



2022/0344(COD)

25.5.2023

OPINION

of the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development

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

on the proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Directive 2000/60/EC establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water policy, Directive 2006/118/EC on the protection of groundwater against pollution and deterioration and Directive 2008/105/EC on environmental quality standards in the field of water policy (COM(2022)0540 – C9-0361/2022 – 2022/0344(COD))

Rapporteur for opinion: Martin Häusling

PA_Legam

SHORT JUSTIFICATION

The rapporteur welcomes the proposed revision of the three water related pieces of legislation and suggests some targeted and limited improvements.

The overall slow progress in achieving the objectives of the Water Framework Directive can be attributed to a lack of implementation, an insufficient scope, and insufficient or inadequate restoration measures ensuring hydrological and ecological connectivity¹.

Member States and the Commission should see to it that the lack of implementation is overcome.

In line with the 2019 fitness check, lists of pollutants affecting surface and groundwater have to be updated, and the way of tackling them harmonised. Obligations for Member States should be swiftly aligned with latest science concerning contaminants of emerging concern. The monitoring of chemical mixtures should be improved. More generally, access to and transparency of data need to be ensured.

In the summer of 2022, the extreme impact of climate change on the availability of water became very apparent, and the scientific consensus tells us that this is just the beginning. Farmers and food production are amongst the first victims of climate change.

The environmental disaster unfolding, also in summer 2022, in the Oder river basin has shown the need to strengthen international cooperation and ensure the full and speedy cooperation of all Member States concerned.

Antimicrobial resistance has become a major threat to public health, and the rapporteur therefore very much agrees with the proposal to include antimicrobial resistance genes in the surface and groundwater watch lists, and draws the attention to water discharged by slaughter houses, which has shown to contain antimicrobial resistance genes².

Certain agricultural practices have been identified as an obstacle to achieving good status in EU water bodies, leading to nitrate and pesticide pollution in groundwater³. Member States should therefore ensure that the relevant Ground Water Quality Standards are fully respected.

Dealing with drought and therefore ensuring good quantitative groundwater status is ever more important. Heightened attention to abstraction practices is warranted, as water abstraction for agriculture has become a major pressure causing failure of good quantitative status of groundwater bodies⁴. Member States have to ensure an efficient and sustainable water use, including in agriculture, and controls over the abstraction of fresh surface water and groundwater may not exclude agricultural use.

Agriculture is both contributing to and victim of degrading qualitative and quantitative status

¹https://www.igb-berlin.de/sites/default/files/media-files/download-files/IGB_Policy_Brief_WFD_2019.pdf

²<https://www.greenpeace.de/publikationen/Antibiotikaresistente%20Keime%20in%20SchlachthofAbw%C3%A4ssern.pdf>

³<https://www.eea.europa.eu/themes/water/european-waters/water-quality-and-water-assessment/water-assessments>

⁴<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52021DC0970>

of surface and groundwater. It is high time to reverse the trend.

AMENDMENTS

The Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development calls on the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety, as the committee responsible, to take into account the following amendments:

Amendment 1

Proposal for a directive Recital 1

Text proposed by the Commission

(1) Chemical pollution of surface and groundwater poses a threat to the aquatic environment, with effects such as acute and chronic toxicity in aquatic organisms, accumulation of pollutants in the ecosystem and loss of habitats and biodiversity, as well as to human health. Setting environmental quality standards ***helps to implement*** the zero pollution ambition ***for*** a toxic-free environment.

Amendment

(1) Chemical pollution of surface and groundwater poses a threat to the aquatic environment, with effects such as acute and chronic toxicity in aquatic organisms, accumulation of pollutants in the ecosystem and loss of habitats and biodiversity, ***to forestry and agriculture***, as well as to human health. Setting environmental quality standards ***contributes to implementing*** the zero pollution ambition ***towards*** a toxic-free environment, ***helping to protect both the natural environment and human health***.

Amendment 2

Proposal for a directive Recital 1 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(1 a) Many territories in the Union are subject to large and increasing water constraints. The large and persistent droughts of recent years, especially in the Mediterranean regions, are putting agricultural production at risk and causing a serious decline in surface and groundwater reserves^{1a}.

Amendment 3

Proposal for a directive Recital 1 b (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(1 b) Given statistics from the European Environment Agency (EEA) show approximately 28% of all water consumed is used in agriculture, future revisions of these Directives should also take into account their impact on the availability of water and therefore food production, as well as quality of drinking water and environmental flow.

