

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

1999



2004

Session document

FINAL
A5-0208/2002

29 May 2002

REPORT

on the proposal and amended proposal for a Council decision adopting a specific programme 2002-2006 for research and training to be carried out by the Joint Research Centre by means of direct actions for the European Atomic Energy Community
(COM(2001)279 – C5-0334/2001 + COM(2002) 43 – C5-0216/2002–
2001/0126(CNS))

Committee on Industry, External Trade, Research and Energy

Rapporteur: Konrad Schwaiger

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
PROCEDURAL PAGE	4
DRAFT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION.....	5
EXPLANATORY STATEMENT	15
OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON BUDGETS	17
OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT	38

PROCEDURAL PAGE

By letter of 6 July 2001 the Council consulted Parliament, pursuant to Article 7(1) of the Euratom Treaty, on the proposal for a Council decision adopting a specific programme 2002-2006 for research and training to be carried out by the Joint Research Centre by means of direct actions for the European Atomic Energy Community (COM(2001)279 – 2001/0126(CNS)).

At the sitting of 3 September 2001 the President of Parliament announced that she had referred this proposal to the Committee on Industry, External Trade, Research and Energy as the committee responsible and the Committee on Budgets and all the committees concerned for their opinions (C5-0334/2001).

On 31 January 2002, the Commission forwarded to Parliament the amended proposal for a Council decision adopting a specific programme 2002-2006 for research and training to be carried out by the Joint Research Centre by means of direct actions for the European Atomic Energy Community (COM(2002)43 – 2001/0126(CNS)).

At the sitting of 29 May 2002 the President of Parliament announced that he had referred this proposal to the Committee on Industry, External Trade, Research and Energy as the committee responsible and the Committee on Budgets and all the committees concerned for their opinions (C5-0213/2002)

The Committee on Industry, External Trade, Research and Energy appointed Konrad Schwaiger rapporteur at its meeting of 19 February 2002.

The committee considered the Commission proposal, the amended proposal and the draft report at its meetings of 26 February, 27 March, 22 April, 21 May and 28 May 2002.

At the last meeting it adopted the draft legislative resolution unanimously.

The following were present for the vote: Carlos Westendorp y Cabeza, chairman; Peter Michael Mombaur, Yves Piétrasanta and Jaime Valdivielso de Cué, (vice-chairmen,); Konrad Schwaiger, rapporteur; Nuala Ahern, Konstantinos Alyssandrakis, Sir Robert Atkins, Luis Berenguer Fuster, Guido Bodrato, Giles Bryan Chichester, Nicholas Clegg, Concepció Ferrer, Norbert Glante, Alfred Gomolka (for Godelieve Quisthoudt-Rowohl), Caroline Lucas, Eryl Margaret McNally, Minerva Melpomeni Malliori (for Erika Mann), William Francis Newton Dunn (for Colette Flesch), Elly Plooi-j-van Gorsel, John Purvis, Bernhard Rapkay (for Gary Titley), Mechtild Rothe, Christian Foldberg Røvsing, Paul Rübig, W.G. van Velzen, Myrsini Zorba and Olga Zrihen Zaari.

The opinions of the Committee on Budgets and the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Developments are attached.

The report was tabled on 29 May 2002.

The deadline for tabling amendments will be indicated in the draft agenda for the relevant part-session

DRAFT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION

European Parliament legislative resolution on the proposal and amended proposal for a Council decision on a specific programme 2002-2006 for research and training to be carried out by the Joint Research Centre by means of direct actions for the European Atomic Energy Community (COM(2001)279 – C5-0334/2001 + COM(2002) 43 – C5-0216/2002– 2001/0126(CNS))

(Consultation procedure)

The European Parliament,

- having regard to the Commission proposal and amended proposal to the Council (COM(2001) 279¹ and COM(2002) 43²)
 - having been consulted by the Council pursuant to Article 7(1) of the Euratom Treaty (C5-0334/2001) (C5-0216/2002),
 - having regard to Rule 67 of its Rules of Procedure,
 - having regard to the report of the Committee on Industry, External Trade, Research and Energy and the opinions of the Committee on Budgets and the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development (A5-0208/2002),
1. Approves the Commission proposal as amended;
 2. Calls on the Commission to alter its proposal accordingly, pursuant to Article 119, second paragraph, of the Euratom Treaty
 3. Calls on the Council to notify Parliament should it intend to depart from the text approved by Parliament;
 4. Asks to be consulted again if the Council intends to amend the Commission proposal substantially;
 5. Instructs its President to forward its position to the Council and Commission.

¹ OJ C 240E, 28.8.2001, pp.259-264.

² OJ C (not yet published).

Amendment 1
Recital 3a (new)

(3a) In implementing this programme, efforts should be made to harmonise nuclear safety criteria both within the Community and with a view to enlargement, as regards both reactor safety and the safety of the nuclear fuel cycle,

Justification

The European Parliament has called for such harmonisation on several occasions, as has the Council in its various resolutions. Because of its independence and technical expertise, the JRC must play a unifying role with regard to these very sensitive subjects, which will be of particular importance with a view to enlargement.

Amendment 2
Recital 3b (new)

(3b) The JRC takes part in European networks on nuclear reactor safety, designed to harmonise as far as possible the various national safety standards. As part of this framework programme, given its expertise, it would be appropriate for the JRC to step up this activity of participation so that Community safety standards can be defined for the planning, construction and operation of reactors and nuclear fuel processing plants in the European Union. In this way a contribution for the establishment of a codex of nuclear security within the EU would be given, which could harmonise the different national standards of high-level nuclear security in the EU and should be proposed as 'acquis communautaire' to and applied in the applicant countries

Justification

Amendment 3

Recital 4

(4) For the purpose of implementing the framework programme, it may be appropriate to engage in international co-operation activities, in particular on the basis of Chapter X of the Treaty, with third countries and international organisations.

Special attention should be paid to Accession Countries.

(4) For the purpose of implementing the framework programme, it may be appropriate to engage in international co-operation activities, in particular on the basis of Chapter X of the Treaty, with third countries and international organisations.

In this connection, the JRC will seek to represent all interests of the Community and its Member States and make the best possible use of the networks it operates.

Justification

The Member States do not always have the resources to take part in the initiatives taken by some of the Community's traditional partners. The JRC should bring together their contributions within its fields of competence, working together with the national organisations concerned.

Amendment 4

Recital 4a (new)

(4a) In implementing this programme, special attention should be paid to the candidate countries. The JRC will make an active contribution to transferring the 'acquis communautaire' and will undertake appropriate training activities in nuclear safety and materials control, including measures to prevent illegal trafficking in nuclear materials.

Justification

Nuclear-related issues are particularly sensitive in the context of enlargement. Because of its privileged position and its technical expertise, the JRC can act independently of all national interests.

Amendment 5 Recital 5

(5) Research activities carried out within this programme should respect the fundamental ethical principles, ***notably those which appear*** in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.

(5) Research activities carried out within this programme should respect the fundamental ethical principles, ***including those reflected in Article 6 of the Treaty on the European Union and*** in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, ***as well as the need to take into account public acceptability of these activities.***

Justification

To be consistent with the EP amendment on the 6th Framework Programme and with the Commission's amended proposal for a Specific Programme for Research and Training on Nuclear Energy (2001/0125 (CNS)).

Amendment 6 Recital 6

(6) Following the Commission Communication “Women and Science”¹ and the Resolution of the Council² and the European Parliament³ on this theme, an action plan is being implemented in order to reinforce and increase the place and role of women in science and research.

(6) Following the Commission Communication “Women and Science”¹ and the Resolution of the Council² and the European Parliament³ on this theme, an action plan is being implemented in order to reinforce and increase the place and role of women in science and research, ***which should ensure the respect of equality of opportunity, irrespective of gender.***

¹ COM (1999) 76

² Resolution of 20 May 1999, OJ C 201, 16.7.1999

³ Resolution of 3 February 2000, PE 284.656

Justification

To be consistent with the EP amendment on the 6th Framework Programme and with the Commission's amended proposal for a Specific Programme for Research and Training on Nuclear Energy (2001/0125 (CNS)).

