



2016/2903(RSP)

15.12.2016

AMENDMENTS

1 - 130

Draft question for oral answer

Herbert Dorfmann, Pavel Poc, Julie Girling, Frédérique Ries, Lynn Boylan, Bart Staes, Mireille D'Ornano, Eleonora Evi
(PE592.356v01-00)

Biological low risk pesticides
(2016/2903(RSP))

Amendment 1
Nicola Caputo, Doru-Claudian Frunzuliță, Pavel Poc

Draft motion for a resolution
Citation 2

Draft motion for a resolution

— having regard to Directive 2009/128/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 October 2009 establishing a framework for Community action to achieve the sustainable use of pesticides², and in particular Article **12** thereof;

² OJ L 309, 24.11.2009, p.71.

Amendment

— having regard to Directive 2009/128/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 October 2009 establishing a framework for Community action to achieve the sustainable use of pesticides², and in particular Article **14** thereof;

² OJ L 309, 24.11.2009, p.71.

Or. it

Amendment 2
Eleonora Evi, Marco Zullo, Piernicola Pedicini, Marco Affronte

Draft motion for a resolution
Citation 2

Draft motion for a resolution

— having regard to Directive 2009/128/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 October 2009 establishing a framework for Community action to achieve the sustainable use of pesticides², and in particular Article 12 thereof;

² OJ L 309, 24.11.2009, p.71.

Amendment

— having regard to Directive 2009/128/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 October 2009 establishing a framework for Community action to achieve the sustainable use of pesticides², and in particular Article **1 and Article 12** thereof;

² OJ L 309, 24.11.2009, p.71.

Or. en

Amendment 3
Annie Schreijer-Pierik

Draft motion for a resolution

Citation 6 a (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

- *having regard to the Action Plan against the rising threats from Antimicrobial Resistance (COM (2011) 748) and the upcoming Antimicrobial Resistance (AMR) Action Plan of the European Commission to be launched in 2017;*

Or. en

Amendment 4
Notis Marias

Draft motion for a resolution
Citation 9 a (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

- *having regard to Protocol No 1 to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) on the role of National Parliaments in the European Union,*

Or. el

Amendment 5
Notis Marias

Draft motion for a resolution
Citation 9 b (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

- *having regard to Protocol No 2 to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) on the application of the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality,*

Or. el

Amendment 6
Annie Schreijer-Pierik

Draft motion for a resolution
Recital A

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

A. *whereas the use of conventional plant protection products is increasingly contentious, due to the risks that they pose for human health and the environment;*

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 7
Eleftherios Synadinos

Draft motion for a resolution
Recital A

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

A. *whereas the use of conventional plant protection products is increasingly contentious, due to the risks that they pose for human health and the **environment**;*

A. *whereas the use of conventional plant protection products is increasingly contentious, due to the risks that they pose for human health, **the environment, biodiversity and the robustness of food chains and food webs in the medium and long term**;*

Or. el

Amendment 8
Julie Girling

Draft motion for a resolution
Recital A

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

A. *whereas the **use of conventional plant protection products is increasingly contentious, due to the risks that they pose** for human health and the environment;*

A. *whereas the **purpose of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 is to ensure that the approval and use of plant protection products ensures a high level of protection** for human health and the environment **whilst at the same time***

*safeguarding the competitiveness of
Community agriculture^{1a} ;*

*^{1a} Recital 8 of Regulation (EC) No
1107/2009.*

Or. en

Amendment 9

Ulrike Müller, Jan Huitema, Jasenko Selimovic

Draft motion for a resolution

Recital A

Draft motion for a resolution

A. whereas the use of conventional plant protection products *is increasingly contentious, due to the risks that they pose for human health and the environment;*

Amendment

A. whereas the use of conventional plant protection products *and their potential risks for human health and the environment is increasingly subject to public debate; whereas the safety of biological pesticides is discussed far less;*

Or. en

Amendment 10

Mireille D'Ornano, Jean-François Jalkh, Sylvie Goddyn

Draft motion for a resolution

Recital A

Draft motion for a resolution

A. whereas the use of conventional plant protection products is increasingly contentious, due to the risks that they pose *for human* health and the environment;

Amendment

A. whereas the use of conventional plant protection products is increasingly contentious, due to the risks that they pose *not only for the health of those who use them, but also for the health of the rest of the population* and the environment;

Or. fr

Amendment 11

Ivan Jakovčić

Draft motion for a resolution
Recital A

Draft motion for a resolution

A. whereas the use of conventional plant protection products is increasingly contentious, due to the risks that they pose for human health and the environment;

Amendment

A. whereas the use of conventional plant protection products is increasingly contentious, due to the risks that they pose for human health, *animals* and the environment;

Or. hr

Amendment 12
Notis Marias

Draft motion for a resolution
Recital A

Draft motion for a resolution

A. whereas the use of conventional plant protection products is increasingly contentious, due to the risks that they pose for human health and the environment;

Amendment

A. whereas the use of conventional plant protection products is increasingly contentious, due to the *serious* risks that they pose for human health and the environment;

Or. el

Amendment 13
Eleonora Evi, Marco Zullo, Piernicola Pedicini, Marco Affronte

Draft motion for a resolution
Recital A

Draft motion for a resolution

A. whereas the use of conventional plant protection products is increasingly contentious, due to the risks that they pose for human health and the environment;

Amendment

A. whereas the use of conventional plant protection products is increasingly contentious, due to the risks that they pose for human health and the environment, *especially for the maintenance of biological diversity*;

Or. en

Amendment 14
Julie Girling

Draft motion for a resolution
Recital A a (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

A a. whereas the number of active substances available on the EU market used for plant protection is decreasing; whereas EU farmers continue to require a variety of crop protection tools;

Or. en

Amendment 15
Ivan Jakovčić

Draft motion for a resolution
Recital A a (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

Aa. whereas it is important to promote the development of alternative procedures or techniques to reduce dependence on conventional pesticides;

Or. hr

Amendment 16
Julie Girling

Draft motion for a resolution
Recital A b (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

A b. whereas preventing food waste is a priority in the EU, and access to appropriate plant protection solutions is essential in preventing damage caused by pests and diseases which results in food waste; whereas, according to the FAO,

20% of fruit and vegetable production in Europe is lost in the fields; ^{1a}

^{1a} FAO (2011) “Global food losses and food waste”.

Or. en

Amendment 17
Ivan Jakovčić

Draft motion for a resolution
Recital A b (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

Ab. whereas it is still possible to find undesirable pesticide residues in soil, water and the environment in general, and even a certain percentage of agricultural products of plant or animal origin may contain pesticide residues above the maximum residue levels for pesticides;

Or. hr

Amendment 18
Ulrike Müller, Jan Huitema, Jasenko Selimovic

Draft motion for a resolution
Recital B

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

B. whereas *the term* “low-risk pesticides” *covers both* biological *and* synthetic *chemical pesticides*;

B. whereas *Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 defines criteria to identify low risk substances that apply independently of the origin of the substance and* low-risk pesticides *could be of* biological *as well as of* synthetic *origin*;

Or. en

Amendment 19
Eleftherios Synadinos

Draft motion for a resolution
Recital B

Draft motion for a resolution

B. whereas the term “low-risk pesticides” covers both biological and synthetic chemical pesticides;

Amendment

B. whereas the term “low-risk pesticides” covers both biological and synthetic chemical pesticides, ***but it is a general term which may prove deceptive***;

Or. el

Amendment 20
Pavel Poc, Paul Brannen

Draft motion for a resolution
Recital B

Draft motion for a resolution

B. whereas the term “low-risk ***pesticides***” covers ***both*** biological and ***synthetic*** chemical ***pesticides***;

Amendment

B. whereas the term “low-risk ***active substance***” covers ***active substances of*** biological and chemical ***origin***;

Or. en

Amendment 21
Eleftherios Synadinos

Draft motion for a resolution
Recital F

Draft motion for a resolution

C. whereas biological pesticides are generally understood to be pesticides based on microorganisms, botanicals or semiochemicals (such as pheromones); whereas the present regulatory framework for pesticides (plant protection products) does not differentiate between biological and synthetic chemical plant protection products;

Amendment

C. whereas biological pesticides are generally understood to be pesticides based on microorganisms, botanicals or semiochemicals (such as pheromones ***and rotenone***), ***but also substances and processes derived naturally from them, such as RNA interference (RNAi)***; whereas the present regulatory framework for pesticides (plant protection products) does not differentiate between biological

and synthetic chemical plant protection products;

