## Questionnaire\_Biodiversity - triggered by Glyphosate renewal implementing regulation (DE)

## Question

- 1. Do you as <u>risk assessors</u> consider the specific provision regarding the risk to diversity and abundance of non-target terrestrial arthropods and vertebrates via trophic interactions in the overall risk assessment for glyphosate products?
  - 1a) If yes, how do you consider the specific provision in the risk assessment?
  - 1b) If no, what are the reasons not to consider the specific provision in the risk assessment (e.g. no environmental concern, no risk assessment method available)?

DE	CZ	UK	SI	IE	NL	ВЕ
5.1.2.a Woo					A harmonized methodology for the assessment of the risk to biodiversity is not available. Ctgb would support an initiative to develop a guidance for the assessment of the risk to biodiversity.  For the time being, the Ctgb uses the present GDs for non-target plants and arthropods, until better assessment methods are available to assess effects on biodiversity.	5.1.2.a Woo

level without available EU guidance. The consulted legal experts concluded that there are no legal obstacles. <sup>1</sup> (see also answer to question 2)					
5.1.2.a \	_		$\blacksquare$	No (harmonized) guidance/ method available	5.1.2.8

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> "National authorities can take indirect effects of plant protection products on biological diversity into account when assessing the admissibility of plant protection products. The assessment of such indirect effects is not subject to a recognition of specific assessment methods by the European Food Safety Agency. The possibility and obligation to consider effects on bio-diversity is also not restricted by the specific assessment and decision criteria contained in EU secondary law. While these criteria only provide for a minimum harmonization of the assessment procedure, they do not prevent the national authority from taking current scientific and technical information into account. The European and national legislation in the area of plant protection contain several provisions that allow member states to adopt risk management measures. These provisions provide a legal basis for the approach for reducing the risk for biological diversity" (Klinger R., Borwieck K., Douhaire C. (2017): Rechtsgutachten zum Schutz von terrestrischen Nichtzielarten einschließlich der biologischen Vielfalt vor den Auswirkungen von Pflanzenschutzmitteln. Auflagen zum Schutz der Biodiversität im Rahmen von Zulassungen nach dem Pflanzenschutzgesetz. UBA-Texte 101/2017: 55 S.

- 2. Do you as <u>risk manager</u> consider the specific provision regarding the risk to diversity and abundance of non-target terrestrial arthropods and vertebrates via trophic interactions in the risk management for glyphosate products?
  - 1a) If yes, how do you consider the specific provision the risk management?
  - 1b) If no, what are the reasons not to consider the specific provision in the risk management (e.g. no environmental concern, no management options available)?

DF.	1.67	LIIV	CL	le le	Lau	DE.
DE	CZ	UK	SI	IE	NL	BE
5.1.2.a Woo					A harmonized approach	5.1.2.a Woo
					(protection goals,	
					management options)	
					regarding biodiversity is	
					not available. Ctgb	
					would support an	
					initiative to develop a	
					harmonized approach	
				_	for the management of	
					the risk to biodiversity.	
				_	As the risk to	
					ecotoxicology was	
					assessed based on the	
	_				present GDs for non-	
	_				target plants and	
					arthropods no specific	
					risk management	
					measures were taken	
_						
					regarding biodiversity.	
		1				

5.1.2.a Woo					
5.1.2.a Woo	1		Ш	No No (harmonized) guidance/ method available	512a

	Would you agree that products with other active substances than glyphosate but with similar broad-spectrum activity towards NTTP and NTA share similar risks to food webs via trophic interaction and would require similar considerations in risk assessment and/or risk management?							
DE	CZ	UK	SI	IE	NL	BE		
5 (22					Once both a harmonized risk assessment methodology and management approach regarding biodiversity are available, they would certainly be applicable to other active substances with similar broadspectrum activity towards NTTP and NTA.  As indicated under question 1. and 2. we consider it prudent to use the available and accepted GDs for non-target plants and arthropods.	е		

4	In an all a second	also state of a second to the second		المراعدانية المالية		landa da arabara a CII au	talaman ta assatlabila
4.	_	the risk via trophic inter	action is relevant for the overal	i risk regulation, n	iow snould ivi5 deal wit	in the fact that no EU gu	idance is available
	so far?						
DE		CZ	UK	SI	IE	NL	BE
5.1	1.2.a Woo					As indicated under	5.1.2.a Woo
						question 1. and 2. we	
						consider it prudent to	
	_					use the available and	
						accepted GDs for non-	
						target plants and	
						arthropods.	
						-	
5.	How do you deal with the	e requirement to minimi	ze the use of products containir	g glyphosate in s	pecific areas ("Member	States shall ensure that	use of plant
	protection products cont	aining glyphosate is mini	mised in the specific areas liste	d in Article 12(a) o	of Directive 2009/128/	EC.")?	
	5.1.2.a Woo					In the Netherlands	5.1.2.a Woo
						legislation prohibits	
						the professional use of	
						ppp's containing	
						glyphosate outside the	
						agricultural domain,	
						such as the uses	
						described in art.12(a)	
						of Directive	
						2009/128/EC.	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> see <a href="http://www.hse.gov.uk/pesticides/topics/using-pesticides/codes-of-practice/code-of-practice-for-using-plant-protection-products.htm">http://www.hse.gov.uk/pesticides/topics/using-pesticides/codes-of-practice/code-of-practice-for-using-plant-protection-products.htm</a> for further information. In particular reference is made to minimizing use in Section 3.1.1. It should be noted that this code of practice is relevant for all pesticide products and not just glyphosate.