EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2004 *2009*

Committee on Industry, Research and Energy

2006/0136(COD)

7.5.2007

OPINION

of the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy

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

on the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning the placing of plant protection products on the market
(COM(2006)0388 – C6-0245/2006 – 2006/0136(COD))

Draftswoman: Dorette Corbey

PA_Legam

SHORT JUSTIFICATION

Plant protection products are essential for agriculture and food production. At the same time, their use is a threat to the environment and public health. So in 1991 extensive legislation was introduced, resulting in the investigation of all stocks of such products throughout the EU. This led to a marked fall in the number of substances on the market: of the 969 substances that were looked at closely, only 77 are now permitted on the market and on 420 no decision has yet been taken. But plant protection products are still an environmental problem. The substances are almost by definition harmful to the living environment and this can create problems, for instance when crops are being sprayed.

Every year the industry places about five new active substances on the market. A number of plant protection products are produced on the basis of these substances. The research involved is complicated and expensive. The industry's costs for each active substance amount to about 200 million euros a year. Partly because of the high research cost, substantial market concentration has taken place, both worldwide and in Europe. In view of the huge cost of new plant protection products, they are developed mainly for major crop species, primarily what are known as the Big Five: rice, wheat, maize, soya and cotton. Products for the minor crops such as potatoes, tomatoes and leeks are often developed from the active substances in products for the Big Five.

In view of the current situation the Commission is proposing a number of significant changes:

- The approval of substances will be more centralised and take place at European level, giving a major role to the European Food Safety Authority, while the Commission will be more directly involved in supervision.
- In three zones of Member States (North, Centre and South) plant protection products will be approved by mutual recognition – provided that the product contains no substances that need to be restricted.
- Incentives are included to develop less harmful products: substances with a low risk profile will obtain a longer period of data protection and a longer initial approval period.
- There is provision for the minor crops: Member States can approve a plant protection product that is used for a major crop to be used for other crops if this is clearly effective.
- To prevent the repetition of animal testing, test results obtained from research on vertebrate animals must be shared.
- Shorter approval and authorisation procedures: while approval under the old rules takes at least five years, there is now provision for a period of 25 months.

The draftswoman takes a positive view of the Commission proposal. It contains considerable improvements compared with the present situation. But she would still like to make a number of further improvements:

- Firstly, there is a need to lay down clear and objective criteria to define which substances can claim to have a low risk profile. To encourage the development of less harmful plant protection products, those products with substances with a low risk profile can claim a longer period of data protection and thus a longer cost recovery period. A new 'low risk' category is also introduced.

- Secondly, there is a need to encourage the development of products for the minor crops. The draftswoman is accordingly proposing three amendments. The approval procedure can be carried out free of charge, applicants can expect an extension of the data protection period, and a European promotion fund is set up for small-scale approvals.
- A third, controversial, point concerns mutual recognition. This should naturally form part of a system in which substances are approved at European level. But it can be undesirable to withhold from Member States the ultimate decision on approval for their territory, because natural conditions (the soil, water or climate) can differ considerably, even within one zone.
- Fourthly, the draftswoman wants to help further cut back the use of animal testing in the development of new plant protection products.
- Finally, the draftswoman has considered the position of the industry – and more particularly of applicants. Shorter approval and authorisation periods are a major gain for industry. But in some cases the approval period could be somewhat speeded up, thus further strengthening applicants' position.

AMENDMENTS

The Committee on Industry, Research and Energy calls on the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety, as the committee responsible, to incorporate the following amendments in its report:

Text proposed by the Commission[1]	Amendments by Parliament
Amendment 1 Recital 8 a (new)	
	(8a) To prevent animal testing, tests on vertebrate animals should for the purposes of this Regulation be carried out only as a last resort. Existing results from tests on vertebrate animals must be shared in the process of developing new plant protection products. In accordance with Council Directive 86/609/EEC of 24 November 1986 on the approximation of laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States regarding the

[1] Not yet published in OJ.

protection of animals used for experimental and other scientific purposes*, tests on vertebrate animals must also be replaced, restricted or refined. Implementation of this Regulation must where possible be based on the use of appropriate alternative testing methods. Within at the latest seven years of the entry into force of the Regulation, the Commission must review the rules on the data protection of results from tests on vertebrate animals and where necessary change those rules.

