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MOTION FOR A EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT RESOLUTION

on a Thematic Strategy on the Sustainable Use of Pesticides
(2007/2006(INI))

The European Parliament,

– having regard to the Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: "A Thematic Strategy on the Sustainable Use of Pesticides" (COM(2006)0372),

– having regard to Decision No 1600/2002/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 July 2002 laying down the Sixth Community Environment Action Programme (6th EAP)¹,


– having regard to Article 175 of the EC Treaty,

– having regard to Article 6 of the EC Treaty, by virtue of which environmental protection must be integrated into the definition and implementation of the Community policies in particular with a view to promoting sustainable development,

– having regard to Regulation (EC) No 396/2005 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 February 2005 on maximum residue levels of pesticides in or on food and feed of plant and animal origin ²,


Council of 12 December 2006 on the protection of groundwater against pollution and deterioration\(^1\),


– having regard to the synthesis report of the European Commission entitled "Possibilities for Future EU Environmental Policy on Plant Protection Products" (1997),

– having regard to Rule 45 of its Rules of Procedure,

– having regard to the report of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety and the opinion of the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development (A6-0291/2007),

A. whereas the use of plant protection products (PPPs) in the EU between 1992 and 2003 remained significant and has not decreased despite the proactive policies successfully pursued in some Member States to reduce the use of farm pesticides,

B. whereas undesirable amounts of certain pesticides can still be found in the environment, in particular in soil and water; whereas residues exceeding regulatory limit values are still found in agricultural produce,

C. whereas although the benefits which derive from the use of pesticides and the role they play in ensuring an efficient and sustainable competitive agricultural production in Europe are undeniable, the general public should be better informed on the possible health and environmental risks and short and long-term adverse effects related to their use;

D. whereas continued use of pesticides should be possible only if the precautionary principle is upheld with regard to both human health and the protection of the water and land

---

ecosystem; whereas this means that pesticides should not be used before all impact assessments regarding health and the environment have been carried out; and whereas comparing data and best practices in use reduction in the different Member States should be encouraged and taken into account as a point of reference,

E. whereas a transparent system for reporting and monitoring of pesticide use and residue levels in products, including the development of appropriate indicators, is lacking;

1. Acknowledges the need for a European legal framework in the field of pesticide use as legislation in force has not proved sufficient to achieve the prevention of the hazards and risks to health and environment posed by the use of pesticides;

2. Considers it important to adopt new legislation based on an approach more firmly centred on reducing pesticide use and more ambitious in terms of environmental performance, through the provision of meaningful support for organic farming and integrated production methods;

3. Welcomes the Thematic Strategy on the Sustainable Use of Pesticides which identifies the shortcomings of current Community legislation and proposes to regulate the use phase to "fill the gap" between the placing of PPPs on the market on the one hand and the end of life-cycle of such products on the other;

4. Points out that the EU has now adopted more than a dozen legal acts which directly or indirectly regulate the use of PPPs; stresses, however, that the proposed provisions governing the use of PPPs are leading in the right direction;

5. Notes that the Thematic Strategy on the Sustainable Use of Pesticides covers only PPPs, which constitute only a part of pesticides; calls on the Commission forthwith to include pest control products (biocidal product types 14-19) as defined in Annex V to Directive 98/8/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 February 1998 concerning the placing of biocidal products on the market within the scope of the Thematic Strategy, as they pose similar risks to human health and the environment, and urges the Commission to extend the scope of the Thematic Strategy to include other biocides as soon as possible;

6. Considers it essential to improve the behaviour of pesticide users in order to avoid misuse, overuse and poisoning accidents; welcomes the creation of a system of training and education for professional pesticide users, for which the Commission should draw up guidelines which take account of the differences which exist between the various European regions; considers that certification and training must be a prerequisite for the employment of professional pesticide users and that ongoing professional development should also be provided, in order to update their technical skills and knowledge and to ensure safe and effective use of pesticides; suggests that advisory services to farmers be set up or enhanced in order to increase their awareness concerning safe use of pesticides and encourage the exchange of good practices;

---

7. Calls on the Commission to consider, in accordance with the polluter-pays principle, suitable ways of involving manufacturers of PPPs and/or their active agents in the work of dealing with or remediying the damage to human health or the environment which might be caused by the use of PPPs;

8. Recommends that the sale and distribution of pesticides be performed under the supervision of a qualified professional or practitioner, and that those transactions be recorded in a register to ensure adequate control of the marketing and use of such products;