Amendment 7 Recital 7a (new)

7a. The JRC will seek to maintain its own level of scientific excellence so that it can better fulfil its mission and, with this in view, will step up activities devoted strictly to research, without prejudice to those intended to directly meet the requirements of Community policies.

Justification

As stressed on several occasions by the evaluation committees, the JRC must strike a balance between the service activities it provides for its users and the research activities which are vital for maintaining its scientific level; see also the first amendment to Annex I.

Amendment 8 Recital 11

(11) The Commission should in due course arrange for an independent assessment to be conducted concerning the activities carried out in the fields covered by this programme.

(11) The Commission should in due course arrange for an independent assessment to be conducted concerning the activities carried out in the fields covered by this programme, ***which will be done in a spirit of openness with respect to all the relevant actors.***

Justification

To be consistent with the EP amendment on the 6th Framework Programme and with the Commission's amended proposal for a Specific Programme for Research and Training on Nuclear Energy (2001/0125 (CNS)).

Amendment 9 Article 6, paragraph 1

1. The Commission shall regularly report on the overall progress of the implementation of the specific programme, in accordance with Article 4 of the framework programme.

1. The Commission shall regularly report on the overall progress of the implementation of the specific programme, in accordance with Article 4 of the framework programme; ***information on financial aspects shall be included.***

The Commission shall inform the Parliament on a regular basis on the results of the institutes operating under the Joint Research Centre.

The Commission shall provide prior information to the budgetary authority whenever it intends to depart from the breakdown of expenditure stated in the remarks and annex of the annual budget.

Justification

The rapporteur considers that the Commission should assess on a regular basis the activities of the Joint Research Centre. As to budgetary information, the rapporteur reminds that this procedure was introduced as a result of an agreement between the Committee on Budgets and the Commission in October 1999. This procedure should be maintained to improve the follow-up of the use of funds in the specific programmes of FP6.

Amendment 10 Annex I, chapter 1, indent 3a (new)

- In order constantly to maintain its level of scientific excellence and be able better to fulfil its mission, the JRC will seek to maintain an appropriate balance between activities designed directly to

meet users' needs and those relating strictly to research.

Justification

Incorporates new recital 7a into the text of the decision.

Amendment 11

Annex I, section 2.1, third paragraph

The principal objective will be to further develop collaboration through networking, leading to broad consensus on a range of these issues at European and world-level. The application of Safeguards by the Euratom Safeguards Office (ESO) and the IAEA requires R&D support and direct assistance. Special attention will be given to co-operation with future EU Member States. Training activities will be an important component for JRC to help equip the EU with a future generation of scientists with necessary nuclear skills and expertise. Main areas of research activity will therefore be as follows:

The principal objective will be to further develop collaboration through networking, leading to broad consensus on a range of these issues at European and world-level. ***The possibility of the JRC taking part in networks of excellence and integrated projects will be particularly important in this connection.*** The application of Safeguards by the Euratom Safeguards Office (ESO) and the IAEA requires R&D support and direct assistance. Special attention will be given to co-operation with future EU Member States. Training activities will be an important component for JRC to help equip the EU with a future generation of scientists with necessary nuclear skills and expertise. Main areas of research activity will therefore be as follows:

Justification

Participation of this kind will enable the JRC to involve a greater number of partners in its contribution to these highly sensitive areas, particularly the applicant countries.

Amendment 12

Annex I, section 2.1, third paragraph, second indent

- Safety of the different types of reactors, radiation monitoring and

- Safety of the different types of reactors, monitoring and metrology ***in the***

metrology.

field of radiation.

Justification

The JRC does not monitor ionising radiation which is a national responsibility, but as part of its mission contributes to the implementation of Chapter 3 of the Euratom Treaty.

Amendment 13

Annex I, section 2.2, nuclear safeguards, fourth paragraph

The JRC is closely involved in the international efforts to detect clandestine activities and to combat the illicit trafficking of nuclear materials. Nuclear forensic science will be further developed.

The JRC is closely involved in the international efforts to detect clandestine activities and to combat the illicit trafficking of nuclear materials. ***The JRC will step up its activities and research efforts in this field so that it can provide support for any Member State or applicant state which so requests.*** Nuclear forensic science will be further developed.

Justification

The JRC's Institute for Transuranium Elements has the only civilian laboratory capable of conducting the necessary analyses.

Amendment 14

Annex I, section 2.2, From nuclear safeguards to non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction

The JRC will support the non-proliferation by adapting specialised know-how and techniques used for nuclear safeguards that may also potentially support verification regimes of nuclear and other weapons for mass destruction.

The JRC will support the non-proliferation by adapting specialised know-how and techniques used for nuclear safeguards that may also potentially support verification regimes ***and the disarmament*** of nuclear and other weapons for mass destruction ***to prevent any use of the material, including for terrorist purposes. With this in view, the JRC will seek to bring together all possible expertise, including in the non-nuclear field, and to fully associate its partners in the ESARDA network.***

Justification

This problem has assumed special importance since 11 September 2001, since the JRC and its partners in ESARDA need to step up their cooperation and enable other sensitive sectors to benefit from the expertise they have developed over several decades.

Amendment 15

Annex I, section 2.3, first paragraph

The high safety level of plants within the EU must be maintained, in particular for reactors to be operated for a further 10-50 years. The JRC will continue supporting safety authorities and nuclear plant operators by networking on ageing, damage detection, in-service inspection, structural integrity assessment and production of fundamental neutron data. Accident analysis and management, validation of codes, systems' analysis, and risk-informed methods development are traditional JRC competencies, which are important both for EU harmonisation and in view of enlargement. Support to the PHEBUS programme will continue. Retrieval of experimental data and their archiving for easy availability will be supported.

The high safety level of plants within the EU must be maintained, in particular for reactors to be operated for a further 10-50 years. The JRC will continue supporting safety authorities and nuclear plant operators by networking on ageing, damage detection, in-service inspection, structural integrity assessment and production of fundamental neutron data. Accident analysis and management, validation of codes, systems' analysis, and risk-informed methods development are traditional JRC competencies, which are important both for EU harmonisation and in view of enlargement. Support to the PHEBUS programme will continue. Retrieval of experimental data and their archiving for easy availability will be supported, ***with special attention being paid to the management and, above all, the dissemination of these data.***

Justification

Collecting data is a passive activity, whereas the JRC should be an active body, particularly with reference to the European Research Area.

Amendment 16

Annex I, section 2.3, third paragraph

On the safety of nuclear fuel, JRC will

On the safety of nuclear fuel, JRC will

concentrate on mechanical and chemical interactions at the fuel/cladding interface and on fuel behaviour at high burn-up. The TRANSURANUS fuel performance codes will continue to be extended with new data **and** training of users, including scientists from Eastern European countries.

concentrate on mechanical and chemical interactions at the fuel/cladding interface and on fuel behaviour at high burn-up. The TRANSURANUS fuel performance codes will continue to be extended with new data which will ***be intensively disseminated.*** ***Special attention will be paid to*** training of users, including scientists from Eastern European countries.

Justification

The JRC must exploit its position and take a more proactive approach.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

Nuclear safety: One of the research topics included in the specific programme for the Joint Research Centre (JRC) is the safety of different types of reactors. In this connection, it must be said that there is a little confusion and some doubt regarding the Community's competence in the field of nuclear safety in general.

