



ENVIRONMENTAL MANIFESTO FOR EUROPEAN ELECTIONS 2004

A call from the eight largest European environmental organisations to parties and politicians to give the environment the priority it deserves.

A joint document from the Green 8:

BirdLife International

Climate Network Europe (CAN)

European Environmental Bureau (EEB)

Friends of the Earth Europe

Friends of Nature International

Greenpeace European Unit

European Federation for Transport and Environment (T&E)

WWF European Policy Office

The European Parliament is the only body of the European Union directly representing EU citizens. Over the past decade, the Parliament has assumed an increasingly important role in the EU decision-making process.

However, large sections of the public are either ignorant or sceptical of the Parliament's work. In 1999, this led to worryingly low turnouts at the European elections. Such low election turnouts mean that the Parliament has not realised its full potential for influence.

The 2004 elections provide an important opportunity for politicians to increase citizens' support for the European Parliament. Political parties and candidates can present their views and policies on the issues on which the European Parliament has the power to make a difference. They can clarify what the European Parliament can do for the EU citizen in concrete terms.

In the Accession Countries, the European Parliamentary elections will take place for the first time. Obtaining a strong mandate from the public in these countries will be a considerable challenge. However, campaigning on the basis that the European Parliament can make a difference to people's lives should increase public interest in the elections.

Surveys show that EU citizens are aware that environment is a logical policy area on which action should be taken at the EU level. Pollution does not respect national boundaries.. Citizens expect EU action to create a clean and safe environment and ensure the protection of precious wildlife.

The environment is not only an issue where the citizens have high expectations. It is also an area where the European Parliament can make a real difference, primarily through the 'co-decision' process with the Council of Ministers.

Environmental issues also deserve the attention of MEP candidates because, despite the existing environmental policies, the situation is not good at all. Reports from the European Environmental Agency make this clear: wildlife is in decline, the climate is changing, fish stocks are becoming depleted, soil erosion and desertification are major problems in areas of the EU, chemicals continue to threaten people's health and so on.

The enlargement of the Union in 2004 increases the importance of these challenges.

There has been a clear European Union mandate to protect the environment since 1987. In 1997, the concepts of 'Sustainable Development' and the integration of the environment into all policy areas were enshrined in the Amsterdam Treaty. The future EU Constitution should reconfirm these commitments.

In reality, the results of the EU's efforts on environmental protection are mixed. We have both ambitious and weak Directives, a varying implementation and enforcement of legislation across the Union and environmental degradation caused by the EU's Common Agricultural and Fisheries Policies and the Cohesion Policy.

It cannot go on like this. It is vital that, over the course of the next term, the European Parliament demonstrates a clear commitment to the environment, as an investment in the future. MEPs should continue to show environmental leadership, having made important improvements to legislation on water policy, climate change, air quality, GMOs, waste management and access to information. The Parliament should also set up an effective mechanism to guarantee that all its policy decisions are environmentally sustainable.

In the 2004-2009 period, **commitments** are needed in **ten key areas**: *biodiversity, chemicals, agriculture, cohesion, transport, climate, waste management, external policies, implementation and enforcement, and environmental policy integration*. We call on all political parties and MEP candidates to sign up to the following 61 policy recommendations:

1. HALT THE DECLINE OF EUROPE'S BIODIVERSITY BY 2010

The EU Heads of States and the European Commission have set 2010 as the target for halting the decline of biodiversity (Gothenburg Summit, 6th Environmental Action Programme). Concrete action is needed in order to achieve this objective.

The European Parliament has played a very important role in scrutinising the implementation and enforcement of the Birds and Habitats Directives.

The use of Structural Funds both in the old and new Member States must also be closely monitored in order to ensure that these funds are not used to damage important sites for nature conservation.

The Natura 2000 network of sites, designated under the Birds and Habitats Directives, protects Europe's most important wildlife areas. With the completion of the Natura 2000 list approaching, Member States are turning their attention to managing the network.

