

# EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2004



2009

---

*Session document*

FINAL  
**A6-0438/2006**

19.12.2006

## **REPORT**

A Thematic Strategy on the recycling of waste  
(2006/2175(INI))

Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety

Rapporteur: Johannes Blokland

**CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
MOTION FOR A EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT RESOLUTION.....	3
EXPLANATORY STATEMENT .....	10
PROCEDURE.....	15

## MOTION FOR A EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT RESOLUTION

### A Thematic Strategy on recycling of waste (2006/2175(INI))

*The European Parliament,*

- having regard to the Commission communication to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on 'Taking sustainable use of resources forward: A thematic strategy on the prevention and recycling of waste' (COM(2005)0666),
- having regard to Articles 2 and 6 of the EC Treaty, by virtue of which environmental protection requirements must be integrated into the various sectors of Community policy with the aim of promoting an environmentally sustainable development of economic activities,
- having regard to Article 175 of the EC Treaty,
- having regard to Decision No 1600/2002/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 July 2002 laying down the Sixth Community Environment Action Programme<sup>1</sup> (6<sup>th</sup> EAP), in particular Article 8 thereof,
- having regard to the Commission's communication on 'A thematic strategy on the sustainable use of natural resources" (COM(2005)0670),
- having regard to its resolution of 20 April 2004 on the communication from the Commission: 'Towards a thematic strategy on the prevention and recycling of waste'<sup>2</sup>,
- having regard to its resolution of 19 November 2003 on the follow-up report on Council Directive 75/442/EEC (Waste Framework Directive)<sup>3</sup>,
- having regard to its resolution of 14 November 1996 on the communication from the Commission on the review of the Community strategy for waste management and the draft Council resolution on waste policy<sup>4</sup> and to the Council Resolution of 24 February 1997 on a Community strategy for waste management<sup>5</sup>,
- having regard to the judgments of the Court of Justice of the European Communities, particularly in Cases C-203/96, C-365/97, C-209/98, C-418/99, C-419/99, C-9/00, C-228/00, C-458/00, C-416/02 and C-121/03,
- having regard to Rule 45 of its Rules of Procedure,

---

<sup>1</sup> OJ L 242, 10.9.2002, p. 1.

<sup>2</sup> OJ C 104 E, 30.4.2004, p. 401.

<sup>3</sup> OJ C 87E, 7.4.2004, p. 400.

<sup>4</sup> OJ C 362, 2.12.1996, p. 241.

<sup>5</sup> OJ C 76, 11.3.1997, p. 1.

- having regard to the report of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety (A6-0438/2006),

### ***1. Introduction***

- A. whereas Article 8 of the 6<sup>th</sup> EAP has set very clear objectives, targets and principles for EU waste policy,
- B. whereas Article 8(2), point (iv) of the 6<sup>th</sup> EAP provides for the development or revision of the directives on construction and demolition waste, sewage sludge and biodegradable wastes,

### ***2. The current situation***

- C. whereas, despite some successes achieved by the waste policy of the EU in the past 30 years, the following problems remain:
  - 1. Waste volumes continue to grow, both for hazardous and non-hazardous waste;
  - 2. The potential for waste prevention and recycling is not fully used;
  - 3. Illegal (cross-border) waste shipments are still increasing;
  - 4. Waste management generates emissions to air, water and soil;
  - 5. Legislation is missing for certain important waste streams;
  - 6. Waste legislation is in many cases poorly implemented;
  - 7. Member States have a different approach in solving waste problems;
  - 8. The current wording of EU waste law gives rise to some interpretation problems,
- D. whereas economies are like ecosystems: both systems take in energy and materials and turn them into products and processes, the difference being that our economy follows linear resource flows whereas nature is cyclic; and whereas ecosystems perform functions which convert waste into resources, by transferring energy from the sunlight, and whereas industrial processes are not able to do this; whereas, against the backdrop of rapidly growing economies and populations, production and products that lead to waste streams which nature cannot absorb and turn into new resources are increasingly problematic from the point of view of sustainability,
- E. whereas a transformation of the present system of production and consumption is urgently needed; whereas the main objective is to change consumption in a sustainable direction and bring the processes of raw material extraction, production and product design as much into line with natural processes and designs as possible,
- F. whereas an enhanced understanding of how natural systems work and of structuring business along biological lines can improve both the environment and establish the bottom line,
- G. whereas promotion of more integrated and systems-based practices, such as for instance the clustering of production, functional thinking (turning products into services), dematerialisation and technology development based on imitating nature is a means to prevent waste generation,

