



**2017/2128(INI)**

30.1.2018

# **AMENDMENTS**

## **1 - 169**

**Draft opinion**

**Peter Jahr**

Implementation of the Plant Protection Programme Regulation EC/1107/2009  
(2017/2128(INI))



## Amendment 1

Nicola Caputo, Karin Kadenbach, Molly Scott Cato

### Draft opinion

#### Paragraph 1

##### *Draft opinion*

1. Welcomes the fact that an implementation report for Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 is being undertaken with the aim of ensuring a high level of protection of both human and animal health as well as the environment, while safeguarding the competitiveness of the EU's agriculture sector by providing access to a broad range of active substances and Plant Protection Products (PPP) for all farmers and producers, irrespective of the Members States they are operating in;

##### *Amendment*

1. Welcomes the fact that an implementation report for Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 is being undertaken with the aim of ensuring a high level of protection of both human and animal health as well as the environment, while safeguarding the competitiveness of the EU's agriculture sector by providing access to a broad range of active substances and Plant Protection Products (PPP) for all farmers and producers, irrespective of the Members States they are operating in; ***recalls recital (8) of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 which clearly highlights that particular attention should be paid to the protection of vulnerable groups of the population, including pregnant women, infants and children, that the precautionary principle should be applied and that this Regulation should ensure that industry demonstrates that substances or products produced or placed on the market do not have any harmful effect on human or animal health or any unacceptable effects on the environment;***

Or. en

## Amendment 2

Jean-Paul Denanot, Eric Andrieu

### Draft opinion

#### Paragraph 1

##### *Draft opinion*

1. Welcomes the fact that an implementation report for Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 is being undertaken with the aim of ensuring a high level of protection

##### *Amendment*

1. Welcomes the fact that an implementation report for Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 is being undertaken with the aim of ensuring a high level of protection

of **both human** and animal health as well as the environment, while safeguarding the competitiveness of the EU's agriculture sector by **providing** access to a **broad** range of active substances and Plant Protection Products (PPP) for all farmers and producers, irrespective of the Members States they are operating in;

of **human, plant** and animal health as well as the environment **and improving the sustainability of agricultural development**, while safeguarding the competitiveness of the EU's agriculture sector by **continuing to provide** access to a range of active substances and Plant Protection Products (PPP) for all farmers and producers, irrespective of the Members States they are operating in **and in tandem with increased research and the use of alternatives to PPPs**;

Or. fr

**Amendment 3**  
**Ulrike Müller, Hilde Vautmans**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 1**

*Draft opinion*

1. Welcomes the fact that an implementation report for Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 is being undertaken with the aim of ensuring a high level of protection of both human and animal health as well as the environment, while safeguarding the competitiveness of the EU's agriculture sector **by providing access to a broad range of active substances and Plant Protection Products (PPP) for all farmers and producers, irrespective of the Members States they are operating in**;

*Amendment*

1. Welcomes the fact that an implementation report for Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 is being undertaken with the aim of **scrutinising the Regulation's performance in** ensuring a high level of protection of both human and animal health as well as the environment, while safeguarding the competitiveness of the EU's agriculture sector;

Or. en

**Amendment 4**  
**Luke Ming Flanagan**  
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 1**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

1. Welcomes the fact that an implementation report for Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 is being undertaken with the aim of ensuring a high level of protection of both human and animal health as well as the environment, while safeguarding the competitiveness of the EU's agriculture sector by providing access to a broad range of active substances and Plant Protection Products (PPP) for all farmers and producers, irrespective of the Members States they are operating in;

1. Welcomes the fact that an implementation report for Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 is being undertaken with the aim of ensuring a high level of protection of both human and animal health as well as the environment, while safeguarding the competitiveness **and sustainability** of the EU's agriculture sector by providing access to a broad range of active substances and Plant Protection Products (PPP) **that have no adverse side effects** for all farmers and producers, irrespective of the Members States they are operating in;

Or. en

## Amendment 5

Mairead McGuinness, Angélique Delahaye

### Draft opinion

#### Paragraph 1

##### *Draft opinion*

1. Welcomes the fact that an implementation report for Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 is being undertaken with the aim of ensuring a high level of protection of both human and animal health **as well as the environment**, while safeguarding the competitiveness of the EU's agriculture sector by providing access to a broad range of active substances and Plant Protection Products (PPP) **for all** farmers and producers, irrespective of **the** Members **States** they are operating in;

##### *Amendment*

1. Welcomes the fact that an implementation report for Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 is being undertaken with the aim of ensuring a high level of protection of both human and animal health, **food safety and environmental protection**, while safeguarding the competitiveness of the EU's agriculture sector by providing **a level playing field through** access to a broad range of active substances and Plant Protection Products (PPP) **to** farmers and producers, irrespective of **which** Members **State** they are operating in;

Or. en

## Amendment 6

Miguel Viegas

### Draft opinion

#### Paragraph 1

*Draft opinion*

1. Welcomes the fact that an implementation report for Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 is being undertaken with the aim of ensuring a high level of protection of both human and animal health as well as the environment, ***while safeguarding the competitiveness of the EU's agriculture sector*** by providing access to a broad range of active substances and Plant Protection Products (PPP) for all farmers and producers, irrespective of the ***Members*** States they are operating in;

*Amendment*

1. Welcomes the fact that an implementation report for Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 is being undertaken with the aim of ensuring a high level of protection of both human and animal health as well as the environment, by providing access to a broad range of active substances and Plant Protection Products (PPP) for all farmers and producers, irrespective of the ***Member*** States they are operating in;

Or. pt

**Amendment 7**

**Angélique Delahaye, Mairead McGuinness**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 1**

*Draft opinion*

1. Welcomes the fact that an implementation report for Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 is being undertaken with the aim of ensuring a high level of protection of both human and animal health as well as the environment, while safeguarding the competitiveness of the EU's agriculture sector by providing access to a broad range of active substances and Plant Protection Products (PPP) for all farmers and producers, irrespective of the Members States they are operating in;

*Amendment*

1. Welcomes the fact that an implementation report for Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 is being undertaken with the aim of ensuring a high level of protection of both human and animal health as well as the environment, while safeguarding the competitiveness of the EU's agriculture sector by providing access to a broad range of ***reasonably-priced*** active substances and Plant Protection Products (PPP) for all farmers and producers, irrespective of the Members States they are operating in;

Or. fr

**Amendment 8**

**Molly Scott Cato**

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

**Karin Kadenbach**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 1**

PE616.638v01-00

6/83

AM\1143540EN.docx

*Draft opinion*

1. Welcomes the fact that an implementation report for Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 is being undertaken with the aim of ensuring a high level of protection of both human and animal health as well as the environment, while ***safeguarding the competitiveness of the EU's agriculture sector by providing access to a broad range of*** active substances and Plant Protection Products (PPP) ***for all farmers and producers, irrespective of the Members States they are operating in;***

*Amendment*

1. Welcomes the fact that an implementation report for Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 is being undertaken with the aim of ensuring a high level of protection of both human and animal health as well as the environment, while ***aiming as much as possible for a level playing field for farmers from different EU member states in terms of*** access to ***genuinely safe*** active substances and Plant Protection Products (PPP);

Or. en

**Amendment 9**

**Rosa D'Amato, Marco Zullo**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 1**

*Draft opinion*

1. Welcomes the fact that an implementation report for Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 is being undertaken with the aim of ensuring a high level of protection of both human and animal health as well as the environment, while safeguarding the competitiveness of the EU's agriculture sector by providing access ***to a broad range of*** active substances and Plant Protection Products (PPP) ***for all farmers and producers, irrespective of the Members States they are operating in;***

*Amendment*

1. Welcomes the fact that an implementation report for Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 is being undertaken with the aim of ensuring a high level of protection of both human and animal health as well as the environment, while safeguarding the competitiveness of the EU's agriculture sector, by providing access ***for all farmers and producers only to those*** active substances and Plant Protection Products (PPP) ***which conform to the criteria set out in the present Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009;***

Or. it

**Amendment 10**

**Clara Eugenia Aguilera García, Paolo De Castro, Ricardo Serrão Santos**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 1**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

1. Welcomes the fact that an implementation report for Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 is being undertaken with the aim of ensuring a high level of protection of both human and animal health as well as the environment, while safeguarding the competitiveness of the EU's agriculture sector by providing access to a broad range of active substances and Plant Protection Products (PPP) for all farmers and producers, irrespective of the Members States they are operating in;

*(Does not affect the English version.)*

Or. es

**Amendment 11**

**Philippe Loiseau, Edouard Ferrand, Angelo Ciocca**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 1**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

1. ***Welcomes the fact*** that an implementation report for Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 is being undertaken with the aim of ensuring a high level of protection of both human and animal health as well as the environment, ***while safeguarding*** the competitiveness of the EU's agriculture sector by providing access to a broad range of active substances and Plant Protection Products (PPP) for all farmers and producers, irrespective of the Members States they are operating in;

1. ***Notes*** that an implementation report for Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 is being undertaken with the aim of ensuring a high level of protection of both human and animal health as well as the environment; ***calls for*** the competitiveness of the EU's agriculture sector ***to be safeguarded*** by providing access to a broad range of active substances and Plant Protection Products (PPP) for all farmers and producers, irrespective of the Members States they are operating in;

Or. fr

**Amendment 12**

**Anthea McIntyre**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 1 a (new)**



*1 a. Notes the outcome of the European Parliament Hearing on Sustainable Plant Protection held on 20th March 2017 which concluded that the EU approval process for Plant Protection Products is one of the most stringent in the world. It currently takes over 11 years, requires an average of over 200 scientific studies and costs in excess of 220 million euros to bring a product to the EU market. This rigorous testing, combined with farmers' commitment to responsible use and stewardship, ensures that products are safe for human health and the environment. It does, however, result in a challenging shortage of active ingredients for use on speciality crops which include most fruit and vegetables;*

Or. en

**Amendment 13**  
**Molly Scott Cato**  
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 1 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

*1 a. Notes the failure of the regulatory framework to consider inevitable non-target impacts, notably on bees and other pollinators and other insects beneficial to farming like predators of pests; Notes the recent scientific study illustrating the "insect Armageddon"<sup>1a</sup>, whereby 75% winged insects have become regionally extinct across Germany, even in nature reserves where no pesticides were used for agriculture.*

---

*<sup>1a</sup> More than 75 percent decline over 27 years in total flying insect biomass in protected areas, Hallmann et al, 2017.  
<http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id>*

Or. en

**Amendment 14**  
**Ulrike Müller, Hilde Vautmans**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 1 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***1 a. Takes note of the European Commission's ongoing REFIT Evaluation of Regulation 1107/2009 and of its planned completion by November 2018; trusts that these findings will be an adequate basis for the co-legislators to discuss the future development of Regulation 1107/2009;***

Or. en

**Amendment 15**  
**Daciana Octavia Sârbu, Karin Kadenbach, Pavel Poc**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 1 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***1 a. Underlines that the provisions of the Regulations are underpinned by the precautionary principle in order to ensure that active substances or products placed on the market do not adversely affect human or animal health or the environment;***

Or. en

**Amendment 16**  
**Esther Herranz García, Gabriel Mato, Ramón Luis Valcárcel Siso**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 1 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***1a. Stresses the fact that between 1993 and 2009 the number of authorised active pesticidal substances fell by 70% while the number of pest outbreaks in the EU increased;***

Or. es

**Amendment 17**

**Karin Kadenbach, Maria Noichl, Daciana Octavia Sârbu**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 1 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***1 a. Points out that environmental measures aimed to prevent, limit and contain the spread of pathogens and pests has to remain the focus of all current and further actions;***

Or. en

**Amendment 18**

**Ulrike Müller, Hilde Vautmans, Hannu Takkula**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 1 b (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***1 b. Recognises that plant protection products have played a significant role in improving the agricultural sector's capability to satisfy global nutritional needs, which has contributed to reducing the global share of undernourished people in the population from 18.6% in 1990-1992 to around 10.9% in 2014-2016 according to the FAO<sup>1a</sup>, thus takes the view that the current system should be improved by intensifying efforts to***

*eliminate adverse effects rather than by dismissing it without having alternatives at hand that are equally capable of maintaining and further increasing the supply of food;*

---

<sup>1a</sup> See FAO (2015): *The State of Food Security in the World*,  
<http://www.fao.org/3/a-i4646e.pdf>.

