9)</p> <p>The requested information has been collected and a revised proposal is presented. Since children are brought forward as “population of concern” in terms of UV-filter exposure and the aligned studies in children have expressed little interest in analysing UV-filters (see results in Appendix of the DM), WP8 proposes a second option which is to analyse UV-filters in the samples of the SPECIMEn study.</p> <p><b>Budget implications:</b> Rough estimates</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">Option 1: Implementing analysis of UV-filters (benzophenones) in aligned studies in teenagers and/or adults.</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Age group</th> <th>Chemical analysis</th> <th>WP</th> <th>PM per partner</th> <th>PM total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="3">Teenagers</td> <td rowspan="3">€84.000 – 300.000</td> <td>8</td> <td>2.5PM</td> <td>10 PM</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10</td> <td>1PM</td> <td>4 PM</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10</td> <td></td> <td>3 PM</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="3">Adults</td> <td rowspan="3">€105.000 – 375.000</td> <td>8</td> <td>2.5PM</td> <td>12.5 PM</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10</td> <td>1PM</td> <td>5 PM</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10</td> <td></td> <td>3 PM</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="3">Teenagers + Adults</td> <td rowspan="3">€189.000 – 675.000</td> <td>8</td> <td>2.5PM</td> <td>22.5 PM</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10</td> <td>1PM</td> <td>9 PM</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10</td> <td></td> <td>6 PM</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">Option 2: Implementing analysis of UV-filters (benzophenones) in samples of the SPECIMEn study</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Age group</th> <th>Chemical analysis</th> <th>WP</th> <th>PM per partner</th> <th>PM total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="3">SPECIMEn (children + adults)</td> <td rowspan="3">€140.000 – 500.000</td> <td>8</td> <td>2.5PM</td> <td>12.5 PM</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10</td> <td>1PM</td> <td>5 PM</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10</td> <td></td> <td>3 PM</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Decision proposal:</b> The MB is asked to decide on the implementation of analysis of UV-filters in the aligned studies or the SPECIMEn study.</p> <p>VITO as Task Leader of 8.1 gave a short overview of the decision proposal. The two options were discussed briefly.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> The MB decided in favour of Option 1 (Option 1 (aligned studies): 10 votes; Option 2: 2 votes; 1 abstention). In a second step, the following conditions for the approval of Option 1 were adopted with 12 votes (WPL14 was absent):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) At least 1 country from each of the four geographic regions agrees to analyse samples or share data with regard to the analysis of UV-filters in the aligned studies</li> </ol>	Option 1: Implementing analysis of UV-filters (benzophenones) in aligned studies in teenagers and/or adults.					Age group	Chemical analysis	WP	PM per partner	PM total	Teenagers	€84.000 – 300.000	8	2.5PM	10 PM	10	1PM	4 PM	10		3 PM	Adults	€105.000 – 375.000	8	2.5PM	12.5 PM	10	1PM	5 PM	10		3 PM	Teenagers + Adults	€189.000 – 675.000	8	2.5PM	22.5 PM	10	1PM	9 PM	10		6 PM	Option 2: Implementing analysis of UV-filters (benzophenones) in samples of the SPECIMEn study					Age group	Chemical analysis	WP	PM per partner	PM total	SPECIMEn (children + adults)	€140.000 – 500.000	8	2.5PM	12.5 PM	10	1PM	5 PM	10		3 PM
Option 1: Implementing analysis of UV-filters (benzophenones) in aligned studies in teenagers and/or adults.																																																																		
Age group	Chemical analysis	WP	PM per partner	PM total																																																														
Teenagers	€84.000 – 300.000	8	2.5PM	10 PM																																																														
		10	1PM	4 PM																																																														
		10		3 PM																																																														
Adults	€105.000 – 375.000	8	2.5PM	12.5 PM																																																														
		10	1PM	5 PM																																																														
		10		3 PM																																																														
Teenagers + Adults	€189.000 – 675.000	8	2.5PM	22.5 PM																																																														
		10	1PM	9 PM																																																														
		10		6 PM																																																														
Option 2: Implementing analysis of UV-filters (benzophenones) in samples of the SPECIMEn study																																																																		
Age group	Chemical analysis	WP	PM per partner	PM total																																																														
SPECIMEn (children + adults)	€140.000 – 500.000	8	2.5PM	12.5 PM																																																														
		10	1PM	5 PM																																																														
		10		3 PM																																																														