Chapter 3 of the Euratom Treaty, and in particular Article 30, allows the Community to lay down a set of standards for human exposure to radiation. Indeed, these maximum permissible doses have been established. However, the Treaty does not give the Community any powers as regards protecting the environment from possible damage produced by radiation or matters relating to the safety of nuclear power stations. It should be stressed that the Euratom Safeguards Office provided for in Chapter 7 of the Treaty has nothing to do with nuclear safety. It actually forms part of an accounting system for nuclear materials set up to prevent such materials (essentially plutonium-239 and uranium-235) intended for civil use from being illegally diverted for military purposes or the production of nuclear weapons. The regular inspections performed by the Euratom Safeguards Office are designed solely to check that such uses are not occurring and have nothing to do with the safety of nuclear power stations. Thus, although expressions such as 'international safety standards' or 'western standards' can often be found in European Union documents on nuclear safety, there is no Euratom directive laying down safety standards for the planning, construction and operation of nuclear power plants in the European Union. This is the sole responsibility of the Member States, which have so far not shown much inclination to hand over this power to the Community. During the enlargement negotiations the Member States have been to some extent obliged to attempt to define a common 'acquis' on nuclear safety issues. The WENRA Association has contributed to this, as has the working group on nuclear safety set up at the Council, both of which have produced extensive studies on the safety of nuclear power stations in the applicant countries and have sought to set out guidelines describing best practice in the field of nuclear safety.

Over the years, the JRC has built up extensive experience in this field and appears to be the institution best placed to determine what constitutes the most up-to-date 'best practice' as regards reactor safety and the whole nuclear fuel cycle. The JRC is able to operate as a neutral institution compared to national regulatory agencies and has the necessary technical and scientific experience. Provision should therefore be included in this specific programme for enabling the JRC to cooperate on the harmonisation of various national standards required in the nuclear safety field.

In the EU there is a high level of expertise in the field of nuclear technology. The JRC in particular has excellent experience in this field. This expertise needs to be maintained with a stepping up of international cooperation on the development of new nuclear technologies better than those currently in use. This will ensure a high level of passive safety and allow for improved use of nuclear fuel, while reducing the quantities of radioactive waste produced.

Euratom safeguards control in the context of enlargement: It should be stressed that the JRC has developed extensive expertise in the field of nuclear fuel safeguards (for example, development of seals, remote control techniques, sample analysis, etc.); the Euratom Safeguards Office makes extensive use of this expertise. With the accession of the applicant countries nuclear safeguards activities will take on still greater importance and it is to be

expected that fresh difficulties may arise. The present specific programme should clearly indicate that the JRC must make an important contribution in helping the applicant countries adapt to Euratom nuclear safeguard standards. In this connection, it is important to extend the training of inspectors (currently undertaken by the JRC on behalf of Euratom) to include specialists from the applicant countries.

Nuclear medicine and non-Euratom activities: Many JRC laboratories engaged in activities under this specific programme have nuclear expertise which can and must be used in research activities not included under the current programme. Emphasis should be placed in particular on the need for close cooperation in the field of bio-medical applications of nuclear technologies, including cancer research and human health and environmental protection from radiation and ionising radiation. In this connection, it is particularly important for these JRC laboratories to be able to take part in networks of excellence in all research areas covered by the sixth Framework Programme.

Cooperation between JRC and other research centres: In general, in addition to encouraging JRC participation in networks of excellence, closer cooperation is needed with research centres and institutes at Community, national and regional level.

Maintaining the JRC's advanced level of scientific excellence: There is a temptation, especially within the Member States, to see the JRC as an entirely customer-driven service. This is reasonable up to a point, but we must not forget that in order to provide sound science for its customers, the JRC must be able to generate and maintain a very high level of scientific expertise and competence. Thus a balance has to be found between activities designed to meet the needs of its customers, and those designed to meet its own needs to maintain its scientific expertise and credibility.

Budget: The Council's decision cuts the budget for the specific programme from EUR 330 to 290 m. The main activities under this programme require the bodies involved to incur extensive fixed expenditure (safety equipment, access control equipment, etc.) which by its very nature cannot be reduced. As a result the EUR 40 m reduction will entail a cutback in the scientific and technical staff working on the activities during this framework programme. Consequently, the proposed budget can be seen as the minimum necessary to carry out the technical and scientific activities commensurate with the importance of this specific programme.

22 May 2002

OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON BUDGETS

for the Committee on Industry, External Trade, Research and Energy

1. Proposal for a Council decision adopting a specific programme 2002-2006 for research, technological development and demonstration aimed at integrating and strengthening the European Research Area (COM(2001) 279 – C5-0330/2001 – 2001/0122(CNS))
2. Amended proposal for a Council decision concerning the specific programme 2002-2006 for research, technology development and demonstration aimed at integrating and strengthening the European Research Area (COM(2001) 594 – C5-0554/2001 – 2001/0122(CNS))
3. Amended proposal for a Council decision adopting a specific programme 2002-2006 for research, technological development and demonstration: aimed at “Integrating and strengthening the European Research Area” (2002-2006) (COM(2002) 43 – C5-0212/2002 – 2001/0122(CNS))
4. Proposal for a Council decision adopting a specific programme 2002-2006 for research, technological development and demonstration aimed at structuring the European Research Area (COM(2001) 279 – C5-0331/2001 – 2001/0123(CNS))
5. Amended proposal for a Council decision adopting a specific programme 2002-2006 for research, technological development and demonstration : aimed at “structuring the European Research Area”(2002-2006) (COM(2002) 43 – C5-0213/2002 – 2001/0213(CNS))
6. Proposal for a Council decision adopting a specific programme 2002-2006 for research, technological development and demonstration to be carried out by means of direct actions by the Joint Research Centre (COM(2001) 279 – C5-0332/2001 – 2001/0124(CNS))
7. Amended proposal for a Council decision adopting a specific programme 2002-2006 for research, technological development and demonstration to be carried out by means of direct actions by the Joint Research Centre (2002-2006) (COM(2002) 43 – C5-0214/2002 – 2001/0124(CNS))
8. Proposal for a Council decision adopting a specific programme 2002-2006 (Euratom) for research and training on nuclear energy (COM(2001) 279 – C5-0333/2001 – 2001/0125(CNS))
9. Amended proposal for a Council decision adopting a specific programme 2002-2006 (Euratom) for research and training on nuclear energy (2002-2006) (COM(2002) 43 – C5-0215/2002 – 2001/0125(CNS))
10. Proposal for a Council decision adopting a specific programme 2002-2006 for research and training to be carried out by the Joint Research Centre by means of direct actions for the

European Atomic Energy Community (COM(2001) 279 – C5-0334/2001 – 2001/0126(CNS))

11. Amended proposal for a Council decision adopting a specific programme 2002-2006 for research and training to be carried out by the Joint Research Centre by means of direct actions for the European Atomic Energy Community (COM(2002) 43 – C5-0216/2002 – 2001/0126(CNS))

Draftsman: Ian Stewart Hudgton

PROCEDURE

The Committee on Budgets appointed Ian Stewart Hudgton draftsman at its meeting of 21 January 2002.

It considered the draft opinion at its meeting of 21 May 2002.

At the last meeting it adopted the following amendments unanimously.

The following were present for the vote: Terence Wynn, chairman; Francesco Turchi, vice-chairman; Ian Stewart Hudgton, draftsman; Kathalijne Maria Buitenweg, Joan Colom i Naval, Den Dover, Bárbara Dührkop Dührkop, Salvador Garriga Polledo, Catherine Guy-Quint, Jutta D. Haug, María Esther Herranz García, Wilfried Kuckelkorn, John Joseph McCartin, Juan Andrés Naranjo Escobar, Joaquim Piscaretta, Per Stenmarck, Kyösti Tapio Virrankoski and Ralf Walter.

SHORT JUSTIFICATION

1. Background

The Commission has presented proposals for the 6th framework programme¹ and its specific programmes². The Committee on Budgets adopted its opinion on the framework proposal in September 2001. The Parliament established its position at first reading in November 2001, and the Council approved its common position in January 2002.