Amendment 4

Proposal for a directive Recital 1 c (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(1 c) Water is a public good for the benefit of all which, as an essential natural resource, irreplaceable and indispensable to life, must be carefully considered in its social, economic and environmental dimensions. Climate change, including increased frequency of natural disasters and extreme weather events, and the degradation of biodiversity, both negatively affect water quality and quantity, leading to pressure on sectors dependent on the availability of water, particularly agriculture.

Amendment 5

Proposal for a directive
Recital 1 d (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(1 d) While in its 2018 Report on “European waters - assessment of status and pressures”, the European Environment Agency (EEA) identified certain agricultural practices as obstacles to achieving good chemical status of groundwater in the Union, leading to nitrate and pesticide pollution, a steady decrease in use of mineral fertilisers and in nutrient surpluses has been observed in the EU over the last decades ^{1a}. Other significant sources are discharges that are not connected to a sewerage system, contaminated sites or abandoned industrial sites.

^{1a}

<https://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/state-of-water>

Amendment 6

Proposal for a directive
Recital 1 e (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(1 e) Good status of water bodies and efficient management of water resources represents a priority for agriculture, since farmers rely on water to conduct their activity, and as such, have a vested interest in the sustainable use of this resource.

Amendment 7

Proposal for a directive
Recital 1 f (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(1 f) According to European Commission 2021 Report on the implementation of the Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC), the Environmental Quality Standards Directive (2008/105/EC amended by Directive 2013/39/EU) and the Floods Directive (2007/60/EC), water efficiency continues to be a high priority for Member States, while considerable progress has been observed on basic measures addressing water abstraction, which remains a major pressure against the achievement of good quantitative status of groundwater bodies^{1a}. While agriculture is one of the major users of groundwater abstraction for the purpose of irrigation, food production serves a fundamental societal purpose, and thus should be prioritised in measures to promote water efficiency.

^{1a} <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT%20PDF/?uri=CELEX:52021DC0970>

Amendment 8

Proposal for a directive Recital 1 g (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(1 g) In order to facilitate a transition to a more sustainable and productive agricultural sector that is resistant to water constraints, incentives should be put in place for farmers to improve water management and modernisation of irrigation systems and techniques.

Amendment 9

Proposal for a directive
Recital 1 h (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(1 h) When used imprudently, pesticide use can severely affect water quality and quantity available for agricultural use, leading to negative impacts on both aquatic and terrestrial biodiversity. It is therefore appropriate to monitor the impact and ecotoxicological fate of pesticides and their metabolites in water bodies.

Amendment 10

Proposal for a directive
Recital 1 i (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(1 i) It is essential to consider the efforts achieved so far in sectors such as agriculture, where it has already been possible to reduce phytosanitary contamination by 14 % compared to 2015-2017 and the percentage reaches 26 % if we look at the most harmful pollutants. With all this, the figures show a continuous reduction in the use and risk of chemicals, with 2020 being the second consecutive year in which there has been a significant reduction in the use of pesticides, especially the most dangerous^{1a}.

^{1a}

https://food.ec.europa.eu/plants/pesticides/sustainable-use-pesticides/farm-fork-targets-progress/eu-trends_en

Amendment 11

Proposal for a directive
Recital 1 j (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(1 j) Chemical pollution of surface and groundwater also poses a threat to agriculture by limiting the availability of water suitable for crop irrigation, and further aggravating water scarcity. The Union and Member States should therefore increase support for research and innovation to rapidly deploy solutions to tackle surface and groundwater scarcity and pollution, including digitalisation, precision agriculture, optimised irrigation and modernisation of irrigation and a circular use of resources, for an improved climate-resilient water management and a more targeted application of pesticides and fertilisers for crops, less polluting and safer alternatives to agricultural inputs, more resistant and nutrient-efficient varieties and increased usage of treated wastewater for agricultural irrigation. This should contribute to achieving a sustainable and resilient EU food system while reducing diffuse pollution from agriculture and the need for agricultural abstraction.

Amendment 12

Proposal for a directive
Recital 2 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(2 a) In seeking to achieve a high level of environmental protection and in implementing the Zero Pollution Action Plan, the Union must take account of the diversity of situations in the different regions of the EU, the impact on food security, food production and food affordability, as well as healthy and sustainable diets.

Amendment 13

Proposal for a directive Recital 3 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(3 a) The objectives of achieving “good status of water bodies” and ensuring water availability are cross-cutting and are often not pursued in a sufficiently coherent way. Good water management should be mainstreamed in all EU policies concerning water-using sectors.

Amendment 14

Proposal for a directive Recital 3 b (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(3 b) The new Common Agricultural Policy 2023-2027 already increased the ambition and introduced mandatory respect of environmental and climate objectives, as well as giving the possibility to introduce and promote eco-schemes, including, for example, improving the Union’s water management.