Or. el

Amendment 22
Annie Schreijer-Pierik

Draft motion for a resolution
Recital C

Draft motion for a resolution

C. whereas biological pesticides are generally understood to be pesticides based on microorganisms, botanicals or semiochemicals (such as pheromones); whereas the present regulatory framework for pesticides (plant protection products) does not differentiate between biological and synthetic chemical plant protection products;

Amendment

C. whereas biological pesticides are generally understood to be pesticides based on microorganisms, botanicals, **bio-derived chemicals** or semiochemicals (such as pheromones **and various essential oils**); whereas the present regulatory framework for pesticides (plant protection products) does not **legally** differentiate between biological and synthetic chemical plant protection products;

Or. en

Amendment 23
Julie Girling

Draft motion for a resolution
Recital C

Draft motion for a resolution

C. whereas biological pesticides are generally understood to be pesticides based on microorganisms, botanicals or semiochemicals (such as pheromones); whereas the present regulatory framework for pesticides (plant protection products) does not differentiate between biological and synthetic chemical plant protection products;

Amendment

C. whereas biological pesticides are generally understood to be pesticides based on microorganisms, botanicals or semiochemicals (such as pheromones) **and their by-products**; whereas the present regulatory framework for pesticides (plant protection products) does not differentiate between biological and synthetic chemical plant protection products;

Or. en

Amendment 24
Elisabeth Köstinger

Draft motion for a resolution
Recital C

Draft motion for a resolution

C. whereas biological pesticides are generally understood to be *pesticides* based on microorganisms, botanicals or semiochemicals (such as pheromones); whereas the present regulatory framework for *pesticides* (plant protection products) does not differentiate between biological and synthetic chemical plant protection products;

Amendment

C. whereas biological pesticides are generally understood to be *plant protection products* based on microorganisms, botanicals or semiochemicals (such as pheromones); whereas the present regulatory framework for plant protection products^{1a} does not differentiate between biological and synthetic chemical plant protection products;

^{1a} *The concept of 'pesticides' also covers biocidal products to which this resolution does not apply.*

Or. de

Amendment 25
Annie Schreijer-Pierik

Draft motion for a resolution
Recital C a (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

C a. whereas recent scientific studies have stated that sublethal exposure to certain herbicides may cause negative changes in antibiotic susceptibility in bacteria^{1a} and that a combination of high use of herbicides and antibiotics in proximity to farm animals and insects could drive greater use of antibiotics by a possible compromising of the therapeutic effects of the same;

^{1a} *e.g. Kurenbach B, Marjoshi D, Amabile-Cuevas CF, Ferguson GC, Godsoe W, Gibson P, Heinemann JA. 2015. Sublethal exposure to commercial*

formulations of the herbicides dicamba, 2,4-dichlorophenoxyacetic acid, and glyphosate cause changes in antibiotic susceptibility in Escherichia coli and Salmonella enterica serovar Typhimurium. mBio 6(2):e00009-15. doi:10.1128/mBio.00009-15.

Or. en

Amendment 26
Julie Girling

Draft motion for a resolution
Recital D

Draft motion for a resolution

D. whereas biological low-risk pesticides may *constitute a viable alternative to* conventional plant protection products, both for conventional and for organic farmers, and contribute to *a more* sustainable agriculture; whereas *some* biological *pesticides possess new modes of action, which is beneficial with a view to evolving resistance to conventional pesticides and limits the impact on non-target organisms; whereas biological low-risk pesticides should be the preferred option for* non-professional users and home gardening;

Amendment

D. whereas *the use of* biological low-risk pesticides may *complement the use of* conventional plant protection products, both for conventional and for organic farmers, and contribute to sustainable agriculture; whereas biological *low-risk pesticides offer a choice in plant protection solutions available to* non-professional users and home gardening;

Or. en

Amendment 27
Pavel Poc, Paul Brannen

Draft motion for a resolution
Recital D

Draft motion for a resolution

D. whereas *biological low-risk pesticides* may constitute a viable alternative to conventional plant protection products, both for conventional and for

Amendment

D. whereas *low-risk plant protection products of biological origin* may constitute a viable alternative to conventional plant protection products,

organic farmers, and contribute to a more sustainable agriculture; whereas some biological *pesticides* possess new modes of action, which is beneficial with a view to evolving resistance to conventional pesticides and limits the impact on non-target organisms; whereas *biological low-risk pesticides* should be the preferred *option* for non-professional users and home gardening;

both for conventional and for organic farmers, and contribute to a more sustainable agriculture; whereas some *plant protection products of biological origin* possess new modes of action, which is beneficial with a view to evolving resistance to conventional pesticides and limits the impact on non-target organisms; whereas *low-risk plant protection products of biological origin* should be *one of the preferred options, together with other non-chemical control or prevention methods*, for non-professional users and home gardening;

Or. en

Amendment 28 Eleftherios Synadinos

Draft motion for a resolution

Recital Δ

Draft motion for a resolution

D. whereas biological low-risk pesticides may constitute a viable alternative to conventional plant protection products, both for conventional and for organic farmers, and contribute to a more sustainable agriculture; whereas some biological pesticides possess *new* modes of action, which is beneficial with a view to evolving resistance to conventional pesticides and limits the impact on non-target organisms; whereas biological low-risk pesticides should be the preferred option for non-professional users and home gardening;

Amendment

D. whereas biological low-risk pesticides may constitute a viable alternative to conventional plant protection products, both for conventional and for organic farmers, and contribute to a more sustainable agriculture; whereas some biological pesticides possess *innovative and extremely varied* modes of action, which is *legitimate and probably* beneficial with a view to evolving resistance to conventional pesticides and limits the impact on non-target organisms; whereas biological low-risk pesticides should be the preferred option, *and the one to be encouraged*, for non-professional users and home gardening;

Or. el

Amendment 29 Nicola Caputo, Doru-Claudian Frunzuliță, Pavel Poc

Draft motion for a resolution

Recital D

Draft motion for a resolution

D. whereas biological low-risk pesticides may constitute a viable alternative to conventional plant protection products, both for conventional and for organic farmers, and contribute to a more sustainable agriculture; whereas some biological pesticides possess new modes of action, which is beneficial with a view to evolving resistance to conventional pesticides and limits the impact on non-target organisms; whereas biological low-risk pesticides should be the preferred option for non-professional users and home gardening;

Amendment

D. whereas biological low-risk pesticides may constitute a viable alternative to conventional plant protection products, both for conventional and for organic farmers, and contribute to a more sustainable agriculture, ***especially if it is based on the implementation of good agronomic practices***; whereas some biological pesticides possess new modes of action, which is beneficial with a view to evolving resistance to conventional pesticides and limits the impact on non-target organisms; whereas biological low-risk pesticides should be the preferred option for non-professional users and home gardening;

Or. it

Amendment 30

Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu

Draft motion for a resolution

Recital D

Draft motion for a resolution

D. whereas biological low-risk pesticides ***may*** constitute a viable alternative to conventional plant protection products, both for conventional and for organic farmers, and contribute to a more sustainable agriculture; whereas some biological pesticides possess new modes of action, which is beneficial with a view to evolving resistance to conventional pesticides and limits the impact on non-target organisms; whereas biological low-risk pesticides should be the preferred option for non-professional users and home gardening;

Amendment

D. whereas biological low-risk pesticides constitute a viable alternative to conventional plant protection products, both for conventional and for organic farmers, and contribute to a more sustainable agriculture; whereas some biological pesticides possess new modes of action, which is beneficial with a view to evolving resistance to conventional pesticides and limits the impact on non-target organisms; whereas biological low-risk pesticides should be the preferred option for non-professional users and home gardening;

Or. ro

Amendment 31

Notis Marias

Draft motion for a resolution

Recital A

Draft motion for a resolution

D. whereas biological low-risk pesticides **may** constitute a viable alternative to conventional plant protection products, both for conventional and for organic farmers, and contribute to a more sustainable agriculture; whereas some biological pesticides possess new modes of action, which is beneficial with a view to evolving resistance to conventional pesticides and limits the impact on non-target organisms; whereas biological low-risk pesticides should be the preferred option for **non-professional users and home gardening**;

Amendment

D. whereas biological low-risk pesticides **should** constitute a viable alternative to conventional plant protection products, both for conventional and for organic farmers, and contribute to a more sustainable agriculture; whereas some biological pesticides possess new modes of action, which is beneficial with a view to evolving resistance to conventional pesticides and limits the impact on non-target organisms; whereas biological low-risk pesticides should be the preferred option for **sustainable agriculture**;

