

# EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2004



2009

---

*Session document*

**A6-0074/2008**

13.3.2008

## **REPORT**

on the mid-term review of the Sixth Community Environment Action  
Programme  
(2007/2204(INI))

Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety

Rapporteur: Riitta Myller

## CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
MOTION FOR A EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT RESOLUTION.....	3
EXPLANATORY STATEMENT .....	14
OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE.....	16
OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT.....	20
OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT	24
RESULT OF FINAL VOTE IN COMMITTEE.....	27

## MOTION FOR A EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT RESOLUTION

### on the mid-term review of the Sixth Community Environment Action Programme (2007/2204(INI))

*The European Parliament,*

- 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>,
- having regard to its resolution of 14 November 2006 on a Thematic Strategy on the Protection and Conservation of the Marine Environment<sup>2</sup>,
- having regard to its position at first reading of 14 November 2006 on the proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a Framework for Community Action in the field of Marine Environmental Policy (Marine Strategy Directive)<sup>3</sup>,
- having regard to its resolution of 25 April 2007 on the Thematic Strategy for the Sustainable Use of Natural Resources<sup>4</sup>,
- having regard to its resolution of 26 September 2006 on the thematic strategy on the urban environment<sup>5</sup>,
- having regard to its resolution of 13 November 2007 on the thematic strategy for soil protection<sup>6</sup>,
- having regard to its position of 14 November 2007 on the proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a framework for the protection of soil and amending Directive 2004/35/EC<sup>7</sup>,
- having regard to its resolution of 26 September 2006 on the thematic strategy on air pollution<sup>8</sup>,
- having regard to its position of 26 September 2006 on the proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on ambient air quality and cleaner air for Europe<sup>9</sup>,

---

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

<sup>2</sup> OJ C 314 E, 21.12.2006, p. 131.

<sup>3</sup> OJ C 314 E, 21.12.2006, p. 86.

<sup>4</sup> *Texts adopted*, P6\_TA(2007)0154.

<sup>5</sup> OJ C 306 E, 15.12.2006, p. 182.

<sup>6</sup> *Texts adopted*, P6\_TA(2007)0504.

<sup>7</sup> *Texts adopted*, P6\_TA(2007)0509.

<sup>8</sup> OJ C 306 E, 15.12.2006 p. 176.

<sup>9</sup> OJ C 306 E, 15.12.2006 p. 103.

- having regard to its resolution of 13 February 2007 on a thematic strategy on the recycling of waste<sup>1</sup> ,
  - having regard to its position of 13 February 2007 on the proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on waste<sup>2</sup> ,
  - having regard to its position of 23 October 2007 on the proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a framework for Community action to achieve a sustainable use of pesticides<sup>3</sup> ,
  - having regard to its resolution of 24 October 2007 on a Thematic Strategy on the Sustainable Use of Pesticides<sup>4</sup>,
  - having regard to its position of 23 October 2007 on the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning the placing of plant protection products on the market<sup>5</sup>,
  - having regard to Rule 45 of its Rules of Procedure,
  - having regard to the report of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety and the opinions of the Committee on International Trade, the Committee on Regional Development and the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development (A6-0074/2008),
- A. whereas Europe is not yet on the path towards genuinely sustainable development,
- B. whereas the Commission recognises that there has been only limited progress on the fundamental issues of integrating environmental concerns into other policy areas and improving the enforcement of Community legislation,
- C. whereas the Commission points to the fact that many environmental pressures are actually increasing: global emissions of greenhouse gases are rising, the loss of biodiversity is accelerating, pollution still has a major effect on public health, the amount of waste produced within the EU continues to increase, and our ecological footprint is steadily growing; whereas this raises serious questions about the environmentally counterproductive effects of other major EU policies,
- D. whereas it is unlikely that sustainable development will ever be achieved as long as environmental concerns are not fully integrated into all major policy areas;
- E. whereas a clean and healthy environment is essential for human well-being and good social conditions,

---

<sup>1</sup> OJ C 287 E, 29.11.2007, p. 168.

<sup>2</sup> OJ C 287 E, 29.11.2007, p. 136.

<sup>3</sup> *Texts Adopted*, P6\_TA(2007)0444.

<sup>4</sup> *Texts Adopted*, P6\_TA(2007)0467.

<sup>5</sup> *Texts Adopted*, P6\_TA(2007)0445.

F. whereas well designed environmental policies can also contribute to other objectives such as increasing competitiveness, stimulating economic growth, enhancing job creation and innovation and fostering scientific progress through the development of new, safe technologies,

