

**Question for written answer P-002567/2019
to the Commission**

Rule 138

Saskia Bricmont (Verts/ALE), Michèle Rivasi (Verts/ALE), Tilly Metz (Verts/ALE), Sarah Wiener (Verts/ALE), Petra De Sutter (Verts/ALE) and Jutta Paulus (Verts/ALE)

Subject: Chlorpyrifos

Chlorpyrifos is a pesticide authorised by the European Union since 2006 but banned (or never authorised) in eight Member States. In recent years, scientific evidence of the dangers inherent in this neurotoxic and endocrine disruptor has multiplied (for example, brain damage, risk of autism, hyperactivity disorders). It is thought that some people consume as much as 200 % of the acceptable daily intake. The European Food Safety Authority, the EFSA, found these substances to be present in quantities exceeding the 'maximum residue limit' in 847 samples. Due to the free movement of food products, traces of chlorpyrifos have even been found in the countries in which it has been banned.

Should chlorpyrifos and its derivatives not be banned by the Union in the light of the growing number of scientific studies and the subsidiarity and precautionary principles, as regards transactions in the internal market which enable the spreading of that substance and its effects?

And if so, how can it be ensured that, through trade agreements, this substance is not re-introduced in Europe?

How can it be ensured, in future, that the designated rapporteur country submits its conclusions on the impact assessment within shorter deadlines in order to avoid a de facto blocking of the process, leading to an extension of the marketing authorisation by default?