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

1. Recognises the importance of EU macro-regional strategies, namely the 2009 EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region (EUSBSR), the 2011 EU Strategy for the Danube Region (EUSDR), the 2014 EU Strategy for the Adriatic and Ionian Region (EUSAIR), and the 2015 EU Strategy for the Alpine Region (EUSALP); notes that macro-regional strategies are being consistently integrated into policy planning at EU level, but more sporadically at national and regional level; welcomes the Commission’s report but considers that further assessment was needed regarding the implementation of the existing macro-regional strategies, and especially of aspects pertaining to the environment, as one of the pillars of sustainable development; urges the Commission to focus in particular on the results of projects under the macro-regional strategies in forthcoming reports;

2. Recognises the importance of macro-regional strategies in providing a single integrated framework and fostering coordinated action for addressing the common challenges faced by different actors in a defined geographical area encompassing Member States and third countries, which benefit in this way from strengthened cooperation contributing to the achievement of economic, social and territorial cohesion; calls on the Commission and participating countries and their regions to develop synergies, and to further integrate macro-regional strategies into EU sectoral policies, particularly in the areas of environmental and biodiversity protection, climate mitigation and adaptation;

3. Underlines the potential benefits of collective action in the framework of macro-regional strategies with regard to environmental issues, including but not limited to those of a cross-border nature, such as the reduction of greenhouse gases and pollutant emissions, biodiversity and environmental protection, as well as ecosystem-based climate change adaptation strategies; considers that the strategies could be even more effectively administered as regards sustainable development, climate change, renewables and the blue economy; believes that policy coordination among regions is an effective approach for finding lasting solutions to environmental challenges; calls for the concept of environmental integration to be mainstreamed in the design and implementation of various cross-sectoral policies for the current and future macro-regions;

4. Encourages the expansion of conservation areas to protect the environment and halt biodiversity loss, particularly through the enhancement of the Natura 2000, Emerald networks, and the LIFE programme;

5. Considers that the macro-regional strategies and associated environmental programmes are useful instruments for making the benefits of European cooperation visible to citizens, and therefore urges all parties involved to fully commit to the strategies and play their part in their implementation;

6. Calls for the timely adoption of maritime spatial planning and integrated coastal management strategies by the Member States as well as coastal candidate and potential candidate countries;
7. Points out that in rural areas nature is the economic base for many inhabitants and that environmental programmes can only be successful if supported by the local inhabitants; stresses, therefore, that in order to deliver on environmental protection goals such projects must take full account of the long-term economic interests of locals;

8. Urges all stakeholders to pursue climate change policies encompassing production and consumption patterns that are in line with the principles of the circular economy, environmental and health protection and shorter cycles in the food supply chain, and to place the emphasis on the rational use and reuse of local materials and natural resources, insuring non-toxic material cycles, including wastewater and agricultural waste, and to foster close links between producers and consumers at local level; encourages all macro-regional strategies to apply a policy of green public procurement in order to boost eco-innovation and the development of new business models;


10. Stresses the importance of stakeholder dialogue and public communication of the macro-regional strategies to make them known and gain acceptance in the local communities; considers this a key element to lead the macro-regional strategies to success;

11. Calls for the specific synchronisation and better coordinated use of existing funds at all levels to reach macro-regional objectives, and to unlock the potential of macro-regional strategies; recommends that the experiences gained from macro-regional strategies be used to improve the effectiveness of the relevant Union financial instruments; takes note that Union funding is usually linked to defined projects whereas environmental challenges require a long-term approach; highlights the need for the Commission, Member States and competent authorities to consider this long-term perspective in the funding of projects and in the design of future funding programmes and to coordinate more effectively the resources available for funding the particular environmental goals of the macro-regions and to tailor their use towards political priorities;

12. Stresses the importance of developing monitoring and evaluation tools for various indicators in order to better measure the achievement of environmental targets without creating an unnecessary administrative burden for project partners and stakeholders;

