List of questions for the hearing on 28 September 2015

1. What is the substantive basis for the different opinions which exist on the question of whether glyphosate is likely to be carcinogenic? How should these differences be viewed and what course of action will now be taken in this regard? What role does the fact that exposure varies depending on directions for use play in assessing the risks?
   What routes of exposure which could lead to an increased risk of cancer are relevant for Germany, with the directions for use currently in application?

2. How do you view the approval of active substances and plant protection products at European Union (EU) level and at national level? Should the existing legal requirement obliging companies applying for approval to make available and finance the necessary scientific studies be changed? And, if so, who should cover the costs? How many scientific studies on the possible carcinogenicity of glyphosate were assessed and did the studies apply to the active substance or to the plant protection product?

3. What alternative plant protection products are available to the agricultural sector to replace glyphosate and what environmental and health impacts would increased use of these products have? What would be the impacts on resistance management if glyphosate were no longer used? What would be the impacts on conservation tillage of replacing glyphosate?

4. What indications of other health hazards posed by glyphosate are you aware of, apart from the probable carcinogenic effects? Which institutions, particularly at international level, are investigating these indications of possible health hazards and what current international research projects assessing the possible health hazards posed by the active substance are you aware of?

5. A significant proportion of studies used by the Federal Institute for Risk Assessment (BfR) are financed or initiated by the chemical industry. What is your opinion of such studies and how do you view their findings?

6. To what extent should the monograph produced by the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) influence the re-authorisation of glyphosate at EU level in your view and to what extent should the precautionary principle be applied regarding authorisation of glyphosate, against the background of studies concluding that glyphosate

is “probably carcinogenic”?

7. What impacts on the health of users, local residents and consumers in your opinion indicate that glyphosate ought not to be used in agriculture?

8. In your view, what impacts on the environment and on agriculture of the active substance glyphosate on the one hand and herbicide-resistant genetically modified plants on the other indicate that glyphosate ought not to be used as an active substance in agriculture?

9. What consequences would a ban on the use of glyphosate have on the agricultural sector in the EU and in countries which export agricultural commodities to the EU?

10. What differences are you aware of regarding the regulations, procedures and criteria applied in assessments by the IARC, Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues (JMPR), Institute for Risk Assessment (BfR), European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) and, if applicable, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)? Which regulations may lead to scientific studies not being taken into account and how are the different conclusions reached by these institutions regarding the carcinogenicity of the active substance glyphosate to be viewed against this background?
(If you represent one of the institutions listed above, please indicate this to the *left* of the descriptions of the various regulations, procedures and criteria.)

11. How do you assess the current availability of data regarding the exposure of various groups in the population to glyphosate (with particular reference to professional and non-professional users, residents/bystanders/land users, consumers and children/infants)? In particular, how precisely can the level of (acute and background) exposure be assessed in your view and what (if any) recommendations do you have to improve the availability of data on glyphosate?

12. What consequences would adoption of the IARC classification as "probably carcinogenic to humans" have on the possible new authorisation of glyphosate as an active substance?
(c.f.:
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A02008R1272-20150601
p. 152 onwards, Annex 1, 3.6: Carcinogenicity)