1. Considers it regrettable that the mid-term review of the Sixth Environment Action Programme has been delayed by *almost a year* and deplores the fact that, on the whole, the European Union is not on schedule with the implementation of the measures planned in the Action Programme, contrary to what the Commission claims in its own mid-term review; recalls that, unlike its predecessor, the Sixth Environment Action Programme was adopted under codecision, pursuant to Article 251 of the EC Treaty; calls for the EU to do everything in its power to attain the objectives agreed in the Sixth EAP, as failure to attain them would damage the EU's credibility, inter alia in the eyes of members of the public who are concerned about the state of the environment;
2. Notes that the use of thematic strategies as a new procedural tool has increased the importance of the pre-legislative processes and created additional opportunities for stakeholder involvement and a more strategic approach to EU legislative policy; however, regrets that thematic strategies have also lengthened the duration of the environmental policy-making process by delaying the formulation of concrete policy proposals and the adoption of resulting measures;
3. Considers it essential to strengthen the position of the Sixth Environment Action Programme as the environmental dimension of the EU's sustainable development strategy;
4. Points out that thematic strategies are not useful if they coincide in timing with large legislative dossiers, they are useful either before the appearance of the relevant legislative document or on their own;
5. Stresses the direct connection between the state of the human environment and human health; calls on the Commission, with the aim of implementing the 'health in all policies' approach, to draft studies indicating the causal relationship between change in the quality of the environment and change in the state of people's health;

### ***Thematic Strategies***

6. Considers that the EU has acted consistently to attain the climate diplomacy objectives set in the Sixth Environment Action Programme; recalls, however, that, as far as the objectives and priority actions to halt climate change are concerned, the EU has not succeeded in fulfilling all the commitments; is extremely concerned about the increase in transport emissions and the slow effect of the measures which have been used in an attempt to improve energy efficiency; reminds the Commission to publish a communication on quantified environmental objectives for a sustainable transport system; expects Member States to attain the greenhouse gas emission reduction targets for individual countries laid down in the Kyoto Protocol by 2012;

7. Deplores the fact that the objective of halting the decline of biodiversity by 2010 will probably not be attained and that the proposed strategies for protecting the marine environment and soil will not produce concrete environmental results by 2012; notes that greater effort is needed to assist the integration of biodiversity policy into other policy areas; draws attention to the need for appropriate funding of Natura 2000 and other closely related priority objectives;
8. Considers that, as far as chemicals are concerned, Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006<sup>1</sup> of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 concerning the Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals (REACH) and establishing a European Chemicals Agency represents progress in reducing risks to human beings and the environment, but that it has yet to prove that it will effectively do so in a significant manner, and regrets that the regulation does not in all respects accord with the objectives agreed in the Sixth Environment Action Programme; considers it regrettable that the thematic strategy concerning the sustainable use of pesticides has been substantially delayed, and that the measures taken to improve air quality and the urban environment and to reduce noise fall far short of the objectives of the Environment Action Programme; calls on the Commission to present a proposal for a revised National Emission Ceilings Directive as soon as possible; believes that it is necessary to ensure full enforcement of the Environmental Noise Directive;
9. Given that indoor air quality affects health, urges the Commission and the Member States to support the World Health Organisation's work on indoor air quality and calls on the Commission to propose concrete legislative measures on indoor air quality as soon as possible;
10. Notes no major gaps in the specific objectives for water protection set out in the Sixth Environment Action Programme; however, calls on the Commission to ensure full implementation of the Water Framework Directive and to re-evaluate the integration of EU water protection commitments into other policies; in addition, urges the Commission to put forward as soon as possible a proposal for a directive on cutting the phosphorus load in agriculture as well as in detergents pursuant to Article 16 of Regulation (EC) No 648/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 31 March 2004 on detergents<sup>2</sup>;
11. Emphasises the need for a new water policy that focusses on the saving of water and on the sustainable management of water resources;
12. Considers it regrettable that the thematic strategies on natural resources and waste have watered down the objectives of the Sixth Environment Action Programme; regrets that no concrete targets have been formulated at EU level to decouple economic growth from resource use by turning towards a sustainable model of production and consumption; agrees that further action is needed on biowaste to encourage further diversion from landfill and ensure that the best treatment options, such as those based on mitigating

---

<sup>1</sup> OJ L 396, 30.12.2006, p. 1, Regulation as amended by Council Regulation (EC) No 1354/2007 (OJ L 304, 22.11.2007, p. 1).

<sup>2</sup> OJ L 104, 8.4.2004, p. 1.

climate change, are followed; further encourages support for environmentally friendly forms of waste management and measures to render more severe the consequences of landfilling of waste, which pollutes the environment;

13. Calls on the Commission and the Member States to take all appropriate action in order to ensure that natural resources are used rationally and efficiently and in a way which does not jeopardise biodiversity;

#### ***Implementation and enforcement of existing legislation***

14. Recalls that full and correct implementation of the existing legislation is a *top* priority and considers that binding legislation remains central to meeting environmental challenges; calls on the Commission to strengthen its activities as guardian of the Treaty; therefore also calls on the EU budgetary authority to provide the Commission with all the necessary financial and human resources to ensure that the most efficient monitoring of the implementation and enforcement of existing legislation is carried out in all Member States;
15. Emphasises the need for effective and accurate implementation of Community environmental legislation and recommends that special support measures be adopted for the benefit of regions which face difficulties in implementing that aspect of the Community acquis; encourages Member State authorities to draw up transposition strategies in order to clearly define the roles and responsibilities of national, regional and local authorities in correctly transposing and implementing Community environmental law;
16. Is nonetheless concerned at the various proponents' suggestions that common regulations should be reduced and weakened, or even replaced with voluntary agreements or other non-binding measures; therefore reiterates that better regulation should concentrate on unambiguous and transparent rules and standards based on legislation linked to agreed objectives, and on better enforcement thereof;
17. Commends the Commission's proposals to strengthen enforcement of environmental legislation at the national level through improved access to justice and harmonised use of punitive law; notes that the preventive aspects of punitive law contribute to better enforcement and protection of the environment;
18. Calls, furthermore, for EU environmental policies to be designed, and reviewed, so as to focus more on goal prescriptions rather than means descriptions, leaving Member States and farmers free to find the most effective and efficient means for reaching the desired goals;