13. Calls on the stakeholders of the macro-regions to use European Structural and Investment Funds (ESI Funds) and other Union funding to promote environment-related investments that have climate change mitigation among their objectives;

14. Calls on stakeholders in the macro-regions, in addition to the funds relevant to macro-regional strategies and the instruments for the financing of particular environmental objectives, to also consider using the European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSI);

15. Points out that the sea of the Adriatic and Ionian region is threatened by various sources of pollution, including untreated waste, marine litter, untreated effluent and eutrophication from agricultural runoff and fish farms; calls therefore on the participating countries to further step up their efforts in tackling these environmental challenges; stresses the importance of introducing for this purpose a proper system for the treatment of waste and
effluent and the protection of water supplies;

16. Points out that the Adriatic Sea, due to its semi-enclosed nature, is especially vulnerable to pollution and has unusual hydrographic features – its depth and the length of its coastline vary considerably between the north and south of the region; welcomes the fact that all four pillars of the Adriatic and Ionian region are designed to contribute to sustainability goals;

17. Believes that completion of road and transport infrastructures and measures to realise the immense untapped potential of renewable energy sources are essential conditions for achieving environmental sustainability goals in the macro-region;

18. Points to the need to ensure environmental sustainability in the Adriatic and Ionian macro-region by means of specific environmental protection measures, including projects for the launching of surveys and the prevention of subsidence;

19. Recalls its previous position as set out on its resolution of 3 July 2012 on the evolution of EU macro-regional strategies: present practice and future prospects, especially in the Mediterranean; points out that the Mediterranean is a coherent whole, constituting a single cultural and environmental area, and sharing very many characteristics and priorities common to the ‘Mediterranean climate’: the same crops, abundant renewable energy sources, particularly solar energy, the importance of tourism, the same natural disaster risks (fires, floods, earthquakes, water shortages) and the risks from human activity, particularly maritime pollution; reaffirms once again its support for the implementation of a macro-regional strategy for the Mediterranean basin, so as to offer an action plan for addressing the common and problematic challenges facing the Mediterranean countries and regions and to give structure to this key area for Europe’s development and integration, and calls on the Council and the Commission to act quickly on this matter;

20. Calls on the Commission to ensure that third countries involved in projects in the macro-region comply with the relevant Union acquis, in order to guarantee the sustainable exploitation of the Union’s resources, in particular the Marine Strategy Framework, the Water Framework, Urban Waste Water, Nitrates, Waste, Birds and Habitats Directives and the Green Infrastructure Strategy; recommends that agreements and conventions be used to involve countries outside the EU in EU environmental projects;

21. Considers the Sustainable Tourism pillar of the Adriatic and Ionian region as a positive instrument to create sustainable economic growth in the region as well as raising awareness for environmental challenges and the macro-regional strategies;

22. Points out that the rich biodiversity of the marine-coastal areas of the Adriatic-Ionian region is a major draw for tourism, recreational and fishing activities, and contributes to the cultural heritage of the macro-region; considers, therefore, the lack of habitat maps unfortunate; calls on the participant countries to undertake mapping actions within the framework of the EUSAIR;

23. Emphasises that an ecosystem-based approach to the coordination of activities is needed within the framework of Integrated Coastal Management (ICM) and Marine Spatial Planning (MSP), in order to ensure the sustainable use of resources, as both frameworks are important stimulants for trans-boundary collaboration and stakeholder cooperation
across different coastal and maritime sector activities, and have the potential to bring together ecosystem services and Blue Growth opportunities in a sustainable way;

24. Calls for the establishment of a coordinated monitoring system and database on marine litter and marine pollution, including the identification of sources and types of litter and pollution, as well as a geographic information system (GIS) database on the location and sources of marine litter;

25. Calls for the drafting and implementation of a joint contingency plan for oil spills and other large-scale pollution events, building on the work of the sub-regional contingency plan developed by the joint commission for the Protection of the Adriatic Sea and its Coastal Areas, and the Barcelona Convention protocols;

26. Calls on the countries involved to give priority to capacity-building directed at the EUSAIR key implementers, as well as at programme authorities responsible for EUSAIR relevant operational programmes;

