

**Question for written answer E-002683/2014/rev.1
to the Commission**

Rule 117

Hiltrud Breyer (Verts/ALE)

Subject: Pesticides: independent literature and scientists to scrutinise European Food Safety Authority opinion

Under Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009, the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) was given the task of defining independent peer-reviewed literature. It did this in such a way that, generally, only industry-sponsored studies qualified and academic studies did not. This is exactly the opposite of what the regulation was intended to achieve.

In the first cases of assessment with this requirement (Glyphosate, Diquat, 2,4-D, etc.), industry took advantage of this EFSA opinion and did a 'review', with the result that no academic study is relevant for decision-making, owing to the Klimisch loophole. This means the requirement of the regulation is completely undermined.

1. Does the Commission think academic studies are completely useless for Brussels decision-making?
2. Does the Commission agree with the EFSA opinion that industry-sponsored studies are always reliable and relevant?
3. Now that it is clear that no independent studies are taken into account, is it not time to revise and redesign the EFSA opinion?
4. What does the Commission think about involving independent scientists to scrutinise the results of the EFSA opinion?