Or. el

Amendment 32

Ulrike Müller, Jan Huitema, Jasenko Selimovic

Draft motion for a resolution

Recital D

Draft motion for a resolution

D. whereas biological low-risk pesticides may constitute a viable alternative to conventional plant protection products, both for conventional and for organic farmers, and contribute to a more sustainable agriculture; whereas some biological pesticides possess new modes of action, which **is** beneficial with a view to evolving resistance to conventional pesticides and **limits** the impact on non-target organisms; whereas **biological** low-risk pesticides should be the preferred option for non-professional users and home gardening;

Amendment

D. whereas biological low-risk pesticides may constitute a viable alternative to conventional plant protection products, both for conventional and for organic farmers, and contribute to a more sustainable agriculture; whereas some biological pesticides possess new modes of action, which **could be** beneficial with a view to evolving resistance to conventional pesticides and **limiting** the impact on non-target organisms; whereas low-risk pesticides should be the preferred option for non-professional users and home gardening;

Amendment 33
Annie Schreijer-Pierik

Draft motion for a resolution
Recital D

Draft motion for a resolution

D. whereas biological low-risk pesticides may constitute a viable alternative to conventional plant protection products, both for conventional and for organic farmers, and contribute to a more sustainable agriculture; whereas some biological pesticides possess new modes of action, which is beneficial with a view to evolving resistance to conventional pesticides and limits the impact on non-target organisms; whereas biological low-risk pesticides should be the preferred option for non-professional users *and home gardening*;

Amendment

D. whereas biological low-risk pesticides may constitute a viable alternative to conventional plant protection products, both for conventional and for organic farmers, and contribute to a more sustainable agriculture; whereas some biological pesticides possess new modes of action, which is beneficial with a view to evolving resistance to conventional pesticides and limits the impact on non-target organisms; whereas biological low-risk pesticides should be the preferred option for *untrained*, non-professional users;

Amendment 34
Elisabeth Köstinger

Draft motion for a resolution
Recital D

Draft motion for a resolution

D. whereas biological low-risk pesticides may constitute a viable alternative to conventional plant protection products, both for conventional and for organic farmers, and contribute to a more sustainable agriculture; whereas some biological pesticides possess new modes of action, which is beneficial with a view to evolving resistance to conventional *pesticides* and limits the impact on non-target organisms; whereas biological low-risk pesticides should be the preferred

Amendment

D. whereas biological low-risk pesticides may constitute a viable alternative to conventional plant protection products, both for conventional and for organic farmers, and contribute to a more sustainable agriculture; whereas some biological pesticides possess new modes of action, which is beneficial with a view to evolving resistance to conventional *plant protection products* and limits the impact on non-target organisms; whereas biological low-risk pesticides should be the

option for non-professional users and home gardening;

preferred option for non-professional users and home gardening;

Or. de

Amendment 35
Julie Girling

Draft motion for a resolution
Recital D a (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

D a. whereas developing resistance to pesticides, including biological low risk pesticides, is of growing concern; whereas there is evidence that semio-chemicals (belonging to biological tools) begin to lose efficacy after 4-5 years^{1a} ; whereas the highly specific modes of action possessed by some biological low risk pesticides can lead to resistance quickly; whereas according to the draft Commission Regulation amending Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 concerning the placing of plant protection products on the market as regards the criteria for the approval of low risk active substances, micro-organisms may only be considered low-risk unless at strain level they have demonstrated multiple resistance to antimicrobials used in human or animal medicine;^{1b}

^{1a} *Japanese Journal of Applied Entomology and Zoology (2002) 37(2), 99-30.*

Or. en

Amendment 36
Mireille D'Ornano, Sylvie Goddyn, Jean-François Jalkh

Draft motion for a resolution
Recital D a (new)

Da. whereas, with regard to the ongoing debate about introducing a certain percentage threshold for chemical pesticides in organic farming, the development of biological pesticides would seem to be the best defence against such a move, which would see the sector lose its product integrity, its health-related quality and, consequently, consumer confidence;

Or. fr

Amendment 37
Elisabeth Köstinger

Draft motion for a resolution
Recital D a (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

Da. whereas, in order to adequately meet food and feed needs, the use of plant protection products is necessary and whereas the precautionary principle^{2a} is applied in the procedure for authorising such products and their active substances;

^{2a} Article 1(4) of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009

Or. de

Amendment 38
Eleftherios Synadinos

Draft motion for a resolution
Recital E

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

E. whereas the long approval and registration process before commercialization of biological low-risk

E. whereas the long approval and registration process before commercialization of biological low-risk

pesticides represents an *important economic* barrier to manufacturers;

pesticides represents an *economic and administrative* barrier to manufacturers, *and whereas this is an artificial, institutional barrier which might be necessary in order to maximise the protection of public health;*

Or. el

Amendment 39

Ulrike Müller, Jan Huitema, Jasenko Selimovic

Draft motion for a resolution

Recital E

Draft motion for a resolution

E. whereas the long approval and registration process before commercialization of *biological* low-risk pesticides represents an important economic barrier to manufacturers;

Amendment

E. whereas the long approval and registration process before commercialization of low-risk pesticides represents an important economic barrier to manufacturers;

Or. en

Amendment 40

Julie Girling

Draft motion for a resolution

Recital E

Draft motion for a resolution

E. whereas the long approval and registration process before commercialization of biological low-risk pesticides represents an important economic barrier to manufacturers;

Amendment

E. whereas the long approval and registration process before commercialization of *pesticides, including* biological low-risk pesticides represents an important economic barrier to manufacturers;

Or. en

Amendment 41

Mireille D'Ornano, Sylvie Goddyn, Jean-François Jalkh

Draft motion for a resolution

Recital E

Draft motion for a resolution

E. whereas the long approval and registration process before commercialization of biological low-risk pesticides represents an important economic barrier to manufacturers;

Amendment

E. whereas the long approval and registration process before commercialization of biological low-risk pesticides represents an important economic barrier to manufacturers; ***whereas, additionally, there is an oligopolistic situation in the agrochemicals sector, where the presence of giant firms makes it extremely difficult for competitors to enter the market, especially when they are seeking to develop biological pesticides, even though sufficient competition is a prerequisite for innovation;***

Or. fr

Amendment 42

Pavel Poc, Paul Brannen

Draft motion for a resolution

Recital E a (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

E a. whereas Integrated Pest Management implementation is mandatory within the EU and more emphasis is placed by Member States on sustainable pesticides use including low-risk plant protection alternatives;

Or. en

Amendment 43

Annie Schreijer-Pierik

Draft motion for a resolution

Recital E a (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

E a. whereas Integrated Pest Management implementation is mandatory in the Union according to Directive 2009/128/EC on the sustainable use of pesticides;

Or. en

Amendment 44
Annie Schreijer-Pierik

Draft motion for a resolution
Recital E b (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

E b. whereas both Member States as well as local authorities place more emphasis on the sustainable use of available pesticides including low-risk plant protection solutions and techniques, including their use in Ecological Focus Areas;

Or. en

Amendment 45
Eleftherios Synadinos

Draft motion for a resolution
Recital ΣT

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

F. whereas under Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009, active substances are approved at Union level, while the authorisation of plant protection products containing those active substances lies within the remit of the Member States;

F. whereas ***there are two parallel, complementary structures, because*** under Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009, active substances are approved at Union level, while the authorisation of plant protection products containing those active substances lies within the remit of the Member States;

Or. el

Amendment 46

PE595.672v01-00

22/59

AM\1112531EN.docx

Sylvie Goddyn, Mireille D'Ornano, Jean-François Jalkh

Draft motion for a resolution

Recital H a (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

Ha. whereas no natural essential oil-based substance has been authorised, despite numerous applications for such substances to be authorised for use in organic farming;

Or. fr

Amendment 47

Annie Schreijer-Pierik

Draft motion for a resolution

Recital I

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

I. whereas biological low-risk pesticides ***are often*** refused authorisation by Member States due to ***their*** lower efficacy as compared to synthetic chemical pesticides;

I. whereas biological low-risk pesticides ***have been*** refused authorisation by ***a certain number of*** Member States due to ***a perceived*** lower efficacy as compared to synthetic chemical pesticides, ***without any regard to the ongoing innovation in the biological low-risk pesticides sector, without considering the resource efficiency benefits for organic farming and without considering agricultural and environmental costs of certain other plant protection products;***

