

Abstracts: Oral Presentation

The honey bee colony can provide four main matrices for environmental monitoring: bees, honey, pollen and wax. Because of the non-destructive remit of the project, for pesticides, pollen is the focal matrix and used as trapped pollen and beebread in this study. Although beeswax can be used as a passive sampler for pesticides, this matrix is not being used in INSIGNIA because of its polarity dependent absorbance, which limits the required wide range of pesticides to be monitored. Alternatively, two innovative non-biological matrices are being tested: i) the “Beehold tube”, a tube lined with the generic absorbent polyethylene-glycol PEG, through which hive-entering bees are forced to pass, and ii) the “APIStrip” (Absorbing Pesticides In-hive Strips) with a specific pesticide absorbent which is hung between the bee combs.

Beebread and pollen collected in pollen traps are being sampled every two weeks to be analysed for pesticide residues and to record foraging conditions. Trapped pollen provides snapshots of the foraging conditions and contaminants on a single day. During the active season, the majority of beebread is consumed within days, so beebread provides recent, random sampling results. The Beehold tube and the APIStrips are present throughout the 2-weeks sampling periods in the beehive, absorbing and accumulating the incoming contaminants. The four matrices (*i.e.*, trapped pollen, beebread, Beehold tube and APIStrips) will be analysed for the presence of pesticides. The botanical origin of trapped pollen, beebread and pollen in the Beehold tubes will also be determined with an innovative molecular technique. Data on pollen and pesticide presence will then be combined to obtain information on foraging conditions and pesticide use, together with evaluation of the CORINE database for land use and pesticide legislation to model the exposure risks to honey bees and wild bees. All monitoring steps from sampling through to analysis will be studied and rigorously tested in four countries in Year 1, and the best practices will then be ring-tested in nine countries in Year 2. Information about the course of the project, its results and publications will be available on the INSIGNIA website www.insignia-bee.eu and via social media: on Facebook (<https://www.facebook.com/insigniabee.eu/>); Instagram ([insignia_bee](https://www.instagram.com/insignia_bee/)); and Twitter ([insignia_bee](https://twitter.com/insignia_bee)). Although the analyses of pesticide residues and pollen identification will not be completed until December 2019, in my talk I will present preliminary results of the Year 1 sampling.

5.5 Report of the activities of the ICP-PR Bee Brood Working Group

Matthew J. Allan, Markus Barth, Roland Becker, Sigrun Bocksch, Magdaléna Cornement, Jakob H. Eckert, Hervé Giffard, Bettina Hodapp, Lukas Jeker, Stefan Kimmel, Johannes Lückmann, Markus Persigehl, Ed Pilling, Natalie Ruddle, Rastislav Sabo, Christof Schneider, Stephan Schmitzer, Maryam Sultan, Verena Tänzler, Selwyn Wilkins

ICP-PR Bee Brood Working Group (WG)

Co-Chairs: Verena Tänzler (Ibacon), Lukas Jeker (Agroscope) and Selwyn Wilkins (Fera)

DOI 10.5073/jka.2020.465.038

Abstract

The ICP-PR Bee Brood Working Group (WG) was founded at the 9th Symposium held at York, UK, in 2005. It was chaired by Roland Becker (BASF) until the 13th Symposium in 2017 in Valencia, Spain; the WG is currently chaired by Verena Tänzler (Ibacon), Lukas Jeker (Agroscope) and Selwyn Wilkins (Fera). The first WG meeting following Valencia was held in Amsterdam in March 2018. The first task was to identify WG priorities given recent regulatory developments and data requirements on higher-tier bee brood studies *i.e.* semi-field and field testing. The aim was to continue the previous work of the group toward improving and harmonizing the OECD 75¹ and Oomen *et al.* 1992² methods. A full review of the available test methods was undertaken, looking at the strengths and limitations of the semi-field and full-field brood testing methods. Additionally, one of the major issues noted was lack of a clear structure or guidance for progressing through the testing methods and under what circumstances should a particular test be considered? Based on this initial meeting and discussions, three subgroups were formed each working separately on their tasks and coming together at joint WG meetings to discuss their progress.

1. Conceptual Framework sub-group (Maryam Sultan - Bayer)

Tasked by the WG to develop a conceptual framework (road map) in which OECD 75 and the Oomen *et al.* tests (both original and modified) may be improved and where the methods can be applied most effectively. A draft has been produced.

2. OECD75 revision sub-group: (Verena Tänzler – Ibacon)

To review the OECD 75 method and to identify possible amendments to OECD Guidance Document (GD), and address issues associated with meeting validity criteria. Based on other

Abstracts: Oral Presentation

guidance documents, the subgroup determined that there is sufficiently new information (e.g., inclusion of new photographic methodologies) to recommend a revised OECD GD. The subgroup elected to present their thoughts and findings to ICP-PR and seek feedback.

3. Oomen de Reuter_sub-group (Johannes Lückmann – RIFCON)

To expand improve the method based upon recent developments (e.g., including recommendations of ICPPR Bee Brood WG and papers of Lückmann and Schmitzer 2019³ and AG Bienenschutz).

Literatur

OECD. 2007. Guidance document on the honey bee (*Apis mellifera* L.) brood test under semi-field conditions. Series on Testing and Assessment No. 75. ENV/JM/MONO(2007)22

² OOMEN, P. A. A. DE RUIJTER AND J. VAN DER STEEN. 1992. Method for honey bee brood feeding tests with insect growth-regulating insecticides. Bul OEPP/EPPO Bulletin 22: 613 – 616.

³ LÜCKMANN, J. AND S. SCHMITZER. 2019. The Oomen bee brood test—revision of the method to current needs and developments. Bulletin OEPP 49(1): 137 – 146. <https://doi.org/10.1111/epp.12553>