27. Stresses that preventing damage caused by massive floods remains one of the great environmental challenges for the countries of the Danube macro-region; highlights that supplementary joint measures to prevent cross-border pollution should be considered;

28. Notes with appreciation the implementation of projects such as DANUBEPARKS 2.0, STURGEON 2020, SEERISK, CC-WARE and the Danube Air Nexus cluster in reaching the EUSDR environmental goals;

29. Welcomes the Danube region project ‘EuroAccess’ as a tool to make available funding more accessible and encourages other macro-regional regions to consider this as a best practice;

30. Calls on the Commission to commence the development of an Iberian Peninsula macro-region meeting the challenges of conducting a properly planned forestry policy in line with climatic requirements, in a bid to remedy rural depopulation, desertification and soil erosion through the proper ecological management and diversification of forests, planting native deciduous trees that are more fire-resistant, thereby helping to reverse the massive fire damage sustained by forests every year in Portugal and Spain;

31. Welcomes the setting up of the Interreg Danube Transnational Programme as a tool for providing support to its governance, and highlights its direct contribution to the strategy’s implementation as being one of the most visible results of the EUSDR;

32. Stresses that a more integrated approach to mobility and multimodality in the Danube region would also be beneficial to the environment;

33. Stresses that the Commission should rapidly initiate studies for the development of an Iberian macro-region in view of the major cross-border challenges arising in connection with climate change, environmental protection, risk prevention and management, the efficient use of resources, nature conservation, biodiversity, shared water resources and exploration of the potential of the blue economy and of renewables;

34. Welcomes the setting up of the Danube Strategy Point as a new body for facilitating the
implementation of the EUSDR, and encourages the involvement of all parties concerned and potentially interested actors;

35. Notes with concern that, compared to the first years of its activity, the EUSDR now seems to have been given a lower priority slot in the political narrative at national level in those countries involved; emphasises the need to maintain the political momentum since the commitment by countries directly affects the availability of human resources in the national and regional administrations, and this is crucial for the smooth functioning of the strategy, and for working towards a consolidation of the progress made and results achieved so far;

36. Calls on the participant countries to ensure an adequate participation of national representatives in EUSDR Steering Group meetings on priority areas, and to consider reducing the number and scope of current priority areas if sufficient resources are not allocated within well-defined timeframes;

37. Highlights the issue of numerous sunken ships in the Danube that present a navigational and ecological danger, especially where water levels are low; points out that sunken wrecks contain appreciable amounts of fuel and other substances that pollute water constantly, while the rusting metal of the ships generates pollution on a continuous basis with serious repercussions; calls for the mobilisation of EU funds for tackling this problem and greater co-operation in the framework of the EUSDR;

38. Calls on the stakeholders of the Alpine macro-region to use ESI Funds and other Union funding to promote environment-related investments that have climate change mitigation and adaptation among their objectives; welcomes, in particular, the region’s integrated approach to align the preservation of the environment and ecosystems with the pursuit of economic and social prosperity;

39. Underlines that environmental policy is of a cross-cutting nature and that the favoured options in Alpine strategy fields must reconcile environmental sustainability and economic development; points out that the Alpine region is an important regional transport hub and, at the same time, one of the largest natural and recreation areas, and one of the most attractive tourism regions in Europe; notes however that, because of its particular geographical and natural conditions, access to parts of the region is a challenge; considers that, in order to preserve the Alps as a unique natural area, it is vital to create sustainable and interrelated transport strategies and take into account climate change mitigation and biodiversity preservation policies, such as habitat connectivity, to allow species migration;

40. Is concerned that climate change can give rise to hydrogeological instability and threaten biodiversity in the Alpine Region; underlines that rising temperatures are a serious threat to the survival of species’ populations living at high altitudes, and that the melting of glaciers is a further cause for concern, as it has a major impact on groundwater reserves;

41. Stresses that the Alpine region’s tourism and agricultural sector are key stakeholder for the regional sustainable development and therefore should be integrated at all stages of the implementation of environmental projects;

