

**Question for written answer E-004943/2025
to the Commission**

Rule 144

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE), Jan Farský (PPE), Christine Singer (Renew), Alexandr Vondra (ECR), Ondřej Krutílek (ECR), Jana Nagyová (Pfe), Ondřej Knotek (Pfe), Markus Ferber (PPE)

Subject: Procedural gaps and the agricultural and supply-chain impact of the proposed REACH restriction on calcium cyanamide

Calcium cyanamide (CaCN_2 , or *Kalkstickstoff*) has been under the REACH restriction procedure since 2019. In 2021, the European Chemicals Agency recommended banning its use as a fertiliser, even though its socio-economic assessment questioned the necessity and proportionality of a full ban. Two public consultations produced 122 contributions from Member States and non-EU countries, which largely found the ban to be disproportionate and warned about the impact on niche fertiliser availability and the viability of CaCN_2 production within the EU. Nevertheless, in April 2025 the Commission tabled a largely identical restriction proposal with transitional periods of around five to six years, despite repeated Member State concerns about gaps in the impact assessment.

1. How did the Commission incorporate consultation feedback and Member State concerns about the incomplete impact assessment, and why was no updated socio-economic and impact analysis presented before the April 2025 proposal?
2. What specific alternatives to a full fertiliser ban did the Commission assess (e.g. restricting the use of CaCN_2 to professionals, tighter application conditions, targeted crop or regional derogations or mandatory training and monitoring), and on which evidence-based criteria were they rejected?
3. How will the Commission monitor the effects during the transition period on EU agricultural production and fertiliser availability and prices, and under what predefined conditions would it revise the proposal?

Submitted: 15.12.2025