Amendment 15

Proposal for a directive Recital 3 c (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(3 c) The fitness check pointed out that a better integration of water objectives in agricultural policy was necessary. The new CAP introduced measures making water management more sustainable. For an enhanced coherence between agriculture and water policy, Member

States should make full use of the opportunities available in the new CAP and integrate water issues fully in their strategic plans, including use of the AKIS, and stimulate advisory services to promote best practices concerning water management.

Amendment 16

Proposal for a directive Recital 7 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(7 a) The proper transposition of this Directive depends very much on the preventive measures put in place by Member States and the Union. Member States have not only a duty to measure, to the best of their ability, the chemical status of ground and surface waters, but also to take all reasonable steps to prevent water pollution.

Amendment 17

Proposal for a directive Recital 9 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(9 a) According to applicable Union law, Member States are obliged to identify affected and at-risk waters, designate nitrate-vulnerable zones, develop action programmes and implement relevant measures. In this regard, there is still a need for an improvement in the harmonisation of control measures and water quality measurement systems between Member States, so as to allow for harmonised standards across the Union that make comparability between Member States possible, thus avoiding competition problems in the European agricultural

sector, resulting in disturbances to the internal market.

Amendment 18

Proposal for a directive

Recital 10

Text proposed by the Commission

(10) Concern has been expressed about the risk of antimicrobial resistance developing from the presence of antimicrobial resistant microorganisms and antimicrobial resistance genes in the aquatic environment, but little monitoring has taken place. Relevant antimicrobial resistance genes should also be included in the surface and ground water watch lists and monitored as soon as suitable monitoring methods have been developed. This is in line with the 'European One Health Action Plan against Antimicrobial Resistance', adopted by the Commission in June 2017, and with the Pharmaceutical Strategy for Europe, which also addresses this concern.

Amendment

(10) Concern has been expressed about the risk of antimicrobial resistance developing from the presence of antimicrobial resistant microorganisms and antimicrobial resistance genes in the aquatic environment, ***including the risk to human health due to the use in agriculture of antibiotics supposed to be reserved for human use***, but little ***advancement of*** monitoring has taken place. ***This is due to a lack of standardized methods, including a lack of benchmarking and threshold data to inform evolutionary, epidemiological, and other risk modelling efforts^{1a}. The presence of AMR microorganisms and genes is a consequence of antibiotics use in human and veterinary medicine, while it must be noted that in the period of 2011-2018 a reduction of antibiotic burden in agriculture by 35% was achieved. However, to improve the knowledge base on their presence and origin***, relevant antimicrobial resistance genes should also be included in the surface and ground water watch lists and monitored as soon as suitable monitoring methods have been developed. This is in line with the 'European One Health Action Plan against Antimicrobial Resistance', adopted by the Commission in June 2017, and with the Pharmaceutical Strategy for Europe, which also addresses this concern. ***Member States should strive to identify key hotspots for evolution and dissemination of antimicrobial resistance.***

*^{1a} ECDC/EFSA/EMA second joint report on the integrated analysis of the consumption of antimicrobial agents and occurrence of antimicrobial resistance in bacteria from humans and food-producing animals, 2017
<https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/ecdcfsaema-second-joint-report-integrated-analysis-consumption-antimicrobial>*

Amendment 19

Proposal for a directive Recital 10 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(10 a) Substances such as microplastics pose a clear risk to public health and the environment, but also to basic activities such as the development of agriculture. The presence of these and other particles can have implications not only on the water received by livestock and crops, but also on soil fertility, thereby compromising the health and good development of present and future crops^{1a}.

1a

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2352186422000724>

Amendment 20

Proposal for a directive Recital 10 b (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(10 b) Commission Implementing Decision (EU) 2020/1729 repealing Implementing Decision 2013/652/EU^{1a} sets the framework to obtain comparable

and reliable data on antimicrobial resistance in the European Union, including by monitoring slaughterhouse wastewater as a potential vehicle of antibiotic-resistant bacteria and therefore a possible environmental contamination route. Antibiotic-resistant bacteria have been found in water discharged by slaughterhouses.

Amendment 21

Proposal for a directive Recital 12 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(12 a) Overall, the conclusions of the fitness check indicate that the Directives are broadly fit for purpose, with scope for improvement, including accelerating the proper implementation of their objectives, which might be achieved through more EU funding. The assessment indicates that the Directives have so far generally led to a higher level of protection of water bodies and flood risk management.

Amendment 22

Proposal for a directive Recital 13 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(13 a) In line with the subsidiarity principle, adequate flexibility should be provided when identifying specific measures on the national and regional scales.

