

International Platform of Insects for Food & Feed (IPIFF)

Rue Joseph Stevens, 7, 13th floor, 1000 BRUXELLES



Attention:

Mr. Olivér Várhelyi
European Commissioner for Health and Animal Welfare
European Commission
Rue de la Loi, 200
1049 Brussels,
Belgium

Brussels, 5 January 2026

Subject: Urgent Action Required on Delayed Novel Food Application for Acheta domesticus (House Cricket) Powder (Società Agricola Italian Cricket Farm S.r.l.)

Dear Commissioner,

I am writing on behalf of the [International Platform of Insects for Food and Feed \(IPIFF\)](#), the EU umbrella organisation representing the insect-producing sector. IPIFF comprises 57 members, predominantly small and medium-sized enterprises that produce insects and insect-derived products for the European market, employing over 3,500 EU citizens. Our mission is to promote insects as a sustainable, high-quality source of nutrition for human consumption, animal feed, and plant fertilisation.

We write with deep concern regarding the unjustified delay in the authorisation of the novel food application for *Acheta domesticus* (house cricket) powder, submitted by Società Agricola Italian Cricket Farm S.r.l. on 11 June 2021¹ under [Article 10 of Regulation \(EU\) 2015/2283](#).

On 29 July 2024, the [European Food Safety Authority \(EFSA\) adopted a positive scientific opinion, confirming the product's safety under the proposed conditions of use](#)². According to [Article 7 of the Regulation](#)³, such an opinion should enable the product's inclusion in the Union list, as it presents no risk to human health.

Pursuant to [Article 12\(1\) of the Regulation](#)⁴, the Commission was required to submit a draft implementing act to the relevant committee within seven months of the EFSA opinion's publication, by 1 March 2025. This deadline has now been exceeded by more than a year, without legal justification or communication.

Although the draft act was included on the agenda for the PAFF⁵ Committee meeting of the Section Novel Food and Toxicology Safety of 27 February 2025, the Commission postponed the discussion without explanation or prior consultation. By doing so—and before opening the floor for debate or allowing a vote, the Commission effectively denied Member States their rightful role in the procedure⁶.

Subsequent requests by Member States and the applicant company for legal or substantive justification for the postponement have gone unanswered, and no revised timeline has been provided.

This unexplained delay breaches several legal provisions:

- [Article 12\(1\) of Regulation \(EU\) 2015/2283](#), which sets a binding seven-month deadline;

¹ [EFSA-Q-2021-00262](#)

² [EFSA Scientific Opinion on the Safety of Acheta domesticus powder as a Novel food pursuant to Regulation \(EU\) 2015/2283, adopted on the 26th of June 2024 and published on the 29th of July, 2024.](#)

³ [Article 7 of Regulation \(EU\) 2015/2283 of 25 November 2015 on novel foods](#) sets the General conditions for inclusion of novel foods in the Union list.

⁴ [Article 12 \(1\) of the Regulation EU\) 2015/2283 of 25 November 2015 on novel foods](#) clearly stipulates 'Within seven months from the date of publication of the Authority's opinion, the Commission shall submit to the committee referred to in Article 30(1) a draft implementing act authorising the placing on the market within the Union of a novel food and updating the Union list'.

⁵ Standing Committee on Plants, Animals, Food and Feed

⁶ [Standing Committee on Plants, Animals, Food and Feed Section Novel Food and Toxicological Safety of the Food Chain 27 February 2025, Summary Report.](#)



- [Articles 21⁷ and 22⁸ of the same Regulation](#), which provide the only legal grounds for extension and have not been invoked;
- [Article 296 TFEU⁹](#), regarding the duty to state reasons; and
- [Article 41 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union¹⁰](#), which guarantees the right to good administration.

We further note that on 8 April 2025, the European Parliament's ENVI Committee overwhelmingly rejected two non-binding motions¹¹ to block this authorisation, criticising them for undermining science-based decision-making. The Commission's continued inaction disregarded this clear parliamentary stance towards the conclusion of the procedures for the authorization of this Novel food application.

In summary, the Commission's conduct sets a damaging political precedent by:

- Restricting Member States' right to deliberate and vote;
- Ignoring the position of the European Parliament;
- Undermining legal certainty and the credibility of the EU novel food authorisation process; and
- Endangering the viability of an innovative SME that has invested significantly in this application over several years and thus, placing at risk the livelihood of its employees.

We therefore urgently call on the Commission to:

1. **Immediately submit the draft implementing act for discussion and vote at the next PAFF Committee meeting** (scheduled for 13 February 2026¹²). Any further postponement is unacceptable.
2. **Provide a clear and binding timeline for completing the authorisation procedure**, including the expected publication date of the relevant Commission Implementing Regulation.

Should the Commission fail to act promptly and in compliance with EU law, IPIFF will have no choice but to advise the applicant to pursue all available legal remedies and seek for rightful compensation.

Lastly, we reiterate our request for a meeting with you—initially sought in January 2025—to discuss not only this urgent matter, but also the insect sector's potential contribution to the EU's Biotech Act.

We trust in your commitment to upholding EU law and ensuring a fair, predictable, and science-based regulatory environment.

*Yours sincerely,
Remaining at your disposal,
The IPIFF President,
Adriana Casillas,*

⁷ [Article 21 of the Regulation \(EU\) of 25 November 2015 on novel foods](#) sets forward the conditions for the request of additional information from the applicant by the Commission.

⁸ [Article 22 of the Regulation \(EU\) of 25 November 2015 on novel foods](#) sets out the conditions for Ad hoc extension of time periods.

⁹ [Article 296 of the treaty of Functioning of the European Union](#) clearly states that where the Treaties do not specify the type of act to be adopted, the institutions shall select it on a case-by-case basis, in compliance with the applicable procedures and with the principle of proportionality. Legal acts shall state the reasons on which they are based and shall refer to any proposals, initiatives, recommendations, requests or opinions required by the Treaties.

¹⁰ [According to Article 41 of EU Charter of Fundamental Rights](#)- right of good administration, every person has the right to have his or her affairs handled impartially, fairly and within a reasonable time by the institutions, bodies, offices and agencies of the Union; the right of every person to be heard, before any individual measure which would affect him or her adversely is taken; the obligation of the administration to give reasons for its decisions.

¹¹ [Objection pursuant to Rule 115\(2\) and \(3\) of the Rules of Procedure on draft Commission Implementing Regulation authorising the placing on the market of *Acheta domesticus* \(house cricket\) powder as a novel food and amending Implementing Regulation \(EU\) 2017/2470.](#)

¹² [Provisional planning \(last update 19/12/2025\) of Standing committee meetings 2026 for Directorates D-E-G.](#)