As a result, the Commission revised its proposals on the specific programmes and took up a significant part of the Parliament's amendments.³ In its proposals, the Commission modified the objectives and breakdown of expenditure of the main areas of research:

Breakdown of expenditure per specific programme of FP6 (EC, EURATOM and total)

EUR million

<i>Main areas (Community)</i>		<i>2003</i>	<i>2004</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2006</i>	<i>Total</i>
Integrating research	OC*	2 776.2	2 971.2	3 119.2	3 217.1	12 083.7
	AE**	185.8	191.6	195.4	198.5	771.3
	Total	2 962.0	3 162.8	3 314.6	3 415.6	12 855.0
Structuring the European Research Area	OC	573.7	613.5	643.7	664.8	2 495.7
	AE	38.3	39.5	40.3	41.2	159.3
	Total	612.0	653.0	684.0	706.0	2 655.0
Activities carried out by the Joint Research Centre	OC	164.579	167.134	169.903	173.609	675.225
	AE	20.421	21.066	21.497	21.791	84.775
	Total	185.0	188.2	191.4	195.4	760.0
Community programmes	OC	3 514.479	3 751.834	3 932.803	4 055.509	15 254.625
	AE	244.521	252.166	257.197	261.491	1 015.375
	Total	3 759.0	4 004.0	4 190.0	4 317.0	16 270.0

<i>Main areas (EURATOM)</i>		<i>2003</i>	<i>204</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2006</i>	<i>Total</i>
Nuclear energy	OC	187.8	195.7	197.8	203.6	784.9
	AE	37.6	38.4	39.2	39.9	155.1
	Total	225.4	234.1	237.1	243.5	940.0
Activities carried out by the Joint Research Centre	OC	62.313	63.362	64.312	65.657	255.644
	AE	8.287	8.538	8.688	8.843	34.356
	Total	70.6	71.9	73.0	74.5	290.0
EURATOM programmes	OC	250.113	259.062	262.112	269.257	1 040.544
	AE	45.887	46.938	47.888	48.743	189.456
	Total	296.0	306.0	310.0	318.0	1 230.0

<i>6th framework programme</i>		<i>2003</i>	<i>2004</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2006</i>	<i>Total</i>
Grand total	OC	3 537.7	4 010.896	4 194.915	4 324.766	16 295.169
	AE	517.3	299.104	305.085	310.234	1 204.831
	Total	4 055.0	4 310.0	4 500.0	4 635	17 500

* OC = operational costs

** AE = administrative expenditure

These activities can be further broken down into thematic priorities and their respective appropriations (see Annex 1).

¹ COM(2001) 94 of 21.2.2001.

² COM(2001) 279 of 30.5.2001.

³ COM(2002) 43 of 30.1.2002.

2. General assessment

In its proposals, the Commission has modified the structure and content of several thematic priorities by adjusting the specific programme entitled "Integrating and strengthening the European Research Area". Similarly, it has re-attributed research activities in relation to some thematic priorities to take account of the modifications and the financial reductions introduced by the Parliament. Finally, the Commission has clarified the description of some of the instruments stated in the annex of the proposal to reflect the principle of smooth transition from traditional to new instruments, and the idea of a fourth instrument suggested by the Parliament.

The rapporteur considers that the Commission has taken onboard most of the key amendments proposed by the Parliament. This is also the case with the amendments presented by the Committee on Budgets. For instance, the Commission followed COBU's request concerning the future nomenclature of FP6, whereby each thematic priority has now its own budget line so as to ensure a better flow of information between the Commission and the budgetary authority. Similarly, operational and administrative expenditure are presented separately so as to enable a better follow-up of the financial implementation of direct and indirect actions.

The Commission also agreed to maintain some of the instruments used under the current framework programme alongside the new ones following the request of the Parliament. (These instruments generally involve small-scale contracts, which the rapporteur considers of major importance as smaller projects are often more agile and likely to produce market-oriented results.) In addition, the Commission has introduced a reference to basic research, an earmarking of 15% to the SMEs, and a possibility to provide financial support to the candidate countries from the pre-accession instruments. All of these points had been tabled by the Committee on Budgets

Turning to the ratio of operational and administrative expenditure per specific programme, the rapporteur notes that the Commission has reduced administrative costs in non-nuclear, indirect research (Integrating research and Structuring the European Research Area) from 7.0% under the 5th framework programme to 6.0% under the revised proposals.

By contrast, nuclear activities financed under the Euratom Treaty, as well as nuclear and non-nuclear direct actions implemented by the Joint Research Centre have a higher percentage of administrative expenditure (16.5%, 12% and 11%, respectively) compared to non-nuclear indirect research, which is implemented by third parties and sub-contracted by the Community. This can be justified due to the diverging research activities implemented by the Community: unlike DG Research, DG JRC is directly involved in academic research and project management, whereby the definition of its expenditure (operational or administrative) is sometimes difficult.

The Commission has agreed to provide further clarification on the JRC's establishment plans and financial statements through the budget remarks and the working documents accompanying the general budget so that the budget authority can better evaluate the cost-efficiency of its activities. The rapporteur suggests that the Commission should also present to the Parliament

an annual report on the achievements of the institutes¹ operating under the JRC and propose a revision of their objectives and establishment plans, if deemed necessary.

3. Financial remarks

As to the overall budget of the 6th framework programme, the two arms of the budgetary authority seem to have reached an agreement on the amount proposed by the Commission (EUR 17.5 billion for 2003-2006). This represents an increase of 17% compared to the current framework programme. However, assuming that other activities under heading 3 are maintained at the current level, the share of research costs would remain virtually unchanged if compared to the level in 2001. If the proposals were approved as such, they would leave a margin of approximately EUR 750 million under the ceiling of heading 3 (see table below).

On the other hand, research appropriations should be consistent with the requirements of the current financial perspective. The 6th framework programme should not be financed at the expense of other Community activities in heading 3. Consequently, the rapporteur considers that the Commission should present a programming report on all the activities to be financed under heading 3 during 2003-2006 before the budgetary authority can take a final decision on the funding of the new framework programme.

The Commission believes that the new decision-making structure will improve the implementation of the research framework programme. This in turn should reduce the backlog of payments, which on 31 December 2001 amounted to EUR 6 685.3 million. The rapporteur maintains certain reservations to this optimism as the Commission will have to cope with two different sets of instruments, which can further complicate the administrative procedures and the management of projects within the Commission.

Finally, the rapporteur reminds that COBU has traditionally introduced amendments, which have replaced the management procedure with advisory committees. Such an approach would be also consistent with the recommendations made by the panel of independent experts who evaluated the 5th framework programme.² Therefore, he suggests to modify the Commission's proposals by presenting amendments on commitology.

Margin under heading 3 of the financial perspective in 2002-2006
(in € million, adjusted to 2003 prices)

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Total 2003-2006
FP ceiling for heading 3	6 272	6 558	6 796	6 915	7 034	7 165	27 910
Other policies heading 3	2 312	2 502.8	2 552.9	2 465.9	2 371	2 271.1	9 660.9
<i>RTD costs</i>	<i>3 920</i>	<i>4 055</i>	<i>4 055</i>	<i>4 310</i>	<i>4 500</i>	<i>4 635</i>	<i>17 500</i>
Total costs in heading 3 *	6 232	6 557.8	6 607.9	6 775.9	6 871	6 906.1	27 160.9

¹ Institute for Advanced Materials (Petten, Netherlands), Institute for Transuranium Elements (Karlsruhe, Germany), Institute for Reference Materials and Measurements (Geel, Belgium), Institute for Prospective Technological Studies (Seville, Spain), and four institutes operating in Ispira, Italy (Environment Institute, Space Applications Institute, Institute for Health and Consumer Protection, and Institute for Systems, Informatics and Society).

² Five-year assessment of the European Union research and technological development programmes, July 2000.