### ***3. Aims of an evolving EU policy on waste***

- H. whereas in most Member States disposal, in particular landfill, is still the most common form of waste treatment,
- I. whereas prevention, re-use, recycling and energy recovery of waste - with the order reflecting the degree of relevance – can save natural resources,
- J. whereas Community and national prevention targets have never been achieved, although prevention is still the most important objective;
- K. whereas there are no adequate Community minimum standards applying to many recovery and recycling facilities, which results in different levels of environmental protection in the Member States, eco-dumping and distortions of competition,
  - 1. Recognises the Commission’s Communication on 'Taking sustainable use of resources forward: A Thematic Strategy on the prevention and recycling of waste' as a basis for the discussion on future waste policy;
  - 2. Stresses the substantial aim for waste management of achieving a high level of protection of the environment and human health rather than facilitating the functioning of the internal market for waste recovery;
  - 3. Points out that account should be taken not only of the environmental impact in the EU but also of the impact outside the EU;
  - 4. Underlines the importance of the general principles of waste management, such as the precautionary principle and the polluter pays principle, the principle of the waste generator’s responsibility and, for specific waste flows, the principle of individual producer responsibility, as well as the principles of proximity and self-sufficiency;

### ***4. Main actions***

- 5. Emphasises that full implementation of existing EU waste legislation and equal enforcement across all Member States is a key priority;
- 6. Fails to understand why, despite a proposal for the revision of the Waste Framework Directive, many concrete implementing measures and instruments (which were foreseen in the 6th EAP) are missing;

#### ***4.1 Simplification and modernisation of existing legislation***

- 7. Stresses that changing definitions should only be undertaken for reasons of clarification, and not to weaken environmental protection rules or encourage public acceptance of a concept (for instance by softening the negative connotation of “waste” or “disposal”);
- 8. Stresses that political decisions, such as the definitions of waste, recovery and disposal, must not be taken in committee, but by codecision;

9. Emphasises that the use of the comitology procedure should be limited to non-political decisions, especially those of a technical and scientific nature;
10. Opposes a general declassification of waste that could lead to inappropriate environmental treatment and a lack of traceability of waste streams; emphasises that procedures for the declassification of waste could only be considered for exceptional cases of homogeneous waste streams, such as compost, recycled aggregates, recovered paper and recovered glass;
11. Emphasises that the end-of-waste status should only be achieved after the waste stream in question has been re-used, recycled or undergone a recovery operation - which does not exclude the possibility that a recovery operation may generate new waste - and meets agreed European standards, making it fit for a purpose, and after traceability rules have been adopted and are being applied;
12. Demands that all waste intended for energy recovery or incineration should remain waste, in respect of which Directive 2000/76/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 4 December 2000 on the incineration of waste<sup>1</sup> (the waste incineration directive) should apply;
13. Emphasises that the recovery and disposal lists in the annexes to the Waste Framework Directive should be revised and adapted to current waste management practices in accordance with the codecision procedure;
14. Expresses strong reservations on the proposed energy efficiency calculation method, and the fact that it is to apply to municipal waste incinerators only; calls on the Commission to revise the waste incineration directive, in order to set equal environmental standards (for emissions and energy efficiency) for both incineration and co-incineration of waste;

#### *4.2 Introducing life-cycle thinking in waste policy*

15. Emphasises the key importance of the waste hierarchy, which sets out priorities for action in descending order:
  - prevention;
  - re-use;
  - material recycling;
  - other recovery operations, for example energy recovery;
  - disposal,as a general rule of waste management in achieving the aim of reducing the generation of waste as well as the adverse impacts on health and the environment resulting from waste generation and management;
16. Regards life-cycle thinking as a useful concept to evaluate the environmental and human health impacts of waste; stresses that the hierarchy itself is based on this concept, but

---

<sup>1</sup> OJ L 332, 28.12.2000, p. 91.

acknowledges that life-cycle and other analyses can be used in exceptional cases to deviate from the waste hierarchy, though only when there is clear evidence that another option is actually better on environmental or health grounds or to avoid unreasonably high costs;

