

- 1-1999 Kristensen, M., A. Spencer and J. B. Jespersen: Biochemical and toxicological analysis of CGA-293 in susceptible and resistant strains of the housefly *Musca domestica*, 24 pp.
- 2-1999 Kristensen, M. and J. B. Jespersen: Larvicidal efficacy of CGA-293 in tests with two susceptible strains of the housefly *Musca domestica*, 6 pp.
- 3-1999 Larvicidal efficacy of dicyclanil in tests with two susceptible strains of the housefly *Musca domestica*, 6 pp.
- 4-1999 Lauridsen, M. K., J. B. Jespersen and M. Kristensen: Field evaluation of Fipronil Fly-bait Gel for control of the housefly *Musca domestica*, 34 pp.
- 5-1999 Kristensen, M. and J. B. Jespersen: Larvicidal efficacy of dicyclanil in tests with three resistant strains of the housefly *Musca domestica*. (9 pp.)
- 6-1999 Jespersen, J. B. and M. K. Lauridsen: Laboratory evaluation of NAF granular formulations for control of the housefly *Musca domestica*, 14 pp.

16. Evaluation of the efficacy of pesticides

16.1 Formulations submitted for registration

According to the Danish Act on Chemical Substances and Products (No. 424 of 10 June, 1997), the registration of a new pesticide formulation requires documentation of the efficacy of the formulation used according to the directions on the label and under Danish conditions. The National Agency of Environmental Protection makes decisions on registration concerned with the control of the pest in question, but the Agency sends the applications to a hearing at the national laboratories, e.g. the DPIL or the Plant Protection Centre. These institutes evaluate the efficacy and possible risks and drawbacks of using the formulation, including the potential for developing resistance and cross-resistance (see Annual Report 1982, p.102).

In 1998, pesticides submitted for evaluation and registration included formulations for control of rodents and various insects, such as houseflies and flies on cattle, fleas, ectoparasites on livestock, ants, cockroaches, storage pests, and household insects generally, as well as insects attacking wood or textiles. We recommended that several formulations be approved, but in some cases we concluded that more documentation was needed, supplementary tests should be carried out, or we recommended that the formulation should for certain reasons not be permitted for the use requested. The registration authorities generally followed our recommendations.

In 1998 we received, as usual, a steady stream of drafts of new pesticide labels submitted to the National Agency of Environmental Protection for approval. In many cases we suggested or required changes in the directions for use.