Or. en

**Amendment 19**  
**Anthea McIntyre**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 1 b (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

*1 b. Stresses the importance of creating an innovation friendly regulatory framework, which allows for the replacement of older chemistry by new and better crop protection products; underlines the importance of the availability of a broad spectrum of Plant Protection Products with different modes of action to avoid the development of resistances and maintain the effectiveness of crop protection product application;*

Or. en

**Amendment 20**  
**Esther Herranz García, Gabriel Mato, Ramón Luis Valcárcel Siso**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 1 b (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

*1b. Underlines that that EU rules for the approval of active substances for agricultural uses are among the most restrictive in the world, thus putting EU*

*farmers – who have to compete in an increasingly globalised market with imports from countries which permit the use of substances and technologies that are prohibited in the EU – at a competitive disadvantage;*

Or. es

**Amendment 21**  
**Molly Scott Cato**  
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group  
**Karin Kadenbach**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 1 b (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

*1 b. Calls for the implementation by the MS of the 2013 EFSA guidelines <sup>1c</sup> on assessing risk of PPPs to bees, developed collaboratively between the Commission and the MS, which has regrettably not been implemented so far;*

---

<sup>1c</sup>

*<https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/3295>*

Or. en

**Amendment 22**  
**Ulrike Müller, Hilde Vautmans**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 1 c (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

*1 c. underlines its belief that the Regulation's set of targets can be achieved most effectively if (complementary to further conditions set in the MRL Regulation and Sustainable Use Directive, in particular the principles*

*of Integrated Pest Management and Good Agricultural Practices) farmers and producers, irrespective of the Member States they are operating in, have access to a broad range of active substances and Plant Protection Products (PPP) that allows them to efficiently tackle pests; stresses that the availability of a broad range of PPPs is the basis for any meaningful reduction strategy, because otherwise farmers would be dependent on less targeted and hence less efficient PPPs, which leads to higher consumption;*

Or. en

**Amendment 23**

**Esther Herranz García, Ramón Luis Valcárcel Siso, Gabriel Mato**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 1 c (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

*1c. Expresses concern at the small number of new active substances that have been authorised since Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 entered into force; points out that since the current rules were introduced, only eight new active substances have been authorised for use on the EU market;*

Or. es

**Amendment 24**

**Molly Scott Cato**

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

**Karin Kadenbach**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 1 c (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

*1 c. Notes that the cumulative effects*

*of pesticides on non-target species, and also synergistic effects as pesticides are increasingly applied in cocktails of different products, which can alter the expected impacts on organisms exposed to them;*

Or. en

**Amendment 25**  
**Molly Scott Cato**  
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 1 d (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

*1 d. Notes the duty of care of the Commission, in balancing the public and environmental health with economic interests of chemical producers to ensure only genuinely safe active substances are approved;*

Or. en

**Amendment 26**  
**Molly Scott Cato**  
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 1 e (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

*1 e. Notes that the final approval of the product by the MS is often granted conditionally upon certain mitigation criteria being fulfilled, for example in restricting use under certain conditions; Regrets that these are so poorly controlled, if at all, by the MS authorities;*

Or. en

**Amendment 27**  
**Molly Scott Cato**  
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 1 f (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

*1 f. Notes that because both active substance and product authorisations are often granted conditional upon fulfilment of certain criteria of use which are then not checked, this means that even if mitigation measures intending to limit environmental damage were disregarded, inappropriate and illegal use has been rewarded with CAP payments. This should not continue, and respect of mitigation measures should form part of the baseline of sustainability in the CAP;*

Or. en

**Amendment 28**  
**Molly Scott Cato**  
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 1 g (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

*1 g. Notes the health costs associated with pesticide use, which are often hidden, and the struggle of farmers and agricultural workers as well as those working in storage and transport of grain who are poisoned by pesticides; Notes further that these hidden costs and personal struggles are too often conveniently forgotten by the representatives of farming communities;*

Or. en

**Amendment 29**

PE616.638v01-00

16/83

AM\1143540EN.docx



**Molly Scott Cato**  
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 1 h (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***1 h. Calls for neonicotinoids and other systemic insecticides that are damaging to non-target species especially bees to be comprehensively banned, in order to ensure pollination and other biodiversity-driven ecosystem services useful for farmers, also including predators keeping pest populations in check;***

Or. en

**Amendment 30**  
**Molly Scott Cato**  
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 1 i (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***1 i. Notes a weed is defined simply as a plant in the wrong place, and notes they are also wildflowers that feed bees and pollinators and also support natural predators of pests and other beneficial species useful to farming;***

***Notes further only 20% of weed species are actually capable of damaging crops and then, only when in sufficiently high concentrations to affect the yield; 80% of them are so weak in competition with the crops that they do not affect yield substantially <sup>1d</sup>.***

---

***<sup>1d</sup> Andreassen, C. et al., 1996: Decline of the flora in the Danish Arable field. J. Appl. Ecol. 33, p. 619-626. Studies on wild plant species from 1970 to 1990 on approx. 200 wild plant species***

**Amendment 31****Molly Scott Cato**

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

**Draft opinion****Paragraph 2***Draft opinion*

2. Points out that this regulation is part of the wider EU Plant Protection Products (PPP) regime, which also includes the Sustainable Use Directive (SUD) and the regulation setting Maximum Residue Levels (MRL), and that all three parts must be considered together in order to identify whether they are fit for purpose, including with a view to reducing the total volume of PPPs used;

*Amendment*

2. Points out that this regulation is part of the wider EU Plant Protection Products (PPP) regime, which also includes the Sustainable Use Directive (SUD) and the regulation setting Maximum Residue Levels (MRL), and that all three parts must be considered together in order to identify whether they are fit for purpose, including with a view to reducing the total volume of PPPs used, ***notably through the MS and the Commission ensuring implementation of Integrated Pest Management (IPM), which can be as simple as crop rotation, and for IPM to be integrated into the CAP as foreseen already in the SUD and the current CAP regulations since 2013;***

**Amendment 32****Michel Dantin****Draft opinion****Paragraph 2***Draft opinion*

2. Points out that this regulation is part of the wider EU Plant Protection Products (PPP) regime, which also includes the Sustainable Use Directive (SUD) and the regulation setting Maximum Residue Levels (MRL), and that all three parts must be considered together in order to identify whether they are fit for purpose,

*Amendment*

2. Points out that this regulation is part of the wider EU Plant Protection Products (PPP) regime, which also includes the Sustainable Use Directive (SUD) and the regulation setting Maximum Residue Levels (MRL), and that all three parts must be considered together in order to identify whether they are fit for purpose,

including with a view to reducing the total volume of PPPs used;

including with a view to ***increasingly*** reducing the total volume of PPPs used ***and encouraging the use of low-risk PPPs***;

Or. fr

### Amendment 33

Clara Eugenia Aguilera García, Paolo De Castro, Ricardo Serrão Santos

#### Draft opinion

#### Paragraph 2

##### *Draft opinion*

2. Points out that this regulation is part of the wider EU Plant Protection Products (PPP) regime, which also includes the Sustainable Use Directive (SUD) ***and*** the regulation setting Maximum Residue Levels (MRL), and that all ***three*** parts must be considered together in order to identify whether they are fit for purpose, including with a view to reducing the total volume of PPPs used;

##### *Amendment*

2. Points out that this regulation is part of the wider EU Plant Protection Products (PPP) regime, which also includes the Sustainable Use Directive (SUD), the regulation setting Maximum Residue Levels (MRL) ***and the Regulation on Classification, Labelling and Packaging of Substances and Mixtures***, and that all ***four*** parts must be considered together in order to identify whether they are fit for purpose, including with a view to reducing the total volume of PPPs used;

Or. es

### Amendment 34

Mairead McGuinness

#### Draft opinion

#### Paragraph 2

##### *Draft opinion*

2. Points out that this regulation is part of the wider EU Plant Protection Products (PPP) regime, which also includes the Sustainable Use Directive (SUD) and the regulation setting Maximum Residue Levels (MRL), and that all three parts must be considered together in order to identify whether they are fit for purpose, ***including with a view to reducing the total***

##### *Amendment*

2. Points out that this regulation is part of the wider EU Plant Protection Products (PPP) regime, which also includes the Sustainable Use Directive (SUD) and the regulation setting Maximum Residue Levels (MRL), and that all three parts must be considered together in order to identify whether they are fit for purpose;

*volume of PPPs used;*

Or. en

## **Amendment 35**

**Rosa D'Amato, Marco Zullo**

### **Draft opinion**

#### **Paragraph 2**

##### *Draft opinion*

2. Points out that this regulation is part of the wider EU Plant Protection Products (PPP) regime, which also includes the Sustainable Use Directive (SUD) and the regulation setting Maximum Residue Levels (MRL), and that all three parts must be considered together in order to identify whether they are fit for purpose, ***including with a view to reducing*** the total volume of PPPs used;

##### *Amendment*

2. Points out that this regulation is part of the wider EU Plant Protection Products (PPP) regime, which also includes the Sustainable Use Directive (SUD) and the regulation setting Maximum Residue Levels (MRL), and that all three parts must be considered together in order to identify whether they are fit for purpose, ***the purpose being to help reduce*** the total volume of PPPs used;

Or. it

## **Amendment 36**

**Molly Scott Cato**

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

### **Draft opinion**

#### **Paragraph 2 a (new)**

##### *Draft opinion*

##### *Amendment*

***2 a. Notes that a farmer's "toolbox" is based on methods, agronomic practices as well as chemical substances and alternatives to those, such as biological control. Notes that this broader definition of toolkit is the basis of IPM, which can cut pesticide use by between 50-30%, and can be as simple as crop rotation or avoiding monocultures;***

***Notes the "many little hammers" approach of these alternative tools, as opposed to blanket metaphylaxis by broad spectrum chemical pesticides that can***

*disable other tools in the toolbox;*

Or. en

**Amendment 37**  
**Ulrike Müller, Hilde Vautmans**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 2 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***2 a. Considers that the Sustainable Use Directive has not been sufficiently implemented by EU Member States; highlights the importance of continuous training and education of farmers in the proper use of plant protection products; urges Member States and competent authorities to make better use of all available measures to increase the safe use of plant protection products and reduce adverse environmental effects;***