#### *4.3 Improving the knowledge base*

17. Supports the improvement of the knowledge base with regard to EU waste policy, but stresses that the implementation of concrete actions is more important;

#### *4.4 Waste prevention*

18. Regrets the lack of quantitative and qualitative reduction targets covering all relevant waste, which were indicated as one of the priority actions in the 6th EAP; calls on the Commission to come forward with a proposal for targets in its final assessment of the 6th EAP;
19. Calls on the Commission to come forward with concrete waste prevention measures in the fields of product policy, chemicals policy and eco-design, to minimise both the generation of waste and the presence of hazardous substances in waste, and thereby foster the safe and environmentally sound treatment of waste; emphasises the importance of promoting products and technologies which are less harmful to the environment as well as products which are more suitable for re-use and recycling;
20. Draws attention to the interaction between waste strategies and other strategies, particularly the sustainable use of natural resources, sustainable development and integrated product policy;
21. Calls on the Commission to develop a set of indicators by 2008, as announced in the Resources Strategy;
22. Emphasises that proper implementation of the concept of producer responsibility is a strong instrument to prevent waste;
23. Draws attention to the role of information campaigns on waste policy, particularly on prevention and raising public awareness of the benefits of sustainable waste management;
24. Calls on the Commission to reinforce the waste prevention aspects of the Best Available Technique reference documents (BREFs) developed under Council Directive 96/61/EC of 24 September 1996 concerning Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control<sup>1</sup> (the IPPC Directive) and to include relevant guidance in these documents;

#### *4.5 Re-use*

25. Calls on the Commission to come forward with concrete measures to promote re-use and repair activities:

---

<sup>1</sup> OJ L 257, 10.10.1996, p. 26.

- setting up an accreditation for re-use centres;
- introducing a reduced VAT rate on products sold by accredited re-use centres;
- development of a road-map to elaborate re-use standards at EU level;
- ensuring monitoring and reporting on re-use activities;

#### *4.6 Towards a European recycling society*

26. Underlines the importance of achieving common minimum standards for recovery and recycling at EU level, and stresses that a level playing field will only be established when the use of economic instruments is approximated throughout the EU;
27. Emphasises the importance of source separation of waste, as well as recycling targets and producer responsibility in order to increase the recycling rate of certain waste streams;
28. Recognises the need for better EU cooperation in managing cross-border waste problems;
29. Points out that any material-based approach to boost recycling should go hand in hand with a waste stream based approach; calls on the Commission to investigate further the feasibility and economic viability of such a strategy;
30. Calls once again on the Commission to propose separate directives on biodegradable waste, construction and demolition waste and sewage sludge, as indicated in the 6<sup>th</sup> EAP;
31. Calls on the Commission to follow up on its Green Paper on PVC and propose a separate directive on PVC, given the numerous environmental and health problems over its entire life cycle, in particular when it becomes a waste;
32. Calls for the quantities of waste for disposal to be reduced to a minimum; calls on the Commission again to revise the landfill directive, including a timetable:
  - from 2010, a ban on landfill of non-pretreated waste with fermentable components;
  - from 2015, a ban on landfill of paper, cardboard, glass, textiles, wood, plastics, metals, rubber, cork, pottery, concrete, brick and tiles;
  - from 2020, a ban on landfill of all recyclable waste;
  - from 2025, a ban on landfill of all residual waste, except where this is unavoidable or hazardous (e.g. filter ash);
33. Considers that Regulation (EC) No 1013/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 June 2006 on shipments of waste<sup>1</sup> implements legal obligations from the UN Basel Convention and OECD Decisions; supports the prevention of eco-dumping and sham recovery and underlines that an objective of regulating shipments of waste is to enhance the re-use and recycling of waste ensuring a high level of environmental and human health protection;

---

<sup>1</sup> OJ L 190, 12.7.2006, p. 1.



34. Emphasises the right of Member States to apply the proximity and self-sufficiency principle in relation to recovery or disposal of mixed municipal waste in order to encourage national planning of waste management and waste incineration capacity;

0

0 0

35. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council and Commission, and the governments and parliaments of the Member States.

## EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

### 1. Introduction

In December 2005 the Commission submitted a Thematic Strategy on the prevention and recycling of waste to the Council and the European Parliament, along with a proposal for revision of the Waste Framework Directive.

