Question for written answer E-005051/2020
to the Commission
Rule 138
Ernest Urtasun (Verts/ALE)

Subject: Application of Article 53(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009

Following a number of questions to Parliament about the circumstances under which Article 53(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 is applied, we are still not sure from reading the answers received what protocol the Commission has established for this procedure.

Concerning the decisions taken on neonicotinoids, it would seem that it was the constant re-issuance of emergency authorisations by Lithuania and Romania that triggered the request for a report from the European Food Safety Authority.

I therefore tabled questions E-004191/2019 and E-004166/2020 (27 emergency authorisations for the substances 1,3-dicloropropene and cloropicrin in nine years in Spain). The Commission referred in its answers to its response to a petition by a Spanish citizen. However as this seems to be the subject of an appeal that is still pending, it is difficult to understand what justification there is for routinely repeating the same thing each year.

Maybe the application of Article 53(2) in 2017 was due to the fact that no sooner were the substances banned than emergency authorisations were issued. This also happened with the substance ethoprophos in Spain, the subject of our question E-003699/2020. However the answer received was that this was not the reason.

Could the Commission explain clearly and concisely what protocol or instructions its officials have established for application of Article 53(2)?