EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

1999 *2004*

Session document

FINAL
A5-0232/2004

6 April 2004

*

REPORT

on the proposal for a Council regulation on actions in the field of beekeeping
(COM(2004) 30 – C5-0052/2004 – 2004/0003(CNS))

Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development

Rapporteur: Astrid Lulling

Symbols for procedures

*	Consultation procedure *majority of the votes cast*
**I	Cooperation procedure (first reading) *majority of the votes cast*
**II	Cooperation procedure (second reading) *majority of the votes cast, to approve the common position* *majority of Parliament's component Members, to reject or amend the common position*
***	Assent procedure *majority of Parliament's component Members except in cases covered by Articles 105, 107, 161 and 300 of the EC Treaty and Article 7 of the EU Treaty*
***I	Codecision procedure (first reading) *majority of the votes cast*
***II	Codecision procedure (second reading) *majority of the votes cast, to approve the common position* *majority of Parliament's component Members, to reject or amend the common position*
***III	Codecision procedure (third reading) *majority of the votes cast, to approve the joint text*

(The type of procedure depends on the legal basis proposed by the Commission)

Amendments to a legislative text

In amendments by Parliament, amended text is highlighted in ***bold italics***. Highlighting in *normal italics* is an indication for the relevant departments showing parts of the legislative text for which a correction is proposed, to assist preparation of the final text (for instance, obvious errors or omissions in a given language version). These suggested corrections are subject to the agreement of the departments concerned.

CONTENTS

Page

DRAFT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION

on the proposal for a Council regulation on actions in the field of beekeeping (COM(2004) 30 – C5-0052/2004 – 2004/0003(CNS))

(Consultation procedure)

The European Parliament,

– having regard to the Commission proposal to the Council (COM(2004) 30)[1],

– having regard to Articles 36 and 37 of the EC Treaty, pursuant to which the Council consulted Parliament (C5-0052/2004),

– having regard to Rule 67 of its Rules of Procedure,

– having regard to the report of the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development (A5-0232/2004),

1. Approves the Commission proposal as amended;

2. Calls on the Commission to alter its proposal accordingly, pursuant to Article 250(2) of the EC Treaty;

3. Calls on the Council to notify Parliament if it intends to depart from the text approved by Parliament;

4. Calls for initiation of the conciliation procedure under the Joint Declaration of 4 March 1975 if the Council intends to depart from the text approved by Parliament;

5. Asks the Council to consult Parliament again if it intends to amend the Commission proposal substantially;

6. Instructs its President to forward its position to the Council and Commission.

Text proposed by the Commission	Amendments by Parliament
	Amendment 1 Recital 5 a (new)
	(5a) In implementing Article 26a of Directive 2001/18/EC, Member States should take legislative measures on the coexistence of genetically modified, conventional and organic crops that also allow beekeepers to manufacture honey with a pollution level below the threshold

[1] Not yet published in OJ.

value of 0.9 %.

Amendment 2
Recital 5 b (new)

(5b) There continues to be an imbalance between supply and demand in the market in honey within the Community and the level of self-sufficiency has fallen still further in the last three years, as a result of which the price of honey in the European Union depends directly on the world price, which is itself very unstable.

Amendment 3
Recital 5 c (new)

(5c) Honey is a high-quality agricultural product and remains one of the few products listed in Annex I to the Treaty establishing the European Community neither to benefit from a comprehensive regulatory and direct support framework under the CAP nor to enjoy sufficient differentiation in respect of imported honeys.

Amendment 4
Recital 5 d (new)

(5d) The Member States of the European Union have a substantial beekeeping tradition and some are large producers of honey, which should be taken into account in the implementation of this regulation, not least in terms of the budget allocated thereto.

Amendment 5
Recital 6

(6) In view of the spread of varroasis in

(6) In view of the spread of varroasis in

several Member States in recent years and the ***problems which*** this disease ***causes for*** honey production, action by the Community is necessary as varroasis cannot be completely eradicated and treatment with approved products is recommended.	several Member States in recent years and the ***effects of*** this disease ***on*** honey production, action by the Community is necessary as varroasis cannot be completely eradicated and treatment with approved products is recommended.

Justification

Clearer wording.