Or. en

Amendment 48

Pavel Poc, Paul Brannen

Draft motion for a resolution

Recital I

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

I. whereas ***biological low-risk***

I. whereas ***products containing low-***

pesticides are often refused authorisation by Member States due to their lower efficacy as compared to synthetic chemical pesticides;

risk active substances of biological origin are often refused authorisation by Member States due to their lower efficacy, as compared to synthetic chemical pesticides, *without sufficiently considering health and environmental costs*;

Or. en

Amendment 49

Mireille D'Ornano, Sylvie Goddyn, Jean-François Jalkh

Draft motion for a resolution

Recital I

Draft motion for a resolution

I. whereas biological low-risk pesticides *are often refused authorisation by Member States due to their lower efficacy as compared to* synthetic chemical pesticides;

Amendment

I. whereas biological low-risk pesticides *regularly fail to be authorised because, until now, they have often been regarded as less effective than* synthetic chemical pesticides;

Or. fr

Amendment 50

Notis Marias

Draft motion for a resolution

Recital ①

Draft motion for a resolution

I. whereas biological low-risk pesticides are often refused authorisation by Member States due to their lower efficacy as compared to synthetic chemical pesticides;

Amendment

I. whereas, *regrettably*, biological low-risk pesticides are often refused authorisation by Member States due to their lower efficacy as compared to synthetic chemical pesticides;

Or. el

Amendment 51

Eleftherios Synadinos

Draft motion for a resolution

PE595.672v01-00

24/59

AM\1112531EN.docx

Recital Ө

Draft motion for a resolution

I. whereas ***biological low-risk pesticides are often refused authorisation by Member States*** due to their lower efficacy as compared to synthetic chemical pesticides;

Amendment

I. whereas ***Member States are reluctant to authorise biological low-risk pesticides*** due to their lower efficacy as compared to synthetic chemical pesticides;

Or. el

Amendment 52

Mireille D'Ornano, Sylvie Goddyn, Jean-François Jalkh

Draft motion for a resolution

Recital I a (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

Ia. whereas comparisons of efficacy between chemical and biological pesticides should be regularly updated to take account of the growing resistance to widely used chemical pesticides; whereas, to be applicable, these comparisons must weigh the effectiveness of chemical pesticides against the risks they pose to human health and the environment;

Or. fr

Amendment 53

Pavel Poc, Paul Brannen

Draft motion for a resolution

Recital K

Draft motion for a resolution

K. whereas Article 12 of Directive 2009/128/EC provides that the use of ***low-risk plant protection products*** shall be ***prioritised in*** specific areas, such as areas used by the general public and protected areas;

Amendment

K. whereas Article 12 of Directive 2009/128/EC provides that the use of ***pesticides*** shall be ***minimised or prohibited in certain*** specific areas, such as areas used by the general public and protected areas; ***whereas in such cases appropriate risk management measures shall be taken and***

the use of low-risk plant protection products and biological control measures shall be considered in the first place;

Or. en

Amendment 54

Eleonora Evi, Marco Zullo, Piernicola Pedicini, Marco Affronte

Draft motion for a resolution

Recital K

Draft motion for a resolution

K. whereas Article 12 of Directive 2009/128/EC provides that the use of low-risk plant protection products shall be prioritised in specific areas, such as areas used by the general public and protected areas;

Amendment

K. whereas Article 12 of Directive 2009/128/EC provides that the use of low-risk plant protection products shall be prioritised in specific areas, such as areas used by the general public, *areas used by vulnerable groups* and protected areas *such as those which form the Natura 2000 ecological network across the EU*;

Or. en

Amendment 55

Nicola Caputo, Doru-Claudian Frunzulică, Pavel Poc

Draft motion for a resolution

Recital K

Draft motion for a resolution

K. whereas Article 12 of Directive 2009/128/EC provides that the use of low-risk plant protection products shall be prioritised in specific areas, such as areas used by the general public and protected areas;

Amendment

K. whereas Article 12 of Directive 2009/128/EC provides that the use of low-risk plant protection products shall be prioritised in specific areas, such as areas used by the general public and protected areas; *whereas some Member States have, for a long time now, prohibited the use of pesticides in these specific areas*;

Or. it

Amendment 56

PE595.672v01-00

26/59

AM\1112531EN.docx

Julie Girling

Draft motion for a resolution

Recital L

Draft motion for a resolution

L. whereas the Commission submitted a draft Commission regulation amending Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 as regards the criteria for the approval of low risk active substances to the Standing Committee on Plants, Animals, Food and Feed; whereas this draft provides an assumption of low-risk status for micro-organisms;

Amendment

L. whereas the Commission submitted a draft Commission regulation amending Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 as regards the criteria for the approval of low risk active substances to the Standing Committee on Plants, Animals, Food and Feed; whereas this draft provides an assumption of low-risk status for **active substances which are** micro-organisms;

Or. en

Amendment 57

Eleftherios Synadinos

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 1

Draft motion for a resolution

1. Stresses the need to increase the availability of biological low-risk pesticides without any further delay;

Amendment

1. Stresses the need to increase the availability of biological low-risk pesticides without any further delay, **assigning absolute priority to specific areas such as those used by the general public and conservation areas;**

Or. el

Amendment 58

Notis Marias

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 1

Draft motion for a resolution

1. Stresses the need to increase the availability of biological low-risk pesticides without any further delay;

Amendment

1. Stresses the need to increase the availability of biological low-risk pesticides without any further delay **in**

order to reduce the use of conventional plant protection products;

Or. el

Amendment 59

Angélique Delahaye, Michel Dantin

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 1

Draft motion for a resolution

1. Stresses the *need to increase* the availability of biological low-risk pesticides without any further delay;

Amendment

1. Stresses the *importance of increasing research and innovation and* the availability of biological low-risk pesticides without any further delay;

Or. fr

Amendment 60

Julie Girling

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 1

Draft motion for a resolution

1. Stresses the need to increase the availability of biological low-risk pesticides without any further delay;

Amendment

1. Stresses the need to increase the availability of *low-risk pesticides, including* biological low-risk pesticides without any further delay;

Or. en

Amendment 61

Pavel Poc, Paul Brannen

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 1

Draft motion for a resolution

1. Stresses the need to increase the availability of *biological low-risk*

Amendment

1. Stresses the need to increase the availability of *low-risk plant protection*

pesticides without any further delay;

products of biological origin without any further delay;

Or. en

Amendment 62

Annie Schreijer-Pierik

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 1

Draft motion for a resolution

1. Stresses the need to increase the availability of biological low-risk pesticides without any further delay;

Amendment

1. Stresses the need to increase the availability of biological low-risk pesticides *in the Union* without any further delay;

Or. en

Amendment 63

Sylvie Goddyn, Mireille D'Ornano, Jean-François Jalkh

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

1a. Calls on the Commission to authorise the use of natural essential oil-based pesticides in organic farming in order to expand the available plant health arsenal;

Or. fr

Amendment 64

Ivan Jakovčić

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

1a. Stresses the vital importance of

giving special emphasis to products protected by biological low-risk pesticides, as opposed to products protected by conventional means;

Or. hr

Amendment 65
Julie Girling

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 2

Draft motion for a resolution

2. Stresses that farmers need to have a bigger toolbox at hand to protect their crops and to decide which measure will most sustainably protect their crops; therefore encourages wider use of *various alternatives to synthetic chemical pesticides*, including biological pesticides, *as a component* of integrated pest management;

Amendment

2. Stresses that farmers need to have a bigger toolbox at hand to protect their crops and to decide which measure will *best and* most sustainably protect their crops; therefore encourages wider use of *different tools* including biological *low-risk* pesticides, *following the principles* of integrated pest management;

Or. en

Amendment 66
Eleftherios Synadinou

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 2

Draft motion for a resolution

2. Stresses that farmers need to have a bigger toolbox at hand to protect their crops and to decide which measure will most sustainably protect their crops; therefore encourages wider use of various alternatives to synthetic chemical pesticides, including biological pesticides, as a component of integrated pest management;

Amendment

2. Stresses that farmers need to have a bigger toolbox at hand to protect their crops and to decide which measure will most sustainably protect their crops; therefore encourages wider use of various alternatives to synthetic chemical pesticides, including biological pesticides, as a component of integrated pest management, *and considers that farmers should be informed in an informal, coordinated and institutional manner of the options available to them;*