42. Notes that the first steps in the implementation of the EUSALP strategy have shown that
its integration into the existing programmes has proven difficult, as they are governed by structures, frameworks and timeframes which are often incompatible with the needs of a macro-regional strategy;

43. Calls on the participant countries to reinforce their commitment, continuity, stability, empowerment and support to the EUSALP Action Group members who will represent them, and to make sure that all Action Groups are adequately represented;

44. Welcomes the implementation of environmentally beneficial projects in the Baltic region, such as BLASTIC to reduce marine littering, the Climate Dialogue Platform to strengthen an integrated response to climate challenges and PRESTO to improve water quality; considers however that further efforts are needed to tackle the environmental challenges faced in the Baltic macro-region, and in particular as regards eutrophication, better protection of the sea itself, air quality and pollution;

45. Points out that the environmental state of the Baltic Sea has remained the main focus of the EUSBSR since its launch in 2009;

46. Recalls that the Baltic Sea is one of the most polluted seas in the world; stresses the importance of cooperation to improve the state of the Baltic Sea; calls for neighbourhood programmes to continue throughout the Baltic Sea catchment area and to include in them funding by means of which the state of the environment can be improved throughout the catchment area;

47. Notes that achieving a good environmental status by 2020 is one of the key objectives of policy actions in the Baltic Sea Region;

48. Considers it deplorable from the point of view of the marine macro-regions that ships can discharge untreated effluent into the sea if they are more than 12 nautical miles (approximately 22 km) from the coast and that treated effluent can even be discharged into the water three nautical miles (approximately 5.5 km) from the coast; calls for funding to be provided to increase the reception capacity for effluent at ports so that all passenger vessels can treat their effluent as required by the revised Annex IV to the MARPOL Convention;

49. Calls on all stakeholders to organise more frequent and regular political discussions on the EUSBSR at national level within the parliament or government, and also within the Council at the relevant Ministerial meetings;

50. Welcomes, from the point of view of the Baltic macro-region, the Sulphur Directive adopted by the EU and the decision by the Marine Environment Protection Committee of the International Maritime Organisation (IMO) of 27 October 2016 to designate the Baltic Sea and the North Sea an NO\textsuperscript{X}Emission Control Area (NECA); recalls that the unclean fuels used by vessels are still resulting in the emission of large quantities of nitrogen and sulphur into the air, from where they fall into the sea;

51. Notes that the EUSBSR is a stable cooperation framework with more than 100 flagship initiatives and new networks; nevertheless, urges stakeholders to maintain its momentum and to improve policy coordination and content by building on project results;
52. Considers it important to review the permission for users of open-loop sulphur scrubbers to discharge sulphur-scrubbing water back into the sea; observes that effluent from closed-loop sulphur scrubbers has to be delivered for treatment, but that effluent from open-loop scrubbers is discharged directly back into the sea, creating a greenwash operational model, in which sulphur is removed from the air but ends up in the sea;

53. Recalls the importance of safety at sea, particularly in the Baltic; stresses the importance of cooperation among the countries of the Baltic region in order to tackle the challenges arising from the growing volume of maritime transport and particularly conveyance of oil and hazardous substances;

54. Recalls that Blue Growth in marine macro-regions is based on sustainable use of the potential of the seas, which means that the environmental aspect must be taken into account in all activities; recalls that, within the framework of the Blue Bioeconomy, it is possible to find new products and services and to develop and cultivate know-how based on them in order to promote employment; stresses that sustainable use of natural resources and favourable status of aquatic and marine environments create a strong foundation for the Blue Bioeconomy;

55. Stresses the significant shift towards the bioeconomy and the circular economy in economic thinking, modes of action and methods, which can help to tackle the environmental challenges in the Baltic; recalls the opportunities for exploiting renewable energy and improving energy efficiency in the Baltic region;

56. Attaches importance to the possibility of connecting the Baltic region to energy networks in order to reduce and eliminate energy poverty and to increase energy security and security of supply.
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