

**Question for written answer E-004166/2020
to the Commission**
Rule 138
Ernest Urtasun (Verts/ALE)

Subject: Monitoring emergency authorisations

The answer to my written question E-002367/2020 indicates that SANCO/10087/2013 provides an up-to-date interpretation of Article 53 of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009.

Section 2.2, concerning non-approved substances, states that 'The use should generally be connected to a single pest species, or related group of pest species where the use is not for disinfection purposes.' It goes on to say that only in very exceptional cases may repeat authorisations remain necessary and, in this instance, economic evidence must be provided proving that the system cannot be changed within a year.

Between 2011 and 2017, Spain granted 27 emergency authorisations (including four this year) for 1,3-Dichloropropene, Chloropicrin and their compounds for the purpose of soil disinfection.

1. In the Commission's view, does the repeat of this type of emergency authorisation for soil disinfection granted by Spain, as well as by Portugal, Hungary and Italy, comply with the current Working document (SANCO/10087/2013) or should the same mechanisms apply as those activated for neonicotinoids?
2. Do any other documents provide other reasons that can justify the use of Article 53?