

**Question for written answer E-007424/2015
to the Commission**

Rule 130

Lidia Senra Rodríguez (GUE/NGL)

Subject: Systematic aerial spraying authorised by the Spanish Government

Article 9 of Directive 2009/128/EC states that 'Member States shall ensure that aerial spraying is prohibited', and defines aerial spraying as the 'application of pesticides from an aircraft (plane or helicopter)'.

It then describes the conditions under which, exceptionally and in an emergency (according to the transposition of the Directive by the Spanish government), it may authorise aerial spraying: 'there must be no viable alternatives, or there must be clear advantages (...) as compared with land-based application of pesticides' and '(...) aircraft shall be equipped with accessories that constitute the best available technology to reduce spray drift.'

However, the Spanish Government systematically grants emergency permits. Last year, 86 municipalities and 40 000 hectares of pine forest were sprayed from the air against pine processionary moth.

Several environmental organisations have, however, shown that the sprays are designed months in advance, they are carried out in areas where there is no significant presence of pine processionary, they affect Natura 2000 Network areas or are not the best alternative for treating pine processionary.

Will the Commission be carrying out any control or supervision of such permits or of the criteria for granting them?

Does the Commission not believe that the transposition of the directive by the Spanish Government (which has been the subject of infringement proceedings due to the delay with which it was made) does not sufficiently restrict the use of aerial spraying?