9. Stresses that minimisation of the hazards and risks to health and environment from the use of pesticides cannot be effectively achieved without a constructive dialogue and capacity building, including financial stimulation, with third countries together with stringent checks on products imported into the EU to ensure a level playing field for competition;

10. Calls on the Commission to formulate a protection and cooperation policy vis-à-vis the EU's neighbours, on the use of pesticides and PPPs;

11. Emphasises the importance of the media's role in informing the general public, and non-professional users of pesticides in particular, about pesticide issues; and suggests that public information and awareness-raising campaigns be devised;

12. Welcomes in general the measures chosen by the Commission; stresses, however, that ambitious National Action Plans of the Member States are key elements in the whole process;

13. Regrets, furthermore, that the Commission opted for the exclusion of quantitative and qualitative criteria in the National Action Plans, thus reducing their level of ambition;

14. Stresses that without quantitative use reduction targets in the National Action Plans, the notion "reduction of hazards, risks and dependence on pesticides" is very imprecisely and ambiguously defined, and will not push the Member States to lower the amount of pesticides used or to prioritise non-chemical alternatives to plant protection and pest and crop management;

15. Suggests that the Commission should combine the elimination of hazards, risks and dependence on pesticides with quantitative criteria in the National Action Plans, by stipulating that Member States must set their own national targets, timetables and criteria for reducing pesticide use, taking into account the positive experience from some Member States which already use quantitative reduction targets, which has demonstrated that pesticide use can be reduced without significant costs to farmers;

16. Stresses that a commitment to curb the use of PPPs to make them less dangerous and to seek alternative plant protection products, resources and methods which are more environmentally friendly and less harmful to humans and animals will, in addition to environmental and public health benefits, improve the quality of European agricultural products and increase their added value as a result of widespread public awareness and consumer sensitivity regarding these issues;
17. Agrees that National Action Plans should be adapted to the specific climatic, agricultural and pest conditions of each Member State, where certain specific treatments are necessary and particularly in the case of minor crops;

18. Hopes that the Commission will specify the European financial aid that can be harnessed by Member States to conduct studies, compile databases and enhance knowledge concerning pesticides;

19. Welcomes the statement by the Commission that the most important expected outcome of the Thematic Strategy is the reduction of the negative impacts of pesticide use on human health;

20. Regrets that, although pesticides are linked to immunological effects, endocrine-disrupting effects, neurotoxic disorders and cancer\(^1\), health is only marginally mentioned in the Thematic Strategy;

21. Emphasises that substances which are carcinogenic, mutagenic or toxic to reproduction, or persistent, bio-accumulative or toxic, or which show endocrine disrupting properties, must not be approved as active substances in pesticides;

22. Points out that foetuses, infants, children as well as pregnant women, the elderly, the chronically sick and those with pre-existing medical problems are more vulnerable and more exposed to pesticides, especially to cumulative effects of different types of pesticides, than the rest of the population;

23. Points out that prior authorisation of a PPP is a precondition for its use and that such authorisation is based on a scientific assessment of the PPP and its active agents in the course of which the product is tested to determine what risks it poses, when properly used, to human and animal health and the environment;

24. Considers it essential to conduct further research into the health effects of pesticide use, and particularly of combined and cumulative use;

25. Warmly welcomes the banning of substances on the basis of their intrinsic hazards and the so-called "substitution principle" whereby the more dangerous substances will be removed from the market where safer, including non-chemical, alternatives exist;

26. Calls on the Commission, working together with the Member States and the industry, to take measures to prevent the import and marketing of counterfeit and/or unauthorised PPPs;

27. Calls on the Commission to ensure that when levels of pesticides which exceed the relevant limit values are found on and in imported foodstuffs the same measures are taken and the same penalties are imposed as in the case of products manufactured in the EU; calls for immediate steps to be taken to ensure that sufficiently frequent checks are carried out on imported goods (which are generally subject to less strict legislation on the use of PPPs meaning that there is a higher risk of illegal residue levels) in all Member States in

\(^1\) European Environment and Health Strategy, COM(2003)0338, p. 5.
the same way, so that European farmers and manufacturers are not placed at a
disadvantage and a level playing field is established within the EU;

28. Calls for appropriate controls and a ban on imports into the EU of foodstuffs produced
using PPPs and pesticides whose use and marketing are not permitted in the EU;

29. Calls for coordinated systems for the collection of information on the production, import,
export, sale, distribution and use of generally available pesticides;