Margin under heading 3	40	0.2	188.1	139.1	163	258.9	749.1
RTD costs vs. FP ceiling	62.50%	61.83%	59.67%	62.33%	63.98%	64.69%	62.70%

* Assuming that the sixth framework programme is adopted as proposed by the Commission and that other activities under heading 3 are maintained at the current level without any increases.

Breakdown of expenditure per main research activity under FP6

INTEGRATING AND STRENGTHENING THE EUROPEAN RESEARCH AREA (EC)		EUR million
1)	<i>Focusing and integrating Community research (breakdown per thematic priority)</i>	12 525
	Genomics and biotechnology for health	2200
	- <i>Advanced genomics and its applications for health</i>	1 150
	- <i>Combating major diseases</i>	1 050
	Information society technologies	3 600
	Nanotechnologies and nanosciences, knowledge-based multifunctional materials, and new production processes and devices	1 300
	Aeronautics and space	1 075
	Food quality and safety	685
	Sustainable development, global change and ecosystems	2 120
	- <i>Sustainable energy systems</i>	810
	- <i>Sustainable surface transport</i>	610
	- <i>Global change and ecosystems</i>	700
	Citizens and governance in a the European knowledge-based society	225
	Specific activities covering a wider field of research	1 320
	- <i>Supporting policies and anticipating scientific and technological needs</i>	570
	- <i>Horizontal research activities involving SMEs</i>	450
	- <i>Specific measures in support of international co-operation</i>	300
2)	<i>Strengthening the foundations of the European Research Area</i>	330
	Support for the coordination of activities	280
	Support for the coherent development of policies	50
	TOTAL	12 855

STRUCTURING THE EUROPEAN RESEARCH AREA (EC)		EUR million
1)	<i>Research and innovation</i>	300
2)	<i>Human resources</i>	1 630
3)	<i>Research infrastructure</i>	665
4)	<i>Science and society</i>	60
	TOTAL	2 655

ACTIVITIES CARRIED OUT BY THE JOINT RESEARCH CENTRE (EC)		EUR million
1)	<i>Food, chemical products and health</i>	212
2)	<i>Environment and sustainable development</i>	286
3)	<i>Horizontal activities</i>	262
	TOTAL	760

NUCLEAR ENERGY (EURATOM)		EUR million
1)	<i>Controlled thermonuclear fusion</i>	750
2)	<i>Management of radioactive waste</i>	90
3)	<i>Radiation protection</i>	50
4)	<i>Other activities in the field of nuclear technologies and safety</i>	50
	TOTAL	940

ACTIVITIES CARRIED OUT BY THE JOINT RESEARCH CENTRE (EURATOM)		EUR million
1)	<i>Radio-active waste management and safeguards</i>	186
2)	<i>Safety of the different types of reactors, radiation monitoring and metrology</i>	89
3)	<i>Staff for the monitoring of the decommissioning of JRC obsolete installations</i>	15
	TOTAL	290

AMENDMENTS

The Committee on Budgets calls on the Committee on Industry, External Trade, Research and Energy, as the committee responsible, to incorporate the following amendments in its report:

Amended proposal for a Council Decision adopting a specific programme for research, technological development and demonstration: aimed at “Integrating and strengthening the European Research Area” (2002-2006) (COM(2002) 43 – C5-0330/2001 – 2001/0122(CNS))

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAFT LEGISLATIVE TEXT

Text proposed by the Commission¹

Amendments by Parliament

Amendment 1
Recital 16 (new)

(16) Whereas the specific programme should be compatible with the current ceiling of heading 3 without restricting other policies.

Justification

The amount proposed for the specific programme should be compatible with the ceiling under the financial perspective. If, in the course of the adoption of the decision, other amounts were to be proposed by the legislative authority, the budgetary authority would need to be consulted again. In this case, the Committee on Budgets would consider the impact on the ceiling under the current financial perspective. Similarly, if during the multiannual framework programme the evolution of the ceiling of the financial perspective were to change dramatically, the budgetary authority would have to reconsider the financial envelope of each specific programme.

Amendment 2
Article 7, paragraphs 1-3

1. The Commission shall be assisted by a committee, composed of ***representatives of the Member States*** and chaired by the representative of the Commission.

1. The Commission shall be assisted by a committee, composed of ***one representative of each Member State*** and chaired by the representative of the Commission.

¹ OJ C (not yet published).

2. Where reference is made to this paragraph, the management procedure laid down in Article 4 of Decision 1999/468/EC¹ shall apply, in compliance with Article 7 (3) thereof.

3. ***The period provided for in Article 4(3) of Decision 1999/468/EC shall be two months.***

OJ L 184, 17.7.1999, p. 23

2. Where reference is made to this paragraph, the management procedure laid down in Article 3 of Decision 1999/468/EC¹ shall apply, in compliance with Article 7 (3) thereof.

3. ***Deleted.***

OJ L 184, 17.7.1999, p. 23

Justification

The rapporteur considers that there is no reason why the advisory procedure could not be introduced to FP6 committee proceedings. Similarly, Member States should be restricted to one representative in order to facilitate the decision-making of the committee.

Amendment 3 Article 8, paragraph 1

1. The Commission shall regularly report on the overall progress of the implementation of the specific programme, in accordance with Article 4 of the framework programme; information on financial aspects shall be included.

1. The Commission shall regularly report on the overall progress of the implementation of the specific programme, in accordance with Article 4 of the framework programme; information on financial aspects shall be included.

The Commission shall provide prior information to the budgetary authority whenever it intends to depart from the breakdown of expenditure stated in the remarks and annex of the annual budget.

Justification

This procedure was introduced as a result of an agreement between the Committee on Budgets and the Commission in October 1999. The rapporteur considers that the procedure should be maintained to improve the follow-up of the use of funds in the specific programmes of FP6.

AMENDMENT TO THE DRAFT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION

Amendment 4

[The European Parliament,]

Considers that the financial envelope of the proposal should be compatible with the ceiling under heading 3 of the current Financial Perspective without restricting other policies.

Justification

The amount proposed for the specific programme should be compatible with the ceiling under the financial perspective. If, in the course of the adoption of the decision, other amounts were to be proposed by the legislative authority, the budgetary authority would need to be consulted again. In this case, the Committee on Budgets would consider the impact on the ceiling under the current financial perspective. Similarly, if during the multiannual framework programme the evolution of the ceiling of the financial perspective were to change dramatically, the budgetary authority would have to reconsider the financial envelope each specific programme.

AMENDMENTS

The Committee on Budgets calls on the Committee on Industry, External Trade, Research and Energy, as the committee responsible, to incorporate the following amendments in its report:

Amended proposal for a Council Decision adopting a specific programme for research, technological development and demonstration aimed at “structuring the European Research Area” (2002-2006) (COM(2002) 43 – C5-0331/2001 – 2001/0123(CNS))

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAFT LEGISLATIVE TEXT

Text proposed by the Commission¹

Amendments by Parliament

Amendment 5
Recital 13 (new)

(13) Whereas the specific programme should be compatible with the current ceiling of heading 3 without restricting other policies.

¹ OJ C (not yet published).

Justification

The amount proposed for the specific programme should be compatible with the ceiling under the financial perspective. If, in the course of the adoption of the decision, other amounts were to be proposed by the legislative authority, the budgetary authority would need to be consulted again. In this case, the Committee on Budgets would consider the impact on the ceiling under the current financial perspective. Similarly, if during the multiannual framework programme the evolution of the ceiling of the financial perspective were to change dramatically, the budgetary authority would have to reconsider the financial envelope of each specific programme.