#### ***Nature, biodiversity and climate change***

19. Considers that Sixth EAP should take due account of existing problems and the reluctance shown by many Member States to implement the Habitats and Natura 2000 Directives, and that thought should therefore be given to introducing incentives for landowners and local authorities to adopt constructive attitudes, with a view to rehabilitating the areas concerned and promoting their conservation; recommends, with due regard for the

principle of subsidiarity, that taxation measures be taken to promote best practice and deter people from engaging in activities that generate pollution;

20. Draws the Commission's attention, however, to the fact that holding out the prospect of consequences under the criminal law is not sufficient in every case to prevent illegal and at the same time environmentally polluting behaviour; stresses therefore the importance of penalties after the fact under the criminal law, particularly for the illegal dumping of hazardous waste in the territory of other countries;

#### ***Environment incentives and reform of environmentally harmful subsidies***

21. Welcomes the Commission's green paper on market-based instruments for environment and related policy purposes; believes that wider use of market based instruments, taking the environmental impact of all production and distribution processes and consumption patterns into consideration, is needed;
22. Is of the opinion that the EU Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS) has so far not led to reductions in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions because of the overly generous allocation of emission allowances; points out that the EU has committed itself to reducing its greenhouse gas emissions from 1990 levels by at least 20% by 2020; insists that the EU ETS for the post-2012 period include a sufficiently stringent cap, full auctioning and a quantitative and qualitative limit of the use of certified emission reductions (CERs) and emission reduction units (ERUs);
23. Nevertheless, notes that the role of eco-taxation remains modest and does not show an increasing trend; calls on the Commission and the Member States to devote more effort to ecological tax reform including a gradual shift of the tax burden from welfare-negative taxes (e.g. on labour) towards welfare-positive taxes, (e.g. on environmentally damaging activities, such as resource use or pollution); points out that despite the unanimity requirement in the area of taxation the treaties offer the possibility of enhanced cooperation, and draws attention to the existence of the open coordination method;
24. Notes the impetus that has been given to removing environmentally harmful subsidies; however, finds it unacceptable that no concrete steps towards the reform of environmentally harmful subsidies are expected in the near future, and therefore calls on the Commission to put forward concrete proposals by the end of 2008 to gradually phase out all environmentally harmful subsidies over the next five years;

#### ***Environmental policy integration, international cooperation and incentives for innovation***

25. Urges the Commission and the Member States to promote stronger and more coherent environmental policy integration in all EU policy-making; with the aim of implementing the 'health in all policies' approach which has been proclaimed in the European Union, calls for integration of environmental protection and health protection aspects into all policies and also to involve regions and towns in this; regrets both the lack of integration of these aspects in various environmental legal frameworks and the preparations for new legislation and the lack of their integration into legislation which has primary objectives



other than environmental protection;

26. Considers that, in order to achieve concrete results in the integration of environmental considerations in other economic sectors, there is a need to draw up binding sectoral targets and timetables; at the same time, stresses the responsibility of economic actors in individual sectors of industry for achieving long-term results in terms of climate and energy policy;
27. Emphasises the fundamental link between an efficient environmental policy and improved quality of life and, in this connection, highlights the importance of the regional dimension in the implementation of the Sixth EAP, especially in actions concerning the mitigation of and adaptation to climate change; highlights the importance of campaigns to raise public awareness of the objectives of the Sixth EAP and its implementation process;
28. Points to the need for regional development plans to take into account the Natura 2000 programme, so as to reconcile the principle of protecting Europe's biodiversity with the development and improvement of quality of life; with this in view, believes that a wide-ranging information campaign is needed, together with the promotion of good practice, to demonstrate how these two apparently contradictory goals can be reconciled;
29. Emphasises the need for better coordinated networks of regional and local actors in order to disseminate best practices to less developed regions and implement them; supports the promotion of cross-border environmental cooperation, both among Member States and with countries and regions neighbouring the EU, such as the regions of the Black Sea and Baltic Sea as well as the Mediterranean, particularly with the aim of preventing cross-border pollution;
30. Is concerned by the findings of various independent studies<sup>1234</sup> that the Commission guidelines on impact assessments are not fully respected by Commission DGs, that the assessment and quantification of economic impacts has been emphasised at the expense of environmental, social and international impacts, that the costs of legislation are assessed far more than the benefits, and that short-term considerations overshadow the long-term; considers that such unbalanced impact assessments are counterproductive with regard to environment policy itself and its integration into other EU policies; calls on the Commission to take action to rectify these persistent deficiencies;
31. Commends the Commission for its strong commitment to enhancing the international dimension of environment policy; believes it is necessary to ensure environmental policy integration in all the EU's external actions and improve international environmental governance; encourages the Commission and the Member States to continue promoting ambitious environmental policies and requirements, for example by promoting technology

---

<sup>1</sup> Impact Assessment of European Commission Policies: Achievements and Prospects, European Environment and Sustainable Development Advisory Councils, April 2006.