Or. en

**Amendment 38**  
**Annie Schreijer-Pierik**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 2 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***2a. Points out that fewer and fewer active substances for plant protection purposes are available on the EU market; stresses that European farmers and horticulturalists need to have at their disposal a range of products for effective plant protection and pest management; stresses that green low-risk plant protection products (and the active substances in them) play a key role here;***

Or. nl

**Amendment 39**

**Daciana Octavia Sârbu, Karin Kadenbach, Pavel Poc**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 2 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***2 a. Notes that the proper use of plant protection products shall comply with the provisions of Directive 2009/128/EC and in particular, with general principles of integrated pest management (IPM); regrets that those principles are not used to their full potential in the MS and that IPM development is hindered by limited availability of low risk and non-chemical pesticides;***

Or. en

**Amendment 40**

**Karin Kadenbach, Maria Noichl, Daciana Octavia Sârbu**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 2 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***2 a. Recalls that there is a substantial need for an integrative approach and that the Regulation (EC) No 1185/2009 on statistics on pesticides has to be part of the assessment by using its results reducing the quantity and as consequence minimising the risks and their negative impact on health and environment;***

Or. en

**Amendment 41**

**Angélique Delahaye**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 2 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**2a. Stresses that farmers and producers need guidance in good PPP practice, as do actors in these sectors in the transition of agricultural systems towards reducing the use of PPPs;**

Or. fr

**Amendment 42**  
**Anthea McIntyre**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 2 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**2 a. Urges the Commission to ensure that technological innovation in agriculture is specifically taken into account to match the way that Plant Protection Products are applied in the implementation of Integrated Pest Management practices, in line with the principles of 2009/128/EC;**

Or. en

**Amendment 43**  
**Mairead McGuinness, Angélique Delahaye**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 2 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**2 a. Considers that all future reviews of the regulatory framework for PPPs should encourage competitiveness and innovation in order to produce PPPs that are compatible with sustainable agriculture systems, environmentally sound, effective and affordable;**

Or. en

**Amendment 44**

**Esther Herranz García, Gabriel Mato, Ramón Luis Valcárcel Siso**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 2 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**2a. Highlights the potential that precision farming techniques can have in helping European farmers optimise pest control arrangements in a more sustainable manner;**

Or. es

**Amendment 45**

**Jan Huitema, Hannu Takkula, Hilde Vautmans**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 2 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**2 a. Highlights the importance of a holistic approach that includes integrated pest management (IPM);**

Or. en

**Amendment 46**

**Ulrike Müller, Jan Huitema, Hilde Vautmans, Hannu Takkula**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 2 b (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**2 b. Highlights the potential efficiency gains in plant protection that could be realised through the use of precision farming technologies, which will allow farmers to apply plant protection products more targeted in regard to where and in what quantity exactly they are needed**



*instead of a general application on the entire field, which would lead to a significant reduction of consumption quantity;*

Or. en

**Amendment 47**  
**Angélique Delahaye, Mairead McGuinness**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 2 b (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**2b. Stresses the need to distinguish between the professional and the private use of PPPs, given that they do not share the same framework obligations, and calls on the Commission and the Member States to clearly distinguish between these two kinds of use and to amend the rules accordingly;**

Or. fr

**Amendment 48**  
**Annie Schreijer-Pierik**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 2 b (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**2b. Stresses that the application of integrated pest management is mandatory in the Union under Directive 2009/128/EC; considers that Member States and local authorities should place more emphasis on the sustainable use of pesticides, including low-risk plant protection alternatives;**

Or. nl

**Amendment 49**

**Esther Herranz García, Gabriel Mato, Ramón Luis Valcárcel Siso**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 2 b (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***2b. Stresses the fact that, if farmers have no access to plant-protection products, they will be powerless to prevent the growth of some natural pathogens present in crops, thus jeopardising our food security;***

Or. es

**Amendment 50**

**Molly Scott Cato**

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 2 b (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***2 b. Notes that for some tools of the "toolkit" like biological controls using natural predators of pests or their parasites or parasitoids to work, it is important that untargeted broad spectrum pesticides should be avoided until being used as a last resort:***

Or. en

**Amendment 51**

**Anthea McIntyre**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 2 b (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***2 b. Highlights the importance of encouraging farmers to invest in new technologies such as precision and low***

*drift sprayers, deflectors and digital farming tools that optimise the use of Plant Protection Products and reduce environmental impact;*

Or. en

**Amendment 52**  
**Mairead McGuinness**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 2 b (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**2 b.** *Highlights the important role PPPs play in enabling crops to be grown and harvested with reduced losses arising from diseases and pest infestations, and increasing quality yields and rural incomes;*

Or. en

**Amendment 53**  
**Molly Scott Cato**  
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 2 c (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**2 c.** *Notes the need to for careful use of pesticides and only when all other alternative methods have failed, due to growth of resistance of pests to overused pesticides: Notes resistance is a biological inevitability when dealing with fast-reproducing pests and diseases; Emphasises the use of IPM as a way to prevent resistance and the need to avoid blanket or metaphylactic treatment often when no single pests is even detected, which also knocks out other beneficial species, which would otherwise be regulating pest populations, leaving crops*

*susceptible to future attacks;*

Or. en

**Amendment 54**

**Mairead McGuinness, Angélique Delahaye**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 2 c (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**2 c.** *Notes that PPPs represent a significant expense for farmers as part of their crop production systems;*

Or. en

**Amendment 55**

**Molly Scott Cato**

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

**Karin Kadenbach**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 2 d (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**2 d.** *Underlines the need for knowledge sharing and skill acquisition for alternatives to chemical pesticides and IPM, including finding the optimum crop rotation for farmers' market and climatic situations; Notes further that this is already foreseen in the horizontal regulation of the CAP, notably also Farm Advisory Services financed within Rural Development;*

Or. en

**Amendment 56**

**Molly Scott Cato**

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 2 e (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

*2 e. Notes the increasing use of broad spectrum pesticides as desiccants and crop ripeners and underlines the principle of not applying pesticide on the final products as this will inevitably raise residue levels in food and feed sometimes to unacceptable levels, given the proximity of this usage to human food chain;*

*Calls therefore for severely limiting this use, with a view to re-writing the authorisations and phasing out this use of pesticides;*

Or. en

**Amendment 57**  
**Molly Scott Cato**  
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 2 f (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

*2 f. Stresses the importance of using IPM as the basis for approving less damaging active substances, when candidates for substitution of the most dangerous pesticides are being considered; this means when MS are considering to authorise an alternative chemical (to substitute a more dangerous one), if the same effect to protect against past damage can be ensured by agronomic practices or alternatives, neither pesticide should be approved;*

Or. en

**Amendment 58**  
**Jean-Paul Denanot, Eric Andrieu**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 3**

*Draft opinion*

3. Stresses the importance of a science-based approach in authorising any active substance, in line with the EU's risk analysis principles and the precautionary principle as established in the General Food Law (Regulation (EC) No 178/2002);

*Amendment*

3. Stresses the importance of a science-based approach in authorising any active substance, in line with the EU's risk analysis principles and the precautionary principle as established in the General Food Law (Regulation (EC) No 178/2002); ***sees a need to review the procedure currently used to evaluate substances before their approval for distribution in order to improve evaluations, increase the independence of the authorities tasked with carrying out studies, avoid conflicts of interest and make the procedure more transparent;***

Or. fr

**Amendment 59**  
**Luke Ming Flanagan**  
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 3**

*Draft opinion*

3. Stresses the importance of ***a science-based*** approach in authorising any active substance, in line with the EU's risk analysis principles and the precautionary principle as established in the General Food Law (Regulation (EC) No 178/2002);

*Amendment*

3. Stresses the importance of ***objective, peer-reviewed evidence, derived from an open independent, and multidisciplinary scientific*** approach in authorising any active substance, in line with the EU's risk analysis principles and the precautionary principle as established in the General Food Law (Regulation (EC) No 178/2002), ***further believes that the commercial formulations in PPPs must be assessed and analyzed as research has shown that exposure to the "cocktail effect" can be much more hazardous than exposure to the single active ingredient;***

Or. en

## Amendment 60

Ulrike Müller, Hilde Vautmans, Hannu Takkula

### Draft opinion

#### Paragraph 3

##### *Draft opinion*

3. Stresses the importance of *a science-based approach* in authorising any active substance, in line with the EU's risk analysis principles and the precautionary principle as established in the General Food Law (Regulation (EC) No 178/2002);

##### *Amendment*

3. *Expresses its concern that in recent debates the European Union's current science-based evaluation system for PPPs has been more and more called into question; therefore* stresses the importance of *maintaining and further strengthening a scientifically robust decision making* in authorising any active substance, in line with the EU's risk analysis principles and the precautionary principle as established in the General Food Law (Regulation (EC) No 178/2002);

Or. en

## Amendment 61

Peter Jahr, Albert Deß, Mairead McGuinness, Angélique Delahaye, Norbert Lins

### Draft opinion

#### Paragraph 3

##### *Draft opinion*

3. Stresses the importance of a science-based approach in authorising any active substance, in line with the EU's risk analysis principles and the precautionary principle as established in the General Food Law (Regulation (EC) No 178/2002);

##### *Amendment*

3. Stresses the importance of a science-based approach in authorising any active substance, in line with the EU's risk analysis principles and the precautionary principle as established in the General Food Law (Regulation (EC) No 178/2002); *calls therefore for an adequate and sufficient funding as well as for the appropriate amount of staff of the relevant agencies such as for example EFSA, ECHA, etc. in order to ensure an independent, transparent and timely authorization process;*

Or. en

**Amendment 62**  
**Daniel Buda, Viorica Dăncilă**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 3**

*Draft opinion*

3. Stresses the importance of a science-based approach in authorising any active substance, in line with the EU's risk analysis principles and the precautionary principle as established in the General Food Law (Regulation (EC) No 178/2002);

*Amendment*

3. Stresses the importance of a science-based approach in authorising any active substance, in line with the EU's risk analysis principles and the precautionary principle as established in the General Food Law (Regulation (EC) No 178/2002); ***insists that the procedure for approval of active substances must take into account the actual use of plant protection products, as well as scientific and technological progress in this area;***

Or. ro

**Amendment 63**  
**Mairead McGuinness**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 3**

*Draft opinion*

3. Stresses the importance of a science-based approach in authorising any active substance, in line with the EU's risk analysis principles and the precautionary principle as established in the General Food Law (Regulation (EC) No 178/2002);

*Amendment*

3. Stresses the importance of a science-based approach in authorising any active substance, in line with the EU's risk analysis principles and the precautionary principle as established in the General Food Law (Regulation (EC) No 178/2002); ***expresses concern about the impact of recent political debates on EFSA and ECHA and their role in the authorisation of active substances;***

Or. en

**Amendment 64**  
**Molly Scott Cato**  
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group  
**Nicola Caputo, Karin Kadenbach**

PE616.638v01-00

32/83

AM\1143540EN.docx



**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 3**

*Draft opinion*

3. Stresses the importance of *a science-based* approach in authorising any active substance, in line with the EU's *risk* analysis *principles* and the precautionary principle as established in the General Food Law (Regulation (EC) No 178/2002);

*Amendment*

3. Stresses the importance of *objective, peer-reviewed evidence derived from an open and independent, holistic and multidisciplinary scientific* approach in authorising any active substance, in line with the EU's analysis *of hazards* and the precautionary principle as established in the General Food Law (Regulation (EC) No 178/2002);

