

**Question for written answer E-000056/2015  
to the Commission**

Rule 130

**Alojz Peterle (PPE), Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D), Pavel Poc (S&D), Nicola Caputo (S&D), Karin Kadenbach (S&D), Benedek Jávor (Verts/ALE), Marco Zullo (EFDD), Christel Schaldemose (S&D) and Paul Brannen (S&D)**

Subject: Aerial spraying of pesticides

EU Directive 128/2009 on sustainable use of pesticides states in its Article 9 that Member States shall ensure that aerial spraying is prohibited, but that a derogation may be granted where there are no viable alternatives or where there are clear advantages in terms of reduced impact on human health and the environment as compared with land-based application of pesticides. However, the Directive clearly states that the area to be sprayed shall not be in close proximity to residential areas.

Will the Commission take actions against Member States not introducing a ban on aerial spraying in their national action plan?

What can the Commission do to step up actions against unjustified and irrelevant derogations, including ensuring that spraying has not been carried out close to residential areas and that drift has been mitigated?

Is it the Commission, the Member States or the individual farmer who defines what the (environmental and economic) viable alternatives are?