Amendment 67

Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu

Draft motion for a resolution**Paragraph 2***Draft motion for a resolution*

2. Stresses that farmers need to have a bigger toolbox at hand to protect their crops and to decide which measure will most sustainably protect their crops; therefore encourages *wider* use of *various alternatives to synthetic chemical pesticides, including* biological pesticides, as a component of integrated pest management;

Amendment

2. Stresses that farmers need to have a bigger toolbox at hand to protect their crops and to decide which measure will most sustainably protect their crops; therefore encourages *efficient* use of *plant protection methods, including the use of* biological pesticides, as a component of integrated pest management *and maintenance of land in good agricultural and environmental condition*;

Or. ro

Amendment 68

Pavel Poc, Paul Brannen

Draft motion for a resolution**Paragraph 2***Draft motion for a resolution*

2. Stresses that farmers need to have a bigger toolbox at hand to protect their crops and to decide which measure will most sustainably protect their crops; therefore encourages wider use of various alternatives to synthetic chemical pesticides, including biological pesticides, as a component of integrated pest management;

Amendment

2. Stresses that farmers need to have a bigger toolbox at hand to protect their crops and to decide which measure will most sustainably protect their crops; therefore encourages wider use of various alternatives to synthetic chemical pesticides, including biological *control measures and low-risk pesticides of biological origin*, as a component of integrated pest management;

Or. en

Amendment 69

Elisabeth Köstinger

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 2

Draft motion for a resolution

2. Stresses that farmers need to have a bigger toolbox at hand to protect their crops and to decide which measure will most sustainably protect their crops; therefore encourages wider use of various alternatives to synthetic chemical **pesticides**, including biological pesticides, as a component of integrated pest management;

Amendment

2. Stresses that farmers need to have a bigger toolbox at hand to protect their crops and to decide which measure will most sustainably protect their crops; therefore encourages wider use of various alternatives to synthetic chemical **plant protection products**, including biological pesticides, as a component of integrated pest management;

Or. de

Amendment 70

Notis Marias

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 2

Draft motion for a resolution

2. Stresses that farmers need to have a bigger toolbox at hand to protect their crops and to decide which measure will most sustainably protect their crops; therefore encourages wider use of various alternatives to synthetic chemical pesticides, including biological pesticides, as a component of integrated pest management;

Amendment

2. Stresses that farmers need to have a bigger toolbox at hand to protect their crops and to decide which measure will most sustainably protect their crops, **thereby boosting sustainable agriculture**; therefore encourages wider use of various alternatives to synthetic chemical pesticides, including biological pesticides, as a component of integrated pest management;

Or. el

Amendment 71

Merja Kyllönen

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

2 a. Calls on the CAP post 2020 reform to have better financial support mechanisms for the farmers under EAFRD to compensate the income lost or additional costs created by ensuring the sustainability of farming including crop protection going beyond the requirements of the legislation;

Or. en

Amendment 72

Annie Schreijer-Pierik

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

2 a. stresses the need to increase the availability of a pest management toolbox for organic farming, which complies with both organic farming as well as resource efficiency requirements;

Or. en

Amendment 73

Pavel Poc, Paul Brannen

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

2 a. Emphasizes that consumers' demand for safe food that is both affordable and produced in a sustainable way must be satisfied;

Or. en

Amendment 74

Julie Girling

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 3

Draft motion for a resolution

3. Underlines that in order to promote the development of new biological low-risk pesticides, the evaluation of efficacy in comparison with existing chemical pesticides should be designed in a way ***not to hinder their development and market entry***;

Amendment

3. Underlines that in order to promote the development of ***low-risk pesticides, including*** new biological low-risk pesticides, the evaluation of efficacy in comparison with existing chemical pesticides should be designed in a way ***to provide farmers with an appropriate level of plant protection***;

Or. en

Amendment 75

Eleftherios Synadinos

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 3

Draft motion for a resolution

3. Underlines that in order to promote the development of new biological low-risk pesticides, the evaluation of efficacy in comparison with existing chemical pesticides should be designed in a way not to hinder their development and market entry;

Amendment

3. Underlines that in order to promote the development of new biological low-risk pesticides, the evaluation of efficacy in comparison with existing chemical pesticides should be designed in a way not to hinder their development and market entry; ***stresses that their market entry should not in general be artificially hindered in any way whatsoever, for example because of chemical pesticides already on the market***;

Or. el

Amendment 76

Angélique Delahaye, Michel Dantin

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 3

Draft motion for a resolution

3. Underlines that in order to promote the development of new biological low-risk pesticides, the evaluation of efficacy *in comparison with existing chemical pesticides* should be designed in a way not to hinder their development and market entry;

Amendment

3. Underlines that in order to promote the development of new biological low-risk pesticides, the evaluation of *their efficacy and risks and of their capacity to respond to the environmental, health-related and economic needs of agriculture* should be designed in a way not to hinder their development and market entry;

Or. fr

Amendment 77

Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 3

Draft motion for a resolution

3. Underlines that in order to promote the development of new biological low-risk pesticides, the evaluation of efficacy in comparison with existing chemical pesticides should be designed in a way not to hinder their development and market entry;

Amendment

3. Underlines that in order to promote the development *and use* of new biological low-risk pesticides, the evaluation of efficacy in comparison with existing chemical pesticides should be designed in a way not to hinder their development and market entry;

Or. ro

Amendment 78

Pavel Poc, Paul Brannen

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 3

Draft motion for a resolution

3. Underlines that in order to promote the development of new *biological low-risk pesticides*, the evaluation of efficacy in comparison with existing chemical pesticides should be designed in a way not to hinder their development and market entry;

Amendment

3. Underlines that in order to promote the development of new *low-risk plant protection products of biological origin*, the evaluation of efficacy in comparison with existing chemical pesticides should be designed in a way not to hinder their development and market entry;

Amendment 79
Annie Schreijer-Pierik

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 3

Draft motion for a resolution

3. Underlines that in order to promote the development of new biological low-risk pesticides, the evaluation of efficacy in comparison with existing chemical pesticides should be designed in a way not to hinder their development and market entry;

Amendment

3. Underlines that in order to promote the development of new biological low-risk pesticides, the evaluation of efficacy in comparison with existing *synthetic* chemical pesticides should be designed in a way not to hinder their development and market entry;

Or. en

Amendment 80
Elisabeth Köstinger

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 3

Draft motion for a resolution

3. Underlines that in order to promote the development of new biological low-risk pesticides, the evaluation of efficacy in comparison with existing chemical *pesticides* should be designed in a way not to hinder their development and market entry;

Amendment

3. Underlines that in order to promote the development of new biological low-risk pesticides, the evaluation of efficacy in comparison with existing chemical *plant protection products* should be designed in a way not to hinder their development and market entry;

Or. de

Amendment 81
Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

3a. *Stresses that in order to assess the effectiveness of low-risk pesticides and their sustainable use, Member States should be encouraged to use economic instruments, without this prejudicing the applicability of state aid rules;*

Or. ro

Amendment 82

Eleonora Evi, Marco Zullo, Piernicola Pedicini, Marco Affronte

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

3 a. *Underlines that the increased promotion and use of alternatives to synthetic chemical pesticides by farmers who adopt Integrated Pest Management (IPM) approaches can also be beneficial to neighbouring organic farmers;*

Or. en

Amendment 83

Ulrike Müller, Jan Huitema, Jasenko Selimovic

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 4

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

4. Underlines the need to engage in a wider public debate about making biological low-risk alternatives to conventional pesticides available to farmers and growers, **and** the necessity to educate **and propagate knowledge** on the need to ensure sustainability of crop protection;

4. Underlines the need to engage in a wider public debate about **the benefits and risks of both biological and synthetic pesticides and about making a wider choice of substances, i.e.** biological low-risk alternatives to conventional pesticides, available to farmers and growers **to facilitate targeted plant protection in an efficient and sustainable way; further underlines** the necessity to educate on the need to ensure sustainability of crop protection;

Amendment 84

Julie Girling

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 4

Draft motion for a resolution

4. Underlines the need to engage in a wider public debate about ***making biological low-risk alternatives to conventional*** pesticides ***available*** to farmers and growers, and the necessity to educate and propagate knowledge on the need to ensure sustainability of crop protection;

Amendment

4. Underlines the need to engage in a wider public debate about ***the availability of low-risk pesticides, including biological low-risk*** pesticides to farmers and growers, and the necessity to educate and propagate knowledge on the need to ensure sustainability of crop protection;

