

Question for written answer E-003810/2025
to the Commission
Rule 144
Sebastian Kruis (PfE)

Subject: The EU should withdraw the Deforestation Regulation (EUDR) and pursue alternative approaches

The Deforestation Regulation¹ was designed to reduce global deforestation by ensuring that products placed on the EU market are deforestation-free. In practice, however, the regulation is generating a parallel industry in South America that caters exclusively to the EU, raising consumer prices, and creating an excessive bureaucratic burden for companies in Europe as well as in exporting countries. At the same time, deforestation is not being stopped, since products from newly deforested areas are simply redirected to other markets, particularly China. Instead of merely postponing the application of the regulation, the European Union should recognise that the EUDR is unworkable and withdraw it entirely.

In this context:

1. Is the Commission aware of the emergence of such a parallel export industry in South America, and if so, how does it assess the impact on European consumers and businesses?
2. How does it justify the excessive and impractical bureaucratic and reporting requirements that burden both EU companies and producers in exporting countries?
3. Will the Commission acknowledge that withdrawal of the regulation is the only realistic option and focus its energy on concrete alternative strategies to help producer countries tackle deforestation in a cooperative and effective manner, rather than through counterproductive trade restrictions?

Submitted: 1.10.2025

¹ OJ L 150, 9.6.2023, p. 206, ELI: <http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2023/1115/oj> (<http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2023/1115/oj>).