

**Question for written answer P-002321/2016
to the Commission**

Rule 130

Bart Staes (Verts/ALE), Karin Kadenbach (S&D), Stefan Eck (GUE/NGL), Anja Hazekamp (GUE/NGL), Kateřina Konečná (GUE/NGL), Martin Häusling (Verts/ALE), Younous Omarjee (GUE/NGL), Gilles Pargneaux (S&D), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE) and Pavel Poc (S&D)

Subject: Biased glyphosate residue levels in food

The US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) announced its intention to start testing glyphosate residues in food on 17 February 2016, after the US Government Accountability Office rebuked the agency for failing to carry out such assessments, and for not disclosing this shortcoming to the public.

In the 2013 report on pesticide residues in food, the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) pointed out the lack of sound data on glyphosate residues in the EU:

‘Similar to previous years, EFSA noted that for certain pesticides covered by the 2013 EUCP the number of determinations reported was significantly below the number needed to derive statistically sound conclusions. This is true in particular for 2,4-D, amitraz, amitrole, bixafen, bromide-ion, chlordane, cyromazine, dithianon, dodine, ethephon, fenbutatin-oxide, flonicamid, fluazifop-p-butyl, flubendiamide, glyphosate, maleic hydrozide, meptyldinocap and prothioconazole (RD) (see Appendix C, Table C1, Section 2.2. and 2.3). Thus, reporting countries should extend the scope of the analytical methods used for enforcement of MRLs to make sure that the detection rate and the MRL exceedance rate is not biased by the low number of determinations or lack of data from certain countries.’

What measures have been taken by the Commission to make sure that official residue levels for glyphosate and the other substances listed by the EFSA above are not biased, whether by the low number of determinations, the lack of data or any other factor?