Or. en

Amendment 85

Angélique Delahaye, Michel Dantin

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 4

Draft motion for a resolution

4. Underlines the ***need to engage in a wider*** public debate about making biological low-risk alternatives to conventional pesticides available to farmers and growers, and the ***necessity to educate and propagate*** knowledge on the need to ensure sustainability of crop protection;

Amendment

4. Underlines the ***importance of a*** public debate about making biological low-risk alternatives to conventional pesticides available to farmers and growers, and the ***importance of educating and propagating*** knowledge on the need to ensure sustainability of crop protection, ***and encourages research and innovation on pesticides in general in order to find the solutions that are most viable in environmental, health and economic terms***;

Or. fr

Amendment 86

Elisabeth Köstinger

**Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 4**

Draft motion for a resolution

4. Underlines the need to engage in a wider public debate about making biological low-risk alternatives to conventional *pesticides* available to farmers and growers, and the necessity to educate and propagate knowledge on the need to ensure sustainability of crop protection;

Amendment

4. Underlines the need to engage in a wider public debate about making biological low-risk alternatives to conventional *plant protection products* available to farmers and growers, and the necessity to educate and propagate knowledge on the need to ensure sustainability of crop protection, *in order also to draw attention to the need for plant protection products in food and feed production*;

Or. de

**Amendment 87
Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu**

**Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 4**

Draft motion for a resolution

4. Underlines the need to engage in a wider public debate about making biological low-risk alternatives to conventional pesticides available to farmers and growers, *and the necessity* to educate and *propagate knowledge* on the *need to ensure sustainability of crop protection*;

Amendment

4. Underlines the need to engage in a wider public debate about making biological low-risk alternatives to conventional pesticides available to farmers and growers; *stresses the need* to educate and *inform the general public, through awareness campaigns*, on the *effects of the use of biological pesticides on human health and the environment*;

Or. ro

**Amendment 88
Pavel Poc, Paul Brannen**

**Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 4**

Draft motion for a resolution

4. Underlines the need to engage in a wider public debate about making **biological low-risk** alternatives to conventional pesticides available to farmers and growers, and the necessity to educate and propagate knowledge on the need to ensure sustainability of crop protection;

Amendment

4. Underlines the need to engage in a wider public debate about making alternatives to conventional pesticides available to farmers and growers, and the necessity to educate and propagate knowledge on the need to ensure sustainability of crop protection **by using low-risk plant protection products of biological origin and other biological control measures**;

Or. en

Amendment 89

Annie Schreijer-Pierik

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 4

Draft motion for a resolution

4. Underlines the need to engage in a wider public debate about making biological low-risk **alternatives to conventional** pesticides available to farmers and growers, and the necessity to educate and propagate knowledge on the need to ensure sustainability of crop protection;

Amendment

4. Underlines the need to engage in a wider public debate about making biological low-risk pesticides available to farmers and growers, and the necessity to educate and propagate knowledge on the need to ensure sustainability of crop protection;

Or. en

Amendment 90

Mireille D'Ornano, Sylvie Goddyn, Jean-François Jalkh

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 4

Draft motion for a resolution

4. Underlines the **need to engage in a wider public debate about** making biological low-risk alternatives to conventional pesticides available to farmers and growers, and the necessity to

Amendment

4. Underlines the **importance of greater awareness of the necessity of** making biological low-risk alternatives to conventional pesticides available to farmers and growers, and the necessity to

educate and propagate knowledge on the need to ensure sustainability of crop protection;

educate and propagate knowledge on the need to ensure sustainability of crop protection;

Or. fr

Amendment 91

Ivan Jakovčić

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

4a. Stresses the need to launch a wide public debate on the advantages of consuming products protected by alternative low-risk pesticides;

Or. hr

Amendment 92

Eleftherios Synadinos

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 5

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

5. Welcomes the “Implementation Plan on increasing low-risk plant protection product availability and accelerating integrated pest management implementation in Member States” as endorsed by the Council; calls on the Member States, the Commission and the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO) to follow up on the implementation of this plan;

5. Welcomes the “Implementation Plan on increasing low-risk plant protection product availability and accelerating **representative**, integrated pest management implementation in Member States” as endorsed by the Council **and gives its support to this plan**; calls on the Member States, the Commission and the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO) to follow up on the implementation of this plan;

Or. el

Amendment 93

Mireille D'Ornano, Sylvie Goddyn, Jean-François Jalkh

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 5

Draft motion for a resolution

5. Welcomes the “Implementation Plan on increasing low-risk plant protection product availability and accelerating integrated pest management implementation in Member States” as endorsed by the Council; calls on the Member States, the Commission and the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO) to follow up on the implementation of this plan;

Amendment

5. Welcomes the “Implementation Plan on increasing low-risk plant protection product availability and accelerating integrated pest management implementation in Member States” as endorsed by the Council; ***recalls that this plan was drawn up by a group composed of representatives from the Member States and the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA)***; calls on the Member States, the Commission and the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO) to follow up on the implementation of this plan;

Or. fr

Amendment 94
Notis Marias

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 5

Draft motion for a resolution

5. ***Welcomes*** the “Implementation Plan on increasing low-risk plant protection product availability and accelerating integrated pest management implementation in Member States” as endorsed by the Council; calls on the Member States, the Commission and the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO) to follow up on the implementation of this plan;

Amendment

5. ***Takes note of*** the “Implementation Plan on increasing low-risk plant protection product availability and accelerating integrated pest management implementation in Member States” as endorsed by the Council; calls on the Member States, the Commission and the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO) to follow up on the implementation of this plan;

Or. el

Amendment 95
Julie Girling

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 6

Draft motion for a resolution

6. Calls for swift adoption of the draft Commission regulation amending Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 as regards the criteria for the approval of low risk active substances to the Standing Committee on Plants, Animals, Food and Feed;

Amendment

6. Calls for swift adoption of the draft Commission regulation amending Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 as regards the criteria for the approval of low risk active substances to the Standing Committee on Plants, Animals, Food and Feed; ***calls on the Commission to continuously update the criteria in line with the most up-to-date scientific knowledge;***

Or. en

Amendment 96
Ulrike Müller, Jan Huitema, Jasenko Selimovic

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 7

Draft motion for a resolution

7. Calls on the Commission and the Member States to ***give priority to*** the evaluation, authorisation and registration of biological low-risk plant protection products;

Amendment

7. Calls on the Commission and the Member States to ***accelerate*** the evaluation, authorisation and registration of biological low-risk plant protection products;

Or. en

Amendment 97
Angélique Delahaye, Michel Dantin

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 7

Draft motion for a resolution

7. Calls on the Commission and the Member States to give priority to the evaluation, authorisation and registration of biological low-risk plant protection products;

Amendment

7. Calls on the Commission and the Member States to give priority to the evaluation, authorisation and registration of biological low-risk plant protection products ***while maintaining risk***

assessment at a high level;

Or. fr

Amendment 98
Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 7

Draft motion for a resolution

7. Calls on the Commission and the Member States to give priority to the evaluation, authorisation **and registration** of biological low-risk plant protection products;

Amendment

7. Calls on the Commission and the Member States to give priority to the evaluation, authorisation, **registration and monitoring of the use** of biological low-risk plant protection products;

Or. ro

Amendment 99
Eleftherios Synadinos

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 7

Draft motion for a resolution

7. Calls on the Commission and the Member States to **give priority to** the evaluation, authorisation and registration of biological low-risk plant protection products;

Amendment

7. Calls on the Commission and the Member States to **step up efforts regarding** the evaluation, authorisation and registration of biological low-risk plant protection products;

Or. el

Amendment 100
Notis Marias

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 7

Draft motion for a resolution

7. Calls on the Commission and the
PE595.672v01-00

Amendment

7. Calls on the Commission and the

Member States to give priority to the evaluation, authorisation and registration of biological low-risk plant protection products;

Member States to give priority to the evaluation **and then to the** authorisation and registration of biological low-risk plant protection products;

Or. el

Amendment 101
Julie Girling

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 7

Draft motion for a resolution

7. Calls on the Commission and the Member States to give priority to the evaluation, authorisation and registration of biological low-risk **plant protection products**;

Amendment

7. Calls on the Commission and the Member States to give priority to the evaluation, authorisation and registration of **low-risk pesticides, including** biological low-risk **pesticides**;

Or. en

Amendment 102
Pavel Poc, Paul Brannen

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 7

Draft motion for a resolution

7. Calls on the Commission and the Member States to give priority to the evaluation, authorisation and registration of **biological** low-risk plant protection products;

Amendment

7. Calls on the Commission and the Member States to give priority to the evaluation, authorisation and registration of low-risk plant protection products **of biological origin**;

(This amendment applies throughout the text. Adopting it will necessitate corresponding changes throughout, from "biological pesticides/plant protection products/active substances" to "pesticides/plant protection products/active substances of biological origin".)

