Question for written answer E-000298/2015
to the Commission
Rule 130
Eleonora Evi (EFDD), Laura Ferrara (EFDD), Marco Affronte (EFDD), Marco Zullo (EFDD), Tiziana Beghin (EFDD), Marco Valli (EFDD), Isabella Adinolfi (EFDD), Marco Zanni (EFDD), Dario Tamburrano (EFDD), Piernicola Pedicini (EFDD), Fabio Massimo Castaldo (EFDD) and Ignazio Corrao (EFDD)

Subject: Methods of toxicological evaluation constituting alternatives to animal testing

On 5 May 2014, the British Medical Journal published an article entitled 'Is Animal Research Sufficiently Evidence-Based to be a Cornerstone of Biomedical Research?' questioning the need for animal testing aimed at preventing diseases among humans. In the US, the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS), the National Human Genome Research Institute (NHGRI) and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) are already applying the indications contained in the programme of the US National Research Council (NRC) entitled '**Toxicity** Testing in the **21st Century'**.

A toxicogenomics programme could enable thousands of substances to be tested more rapidly and with predictive reliability indices far higher than those obtained using the traditional and ineffective method of animal testing.

In the light of the above, will the Commission call on the European Chemicals Agency to ensure the successful adoption of alternatives to animal testing for the toxicological evaluation of the chemical substances provided for in Regulation 1907/2006? Will it make similar recommendations to the European Medicines Agency with the dual purpose of avoiding unnecessary cruelty to animals and reducing the risk of harmful and unpredictable side-effects resulting from animal testing?