

**Question for written answer E-002897/2025**

**to the Commission**

Rule 144

**Jutta Paulus (Verts/ALE), Tilly Metz (Verts/ALE)**

**Subject:** Consideration of the IARC classification in the EU's re-evaluation of aspartame

In June 2023, the WHO's International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) classified the sweetener aspartame (E 951) as a possibly carcinogenic agent (category 2B) on the basis of an extensive review of all the scientific evidence available on the substance. The monograph summarising the opinion highlights the fact that experts were divided on the strength of the evidence in animal tests and that a minority supported an even stronger classification as a potential carcinogen (category 2A).

The Commission has indicated that it does not currently plan to re-evaluate the safety of aspartame on the basis of those findings, although the last evaluation dates back to 2013, thus obviously not taking into account newer studies. The Commission plans to take this opinion into account only in the context of the re-evaluation of salt of aspartame-acesulfame (E962) and neotame (E961).

1. Will the Commission extend the findings of the re-evaluation of aspartame-acesulfame and neotame to aspartame? If not, why does the Commission believe that aspartame reacts differently from its salt?
2. How does the Commission justify considering a risk assessment conducted over a decade ago as still scientifically valid and up to date?
3. Does the Commission deem the assessments of the WHO IARC valid? If not, why not?

Submitted: 15.7.2025