**** OJ L 358, 18.12.1986, p. 1. Directive as amended by Directive 2003/65/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council (OJ L 230, 16.9.2003, p. 32).***

Justification

The measures to prevent the repetition of animal experiments need tightening up.

Amendment 2
Recital 15 a (new)

(15a) To encourage the development of plant protection products, incentives must be incorporated for placing on the market products with a low risk profile or a risk profile that is lower than that of products already on the market. Clear and objective criteria must be laid down to define which products may claim such a profile.

Justification

The proposal does include incentives for the use of products with a low risk profile. But the definition does not say which substances should be eligible. Article 22 comes up with a very broad definition that is likely to be interpreted in a number of different ways. But businesses need clarity and legal certainty, especially in view of the costly investment in research that is involved in developing new substances.

Amendment 3
Article 1

Subject matter	Subject matter ***and purpose***
This Regulation lays down rules for the authorisation of plant protection products in commercial form and for their placing on the market, use and control within the Community.	***1.*** This Regulation lays down rules for the authorisation of plant protection products in commercial form and for their placing on the market, ***for encouraging the development of products with a less harmful effect on the environment, and for their*** use and control within the Community. ***The Regulation also aims to encourage the development of products intended for limited use.***
This Regulation lays down both rules for the approval of active substances, safeners and synergists, which plant protection products contain or consist of, and rules for adjuvants and co-formulants.	***2.*** This Regulation lays down both rules for the approval of active substances, safeners and synergists, which plant protection products contain or consist of, and rules for adjuvants and co-formulants.
	3. The purpose of this Regulation is to ensure a high level of protection of both human and animal health and of the environment.

Justification

Encouraging the development of less harmful plant protection products is a very important aim and should form part of the regulation's subject matter.

In the current proposal the purpose of the Regulation is only enshrined in the Recitals. The purpose should be laid out in the first articles.

Amendment 4
Article 3, point 9 a (new)

	(9a) 'parallel trade'
	The import of a plant protection product from a Member State where the product has been authorised in accordance with the provisions of Directive 91/414/EEC or this Regulation, with the intention of placing it on the market in the importing Member State, in which that product or an identical reference product has been authorised in accordance with the provisions of Directive 91/414/EEC or this Regulation;

Amendment 5
Article 3, point 9 b (new)

(9b) 'identical'

Plant protection products shall be deemed identical where they:

• share a common origin,

• have been manufactured by the same company or an associated undertaking or under licence, and

• have at least been manufactured according to the same formulation, using the same active ingredient, and have the same effect with due regard, in particular, to differences which may exist in conditions relating to agriculture, plant health and the environment, in particular climatic conditions;

Amendment 6
Article 3, point 20 a (new)

(20a) 'Good Experimental Practice'

Practice in accordance with Directive 2004/10/EC;

Justification

Definition of the term used in Chapter V.

Amendment 7
Article 3, point 21 a (new)

(21a) 'Good Agricultural Practice'

Nationally authorised safe uses of plant protection products, under actual conditions necessary for effective pest control. It encompasses a range of levels of plant protection product applications up to the highest authorised use, applied in a manner which leaves a residue which is the smallest amount practicable.

	Authorised safe uses are determined at the national level and include nationally registered or recommended uses, which take into account public and occupational health and environmental safety considerations.
	Actual conditions include any stage in the production, storage, transport and distribution of food commodities and animal feed.

Justification

The Food and Agriculture Organisation's definition of 'good agricultural practice' should be incorporated in the regulation.

