

Follow up to the European Parliament non-legislative resolution on the draft Commission implementing decision authorising the placing on the market of products containing, consisting of or produced from genetically modified maize DAS1131 pursuant to Regulation (EC) No 1829/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council

- 1. Resolution tabled pursuant to Rules 115(2) and (3) of the European Parliament's Rules of procedure**
- 2. References:** 2025/2893(RSP) / B10-0489/2025 / P10_TA(2025)0288
- 3. Date of adoption of the resolution:** 25 November 2025
- 4. Competent Parliamentary Committee:** Committee on the Environment, Climate and Food Safety (ENVI)
- 5. Brief analysis/assessment of the resolution and requests made in it:**

The resolution calls on the Commission to withdraw the Commission draft implementing decision (**paragraph 3**) on the grounds that it exceeds the implementing powers provided for in Regulation (EC) No 1829/2003 (**paragraph 1**) and that it is not compatible with the aim of that Regulation and the general principles of Regulation (EC) No 178/2002, i.e. the protection of human life and health, animal health and welfare, the environment and consumer interests, whilst ensuring effective functioning of the internal market (**paragraph 2**).

The resolution calls on the Commission not to authorise the Genetically Modified (GM) maize due to the lack of sufficient evidence on long-term impacts on biodiversity, food safety and farmers' livelihoods in line with the One Health Approach (**paragraph 4** and **recitals C to G** and **M**). In particular, the resolution raises concerns on availability of studies on the insecticidal protein (Cry1Da2) in terms of its toxicity or mode of action (**recital H**). It also raises questions on the appropriateness of the field trials (**recital F**).

The resolution also considers that adopting the draft decision would allow imports that do not meet standards applied to the EU farmers, putting them at a competitive disadvantage (**recital K**).

The draft resolution calls on the Commission to submit, without delay, a legislative proposal to reform the decision-making procedure on Genetically

Modified Organisms (GMOs) in order to respond to the consistent objections of Parliament and the lack of qualified majority support among Member States (**paragraph 5** and **recital L**).

In addition, it urges the Commission to consider the EU's obligations under international agreements, such as the Paris Climate Agreement, the United Nations (UN) Convention on Biological Diversity and the UN Sustainable Development Goals, as regards pesticide reduction (**paragraph 6**).

6. Response to the requests and overview of actions taken, or intended to be taken, by the Commission:

The Commission would like to recall that the draft implementing decision concerns the authorisation for the placing on the market of products containing, consisting of or produced from GM maize DAS1131, but not the cultivation of this maize.

With respect to **paragraphs 1** and **3** of the resolution, the Commission would like to point out that the draft decision has been prepared in line with and has undergone the procedural steps set out in Regulation (EC) No 1829/2003 on GM food and feed and in Regulation (EU) No 182/2011 on comitology, as illustrated below:

- on 17 June 2022, Corteva Agriscience Belgium B.V., on behalf of Corteva Agriscience LLC based in the United States, submitted to the national competent authority of the Netherlands an application for authorisation for the placing on the market of GM maize DAS1131 for food/feed and other uses, except of cultivation;
- on 19 March 2025, the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) issued a favourable scientific opinion and concluded that GM maize DAS1131 is as safe as its conventional counterpart and the tested non-GM maize reference varieties with respect to the potential effects on human and animal health and the environment;
- in its scientific opinion, EFSA considered all the questions and concerns raised by the Member States in the context of the consultation of the national competent authorities as provided for by Article 6(4) and Article 18(4) of Regulation (EC) No 1829/2003;
- the public commented on the EFSA opinion, and all the scientific comments received were scrutinised by EFSA, which confirmed the conclusions of its initial scientific opinion;
- the draft decision was voted in the Standing Committee on 15 September 2025 with no qualified majority against or in favour;
- the draft decision was voted in the Appeal Committee on 21 October 2025 with no qualified majority against or in favour;

- in accordance with the rules set out in Regulation (EC) No 1829/2003, a decision has to be taken on the application;
- in accordance with the rules set out in Regulation (EC) No 182/2011 on comitology, it is for the Commission to decide on the adoption;
- on that basis, the Commission will proceed with the adoption of this decision.