Or. en

**Amendment 65**  
**Angélique Delahaye, Mairead McGuinness**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 3**

*Draft opinion*

3. Stresses the importance of *a science-based approach* in authorising any active substance, in line with the EU's risk analysis principles and the precautionary principle as established in the General Food Law (Regulation (EC) No 178/2002);

*Amendment*

3. Stresses the importance of *an approach based on sound, objective and non-discriminatory scientific principles* in authorising any active substance, in line with the EU's risk analysis principles and the precautionary principle as established in the General Food Law (Regulation (EC) No 178/2002);

Or. fr

**Amendment 66**  
**Philippe Loiseau, Edouard Ferrand, Angelo Ciocca**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 3**

*Draft opinion*

3. Stresses the importance of a science-based approach in authorising any

*Amendment*

3. Stresses the importance of a science-based approach in authorising any

active substance, in line with the EU's risk analysis principles and the precautionary principle as established in the General Food Law (Regulation (EC) No 178/2002);

active substance, in line with the ***Member States' and the*** EU's risk analysis principles and the precautionary principle as established in the General Food Law (Regulation (EC) No 178/2002);

Or. fr

**Amendment 67**  
**Anthea McIntyre**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 3**

*Draft opinion*

3. Stresses the importance of a ***science-based*** approach in authorising any active substance, in line with the EU's risk analysis principles and the precautionary principle as established in the General Food Law (Regulation (EC) No 178/2002);

*Amendment*

3. Stresses the importance of a ***scientifically robust risk-based*** approach in authorising any active substance, in line with the EU's risk analysis principles and the precautionary principle as established in the General Food Law (Regulation (EC) No 178/2002);

Or. en

**Amendment 68**  
**Norbert Erdős**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 3 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***3 a. In the event of a pesticide active substance not being granted EU authorisation or having authorisation withdrawn in the course of the appropriate procedure and on the basis of scientific evidence, calls on the Commission, the Member States and pesticide manufacturers urgently to consider introducing replacement substances for the relevant active substances and encourage farming practices such as plant protection using few pesticides, biological monitoring or***

*integrated plant protection;*

Or. hu

**Amendment 69**  
**Molly Scott Cato**  
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 3 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**3 a.** *Notes that Ecology is also a scientific discipline that deals with the interaction between all living organisms including the impacts of chemicals on non-target species. Notes that Toxicology is also a scientific discipline, with the sub-discipline of Ecotoxicology. Welcomes therefore a holistic, science-based approach based on publically funded and published, peer-reviewed science, and especially welcomes moving on from outdated 1950's arguments that undermine scientific approaches that are not chemistry;*

Or. en

**Amendment 70**  
**Ulrike Müller, Hilde Vautmans**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 3 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**3 a.** *Welcomes the Commission's interpretation of the precautionary principle, as expressed in the REFIT evaluation of the general food law<sup>1a</sup>, that it is not an alternative to a risk management approach but rather a particular form of risk management, recalls that this view is also supported by EU court rulings<sup>1b</sup>; calls on the*

*Commission to assess whether the cut-off criteria as laid down in 1107/2009 are fit for purpose in this regard;*

---

*<sup>1a</sup> SWD(2018) 38 final.*

*<sup>1b</sup> e.g. Judgement of the General Court of 9 September 2011 in France vs. Commission, T-257/07, EU:T:2011:444.*

Or. en

**Amendment 71**  
**Daciana Octavia Sârbu, Karin Kadenbach, Pavel Poc**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 3 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

*3 a. Notes that the rapporteur Member State shall prepare and submit to the Commission, with a copy to the Authority, a report referred to as "draft assessment report", assessing whether the active substance can be expected to meet the approval criteria provided for in article 4; highlights that the rapporteur Member State shall make an independent, objective and transparent assessment in the light of current scientific and technical knowledge;*

Or. en

**Amendment 72**  
**Jean-Paul Denanot, Eric Andrieu**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 3 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

*3a. Considers it vital to improve harmonisation in the legislation on placing PPPs on the market in the EU in order to prevent distortions of competition*

*in production and cross-border product-trafficking and enabling a product which is authorised in one country but not in another to enter and be used in the latter;*

Or. fr

**Amendment 73**

**Ulrike Müller, Hilde Vautmans, Hannu Takkula**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 3 b (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**3 b. Highlights that the credibility of the PPP authorisation system strongly depends on public trust in EFSA, which provides the scientific opinions that are the basis for approvals and risk management; underlines that transparency of the scientific assessment is important to maintain public trust; welcomes in this regard that the Commission in its REFIT evaluation of the General Food Law<sup>1a</sup> comes to the conclusion that EFSA has been highly transparent and has shared data within the boundaries of strict confidentiality rules given by the Co-Legislators; further welcomes the EFSA's continuous efforts to improve its system to ensure independence and the management of potential conflicts of interests which was praised by the Court of Auditors as the most advanced system of the audited agencies in 2012<sup>1b</sup> and has recently been updated in June 2017<sup>1c</sup>; calls on the Commission to propose improvements to further enhance the transparency of the regulatory process, including the access to the data of safety studies submitted by producers as part of their applications for market authorization of PPPs in the EU;**

---

<sup>1a</sup> SWD(2018) 38 final.

<sup>1b</sup>

[https://www.eca.europa.eu/Lists/News/NEWS1210\\_11/NEWS1210\\_11\\_EN.PDF](https://www.eca.europa.eu/Lists/News/NEWS1210_11/NEWS1210_11_EN.PDF)

1c

[https://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/corporate\\_publications/files/policy\\_independence.pdf](https://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/corporate_publications/files/policy_independence.pdf)

Or. en

#### **Amendment 74**

**Molly Scott Cato**

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

#### **Draft opinion**

#### **Paragraph 3 b (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**3 b. Notes that in science it is harder to find a causal relationship than for this relationship to remain hidden, and that determining those causal relationships and impacts requires objective investigation in the right places, in replicable datasets and for long enough time periods - this is rarely the case, which limits the usefulness of the weight of evidence approach, especially when those conducting experiments and field trials, e.g. via private science, have a vested interest not to find anything;**

Or. en

#### **Amendment 75**

**Ulrike Müller, Hilde Vautmans**

#### **Draft opinion**

#### **Paragraph 3 c (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**3 c. Expresses its concern that Regulation 834/2007 provides no equal scientifically robust and thorough regime for the assessment of effects on human health, animal health and the**

*environment for the authorisation of substances for plant protection in organic production; notes that the principle of separating risk assessment and risk management is not applied in that regulation;*

Or. en

**Amendment 76**  
**Molly Scott Cato**  
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 3 c (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**3 c.** *Notes that the weight of evidence approach is not used in the same way for the approval of pharmaceuticals, where risk managers avoid using any studies that are repeated, are not peer reviewed, are not published, are duplicated, have conflicts of interest or are otherwise compromised;*

Or. en

**Amendment 77**  
**Ulrike Müller, Hilde Vautmans**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 4**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

4. Expresses its concern about systematic delays in the authorisation processes and the increasing use of derogations as laid down in Article 53 of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009, ***while underlining*** the necessity for Member States to comply with the legal deadlines to ensure predictability for applicants and facilitate the market introduction of innovative PPPs that are in line with more

4. Expresses its concern about systematic delays in the authorisation processes and the increasing use of derogations as laid down in Article 53 of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009; ***stresses that these delays seriously hinder the market introduction of efficient and safer innovative products and that they also lead to an increasing use of emergency authorisations, which come with a higher***

stringent requirements;

*environmental burden; underlines the necessity for Member States to comply with the legal deadlines to ensure predictability for applicants and facilitate the market introduction of innovative PPPs that are in line with more stringent requirements; highlights that a Commission audit carried out in 2016 and 2017 in 7 Member States<sup>1a</sup> showed that the majority of the audited Member States had no sufficient systems in place to ensure the processing of applications within legal deadlines;*

---

<sup>1a</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/food/audits-analysis/overview\\_reports/details.cfm?rep\\_id=108](http://ec.europa.eu/food/audits-analysis/overview_reports/details.cfm?rep_id=108)

Or. en

## Amendment 78

Nicola Caputo, Karin Kadenbach, Molly Scott Cato

### Draft opinion

#### Paragraph 4

##### *Draft opinion*

4. Expresses its concern about systematic delays in the authorisation processes and the increasing use of derogations as laid down in Article 53 of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009, while underlining the necessity for Member States to comply with the legal deadlines to ensure predictability for applicants and facilitate the market introduction of innovative PPPs that are in line with more stringent requirements;

##### *Amendment*

4. Expresses its concern about systematic delays in the authorisation processes and the increasing use of derogations as laid down in Article 53 of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009, while underlining the necessity for Member States to comply with the legal deadlines to ensure predictability for applicants and facilitate the market introduction of innovative PPPs that are in line with more stringent requirements; *recalls recital (10) of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 which clearly highlights that substances should only be included in plant protection products where it has been demonstrated that they present a clear benefit for plant production and they are not expected to have any harmful effect on human or animal health or any unacceptable effects*



*on the environment;*

Or. en

## **Amendment 79**

**Esther Herranz García, Gabriel Mato, Ramón Luis Valcárcel Siso**

### **Draft opinion**

#### **Paragraph 4**

##### *Draft opinion*

4. Expresses its concern about systematic delays in the authorisation processes ***and the increasing*** use of derogations as laid down in Article 53 of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009, while underlining the necessity for Member States to comply with the legal deadlines to ensure predictability for applicants and facilitate the market introduction of innovative PPPs that are in line with more stringent requirements;

##### *Amendment*

4. Expresses its concern about systematic delays in the authorisation processes ***for new active substances and products and in the re-evaluation processes for substances and products already available on the market, and stresses that these delays lead to the increased*** use of derogations as laid down in Article 53 of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009, while underlining the necessity for Member States to comply with the legal deadlines to ensure predictability for applicants and facilitate the market introduction of innovative PPPs that are in line with more stringent requirements;

Or. es

## **Amendment 80**

**Michel Dantin**

### **Draft opinion**

#### **Paragraph 4**

##### *Draft opinion*

4. Expresses its concern about systematic delays in the authorisation processes and the increasing use of derogations as laid down in Article 53 of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009, while underlining the necessity for Member States to comply with the legal deadlines to ensure predictability for applicants and facilitate the market introduction of

##### *Amendment*

4. Expresses its concern about systematic delays in the authorisation processes and the increasing use of derogations as laid down in Article 53 of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009; ***considers that any derogation should be duly justified and reassessed at regular intervals***, while underlining the necessity for Member States to comply with the legal

innovative PPPs that are in line with more stringent requirements;

deadlines to ensure predictability *and legal security* for applicants and facilitate the market introduction of innovative PPPs that are in line with more stringent requirements;

Or. fr

#### **Amendment 81**

**Molly Scott Cato**

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

#### **Draft opinion**

##### **Paragraph 4**

##### *Draft opinion*

4. Expresses its concern about systematic delays in the authorisation processes and the increasing use of derogations as laid down in Article 53 of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009, while underlining the necessity for Member States to comply with the legal deadlines to ensure predictability for applicants and facilitate the market introduction of innovative PPPs that are in line with more stringent requirements;