Time	Item No.	Topic
		<p>2) One age group will be included for the UV filters, preferably adults. If adults cannot be included, adolescents can be considered.</p> <p>VITO will contact CGL to make a proposal for the selection of metabolites, 2-3 expert labs will be identified. Potentially interested countries need to accept participation under these circumstances.</p>
13:50 – 14:23	15	<p><b>Interpretation and communication of the HBM4EU results (Greet Schoeters)</b></p> <p>During the telco on 28 August 2019, it was discussed that a joint approach how to interpret and communicate HBM4EU results to stakeholders, agencies and other target groups should be discussed. First ideas shall be discussed with the MB.</p> <p>PL1 presented some first ideas for the mapping of potential points in study timeline that could be used for communication of first results to different target groups. Potential points could be the aggregation of data at national level, the aggregation of data at EU level, the submission and approval of the full analysis report, and peer-reviewed publication. The points in study timeline have to be distinguished for the studies in HBM4EU (e.g. existing studies, aligned studies, time-trend analysis). PL1 showed a table listing up these points for each study.</p> <p>However, the full analysis report is planned to be approved in Q4 of 2021 and peer reviewed publications including the data will be also only available by then. First, this makes communication activities difficult due to the end of the project. Second the availability of data might be expected at an earlier stage of time. This leads to the question if it needs to be waited until the end to inform stakeholders about the results. In discussion, the MB pointed out that a joint approach and rules for interpretation and communication of results will be essential. It was discussed that first results could also be shared with policy makers and stakeholders under a non-disclosure agreement. The expectations from agencies to have access to data as soon as possible was also brought up as a noteworthy point for consideration, as well as the expectations from the participating countries (who fund 50% of the sampling/analysis costs) to receive data first.</p> <p>It was pointed out that HBM4EU has created a lot of expectations for stakeholders of different kinds and that it is important now to be in dialogue with stakeholders and policy makers about the time schedule for results release.</p> <p><u>First conclusions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ VITO will contact study PIs to collect restrictions with regard to data sharing from national study owners, including partners participating in the aligned studies, occupational studies and time-trend analysis.</li> </ul>



Time	Item No.	Topic
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ A small working group with involved WPL will be created. Members are WPL2 and PL1, perhaps others.</li> </ul> <p>During the content meeting of the upcoming MB meeting in November 2019, this topic is foreseen to be discussed again.</p>
14:24 – 14:45	16	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p><b>Change in WP10 deliverables (Greet Schoeters)</b></p> <p>For WP10, the deliverable D10.10 (Draft statistical analysis plan for each substance group for 3rd set of substances) and deliverable D10.12 (Final statistical analysis plan for each substance group) should be discarded. Instead, VITO proposes to have the additional deliverables AD10.1 (Statistical analysis plan for the aligned studies of task 8.1 and time trend analysis of task 8.2). As there are plans to have also effect markers measured and health data obtained in the aligned studies, the additional deliverable AD10.2 “Update statistical analysis plan or the aligned studies including the strategy to connect to effect markers and health data” is proposed as well to describe the statistical analysis plans for these data.</p> <p><b>Decision proposal:</b> The Management Board is asked to decide upon the change of the scope of the work for WP 10, namely the removal of the deliverables D10.10 and D10.12 and the introduction of additional deliverables 10.1 and 10.2</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> The MB agreed unanimously to the proposed DM.</p> <p><b>Conferences:</b></p> <p>The Coordinator reminded the MB to send information about conference attendance to WP2 (Joana). Planned conference attendance as well as invitations have been shared with the MB. WPL12 agreed to present HBM4EU and the modelling activities of WP12 at the DTU High Tech Summit 2019 on 30 and 31 October 2019.</p>
14:45 – 15:00		<i>Coffee Break</i>
15:00 – 17:00	--	<p><b>Content Meeting - EEA work on environmental monitoring on HBM4EU priority substances</b></p> <p>Presentation of the current work on environmental monitoring on HBM4EU priority substances at EEA by EEA staff.</p>

**Attendance 5 September 2019:**

WP	Partner	First Name	Name
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	Denis	Sarigiannis
13	MU	Ludek	Blaha
14	UGR	Marieta	Fernandez
15	RIVM	Mirjam	Luijten
16	INRA	Jean-Philippe	Antignac
	MU	Ludek	Blaha
	ISCI3	Marta	Esteban
	VITO	Liese	Gilles
	EEA	Joana	Lobo Vicente
	UBA	Kim	Pack
	UBA	Lena	Reiber
	INSERM	Elena	Tarroja
	EEA	Xenia	Trier, <i>joined 17:15</i>

**Attendance 6 September 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	<i>Castaño, left 13:30</i>
11	THL	Hanna	Tolonen
12	AUTH	Denis	Sarigiannis
13	MU	Ludek	Blaha
14	UGR	Marieta	Fernandez
15	RIVM	Mirjam	Luijten
16	INRA	Jean-Philippe	Antignac
	MU	Ludek	Blaha
	ISCI3	Marta	Esteban
	VITO	Liese	Gilles
	EEA	Joana	Lobo Vicente
	UBA	Birgit	Puppe
	UBA	Kim	Pack
	UBA	Lena	Reiber
	INSERM	Elena	Tarroja