The Commission therefore considers that by going forward with the adoption process of a decision that fully complies with the procedural steps set out by the co-legislators in the GMO legislation, it does not exceed its implementing powers.

With respect to the other provisions of the resolution, the Commission considers that they fall outside the remit of the right of scrutiny, which is limited to the question of whether the implementing act exceeds the implementing powers provided for in the basic act. The Commission is not required to justify the implementing act as regards these points. Nevertheless, the Commission has carefully considered the position expressed by the Parliament and would like to make the following comments:

EFSA performed a comprehensive risk assessment of this GM crop which concluded positively, after considering Member States' comments as well as comments from the public. Therefore, the Commission considers that its decision is fully in line with the objectives of EU legislation on GM food and feed and of the EU's General Food Law to protect health and the environment in line with the precautionary principle and the One Health approach (**paragraph 2**).

Regarding the concerns about the insecticidal protein (Cry1Da2) in terms of its toxicity or mode of action (**recital H**), EFSA concluded based on comprehensive molecular, bioinformatic, toxicological, and environmental analyses that there is no evidence to suggest that this protein in the maize would interact in a way to raise safety concerns as food or feed and did not identify safety concerns with respect to the potential effects on human and animal health and the environment. Moreover, EFSA confirmed that environmental effects will not differ from that of conventional maize varieties and that the field trials were appropriate to support the risk assessment and the post-market environmental monitoring (**recital F**).

In relation to the call on the Commission not to authorise the GM crop due to the lack of sufficient evidence on long-term impacts on biodiversity, food safety and farmers' livelihoods in line with the One health approach and risks associated with glyphosate use (**paragraph 4** and **recitals C to G** and **M**), EFSA's assessment covered all relevant aspects of food and feed safety, as well as environmental assessment, including interactions of the GM crop with target and non-target organisms, and possible cumulative and combinatorial effects of herbicides use, within the remit of EFSA's responsibilities. The Commission would like to point out that, while the authorisation of GMOs is

not linked to the authorisation of herbicides, the two authorisation systems are geared to ensure a high level of protection of health and the environment. The risk assessment of an application for food and feed uses of an herbicide-tolerant GM crop includes assessment of the safety of the GM crop sprayed with the herbicide by comparison to its conventional counterparts. EFSA concluded favourably for the GM crop concerned by this resolution as mentioned above.

The environmental risk assessment of active substances and plant protection products is done in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 concerning the placing of plant protection products on the market. Maximum residue limits (MRLs) apply to all relevant imported food/ feed, including to GM products and ensure that the health of EU consumers is fully protected.

As regards the concern that allowing imports which do not meet the standards applied to the EU farmers puts them at a competitive disadvantage (**recital K**), all imported food and feed must comply with relevant EU regulations and standards relating to safety and health, which are applicable irrespective of whether the product is produced domestically or is imported.

With regard to the call to submit a legislative proposal to reform the decision-making procedure on GMOs in order to respond to the consistent objections of Parliament and the lack of qualified majority support among Member States (**paragraph 5** and **recital L**), the Commission would like to recall that it submitted a proposal to the Council and the Parliament on 14 February 2017 to amend Regulation (EU) No 182/2011, changing the voting rules at the Appeal Committee to increase transparency and accountability in the GMO decision-making process. However, this proposal has not been adopted by the co-legislators. In light of this situation, the Commission decided to withdraw the proposal on 16 July 2025, and the withdrawal was published on 6 October 2025. As such, the Commission is bound to apply the procedures laid down in Regulation (EU) No 182/2011 on comitology and in Regulation (EC) No 1829/2003 on GM food and feed.

Finally, as regards the call to consider the EU's international obligations (**paragraph 6**), the Commission is fully committed to respecting the EU's international commitments in the field of environmental protection, which have to be implemented in the relevant policy areas (climate change, biodiversity, etc.) or in appropriate initiatives. However, the Commission decisions for the placing on the market of GMOs that do not present risks to health or to the environment do not run counter to such international commitments.