Or. en

Amendment 103
Angélique Delahaye, Michel Dantin

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

7a. Encourages Member States to exchange information and good practices deriving from the results of research into pest control, enabling the provision of alternative solutions that are viable in environmental, health and economic terms;

Or. fr

Amendment 104
Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

7a. Invites the Member States to include the use of low-risk biological pesticides in their national action plans on the protection of the environment and of human health;

Or. ro

Amendment 105
Angélique Delahaye, Michel Dantin

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 7 b (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

7b. Calls on the Commission to identify low-risk substances already on the market;

Amendment 106

Laima Liucija Andrikiene

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 8

Draft motion for a resolution

8. Welcomes the 2016 Commission REFIT initiative to carry out an evaluation of Regulation 1107/2009; stresses that *this* REFIT initiative must not lead to the lowering of food safety and environmental protection standards;

Amendment

8. Welcomes the 2016 Commission REFIT initiative to carry out an evaluation of Regulation 1107/2009; ***calls on the Commission to prioritize a legislative proposal for the revision of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 with a view to a fast-track evaluation, authorisation and registration process of biological low-risk pesticides; calls for open-ended approval of biological low-risk active substances as a vital incentive for the development of biological low-risk pesticides; in view of the urgency expressed by European farmers, low-risk pesticides producers and consumers, calls on the Commission to finalize the thus required adaptation of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 in less than 2 years;*** stresses that *the* REFIT initiative must not lead to the lowering of food safety and environmental protection standards;

Or. en

Amendment 107

Annie Schreijer-Pierik

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 8

Draft motion for a resolution

8. ***Welcomes the 2016 Commission REFIT initiative to carry out an evaluation of Regulation 1107/2009;*** stresses that this ***REFIT initiative*** must not lead to the lowering of food safety and

Amendment

8. ***Calls upon the Commission to undertake a Fitness Check procedure leading to the adaptation of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 before the end of 2018 and to not use a REFIT regarding the***

environmental protection standards;

*totality of Regulation (EC) 1107/2009 which might take more than eight years; stresses that this **Fitness Check** must not lead to the lowering of food safety and environmental protection standards;*

Or. en

Amendment 108
Pavel Poc, Paul Brannen

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 8

Draft motion for a resolution

8. *Welcomes the 2016 Commission REFIT initiative to carry out an evaluation of Regulation 1107/2009; stresses that **this REFIT initiative** must not lead to the lowering of food safety and environmental protection standards;*

Amendment

8. ***Calls on the Commission to undertake a Fitness Check procedure of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 in maximum two years; stresses that **the Fitness Check procedure** must not lead to the lowering of **human health**, food safety and environmental protection standards;***

Or. en

Amendment 109
Julie Girling

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 8

Draft motion for a resolution

8. Welcomes the 2016 Commission REFIT initiative to carry out an evaluation of Regulation 1107/2009; stresses that this REFIT initiative must not lead to the lowering of food safety and environmental protection standards;

Amendment

8. Welcomes the 2016 Commission REFIT initiative to carry out an evaluation of Regulation 1107/2009; stresses that this REFIT initiative must not lead to the lowering of food safety and environmental protection standards ***and should continue to safeguard the competitiveness of EU agriculture;***

Or. en

Amendment 110

Notis Marias

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 8

Draft motion for a resolution

8. Welcomes the 2016 Commission REFIT initiative to carry out an evaluation of Regulation 1107/2009; stresses that this REFIT initiative must **not** lead to **the lowering of** food safety and environmental protection standards;

Amendment

8. Welcomes the 2016 Commission REFIT initiative to carry out an evaluation of Regulation 1107/2009; stresses that this REFIT initiative must lead to **an improvement in** food safety and environmental protection standards;

Or. el

Amendment 111

Laima Liucija Andrikienė

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 9

Draft motion for a resolution

9. **Stresses the need to revise Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 in order to foster the development, authorisation and placing on the EU market of biological low-risk pesticides; is concerned that the current authorisation process for placing plant protection products on the market is sub-optimal for biological low-risk pesticides;**

Amendment

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 112

Angélique Delahaye, Michel Dantin

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 9

Draft motion for a resolution

9. Stresses the need to revise Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 in order to

Amendment

9. Stresses the need to revise Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 in order to

foster the development, authorisation and placing on the EU market of biological low-risk pesticides; is concerned that the current authorisation process for placing plant protection products on the market is sub-optimal *for biological low-risk pesticides*;

foster the development, authorisation and placing on the EU market of biological low-risk pesticides *and conventional plant protection products*; is concerned that the current authorisation process for placing plant protection products on the market is sub-optimal;

Or. fr

Amendment 113

Nicola Caputo, Doru-Claudian Frunzuliță, Pavel Poc

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 9

Draft motion for a resolution

9. Stresses the need to revise Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 in order to foster the development, authorisation and placing on the EU market of biological low-risk pesticides; is concerned that the current authorisation process for placing plant protection products on the market is sub-optimal for biological low-risk pesticides;

Amendment

9. Stresses the need to revise Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 in order to foster the development, authorisation and placing on the EU market of biological low-risk pesticides; is concerned that the current authorisation process for placing plant protection products on the market is sub-optimal for biological low-risk pesticides; *points out that the current registration process for low-risk basic substances sometimes, in practice, acts as a kind of patent, making it difficult to use a product based on the same substance which is not registered in another Member State*;

Or. it

Amendment 114

Mireille D'Ornano, Sylvie Goddyn, Jean-François Jalkh

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 9

Draft motion for a resolution

9. Stresses the need to revise Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 in order to foster the development, authorisation and

PE595.672v01-00

Amendment

9. Stresses the need to revise Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 in order to foster the development, authorisation and

placing on the EU market of biological low-risk pesticides; is concerned that the current authorisation process for placing plant protection products on the market is sub-optimal for biological low-risk pesticides;

placing on the EU market of biological low-risk pesticides; is concerned that the current authorisation process for placing plant protection products on the market is sub-optimal for biological low-risk pesticides, ***while keeping in mind the necessity of respecting Member State prerogatives, including the authorisation of plant protection products containing these active substances;***

Or. fr

Amendment 115
Julie Girling

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 9

Draft motion for a resolution

9. Stresses the need to revise Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 in order to foster the development, authorisation and placing on the EU market of biological low-risk pesticides; is concerned that the current authorisation process for placing plant protection products on the market is sub-optimal for biological low-risk pesticides;

Amendment

9. Stresses the need to revise Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 in order to foster the development, authorisation and placing on the EU market of ***low-risk pesticides, including*** biological low-risk pesticides; is concerned that the current authorisation process for placing plant protection products on the market is sub-optimal for ***all pesticides, including*** biological low-risk pesticides;

Or. en

Amendment 116
Herbert Dorfmann

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 9 a (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

9 a. Is aware that the general revision of the entire Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 in connection with its REFIT evaluation will take up to ten years; believes that Regulation (EC) No

1107/2007 should swiftly be amended specifically with a view to boosting the availability of biological low-risk pesticides, outside of the general revision of that Regulation;

Or. en

Amendment 117
Annie Schreijer-Pierik

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 10

Draft motion for a resolution

10. Calls on the Commission to **submit a legislative proposal for the revision of Regulation 1107/2009 with a view to** a fast-track evaluation, authorisation and registration process of biological low-risk pesticides; calls for open-ended approval of biological low-risk active substances as an important incentive for the development of biological low-risk pesticides;

Amendment

10. Calls on the Commission to **develop** a fast-track evaluation, authorisation and registration process of biological low-risk pesticides **without any further delay**; calls for open-ended approval of biological low-risk active substances as an important incentive for the development of biological low-risk pesticides; **urges to implement the above-mentioned mechanism through a Commission Communication, thereby simultaneously setting out a Commission action plan which shall include a concrete legislative proposal to partially yet swiftly revise Regulation (EC) 1107/2009;**

Or. en

Amendment 118
Pavel Poc, Paul Brannen

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 10

Draft motion for a resolution

10. Calls on the Commission to submit a **legislative proposal for the revision of Regulation 1107/2009 with a view to** a fast-track evaluation, authorisation and registration process of biological low-risk pesticides; calls for open-ended approval of