Amendment 23

Proposal for a directive Recital 13 b (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(13 b) More than half of the water bodies in the EU do not comply with the threshold implemented for water quality, and there is a lack of data, which denotes the difficulties of the Member States' inspection and monitoring services in achieving the objectives set by the Directive^{1a}. It is therefore necessary to provide sufficient financial and human resources to the Member States' inspection and monitoring services in order to achieve the objectives laid down by the Directive.

^{1a} EEA, 2018

<https://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/state-of-water>

Amendment 24

Proposal for a directive Recital 13 c (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(13 c) Any decision in the selection, review of substances and EQS setting must be based on risk assessment and follow a proportionate, transparent and science-based approach, considering socio-economic consequences including food security and taking into consideration recommendations from the European Parliament, Member States and relevant stakeholders.

Amendment 25

Proposal for a directive Recital 13 d (new)

(13 d) While Directive 2000/60/EC set the rules to advance on water quantity and quality, the fitness check showed that the slow progress in achieving the objectives of this Directive can amongst other things be attributed to a lack of sufficient financial resources as well as regulatory and ecological complexity, including possible time lags for groundwater to respond to measures and with respect to reporting timelines. Measures that improve the status of water bodies through restoration of rivers and ecosystem services provide financial benefits that outweigh the costs and could reduce necessary expenditure for Member States. Furthermore, the evaluation points to a lack of implementation, an insufficient scope, and insufficient or inadequate restoration measures ensuring hydrological and ecological connectivity^{1a}.

^{1a} https://www.igb-berlin.de/sites/default/files/media-files/download-files/IGB_Policy_Brief_WFD_2019.pdf

Amendment 26

Proposal for a directive Recital 17

(17) The review of the list of priority substances in Part A of Annex I to Directive 2008/105/EC has concluded that several priority substances are no longer of Union wide concern and should therefore no longer be included in Part A of Annex I to that Directive. Those substances should therefore be considered as river basin specific pollutants and included in Part C

(17) The review of the list of priority substances in Part A of Annex I to Directive 2008/105/EC has concluded that several priority substances are no longer of Union wide concern and should therefore no longer be included in Part A of Annex I to that Directive. Those substances should therefore be considered as river basin specific pollutants and included in Part C

of Annex II to Directive 2008/105/EC together with their corresponding EQS. Considering that those pollutants are no longer considered to be of Union wide concern, the EQS need only be applied where those pollutants could still be of national or regional or local concern.

of Annex II to Directive 2008/105/EC together with their corresponding EQS. Considering that those pollutants are no longer considered to be of Union wide concern, the EQS need only be applied where those pollutants could still be of national or regional or local concern ***in that they present significant risks.***

Amendment 27

Proposal for a directive Recital 21 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(21a) In order to ensure consistency and clarity of the rules within the Union, it is necessary that this revision is in line and consistent with other rules linked to the same topic and which are currently under review or negotiation within the co-legislators.

Amendment 28

Proposal for a directive Recital 32

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(32) Considering the increases in unforeseeable weather events, in particular extreme floods and prolonged droughts, and in significant pollution ***incidents resulting*** in or exacerbating transboundary accidental pollution, Member States should be required to ensure that immediate information on such incidents is provided to other potentially affected Member States and effectively cooperate with potentially affected Member States to mitigate the effects of the event or incident. It is also necessary to reinforce cooperation between Member States and streamline procedures for

(32) Considering the increases in unforeseeable weather events, in particular extreme floods and prolonged droughts, ***which are the main drivers of crop failure,*** and in significant pollution ***incidents resulting*** in or exacerbating transboundary accidental pollution, ***as well as fires,*** Member States should be required to ensure that immediate information on such incidents is provided to other potentially affected Member States and effectively cooperate with potentially affected Member States to mitigate the effects of the event or incident. ***In this regard, it is essential to take into account***

transboundary cooperation in case of more structural, i.e. non accidental and longer term transboundary issues which cannot be solved at Member State level, in accordance with Article 12 of Directive 2000/60/EC. In case European assistance is necessary, competent national authorities may send requests for assistance to the Emergency Response Coordination Centre of the Commission, which will coordinate possible offers of assistance and their deployment through the Union Civil Protection Mechanism, in accordance with Article 15 of Decision 1313/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council⁶⁴.