##### *Amendment*

4. Expresses its concern about systematic delays in the authorisation processes and the increasing use of *unjustified and inappropriate* derogations as laid down in Article 53 of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009, *and the associated working document* <sup>1b</sup>, while underlining the necessity for Member States to comply with the legal deadlines to ensure predictability for applicants and facilitate the market introduction of innovative PPPs that are in line with more stringent requirements;

---

*<sup>1b</sup> see annex 1 of the Working Document on Emergency Situations According to Art.53 of Reg.1107/2009 of DG SANTE of the Commission*

Or. en

#### **Amendment 82**

**Rosa D'Amato, Marco Zullo**

#### **Draft opinion**

##### **Paragraph 4**

##### *Draft opinion*

##### *Amendment*

4. Expresses its concern about systematic delays in the authorisation processes and the increasing use of derogations as laid down in Article 53 of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009, while underlining the necessity for Member States to comply with the legal deadlines to ensure predictability for applicants and facilitate the market introduction of innovative PPPs that are in line with more stringent requirements;

4. Expresses its concern about systematic delays in the authorisation processes and **condemns** the increasing use of derogations as laid down in Article 53 of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009, while underlining the necessity for Member States to comply with the legal deadlines to ensure predictability for applicants and facilitate the market introduction of innovative PPPs that are in line with more stringent requirements;

Or. it

### **Amendment 83**

**Philippe Loiseau, Edouard Ferrand, Angelo Ciocca**

#### **Draft opinion**

##### **Paragraph 4**

###### *Draft opinion*

4. ***Expresses its concern about*** systematic delays in the authorisation processes and ***the*** increasing use of derogations as laid down in Article 53 of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009, while underlining the necessity for Member States to comply with the legal deadlines to ensure predictability for applicants and facilitate the market introduction of innovative PPPs that are in line with more stringent requirements;

###### *Amendment*

4. ***Highlights the existence of*** systematic delays in the authorisation processes and ***an*** increasing use of derogations as laid down in Article 53 of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009, while underlining the necessity for Member States to comply with the legal deadlines to ensure predictability for applicants and facilitate the market introduction of innovative PPPs that are in line with more stringent requirements;

Or. fr

### **Amendment 84**

**Molly Scott Cato**

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

#### **Draft opinion**

##### **Paragraph 4 a (new)**

###### *Draft opinion*

###### *Amendment*

***4 a. Expresses dissatisfaction regarding derogations to prohibitions of***

*use, and notes the rules are being abused; notes the current regulation and comitology arrangement allows a member state to simply announce its will to derogate and it is deemed to pass; Notes that often there is no justification for derogations, e.g. those that have been systematically granted to the partial neonicotinoid bans. Underlines that the Commission has a duty as Guardian of the Treaties to check the derogations are really justified and there are no alternatives, such as crop rotation or combinations of alternatives, that negate the need to use those substances or limit the extent of an expected pest outbreak. If no alternative preventive measures are taken, the derogations should not be granted;*

Or. en

**Amendment 85**  
**Daciana Octavia Sârbu, Karin Kadenbach, Pavel Poc**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 4 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

*4 a. Notes that by the way of derogation from article 28, in special circumstances a Member State may authorise, for a period not exceeding 120 days, the placing on the market of plant protection products, for limited and controlled use, where such a measure appears necessary because of a danger which cannot be contained by any other reasonable means; raises concerns that Article 53 is being used as a loophole for placing products on the market and that sometimes the derogations are granted without proper justification;*

Or. en

**Amendment 86**

**Michel Dantin**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 4 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***4a. Deplores unilateral decisions by Member States which can lead to the abolition or a restriction in the use of products approved by other Member States, and the lack of harmonisation in the time taken to process requests for authorisation, which gives rise to distortions of competition in the internal market and forces farmers into technical dead-ends which are both harmful to the environment and counter-productive for the competitiveness of farms;***

Or. fr

**Amendment 87**

**Karin Kadenbach, Maria Noichl, Daciana Octavia Sârbu**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 4 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***4 a. Recalls that in case of emergency Plant Protection Products authorisations the standard of the technical audit has to remain at a constant high level to ensure protection of human health and/or environment in particular with regard to ecologically or environmentally sensitive areas and that these derogations and their justifications are constantly subject to a critical review;***

Or. en

**Amendment 88**

**Clara Eugenia Aguilera García, Paolo De Castro, Ricardo Serrão Santos**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 4 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**4a.** *Points to the existence of specific requirements in each Member State and the lack of harmonisation in the methodologies used for the evaluations as the main causes of the lack of trust between states and the reason why they carry out re-assessments based on their own national models;*

Or. es

**Amendment 89**  
**Mairead McGuinness, Angélique Delahaye**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 4 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**4 a.** *Underlines the role of Member States in the effective implementation of Regulation (EC) 1107/2009; highlights the benefits of efficient authorisation, including more timely access to PPPs including low risk alternatives;*

Or. en

**Amendment 90**  
**Karin Kadenbach, Maria Noichl, Daciana Octavia Sârbu**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 4 b (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**4 b.** *Observes in this context that there is still a lack in the availability of detailed data associated with market authorisations and the criteria for the application of active substances in Plant Protection Products whereby their risk*

*assessment for health and environment cannot be carried out in an appropriate manner by sciences, research or other user groups; therefore the confidentiality restrictions have to be abolished;*

Or. en

**Amendment 91**  
**Michel Dantin**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 4 b (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

*4b. Stresses that the aim, in terms of the single market, of the procedure of mutual recognition by Member States in a particular geographical region was to simplify procedures and increase trust among the Member States; is of the opinion that, given the discrepancies in practice among the Member States and the list of products which are effectively authorised, these objectives have not been achieved;*

Or. fr

**Amendment 92**  
**Nicola Caputo, Karin Kadenbach, Molly Scott Cato**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 5**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

5. Points out that the zonal evaluation of PPP applications, which allows applicants to propose one zonal Rapporteur Member State (zRMS) to carry out the assessment, should lead to the concerned Member States (cMS) taking a decision within the maximum time limit of 120 days after the zRMS has issued the registration report;

5. Points out that the zonal evaluation of PPP applications, which allows applicants to propose one zonal Rapporteur Member State (zRMS) to carry out the assessment, should lead to the concerned Member States (cMS) taking a decision within the maximum time limit of 120 days after the zRMS has issued the registration report; ***recalls recital (16) of Regulation***

*(EC) No 1107/2009 which clearly highlights the possibility of amending or withdrawing the approval of an active substance in cases where the criteria for approval are no longer satisfied, or where compliance with Directive 2000/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2000 establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water policy is compromised, should be provided for under certain conditions;*

Or. en

**Amendment 93**  
**Georgios Epitideios**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 5**

*Draft opinion*

5. Points out that the zonal evaluation of PPP applications, which allows applicants to propose one zonal Rapporteur Member State (zRMS) to carry out the assessment, should lead to the concerned Member States (cMS) taking a decision within the maximum time limit of 120 days after the zRMS has issued the registration report;

*Amendment*

5. Points out that the zonal evaluation of PPP applications, which allows applicants to propose one zonal Rapporteur Member State (zRMS) to carry out the assessment, should lead to the concerned Member States (cMS) taking a decision ***in cooperation with each other*** within the maximum time limit of 120 days after the zRMS has issued the registration report;

Or. el

**Amendment 94**  
**Philippe Loiseau, Edouard Ferrand, Angelo Ciocca**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 5**

*Draft opinion*

5. Points out that the zonal evaluation of PPP applications, which allows applicants to propose one zonal Rapporteur Member State (zRMS) to carry out the

*Amendment*

5. Points out that the zonal evaluation of PPP applications, which allows applicants to propose one zonal Rapporteur Member State (zRMS) to carry out the



assessment, *should lead to the concerned Member States (cMS) taking a decision within the maximum time limit of 120 days after the zRMS has issued the registration report;*

assessment, *violates the subsidiarity principle and increases the lack of transparency surrounding the decisions taken by Member States' health agencies;*

Or. fr

**Amendment 95**  
**Michel Dantin**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 5**

*Draft opinion*

5. Points out that the zonal evaluation of PPP applications, which allows applicants to propose one zonal Rapporteur Member State (zRMS) to carry out the assessment, *should* lead to the concerned Member States (cMS) taking a decision within the maximum time limit of 120 days after the zRMS has issued the registration report;

*Amendment*

5. Points out that the *aim of the* zonal evaluation of PPP applications, which allows applicants to propose one zonal Rapporteur Member State (zRMS) to carry out the assessment, *was to* lead to the concerned Member States (cMS) taking a decision within the maximum time limit of 120 days after the zRMS has issued the registration report;

Or. fr

**Amendment 96**  
**Molly Scott Cato**  
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 5 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*5 a. Notes that Reg.1107/2009 gives the possibility of amending or withdrawing the approval of an active substance in cases where the criteria for approval are no longer satisfied, or where its use breaches or compromises compliance with the Water Framework Directive 2000/60/EC<sup>1e</sup> ;*  
*Notes in this regard that the first systematic testing of rivers was mandated*

*Amendment*

*the WFD - as an example in the UK these were conducted in 2016, and results showed that half of the 16 rivers tested in England had either chronic or acute levels of neonicotinoid contamination, and they were found in 17 of the 23 rivers tested across Britain;*

---

*<sup>1e</sup> Directive 2000/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2000 establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water policy*

Or. en

**Amendment 97**  
**Ulrike Müller, Hilde Vautmans**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 5 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

*5 a. Recalls that the zonal evaluation system should in principle lead to an authorisation of plant protection products that is more time- and cost-efficient for all parties concerned; expresses its concern that in practice those benefits could barely or not be realised due to a lack of cooperation, harmonised methodology and models as well as application conditions (such as quantity per surface area, distance requirements, re-entry safety intervals, periods of application etc.) between Member States, leading to systematic delays in the authorisation process and an increased use of emergency authorisations;*

Or. en

**Amendment 98**  
**Anthea McIntyre**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 5 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**5 a.** *Regrets the lack of trust between EU Member States regarding scientific assessments of substance authorisations as well as the zonal authorisation system; calls on the Commission to properly implement the existing regulatory framework to harmonise the approval system and ensure mutual recognition of products across the EU Member States in the zones identified in Regulation EC 1107/2009; underlines that the full implementation of the existing legislation should have the aim of avoiding duplication of work and making new substances available to farmers without unnecessary delays;*

Or. en

**Amendment 99**  
**Esther Herranz García, Gabriel Mato, Ramón Luis Valcárcel Siso**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 5 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**5a.** *Points out that the complexities of the current evaluation and authorisation system lead to deadlines being missed and mean that the entire system cannot work properly; stresses, therefore, the need to review and simplify this system;*

Or. es

**Amendment 100**  
**Daciana Octavia Sârbu, Karin Kadenbach, Pavel Poc**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 5 a (new)**

**5 a.** *Highlights the imbalance in the number of applications between some MS of the same zone and of similar size and agricultural conditions;*

Or. en

**Amendment 101**

**Angélique Delahaye, Mairead McGuinness**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 6**

*Draft opinion*

6. Stresses the need to encourage work sharing between Member States by fostering the availability and use of harmonised methodology and models to conduct evaluations, while reducing the existence of additional national requirements;

*Amendment*

6. Stresses the need to encourage work sharing ***and information exchange*** between Member States by fostering the availability and use of harmonised methodology and models to conduct evaluations while reducing the existence of additional national requirements, ***in order to ensure the optimal operation of the internal market;***

