

Food and Feed Safety Omnibus-Why APIMONDIA is opposing

What is Omnibus all about?

We in APIMONDIA express our serious concern regarding the European Commission's proposal for a food and feed safety [Omnibus](#). The proposal significantly weakens EU pesticide legislation and undermines the protection of human health, the environment, and food from hazardous pesticides.

The current pesticide framework, which is in force since 2011, is based on the **precautionary principle** and requires pesticides to be **regularly reviewed** in light of the latest scientific evidence. According to the Commission itself, this system has been effective and has led to the identification and banning of **54 harmful pesticide active substances since 2011**, including substances with serious risks to human health, pollinators and the environment.

The Omnibus proposal reverses this logic. It risks allowing hazardous pesticides to remain on the market indefinitely, restricts the use of new science, and contradicts EU primary law, the Green Deal, and citizens' demands for stronger protection.

Key problems with Omnibus proposal in brief

- Unlimited approval would become the norm; [49 synthetic substances](#) could **automatically receive unlimited approval**, including broadly used and toxic substances such as glyphosate, acetamiprid and PFAS substances.
- National authorisations could last up to 15 years, with restricted act on new studies.
- After being found hazardous, substances could even remain on the market for up to **three additional** .
- Derogations could be justified not only by plant health, but also by plant *production* (yield concerns).
- Synthetically produced substances could qualify for 'biocontrol' if deemed "functionally identical" to natural ones.
- Certain types of drones could be allowed to be used for pesticide application without individual derogations.

Detailed arguments for what is at stake

- Of particular concern is the proposal to make unlimited approval periods for pesticide active substances the default, thereby dismantling the system of regular, systematic re-evaluations. These periodic reviews are essential for incorporating new scientific evidence, which repeatedly reveals previously unknown toxic effects on humans and non-target species, leading to necessary bans on hazardous substances. Removing this mechanism risks allowing dangerous pesticides to remain on the market indefinitely.
- At the same time, the proposal would restrict Member States' ability to rely on the most recent scientific evidence when authorising pesticide products at national level. This

approach contradicts established EU case law and undermines the role of national authorities in protecting public health and the environment.

- The proposal further extends grace periods for substances that no longer meet approval criteria, including for health and environmental reasons, normalizing the continued use of hazardous pesticides for up to three years. In parallel, it broadens derogations from safety criteria, allowing substances that fail to meet the approval requirements to be authorized not only in cases of serious plant health danger, but also to safeguard plant production. This shift directly contradicts the hierarchy of objectives established in Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009, which clearly prioritizes health and environmental protection over production considerations.
- The proposal also broadens the possibility of pesticide application by drones, raising further concerns about exposure risks and environmental contamination.
- While facilitating access to safer alternatives to synthetic pesticides is welcome, the proposal introduces an insufficiently precise definition of biocontrol active substances, risking the inclusion of synthetically produced substances with poorly understood or harmful properties and impacts. These concerns are further exacerbated by provisional authorization procedures and the removal of record-keeping obligations.
- Finally, the proposal fails to meaningfully address pesticide residues in food, maintaining a permissive framework that allows residues of EU-banned pesticides in imported products, while treating bans on such residues as exceptional rather than standard practice. This approach perpetuates the double standard between imported and EU-grown food and effectively encourages the use of pesticides known to be dangerous elsewhere, harming local communities and the environment. It also creates a market opportunity for European companies to continue selling their banned pesticides to these countries.
- Taken together, these changes fundamentally undermine the purpose of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009, weaken the precautionary principle, and contradict the EU's stated objective of transitioning away from a pesticide-dependent agricultural model. Far from promoting biocontrol and safer alternatives, the proposal functions as a deregulation 'Trojan horse' for hazardous pesticides and reflects pesticide industry demands rather than the public interest. It was found to breach EU primary law on both substantive and procedural grounds, notably the precautionary principle and the principle of proportionality.
- These concerns are consistent with those raised by 139 organizations, including ours, in a [letter](#) sent to Commission President Ursula von der Leyen in October 2025, calling for stronger implementation of EU pesticide law and opposing any weakening of existing safeguards under the guise of regulatory simplification.
- Citizens across Europe have repeatedly and consistently called for stronger pesticide regulation and better protection of health and the environment. This proposal moves decisively in the opposite direction.

We therefore urge all European Member States to firmly oppose and reject the food and feed safety omnibus proposal in its entirety, and to defend the integrity of EU pesticide legislation and the high standards of protection it provides.

What should be done

APIMONDIA joins PAN Europe and other environmental NGOs, on a campaign against Omnibus proposal called [**“For Health, Bees, and Farmers”**](#).

We urge the European Parliament and the Council to **oppose and reject** the proposal.

Rather than deregulating pesticides, the EU should:

- Fully implement and enforce Regulation 1107/2009.
- Ensure only complete, high-quality dossiers are accepted.
- Adjust and ring-fence fees to properly resource authorities.
- Launch infringement procedures against non-compliant Member States.
- Strengthen, not weaken, science-based reviews and precautionary safeguards.

[Read more about the Food and Feed Safety Omnibus](#)

This Omnibus represents a clear case of regulatory rollback that threatens human health, biodiversity, clean water and fair conditions for farmers, while primarily benefiting the pesticide industry. It is a move in the wrong direction. The pesticide regulation needs to be implemented better to stop damaging health and biodiversity collapse.

Signed by Apimondia Bee Health Commission