⁶⁴ Decision No 1313/2013/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 December 2013 on a Union Civil Protection Mechanism (OJ L 347, 20.12.2013, p. 924).

in this revision that there are European regions that are particularly exposed to this type of extreme weather phenomena, as well as to water pollution, due to their particular geographical and climatological characteristics. It is also necessary to reinforce cooperation between Member States and streamline procedures for transboundary cooperation in case of more structural, i.e. non accidental and longer term transboundary issues which cannot be solved at Member State level, in accordance with Article 12 of Directive 2000/60/EC. In case European assistance is necessary, competent national authorities may send requests for assistance to the Emergency Response Coordination Centre of the Commission, which will coordinate possible offers of assistance and their deployment through the Union Civil Protection Mechanism, in accordance with Article 15 of Decision 1313/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council.

⁶⁴ Decision No 1313/2013/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 December 2013 on a Union Civil Protection Mechanism (OJ L 347, 20.12.2013, p. 924).

Amendment 29

Proposal for a directive

Article 1 – paragraph 1 – point 2 – point d

Directive 2000/60/EC

Article 2 – point 35

Text proposed by the Commission

‘Environmental quality standard’ means the concentration of a particular pollutant or group of pollutants in water, sediment or biota not to be exceeded in order to protect human health and the environment or a trigger value for the adverse effect on human health or the environment of such a pollutant or group of pollutants measured

Amendment

‘Environmental quality standard’ means the concentration of a particular pollutant or group of pollutants in water, sediment or biota not to be exceeded in order to protect human health and the environment or a trigger value for the adverse effect on human health or the environment of such a pollutant or group of pollutants measured

using an appropriate effect-based method.’;

using an appropriate effect-based method
*in combination with state-of-the-art
chemical analysis and according to the
best available scientific knowledge’* ;

Amendment 30

Proposal for a directive

Article 1 – paragraph 1 – point 3

Directive 2000/60/EC

Article 3 – paragraph 4a

Text proposed by the Commission

4a. In the case of exceptional circumstances *of natural origin or force majeure*, in particular *extreme* floods and *prolonged* droughts, or *significant* pollution incidents, which could affect downstream water bodies situated in other Member States, Member States shall ensure that the competent authorities for downstream water bodies in such Member States, as well as the Commission, are immediately informed and that the necessary cooperation is set up to investigate the causes and address the consequences of the exceptional circumstances or incidents.

Amendment

4a. In the case of exceptional circumstances, in particular floods, *fires* and droughts, or pollution incidents, which could affect downstream water bodies situated in other Member States, Member States shall ensure that the competent authorities for downstream water bodies in such Member States, as well as the Commission, are immediately informed and that the necessary cooperation is set up to investigate the causes and address the consequences of the exceptional circumstances or incidents.

Amendment 31

Proposal for a directive

Article 1 – paragraph 1 – point 7 a (new)

Directive 2000/60/EC

Article 11 – paragraph 3 – point c

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(7 a) in Article 11(3), point (c) is replaced by the following:

(c) "measures to promote an efficient and sustainable water use, including in agriculture, in order to avoid compromising the achievement of the objectives specified in Article 4;"

Amendment 32

Proposal for a directive

Article 1 – paragraph 1 – point 9

Directive 2000/60/EC

Article 12 – paragraph 1

Text proposed by the Commission

1. Where a Member State identifies an issue which has an impact on the management of its water but cannot be resolved by that Member State, it shall notify the issue to the Commission and any other Member State concerned and make recommendations for the resolution of it.

Amendment

1. Where a Member State identifies an issue which has an impact on the management of its water but cannot be resolved by that ***Member State or might affect another*** Member State, it shall notify the issue to the Commission and any other Member State concerned and make recommendations for the resolution of it.

Amendment 33

Proposal for a directive

Article 1 – paragraph 1 – point 9

Directive 2000/60/EC

Article 12 – paragraph 1a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

1 a. The Commission shall respond to any notifications from Member States within a period of six months. Where the issue concerns failure to meet good chemical status, the Commission shall act in accordance with Article 7a of Directive 2008/105/EC.

Amendment 34

Proposal for a directive

Article 1 – paragraph 1 – point 11

Directive 2000/60/EC

Articles 16 and 17

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(11) Articles 16 and 17 are deleted; **deleted**

Justification

Articles 16 and 17 include valuable provisions for a risk assessment and management that democratically involves all stakeholders

Amendment 35

Proposal for a directive

Article 2 – paragraph 1 – point 4 – point c

Directive 2006/118/EC

Article 3 – paragraph 5 – subparagraph 2 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

Member States shall ensure that the residents of the concerned river basin district or of the part of the international river basin district falling within the territory of a Member State are adequately and timely informed.

