

---

**From:** Francesco Panella

**Sent:** 27 December 2016 17:09:33 (UTC+01:00) Brussels, Copenhagen, Madrid, Paris

**To:** SG INPUT ROADMAPS FEEDBACK

**Subject:** Roadmap: Feedback received for REFIT Evaluation of the EU legislation on plant protection products and pesticides residues (Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 and Regulation (EC) No 396/2005) - DG:SANTE - Register ID :586313213546-65

*Please do not reply to this automatic email.*

---

## **Your Voice In Europe: ROADMAP feedback for REFIT Evaluation of the EU legislation on plant protection products and pesticides residues (Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 and Regulation (EC) No 396/2005)**

### **User's data:**

- Domain: Non governmental organisation
- Name: Francesco Panella
- Email: [coeur@bee-life.eu](mailto:coeur@bee-life.eu)
- Country: Belgium
- Organisation: Bee Life-European Beekeeping Coordination
- Headquarter: select
- Register: 586313213546-65
- Size: select
- Publication: can be published with your personal information

**Related document: REFIT Evaluation of the EU legislation on plant protection products and pesticides residues (Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 and Regulation (EC) No 396/2005)**

### **Feedback:**

*The Roadmap of the European Commission for the REFIT of the legislation on plant protection products and pesticide residues is an administrative exercise of the Commission to evaluate the quality of present legislation and its relevance in answering real life questions and in corresponding with field realities. In Bee Life's opinion the proposed Roadmap invites to think that the Commission is engaging itself in a cumbersome exercise that we fear will not help improving the real situation we experience in the field, but will rather increase the administrative burden.*

*As an organisation working with bees, ubiquitous environmental bio-indicators that also produce foodstuffs, our experience is that the legislation in place does not translate in a safe environment for pollinators, nor in safe feedstuffs for animals. This negatively affects both food production directly, through beekeeping products, and indirectly, through pollination. "Better regulation for better results" should mean that*

*all legislations linked to pesticides or biocides, even veterinary products if they contain the same active substances but with a different target (an animal instead of a plant), would be dealt together in a coherent way. This for the benefit of all and especially of beekeepers, that are suffering from the negative consequences of the failure of the current system. At the end of the day, all of these legislations shape the type and load of synthetic molecules for pest control that are found in nature.*

*The ultimate objective of the review should be to ensure the safety of products conceived to kill a wide spectrum of living being with regards to human, animal and environmental health. Indeed, it makes no sense to carry out an evaluation of the legislations for the authorisation and establishment of maximum residue levels of pesticides in foodstuffs if the use of these substances is not targeted at the same time. Similarly, it is difficult to assess the quality of the implementation of these pieces of legislations without having in mind indicators like the contamination with pesticides of water/air/food/pollen/blood/urine/other. As a result this specific review should have a more holistic approach in its scope.*

*Furthermore, we would like to point out that MRLs are only set for foodstuffs intended for human consumption, without consideration of the fact that these foodstuffs are in occasions feedstuffs that can damage animal health as well. If Regulation 1107/2009 should ensure both human and animal health as well as that of the environment, how is it possible that Regulation 396/2005 de facto permits animal damage?*

*We would like to take the opportunity of this consultation to raise a point that seems pertinent to us about the EU Pesticide database, which is the relevance of the information contained in it. In our opinion, the content of the database should be completed with the yearly amount of active substance sold/used per country. This information is key for understanding the potential incoherences/problems in legislation. As the legislation correctly states: the risk of a pesticide depends on the possibility to be exposed to it. So far, some of the main problems faced by these legislations came from pesticides used in large scale, like glyphosate or neonicotinoid pesticides. The EU Pesticide Database should as well include if the active ingredient is authorised for other purposes as biocide, veterinary product or other.*

*The REFIIt exercise should serve to make the definition of active substance and plant protection product (PPP) more appropriate. Any active substance is degraded into metabolites, some of which have toxicity and non-negligible persistence. Defining the relevance of a metabolite based on a concentration greater than 10% relative to the parental molecule is an absurdity in eco-/toxicological terms (Active substance = parental molecule and active metabolites even at low concentrations). The definition of PPP should include only one active substance because the interactions between active substances are complex and far from being understood. Finally, the definition of PPP is unclear as regards the physical form of that PPP (e.g. a nanoparticle formulation has nothing in common with a conventional emulsion).*

*We were surprised by the mention of costs included in the framework. We might be touching an ethical question here, but who is the cost trigger in pesticide authorisation: the Commission and Member States, whose responsibility is to ensure safety in the territory based on the precautionary principle, or the pesticide industry, whose business model is based on selling their potentially unsafe products? It is*

*logical that pesticide industry incurs costs for the authorisation of their products because they will eventually make profit over their commercialisation. What is not normal is that consumers, population in rural areas, (organic) farmers, beekeepers, water companies, etc. have to face external costs because of health problems, loss of quality of their products/impossibility of commercialisation of their products, depuration costs, loss of livestock or production capacity, etc. Within these groups of people there are SMEs and micro-enterprises as well. It is quite astonishing to see how the pesticide industry has managed to make those responsible of our safety feel bad about doing their job. We hereby would like to remind the Commission and Member States that they are the ones responsible for our safety, whatever it takes and that the precautionary principle should prevail.*

*On the matter of the topics included in the evaluation, a number of areas have been listed by the Commission identifying problematic points in the implementation of the legislation. While Bee Life agrees that transparency in the implementation is one of the main issues to be dealt with, we miss the following points in the list of points covered.*

**Feedback file:**

[BeeLife2016ContributiontoRoadmapREFIT1107\\_2009and396\\_2005.pdf](#)