

**Question for written answer E-000697/2017
to the Commission**

Rule 130

Norbert Erdős (PPE)

Subject: The Commission's legal proposal on endocrine disruptors

Given the Commission's stated commitment to jobs, growth, competitiveness and the principles of Better Regulation, I was surprised to learn that these elements have been completely overlooked in preparation of the proposal on endocrine disruptors. The Commission's own impact assessment acknowledges that its chosen policy option provides no additional protection for health over the other options considered, and will have the biggest impact on agricultural productivity.

Could the Commission explain why it is willing to jeopardise agricultural productivity in the EU?

Given the continued deadlock between Member States on the question of endocrine disruptor criteria, is it not time for the Commission to revisit the policy options available to it, and introduce the concept of potency and other relevant hazard characterisation elements into the criteria?