Or. fr

**Amendment 102**

**Ulrike Müller, Hilde Vautmans**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 6**

*Draft opinion*

6. ***Stresses the need to encourage work sharing between*** Member States ***by fostering*** the availability and use of harmonised methodology and models to conduct evaluations, while reducing the existence of additional national requirements;

*Amendment*

6. ***Urges*** Member States ***to fully use the opportunity of work sharing provided by the zonal authorisation system by further developing*** the availability and use of harmonised methodology and models to conduct evaluations, while reducing the existence of additional national requirements; ***encourages the Commission and competent authorities to support the Member States in that project;***

### Amendment 103

Rosa D'Amato, Marco Zullo

#### Draft opinion

#### Paragraph 6

##### *Draft opinion*

6. Stresses the need to encourage work sharing between Member States by fostering the availability and use of harmonised methodology and models to conduct evaluations, ***while reducing the existence of additional national requirements;***

##### *Amendment*

6. Stresses the need to encourage work sharing between Member States by fostering the availability and use of harmonised methodology and models to conduct evaluations, ***provided that such methodology is aimed at harmonisation based on better standards to protect public health, safety, and the environment;***

Or. it

### Amendment 104

Philippe Loiseau, Edouard Ferrand, Angelo Ciocca

#### Draft opinion

#### Paragraph 6

##### *Draft opinion*

6. Stresses the need to encourage ***work*** sharing between Member States by fostering the availability and use of harmonised methodology ***and models to conduct evaluations, while reducing the existence of additional national requirements;***

##### *Amendment*

6. Stresses the need to encourage ***data*** sharing between Member States by fostering the availability and use of harmonised methodology ***where feasible;***

Or. fr

### Amendment 105

Georgios Epitideios

#### Draft opinion

#### Paragraph 6

*Draft opinion*

6. Stresses the need to encourage ***work sharing*** between Member States by fostering the availability and use of harmonised methodology and models to conduct evaluations, while ***reducing the existence of additional national*** requirements;

*Amendment*

6. Stresses the need to encourage ***such cooperation*** between Member States by fostering the availability and use of harmonised methodology and models to conduct evaluations, while ***updating national measures in line with present-day*** requirements;

Or. el

**Amendment 106**  
**Michel Dantin**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 6**

*Draft opinion*

6. Stresses the need to encourage work sharing between Member States by ***fostering the availability and use of*** harmonised methodology and models to conduct evaluations, while reducing the existence of additional national requirements;

*Amendment*

6. Stresses the need to encourage work sharing between Member States by ***making available a*** harmonised methodology and models to conduct evaluations while reducing the existence of additional national requirements, ***which often give rise to distortions of competition***;

Or. fr

**Amendment 107**  
**Hannu Takkula, Ivan Jakovčić**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 6**

*Draft opinion*

6. Stresses the need to encourage work sharing between Member States by fostering the availability and use of harmonised methodology and models to conduct evaluations, while reducing the existence of additional national requirements;

*Amendment*

6. Stresses the need to encourage work sharing between Member States by fostering the availability and use of harmonised methodology and models to conduct evaluations, while reducing the existence of ***unnecessary*** additional national requirements;

## Amendment 108

Mairead McGuinness, Angélique Delahaye

### Draft opinion

#### Paragraph 6

##### *Draft opinion*

6. Stresses the need to encourage **work** sharing ***between*** Member States by fostering the availability and use of harmonised ***methodology*** and models to conduct evaluations, ***while reducing the existence of additional*** national requirements;

##### *Amendment*

6. Stresses the need to encourage ***information*** sharing ***among*** Member States by fostering the availability and use of harmonised ***methodologies*** and models to conduct evaluations, ***in order to reduce unnecessary duplication by*** national authorities;

Or. en

## Amendment 109

Ulrike Müller, Hilde Vautmans

### Draft opinion

#### Paragraph 6 a (new)

##### *Draft opinion*

##### *Amendment*

***6 a. Welcomes the idea and targets of the zonal authorisation system, but recognises that those targets potentially could be achieved more efficiently by a single authorisation system on Union level; asks the Commission to evaluate whether the authorisation process could be achieved more time- and cost-efficiently by either improving the current system (e.g. by strengthening the harmonisation of methodology, models and application requirements and/or by introducing a mandatory authorisation for the entire zone following a positive evaluation by the zRMS), or by setting up a single Union approval system;***

Or. en

**Amendment 110**  
**Angélique Delahaye**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 6 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**6a. Reminds the Commission and the Member States of the importance of financing research and innovation aimed at finding viable alternative solutions to PPPs in environmental, health and economic terms and stresses the need to guide farmers in the implementation of these alternative solutions to enable them to reduce their use of PPPs;**

Or. fr

**Amendment 111**  
**Anthea McIntyre**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 6 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**6 a. Calls on the European Commission to improve the functioning of the Mutual Recognition system and for Mutual Recognition to be obligatory unless there are unacceptable environmental effects or different Generally Accepted Practices;**

Or. en

**Amendment 112**  
**Molly Scott Cato**  
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 6 a (new)**



*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**6 a.** *Notes the excellent quality and sufficient provisioning of organic products, the vast majority of which are produced without resorting to any chemical pesticides, but use a wide range of effective agronomic and physical methods and biological controls;*

Or. en

**Amendment 113**

**Mairead McGuinness, Angélique Delahaye**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 6 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**6 a.** *Stresses that PPPs are not only used in agriculture but also for weed and pest control in urban areas including public parks and railways; emphasises that professional and non-professional users of PPPs should receive adequate training;*

Or. en

**Amendment 114**

**Molly Scott Cato**

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 6 b (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**6 b.** *Notes the unintentional effects of pesticides on soil and non-target species and also organic farmers who suffer economic losses from their neighbours' pesticide use, whereby drift from pesticide spraying and movement of persistent active substances in the environment contaminate organic produce and soils;*

*notes that organic farmers are often forced to sell that produce as conventional, losing out on their price premium, or worse become decertified, due to actions that are not their own;*

Or. en

## **Amendment 115**

**Rosa D'Amato, Marco Zullo**

### **Draft opinion**

#### **Paragraph 7**

*Draft opinion*

**7.      *Regards the application of the mutual recognition procedure as an important tool to increase work sharing and ensure compliance with deadlines, as it allows applicants to apply for authorisation in another Member State which makes the same use of the product in question for the same agricultural practices, based on the assessment carried out for the authorisation in the original Member State;***

*Amendment*

***deleted***

Or. it

## **Amendment 116**

**Michel Dantin**

### **Draft opinion**

#### **Paragraph 7**

*Draft opinion*

**7.      *Regards the application of the mutual recognition procedure as an important tool to increase work sharing and ensure compliance with deadlines, as it allows applicants to apply for authorisation in another Member State which makes the same use of the product in question for the same agricultural practices, based on the assessment carried***

*Amendment*

**7.      *Calls attention to the fact that, if the significant discrepancies between the Member States with regard to authorised PPPs and the mistrust between them persist, the principle of mutual recognition, according to which a PPP which is authorised in one Member State may be authorised in another Member State which makes the same use of the***

out for the authorisation in the original Member State;

product in question for the same agricultural practices, based on the assessment carried out for the authorisation in the original Member State, ***cannot be applied effectively; therefore calls on the Commission to proceed in two stages;***

Or. fr

#### **Amendment 117**

**Ulrike Müller, Hilde Vautmans**

#### **Draft opinion**

#### **Paragraph 7**

##### *Draft opinion*

7. Regards the application of the mutual recognition procedure as an important tool to increase work sharing and ensure compliance with deadlines, as it allows applicants to apply for authorisation in another Member State which makes the same use of the product in question for the same agricultural practices, based on the assessment carried out for the authorisation in the original Member State;

##### *Amendment*

7. Regards the application of the mutual recognition procedure as an important tool to increase work sharing and ensure compliance with deadlines, as it allows applicants to apply for authorisation in another Member State which makes the same use of the product in question for the same agricultural practices, based on the assessment carried out for the authorisation in the original Member State; ***expresses its concern that a recent Commission audit<sup>1a</sup> concludes that some Member States fully or partially re-evaluate applications for mutually recognition, which results in exceeding legal deadlines, although the majority of these evaluations have the same or a very similar outcome;***

---

<sup>1a</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/food/audits-analysis/overview\\_reports/details.cfm?rep\\_id=108](http://ec.europa.eu/food/audits-analysis/overview_reports/details.cfm?rep_id=108)

Or. en

#### **Amendment 118**

**Philippe Loiseau, Edouard Ferrand, Angelo Ciocca**

#### **Draft opinion**

#### **Paragraph 7**

*Draft opinion*

7. Regards the ***application of the*** mutual recognition procedure as ***an important tool to increase work sharing and ensure compliance with deadlines, as it allows applicants to apply for authorisation in another Member State which makes the same use of the product in question for the same agricultural practices, based on the assessment carried out for the authorisation in the original Member State;***

*Amendment*

7. Regards the mutual recognition procedure as ***conflicting with the subsidiarity principle;***

Or. fr

**Amendment 119**

**Clara Eugenia Aguilera García, Paolo De Castro, Ricardo Serrão Santos**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 7**

*Draft opinion*

7. Regards the application of the mutual recognition procedure as an important tool to increase work sharing and ensure compliance with deadlines, as it allows applicants to apply for authorisation in another Member State which makes the same use of the product in question for the same agricultural practices, based on the assessment carried out for the authorisation in the original Member State;

*Amendment*

7. Regards the application of the mutual recognition procedure as an important tool to increase work sharing and ensure compliance with deadlines, as it allows applicants to apply for authorisation in another Member State which makes the same use of the product in question for the same agricultural practices, based on the assessment carried out for the authorisation in the original Member State, ***which, for its part, shall be responsible at all times for the assessment issued to Member States applying mutual recognition, as laid down in Regulation (EU) No 528/2012 on biocidal products;***

Or. es

**Amendment 120**

**Angélique Delahaye, Mairead McGuinness**

**Draft opinion**

PE616.638v01-00

60/83

AM\1143540EN.docx

## Paragraph 7

### *Draft opinion*

7. Regards the application of the mutual recognition procedure as an important tool to increase work sharing and ensure compliance with deadlines, as it allows applicants to apply for authorisation in another Member State which makes the same use of the product in question for the same agricultural practices, based on the assessment carried out for the authorisation in the original Member State;

### *Amendment*

7. Regards the application of the mutual recognition procedure as an important tool to increase work sharing and ensure compliance with deadlines ***whilst guaranteeing optimum protection for users***, as it allows applicants to apply for authorisation in another Member State which makes the same use of the product in question for the same agricultural practices, based on the assessment carried out for the authorisation in the original Member State;

Or. fr

## Amendment 121

Mairead McGuinness, Angélique Delahaye

### Draft opinion

#### Paragraph 7

### *Draft opinion*

7. Regards the application of the mutual recognition procedure as an important tool to increase work sharing and ensure compliance with deadlines, ***as it allows*** applicants to apply for authorisation in another Member State which makes the same use of the product in question for the same agricultural practices, based on the assessment carried out for the authorisation in the original Member State;