Amendment 36

Proposal for a directive

Article 2 – paragraph 1 – point 4 – point d

Directive 2006/118/EC

Article 3 – paragraph 6 – subparagraph 1

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

‘Member States shall amend the list of threshold values applied in their territories whenever new information on pollutants, groups of pollutants, or indicators of pollution indicates that a threshold value needs to be set for an additional substance, that an existing threshold value needs to be modified, or that a threshold value previously removed from the list needs to be re-inserted. If relevant threshold values are established or amended at Union level,

‘Member States shall amend the list of threshold values applied in their territories whenever ***scientific data in*** new information on pollutants, groups of pollutants, or indicators of pollution indicates that, ***as reported by on-the-ground monitoring at national level***, a threshold value needs to be set for an additional substance, that an existing threshold value needs to be modified, or that a threshold value previously removed

Member States shall adapt the list of threshold values applied in their territories to those values. ’; .

from the list needs to be re-inserted. If relevant threshold values are established or amended at Union level, Member States shall adapt the list of threshold values applied in their territories to those values. ’; .

(Article 2, paragraph 1, point 4, Directive 2006/118/EC)

Justification

This emphasises the importance of scientific data and the real situation at the national level

Amendment 37

Proposal for a directive

Article 2 – paragraph 1 – point 6

Directive 2006/118/EC

Article 6 a (new)– paragraph 1 – subparagraph 2

Text proposed by the Commission

The watch list shall contain a maximum of five substances or groups of substances and shall indicate the monitoring matrices and the possible methods of analysis for each substance. Those monitoring matrices and methods shall not entail excessive costs for the competent authorities. The substances to be included in the watch list shall be selected from amongst those substances for which the information available indicates that they may pose a significant risk at Union level to, or via, the aquatic environment and for which monitoring data are insufficient. This watch list shall include substances of emerging concern.

Amendment

The watch list shall contain a maximum of five substances or groups of substances and shall indicate the monitoring matrices and the possible methods of analysis for each substance. Those monitoring matrices and methods shall not entail excessive costs ***nor excessive administrative burden*** for the competent authorities. The substances to be included in the watch list shall be selected from amongst those substances for which the information available indicates that they may pose a significant risk at Union level to, or via, the aquatic environment and for which monitoring data are insufficient. This watch list shall include substances of emerging concern.

Amendment 38

Proposal for a directive

Article 2 – paragraph 1 – point 6

Directive 2006/118/EC

Article 6 a (new) – paragraph 1 – subparagraph 3

Text proposed by the Commission

As soon as suitable monitoring methods for micro-plastics and selected antimicrobial resistance genes have been identified, those substances shall be included in the watch list.

Amendment

As soon as suitable monitoring methods for micro-plastics and selected antimicrobial resistance genes have been identified, those substances shall be included in the watch list. ***The Commission shall consider whether including non-relevant metabolites of pesticides (NrMs) in the watch list is necessary to improve availability of data on their presence with regard to the scope of this directive.***

((This amendment corresponds to an amendment to Directive 2008/105/EC Annex I – table – row 7.))

Justification

The Drinking Water Directive (EU) 2020/2184 does not set a limit value for non-relevant metabolites of pesticides (NrMs). As quality standards for drinking water should have the relatively highest level in relation to other water quality standards, it is not apparent why stricter standards should apply to other types of water. Instead, the Commission should consider adding NrMs to the watch lists to be established under Article 2(6) and Article 3(7) of the proposal.

Amendment 39

Proposal for a directive

Article 2 – paragraph 1 – point 6

Directive 2006/118/EC

Article 6a (new) - paragraph 1 – subparagraph 4

Text proposed by the Commission

ECHA shall prepare scientific reports to assist the Commission in selecting the substances for the watch list, taking into account the following information:

Amendment

ECHA shall prepare scientific reports to assist the Commission in selecting the substances ***and indicator values*** for the watch list, taking into account the ***best available scientific knowledge and the*** following information:

Amendment 40

Proposal for a directive

Article 2 – paragraph 1 – point 6

Text proposed by the Commission

In selecting the representative monitoring stations, the monitoring frequency and the seasonal timing for each substance or group of substances, Member States shall take into account the use patterns and possible occurrence of the substance or group of substances. The frequency of monitoring shall be no less than once per year.

Amendment

In selecting the representative monitoring stations, the monitoring frequency and the seasonal timing for each substance or group of substances, Member States shall take into account the use patterns and possible occurrence of the substance or group of substances. The frequency of monitoring shall be no less than once per year, ***be based on the most updated data available, and set at a level that appropriately takes into account use patterns, possible occurrence of the substance or group of substances as well as climatic or seasonal variabilities.***

Amendment 41

Proposal for a directive

Article 3 – paragraph 1 – point 7

Directive 2008/105/EC

Article 8 b (new)– paragraph 1 – subparagraph 3

Text proposed by the Commission

As soon as suitable monitoring methods for micro-plastics and selected antimicrobial resistance genes have been identified, those substances shall be included in the watch list.

