



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Chief Scientific Adviser to the President

Brussels, 20 June 2013

NOTE TO KARL FALKENBERG, DIRECTOR-GENERAL ENV

Subject: Endocrine Disruptors

I have received the enclosed letter signed by a large number of very eminent experts in the field of toxicology, many of them serving or having served on Scientific Committees of the European Commission. The letter voices strong criticism of the approach taken by the Commission on endocrine disruptors.

In order to prepare my reply, I would appreciate if your service could answer the following questions:

- What scientific evidence has been used – or not used – in the current regulatory process on endocrine disruptors?
- How was this evidence procured and assessed?
- Is it correct that advice received from EFSA was ignored and if so, why?
- Why have the relevant Scientific Committees set up by the EC, such as the Scientific Committee on Health and Environmental Risks, not been consulted?
- Is it correct that a departure from existing principles – in particular the definition of safe thresholds for substances that are classified as endocrine disruptors, i.e. going from a risk to a hazard-based assessment – is intended and if so, why and on which scientific grounds?
- Is it correct that the intended legislation would allow classifying a substance as endocrine disruptor based on *in vitro* tests only?
- Has the impact of the foreseen legislation been assessed and what was the result?

I also would like to ask you to involve the Chief Scientific Adviser to the President already at an early stage in scientifically relevant files that are of such a sensitive and controversial nature. Thank you in advance for your cooperation and I am looking forward to working with you on this file.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Anne Glover'.

Professor Anne Glover CBE

Cc: J. LAITENBERGER, K. VANDENBERGHE, J. BELL, C. DAY, P. TESTORICOGGI, D. CALLEJA CRESPO, D. RISTORI