The strategy stems from the Sixth Environment Action Programme (July 2002) and follows from the Council's conclusions and Parliament's conclusions of April 2004 in response to a communication from the Commission. The objective of the strategy is to contribute to achieving efficient and sustainable use of natural resources, with a view to reducing the negative impact of waste on the environment. That is one of the reasons for the simultaneous publication of the strategy on resource use.

The European Union has been pursuing a policy on waste for more than 30 years. The policy was introduced in response to the fact that the problems of waste were becoming increasingly manifest, and the environment and public health were being put at risk by all of the harmful effects associated with the uncontrolled dumping of waste. That was the crucial reason for developing a policy on waste. The most important goal of waste policy has always been the protection of the environment. It is very important to keep this concern, the protection of the environment, firmly in mind.

### 2. The current situation

A great deal has been achieved over the past 30 years. Many harmful substances have been eliminated from products and therefore no longer end up in waste. More environmentally friendly methods of treating waste have been developed. It should, however, be pointed out that there are major differences between the Member States as regards the volume of waste re-used or recycled. At the EU level, legislation has been adopted on the export, landfilling and incineration of waste. In addition, legislation has been introduced for specific waste streams, such as waste batteries, packaging, cars and electrical equipment. It is proving no simple matter to adopt, implement, monitor and enforce legislation relating to so many different waste streams and different treatment methods, applying in 25 different Member States.

Although a great deal has been achieved with regard to legislation and its implementation, the following problems and shortcomings, in particular, exist:

- The volume of waste is continuing to increase.
- Too much waste is still being landfilled.
- There is still too little re-use or recycling of waste.
- Differences between Member States in terms of progress in (implementing) waste policy are still too numerous and too wide.
- Partly as a consequence of this, illegal and undesirable transport of waste is still a frequent occurrence.

- There is a continuing debate on the interpretation and implementation of waste policy, including with regard to definitions.
- EU legislation on waste is being inadequately implemented and enforced.

In the light of these problems, your rapporteur welcomes the fact that the Commission has finally put forward a proposal for a strategy. Regrettably, however, the proposal only addresses the aforementioned problems to a very limited extent. Few concrete measures are being proposed in the area of prevention and recycling. The only concrete proposals put forward have been taken up in the revision of the framework directive.

### **3. Aims of an evolving EU policy on waste**

The main aim of EU waste policy is to protect the environment, not to facilitate the internal market for waste. It is, of course, important to eliminate unfair competition on the waste market. That means that the same environmental conditions must apply to all of the Member States and must be enforced. Despite a history of 30 years of European legislation on waste, we are, regrettably, still a long way from applying the same environmental conditions. In the case of a number of waste streams, no legislation is in place as yet. In addition, existing legislation is not being implemented and enforced (in the same way) in every Member State. It is therefore very important to pay attention to improving the way in which current EU waste legislation is applied, implemented and enforced.

It should also be stressed that the precautionary principle, the 'polluter pays' principle, the principle of producer responsibility and the principles of proximity and self-sufficiency must continue to be fully applied in future EU waste policy. Above all for specific waste streams, the principle of individual producer responsibility can produce positive results, as, for example, in the case of packaging, batteries, cars and electrical equipment.

### **4. The key measures**

The Commission has proposed a package of measures, which may be divided into four main areas. These measures are set out, and commented on, below:

#### **4.1 Simplification and modernisation of existing legislation**

The Commission is proposing that a number of definitions be clarified, applied in a different way or interpreted differently. The definitions concerned are those of waste, disposal, recovery and recycling. In practice, it has become apparent that there are various misunderstandings, and some uncertainty, surrounding the definitions used in EU waste policy. The main reason for this is that the situation in practice, involving all kinds of different waste streams and different types of waste handling, is very complex. Moreover, the waste industry has often insisted on testing the boundaries of European waste legislation in the courts. This has led to a number of rulings by the European Court of Justice interpreting or clarifying the legislation. Generally speaking, the idea is that the Court of Justice only tests cases against current legislation. As, however, the current legislation is evidently unclear in places and contains shortcomings, the Court has been stepping to a greater extent into the shoes of the legislature.

