Question for written answer E-003699/2020
to the Commission
Rule 138
Ernest Urtasun (Verts/ALE)

Subject: Monitoring emergency licences

In accordance with Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/344, it was decided to renew the approval period of the active substance ethoprophos by granting a grace period which would expire by 21 March 2020 at the latest.

As soon as this grace period expired, Spain granted an emergency authorisation for use under Article 53 of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009, whereby it could be placed on the market and used in certain autonomous communities.

This calls to mind what happened recently with three neonicotinoids (imidacloprid, clothianidin and thiamethoxam), covered by Implementing Regulations (EU) 2018/783, (EU) 2018/784 and (EU) 2018/785, for which Lithuania and Romania immediately granted emergency authorisations. Consequently, Article 53 (2) of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 was applied and EFSA was asked for a report, which led to both countries' emergency authorisations being banned in February 2020.

1. In the Commission's view, are we in a similar situation and, as a result, will it ask EFSA for a report on the possible misuse of Article 53?

2. In the event that it does not consider making a request to EFSA necessary, can it explain what differences there are with what happened in 2018 and how it can justify not applying paragraphs 2 and 3 of Article 53?