Amendment 8
Article 3, point 21 b (new)

	(21b) 'Minor Uses'
	The use of a plant protection product on a crop which is not widely grown in a Member State, or on a widely grown crop to meet a limited or sporadic and exceptional need, or on seed.

Justification

Definition of the term 'minor uses' used in Article 49.

Amendment 9
Article 4, paragraph 1

1. An active substance shall be approved in accordance with Annex II, if it may be expected, in the light of current scientific and technical knowledge, that, taking into account the approval criteria set out in points 2 and 3 of that Annex, plant protection products containing that active substance will fulfil the conditions provided for in paragraphs 2 and 3.	1. An active substance shall be approved in accordance with Annex II, if it may be expected, in the light of current scientific and technical knowledge, that, taking into account the approval criteria set out in points 2 and 3 of that Annex, plant protection products containing that active substance will fulfil the conditions provided for in paragraphs 2 and 3. ***These conditions have to be used as a cut-off criterion.***

Justification

All substances with or suspected carcinogenic, mutagenic, reprotoxic, endocrine disrupting,

sensitising properties and substances that are persistent, bio-accumulative or toxic or otherwise give grounds for concern should not be approved.

Amendment 10
Article 4, paragraph 2, point (a)

(a) they shall not have any harmful effects on human health, ***including*** vulnerable groups, or animal health, taking into account known cumulative and synergistic effects when the methods to assess such effects are available, or on ground water;	(a) they shall not have any harmful effects on human health, ***in particular that of*** vulnerable groups ***such as pregnant women, embryos and children***, or animal health, taking into account known cumulative and synergistic effects, or on ground water;

Justification

According to the precautionary principle substances should not have any negative impact on human health, in particular vulnerable groups such as embryos and children . This is in line with the reaction of the EP (EP Resolution P5_TA(2002)0276) to the earlier Commission Communication on the revision of Directive 91/414.

Amendment 11
Article 7, paragraph 1 a (new)

	1a. Assessment of an application may be performed by a number of Member States together under the co-rapporteur system.

Justification

The same provision applies to assessments under Directive 91/414/EEC and has a considerable influence on the speed and quality of the assessment reports on active substances.

Amendment 12
Article 11, paragraph 1

1. Within ***twelve*** months of the date of the notification provided for in the first subparagraph of Article 9(3), the rapporteur Member State shall prepare and submit to the Authority a report (hereafter called "draft assessment report") assessing whether the active substance can be expected to meet the requirements of Article 4.	1. Within ***ten*** months of the date of the notification provided for in the first subparagraph of Article 9(3), the rapporteur Member State shall prepare and submit to the Authority a report (hereafter called "draft assessment report") assessing whether the active substance can be expected to meet the requirements of Article 4.
Where the Member State needs additional information, it shall set a time period for the	Where the Member State needs additional information, it shall set a ***reasonable*** time

applicant to supply it. In that case, the ***twelve-months*** period shall be extended by the additional time period granted by the Member State. It shall inform the Commission and the Authority.	period for the applicant to supply it. In that case, the ***ten-month*** period shall be extended by the additional time period granted by the Member State. It shall inform the Commission and the Authority ***, which shall notify the other Member States***.
The Member State may consult the Authority.	The Member State may consult the Authority.

Justification

It is important to speed up the access of new, innovative products to the market. Rapporteur Member States could already start the evaluation of available information before the date of the notification provided in Article 9(3). Therefore a 10-month limit seems reasonable and desirable.

Amendment 13
Article 14, paragraph 2

2. The renewal shall be for ***an unlimited*** period ***of time***.	2. The renewal shall be for ***a*** period ***not exceeding 10 years. The approval may be renewed more than once***.

Justification

Authorisation should not be unlimited in time after the first renewal. This would be contrary to the precautionary principle. Decisions should be taken in the light of current scientific and technical knowledge, as is laid down in Art. 4(10).

