

Dear all  
just quickly, as there have been some questions:

As explained by Sarah last night, the reason why we had to vote against in the end (instead of abstaining, as discussed before) is that a combination of really bad AMs passed, which we would not have expected to pass (and where both our RE and S&D partners were sure they were be safe in their respective groups).

The most important ones were the deletions of two whole articles, one on the obligation for farmers to record IPM\* (ENVI def see below) measures, and another one on setting up a central electronic register for IPM measures taken (+ other AMs weakening the IPM part, incl the one turning the mandatory "rules" into "guidelines" re crop specific IPM rules). If the text on IPM had stayed strong, with clear and controllable obligations for farmers, we could have still argued that this alone will lead to pesticide reduction (even with very weak targets, and almost no protection for sensitive areas). But the AMs adopted made the whole part on IPM become meaningless, and would not have changed the current situation.

This – of course in combination with all the other bad stuff adopted (see list below, and incl. the deletion of all possibilities for financing the SUR) was finally the last straw.  
Hope that helps. We'll provide you with the results of RCVs asap.  
Best wishes,  
the SUR team

**From:** ZERGER Corinna <[corinna.zerger@europarl.europa.eu](mailto:corinna.zerger@europarl.europa.eu)>  
**Sent:** 22 November 2023 15:15  
**To:** Verts/ALE - Groupe Politique, Mep et Assistants <[DL-Verts-ALE-all@europarl.europa.eu](mailto:DL-Verts-ALE-all@europarl.europa.eu)>  
**Cc:** WOHSMANN Vivien <[vivien.wohsmann@europarl.europa.eu](mailto:vivien.wohsmann@europarl.europa.eu)>; NOWAKOWSKI Andrzej <[Andrzej.Nowakowski@europarl.europa.eu](mailto:Andrzej.Nowakowski@europarl.europa.eu)>  
**Subject:** Wiener report SUR rejected

Dear all,  
very sadly, Sarah's report on reducing pesticide use has been rejected by the EP (207/299/121).  
As so many bad AMs had been adopted, we had to vote against as well. Please find below some of the key issues.  
The referral back to committee (which we supported) was rejected by EPP and allies (292/324/10).  
Sadly,  
the SUR team

- Targets: nothing meaningful is left, e.g.:
  - 50% on EU level only (only 35% on MS level possible)
  - the whole procedure for setting targets and the EC checking them deleted
  - the reference period is brought back in time, which makes it even more easy to reach them
- IPM is weakened so much that almost nothing is left:
  - crop-specific guidelines instead of rules

- no registration obligations for farmers and no central electronic register for controlling IPM measures
- several obligations related to IPM deleted
- On sensitive areas, we got the weakest possible text: MS can define what sensitive areas are (no definition at EU level); no clear rules for MS what needs to be protected (it would mean no changes compared to current situation), no protection for vulnerable human populations, nature areas, or water resources.
- They deleted major financing possibilities for the SUR: not via the CAP, nor the other possibilities included in the ENVI position
- The ENVI text on facilitating market access for biocontrol products was kept, but copper would now have been included into biocontrol!
- The ENVI text changing the calculation method for measuring pesticide reduction was kicked out. The current method is absolutely inappropriate and misleading (favouring highly effective more hazardous pesticides)
- The obligation to see an independent advisor was brought down to once every 3 years (instead of annually)
- for biocontrol, "horizontal authorisations" without further data for the different crops possible

Altogether, it would have meant almost no changes to the current situation, targets which would have been reached very quickly, thus pure greenwashing.