Amendment

10. Calls on the Commission to submit a **Communication for** a fast-track evaluation, authorisation and registration process of biological low-risk pesticides; calls for open-ended approval of biological low-risk active substances as an important

biological low-risk active substances as an important incentive for the development of biological low-risk pesticides;

incentive for the development of biological low-risk pesticides;

Or. en

Amendment 119

Ulrike Müller, Jan Huitema, Jasenko Selimovic

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 10

Draft motion for a resolution

10. Calls on the Commission to submit a legislative proposal for the revision of Regulation 1107/2009 with a view to a fast-track evaluation, authorisation and registration process of **biological** low-risk pesticides; calls for open-ended approval of **biological** low-risk active substances as an important incentive for the development of biological low-risk pesticides;

Amendment

10. Calls on the Commission to submit a legislative proposal for the revision of Regulation 1107/2009 with a view to a fast-track evaluation, authorisation and registration process of low-risk pesticides; calls for open-ended approval of low-risk active substances as an important incentive for the development of biological low-risk pesticides;

Or. en

Amendment 120

Angélique Delahaye, Michel Dantin

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 10

Draft motion for a resolution

10. Calls on the Commission to submit a legislative proposal for the revision of Regulation 1107/2009 with a view to a fast-track evaluation, authorisation and registration process of biological low-risk pesticides; ***calls for open-ended approval of biological low-risk active substances as an important incentive for the development of biological low-risk pesticides;***

Amendment

10. Calls on the Commission to submit a legislative proposal for the revision of Regulation 1107/2009 with a view to a fast-track evaluation, authorisation and registration process of biological low-risk pesticides;

Or. fr

Amendment 121
Eleftherios Synadinos

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 10

Draft motion for a resolution

10. Calls on the Commission to submit a legislative proposal for the revision of Regulation 1107/2009 with a view to **a fast-track** evaluation, authorisation and registration process of biological low-risk pesticides; calls for open-ended approval of biological low-risk active substances as an **important** incentive for the development of biological low-risk pesticides;

Amendment

10. Calls on the Commission to submit a legislative proposal for the revision of Regulation 1107/2009 with a view to **an** evaluation, authorisation and registration process of biological low-risk pesticides **which is fast-track but at the same time has adequate safety guarantees**; calls for open-ended approval of biological low-risk active substances as an **additional** incentive for the development of biological low-risk pesticides, **accompanied by a requirement for the periodic confirmation and updating of the information which appears in the authorisation report**;

Or. el

Amendment 122
Herbert Dorfmann

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 10

Draft motion for a resolution

10. Calls on the Commission to submit **a** legislative proposal for the **revision of Regulation 1107/2009** with a view to a fast-track evaluation, authorisation and registration process of biological low-risk pesticides; calls for open-ended approval of biological low-risk active substances as an important incentive for the development of biological low-risk pesticides;

Amendment

10. Calls on the Commission to submit, **within two years, a specific** legislative proposal for the **amendment of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009** with a view to a fast-track evaluation, authorisation and registration process of biological low-risk pesticides; calls for open-ended approval of biological low-risk active substances as an important incentive for the development of biological low-risk pesticides;

Or. en

Amendment 123

Julie Girling

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 10

Draft motion for a resolution

10. Calls on the Commission to submit a legislative proposal for the revision of Regulation 1107/2009 with a view to a fast-track evaluation, authorisation and registration process of **biological** low-risk pesticides; ***calls for open-ended approval of biological low-risk active substances as an important incentive for the development of biological low-risk pesticides;***

Amendment

10. Calls on the Commission to submit a legislative proposal for the revision of Regulation 1107/2009 with a view to a fast-track evaluation, authorisation and registration process of low-risk pesticides, ***including biological low-risk pesticides, without lowering the level of protection of protection of human health or the environment;***

Or. en

Amendment 124

Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 10 a (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

10a. Calls on the Commission to create the opportunity to develop an integrated system that includes an appropriate database of low-risk biological pesticides with that information being made available to all interested parties: the competent authorities, researchers, farmers, users, the general public, etc.;

Amendment

Or. ro

Amendment 125

Herbert Dorfmann

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 11

Draft motion for a resolution

11. Highlights the need for a definition of “biological plant protection product”, covering plant protection products the active substance *of which* is a microorganism or a molecule existing in nature, either obtained from a natural process or synthesized as identical to the natural molecule, *in contrast to “synthetic chemical plant protection products”, meaning plant protection products the active substance of which is a synthetic molecule not existing in nature;*

Amendment

11. Highlights the need for a definition of “biological plant protection product” *within Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009*, covering plant protection products *where* the active substance is a microorganism or a molecule existing in nature, either obtained from a natural process or synthesized as identical to the natural molecule;

Or. en

Amendment 126

Julie Girling

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 11

Draft motion for a resolution

11. Highlights the need for a definition of “biological plant protection product”, covering plant protection products the active substance of which is a microorganism or a molecule existing in nature, either obtained from a natural process or synthesized as identical to the natural molecule, *in contrast to “synthetic chemical plant protection products”, meaning plant protection products the active substance of which is a synthetic molecule not existing in nature;*

Amendment

11. Highlights the need for a definition of “biological plant protection product”, covering plant protection products the active substance of which is a microorganism or a molecule existing in nature, either obtained from a natural process or synthesized as identical to the natural molecule;

Or. en

Amendment 127

Elisabeth Köstinger

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 11

Draft motion for a resolution

11. Highlights the need for a definition of “biological plant protection product”, covering plant protection products the active substance of which is a microorganism or a molecule existing in nature, either obtained from a natural process or synthesized as identical to the natural molecule, in contrast to “synthetic chemical plant protection products”, meaning plant protection products the active substance of which is a synthetic molecule not existing in nature;

Amendment

11. Highlights the need for a definition of “biological plant protection product”, covering plant protection products the active substance of which is a microorganism or a molecule existing in nature, either obtained from a natural process or synthesized as identical to the natural molecule, in contrast to “synthetic chemical plant protection products”, meaning plant protection products the active substance of which is a synthetic molecule not existing in nature; ***proposes that it should be possible, on less stringent terms, to authorise and use repellents and products to protect against browsing whose active substances are molecules which occur in nature and are either obtained from a natural process or synthesised as identical to the natural molecule;***^{3a}

^{3a} Some products which are designed to deter browsing animals do so by means of their mechanical effect (in a similar way to a fence - e.g. quartz sand) or their odour. These products should be subject to authorisation and use on less stringent terms.

Or. de

Amendment 128
Eleftherios Synadinos

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 11

Draft motion for a resolution

11. Highlights the need for a definition of “biological plant protection product”, covering plant protection products the active substance of which is a microorganism or a molecule existing in nature, either obtained from a natural process or ***synthesized*** as identical to the

Amendment

11. Highlights the need for a ***detailed and comprehensive*** definition of “biological plant protection product”, covering plant protection products the active substance of which is a microorganism or a molecule ***or a combination of molecules and polymers***

natural *molecule*, in contrast to “synthetic chemical plant protection products”, meaning plant protection products the active substance of which is a synthetic molecule not existing in nature;

existing in nature, either obtained from a natural process or *synthetised* as identical to the natural *version*, in contrast to “synthetic chemical plant protection products”, meaning plant protection products the active substance of which is a synthetic molecule not existing in nature;

Or. el

Amendment 129
Pavel Poc, Paul Brannen

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 11

Draft motion for a resolution

11. Highlights the need for a definition of “*biological* plant protection product”, covering plant protection products the active substance of which is a microorganism or a molecule existing in nature, either obtained from a natural process or synthetized as identical to the natural molecule, in contrast to “*synthetic chemical* plant protection products”, meaning plant protection products the active substance of which is a synthetic molecule not existing in nature;

Amendment

11. Highlights the need for a definition of “plant protection product *of biological origin*”, covering plant protection products the active substance of which is a microorganism or a molecule existing in nature, either obtained from a natural process or synthetized as identical to the natural molecule, in contrast to “plant protection products *of synthetic chemical origin*”, meaning plant protection products the active substance of which is a synthetic molecule not existing in nature;

Or. en

Amendment 130
Eleftherios Synadinos

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 12

Draft motion for a resolution

12. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council, the Commission and the governments and parliaments of the Member States.

Amendment

12. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council, the Commission and the governments and parliaments of the Member States, *whose input it requests and whom it invites to engage in dialogue.*