### *Amendment*

7. Regards the application of the mutual recognition procedure as an important tool to increase work sharing and ensure compliance with deadlines, ***allowing*** applicants to apply for authorisation in another Member State which makes the same use of the product in question for the same agricultural practices, based on the assessment carried out for the authorisation in the original Member State;

Or. en

## Amendment 122

Michel Dantin

### Draft opinion

#### Paragraph 7 – point a (new)

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**(a) review the mutual recognition procedure with the aim of increasing its effectiveness and improving implementation, meeting deadlines and mutual trust between the Member States;**

Or. fr

**Amendment 123**

**Michel Dantin**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 7 – point b (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**(b) carry out an impact assessment in order to gauge the feasibility of setting up an authorisation procedure for PPPs (at European level and directly spearheaded by the Commission), taking into account specific geographical characteristics, with the aim of harmonising the rules among the Member States, dramatically reducing costs and time limits and resolving problems of unfair competition by strengthening the internal market for PPPs, and bearing in mind the fact that this kind of procedure will not be possible without sufficient budget resources and expertise from the Member States;**

Or. fr

**Amendment 124**

**Clara Eugenia Aguilera García, Paolo De Castro, Ricardo Serrão Santos**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 7 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**7a. Believes that establishing a single authority at EU level, responsible for all aspects of the evaluation and**

*authorisation of active substances, would avoid duplication of work, significantly reducing costs and the administrative burden, and would ensure a uniformly high level of protection of the environment and human health as well as providing a 'one-stop shop' for the evaluation and registration of active substances;*

Or. es

**Amendment 125**

**Michel Dantin**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 7 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

*7a. Takes the view that an authorisation procedure for PPPs which is harmonised at European level might provide common solutions for small farms which are currently in technical dead-ends because of the cost of obtaining authorisation and the lack of investment and research on the part of private and public stakeholders;*

Or. fr

**Amendment 126**

**Daciana Octavia Sârbu, Karin Kadenbach, Pavel Poc**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 7 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

*7 a. Expresses its concern that the Member States are not sufficiently equipped to deal with illegal and counterfeit plant protection products;*

Or. en

**Amendment 127**

**Karin Kadenbach, Maria Noichl, Daciana Octavia Sârbu**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 7 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**7 a. States that the Member States' right to refuse authorized Plant Protection Products remain unaffected;**

Or. en

**Amendment 128**

**Daciana Octavia Sârbu, Karin Kadenbach, Pavel Poc**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 7 b (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**7 b. Notes that the lack of coordination between the Member States is leading to duplication of work, resulting in inefficient expenditure and administrative burden;**

Or. en

**Amendment 129**

**Miguel Viegas**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 8**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

8. Stresses the contribution that the authorisation of low-risk PPPs makes to a sustainable EU farming sector, and draws attention to the importance of contributing to a better functioning agricultural ecosystem and a sustainable farming sector, while pointing out that the lack of

8. Stresses the contribution that the authorisation of low-risk PPPs makes to a sustainable EU farming sector, and draws attention to the importance of contributing to a better functioning agricultural ecosystem and a sustainable farming sector, while pointing out that the lack of



availability of PPPs could jeopardise the diversification of agriculture and cause harmful organisms to become resistant to PPPs.

availability of PPPs could jeopardise the diversification of agriculture and cause harmful organisms to become resistant to PPPs; *points out that the growing need for PPPs stems from deregulation and liberalisation of the common agricultural policy, a process that is making farmers adopt increasingly more intensive practices requiring additional substances which in many cases are at odds with sustainable practices, thus endangering public health and biodiversity.*

Or. pt

**Amendment 130**  
**Michel Dantin**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 8**

*Draft opinion*

8. Stresses the contribution that the authorisation of *low-risk PPPs* makes to a sustainable EU farming sector, and draws attention to the *importance of contributing* to a better functioning agricultural ecosystem and a sustainable farming sector, while pointing out that the lack of availability of PPPs could jeopardise the diversification of agriculture and cause harmful organisms to become resistant to PPPs.

*Amendment*

8. Stresses the contribution that the authorisation of *PPPs which pose little risk to human health and the environment* makes to a sustainable EU farming sector and draws attention to the *fact that this category currently contains only ten substances, while some substances which were granted authorisation before 2011 might satisfy the conditions, and that it is therefore necessary to reassess these in order to increase this number and contribute* to a better functioning agricultural ecosystem and a sustainable farming sector, while pointing out that the lack of availability of PPPs could jeopardise the diversification of agriculture and cause harmful organisms to become resistant to PPPs.

Or. fr

**Amendment 131**  
**Luke Ming Flanagan**  
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group  
AM\1143540EN.docx

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 8**

*Draft opinion*

8. Stresses the contribution that the authorisation of low-risk **PPPs makes** to a sustainable EU farming sector, and draws attention to the importance of contributing to a better functioning agricultural ecosystem and a sustainable farming sector, while pointing out that the **lack of availability** of PPPs could jeopardise the diversification of agriculture and cause harmful organisms to become resistant to PPPs.

*Amendment*

8. Stresses the contribution that the authorisation of low-risk **natural PPPs based on natural products can make** to a sustainable EU farming sector, and draws attention to the importance of contributing to a better functioning agricultural ecosystem and a sustainable farming sector, while pointing **that this category should not be used as a loophole for GMOs and mainstream chemical pesticides to avoid the authorization process, also points** out that the **overuse** of PPPs could jeopardise the diversification of agriculture and cause harmful organisms to become resistant to PPPs.

Or. en

**Amendment 132**  
**Georgios Eptideios**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 8**

*Draft opinion*

8. Stresses the contribution that the authorisation of low-risk PPPs makes to a sustainable EU farming sector, and draws attention to the importance of contributing to a better functioning agricultural ecosystem and a sustainable farming sector, while pointing out that the lack of availability of PPPs could jeopardise the diversification of agriculture and cause harmful organisms to become resistant to PPPs.

*Amendment*

8. Stresses the contribution that the authorisation of low-risk PPPs makes to a sustainable EU farming sector, and draws attention to the importance of contributing to a better functioning agricultural ecosystem and a sustainable farming sector, while pointing out that the lack of availability of PPPs could jeopardise the diversification of agriculture and cause harmful organisms to become resistant to PPPs. **In any case, however, PPPs should be used in a manner that will not disrupt the balance of the natural process.**

Or. el

**Amendment 133**  
**Molly Scott Cato**  
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 8**

*Draft opinion*

8. Stresses the contribution that the authorisation of low-risk **PPPs makes** to a sustainable EU farming sector, **and** draws attention to the importance of contributing to a better functioning agricultural ecosystem and a sustainable farming sector, **while pointing out that the lack of availability** of PPPs could jeopardise the diversification of agriculture and cause **harmful organisms** to become resistant to PPPs.

*Amendment*

8. Stresses the contribution that the authorisation of low-risk **natural PPPs based on natural products can make** to a sustainable EU farming sector, **especially efficient when introduced/used in combination with good agronomic practices**; Draws attention to the importance of contributing to a better functioning agricultural ecosystem and a sustainable farming sector; **Points** out that the **overuse** of PPPs could jeopardise the diversification of agriculture and cause **pests and diseases** to become resistant to PPPs.

Or. en

**Amendment 134**  
**Rosa D'Amato, Marco Zullo**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 8**

*Draft opinion*

8. Stresses the contribution that the authorisation of low-risk PPPs **makes** to a sustainable EU farming sector, and draws attention to the importance of contributing to a better functioning agricultural ecosystem **and a sustainable farming sector, while pointing out that the lack of availability of PPPs could jeopardise the diversification of agriculture and cause harmful organisms to become resistant to PPPs.**

*Amendment*

8. Stresses the contribution that the authorisation of low-risk PPPs **might make** to a sustainable EU farming sector **in the short term**, and draws attention to the importance of contributing to a better functioning agricultural ecosystem **by employing sustainable, innovative soil management techniques**;

Or. it

**Amendment 135**  
**Momchil Nekov, Karin Kadenbach**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 8**

*Draft opinion*

8. Stresses the contribution that the authorisation of low-risk PPPs makes to a sustainable EU farming sector, and draws attention to the importance of contributing to a better functioning agricultural ecosystem and a sustainable farming sector, while pointing out that the lack of availability of **PPPs** could jeopardise the diversification of agriculture and cause harmful organisms to become resistant to PPPs.

*Amendment*

8. Stresses the contribution that the authorisation of low-risk PPPs makes to a sustainable EU farming sector, and draws attention to the importance of contributing to a better functioning agricultural ecosystem and a sustainable farming sector, while pointing out that the lack of availability of ***new and safe PPPs and alternatives to the existing ones*** could jeopardise the diversification of agriculture and cause harmful organisms to become resistant to ***existing*** PPPs.

Or. en

**Amendment 136**  
**Angélique Delahaye, Mairead McGuinness**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 8**

*Draft opinion*

8. Stresses the contribution that the authorisation of low-risk PPPs makes to a sustainable EU farming sector, and draws attention to the importance of contributing to a better functioning agricultural ecosystem and a sustainable farming sector, while pointing out that the lack of availability of PPPs could jeopardise the diversification of agriculture and cause harmful organisms to become resistant to PPPs.

*Amendment*

8. Stresses the contribution that the authorisation of low-risk PPPs makes to a sustainable EU farming sector, and draws attention to the importance of contributing to a better functioning agricultural ecosystem and a sustainable farming sector, while pointing out that the lack of availability of PPPs could jeopardise the diversification of agriculture and ***the quality of Europe's agricultural production and*** cause harmful organisms to become resistant to PPPs.

Or. fr

**Amendment 137**

PE616.638v01-00

68/83

AM\1143540EN.docx

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 8**

*Draft opinion*

8. Stresses the contribution that the authorisation of low-risk PPPs makes to a sustainable EU farming sector, and draws attention to the importance of contributing to a better functioning agricultural ecosystem and a sustainable farming sector, while pointing out that the lack of availability of PPPs could jeopardise the diversification of agriculture and cause harmful organisms to become resistant to PPPs.

*Amendment*

8. Stresses the contribution that the authorisation of low-risk PPPs makes to a sustainable EU farming sector, and draws attention to the importance of contributing to a better functioning agricultural ecosystem and a sustainable farming sector, while pointing out that the lack of availability of PPPs ***or the lack of research and development in new PPPs*** could jeopardise the diversification of agriculture and cause harmful organisms to become resistant to PPPs.

Or. fr

**Amendment 138**

**Mairead McGuinness, Angélique Delahaye**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 8**

*Draft opinion*

8. Stresses the contribution that the authorisation of low-risk PPPs makes to a sustainable EU farming sector, and draws attention to the importance of contributing to a better functioning agricultural ecosystem and a sustainable farming sector, while pointing out that the lack of availability of PPPs could jeopardise the diversification of agriculture and cause harmful organisms to become resistant to PPPs.