Amendment 6
Recital 6 a (new)

	(6a) Bearing in mind on the one hand the European Parliament's resolution of 9 October 2003 on the difficulties faced by the European beekeeping sector[1], which officially recognises the exceptional decline in the bee population in recent years, and on the other hand Regulation (EC) 1398/2003[2], which prohibits the import of packets of bees, and the current shortage of biological material production units, measures need to be introduced in support of the restoration and development of the Community's bee population.
	[1] P5_TA(2003)0430.
	[2] OJ L 198, 6.8.2003, p. 3.

Amendment 7
Recital 6 b (new)

	(6b) Quality control checks on honey play a major part in enabling, on the one hand, improvement of the production and marketing of honey and, on the other, prevention of the marketing of honey that

	fails to meet the European quality criteria principally laid down in Council Directive 2001/110/EC of 20 December 2001 relating to honey[1]. These checks make for stabilisation of the market and of prices.
	[1] OJ L 10, 12.1.2002, p. 47.

Amendment 8
Recital 7

(7) Given these circumstances and in order to improve the production and marketing of apiculture products in the Community, national programmes should be drawn up every three years ***comprising technical assistance, control of varroasis, rationalisation of transhumance, management of the restocking of hives in the Community, and cooperation on research programmes on beekeeping and apiculture products.***	(7) Given these circumstances and in order to improve the production and marketing of apiculture products in the Community, national programmes should be drawn up every three years ***and reviewable annually, and should comprise:***
	(a) technical assistance to beekeepers and groupings of beekeepers;
	(b) control of varroasis and its corollaries;
	(c) rationalisation of transhumance;
	(d) measures to support the restoration and development of the Community's bee population;
	(e) cooperation with specialised bodies for the implementation of applied research programmes in the field of improving the bee population and the quality of honey and apiculture products;
	(f) measures in support of honey analysis laboratories;
	(g) any other measure apt to improve the production and marketing of honey and apiculture products.

Justification

The amendment provides greater clarity and detail.

Amendment 9
Recital 8

(8) In order to supplement the statistical data on beekeeping, Member States should carry out studies on the structure of the sector, covering production, marketing and price formation.	(8) In order to supplement the statistical data on beekeeping, Member States should carry out ***detailed*** studies on the structure of the sector, covering production, marketing and price formation.

Justification

This will enable compilation of a more comprehensive database.

Amendment 10
Article 1, paragraph 1, subparagraph 2

To this end, each Member State ***may*** draw up a national programme for a period of three years, hereinafter referred to as the "apiculture programme".	To this end, each Member State ***must*** draw up a national programme for a period of three years, ***reviewable annually,*** hereinafter referred to as the "apiculture programme".

Justification

Beekeeping is an industry common to all Member States and is in difficulty everywhere. Not implementing the programme in all the Member States will distort competition between beekeepers in the different Member States. Moreover, an annual review of the programme is necessary in order to ensure flexibility in the implementation of the programme.

Amendment 11
Article 2, subparagraph 1

The measures which may be included in the apiculture programme shall be the following:	The measures which may be included in the apiculture programme shall be the following:
(a) technical assistance to beekeepers and groupings of beekeepers,	(a) technical assistance to beekeepers and groupings of beekeepers,
(b) control of varroasis,	(b) control of varroasis ***and its corollaries***,
(c) rationalisation of transhumance;	(c) rationalisation of transhumance;

(d) measures to support the ***restocking of hives in the Community***,	(d) measures to support the ***restoration and development of the Community's bee population***,
(e) cooperation with specialised bodies for the implementation of applied research programmes in the field of ***beekeeping and apiculture products***.	(e) cooperation with specialised bodies for the implementation of applied research programmes in the field of ***improving the bee population and the quality of honey and apiculture products;***
	(ea) measures in support of honey analysis laboratories;
	(eb) any other measure apt to improve the production and marketing of honey and apiculture products.

Justification

Varroasis is a disease whose effects are primarily felt through its connected diseases such as the viral or bacterial infections that can develop owing to the biting-sucking characteristics of the parasite (b). It is necessary to reorient the programme and its direct effects on the industry (e).

Amendment 12
Article 3

To be eligible for the part-financing provided for in Article 4(2), Member States ***shall carry out*** a study of the production and marketing structure in the beekeeping sector in their territory. This study shall be communicated with the apiculture programme.	To be eligible for the part-financing provided for in Article 4(2), Member States ***must carry out*** a ***detailed*** study of the production and marketing structure in the beekeeping sector in their territory. This study shall be communicated with the apiculture programme.