Amendment 14
Article 15, paragraph 1

1. The application provided for in Article 14 shall be submitted by a producer of the active substance to ***a*** Member State, with a copy to the other Member States, the Commission and the Authority, no later than three years before the expiry of the first approval.	1. The application provided for in Article 14 shall be submitted by a producer of the active substance to ***the*** Member State ***concerned***, with a copy to the other Member States, the Commission and the Authority, no later than three years before the expiry of the first approval.

Amendment 15
Article 22, paragraph 1

1. By way of derogation from Article 5, an	1. By way of derogation from Article 5, an

active substance complying with the criteria provided for in Article 4 shall be approved for a period not exceeding 15 years, where it may be expected that plant protection products containing that substance will pose only a low risk to human and animal health and the environment***, as provided for in Article 46(1)***.	active substance complying with the criteria provided for in Article 4 shall be approved for a period not exceeding 15 years, where it may be expected that plant protection products containing that substance will pose only a low risk to human and animal health and the environment. ***The present derogation shall not apply to any active substance classified in accordance with Directive 67/548/EEC as:*** ***– carcinogenic,*** ***– mutagenic,*** ***– toxic to reproduction,*** ***– sensitising,*** ***or to substances that are qualified as:*** ***– persistent with a half-life of more than 60 days,*** ***– endocrine disrupters appearing on the EU list of suspected endocrine disrupters,*** ***– toxic,*** ***– bioaccumulative and non-readily degradable.*** ***No later than ...*, the Commission shall review and if necessary specify the criteria for treating an active substance as a low risk substance and, if appropriate, submit proposals.*** _____ **** One year after the entry into force of this Regulation.***

Justification

There is a need to lay down clear and objective criteria to define which substances can claim to have a low risk profile. There is no definition for this in the proposal. To encourage research for less harmful substances and products, it is important to provide businesses with clarity and legal certainty on what exactly is meant by a low risk profile. The criteria listed here are partly taken from the biocides directive, 98/8/EC. With these criteria 25 to 30 percent of active substances would be considered as low risk.

Amendment 16
Article 24, paragraph 1

1. ***By way of derogation from Article 5 and Article 14(2),*** an active substance complying with the criteria provided for in Article 4 shall be approved ***for a period not exceeding seven years, where other already approved active substances are significantly less toxic for consumers or operators or present significantly fewer risks for the environment. The assessment shall take account of the criteria laid down in point 4 of Annex II***.	1. An active substance complying with the criteria provided for in Article 4 ***and the criteria provided for in point 4 of Annex II*** shall be ***classified and*** approved as a 'candidate for substitution'.
Such a substance is referred to hereinafter as a 'candidate for substitution'**.**	
	The approval shall be valid for a period of 10 years. Article 14(2) shall not apply.

Justification

To be classified as candidates for substitution, active substances have to conform to the criteria laid down in the draft regulation.

Amendment 17
Article 32, paragraph 5 a (new)

	5a. Application forms shall be standard in all Member States.

Amendment 18
Article 36, paragraph 1, subparagraph 2

Where the Member State needs additional information, it shall set a time period for the applicant to supply it. In that case, the twelve-month period shall be extended by the additional time period granted by the Member State.	Where the Member State needs additional information, it shall set a time period for the applicant to supply it. In that case, the twelve-month period shall be extended by the additional time period granted by the Member State. ***This shall be based on the time that the applicant needs to provide the additional information.***

Justification

Applicants must receive adequate time to supply extra information.

Amendment 19
Article 40, paragraph 1

1. The Member State to which an application under Article 39 is submitted shall authorise the plant protection product concerned under the same conditions, including classification for the purpose of Directive 1999/45/EC, as the reference Member State.	1. The Member State to which an application under Article 39 is submitted shall authorise the plant protection product concerned under the same conditions, including classification for the purpose of Directive 1999/45/EC, as the reference Member State***, unless the Member State can show that the use of a plant protection product has a different effect on the environment on its territory in comparison with the reference Member State***.