Amendment

As soon as suitable monitoring methods, ***following public discussion and involvement of relevant stakeholders,*** for micro-plastics and selected antimicrobial resistance genes have been identified, those substances shall be included in the watch list. ***The Commission shall consider whether including non-relevant metabolites of pesticides (NrMs) in the watch list is necessary to improve availability of data on their presence with regard to the scope of this directive.***

((This amendment corresponds to an amendment to Directive 2008/105/EC Annex I – table – row 7.))

Justification

The Drinking Water Directive (EU) 2020/2184 does not set a limit value for non-relevant

metabolites of pesticides (NrMs). As quality standards for drinking water should have the relatively highest level in relation to other water quality standards, it is not apparent why stricter standards should apply to other types of water. Instead, the Commission should consider adding NrMs to the watch lists to be established under Article 2(6) and Article 3(7) of the proposal.

Amendment 42

Proposal for a regulation

Annex III

Directive 2006/118/EC

Annex I – table – row 2 – footnote 12a (new)

<i>Amendment</i>					
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
[Entry] Nº	Name of substance	Category of substances	CAS number (¹)	EU number (²)	Quality Standard (³) [µg/l unless otherwise indicated]
1	Nitrates	Nutrients	not applicable	not applicable	50 mg/l
2	Active substances in pesticides, including their relevant metabolites, degradation and reaction products (⁴)	Pesticides	not applicable	not applicable	0,1 (individual) (^{12a(new)})
					0,5 (total) (⁵) (^{12a(new)})
3	Per- and poly-fluorinated alkyl substances (PFAS) - sum of 24 (⁶)	Industrial substances	See table note 6	See table note 6	0,0044 (⁷)
4	Carbamazepine	Pharmaceuticals	298-46-4	not applicable	0,25
5	Sulfamethoxazole	Pharmaceuticals	723-46-6	not applicable	0,01
6	Pharmaceutical active substances – total (⁸)	Pharmaceuticals	not applicable	not applicable	0,25

Footnote (12a) For freshwater used for the abstraction and preparation of drinking

water.

Justification

The individual and total limit value for active substances is derived from quality standards for drinking water under Directive (EU) 2020/2184. As quality standards for drinking water should have the relatively highest level in relation to other water quality standards, it is not apparent why the same standard should apply to all water bodies. Therefore and to comply with the risk management approach defined by Article 8 (4) of the Drinking Water Directive, the limit value should only apply to water bodies used for the abstraction and preparation of drinking water.

Amendment 43

Proposal for a regulation

Annex III

Directive 2006/118/EC

Annex I – table – row 7

<i>Text proposed by the Commission</i>					
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
[Entry] N°	Name of substance	Category of substances	CAS number ⁽¹⁾	EU number ⁽²⁾	Quality Standard ⁽³⁾ [µg/l unless otherwise indicated]
1	Nitrates	Nutrients	not applicable	not applicable	50 mg/l
2	Active substances in pesticides, including their relevant metabolites, degradation and reaction products ⁽⁴⁾	Pesticides	not applicable	not applicable	0,1 (individual)
					0,5 (total) ⁽⁵⁾
3	Per- and poly-fluorinated alkyl substances (PFAS) - sum of 24 ⁽⁶⁾	Industrial substances	See table note 6	See table note 6	0,0044 ⁽⁷⁾
4	Carbamazepine	Pharmaceuticals	298-46-4	not applicable	0,25
5	Sulfamethoxazole	Pharmaceuticals	723-46-6	not applicable	0,01
6	Pharmaceutical active substances – total ⁽⁸⁾	Pharmaceuticals	not applicable	not applicable	0,25
7	<i>Non-relevant metabolites of</i>	<i>Pesticides</i>	<i>not applicable</i>	<i>not applicable</i>	<i>0,1 ⁽⁹⁾ or 1 ⁽¹⁰⁾ or 2,5 or 5 ⁽¹¹⁾</i>

	<i>pesticides (nrMs)</i>				<i>(individual)</i>
					<i>0,5 ⁽⁹⁾ or 5 ⁽¹⁰⁾ or 12,5 ⁽¹¹⁾ (total) ⁽¹²⁾</i>

