

Dear Honorable Member of the European Parliament,

I write to ask you to **vote against the Motion for Resolution tabled by Pavel Poc: 'Objection pursuant to Rule 106(2) and (3) renewal of the approval of the active substance Bentazone'**.

A copy of the Motion is attached, and will be voted on 23 November by the Plenary.

As representatives of the European Crop Protection Industry, **we disagree with this draft Motion for Resolution** and ask that you **vote against the motion** because:

- 1. It disregards the fact that confirmatory data is a solution provided for in Regulation 1107/2009**, and is a legitimate part of the renewal procedure, as indicated under paragraph 9 of the Ombudsman's opinion.
- 2. It calls into question the positive scientific evaluations for the renewal of the active substance** by the Netherlands, as Rapporteur Member State, and EFSA as the EU authority. Both evaluations concluded that **Bentazone is safe when used appropriately.**
- 3. Bentazone does not meet the applicable criteria for an endocrine disruptor.**
- 4. This motion neglects the significant impact that the loss of an active substance, such as Bentazone, could have on European farmers, their productivity, competitiveness, and sustainability.**

It is important that MEPs protect the established decision-making process for approval and renewal of active substances, and that they support the role of EU scientific bodies which are regarded amongst the best in the World.

We hope we can rely on your support in this matter.

If you require further background information from BASF, the manufacturer of Bentazone, please do not hesitate to contact: [paul.leonard@basf.com](mailto:paul.leonard@basf.com) or [celmira-susana.sousa@basf.com](mailto:celmira-susana.sousa@basf.com).

Yours sincerely,

**Jean-Philippe Azoulay ECPA**