

9.1.2019

A8-0475/26

Amendment 26

Anthea McIntyre

on behalf of the ECR Group

Report

Norbert Lins, Bart Staes

Union's authorisation procedure for pesticides
(2018/2153(INI))

A8-0475/2018

Motion for a resolution

Recital AN a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

ANa. whereas the burden of proof should remain on the applicant, so as to ensure that public money is not spent on studies which could eventually benefit private interests; whereas, at the same time, transparency must be ensured at each step of the authorisation procedure, in full compliance with intellectual property rights, while it must also be ensured that good laboratory principles are consistently upheld throughout the Union;

Or. en

9.1.2019

A8-0475/27

Amendment 27

Anthea McIntyre

on behalf of the ECR Group

Report

Norbert Lins, Bart Staes

Union's authorisation procedure for pesticides
(2018/2153(INI))

A8-0475/2018

Motion for a resolution

Recital AO

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

AO. whereas concern has been raised by several stakeholders concerning the evaluation approach as established by law, and in particular over who should produce the scientific studies and evidence for the evaluation of active substances, who should provide scientific peer-reviewed literature and who should assess the studies;

deleted

Or. en

9.1.2019

A8-0475/28

Amendment 28

Anthea McIntyre

on behalf of the ECR Group

Report

Norbert Lins, Bart Staes

Union's authorisation procedure for pesticides
(2018/2153(INI))

A8-0475/2018

Motion for a resolution

Recital AW

Motion for a resolution

AW. whereas it has been found that different Member States, when acting as RMS, use different practices when it comes to referencing the applicant's summaries of peer-reviewed literature; ***whereas it is a fundamental rule that any scientific work should clearly indicate statements made by others by using quotation marks;***

Amendment

AW. whereas it has been found that different Member States, when acting as RMS, use different practices when it comes to referencing the applicant's summaries of peer-reviewed literature; ***whereas each practice is consistent with the obligations of the RMSs, namely to check the information provided by the applicant and, where relevant, to correct and amend the information, based upon a critical analysis; whereas EFSA has confirmed that there are no requirements that prevent the RMSs from incorporating text directly into the Draft Assessment Report (DAR) where the RMSs concur with the summary or evaluation;***

Or. en

9.1.2019

A8-0475/29

Amendment 29

Anthea McIntyre

on behalf of the ECR Group

Report

Norbert Lins, Bart Staes

Union's authorisation procedure for pesticides
(2018/2153(INI))

A8-0475/2018

Motion for a resolution

Recital AW

Motion for a resolution

AX. whereas Parliament acknowledges *the debate over* the literature review in the risk assessment report on glyphosate by the German Federal Institute for Risk Assessment (BfR); whereas *concerns have been raised by several stakeholders that important assessment elements in* the draft risk assessment report *on glyphosate were taken from* the application, *without being clearly indicated as references*;

Amendment

AX. whereas Parliament acknowledges *misunderstandings raised by some invited panellists regarding* the literature review in the risk assessment report on glyphosate by the German Federal Institute for Risk Assessment (BfR); whereas *Parliament is satisfied with the lengthy and repeated explanations given by the responsible national authority and European regulatory agencies that the BfR has compiled* the draft assessment report *(DAR) in line with standard procedure, which allows the RMS, after checking the information provided and given it concurs with the summary or evaluation, to incorporate parts of* the application *directly into the DAR*;

Or. en

9.1.2019

A8-0475/30

Amendment 30

Anthea McIntyre

on behalf of the ECR Group

Report

Norbert Lins, Bart Staes

Union's authorisation procedure for pesticides
(2018/2153(INI))

A8-0475/2018

Motion for a resolution

Recital AY

Motion for a resolution

AY. whereas the credibility of the Union authorisation system for plant protection products strongly depends on public trust in EFSA, which provides the scientific opinions that are the basis for decisions with regard to food safety in Europe;
whereas the decreasing public trust in EFSA is a concern;

Amendment

AY. whereas the credibility of the Union authorisation system for plant protection products strongly depends on public trust in EFSA, which provides the scientific opinions that are the basis for decisions with regard to food safety in Europe;

Or. en

9.1.2019

A8-0475/31

Amendment 31

Anthea McIntyre

on behalf of the ECR Group

Report

Norbert Lins, Bart Staes

Union's authorisation procedure for pesticides
(2018/2153(INI))