<sup>2</sup> Getting Proportions Right - How far should EU impact assessments go?, Institut for Miljøvurdering, April 2006.

<sup>3</sup> For Better or for Worse? The EU's 'Better Regulation' Agenda and the Environment, Institute for European Environmental Policy, November 2005.

<sup>4</sup> Sustainable Development in the European Commission's integrated impact assessments for 2003, Institute for European Environmental Policy, April 2004.

transfer and the exchange of best practices with developing countries;

32. Stresses that 'climate diplomacy' should be promoted with greater intensity and consistency in the EU's trade relations with states which are not bound by multilateral environmental protection agreements, such as the United States, China and India, which, for various reasons, are not implementing the Kyoto Protocol;
33. Recommends that a sustainability clause be added to the GATT, setting out principles of environmental policy, such as the precautionary principle and the polluter pays principle, against which trade measures can be judged, in order to ensure that trade rules do not undermine environmental protection and that environmental regulation is not used for the purposes of protectionism;
34. Calls on the Council and the Commission to use bilateral and regional trade negotiations to address trade commitments that have direct environmental benefits, such as boosting trade in sustainable goods and services, as well as a commitment to the effective implementation of MEAs; considers that, either within or outside these negotiations, the EU, together with the Member States, needs to intensify dialogue with emerging economies to turn dialogue in areas of mutual concern, such as climate change, waste management and illegal logging, into the implementation of joint programmes; supports the Commission's proposal to establish a Sustainable Development Forum, open to the participation of civil society, with a strong climate component, in each trade agreement and calls for this to be implemented in the current negotiations;
35. Calls on the Commission to assist developing countries in the deployment of sustainable and efficient technologies through such mechanisms as capacity-building, technology transfers, and financial and institutional support; furthermore, emphasises the importance of adhering to the principles of sound environmental policy in all projects of development aid through trade to developing countries, such as Economic Partnership Agreements;
36. Calls on the Commission to continue to seek an ambitious outcome on the negotiations under paragraph 31(i) of the Doha Declaration, emphasising how these different, but equal, bodies of international law should work together and interact in order to ensure mutual supportiveness in trade and environment policy;
37. Calls on the Commission to continue to pursue within the Doha Round a zero percent tariff for environmental goods and services and to work towards a consensus on their definition, which must include sustainability in their modes of production, but recommends, as a starting point, a specific link to climate change;
38. Calls on the Commission and the Member States to promote a more pragmatic and horizontal exploitation of innovation and new technologies in all EU policies, so that those elements play a pivotal role in strengthening the preservation of the environment; stresses the need to introduce without delay an EU 'top runner' approach, a more ambitious on-going improvement instrument for production and consumption patterns, to ensure that, in future, all EU market products are conceived, produced and used in accordance with sustainability criteria;
39. Recalls that investing in innovative, environmentally friendly technologies and in eco-

design, energy end-use efficiency and energy performance of buildings is very beneficial in the long term, despite possible high short-term costs, and emphasises the need for regions to encourage companies to take full advantage of such investments;

40. Encourages the Commission and Member States to adopt genuinely 'green' public procurement rules in order to promote innovation and sustainable consumption and production patterns;
41. Calls on the Commission to assist national, regional and local authorities to engage in joint sustainable procurements by providing a clear framework to facilitate the definition of measurable objectives and quality criteria;
42. Emphasises that energy crops must not jeopardise food supplies in Europe and elsewhere;
43. Calls on the Commission to intensify its efforts to achieve the 20% target for renewables and the 10% target for biofuel consumption; stresses that the sustainability mechanism, which is at the development stage, should apply the most stringent sustainability criteria to biofuels imported from third countries;
44. Points out that agriculture in the EU is increasingly geared to the production of safe, high-quality foods which will protect the health of Union citizens;
45. Encourages the Member States and their regional and local authorities to make optimal use of the new investment opportunities provided by the Structural Funds and the New European Neighbourhood Policy Programmes and to ensure that their Operational Programmes and projects supported by Structural Funds contribute to improved implementation of Community environmental legislation and the long-term goal of EU-wide sustainable development in a way consistent with the other thematic priorities;
46. In light of the problems caused by the use of by-products, considers it essential to improve and disseminate information on the substitution principle, which takes into account the availability, accessibility and costs of the substitute products; points out that account must also be taken of the production and use processes, which enable the use of products that do not represent a risk for human life as they do not come into direct contact with human beings;

***Better regulation principles in environmental policy***

47. Points out that, if better regulation is indeed an aim, there should be a revision of the overlapping in legislation that generates a bureaucratic burden and undermines competitiveness; considers that a new policy of legislative simplification should be developed, keeping the essential objectives and basic principles, but reconsidering the way in which the annexes to directives and regulations have been drafted up to this point;
48. Considers that the philosophical approach applied to the revision process is devoid of critical reasoning and does not involve analysis of the reasons and grounds for the delays; believes that only by analysing and reflecting on the causes of these delays can the right moves be made in the future;

49. Points out that if there truly is a wish to improve legislative methodology and to produce practicable rules that will be easy for the competent authorities, enterprises and citizens to apply, it is imperative to widen interaction between Community institutions and bodies and civil society so as to respond to their queries and to take into account the decisions and opinion of the regions, town halls, affected industries and related associations; stresses also that the real costs and need for transformation of existing equipment must be taken into account;

