



PAN Europe's briefing for Member States on Commission's latest proposal to renew Glyphosate authorisation for 5 years to be discussed on the 9th of November at the Standing Committee of Animals Food and Feed

PAN Europe calls Member States to respect the resolution of the EP to phase out Glyphosate

No support to the new proposal

Commission Health service DG SANTE proposes a 5-year renewal for the herbicide Glyphosate (vote on November 9), which contradicts the vote in the European Parliament for a phase out of Glyphosate. DG SANTE should have included a phase out in the proposal, just as a majority of the members of the parliament have demanded.

You may still ask for the inclusion of a phase-out paragraph. The 'Monsanto-papers' have given sufficient insight in Monsanto's testing policy making that all of its studies are unreliable. This also invalidates the opinion of EFSA. One could therefore make a good case for phase-out based on the IARC-opinion.

Pointless repetition.

The proposal would just lead to a repetition of the discussions we now have on Glyphosate in a few years time. Monsanto will deliver the same dossier and the same RAR can be used. If SANTE was to include a mandate for new tests for carcinogenicity and new chronic testing of the formulation performed by an independent laboratory, it would have been different. DG SANTE did not even include restrictions for use of glyphosate in public areas such as parks and schools, for non-professional use and as a pre-harvest desiccant that results in high amounts of glyphosate residues on the crops.

Extension.

Even an extension (Art.17) would have been more appropriate than this renewal-proposal. At least if a list of conditions could had been included, full independent carcinogenicity testing, full independent formulation testing (e.g. Seralini-study or a repetition of the study). As it was the case with the previous extension on Glyphosate that included specific conditions (to remove the co-formulant POE-tallowamine).

Reform of risk assessment urgently needed.

The Glyphosate case makes it perfectly clear that EU risk assessment needs a full reform. Testing should be done in an independent way, not by industry. Academic literature should have a prominent place, at the same level as protocol studies. Data requirements are highly



insufficient, missing tests for immunotoxicity, endocrine disruption, developmental neurotoxicity, and other major adverse health effects. Risk assessment methodologies need a full review since many of them are designed by industry themselves (historical control data, human relevance, recovery, etc.).

October 27, 2017, Pesticide Action Network Europe.