Amendment 6 Article 7, paragraphs 1-3

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. The Commission shall be assisted by a committee, composed of <i>representatives of the Member States</i> and chaired by the representative of the Commission. | 1. The Commission shall be assisted by a committee, composed of <i>one representative of each Member State</i> and chaired by the representative of the Commission. |
| 2. Where reference is made to this paragraph, the management procedure laid down in Article 4 of Decision 1999/468/EC ¹ shall apply, in compliance with Article 7 (3) thereof. | 2. Where reference is made to this paragraph, the management procedure laid down in Article 3 of Decision 1999/468/EC ¹ shall apply, in compliance with Article 7 (3) thereof. |
| 3. <i>The period provided for in Article 4(3) of Decision 1999/468/EC shall be two months.</i> | 3. <i>Deleted.</i> |

OJ L 184, 17.7.1999, p. 23

OJ L 184, 17.7.1999, p. 23

Justification

The rapporteur considers that there is no reason why the advisory procedure could not be introduced to FP6 committee proceedings. Similarly, Member States should be restricted to one representative in order to facilitate the decision-making of the committee.

Amendment 7 Article 8, paragraph 1

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. The Commission shall regularly report on the overall progress of the implementation of the specific programme, in accordance with Article 4 of the framework | 1. The Commission shall regularly report on the overall progress of the implementation of the specific programme, in accordance with Article 4 of the framework |
|---|---|

programme; information on financial aspects shall be included.

programme; information on financial aspects shall be included.

The Commission shall provide prior information to the budgetary authority whenever it intends to depart from the breakdown of expenditure stated in the remarks and annex of the annual budget.

Justification

This procedure was introduced as a result of an agreement between the Committee on Budgets and the Commission in October 1999. The rapporteur considers that the procedure should be maintained to improve the follow-up of the use of funds in the specific programmes of FP6.

AMENDMENT TO THE DRAFT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION
Amendment 8

[The European Parliament,]

Considers that the financial envelope of the proposal should be compatible with the ceiling under heading 3 of the current Financial Perspective without restricting other policies.

Justification

The amount proposed for the specific programme should be compatible with the ceiling under the financial perspective. If, in the course of the adoption of the decision, other amounts were to be proposed by the legislative authority, the budgetary authority would need to be consulted again. In this case, the Committee on Budgets would consider the impact on the ceiling under the current financial perspective. Similarly, if during the multiannual framework programme the evolution of the ceiling of the financial perspective were to change dramatically, the budgetary authority would have to reconsider the financial envelope each specific programme.

AMENDMENTS

The Committee on Budgets calls on the Committee on Industry, External Trade, Research and Energy, as the committee responsible, to incorporate the following amendments in its report:

Amended proposal for a Council Decision adopting a specific programme for research, technological development and demonstration to be carried out by means of direct actions by the Joint Research Centre (2002-2006) (COM(2002) 43 – C5-0332/2001 – 2001/0124 (CNS))

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAFT LEGISLATIVE TEXT

Text proposed by the Commission¹

Amendments by Parliament

Amendment 9
Recital 13 (new)

(13) Whereas the specific programme should be compatible with the current ceiling of heading 3 without restricting other policies.

Justification

The amount proposed for the specific programme should be compatible with the ceiling under the financial perspective. If, in the course of the adoption of the decision, other amounts were to be proposed by the legislative authority, the budgetary authority would need to be consulted again. In this case, the Committee on Budgets would consider the impact on the ceiling under the current financial perspective. Similarly, if during the multiannual framework programme the evolution of the ceiling of the financial perspective were to change dramatically, the budgetary authority would have to reconsider the financial envelope of each specific programme.

Amendment 10
Article 6, paragraph 1

1. The Commission shall regularly report on the overall progress of the implementation of the specific programme, in accordance with

1. The Commission shall regularly report on the overall progress of the implementation of the specific programme, in accordance with Article 4 of the framework

¹ OJ C (not yet published).

Article 4 of the framework programme.

programme; **information on financial aspects shall be included.**

The Commission shall inform the Parliament on a regular basis on the results of the institutes operating under the Joint Research Centre. Based on this assessment, the Commission may propose changes to their objectives and establishment plans.

The Commission shall provide prior information to the budgetary authority whenever it intends to depart from the breakdown of expenditure stated in the remarks and annex of the annual budget.

Justification

The rapporteur considers that the Commission should assess on a regular basis the activities of the Joint Research Centre. As to budgetary information, the rapporteur reminds that this procedure was introduced as a result of an agreement between the Committee on Budgets and the Commission in October 1999. This procedure should be maintained to improve the follow-up of the use of funds in the specific programmes of FP6.

AMENDMENT TO THE DRAFT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION

Amendment 11

[The European Parliament,]

Considers that the financial envelope of the proposal should be compatible with the ceiling under heading 3 of the current Financial Perspective without restricting other policies.

Justification

The amount proposed for the specific programme should be compatible with the ceiling under the financial perspective. If, in the course of the adoption of the decision, other amounts were to be proposed by the legislative authority, the budgetary authority would need to be consulted again. In this case, the Committee on Budgets would consider the impact on the ceiling under the current financial perspective. Similarly, if during the multiannual framework programme the evolution of the ceiling of the financial perspective were to change dramatically, the budgetary authority would have to reconsider the financial envelope each specific programme.

AMENDMENTS

The Committee on Budgets calls on the Committee on Industry, External Trade, Research and Energy, as the committee responsible, to incorporate the following amendments in its report:

Amended proposal for a Council Decision adopting a specific programme (Euratom) for research and training on nuclear energy (2002-2006) (COM(2002) 43 – C5-0333/2001 – 2001/0125 (CNS))

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAFT LEGISLATIVE TEXT

Text proposed by the Commission¹

Amendments by Parliament

Amendment 12
Recital 12 (new)

(12) Whereas the specific programme should be compatible with the current ceiling of heading 3 without restricting other policies.

Justification

The amount proposed for the specific programme should be compatible with the ceiling under the financial perspective. If, in the course of the adoption of the decision, other amounts were to be proposed by the legislative authority, the budgetary authority would need to be consulted again. In this case, the Committee on Budgets would consider the impact on the ceiling under the current financial perspective. Similarly, if during the multiannual framework programme the evolution of the ceiling of the financial perspective were to change dramatically, the budgetary authority would have to reconsider the financial envelope of each specific programme.

Amendment 13
Recital 13 (new)

(13) Whereas at the next Inter-Governmental Conference, research activities implemented under the Euratom Treaty should be integrated with the EU Treaty so as to bring nuclear research under the co-decision procedure.

¹ OJ C (not yet published).

Justification

The rapporteur refers to the five-year assessment of Community financed research (1995-1999) according to which the Euratom programme should be merged into the Community framework programme so as to provide the Parliament the power to co-decide on nuclear research in the same way as for the rest of the activities implemented under the framework programme.

Amendment 14 Article 7, paragraph 1

1. The Commission shall regularly report on the overall progress of the implementation of the specific programme, in accordance with Article 5(2) of the framework programme, information on financial aspects shall be included.

1. The Commission shall regularly report on the overall progress of the implementation of the specific programme, in accordance with Article 5(2) of the framework programme, information on financial aspects shall be included.

The Commission shall provide prior information to the budgetary authority whenever it intends to depart from the breakdown of expenditure stated in the remarks and annex of the annual budget.

Justification

This procedure was introduced as a result of an agreement between the Committee on Budgets and the Commission in October 1999. The rapporteur considers that the procedure should be maintained to improve the follow-up of the use of funds in the specific programmes of FP6.

AMENDMENT TO THE DRAFT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION

Amendment 15

[The European Parliament,]

Considers that the financial envelope of the proposal should be compatible with the ceiling under heading 3 of the current Financial Perspective without restricting other policies.

Justification

The amount proposed for the specific programme should be compatible with the ceiling under the financial perspective. If, in the course of the adoption of the decision, other amounts were to be proposed by the legislative authority, the budgetary authority would need to be

consulted again. In this case, the Committee on Budgets would consider the impact on the ceiling under the current financial perspective. Similarly, if during the multiannual framework programme the evolution of the ceiling of the financial perspective were to change dramatically, the budgetary authority would have to reconsider the financial envelope each specific programme.