*Paving the way for behavioural change*

50. Points out that new ways to measure welfare based on realistic values for ecological services are needed; considers that GDP, as it cannot alone reflect all facets and needs of a modern society, is no longer an adequate tool to measure well-being and development; encourages the EU to further develop and make political use of a new indicator that integrates the negative impact of economic progress on our environment and health and that contributes to the effort of decoupling economic growth from the exertion of pressure on the environment; considers that this new indicator should promote the development of an integrated society and give the impetus for better integration of environmental considerations in other policies;
51. Calls on the Commission to treat the protection of human health as an issue of the first importance among environmental protection priorities;
52. Considers that the European Union should play a leading role in the development of policy options that would pave the way for radical behavioural changes in consumption and production patterns;
53. Stresses the importance of helping consumers become more aware in their behaviour, which – going beyond the State legal framework – may have a positive influence on the extent and intensity of the environmental commitments of market actors;
54. Considers that the provision of proper information to citizens should be considered a priority; strongly supports the development of a clear and comprehensive labelling system as it would greatly contribute to helping consumers to "make the right choice";
55. Insists that the Commission, or an outsourced institute acting on its behalf, should make an overall assessment of the results of the Sixth EAP before finalising the proposal for the Seventh EAP;
56. Takes the view that the final review of the Sixth Environment Action Programme should be performed by an outside body that is independent of the Commission; Insists that the Commission, or an outsourced institute acting on its behalf, should make a detailed assessment of the results of every chapter of the 6th EAP before finalizing the proposal for the 7th EAP;

o

oo

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

## EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

### Mid-Term Review of the Sixth Community Environment Action Programme

The Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety of the European Parliament has had an assessment made of how well the European Union has so far honoured its commitments under the Sixth Community Environment Action Programme, which was approved in 2002 and runs until 2012. This assessment revealed that the implementation of the Action Programme is either very behind schedule or extremely behind schedule in the case of a number of priority objectives. In the light of the measures so far carried out, it does not seem that the priority environmental objectives of the programme will be achieved by 2012. Accordingly, the assessment does not support the claim by the Commission in its own mid-term review that, on the whole, the EU is on schedule with the implementation of the measures planned in the Action Programme.

Before the Sixth Environment Action Programme was approved, there was considerable debate on how the EU-wide objectives in each priority field should be formulated. Parliament's rapporteur would have liked clearer quantitative and qualitative objectives and timetables to be included in the text. The Commission did not endorse the adoption of clear objectives and timetables. In its opinion, these demands would be taken into account in the thematic strategies to be adopted on the basis of the programme. Regrettably, however, the thematic strategies have proved a disappointment; they contain very few specific objectives and even where they do, they will not serve to attain the objectives of the Sixth Environment Action Programme. One example is the air quality directive, which still remains unfinished.

According to the assessment commissioned by Parliament, it may almost unequivocally be concluded that the Commission's decision to make specific proposals through the thematic strategies has not, on the whole, produced the result hoped for. Although they may be considered to have improved the participation of stakeholders and developed the strategic dimension of environmental policy, they have at the same time prolonged the environmental legislative process by delaying the drafting and adoption of specific legislative proposals. The greatest progress has been made in those subsections of the Environment Action Programme concerning which no separate thematic strategies were drafted. With regard to international climate commitments, for instance, the EU can be said to have succeeded in its action so far.

The Sixth Environment Action Programme provides encouragement for altering support systems which have a substantial adverse impact on the environment and for promoting sustainable production methods and consumption models by fiscal means. Unfortunately only little progress has been made in these areas, although more effective use of market-based instruments would have a strong impact on the attainment of the objectives of the Sixth EAP. Efforts should also continue to fill the gaps in environmental legislation by means of new legislative proposals and the appropriate resources should be provided to ensure that the Community's environmental legislation is implemented properly in every Member State.

Finally, it should be recalled that, unlike its predecessor, the Sixth EAP was adopted under

codecision pursuant to Article 251 of the EC Treaty. It is also more important than before that the EU should do everything in its power to attain the objectives agreed in the Sixth EAP. Failure to attain them would damage the EU's credibility, inter alia in the eyes of members of the public who are concerned about the deterioration in the state of the environment.

19.12.2007

## **OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE**

for the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety

on the Mid-term review of the Sixth Community Environment Action Programme  
(2007/2204(INI))

Draftsperson: Sajjad Karim

### **SUGGESTIONS**

The Committee on International Trade calls on the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety, as the committee responsible, to incorporate the following suggestions in its motion for a resolution:

