Amendment 36
Anthea McIntyre
on behalf of the ECR Group

Report
Norbert Lins, Bart Staes
Union’s authorisation procedure for pesticides
(2018/2153(INI))

Motion for a resolution
Recital BG

Motion for a resolution
Amendment

BG. whereas it was unfortunately not deleted
possible to resolve this controversy in the Special Committee;

Or. en
Recital BI

Motion for a resolution

 whereas the so-called Monsanto Papers and the recent judgment by the Superior Court of the State of California in case Dewayne Johnson v Monsanto (case No CGC-16-550128) and subsequent appeal have raised concerns about the independence and conflicts of interest in the evaluation process of glyphosate;
Amendment 38
Anthea McIntyre
on behalf of the ECR Group

Report
Norbert Lins, Bart Staes
Union’s authorisation procedure for pesticides (2018/2153(INI))

Motion for a resolution
Recital BK

Motion for a resolution

BK. whereas the decision to renew the approval of glyphosate did not contain legally binding risk mitigation measures at Union level; whereas the Commission decided to adopt a specific recommendation in the approval conditions that Member States, when granting authorisations for glyphosate-containing plant protection products, should pay particular attention to the risk to terrestrial vertebrates; whereas a high long-term risk was found for almost all uses of glyphosate for non-target terrestrial vertebrates, including mammals and birds;

Amendment

BK. whereas the decision to renew the approval of glyphosate did not contain legally binding risk mitigation measures at Union level, while the Commission decided to adopt a specific provision in the approval conditions that Member States, when granting authorisations for glyphosate-containing plant protection products, must pay particular attention to the risk to terrestrial vertebrates; whereas a high long-term risk was found for almost all uses of glyphosate for non-target terrestrial vertebrates, including mammals and birds, which were, however, not identified as a critical concern in the EFSA conclusions, because the assessment in line with Article 4(5) of the Regulation deduced for at least one of the representative uses that the risk was expected to be low;

Or. en
Motion for a resolution
Recital BL

Motion for a resolution

BL. whereas ECHA concluded that glyphosate causes serious eye damage and is toxic to aquatic life with long-lasting effects;

Amendment

deleted

Or. en
Amendment 40
Anthea McIntyre
on behalf of the ECR Group

Report
Norbert Lins, Bart Staes
Union’s authorisation procedure for pesticides (2018/2153(INI))

Motion for a resolution
Recital BM

Motion for a resolution

BM. whereas it is not clear under what conditions the Commission and the Member States consider a risk to be unacceptable for the environment;

Amendment

BM. whereas the European Court of Justice, in its ruling in Case T-257/07, states that ‘In determining the level of risk deemed unacceptable for society, the institutions are bound by their obligation to ensure a high level of protection of public health, safety and the environment. That high level of protection does not necessarily, in order to be compatible with that provision, have to be the highest that is technically possible. Moreover, those institutions may not take a purely hypothetical approach to risk and may not base their decisions on a “zero risk”’;

Or. en
Motion for a resolution
Recital BN

Motion for a resolution
Amendment

BN. whereas the fact that the deleted
Commission, with the support of the
Member States, approves active
substances found by EFSA to pose high
risks to the environment and biodiversity
is a concern, given that according to
Article 4(3)(e) of the Regulation a plant
protection product must have no
unacceptable effects on the environment;

Or. en
Amendment 42
Anthea McIntyre
on behalf of the ECR Group

Report
Norbert Lins, Bart Staes
Union’s authorisation procedure for pesticides
(2018/2153(INI))

Motion for a resolution
Recital BO

Motion for a resolution

BO. whereas the European Ombudsman, in her decision in case 12/2013/MDC of 18 February 2016, stated that submission of confirmatory information should not concern data requirements which existed at the time of the submission of the application in relation to the assessment of risks to health and for which adequate guidance documents were available;

Amendment

BO. whereas the European Ombudsman, in her decision in case 12/2013/MDC of 18 February 2016, took note of the Commission’s statement that submission of confirmatory information should not concern data requirements which existed at the time of the submission of the application in relation to the assessment of risks to health and for which adequate guidance documents were available;

Or. en
Amendment 43
Anthea McIntyre
on behalf of the ECR Group

Report
Norbert Lins, Bart Staes
Union’s authorisation procedure for pesticides
(2018/2153(INI))

Motion for a resolution
Recital BP

Motion for a resolution Amendment

BP. whereas confirmatory data are deleted
 generally not subject to the same scientific scrutiny or assessment as data submitted in the original application as they are not subjected systematically to an EFSA peer review; whereas the European Ombudsman, in her 2016 decision, invited the Commission to consider whether, from now on, all confirmatory information should be systematically subject to an EFSA peer review and whether the guidance documents should be amended accordingly;

Or. en
9.1.2019

Amendment 44
Anthea McIntyre
on behalf of the ECR Group

Report
Norbert Lins, Bart Staes
Union’s authorisation procedure for pesticides
(2018/2153(INI))

Motion for a resolution
Recital BQ

Motion for a resolution
Amendment

BQ. whereas, based on the follow-up report submitted by the Commission in February 2018 with regard to ten active substances examined in the context of the Ombudsman’s inquiry, the confirmatory data procedure has led to two active substances, haloxyfop-P and malathion, that would otherwise have been restricted, remaining on the market for an extended period of time;

Or. en
Amendment 45
Anthea McIntyre
on behalf of the ECR Group

Report
Norbert Lins, Bart Staes
Union’s authorisation procedure for pesticides (2018/2153(INI))

Motion for a resolution
Recital BS

Motion for a resolution

BS. whereas despite the risks identified by EFSA in its conclusions on active substances, the Commission often leaves risk mitigation measures to the Member States, notwithstanding the possibility granted to it under the Regulation to impose them at EU level; whereas this approach was condemned by the European Ombudsman in her decision in case 12/2013/MDC;

Amendment

BS. whereas risks are identified by EFSA in its conclusions on active substances, but the Commission often leaves risk mitigation measures to the Member States, which have expertise relevant to country-specific needs, notwithstanding the possibility granted to it under the Regulation to impose them at EU level; whereas this approach was condemned by the European Ombudsman in her decision in case 12/2013/MDC; whereas the Ombudsman declared that her understanding is that the exact definition of mitigation measures should be left to national authorities, in an acknowledgement that this is the most appropriate level for ensuring that such measures are adapted to specific land, soil and climate conditions and local agricultural practices;

Or. en