AMENDMENTS

The Committee on Budgets calls on the Committee on Industry, External Trade, Research and Energy, as the committee responsible, to incorporate the following amendments in its report:

Amended proposal for a Council Decision adopting a specific programme 2002-2006 for research and training to be carried out by the Joint Research Centre by means of direct actions for the European Atomic Energy Community (COM(2002) 43 – C5-0334/2001 – 2001/0126(CNS))

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAFT LEGISLATIVE TEXT

Text proposed by the Commission¹

Amendments by Parliament

Amendment 16
Recital 14 (new)

(14) Whereas the specific programme should be compatible with the current ceiling of heading 3 without restricting other policies.

Justification

The amount proposed for the specific programme should be compatible with the ceiling under the financial perspective. If, in the course of the adoption of the decision, other amounts were to be proposed by the legislative authority, the budgetary authority would need to be consulted again. In this case, the Committee on Budgets would consider the impact on the ceiling under the current financial perspective. Similarly, if during the multiannual framework programme the evolution of the ceiling of the financial perspective were to change dramatically, the budgetary authority would have to reconsider the financial envelope of each specific programme.

Amendment 17
Recital 15 (new)

(15) Whereas at the next Inter-Governmental Conference, research activities implemented under the Euratom Treaty should be integrated with the EU Treaty so as to bring nuclear research under the co-decision procedure.

¹ OJ C (not yet published).

Justification

The rapporteur refers to the five-year assessment of Community financed research (1995-1999) according to which the Euratom programme should be merged into the Community framework programme so as to provide the Parliament the power to co-decide on nuclear research in the same way as for the rest of the activities implemented under the framework programme.

Amendment 18 Article 6, paragraph 1

1. The Commission shall regularly report on the overall progress of the implementation of the specific programme, in accordance with Article 4 of the framework programme.

1. The Commission shall regularly report on the overall progress of the implementation of the specific programme, in accordance with Article 4 of the framework programme; ***information on financial aspects shall be included.***

The Commission shall inform the Parliament on a regular basis on the results of the institutes operating under the Joint Research Centre. Based on this assessment, the Commission may propose changes to their objectives and establishment plans.

The Commission shall provide prior information to the budgetary authority whenever it intends to depart from the breakdown of expenditure stated in the remarks and annex of the annual budget.

Justification

The rapporteur considers that the Commission should assess on a regular basis the activities of the Joint Research Centre. As to budgetary information, the rapporteur reminds that this procedure was introduced as a result of an agreement between the Committee on Budgets and the Commission in October 1999. This procedure should be maintained to improve the follow-up of the use of funds in the specific programmes of FP6.

AMENDMENT TO THE DRAFT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION
Amendment 19

[The European Parliament,]

Considers that the financial envelope of the proposal should be compatible with the ceiling under heading 3 of the current Financial Perspective without restricting other policies.

Justification

The amount proposed for the specific programme should be compatible with the ceiling under the financial perspective. If, in the course of the adoption of the decision, other amounts were to be proposed by the legislative authority, the budgetary authority would need to be consulted again. In this case, the Committee on Budgets would consider the impact on the ceiling under the current financial perspective. Similarly, if during the multiannual framework programme the evolution of the ceiling of the financial perspective were to change dramatically, the budgetary authority would have to reconsider the financial envelope each specific programme.

27 May 2002

OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

for the Committee on Industry, External Trade, Research and Energy

1. Proposal for a Council decision adopting a specific programme 2002-2006 for research, technological development and demonstration aimed at integrating and strengthening the European Research Area (COM(2001) 279 – C5-0330/2001 – 2001/0122(CNS))
2. Amended proposal for a Council decision concerning the specific programme 2002-2006 for research, technology development and demonstration aimed at integrating and strengthening the European Research Area (COM(2001) 594 – C5-0554/2001 – 2001/0122(CNS))
3. Amended proposal for a Council decision adopting a specific programme 2002-2006 for research, technological development and demonstration: aimed at “Integrating and strengthening the European Research Area” (2002-2006) (COM(2002) 43 – C5-0212/2002 – 2001/0122(CNS))
4. Proposal for a Council decision adopting a specific programme 2002-2006 for research, technological development and demonstration aimed at structuring the European Research Area (COM(2001) 279 – C5-0331/2001 – 2001/0123(CNS))
5. Amended proposal for a Council decision adopting a specific programme 2002-2006 for research, technological development and demonstration : aimed at “structuring the European Research Area”(2002-2006) (COM(2002) 43 – C5-0213/2002 – 2001/0213(CNS))
6. Proposal for a Council decision adopting a specific programme 2002-2006 for research, technological development and demonstration to be carried out by means of direct actions by the Joint Research Centre (COM(2001) 279 – C5-0332/2001 – 2001/0124(CNS))
7. Amended proposal for a Council decision adopting a specific programme 2002-2006 for research, technological development and demonstration to be carried out by means of direct actions by the Joint Research Centre (2002-2006) (COM(2002) 43 – C5-0214/2002 – 2001/0124(CNS))
8. Proposal for a Council decision adopting a specific programme 2002-2006 (Euratom) for research and training on nuclear energy (COM(2001) 279 – C5-0333/2001 – 2001/0125(CNS))
9. Amended proposal for a Council decision adopting a specific programme 2002-2006 (Euratom) for research and training on nuclear energy (2002-2006) (COM(2002) 43 – C5-0215/2002 – 2001/0125(CNS))
10. Proposal for a Council decision adopting a specific programme 2002-2006 for research

and training to be carried out by the Joint Research Centre by means of direct actions for the European Atomic Energy Community (COM(2001) 279 – C5-0334/2001 – 2001/0126(CNS))

11. Amended proposal for a Council decision adopting a specific programme 2002-2006 for research and training to be carried out by the Joint Research Centre by means of direct actions for the European Atomic Energy Community (COM(2002) 43 – C5-0216/2002 – 2001/0126(CNS))

Draftsman: Friedrich-Wilhelm Graefe zu Baringdorf

PROCEDURE

At its meeting of 20 March 2002, the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development appointed Friedrich-Wilhelm Graefe zu Baringdorf draftsman.

At its meeting of 27 May 2002, the committee considered the draft opinion.

At the latter meeting it adopted the following conclusions unanimously.

Present for the vote: Joseph Daul (chairman), replacing Friedrich-Wilhelm Graefe zu Baringdorf (vice-chairman and draftsman); Gordon J. Adam, María del Pilar Ayuso González (for Michl Ebner), Sergio Berlato, Reimer Böge (for Francesco Fiori), Niels Busk, Giorgio Celli, Arlindo Cunha, Christel Fiebiger, Christos Folias, Jean-Claude Fruteau, Georges Garot, Lutz Goepel, Liam Hyland, María Izquierdo Rojo, Elisabeth Jeggle, Salvador Jové Peres, Hedwig Keppelhoff-Wiechert, Heinz Kindermann, Dimitrios Koulourianos, Astrid Lulling (for Parish), Véronique Mathieu, Xaver Mayer, Jan Mulder (for Giovanni Procacci), Encarnación Redondo Jiménez, Agnes Schierhuber and Dominique F.C. Souchet.

SHORT JUSTIFICATION

The structure of the proposals submitted

1. On 14 November 2001, the European Parliament considered at first reading the proposal for a European Parliament and Council decision concerning the sixth framework programme (EC and Euratom) for research and technological development.
On 28 January 2002, the Council adopted its common position.
2. The Commission perceived a high degree of consensus between the positions of Parliament and the Council regarding issues of principle and thematic priorities, and on this basis submitted five amended proposals for specific programmes to implement the framework programme. The specific programmes are as follows:
 - COM 2001/0122 (CNS): 'integrating and strengthening the European Research Area'
 - COM 2001/0123 (CNS): 'structuring the European Research Area'
 - COM 2001/0124 (CNS): 'specific programme for research, technological development and demonstration to be carried out by means of direct actions by the Joint Research Centre'
 - COM 2001/0125 (CNS): 'specific programme (Euratom) for research and training on nuclear energy'
 - COM 2001/0126 (CNS): 'specific programme for research and training to be carried out by the Joint Research Centre by means of direct actions for the European Atomic Energy Community'.
3. The amendments which the Commission made to its proposals were intended to take account of the amendments adopted by Parliament at first reading and of the revised budgetary allocations provided for by the Council's common position.
4. Only the first three specific programmes call for an opinion from the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development, the last two being concerned exclusively with fundamental research into nuclear energy.