1. Considers that, in the absence of worldwide compliance and understanding of environmental targets and objectives, the EU's efforts may result in a global competitive disadvantage for EU-based production as well as a very dangerous preference for non-environmentally compliant, poorly controlled sources of production worldwide;
2. Recommends that a sustainability clause be added to the GATT, setting out principles of environmental policy, such as the precautionary principle and polluter pays principle, against which trade measures can be judged, in order to ensure that trade rules do not undermine environmental protection and environmental regulation is not used for the purposes of protectionism;
3. Calls on the Commission to continue to seek an ambitious outcome on the negotiations under paragraph 31(i) of the Doha Declaration, emphasising how these different, but equal, bodies of international law should work together and interact in order to ensure mutual supportiveness in trade and environment policy;
4. Calls on the Commission to continue to pursue a 0% tariff deal for environmental goods and services and to work towards a consensus on their definition, which must include sustainability in their modes of production, within the Doha Round but recommends, as starting point, a specific link to climate change;
5. Notes that recent WTO Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) decisions suggest a preference for multilateral environment standard-setting; calls on the Commission to seek political



endorsement of the DSB's case law in order to reinforce the ability of policy-makers to take legitimate trade measures to achieve environmental objectives; considers it more urgent than ever in this respect to launch a public dialogue with a view to setting up an International Environment Agency to be responsible for all relevant matters of world environmental interest;

6. Stresses that whilst the Kyoto Protocol's enforcement mechanism - whereby, when a country exceeds its allowed emissions in the first commitment period, it will be required to make up the difference during the second commitment period - is good in theory, it is yet to be tested; calls on the Commission and the Member States to rigorously apply the Kyoto Protocol's enforcement mechanism and to contribute to an ambitious and inclusive post-2012 framework, engaging through equitable, differentiated and fair targets; stresses the urgent need for States which did not participate during the first period to join in the second commitment period, and to examine the possible nature of their participation according to their national circumstances; considers that, in the second commitment period, emissions should be allocated on a sectoral basis, through internationally agreed benchmarks and eventually combined with other national allocation targets, reflecting the principles of allocation per capita;
7. Recognises that developing countries will be unable to comply with emission reduction targets without considerable assistance with capacity-building and technological development; notes that the Clean Development Mechanism offers ways in which emissions-reducing investment can be channelled towards developing countries but considers that, in addition to this, developed states must also be prepared to increase resources available through the Global Environment Facility to assist with capacity-building and technological development;
8. Calls on the Commission to intensify its efforts to achieve the 20% target for renewables and the 10% target for biofuel consumption; stresses that the sustainability mechanism, which is at the development stage, should apply the most stringent sustainability criteria to biofuels imported from third countries;
9. Calls on the Council and the Commission to use bilateral and regional trade negotiations to address trade commitments that have direct environmental benefits such as boosting trade in sustainable goods and services, as well as a commitment to the effective implementation of MEAs; considers that, either within or outside of these negotiations, the EU, together with the Member States, needs to intensify dialogue with emerging economies to turn dialogue in areas of mutual concern, such as climate change, waste management and illegal logging, into the implementation of joint programmes; supports the Commission's proposal to establish a Sustainable Development Forum, open to participation of civil society, with a strong climate component, in each trade agreement and calls for this to be implemented in the current negotiations;
10. Stresses that 'climate diplomacy' should be promoted with greater intensity and consistency in the EU's trade relations with states which are not bound by multilateral environmental protection agreements, such as the USA, China and India, which, for various reasons, are not implementing the Kyoto Protocol;
11. Calls on the Commission to argue, in the context of the WTO agreements, for account to

be taken of the ‘sustainability impact assessment’ method and thus to assess over the long term how far the classification of environmental goods in the field of renewable energy sources is being properly taken into account in bilateral and multilateral agreements;

12. Calls on the Member States to adapt their government procurement policies to incorporate legality and sustainability criteria;
13. Considers that curbing deforestation is a highly cost-effective way of reducing greenhouse gas emissions and has the potential to offer significant reductions fairly quickly; calls on the Commission to accelerate the process of agreeing the EU's Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade partnership agreements and spread the system to other consumer countries; considers that, in the long run, this scheme should evolve into a global system to promote trade in sustainable timber; considers that the Commission should encourage companies to take action to control their own supply chains for timber and timber products, including introducing a requirement to include, in their annual reports, information on the legality and sustainability of the products consumed;
14. Calls on the Commission to assist developing countries in the deployment of sustainable and efficient technologies through such mechanisms as capacity-building, technology transfers, and financial and institutional support; furthermore, emphasises the importance of respecting and adhering to the principles of sound environmental policy in all projects of development aid through trade to developing countries, such as with Economic Partnership Agreements.

## RESULT OF FINAL VOTE IN COMMITTEE

<b>Date adopted</b>	18.12.2007
<b>Result of final vote</b>	+: 27 -: 1 0: 1
<b>Members present for the final vote</b>	Francisco Assis, Graham Booth, Daniel Caspary, Christofer Fjellner, Ignasi Guardans Cambó, Jacky Hénin, Syed Kamall, Sajjad Karim, Alain Lipietz, Caroline Lucas, Marusya Ivanova Lyubcheva, Erika Mann, Helmuth Markov, David Martin, Vural Öger, Georgios Papastamkos, Godelieve Quisthoudt-Rowohl, Peter Šťastný, Robert Sturdy, Gianluca Susta, Daniel Varela Suanzes-Carpegna, Iuliu Winkler, Corien Wortmann-Kool
<b>Substitute(s) present for the final vote</b>	Stavros Arnautakis, Jean-Pierre Audy, Jan Marinus Wiersma, Zbigniew Zaleski
<b>Substitute(s) under Rule 178(2) present for the final vote</b>	Guy Bono, Ulrich Stockmann