Justification

Member States should have the final word on authorising plant protection products, since natural conditions (soil, water and climate) may vary considerably between Member States even within a given zone. But mutual recognition may be refused only on environmental grounds.

Amendment 20
Article 46 a (new)

	Article 46a
	Placing on the market and using reduced risk plant protection products
	1. Notwithstanding Article 29, a plant protection product shall be authorised as a reduced risk product if it satisfies the following requirements:
	(a) at least one of the active substances that it contains is a substance as defined in Article 22 ("Low-risk active substances");
	(b) all the active substances, protective substances and synergistic products with a low risk that it contains are approved in accordance with Chapter II;
	(c) it entails, in the light of scientific or technical knowledge, considerably fewer risks to human and animal health or the environment than a comparable plant

protection product that is already authorised;

(d) it is sufficiently active;

(e) it complies with Article 29(1)(b), (c) and (e) to (h) inclusive.

2. Applicants for authorisation of a reduced risk plant protection product must demonstrate that it meets the conditions in paragraph 1 and enclose with the application a detailed and a summary dossier for each point of the details required for the active substance and the plant protection product.

3. The Member State shall decide within 120 days whether to approve an application for authorisation for a reduced risk plant protection product.

This period shall be 90 days if another Member State from the same zone has already granted authorisation for the same reduced risk plant protection product.

If the Member State requires additional information, it shall set a deadline by which the applicant must provide the information. In such a case the period of 120 days shall be extended by the additional period that the Member State has granted.

4. Unless stated otherwise, all the provisions of this Regulation relating to authorisations shall apply.

Justification

To encourage the development of less harmful plant protection products, this introduces a new category of low-risk plant protection products that present a lower risk than current products on the market and *contain at least one low-risk active substance. This category of plant protection products should receive certain advantages such as a longer period of data protection and tax exemption.*

Amendment 21
Article 49, paragraph 3, point (d)

(d) the documentation and information to support an extension of use has been submitted by the persons or bodies referred to in paragraph 2.	(d) the documentation and information to support an extension of use has been submitted by the persons or bodies referred to in paragraph 2. ***The studies necessary in order to determine maximum residue levels may be carried out by scientific institutes or official bodies.***

Justification

The cost of scientific studies poses a very serious obstacle to the development of minor uses. The amendment is intended to offer more viable solutions from the economic point of view.

Amendment 22
Article 49, paragraph 3 a (new)

	3a. The criteria for authorisation for minor uses shall allow for extrapolation of data obtained for other botanically and agronomically closely similar crops.

Justification

When crops are as closely similar as, for example, the cherry and the sloe, the data obtained for the first authorisation should be extrapolated to enable minor uses to be authorised as well.

Amendment 23
Article 49, paragraph 6 a (new)

	6a. The Commission shall, not later than ...*, present a proposal to the European Parliament and the Council for establishing a European promotion fund for minor uses. The fund may be financed from the income from taxes on pest control products. The Fund shall also be entitled to finance additional residue tests for minor uses.
	**** One year after the entry into force of this Regulation.***

Justification

It is important that sufficient plant protection products remain available for restricted

application. A European Promotion Fund could play an important role here.

Amendment 24
Article 49 a (new)

Article 49a

Parallel imports

1. By way of derogation from Article 28(1), Member States shall allow the import and placing on the market of a plant protection product within their territory through parallel trade only after an administrative procedure to verify that it is identical to the plant protection product which is already authorised ('reference plant protection product'). Where this is the case, the imported plant protection product shall receive an identity certificate from the competent authority of the designated Member State.

2. The importers of a plant protection product shall apply for an identity certificate from the competent authority of the designated Member State for the plant protection product they want to import before the first import and the first placing on the market.

