

**To:** [\*] (TRADE)  
**Subject:** FW: Meeting with ECPA 28 April 2015 - endocrine disruptors, import tolerances, TTIP R9  
**Attachments:** 150202 Delays in import tolerance evaluations - ECPA etter to DG Trade.pdf

---

**From:** [\*] (TRADE)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 05, 2015 12:17 PM  
**To:** GARCIA BERCERO Ignacio (TRADE); RATSO Signe (TRADE); [\*] (TRADE); [\*] (TRADE); [\*] (TRADE); [\*] (TRADE); [\*] (TRADE); [\*] (TRADE); [\*] (TRADE); [\*] (TRADE); [\*] (TRADE); [\*] (TRADE)  
**Cc:** [\*] (TRADE); [\*] (TRADE); [\*] (TRADE); [\*] (TRADE); [\*] (TRADE)  
**Subject:** Meeting with ECPA 28 April 2015 - endocrine disruptors, import tolerances, TTIP R9

**DG TRADE meeting with European Crop Protection Association (ECPA), 28 April 2015, 9.30-10.30**

**ECPA:** Euros Jones, Director Regulatory Affairs; [\*], [\*]

**TRADE:** [\*], [\*] (D.3); [\*] (G.3)

- Productive exchange with ECPA focussing on three topics: endocrine disruptors, import tolerances and the 9<sup>th</sup> round of TTIP negotiations where the association is particularly interested in the sectoral discussions on pesticides and chemicals.
- On **endocrine disruptors** (EDs), ECPA informed about recent meetings with DG SANTÉ ([\*]). ECPA has already seen the draft JRC methodology for the screening of substances in the framework of the ongoing Impact Assessment study; the association believes that the JRC's approach will allow some degree of flexibility during the screening exercise, i.e. new substances could be added to the screening at a later stage if needed. TRADE explained that overall the JRC has done a good job, notably on the decision tree. Initial TRADE concerns were limited and concerned mainly a request to also include "margin of exposure" considerations. ECPA acknowledged that its US counterpart association CropLife America (CLA) – along with the US Government – takes a rather hard-line approach and is still fundamentally opposed to any possible EU regulatory action on EDs, pointing to its alleged WTO SPS-incompatibility. ECPA itself is also critical but understands better the EU's regulatory constraints. ECPA will keep in touch with CLA on this matter.
- On **import tolerances / MRLs** (Maximum Residue Limits), ECPA recalled the letter it sent to DG TRADE on 2 February 2015 (see enclosed). One key industry concern is that EFSA (European Food Safety Authority) generally advises against the setting of MRLs until evidence has been provided that the respective use is authorised in the exporting country and that the MRL proposed as an import tolerance is not higher than the one established in the country of origin. ECPA believes that this practice is not in line with the relevant EU MRL Regulation 396/2005 and will lead to important delays. COM took note and remarked that ECPA should address this concern at higher COM level. In any case, it is understandable that

SANTÉ colleagues are trying to avoid unnecessary work on MRLs for which the substance has not yet been authorized in the country of origin.

- COM gave a short overview of the **9<sup>th</sup> round of TTIP negotiations** in the areas of **chemicals and pesticides**. In the field of **pesticides**, both sides have now identified the topics for which a closer cooperation between regulators (notably SANTÉ and US EPA) looks more promising.

[Art. 4.1(a) third indent]

Another idea is to identify key commodities for which further-reaching trade facilitation measures may be considered, notably pre-export checks, in order to avoid costly rejections of shipments at the border. One example concerns possible pre-export checks for olive oil; COM will pursue this further with the US FDA during a visit to Washington, DC in the week of 4 May. With regard to the TTIP **chemicals** negotiations, ECPA is particularly interested in classification and labelling issues. COM stressed the importance of convincing the EPA to implement the relevant UN GHS standard for substances under their jurisdiction, notably pesticides. ECPA acknowledged that the failure of the US to fully implement the GHS leads to problematic double-labelling issues, but pointed to the fact that the domestic debate in the US is mostly focused on farmers who could face severe burdens if the current labelling system in the US were to be changed.