

## The EU glyphosate timeline

*Campaigners and activists met in Brussels and other European cities (Madrid, Rome, Berlin and Paris) today to launch a European Citizens' Initiative (ECI) to ban glyphosate, reform the EU pesticide approval process, and set mandatory targets to reduce pesticide use in the EU. The goal is to collect at least one million signatures from Europeans and submit the petition before the Commission's next move to renew, withdraw or extend the EU licence of glyphosate. To sign the #StopGlyphosate ECI, people can visit [www.banglyphosate.eu](http://www.banglyphosate.eu) and follow a simple two-step procedure.*

In March 2015, months before the EU glyphosate licence was due to run out, cancer experts at the World Health Organisation (WHO) classified glyphosate as “[probably carcinogenic to humans](#)”. This sparked a wide public and political debate on whether the most widely used weedkiller should stay on the shelves.

European Union regulations prohibit the use of herbicides when there is “[sufficient evidence in animals](#)” that links it to cancer, based on WHO criteria. According to WHO experts, glyphosate fulfils these criteria. However, in November 2015, the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) claimed – partly based on a review of unpublished industry-funded studies – that there was insufficient evidence to conclude that glyphosate can cause cancer.

Based on the EFSA conclusion, the European Commission proposed renewing glyphosate's licence for 15 years. However, following a public outcry, the proposal did not receive sufficient backing by national governments and the Commission eventually extended the current approval to 18 months. It will have to revisit this decision and determine the long-term fate of the glyphosate licence before the end of 2017. In the meantime, the European Chemicals Agency (ECHA) is expected to publish an assessment on the safety of glyphosate in summer 2017.

## Questions about transparency and democracy

The glyphosate saga has triggered discussion about a number of broader questions:

- Is it acceptable for the EU to rely on unpublished, industry-funded studies to assess the safety of chemical pesticides?
- Should the European Commission approve pesticides when the decision is not backed by a qualified majority of EU countries? [1]
- Why are decisions on pesticides taken in secret, with no official record of the proposals or votes cast?
- Can the EU's food safety agency be trusted to deliver robust and impartial advice?
- In the end, whose interests are being served?

And, above all, will the EU serve its citizens and the environment by reconsidering the massive use of pesticides, and by taking decisions transparently and democratically?

<b>20 March 2015</b>	The WHO's cancer research agency, IARC, classifies glyphosate as " <a href="#">probably carcinogenic to humans</a> ".
<b>12 November 2015</b>	The European Food Safety Authority, EFSA, claims there is <a href="#">insufficient scientific evidence</a> of a cancer link and suggests increasing the acceptable daily intake of glyphosate. It states that " <a href="#">unpublished studies</a> " unavailable to the IARC experts formed the "core basis" of its evaluation. All national safety agencies, except Sweden's Chemical Agency, support the EFSA conclusion.
<b>27 November 2015</b>	Ninety-six independent scientists, including several of those involved in the WHO's cancer review, slam the EFSA assessment as " <a href="#">not supported by the evidence</a> ".
<b>12 December 2015</b>	The French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational Health and Safety, ANSES, says glyphosate may need to be <a href="#">classified as a 'suspected human carcinogen'</a> and the European Chemical Agency should "rapidly" review its classification.
<b>7 March 2016</b>	The Commission fails to gather sufficient support from EU governments to grant a new 15-year licence to glyphosate. It cancels a planned vote.
<b>4 April 2016</b>	Health Commissioner Vytenis Andriukaitis <a href="#">asks glyphosate producers</a> for the full publication of confidential industry studies on glyphosate's potential cancer link. The producers only offered to make the redacted studies available in <a href="#">guarded reading rooms</a> .
<b>13 April 2016</b>	The <a href="#">European Parliament</a> calls for a ban on glyphosate use: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- in private and public green areas,</li> <li>- in agricultural fields shortly before harvesting,</li> <li>- where weeds can be controlled with other methods.</li> </ul> It says any new licence should be limited to seven years.
<b>16 May 2016</b>	The WHO's and FAO's Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues states that glyphosate is " <a href="#">unlikely to pose a carcinogenic risk to humans from exposure through the diet</a> ". The chair and co-chair of the panel are revealed to be working for an <a href="#">institute that receives money from pesticide companies</a> .
<b>19 May 2016</b>	The Commission fails to gather enough support for a revised proposal to grant a new nine-year licence to glyphosate. It again cancels the vote.
<b>6 June 2016</b>	The Commission requests a vote on a revised proposal to extend the existing licence by 18 months, until the European Chemicals Agency, ECHA, has issued its opinion. The Commission once again fails to get enough support from government representatives.
<b>24 June 2016</b>	In a second vote on the same proposal, the Commission again fails to muster a qualified majority of EU countries [1] in support of the proposal.
<b>29 June 2016</b>	In accordance with EU rules, the Commission unilaterally <a href="#">extends the glyphosate licence</a> until the end of 2017.
<b>11 July 2016</b>	EU governments support a separate Commission proposal to ban all weedkillers containing both glyphosate and polyethoxylated (POE) tallowamine, a co-formulant used in many glyphosate-based herbicides.
<b>1 August 2016</b>	The Commission <a href="#">mandates EU governments</a> to ban products with POE tallowamine.
<b>24 August 2016</b>	Glyphosate producers <a href="#">set up a guarded reading room</a> in Brussels with redacted copies of industry studies. Visitors have to register and are not allowed to take notes or pictures.