3. The competent authority of the designated Member State shall decide within 45 days if the requirements under this article are fulfilled. If the authority ascertains that those requirements are fulfilled, the importer shall receive an identity certificate for the product in question.

4. The applicant shall be exempted from supplying the information, test and study reports required for an authorisation of a plant protection product.

5. The competent authority receiving the application shall ask the competent

	authority of the country of origin:
	(a) to establish the exact composition of the product to check that it is identical to a plant protection product authorised in the reference Member State, and
	(b) to check that the product is authorised in that Member State in accordance with the authorisation procedure laid down in Directive 91/414/EEC or in this Regulation.
	6. Products subject to parallel imports may not be repackaged.
	7. The identity certificate shall expire with the authorisation of the reference product or the expiry of the authorisation of the imported product in the Member State from which it is exported. If the authorisation of the reference product is withdrawn for reasons other than health or environmental reasons, the importer may continue to sell the imported product for one year after the date of withdrawal.

Amendment 25
Article 56, paragraph 1, subparagraph 4

The period of data protection *is* ten years starting *at* the date of the first authorisation in that Member State, except as provided in paragraph 2, in Article 59 or in Article 77. That period *is* extended to ***12 years*** for plant protection products covered by Article 46.	The period of data protection *shall be* ten years starting *on* the date of the first authorisation in that Member State, except as provided in paragraph 2, in Article 59 or in Article 77. That period *shall be* extended to ***15 years*** for plant protection products covered by Article 46 ***and 12 years for those covered by Article 46a***.

Justification

To encourage research for less harmful substances and products, it is important for data protection, and thus for the return on the investment, to expand the use of products with a low or lower risk profile.

Amendment 26
Article 56, paragraph 1, subparagraph 5

A study shall not be protected ***if it was only***	A study ***submitted for the renewal or review***

necessary for the renewal or review of an authorisation.	***of an authorisation*** shall not be protected ***except where required for the purposes of amending the legislation***.

Justification

The Commission proposal constitutes a giant step forward from the present situation from the point of view of protecting the viability of small and medium-sized European enterprises. The amendment is intended to clarify the substance of the text.

Amendment 27
Article 56, paragraph 1 a (new)

	1a. The data protection period for the product concerned shall be extended if the first applicant applies for authorisation for derived plant protection products for restricted uses as defined in Article 49(1). The data protection period shall be extended by three months for each new product for limited use. The data protection period may be extended by a maximum of three years.

Justification

To encourage the development of (derived) plant protection products specifically for minor crops, it is important to extend the data protection, and thus the return on the investment.

Amendment 28
Article 56, paragraph 2, point (b a) (new)

	(ba) where a monopoly is created.

Justification

The new regulation should lay down special provisions to prevent monopolies being created on the market in plant protection products.

Amendment 29
Article 56, paragraph 3 a (new)

	3a. Where the Member State considers that a monopoly might be created, and the prospective applicant and the holder or holders of the authorisations for plant

	protection products containing the same active substance, safener, or synergist cannot reach agreement on the sharing of any tests and studies involving vertebrate animals, the prospective applicant shall inform the competent authority of the Member State to that effect. The two parties shall nevertheless agree which courts and tribunals have jurisdiction for the purposes of the second subparagraph of Article 59(3).

Justification

The new regulation should lay down special provisions to prevent monopolies being created on the market in plant protection products.

Amendment 30
Article 58, paragraph 3

3. The prospective applicant for the authorisation and the holder or holders of relevant authorisations shall take all reasonable steps to reach agreement on the sharing of any test and study reports protected under Article 56 that are required by the applicant for authorisation of a plant protection product.	3. The prospective applicant for the authorisation and the holder or holders of relevant authorisations shall take all reasonable steps to reach agreement on the sharing of any test and study reports protected under Article 56 that are required by the applicant for authorisation of a plant protection product. ***Such an agreement may be replaced by submission of the matter to an arbitration board and acceptance of the arbitration order. In an endeavour to ensure that the costs of sharing the information are determined in a fair, transparent and non-discriminatory way, the Commission may, in accordance with the procedure referred to in Article 76(3), adopt cost-sharing guidelines based on those principles.***

Justification

In order to minimise unnecessary duplication of tests, it is necessary to put in place arbitration- and cost-sharing mechanisms that could help applicants and holders of authorisation to reach an agreement. These provisions have also been introduced in the REACH Directive.