23.1.2008

## **OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

for the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety

on the Mid-term review of the Sixth Community Environment Action Programme  
(2007/2204(INI))

Draftswoman: Rumiana Jeleva

### **SUGGESTIONS**

The Committee on Regional Development calls on the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety, as the committee responsible, to incorporate the following suggestions in its motion for a resolution:

1. Calls on the Commission, with reference to the adoption by the European Council of 15 and 16 June 2006 of a renewed EU Sustainable Development Strategy, to add sustainable development to the list of the EU's key environmental priorities and to adapt the objectives of the Sixth Environmental Action Programme (EAP) accordingly, with a view to improving the quality of life of all citizens;
2. Stresses the direct connection between the state of the human environment and human health; calls on the Commission, with the aim of implementing the 'health in all policies' approach, to draft studies indicating the causal relationship between change in the quality of the environment and change in the state of people's health;
3. Emphasises the need for effective and accurate implementation of Community environmental legislation and recommends that special support measures be adopted for the benefit of regions which face difficulties in implementing that aspect of the Community acquis; encourages Member State authorities to draw up transposition strategies in order to clearly define the roles and responsibilities of national, regional and local authorities in correctly transposing and implementing Community environmental law;
4. Calls for increased cooperation at Community level in the field of disaster prevention, as outlined in the Sixth EPA; calls for the establishment of a European emergency response unit, as proposed in the report by Commissioner Barnier, and deplores the inertia and lack

of follow-up in this area; in this connection, stresses the need to continue to develop a rapid response capacity based on the Member States' civil protection units, in line with the mandate given by the European Council of June 2006; encourages the Commission to include disaster prevention as one of its objectives when addressing the issue of climate change;

5. Stresses the importance of helping consumers become more aware in their behaviour, which – going beyond the State legal framework – may have a positive influence on the extent and intensity of the environmental commitments of market actors;
6. Emphasises the fundamental link between an efficient environmental policy and improved quality of life and, in this connection, highlights the importance of the regional dimension in the implementation of the Sixth EAP, especially in actions concerning the mitigation of and adaptation to climate change; highlights the importance of campaigns to raise public awareness of the objectives of the Sixth EAP and its implementation process;
7. Points to the need for regional development plans to take into account the Natura 2000 programme, so as to reconcile the principle of protecting Europe's biodiversity with the development and improvement of quality of life; with this in view, believes that a wide-ranging information campaign is needed, together with the promotion of good practice, to demonstrate how these two apparently contradictory goals can be reconciled;
8. Emphasises the need for better coordinated networks of regional and local actors in order to disseminate best practices to less developed regions and implement them; supports the promotion of cross-border environmental cooperation, both among Member States and with countries and regions neighbouring the EU, such as the regions of the Black Sea and Baltic Sea as well as the Mediterranean, particularly with the aim of preventing cross-border pollution;
9. Recalls that investing in innovative, environmentally friendly technologies and in eco-design, energy end-use efficiency and energy performance of buildings is very beneficial in the long term, despite possible short-term high costs, and emphasises the need for regions to encourage companies to take full advantage of such investments;
10. Encourages the Member States and their regional and local authorities to make optimal use of the new investment opportunities provided by the Structural Funds and the New European Neighbourhood Policy Programmes and to ensure that their Operational Programmes contribute to improved implementation of Community environmental legislation and the long-term goal of EU-wide sustainable development in a way consistent with the other thematic priorities;
11. Calls, in particular, on Member States to ensure that projects supported by Structural Funds are consonant with the goal of protecting and improving the environment as specified in Article 17 of Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 of 11 July 2006 laying down general provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund and the Cohesion Fund<sup>1</sup>;

---

<sup>1</sup> OJ L 210, 31.7.2006, p. 25.

12. Calls on the Commission to assist national, regional and local authorities to engage in joint sustainable procurements by providing a clear framework to facilitate the definition of measurable objectives and quality criteria;
13. Calls on the Commission in the framework of the Sixth EAP to create a support fund or to extend the scope of existing economic incentives for developments which make it possible to feed energy from renewable sources into the existing grid established for the transmission of energy from fossil fuels; takes the view that the EU should seek to use agricultural waste as a raw material for producing biofuels.

## RESULT OF FINAL VOTE IN COMMITTEE

<b>Date adopted</b>	23.1.2008
<b>Result of final vote</b>	+ : 51 - : 2 0 : 1
<b>Members present for the final vote</b>	Alfonso Andria, Emmanouil Angelakas, Elspeth Attwooll, Jean Marie Beaupuy, Rolf Berend, Jana Bobošíková, Victor Boştinaru, Antonio De Blasio, Bairbre De Brún, Petru Filip, Gerardo Galeote, Iratxe García Pérez, Eugenijus Gentvilas, Ambroise Guellec, Pedro Guerreiro, Zita Gurmai, Marian Harkin, Jim Higgins, Filiz Hakaeva Hyusmenova, Mieczysław Edmund Janowski, Gisela Kallenbach, Tunne Kelam, Evgeni Kirilov, Constanze Angela Krehl, Jamila Madeira, Mario Mantovani, Sérgio Marques, Miroslav Mikolášik, James Nicholson, Lambert van Nistelrooij, Jan Olbrycht, Maria Petre, Markus Pieper, Pierre Pribetich, Wojciech Roszkowski, Grażyna Staniszewska, Catherine Stihler, Margie Sudre, Oldřich Vlasák, Vladimír Železný
<b>Substitute(s) present for the final vote</b>	Peter Baco, Jan Březina, Brigitte Douay, Den Dover, Jill Evans, Emanuel Jardim Fernandes, Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg, Dariusz Maciej Grabowski, Francisca Pleguezuelos Aguilar, Christa Prets, Miloslav Ransdorf, Czesław Adam Siekierski, László Surján
<b>Substitute(s) under Rule 178(2) present for the final vote</b>	Vladimir Urutchev