30. Believes that designation of zones, including drinking water catchment protection areas,
with reduced or zero pesticide use and enhanced protection of the aquatic environment
from pollution by pesticides are necessary in order to avoid unwanted exposure; considers
that “buffer zones” of appropriate width taking account of the different agricultural,
geographical and weather conditions should be established; considers that the use of
pesticides should be prohibited in and around residential areas, public parks, sports
grounds, school grounds and children’s playgrounds, as the Commission has recognised
that the risks to the general public from exposure to pesticides in such areas are high;

31. Notes the contamination of European groundwater and surface waters by pesticides and
stresses the need to strengthen the cohesion of the Thematic Strategy with Framework
Directive 2000/60/EC on water policy; points out that water purifying, however, is mostly
carried out only for human consumption, whereas the rest of the contaminated water gets
into the human body from flora and fauna, giving rise subsequently to high treatment
costs;

32. Recognises that the ban on aerial spraying is inevitable; considers, however, that spraying
can be used where it represents clear environmental advantages or where there are no
viable alternatives, but that at the same time it should be obligatory to notify the general
public about the time of spraying, the amounts and the type of pesticide;

33. Calls on the Commission to speed up Community harmonisation of maximum residue
levels, as the current situation means that there is an uneven playing field within the EU,
hampering trade and confusing consumers;

34. Urges the Commission to set maximum residue levels as low as possible unless it can be
proved that even the best techniques and methods available cannot prevent residue below
a certain level; in this regard calls for Member States to improve the monitoring of
pesticide concentrations in food products and environmental media;

35. Welcomes the proposed invitation to Member States to eliminate provisions allowing
Member States to apply reduced VAT rates for pesticides; considers that the Commission
should help Member States to introduce appropriate support measures for farmers, to be
financed under rural development and by means of a levy on pesticides; considers that a
levy on pesticides can be an important instrument for achieving a significant reduction in
pesticide use;

36. Calls on the Commission to support the Member States in setting up a system of taxes or
levies in order to influence - quantitatively and qualitatively - pesticide use; and calls on
Member States to introduce taxes or charges on pesticides as measures facilitating the
development of general and specific Integrated Pest Management (IPM) methods and practices; considers that Member States must consider the introduction of a system of levies on pesticides in order to finance education, training and the overall implementation of the National Action Plans;

37. Insists that the Commission propose clear definitions and minimum criteria for IPM, including the increasing percentage of areas under organic farming in Europe and applying compulsory general and crop-specific IPM standards to all cultivated land except land under organic farming;

38. Acknowledges that numerous environmental concerns have been integrated into the various regulations which make up the Common Agricultural Policy, thereby making agricultural production methods more environment-friendly;

39. Points to the need for the dissemination of farming practices promoting the use of lower pesticide doses (among other things, integrated production and organic farming), which will contribute to an overall decrease in pesticide use;

40. Urges the Member States to promote low pesticide-input farming and organic farming, and ensure that professional users of pesticides shift towards a more environment-friendly use of all available crop protection products, giving priority to non-chemical alternatives, crop rotation and weeding rather than to systematic use of pesticides;

41. Calls on the Commission and the Member States to make adequate resources available for resistance research, for the cultivation and supply of a wide range of crops with various resistance characteristics, for research into crop rotation and soil cultivation methods to combat pests and plant diseases and for innovations in the area of plant protection, including non-chemical alternatives;

42. Calls on the Member States to ensure the safe storage and handling of pesticides, and that unused, past-expiry pesticides and empty packaging are collected in a controlled way and obsolete pesticides are treated in accordance with the rules for hazardous waste;

43. Calls for Community funding to be provided for the recycling of pesticides, given that within the EU more than 200 000 tonnes of pesticides are still being stored in both underground dumps and open-air stockpiles;

44. Recognises that well-maintained application equipment is essential for reducing the adverse impacts of pesticides on health and the environment, particularly as regards the workers, farmers and residents concerned, and stresses that application equipment must be regularly checked;

45. Urges the Commission to take into account the extremely worrying issue of mortality amongst domestic bees - a problem associated with the use of certain systemic insecticides (containing the active substances Fipronil and Imidaclopride) in order to treat sunflower and maize seeds;
46. Stresses the need to amend European trading standards relating to the shape, size and 
aesthetic qualities of fresh fruit and vegetables, which encourage the intensive use of 
pesticides;

47. Urges the Commission to design the Thematic Strategy as an umbrella for existing and 
future legislation; suggests proposing an enforceable mix of instruments that are not 
contradictory but complementary to each other;

48. Welcomes the fact that, on the basis of the Thematic Strategy, the Commission has put 
forward a comprehensive Community legal framework for measures designed to bring 
about the sustainable use of PPPs;

49. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council and Commission.
EXPLANATORY STATEMENT


The objective of the strategy is to reduce the overall risks and negative impacts on human health and the environment from the use of pesticides. The strategy stems from the Sixth Environment Action Programme, (adopted in July 2002) which calls for pesticides being used in a sustainable way so as to minimise negative impacts for human health and the environment.

