



Hundreds of disclosed documents reveal:

How EU Commission Health service DG SANTE joined forces with economic DG's on the criteria for endocrine disruption and crushed not only their enemy, lead DG Environment, but also the entire new EU policy on endocrine disruption.

= PAN Europe reconstruction of the downfall of the EU endocrine policy =

EU Health service DG SANTE (former DG SANCO) has been in a constant fight with DG Environment who was first granted the lead by EU Commission to develop the criteria for endocrine disruptors (EDs), a crucial element of the new EU endocrine policy. Following an access to documents request and based on 230 documents obtained, PAN Europe reveals the disloyal role of DG SANTE who collaborated with DG Enterprise and other DGs to block the work of DG Environment (DG ENV). This collaboration of the DG SANTE with industry-friendly DGs behind the back of DG Environment put industry interests and US-EU trade talks TTIP at a platform, fuelled also by a massive industry lobby. In the end the draft criteria developed by DG ENV never got published and the Commission missed its mandatory deadline for publishing criteria on December 2013.

While DG ENV was conducting an in-depth research to compose the criteria for EDs, DG SANTE in 2012 secretly cooperated with economic DGs, such as Enterprise, and put the first knife in the back of DG ENV by mandating Food Authority EFSA to redo the work of DG ENV. DG SANTE knew very well that EFSA had published industry-friendly opinions on endocrines, opposing the work of DG ENV. The hostilities continued and in 2013 DG SANCO joined forces with more DGs such as DG Entr, DG Trade and the Secretary-General behind the back of DG Env to further undermine its work. While DG Entr and Trade were collaborating with industry and industry started an unprecedented lobby campaign, the endocrine agenda was changed in favour of industry; now a majority of DGs prepared a 'coup' against DG Env. The full knockout of DG Env was achieved by DG SANCO when the Secr-Gen. stopped the work of DG Env in July 2013 and demanded an impact assessment, making the costs for industry the major topic in a health regulation.

In bullet points:

- After 25 years of accumulated scientific knowledge on endocrine disruption (ED), the EU finally in 2009 adopted a new policy to protect people against the harms of ED
- DG Environment was granted the lead by other DG's to develop criteria (deadline Dec 2013)
- UK and industry protested against the new policy and started drafting undermining criteria; they managed to get Germany on their side in 2010 (discussion on potency)
- Food Authority EFSA was also opposing the new policy and tried to get involved but stayed at the sideline for some time
- The work of DG Env and Prof. Kortenkamp on draft criteria in 2011 was blamed by industry and UK and the start of a massive lobby campaign
- Secretly DG SANCO started cooperating with DG Enterprise behind the back of DG Environment; industry and DG ENTR demanded a 'peer-review' of the work of Kortenkamp
- June 2012 the first "knife in the back" of DG Env was put by DG SANCO by mandating EFSA not only to peer-review the work of Kortenkamp but to fully reassess the criteria for endocrines
- December 2012 EFSA managed to invite experts to their working group on the criteria that were no specialists on ED nor were independent scientists; even civil servants from Germany and UK, being in the forefront of opposing the work of DG Environment, were invited as an independent expert
- March 2013 WHO-UNEP published their landmark report on ED with top-level endocrinologists, saying that traditional risk assessment cannot assess the adverse effects of ED and that new scientific insights on low dose effects should be applied;
- EFSA in March 2013 publishes their opinion, completely contradicting WHO-UNEP and saying that there is no reason to treat ED in any other way than most chemicals;
- Also in March 2013, draft criteria are sent by DG Env to the other DGs to get to the required Commission consensus; several of the industry demands are not part of the draft criteria
- This (not-published) draft creates an unprecedented industry lobby at all Brussels levels with exaggerated claims of damage to industry, demanding to include potency and to conduct an impact assessment;
- SANCO-director Ms. Testori gives credits to the ECPA-claim that 20% (=100 pesticides) will be banned because of the ED-policy; a claim based on science-fiction but still a reason for Testori to alarm the Secretary-General, the one that could start an impact assessment; DG ENV is not cc-ed in the mails
- Also US-companies, -chamber of commerce and -embassy join the industry-campaign and refer to the EU-US trade talks TTIP that could be harmed by the ED policy
- DG ENTr and TRADe clearly collaborate with industry behind the back of DG ENV and support the claims on potency and impact assessment; DG ENV is isolated
- Barroso's chief scientific advisor Prof. Glover adds to the choir of critics with an alarming message to high-level officials, based on a letter of scientists that later all appear to have conflicts of interests with industry
- In June 2013 SANCO-director Testori sends a message to Commissioner Borg saying that many countries complain about the impact of the criteria and that an impact assessment "can be expected".
- In June 2013 the long-awaited 'interservice meeting' to get to a consensus between DGs is convened; the result is negative, a massive coalition of SANCO, ENTR, TRADE, AGRI does not support the DG ENV draft criteria

- July 2, 2013, SG-director Catherine Day puts the second knife in the back of DG ENV by stopping the criteria-setting process and demanding an impact assessment
- One year later the downfall of the ED-policy was manifested to a full extent in a 'roadmap' for the impact assessment where 3 out of 4 options violated the EU rules or even completely destroyed the agreed EU policy on ED; DG SANCO now has obtained the leading role.