Opinion on the proposals submitted

5. It is regrettable that, unlike the provisions concerning other areas of the economy (aeronautics, nuclear energy), those concerning agriculture are not presented as a homogeneous block but are scattered through the chapters on food safety, the environment and development. This approach impairs the overall clarity of the support which the European legislature intends research to provide for the common agricultural policy.
6. This need for coherence is all the more imperative in the agri-food industry because the cornerstone of the CAP is the multifunctionality of farming, which by its nature requires an integrated interdisciplinary approach in order to highlight the interactions

between technical, economic, environmental and social aspects which may occur between this type of enterprise and the environment in which it operates.

7. The Commission proposals sometimes give the impression that the future of agri-food research lies exclusively in following up the results of specialised fundamental research in the life sciences, making frequent use of transgenic techniques. While there may unquestionably be many avenues to be explored here, research must also continue to develop in more traditional areas and to contribute to innovation in the field of sustainable farming, in accordance with the European farming model and the types of foods which consumers want.

The key to the success of these research programmes in the field of agriculture will lie in the balance struck between preserving traditional features of European agriculture and modernising it by making sensible use of innovations arising from research.

8. The following amendments are based on the above considerations.

AMENDMENTS

The Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development calls on the Committee on Industry, External Trade, Research and Energy, as the committee responsible, to incorporate the following amendments in its report:

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendments by Parliament

Amendment 1
I - Proposal COM 2001/0122 (CNS)
Recital 7 a (new)

(7a) In this programme, integrated interdisciplinary research work must be a priority, as must 'bottom-up' approaches to research, which are concerned with the specific needs of the public.

Justification

The cornerstone of the European agricultural model is the multifunctionality of farming, which by its nature requires an integrated interdisciplinary approach in order to highlight the interactions between technical, economic, environmental and social aspects which may occur between this type of enterprise and the environment in which it operates.

Amendment 2

I - Proposal COM 2001/0122 (CNS)
Annex I 1.1.5 – Food quality and safety
First paragraph

This priority area is aimed at assuring the health and well-being of European citizens through a better understanding of the influence of food intake and environmental factors on human health and to provide them with safer, high-quality and health-promoting foods, including seafoods, relying on fully controlled and integrated production systems originating in agriculture, aquaculture and fisheries. By re-addressing the classical approach 'from farm to fork', this thematic priority area aims at ensuring that consumer protection is the main driver for developing new and safer food and feed production chains, i.e. 'from fork to farm', relying **in particular on biotechnology tools** taking into account the latest results of genomics research.

This priority area is aimed at assuring the health and well-being of European citizens through a better understanding of the influence of food intake and environmental factors on human health and to provide them with safer, high-quality and health-promoting foods, including seafoods, relying on fully controlled and integrated production systems originating in agriculture, aquaculture and fisheries. By re-addressing the classical approach 'from farm to fork', this thematic priority area aims at ensuring that consumer protection is the main driver for developing new and safer food and feed production chains, i.e. 'from fork to farm', relying on **both innovation from biotechnology (taking into account the latest results of genomics research) and research and innovation in the area of integrated and organic agriculture.**

Justification

In food and agricultural research biotechnology and organic farming should not be regarded as being at odds with one another. Creative combinations of the most recent technology and research and experience from organic farming can bring about desirable progress. This amendment seeks to bridge the gap between the Graefe zu Baringdorf amendment and the Commission proposal.

Amendment 3

I - Proposal COM 2001/0122 (CNS),
Annex I, 1.1.6.3. - Global change and ecosystems

Research priorities
Indent 5, first paragraph

- Strategies for sustainable land management, including coastal zones, agricultural land and forests. The objective is to contribute to the development of strategies and tools for sustainable use of land, with emphasis on the coastal zones, agricultural lands and forests, including integrated concepts for the multipurpose utilisation of agricultural and forest resources, and the integrated forestry/wood chain in order to ensure sustainable development at economic, social, and at environmental levels.

- Strategies for sustainable land management, including coastal zones, agricultural land and forests. The objective is to contribute to the development of strategies and tools for sustainable use of land, with emphasis on the coastal zones, agricultural lands and forests, including integrated concepts for the multipurpose utilisation of agricultural and forest resources, and the integrated forestry/wood chain in order to ensure sustainable development at economic, social, and at environmental levels; ***the multifunctional performance of farming will be examined separately, in both its qualitative and quantitative aspects.***

Justification

The European agricultural model is based on the concept of the multifunctionality of farming. The application of this concept in the development of the CAP makes it necessary to clarify certain aspects of it, particularly quantitative aspects, to ascertain the monetary value of the services rendered to the community by farming and thus provide a basis for fair remuneration..

Amendment by Jan Mulder

Amendment 4

I - Proposal COM 2001/0122 (CNS)

Annex I 1.2.1 Supporting policies

and anticipating scientific and technological needs

(i) Policy-orientated research

Initial priorities, first paragraph, fifth indent

New and more environment friendly production methods to improve animal health and welfare,

New and more environment friendly production methods to improve animal health and welfare, ***as well as research into animal diseases such as foot-and-mouth disease and swine fever and, particularly, the development of marker vaccines;***

Justification

Research into the livestock industry and animal diseases is necessary from the points of view of, inter alia, animal welfare, social responsibility and agricultural incomes.

Amendment 5

I - Proposal COM 2001/0122 (CNS), Annex I

1.2.3 Specific measures in support of international cooperation

Research priorities

- In the case of the Mediterranean third countries, in support of the development of the Euro-Mediterranean partnership, issues relating to environment, health **and** water issues, as well as protection of the cultural heritage.

- In the case of the Mediterranean third countries, in support of the development of the Euro-Mediterranean partnership, issues relating to environment, health, water issues **and rural development**, as well as protection of the cultural heritage.

Justification

Farming occupies a particularly important position in the economies of third countries in the Mediterranean region. Research is directly transposable to European Mediterranean countries. Thus developing this field is simultaneously a way of meeting our own needs, a form of development aid to these countries and a way of stabilising migratory movements.

Amendment 6

I - Proposal COM 2001/0124 (CNS)

Annex I, 2.1 - Food, chemical products and health

Food safety and quality

Paragraph 4

Technological prospective research will be conducted on the development of food products **and** processes, and on the impact of food safety policies on the agri-food sector.

Technological prospective research will be conducted on the development of food products, **sustainable methods of cultivation and livestock farming, and food production** processes, and on the impact of food safety policies on the agri-food sector.

Justification

Research must not be confined to the final stage of processing of the product but must also apply to methods of production of primary agricultural products, particularly with a view to identifying production processes which make economical use of inputs.

Amendment 7

I - Proposal COM 2001/0124 (CNS), Annex I

2.2. Environment and sustainability

Contributions to sustainable development

Paragraph 1

Work on sustainable development pervades the whole JRC programme and attention is paid to the integration of economic, social and environmental dimensions.

Work on sustainable development pervades the whole JRC programme and attention is paid to the integration of economic, social and environmental dimensions. ***Work on such integration will particularly concern rural development and the role which farming and its multifunctional performance should play in it.***

Justification

In this paragraph, the Commission only mentions energy and environmental protection, omitting the key role which multifunctional farms should continue to play in the sustainable development of rural areas.