The task of the legislature (the European Parliament and Council) is now to rectify the problem of the shortcomings and lack of clarity in the legislation. It is very important, however, to approach this in a well thought-out way. If definitions are changed, this could again lead to a long period of uncertainty and to fresh problems regarding how to interpret the new definitions. It is therefore better to take the existing definitions as the basis and to only clarify and supplement them where necessary. The complete set of definitions is designed to provide a clear framework for European waste legislation. The purpose of amending definitions is absolutely not to deal with problems of image or to get round certain rules on environmental protection laid down in waste legislation. Amending the definition of waste in order to classify certain waste streams as products so as to remove the negative 'waste' label attaching to them is not a legitimate reason for introducing such an amendment. The same applies to amending the definition of recovery with a view to getting away from the negative image of disposal. Failure to achieve targets for re-use, recycling and recovery of waste streams under other directives is also not a good reason for amending definitions. It should be stressed again that definitions should be amended on grounds of logic, consistency and clarity. If there are problems in connection with targets, it may perhaps be necessary to amend the targets, not, however, the definitions!

#### **4.1.1 Definition of waste**

The Commission is proposing to allow the possibility of classifying waste streams as non-waste. So-called 'end-of-waste' criteria have been established to that end. However, great care must be exercised in taking this approach. It is important to specify at the outset that this may only apply to a limited number of waste streams. That means homogenous waste streams which do not (and cannot) have a negative impact on the environment. A further prerequisite is that non-waste status must not lead to a reduction in environmental protection. Finally, non-waste status should only be able to be obtained after the waste has undergone treatment which results in a product that meets specific European quality criteria, ensuring that it may be used for the intended purpose in a safe and environmentally responsible way. Waste streams that may be eligible to be accorded non-waste status are recycled compost and the inert part of destruction and demolition waste (granulated rubble).

#### **4.1.2 Definition of disposal and recovery activities**

The definitions laid down in current legislation, as interpreted by the European Court of Justice, do not tend to promote good environmental practice. For example, co-incineration of waste in a cement kiln is deemed by the Court to constitute recovery and incineration of waste in a specialised incineration kiln to constitute disposal, although the environmental standards applying to pollutant emissions are less stringent in the case of co-incineration plants. In order to resolve this problem, the Commission is proposing to accord recovery status to incineration plants with high energy efficiency. This approach raises questions, as the incineration of waste is, clearly, designed in particular to dispose of waste. It would be better to resolve the problem in relation to incineration and co-incineration plants by imposing the same environmental conditions on both. In practice, that may be done by amending the directive on waste incineration in order to apply the same emissions and energy efficiency standards to both incineration and co-incineration plants.

The Commission gives technical committees an important role in determining when waste

ceases to be waste or when an activity may be regarded as disposal and when it may be regarded as recovery. Given that such decisions may have important consequences, they must be taken at the political level, through the codecision procedure.

#### **4.2 Introduction of life-cycle thinking into waste policy**

The Commission is proposing that, when deciding on the best way of handling a waste stream, a life cycle analysis be carried out. With the help of such an analysis, it is possible to determine what way of handling waste is best for the environment taking account of the whole of the life cycle, from production up to and including the treatment of waste. In principle, this approach is to be viewed positively, as it is based on looking at the overall environmental impact. On the other hand, there is a risk that this approach is chiefly theoretical in nature. In practice, it will be very difficult to carry out an objective life cycle analysis. If there are uncertain factors in the analysis, there will be a lot of room for discussion. That can quickly lead to an assessment being made on the basis of political, rather than purely technical, considerations.

It is therefore better to retain the current five-step waste hierarchy as the starting point. It is possible to envisage deviating from this hierarchy, however, in the case of a limited number of specific waste streams. It is necessary, of course, to clearly demonstrate, in that connection, that the handling of waste at a lower level in the hierarchy has clear environmental benefits. Furthermore, such decisions must not be left to technical committees, as they are policy decisions.

#### **4.3 Improving the knowledge base**

Although it is always desirable to improve the knowledge base in relation to waste policy, there is a risk that a disproportionate amount of time and energy could be devoted to this. This must not be done at the expense of adopting and implementing concrete measures to improve waste policy and better protect the environment.

The knowledge base for a life cycle analysis, for example, must lead to an objective method and be verified by an independent committee of experts.