<i>Amendment</i>					
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
[En try] N ^o	Name of substance	Category of substances	CAS number (¹)	EU number (²)	Quality Standard (³) [µg/l unless otherwise indicated]
1	Nitrates	Nutrients	not applicable	not applicable	50 mg/l
2	Active substances in pesticides, including their relevant metabolites, degradation and reaction products (⁴)	Pesticides	not applicable	not applicable	0,1 (individual)
					0,5 (total) (⁵)
3	Per- and poly- fluorinated alkyl substances (PFAS) - sum of 24 (⁶)	Industrial substances	See table note 6	See table note 6	0,0044 (⁷)
4	Carbamazepine	Pharmaceuticals	298-46-4	not applicable	0,25
5	Sulfamethoxazole	Pharmaceuticals	723-46-6	not applicable	0,01
6	Pharmaceutical active substances – total (⁸)	Pharmaceuticals	not applicable	not applicable	0,25

Justification

For non-relevant metabolites of pesticides, the Drinking Water Directive does not set limit values. For the above-mentioned reasons, it is not appropriate to set limit values for ground water. Instead, the Commission should consider adding NrMs to the watch lists to be established under Article 2(6) and Article 3(7) of the proposal.

PROCEDURE – COMMITTEE ASKED FOR OPINION

Title	Amending Directive 2000/60/EC establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water policy, Directive 2006/118/EC on the protection of groundwater against pollution and deterioration and Directive 2008/105/EC on environmental quality standards in the field of water policy						
References	COM(2022)0540 – C9-0361/2022 – 2022/0344(COD)						
Committee responsible Date announced in plenary	ENVI 19.1.2023						
Opinion by Date announced in plenary	AGRI 19.1.2023						
Rapporteur for the opinion Date appointed	Martin Häusling 8.12.2022						
Discussed in committee	23.3.2023						
Date adopted	23.5.2023						
Result of final vote	<table> <tr> <td>+: </td><td>36</td></tr> <tr> <td>–: </td><td>0</td></tr> <tr> <td>0: </td><td>10</td></tr> </table>	+:	36	–:	0	0:	10
+:	36						
–:	0						
0:	10						
Members present for the final vote	Mazaly Aguilar, Clara Aguilera, Álvaro Amaro, Attila Ara-Kovács, Benoît Biteau, Daniel Buda, Isabel Carvalhais, Asger Christensen, Angelo Ciocca, Ivan David, Paolo De Castro, Jérémy Decerle, Salvatore De Meo, Herbert Dorfmann, Luke Ming Flanagan, Paola Ghidoni, Dino Giarrusso, Martin Häusling, Martin Hlaváček, Krzysztof Jurgiel, Jarosław Kalinowski, Elsi Katainen, Camilla Laureti, Gilles Lebreton, Norbert Lins, Elena Lizzi, Chris MacManus, Colm Markey, Marlene Mortler, Ulrike Müller, Maria Noichl, Juozas Olekas, Bronis Ropė, Anne Sander, Simone Schmiedtbauer, Annie Schreijer-Pierik, Veronika Vrecionová, Sarah Wiener						
Substitutes present for the final vote	Franc Bogovič, Anna Deparnay-Grunenberg, Jan Huitema, Zbigniew Kuźmiuk, Irène Tolleret, Tom Vandenkendelaere						
Substitutes under Rule 209(7) present for the final vote	Mohammed Chahim, Matthias Ecke						

FINAL VOTE BY ROLL CALL IN COMMITTEE ASKED FOR OPINION

36	+
ECR	Mazaly Aguilar, Krzysztof Jurgiel, Zbigniew Kuźmiuk, Veronika Vrecionová
NI	Dino Giarrusso
PPE	Álvaro Amaro, Franc Bogovič, Daniel Buda, Salvatore De Meo, Herbert Dorfmann, Jarosław Kalinowski, Norbert Lins, Colm Markey, Marlene Mortler, Anne Sander, Simone Schmiedtbauer, Annie Schreijer-Pierik, Tom Vandenkendelaere
Renew	Asger Christensen, Jérémy Decerle, Martin Hlaváček, Jan Huitema, Elsi Katainen, Ulrike Müller, Irène Tolleret
S&D	Clara Aguilera, Attila Ara-Kovács, Isabel Carvalhais, Mohammed Chahim, Paolo De Castro, Matthias Ecke, Camilla Laureti, Maria Noichl, Juozas Olekas
The Left	Luke Ming Flanagan, Chris MacManus

0	-

10	0
ID	Angelo Ciocca, Ivan David, Paola Ghidoni, Gilles Lebreton, Elena Lizzi
Verts/ALE	Benoît Biteau, Anna Deparnay-Grunenberg, Martin Häusling, Bronis Ropė, Sarah Wiener

Key to symbols:

+ : in favour

- : against

0 : abstention