Amendment 31
Article 59, paragraph 3 a (new)

3a. By ...* the Commission shall carry out a review of the provisions in this Regulation concerning data protection for tests and studies involving vertebrate animals. The Commission shall submit this assessment, and any proposed amendments for limiting the data protection with regard to animal experiments, to the European Parliament and the Council.

**** Seven years after the entry into force of this Regulation.***

Justification

Under this proposal the results from tests involving vertebrate animals enjoy data protection, but such data have to be shared. This compromise is at present necessary for practical reasons (otherwise many new products will not be marketable), but should be evaluated in due course. A less strict data protection regime will still reduce the number of tests on vertebrate animals.

Amendment 32
Article 60, paragraph 1 a (new)

1a. After giving the claimant an opportunity to state his views, the competent authority shall adopt a decision on the confidentiality of the information, which shall contain an adequate statement of the reasons on which it is based. It shall communicate the decision to the claimant.

Justification

Disclosing information can significantly impact commercial interests. Therefore, information owners must be given an opportunity to express their views on disclosure.

Amendment 33
Article 60, paragraph 2, point (c a) (new) and (c b) (new)

(ca) the names and personal details of scientists and laboratory assistants responsible for carrying out tests and studies in which use is made of vertebrate animals;

(cb) information on current experiments or tests for research or development purposes, as defined in Article 51.

Justification

The confidentiality of information to protect commercial interests must be considered on a case-by-case basis in the light of the arguments put forward by the applicant concerned. In any event, information on research and development is often highly sensitive and should therefore as a rule be treated in confidence.

Laboratory assistants who carry out animal testing are often the target of attacks and their details must therefore be protected.

PROCEDURE

Title	The placing of plant protection products on the market
References	COM(2006)0388 - C6-0245/2006 - 2006/0136(COD)
Committee responsible	ENVI
Opinion by Date announced in plenary	ITRE 5.9.2006
Enhanced cooperation - date announced in plenary	5.9.2006 5.9.2006
Drafts(wo)man Date appointed	Dorette Corbey 12.9.2006
Discussed in committee	28.11.2006 28.2.2007 3.5.2007
Date adopted	3.5.2007
Result of final vote	+: 41 –: 1 0: 0
Members present for the final vote	Šarūnas Birutis, Renato Brunetta, Jerzy Buzek, Jorgo Chatzimarkakis, Silvia Ciornei, Pilar del Castillo Vera, Lena Ek, Nicole Fontaine, Adam Gierek, Norbert Glante, Fiona Hall, David Hammerstein, Erna Hennicot-Schoepges, Mary Honeyball, Romana Jordan Cizelj, Romano Maria La Russa, Pia Elda Locatelli, Angelika Niebler, Reino Paasilinna, Miloslav Ransdorf, Vladimír Remek, Herbert Reul, Mechtild Rothe, Paul Rübig, Andres Tarand, Patrizia Toia, Catherine Trautmann, Claude Turmes, Nikolaos Vakalis, Alejo Vidal-Quadras
Substitute(s) present for the final vote	Pilar Ayuso, Dorette Corbey, Philip Dimitrov Dimitrov, Robert Goebbels, Cristina Gutiérrez-Cortines, Satu Hassi, Eija-Riitta Korhola, Erika Mann, John Purvis, Hannes Swoboda, Silvia-Adriana Ţicău
Substitute(s) under Rule 178(2) present for the final vote	Zuzana Roithová