A8-0475/2018

Motion for a resolution

Recital AY a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

AYa. whereas EFSA's continuous efforts to improve its system to ensure independence and the management of potential conflicts of interest were praised by the Court of Auditors, which deemed that system – updated as recently as June 2017 – the most advanced of all the agencies audited in 2012;

Or. en

9.1.2019

A8-0475/32

Amendment 32

Anthea McIntyre

on behalf of the ECR Group

Report

Norbert Lins, Bart Staes

Union's authorisation procedure for pesticides
(2018/2153(INI))

A8-0475/2018

Motion for a resolution

Recital BB

Motion for a resolution

BB. whereas the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) classified glyphosate as probably carcinogenic to humans (Group 2A) according to its nomenclature (equivalent to category 1B in Regulation (EC) No 1272/2008); whereas ***after reviewing the available information, including the IARC assessment, EFSA and ECHA***, the European agencies responsible for providing scientific assessments ***which form the basis*** for EU risk management decisions, ***concluded that no classification as carcinogenic was warranted pursuant to the provisions of*** Regulation (EC) No 1272/2008;

Amendment

BB. whereas the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) classified glyphosate as probably carcinogenic to humans (Group 2A) according to its nomenclature (equivalent to category 1B in Regulation (EC) No 1272/2008), ***which is not established as a basis for regulatory decision-making***; whereas the European agencies responsible for providing scientific assessments ***relevant to*** EU risk management decisions, ***EFSA and ECHA, after reviewing all available information including the IARC assessment, drew the following conclusion: 'glyphosate is unlikely to pose a carcinogenic hazard to humans and the evidence does not support classification with regard to its carcinogenic potential according to*** Regulation (EC) No 1272/2008';

Or. en

9.1.2019

A8-0475/33

Amendment 33

Anthea McIntyre

on behalf of the ECR Group

Report

Norbert Lins, Bart Staes

Union's authorisation procedure for pesticides
(2018/2153(INI))

A8-0475/2018

Motion for a resolution

Recital BB a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

BBa. whereas the preamble to each IARC Monograph states that ‘no recommendation is given with regard to regulation or legislation, which are the responsibility of individual governments or other international organisations’; whereas IARC classifications and assessments by third countries’ competent authorities play no formal role in the Union’s decision-making process;

Or. en

9.1.2019

A8-0475/34

Amendment 34

Anthea McIntyre

on behalf of the ECR Group

Report

Norbert Lins, Bart Staes

Union's authorisation procedure for pesticides
(2018/2153(INI))

A8-0475/2018

Motion for a resolution

Recital BD

Motion for a resolution

BD. whereas several other competent authorities around the world, including those of the US, Canada, New Zealand, Australia and Japan, have subsequently finalised new assessments of glyphosate and **concluded** that it is not carcinogenic; whereas glyphosate is still under review by the US Environmental Protection Agency, whose draft ecological risk assessment clearly states that there is potential for effects on birds, mammals, and terrestrial and aquatic plants;

Amendment

BD. whereas several other competent authorities around the world, including those of the US, Canada, New Zealand, Australia and Japan, have subsequently finalised new assessments of glyphosate and **are in agreement with the assessment carried out by EFSA concluding** that it is not carcinogenic; whereas glyphosate is still under review by the US Environmental Protection Agency, whose draft ecological risk assessment clearly states that there is potential for effects on birds, mammals, and terrestrial and aquatic plants;

Or. en

9.1.2019

A8-0475/35

Amendment 35

Anthea McIntyre

on behalf of the ECR Group

Report

Norbert Lins, Bart Staes

Union's authorisation procedure for pesticides
(2018/2153(INI))

A8-0475/2018

Motion for a resolution

Recital BF

Motion for a resolution

BF. whereas *concern has been and is still being raised by several stakeholders* over the opinions by EFSA and ECHA concerning their conclusions in favour of not classifying glyphosate as carcinogenic;

Amendment

BF. whereas *despite the broad consensus of competent authorities across the globe, some stakeholder groups still raise concerns* over the opinions by EFSA and ECHA concerning their conclusions in favour of not classifying glyphosate as carcinogenic; *whereas those concerns were raised in the presence of EFSA and ECHA, who in turn provided a reasoned explanation of their conclusions;*

Or. en