<b>14 September 2016</b>	<a href="#">Commission President Jean-Claude Juncker</a> states: “It is not right that when EU countries cannot decide among themselves whether or not to ban the use of glyphosate in herbicides, the Commission is forced by Parliament and Council to take a decision. So we will change those rules – because that is not democracy.”
<b>23 November 2016</b>	In a freedom of information case, the European Court of Justice rules that safety tests conducted by the chemical industry and used by regulators to assess the dangers of pesticides <a href="#">must be disclosed</a> .
<b>7 December 2016</b>	ECHA <a href="#">organises a hearing</a> on glyphosate.
<b>9 December 2016</b>	EFSA <a href="#">releases the confidential industry studies</a> to a small group of individuals, under strict conditions and with large parts redacted.
<b>10 January 2017</b>	Green members of the European Parliament insist on the <a href="#">full disclosure</a> of the studies.  The Commission officially <a href="#">registers the European Citizens’ Initiative</a> on glyphosate.
<b>8 February 2017</b>	Civil society groups across Europe launch the <a href="#">European Citizens’ Initiative</a> to ban glyphosate and protect people and the environment from toxic pesticides
<b>To come:</b>	
<b>14 February 2017</b>	The Commission is to release a report on “Comitology procedures – more democracy for the adoption of delegated and implementing acts”. ‘Comitology’ is the EU procedure used to approve pesticides like glyphosate.
<b>21 February 2017</b>	EFSA is to <a href="#">respond to the request by politicians for full disclosure</a> of the industry studies.
<b>6 - 10 March 2017</b>	ECHA is to <a href="#">discuss the hazard classification</a> of glyphosate.
<b>29 May - 2 June 2017</b>	ECHA is to adopt its opinion on the hazard classification of glyphosate.
<b>August 2017</b>	EFSA is to publish an opinion on potential hormone-disrupting effects of glyphosate.
<b>September 2017</b>	EFSA is to publish an opinion on the impact of glyphosate residues in feed on animal health, and a review of maximum residue levels in food and feed.
<b>October 2017</b>	The Commission is to issue a proposal on the future of glyphosate.
<b>November 2017</b>	EU governments are to vote on the Commission’s proposal.
<b>December 2017</b>	A final decision is expected before the current EU glyphosate licence runs out on 31 December 2017.

**Note:**

[1] A qualified majority requires a favourable vote of at least 16 countries, representing at least 65% of the EU population.

**Contact:**

Franziska Achterberg – Greenpeace EU food policy director, +32 (0)498 362403, [franziska.achterberg@greenpeace.org](mailto:franziska.achterberg@greenpeace.org)

This press briefing is also available on: [www.greenpeace.eu](http://www.greenpeace.eu)

For breaking news and comment on EU affairs: [www.twitter.com/GreenpeaceEU](https://www.twitter.com/GreenpeaceEU)

Greenpeace is an independent global campaigning organisation that acts to change attitudes and behaviour, to protect and conserve the environment and to promote peace. Greenpeace does not accept donations from governments, the EU, businesses or political parties.