Justification

To date, the studies supplied by the Member States have been incomplete and have given only a partial insight into the structure of the beekeeping industry.

Amendment 13
Article 4, paragraph 2

2. The Community shall provide part-financing for the apiculture programmes equivalent to ***50***% of the expenditure borne by Member States.	2. The Community shall provide part-financing for the apiculture programmes equivalent to ***75***% of the expenditure borne by Member States.

Justification

It would be a good idea to increase the European Community's contribution in order to encourage Member States to invest in the programmes.

Amendment 14
Article 5

The apiculture programme ***shall*** be drawn up in close collaboration with the representative organisations and beekeeping cooperatives. It shall be communicated to the Commission, which shall approve it in accordance with the procedure laid down in Article 17 of Regulation (EEC) No 2771/75.	The apiculture programme ***must*** be drawn up in close collaboration with the representative organisations and beekeeping cooperatives. It shall be communicated to the Commission, which shall approve it in accordance with the procedure laid down in Article 17 of Regulation (EEC) No 2771/75.

Justification

There is still no consultation process in some Member States.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

Under Article 6 of Council Regulation (EC) No 1221/97 the Commission is to present to the European Parliament and the Council every three years a report on the implementation of the beekeeping aid scheme.

After considering the Commission's second report, in the conclusions of which the Commission proposes that a new Regulation be adopted in order to adapt the objectives in the beekeeping sector to the current situation, the European Parliament is now presenting its draft legislative resolution in which it amends, for the reasons set out below, the following points in the proposal for a regulation contained in the Commission's second report.

- It is essential to retain all the points in the previous programme, subject to certain adjustments. Your rapporteur would therefore propose the following points:

a) technical assistance to beekeepers and groupings of beekeepers,
b) control of varroasis and its corollaries,
c) rationalisation of transhumance,
d) measures to support the restoration and development of the Community's bee population,
e) cooperation with specialised bodies for the implementation of applied research programmes in the field of improving the bee population and the quality of honey and apiculture products;
f) (new) measures in support of honey analysis laboratories;
g) (new) any other measure apt to improve the production and marketing of honey and apiculture products.

In its proposal, the Commission did away with point f, which is catastrophic for the production and marketing of honey.

- It is crucial to take into account the forthcoming enlargement of the European Union and to provide for an increase in the budget allocated to the beekeeping sector.

- It is important when drawing up and considering the various reports and legislative resolutions in this area to bear in mind the current problems facing the beekeeping sector (diseases, high bee mortality rates, poisoning by insecticides, climate, problem of the marketing of and competition from low-priced poor-quality honeys from countries outside the EU).

These are the three avenues which your rapporteur has pursued and which provided the motive for the 14 amendments made.

PROCEDURAL PAGE

Title	Proposal for a Council regulation on actions in the field of beekeeping
References	COM(2004) 30 – C5-0052/2004 – 2004/0003(CNS)
Legal basis	Article 36 and 37 EC
Basis in Rules of Procedure	Rule 67
Date of consulting Parliament	30.1.2004
Committee responsible Date of referral	AGRI 9.2.2004
Committee(s) asked for opinion(s) Date of referral	BUDG 9.2.2004
Not delivering opinion Date of decision	BUDG 18.2.2004
Hughes Procedure Date announced in plenary	– –
Enhanced cooperation Date announced in plenary	– –
Rapporteur Date appointed	Astrid Lulling 19.2.2004
Simplified procedure Date of decision	– –
Legal basis disputed Date of JURI opinion	– –
Financial endowment amended Date of BUDG opinion	– –
Discussed in committee	15-16.3.2004
Date adopted	5.4.2004
Result of vote	for: 19 against: - abstentions: 2
Members present	
Substitutes present	Gordon J. Adam, Danielle Auroi, Joseph Daul, Christel Fiebiger, Francesco Fiori, Georges Garot, Friedrich-Wilhelm Graefe zu Baringdorf, Elisabeth Jeggle, Salvador Jové Peres, Melopy Kaldi, Hedwig Keppelhoff-Wiechert, Heinz Kindermann, Albert Jan Maat, Xaver Mayer, Agnes Schierhuber and Dominique F.C. Souchet
Rule 153(2) Substitutes present	Wolfgang Kreissl-Dörfler, Astrid Lulling, Jan Mulder, Ioannis Patakis and Eurig Wyn
Date tabled	6.4.2004
Procedure in plenary without amendment or debate	–
Comments	–