



**EUROPEAN COMMISSION**  
**DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR HEALTH AND FOOD SAFETY**

**Deputy Director General for the Food chain**

Brussels,  
 SANTE.03/TD/am(2015)6489156

Dear Petitioner,

The Commissioner asked me to answer to your petition on his behalf.

The Council of the European Union and the European Parliament as co-legislators of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 have agreed on a structured process for the review/renewal of pesticide active substances in the EU, which assigns the evaluation of a substance to a Member State, makes use of the cumulative expertise of scientists from all 28 Member States, and assigns a pivotal independent scientific 'peer review' role to EFSA.

Glyphosate is one of the many active substances which have been evaluated in the past years through this process, which has delivered detailed and robust assessments to ensure the highest level of health and environmental protection. In the case of glyphosate, over 100 scientists and 30 cancer experts from the 28 Member States and EFSA, working in a collegiate manner, reviewed all the available evidence, including the findings of the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) of the World Health Organisation (WHO), and contributed to the evaluation of this substance.

In fulfilling its scientific peer review role, EFSA has acted in line with its principles of excellence, independence, and transparency set out in its founding regulation (178/2002/EC). It involved in the process, scientists who were selected on the basis of very high academic excellence criteria, and who fulfilled to the maximum the very strict and stringent independence criteria by which EFSA operates. In addition, in line with its transparency principle, EFSA has not only solicited the views of the scientific community and the public via a public consultation of its peer review report but has made available on its website all relevant documentation amounting to over 6000 pages.

This laborious and highly involved evaluation of glyphosate, like all other previous evaluations, has once more highlighted the robustness of the European Union scientific advice process which relies on the collective efforts of many, highly qualified, independent experts.



Ladislav Miko