

**Question for oral answer O-000017/2015  
to the Commission**

Rule 128

**Nicola Caputo, Pavel Poc, Jo Leinen, Michèle Rivasi, Bart Staes, Soledad Cabezón Ruiz, Renata Briano, Elena Gentile, Pina Picierno, Renato Soru, Giulia Moi, Dario Tamburrano, Eleonora Evi, Marco Affronte, Rosa D'Amato, Barbara Kappel, Eric Andrieu, Nicolas Bay, Maite Pagazaurtundúa Ruiz, Fabio Massimo Castaldo, Laura Agea, Laura Ferrara, Isabella Adinolfi, Tiziana Beghin, Marco Zullo, Marco Valli, Ignazio Corrao, Fredrick Federley, Jana Žitňanská, Jean-Luc Schaffhauser, Patricija Šulin, Daciana Octavia Sârbu, Tibor Szanyi, Ricardo Serrão Santos, Christel Schaldemose, Marc Tarabella, Maria Arena, Nessa Childers, Biljana Borzan, José Blanco López, Iratxe García Pérez, Matt Carthy, Kostas Chrysogonos, Lynn Boylan, Anja Hazekamp, Paloma López Bermejo, Enrico Gasbarra, Alessia Maria Mosca, Mercedes Bresso, Anneli Jäätteenmäki, Martin Häusling, Karin Kadenbach, Sylvie Goddyn, Mireille D'Ornano, Ivan Jakovčić, Pascal Durand, Diane James, Molly Scott Cato, Margrete Auken, Rolandas Paksas, Valentinas Mazuronis, Benedek Jávor, Yannick Jadot, Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu**

Subject: Criteria for identifying endocrine-disrupting chemicals

On 2 February 2015 *The Guardian* published an article which reported that 'as many as 31 endocrine-disrupting pesticides with a value running into billions could have been banned because of potential health risks, if a blocked EU paper on hormone-mimicking chemicals had been acted upon'.

The Commission's 2013 paper set out possible elements for identifying and categorising endocrine disrupters (EDCs), chemicals that scientists link to a rise in foetal and genital abnormalities, cancer and infertility. The adoption of criteria for EDCs – the legal deadline for which is 13 December 2013 – would have facilitated regulatory action against them, including bans on active substances in pesticides.

However, in July 2013 the Commission decided to launch an impact assessment (IA) on the criteria, which stalled the whole process.

Can the Commission explain why it decided to launch an IA and thus failed to comply with its legal obligation? Why does the Commission consider an IA looking at the economic impacts of different options for definitions to be an appropriate means of answering the scientific question of what constitutes an EDC? Irrespective of the justification for the IA, how will the Commission take into account the benefits of reducing exposure to EDCs in its IA?

Tabled: 13.2.2015

Forwarded: 17.2.2015

Deadline for reply: 24.2.2015