

BTO - Meeting with CGB (French Sugarbeet Grower Organisation)
on active substances used in PPP important to sugar beet growers

Place and date: 17 July 2019, DG SANTE, Brussels

Participants:

DG SANTE (EC): [REDACTED] (E4)

CGB – Confédération Générale des Planteurs de Betteraves:

[REDACTED], [REDACTED]

The meeting was organised on request of CGB.

CGB informed about the difficulties faced by sugar beet growers following the restriction of the approvals of the three neonicotinoids to greenhouses in 2018, in particular as the French government had refused to grant emergency authorisations, unlike other Member States. French sugar beet growers therefore were at a competitive disadvantage.

However, CGB confirmed that alternatives had been found and were used in spray applications (2 to 3 times per growing season). One product had obtained a regular authorisation, the other was also applied under an emergency authorisation. As a consequence of the multiple spray applications instead of seed treatment, however, the treatment frequency index that must be calculated under the French national action plan in the context of the SUD had gone up.

CGB then referred to a number of other substances currently under review (listed below) which are important for the sector and inquired about the Commission's intention as to their renewal.

Herbicides: Lenacile, Trisulfuron methyl, Clomazone, PMP, Clopyralide, Dimethenamid-P

Insecticides Beta-cyfluthrine, Deltaméthrine, 15% alpha-cypermethrine

Fungicides: Difenconazole, Tetraconazole, Fenprovidine

Lastly, CGB mentioned that new sugar beet varieties more resistant to pests could be potentially developed via New Breeding Techniques (NBT) and wondered about the Commission's intentions as to a specific regulatory framework.

SANTE.E.4:

- recalled that emergency authorisations were entirely under the responsibility of the Member States, while the Commission remained vigilant that the conditions in Article 53(1) were fully respected;
- noted with interest the existence of alternatives to the neonicotinoids despite the earlier claims by the sector in 2018 that no such alternatives would be available;
- indicated that CGB could find information about potential issues related to the substances under review in the draft assessment reports and EFSA conclusions (when available on EFSA's website). At this moment, no precise forecast about future intentions of the Commission could be made as these will depend on the actual content of the EFSA conclusions;
- referred to Unit SANTE.E.3 for any discussion about a potential regulatory framework for NTBs.