22.1.2008

## **OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT**

for the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety

on the mid-term review of the Sixth Community Environment Action Programme (2007/2204(INI))

Draftsman: Vincenzo Lavarra

### **SUGGESTIONS**

The Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development calls on the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety, as the committee responsible, to incorporate the following suggestions into its motion for a resolution:

1. Considers eco-conditionality, as applied in the system of Cross Compliance, to be a successful model for integration between agricultural policy and environmental policy and believes that it should serve as an example for other policies;
2. Calls on the Commission and the Member States to ensure that, when the CAP 'health check' is carried out, the application of eco-conditionality is simplified and that award criteria are introduced which will encourage farmers to modify their businesses and their farming practices on the basis of sound environmental criteria;
3. Calls on the Commission and the Member States to take all appropriate action in order to ensure that natural resources are used rationally and efficiently and in a way which does not jeopardise biodiversity;
4. Emphasises the need for a new water policy focusing on the saving of water and on the sustainable management of water resources;
5. Emphasises that energy crops must not jeopardise food supplies in Europe and elsewhere;
6. Calls on the Commission and the Member States to invest primarily in second-generation bio-fuels, algae production and in the use for energy purposes of waste products from



existing production sectors, such as the wine-producing sector;

7. Points out that agriculture can make a major contribution to combating climate change but that at the same time it suffers the effects of such change; adaptation policies should therefore be implemented in order to make agriculture less vulnerable whilst at the same time making it more environmentally sustainable;
8. Calls further for European environmental policies to be designed, and reviewed, so as to focus more on goal prescriptions rather than means descriptions, which would enable Member States and farmers to find the most effective and efficient means for reaching the desired goals;
9. Points out that multifunctional farming helps to protect the rural landscape by saving it from abandonment and hence from the risk of fire and other natural disasters;
10. Points out that European agriculture is increasingly geared to the production of safe, high-quality foods which will protect the health of Europe's people.

## RESULT OF FINAL VOTE IN COMMITTEE

<b>Date adopted</b>	22.1.2008
<b>Result of final vote</b>	+: 29 -: - 0: -
<b>Members present for the final vote</b>	Peter Baco, Niels Busk, Luis Manuel Capoulas Santos, Gintaras Didžiokas, Constantin Dumitriu, Giovanna Corda, Carmen Fraga Estévez, Ioannis Gklavakis, Friedrich-Wilhelm Graefe zu Baringdorf, Esther Herranz García, Lily Jacobs, Elisabeth Jeggle, Heinz Kindermann, Vincenzo Lavarra, Diamanto Manolakou, Véronique Mathieu, Mairead McGuinness, Rosa Miguélez Ramos, Neil Parish, María Isabel Salinas García, Agnes Schierhuber, Willem Schuth, Czesław Adam Siekierski, Alyn Smith
<b>Substitute(s) present for the final vote</b>	Catherine Neris, Maria Petre, Markus Pieper, Struan Stevenson, Kyösti Virrankoski
<b>Substitute(s) under Rule 178(2) present for the final vote</b>	-

## RESULT OF FINAL VOTE IN COMMITTEE

<b>Date adopted</b>	26.2.2008
<b>Result of final vote</b>	+:           50 -:           1 0:           2
<b>Members present for the final vote</b>	Adamos Adamou, Margrete Auken, Pilar Ayuso, Irena Belohorská, Johannes Blokland, John Bowis, Dorette Corbey, Magor Imre Csibi, Chris Davies, Avril Doyle, Mojca Drčar Murko, Edite Estrela, Jill Evans, Matthias Groote, Françoise Grossetête, Cristina Gutiérrez-Cortines, Satu Hassi, Gyula Hegyi, Marie Anne Isler Béguin, Dan Jørgensen, Christa Kläß, Eija-Riitta Korhola, Holger Krahrmer, Urszula Krupa, Aldis Kušķis, Peter Liese, Jules Maaten, Linda McAvan, Roberto Musacchio, Riitta Myller, Miroslav Ouzký, Vladko Todorov Panayotov, Vittorio Prodi, Guido Sacconi, Karin Scheele, Carl Schlyter, Richard Seeber, María Sornosa Martínez, Antonios Trakatellis, Evangelia Tzampazi, Thomas Ulmer, Marcello Vernola, Anja Weisgerber, Åsa Westlund, Anders Wijkman, Glenis Willmott
<b>Substitute(s) present for the final vote</b>	Kathalijne Maria Buitenweg, Philip Bushill-Matthews, Hélène Goudin, Genowefa Grabowska, Jutta Haug, Johannes Lebech, Lambert van Nistelrooij