It has to be acknowledged that the most important goal of this policy is the protection of health and environment. Many efforts have been done in order to minimize the risks linked to the use of pesticides but unwanted amounts still occur in soil and water. Pesticides residues are present in all habitats, 44% of sampled fruit is contaminated with pesticides, 5,5% above the maximum residue level. It is rather disappointing to see that the subject is mostly dealt with the Ministries for Agriculture in the Member States with very little input from the Ministries for the Environment.

The need for an effective legislation in the area of pesticide use remains undisputed. The Thematic Strategy "fills the gap" between two phases which are already regulated- the phase of placing on the market and the end of the life cycle (maximum residue limits and waste legislation). The Thematic Strategy regulates the use phase.

While acknowledging that pesticides use is necessary for the agricultural productivity, your rapporteur is of the opinion that there are other ways how to reduce the use of pesticides without decreasing the productivity of the agricultural sector. Organic farming, crop rotation, weeding or possible substitution/partial substitution of pesticides by GMOs could be alternatives.

Your rapporteur does not want to immediately substitute pesticides by GMOs. The issue is that the undesirable effects of chemicals-pesticides on human health are well known. On the other hand, the effects of GMOs on human health are not yet explored. Therefore, it might be vital to conduct more research.

Because the title of the "Thematic Strategy on the Sustainable Use of Pesticides" might be misleading due to the fact that it only covers plant protection products, which form just part of the pesticides group. Therefore, the scope of the Thematic Strategy should be broadened in order to cover biocides as soon as possible.

It is largely accepted that current knowledge about pesticides and their use is insufficient. Hence your rapporteur warmly welcomes the creation of training programmes for the professional users in order to be fully aware of the risks associated with the use of pesticides.
The cornerstone of the whole process is the introduction of the National Action Plans (NAPs). It is, however, regrettable that the Commission opted for the exclusion of the quantitative criteria in the NAPs and concentrated solely on the "reduction of hazards, risks and dependence on pesticides". This is a vague term which will not put pressure on the Member States to lower the amount of pesticides used or to substitute the more dangerous pesticides by less dangerous ones. NAPs have to be concrete and specify by the most appropriate indicator how the hazards, risks and dependence on pesticides will be reduced. Therefore, your rapporteur is of an opinion that the Commission should combine the elimination of hazards, risks and dependence on pesticides with quantitative criteria in the National Action Plans. In this regards positive experience from Denmark with the use of frequency of application index could be looked at as an example.

It is very disappointing to see that even though the Commission recognized the reduction of negative impacts from the use of pesticides on human health as the main objective of the strategy, one doesn't find an article in the thematic strategy specifically dealing with this issue and that health is dealt with only marginally. Thematic strategy fails to address that pesticides cause several immunological defects, neurotoxic disorders or even cancer. It fails to recognize that pregnant women, children and foetuses are the most vulnerable group.

Your rapporteur, however, welcomes numerous measures introduced by the Commission, supports the substitution principle, ban on aerial spraying, prohibition of reduced VAT rates, enhanced protection of the aquatic environment, designation of zones with reduced or zero pesticide use. However, "buffer zones" should be established in order to protect the general public from the exposure.
OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

for the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety

on the thematic strategy on the sustainable use of pesticides
(2007/2006(INI))

Draftsman: Michl Ebner

SUGGESTIONS

The Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development calls on the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety, as the committee responsible, to incorporate the following suggestions in its motion for a resolution:

1. Points out that in Europe various forms of agriculture exist in parallel, and that the use of plant protection products (PPPs) is a feature of the majority; considers that there is an urgent need to review whether the provision of sufficient quantities of high-quality foodstuffs cannot be guaranteed without chemical plant protection products;

2. Stresses that a commitment to curb the use of plant protection products to make them less dangerous and to seek alternative plant protection products, resources and methods which are more environmentally friendly and less harmful to humans and animals will, in addition to environmental and public health benefits, improve the quality of European agricultural products and increase their added value as a result of widespread public awareness and consumer sensitivity regarding these issues;