#### **4.4 Waste prevention**

The Commission is simply proposing that possible measures on waste prevention be chiefly left to the Member States. The Sixth Environment Action Programme clearly states that specific reduction targets must be introduced. Such targets are not, however, being proposed by the Commission, although this is necessary given that waste generation is continually increasing. In one way or another it is necessary to separate economic growth and waste generation. Further introducing producer responsibility may possibly play a role in this.

#### **4.5 Towards a European recycling society**

The goal to which the Commission aspires, a recycling society, is a laudable one. However, it is important to be aware that, unfortunately, we are still a long way from that goal. Although the Sixth Environment Action Programme specified that the Commission must introduce new

directives relating to biowaste, construction and demolition waste and sewage sludge, it has not yet done so. There is, however, a great need for such legislation, as there is at present a lack of clear rules. That is not helping the environment or the internal market for recycling. Furthermore, the industry itself is asking for European legislation on these waste streams.

In addition, it is very surprising that it is being implied by the Commission that existing EU legislation is a problem. It is even being suggested that the targets for recycling of end-of-life vehicles and waste electrical equipment should be amended. Moreover, according to the Commission, the Waste Shipment Regulation should be overhauled, although (following intensive negotiations) the legislation in question is to be published shortly. The Commission is completely wide of the mark here, as the Waste Shipment Regulation is precisely designed to prevent cross-border shipments of waste that seek to circumvent environmental rules or treat waste in a way which provides less protection for the environment.

It is therefore essential for the European Parliament and the Council to expressly state that the main objective of European waste legislation is the protection of the environment.

Finally, the Commission is proposing that the Waste Oil Directive be repealed. In the proposal for revision of the Waste Framework Directive, the obligation to collect waste oils is retained. The risk, however, is that little motivation will be shown if waste oils may be combusted. The grounds for the proposal are that a life cycle analysis has apparently shown that regeneration of waste oils has no greater advantages for the environment than combustion. This is, however, disputed by the oil processing industry. Furthermore, in a number of Member States investment has specifically been channelled into infrastructure for processing waste oils. The Commission's proposal appears to be at odds with the goal of creating a recycling society.

## PROCEDURE

<b>Title</b>	A Thematic Strategy on recycling of waste
<b>Procedure number</b>	2006/2175(INI)
<b>Committee responsible</b> Date authorisation announced in plenary	ENVI 6.7.2006
<b>Committee(s) asked for opinion(s)</b> Date announced in plenary	ITRE 6.7.2006
<b>Not delivering opinion(s)</b> Date of decision	ITRE 22.2.2006
<b>Enhanced cooperation</b> Date announced in plenary	
<b>Rapporteur(s)</b> Date appointed	Johannes Blokland 29.11.2005
<b>Previous rapporteur(s)</b>	
<b>Discussed in committee</b>	13.7.2006
<b>Date adopted</b>	28.11.2006
<b>Result of final vote</b>	+ 51 - 0 0 0
<b>Members present for the final vote</b>	Adamos Adamou, Georgs Andrejevs, Irena Belohorská, Johannes Blokland, John Bowis, Frieda Brepoels, Dorette Corbey, Chris Davies, Avril Doyle, Mojca Drčar Murko, Edite Estrela, Jill Evans, Anne Ferreira, Matthias Groote, Françoise Grossetête, Cristina Gutiérrez-Cortines, Satu Hassi, Gyula Hegyi, Jens Holm, Marie Anne Isler Béguin, Caroline Jackson, Christa Klač, Eija-Riitta Korhola, Holger Kraemer, Marie-Noëlle Lienemann, Linda McAvan, Roberto Musacchio, Riitta Myller, Péter Olajos, Miroslav Ouzký, Vittorio Prodi, Frédérique Ries, Guido Sacconi, Karin Scheele, Richard Seeber, Kathy Sinnott, Bogusław Sonik, Antonios Trakatellis, Marcello Vernola, Anja Weisgerber, Åsa Westlund
<b>Substitute(s) present for the final vote</b>	Pilar Ayuso, Giovanni Berlinguer, Philip Bushill-Matthews, Niels Busk, Bairbre de Brún, Hélène Goudin, Ambroise Guellec, Jutta Haug, Karsten Friedrich Hoppenstedt, Miroslav Mikolášik
<b>Substitute(s) under Rule 178(2) present for the final vote</b>	
<b>Date tabled</b>	19.12.2006
<b>Comments</b> (available in one language only)	