*Amendment*

8. Stresses the contribution that the authorisation of low-risk PPPs makes to a sustainable EU farming sector and ***the importance of ensuring their availability***; draws attention to the importance of contributing to a better functioning agricultural ecosystem and a sustainable farming sector, while pointing out that the lack of availability of PPPs could jeopardise the diversification of agriculture and cause harmful organisms to become resistant to PPPs;

Or. en

**Amendment 139**

**Jan Huitema, Hannu Takkula, Hilde Vautmans**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 8 – subparagraph 1 (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

*Expresses concerns about the small amount of new substances that have been approved, while at the same time other substances have been taken of the market; stresses the importance of a suitable tool box of plant protection products for farmers to secure the EU's food supply;*

Or. en

**Amendment 140**  
**Luke Ming Flanagan**  
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 8 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

*8 a. believes as a complement to low risk PPPs Integrated pest management should be mainstreamed into EU agriculture, this means careful consideration of all available plant protection methods and subsequent integration of appropriate measures that discourage the development of populations of harmful organisms and keep the use of plant protection products and other forms of intervention to levels that are economically and ecologically justified and reduce or minimise risks to human health and the environment. 'Integrated pest management' emphasises the growth of a healthy crop with the least possible disruption to agro-ecosystems and encourages natural pest control mechanisms.*

*The prevention and/or suppression of harmful organisms should be achieved or supported among other options especially*

*by:*

*crop rotation,*

*use of adequate cultivation techniques (e.g. stale seedbed technique, sowing dates and densities, under-sowing, conservation tillage, pruning and direct sowing),*

*use, where appropriate, of resistant/tolerant cultivars and standard/certified seed and planting material,*

*use of balanced fertilisation, liming and irrigation/drainage practices,*

*preventing the spreading of harmful organisms by hygiene measures (e.g. by regular cleansing of machinery and equipment),*

*protection and enhancement of important beneficial organisms, e.g. by adequate plant protection measures or the utilisation of ecological infrastructures inside and outside production sites.*

Or. en

**Amendment 141**  
**Michel Dantin**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 8 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**8a. Stresses that PPPs can contribute to reducing biodiversity and to the poor state of bodies of water and soil in the Member States, and that there is a need to encourage investment in research to develop new low-risk PPPs and meet the growing demand so that agricultural production can be brought more into line with the protection of health and the environment; underlines, however, the importance of not depriving farmers of PPPs and of replacing these with other substances or production methods which would be more harmful to the**

*environment and human health;*

Or. fr

**Amendment 142**  
**Annie Schreijer-Pierik**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 8 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**8a. Reiterates and underlines that on 15 February 2017<sup>1 a</sup> Parliament asked the Commission, by the end of 2018, to submit a specific legislative proposal to amend Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009, over and above the general revision under the REFIT initiative, in order to introduce an accelerated procedure for the evaluation, authorisation and registration of biological low-risk plant protection products;**

---

**<sup>1 a</sup> European Parliament resolution of 15 February 2017 on low-risk pesticides of biological origin (2016/2903(RSP))**

Or. nl

**Amendment 143**  
**Esther Herranz García, Gabriel Mato, Ramón Luis Valcárcel Siso**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 8 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**8a. Welcomes the effort made by the European Commission in creating the coordination tool for the approval of plant protection products for minor uses but stresses the need to make active substances for these purposes more widely available, and recalls that in many Member States, minor uses represent a**



*large majority of crops;*

Or. es

**Amendment 144**

**Paolo De Castro, Clara Eugenia Aguilera García, Ricardo Serrão Santos, Tibor Szanyi, Nikos Androulakis, Michela Giuffrida, Karin Kadenbach**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 8 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**8 a. Underlines the important role low-risk PPPs can play in a comprehensive strategy of integrated pest management; calls for a better implementation of the existing regulation in regards to the market authorization for low-risk PPPs; stresses the importance of the effectiveness of low-risk PPPs in order to increase acceptance and facilitate a broad uptake in farmers' crop protection strategies.**

Or. en

**Amendment 145**

**Jean-Paul Denanot, Eric Andrieu**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 8 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**8a. Takes the view that Regulation 1107/2009 should also be amended to take more account of substances not regarded as PPPs and which, when used for plant protection, are governed by the Regulation; such substances offer interesting alternatives in terms of integrated production methods and some bio-control products.**

Or. fr

**Amendment 146**  
**Mairead McGuinness, Angélique Delahaye**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 8 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**8 a.** *Notes with concern that farmers have fewer tools available to them due to the low number of new active substances approved since the implementation of Regulation (EC) 1107/2009; notes that research and technology have an important role to play in increasing available tools to meet current and future challenges to agriculture such as counteracting resistance.*

Or. en

**Amendment 147**  
**Rosa D'Amato, Marco Zullo**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 8 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**8a.** *Supports the dissemination of organic crop-growing techniques in order to provide an alternative to the use of PPPs, and maintains that an approach based on prevention, protective measures, and early detection of pathogens harmful to plants is the best safe way to improve crops.*

Or. it

**Amendment 148**  
**Angélique Delahaye, Mairead McGuinness**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 8 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**8a.** *Calls for the development of low-risk PPPs to be encouraged, with the proviso that an assessment of their effectiveness and risks, and of their capacity to meet the environmental, health and economic needs of agriculture, must be guaranteed;*

Or. fr

**Amendment 149**

**Anthea McIntyre**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 8 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**8 a.** *Welcomes the setting up of the Minor Uses Coordination Facility as a forum for improving the co-ordination between Member States, grower organisations and industry in developing solutions for minor uses; stresses the need for long lasting and sustained financing of this facility;*

Or. en

**Amendment 150**

**Jan Huitema, Ulrike Müller, Hilde Vautmans**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 8 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**8 a.** *Stresses the importance of a regulatory framework that stimulates and facilitates research and innovation in order to develop better and safer plant protection products, while at the same time securing the availability of a broad range of plant protection products.*

**Amendment 151**  
**Molly Scott Cato**  
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group  
**Karin Kadenbach**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 8 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**8 a.** *Points out that this low risk PPP category is useful for natural products that carry less risk and therefore should not have to jump through the same legislative hoops to ensure public and environmental safety;*

Or. en

**Amendment 152**  
**Ivari Padar**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 8 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**8a.** *Stresses that glyphosates do not end up in the environment only due to farmers' activities, as they are also widely used in forestry, to treat roadside verges and on railways and greenery;*

Or. et

**Amendment 153**  
**Mairead McGuinness, Angélique Delahaye**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 8 b (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**8 b.** *Stresses the importance of research and innovation in developing low-risk PPPs; highlights that public-private partnerships may help funding of research and ensure sustainable agriculture meets the demands of a growing global population, as well as addressing environmental and health concerns; notes that existing EU agricultural policies and research programmes can play a role in encouraging investment in precision agriculture;*

Or. en

**Amendment 154**  
**Rosa D'Amato, Marco Zullo**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 8 b (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**8b.** *Calls for greater funding for inspections and 'hazard-based surveys' in order to contain and prevent the spread of pathogens that damage crops; believes that when such inspections are conducted, higher priority should be assigned to tree species significant to the EU's historical and cultural heritage.*

Or. it

**Amendment 155**  
**Angélique Delahaye, Mairead McGuinness**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 8 b (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**8b.** *Calls on the Member States to undertake an exchange of information and good practice resulting from research into combating organisms which are*

*harmful to crops, thereby paving the way for alternative solutions which are practicable in environmental, health and economic terms;*

Or. fr

**Amendment 156**

**Paolo De Castro, Clara Eugenia Aguilera García, Ricardo Serrão Santos, Tibor Szanyi, Nikos Androulakis, Michela Giuffrida, Karin Kadenbach**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 8 b (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**8 b. Underlines the transformative role precision agriculture and digital farming can play regarding the use and application of PPPs; calls on the Commission to fully embrace this scientific and technological progress and ensure that farmers, consumers and the environment benefit from it;**

Or. en

**Amendment 157**

**Jan Huitema, Hannu Takkula, Hilde Vautmans**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 8 b (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**8 b. Highlights that special attention should be given to the role of small and medium enterprises (SMEs) in the development of new products, as SMEs often lack the extraordinary resources that are necessary in the process of development and approval of new substances.**

Or. en

**Amendment 158**  
**Molly Scott Cato**  
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 8 b (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**8 b.** *Underlines that the low risk PPP category should not be used as a loophole for avoiding other justifiably more complex authorisation processes for GMOs and mainstream chemical pesticides.*

Or. en

**Amendment 159**  
**Anthea McIntyre**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 8 b (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**8 b.** *Calls on the Commission to strengthen the co-ordination of data generation, particularly residues data, across the Member States;*

Or. en

**Amendment 160**  
**Esther Herranz García, Gabriel Mato, Ramón Luis Valcárcel Siso**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 8 b (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**8b.** *Deplores the fact that the credibility of the European Union's scientific agencies is being unjustifiably undermined.*

Or. es

**Amendment 161**  
**Molly Scott Cato**  
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 8 c (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**8 c.** *Notes that some member states have a tax on pesticide production and usage to cover costs currently eternalised to public health and environmental budgets and so carried by the ordinary citizens and the public purse ;*

*Invites therefore MS and the Commission to look seriously to mainstreaming this tax approach to enforce the Polluter Pays Principle.*

Or. en

**Amendment 162**  
**Paolo De Castro, Clara Eugenia Aguilera García, Ricardo Serrão Santos, Tibor Szanyi, Nikos Androulakis, Michela Giuffrida, Karin Kadenbach**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 8 c (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**8 c.** *Highlights the importance and the need for the Common Agricultural Policy, Horizon 2020 and other supportive funding schemes, to encourage farmers to invest in new technologies adapted to their farm size, such as precision and digital farming tools that optimize the use of PPPs, reduce environmental emissions and exposure to operators;*

Or. en

**Amendment 163**  
**Jean-Paul Denanot, Eric Andrieu**  
PE616.638v01-00

80/83

AM\1143540EN.docx



**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 8 c (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**8c.** *Takes the view that, for each request for a PPP to be placed on the market, Regulation 1107/2009 should provide for a comparative assessment with non-chemical methods of preventing or combating pests in order to give priority to methods which best protect health and the environment.*

Or. fr

**Amendment 164**  
**Mairead McGuinness, Angélique Delahaye**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 8 c (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**8 c.** *Considers that products imported from outside the EU grown using PPPs should be subject to the same strict criteria as products produced inside the EU; is concerned that PPPs not registered in the EU may be used in the production of imported produce;*

Or. en

**Amendment 165**  
**Anthea McIntyre**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 8 c (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**8 c.** *Calls on the Commission to propose a pan-European system of authorisation for Minor Uses and Speciality Crops and a common list of*

*major/minor crops to be applied at EU level;*

Or. en

**Amendment 166**  
**Jan Huitema, Hilde Vautmans**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 8 c (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**8 c.** *Stresses that more priority should be given to the authorisation process of low-risk substances*

Or. en

**Amendment 167**  
**Molly Scott Cato**  
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group  
**Karin Kadenbach**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 8 d (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**8 d.** *Notes that although Precision agriculture can be used to better target pesticide use where it is genuinely needed and cut overall usage, it can in some cases simply shift the type of input dependencies, while many farmers want to become more autonomous and cut input costs.*

Or. en

**Amendment 168**  
**Anthea McIntyre**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 8 d (new)**

PE616.638v01-00

82/83

AM\1143540EN.docx

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***8 d. Takes the view that low-risk pesticides can play an important role in integrated pest management and calls for an accelerated authorisation process for these substances in order to facilitate their inclusion in crop protection strategies;***

Or. en

**Amendment 169**

**Molly Scott Cato**

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

**Karin Kadenbach**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 8 e (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***8 e. Calls for the same approach we currently have for antimicrobial resistance to be applied also to pesticide resistance.***

Or. en