3. Considers that interest should not focus primarily on the constant use of PPPs but rather on the sustainability of agricultural production with reference to food security, the health of consumers, the supply of clean drinking water, the conservation of diverse flora and fauna and the health of those working in agricultural occupations; takes the view that the use of PPPs may be a tool in this connection, but that it should be subject to special rules on account of the potential damage they may cause to health;

4. Points to the need for the dissemination of farming practices promoting the use of lower
pesticide doses (among other things, integrated production and organic farming), which will contribute to an overall decrease in pesticide use;

5. Points out that sustainable resistance management and the further development of plant protection methods are contingent on the availability of a sufficiently broad range of plant protection products and agents, which will also increase support amongst farmers and other operators for the various legal acts regulating their use and reduce failure to comply therewith;

6. Points out that the EU has now adopted more than a dozen legal acts which directly or indirectly regulate the use of PPPs; stresses, however, that the proposed provisions governing the use of PPPs are leading in the right direction;

7. Urges that decisions on the use of authorised PPPs must be left to farmers under the guidance of suitably qualified advisers; considers that rules and checks must allow leeway for such decisions depending on the particular circumstances within the various Member States;

8. Emphasises that Community legislation should not set general quantitative restrictions, as this could encourage farmers and other operators to use substances which are less voluminous but more hazardous;

9. Calls on the Commission and the Member States to provide adequate funding for information, advisory and training programmes; points out that such measures do more to improve the situation than additional documentation or reporting requirements; across-the-board monitoring is completely unrealistic anyway;

10. Urges that the proposed provisions should not increase the burden on farmers by creating unnecessary red tape, but that instead the opportunity offered by the comprehensive harmonisation process should be taken to simplify monitoring procedures without making them less effective;

11. Urges that the planned statistics regulation should not impose new burdens on farmers;

12. Points out that many aspects of the integrated plant protection management system, which will be binding as from 2014, are still unclear, a state of affairs which, in conjunction with cross-compliance, may give rise to legal uncertainty and considerable feelings of insecurity among farmers;

13. Urges that voluntary and supportive measures should be employed in preference to binding provisions; it is for the Member States to take a decision on the correct mix of instruments, after analysing the local situation in the context of national action plans;

14. Calls for national action plans to be drawn up in close consultation with the farming sector, in a transparent manner, taking account of the environmental impact of such measures and ensuring that the objectives are verifiable; advocates Community co-funding for national action plans; considers that the public must be provided with comprehensive information; regular revisions of the action plans are needed in order to compel the Member States to maintain their efforts;
15. Warmly welcomes the further harmonisation of provisions in the area of the authorisation and marketing of PPPs; points out, however, that the procedures must be streamlined and optimised and made more predictable in order to facilitate access to the market for innovative products which generally involve a lesser degree of risk; the opportunity offered by the harmonisation process should also be taken to eliminate instances of legal uncertainty;

16. Calls on the Commission to speed up Community harmonisation of maximum residue levels, as the current situation means that there is an uneven playing field within the EU, hampering trade and confusing consumers;

17. Calls on the Commission, working together with the Member States and the industry, to take measures to prevent the import and marketing of counterfeit and/or unauthorised PPPs;

18. Calls on the Commission to ensure that when levels of pesticides which exceed the relevant limit values are found on and in imported foodstuffs the same measures are taken and the same penalties are imposed as in the case of products manufactured in the EU; calls for immediate steps to be taken to ensure that sufficiently frequent checks are carried out on imported goods (which are generally subject to less strict legislation on the use of PPPs meaning that there is a higher risk of illegal residue levels) in all Member States in the same way, so that European farmers and manufacturers are not placed at a disadvantage and a level playing field is established within the EU;

19. Calls on the Commission and the Member States to make adequate resources available for resistance research, for the cultivation and supply of a wide range of crops with various resistance characteristics, for research into crop rotation and soil cultivation methods to combat pests and plant diseases and for innovations in the area of plant protection, including non-chemical alternatives;

20. Calls for appropriate controls and a ban on imports into the EU of foodstuffs produced using plant protection products and pesticides whose use and marketing are not permitted in the EU;

21. Calls for coordinated systems for the collection of information on the production, import, export, sale, distribution and use of generally available pesticides;

22. Calls for Community funding to be provided for the recycling of pesticides, given that within the EU more than 200 000 tonnes of pesticides are still being stored in both underground dumps and open-air stockpiles;

23. Calls on the Commission to formulate a protection and cooperation policy vis-à-vis the EU’s neighbours, on the use of pesticide and plant protection products.
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