THE NEXT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT SHOULD:

- 1. Oversee the implementation and enforcement of the Birds and Habitats Directives, in order to ensure that these Directives are applied properly in the Member States.*
- 2. Insist on the effective integration of nature conservation objectives into all relevant sectoral policies (in particular transport, fisheries, agriculture, and regional development).*
- 3. Continue to promote environment protection and sustainable development as key objectives for the allocation of EU regional funds.*
- 4. Ensure that sufficient amounts of co-financing are allocated to the management of Natura 2000, taking into account the needs of the old Member States and the increased needs of the new Member States. This should lead to the creation of a new fund as the principal delivery mechanism for financing Natura 2000. It should fund multi-annual programmes and be administered by the environmental authorities and DG Environment.*
- 5. Promote the continuation of the LIFE-Nature fund which offers much-needed opportunities for innovation and pilot projects.*
- 6. Promote a radical reform of the Common Agricultural Policy, in order to contribute to the halting of biodiversity decline by the year 2010.*

2. SAFETY FIRST: A NEW CHEMICALS POLICY

EU citizens are increasingly worried about chemicals in the air, water, soil and in daily food and consumer products. And they are right to be: 25 years of ineffective EU chemicals policy has allowed chemicals to accumulate in our environment and bodies. For about 90% of chemicals on the market there is no safety information available. The EU now has a once-in-a-lifetime chance to reform a flawed chemical management system.

The initial reform ideas from the European Commission, Parliament and Council in 2001 contained all the necessary elements to deal with the current ignorance about chemicals, shifting the burden of proof on to industry, phasing out chemicals of very high concern and providing increased public information. But the reform has been seriously delayed and

watered down due to chemical industry lobbying. The new Parliament a vital role in making the reform a success for society – and the environment – as a whole.

THE NEXT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT SHOULD:

1. *Insist on an EU Chemicals Policy that establishes a paradigm shift, putting the precautionary principle into practice and reversing the burden of proof. The policy must incorporate the 'no data – no market' principle, apply the substitution principle, which means that hazardous chemicals (such as those that accumulate in our bodies or disrupt hormones) will only receive authorisation if there is an overriding societal need for this substance and no safer alternative is available. It should protect European consumers and guarantee full public access to relevant safety information about chemicals on their own and in products. It should lead to a phase out of hazardous chemicals by 2020.*
2. *Resist the strong pressure from the chemical industry to water down the proposals the Commission will put on the table at the end of 2003/early 2004, and, instead, strengthen the legislation in line with the mentioned demands.*
3. *Organise its own promotion campaign for a Chemicals Policy that can be trusted by citizens, involving civil society organisations who represent the interests of society as a whole, rather than the narrow short-termism of industry federations.*

3. SET THE AGRICULTURAL PRIORITIES RIGHT: CLEAN PRODUCTION AND SAFE FOOD IN A HEALTHY SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CONTEXT

The EU's involvement in agriculture dates back to the early days of the European Community. The Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) was established to ensure the security of food supply across Europe. However, it has become too successful in increasing production, and created various social, environmental and economic problems in both the Member States and other countries in the world which are affected by the export policy that forms part of the CAP. Farmland wildlife decline, water pollution and over-use, acid rain and food safety scandals have caused concern among EU citizens. Since the early nineties, the EU has started to develop flanking policies (rural development including agri-environment schemes and cross compliance) and reform the policies that have created large surpluses. But changes have been lacking in ambition, due to the strong influence of various vested interests across Europe.

A new threat to the EU's agriculture and farmland wildlife is the use of GMO seeds. There is legitimate concern that GMOs may irreversibly affect the natural environment. Moreover, the current EU production capacity raises questions about the need to introduce a potentially risky technology.

Pesticide use remains at high and unsustainable levels. Inappropriate and/or excessive use has led to pollution of drinking water supplies and unacceptable residue levels in some foods. The EU's policies have so far been unable to address these problems effectively. An EU instrument to reduce the overall use of pesticides is needed in addition to the EU Marketing Authorisation Directive, which deals with the most hazardous pesticides. Several Member States have already successfully achieved a reduction in the use of pesticides without significant agricultural production losses.

The quality of our soils is essential for human development and ecology. Soils are threatened by general deterioration trends, namely soil erosion, contamination and compaction. As a result, the soil's capacity to store water, to buffer the through flow of agri-

chemicals and to provide fertile ground for farming is affected. The single most important activity currently influencing the soil's functions is inappropriate agriculture with high levels of artificial inputs, intensive tillage, heavy machine use and year-on-year mono-cultural cropping patterns.

The EU is currently developing a thematic strategy for the protection of soils. Unfortunately, the Commission is hesitant to introduce strategic soil protection objectives, which could support sustainable agriculture and other policy changes towards a more sustainable soil use.

The European Parliament currently has limited power in the field of agriculture. We hope this will change in the new Constitution. However, even in the absence of full 'co-decision' in this policy area, MEPs can take action to bring about change by promoting an efficient national implementation of EU policies and calling on the Council and the Commission to bring forward measures.

THE NEXT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT SHOULD:

- **As regards 'Agenda 2007', bring in essential elements for CAP reform**
 1. *Promote environmental protection and sustainability as key objectives for the CAP.*
 2. *Promote subsidies that do not lead to environmentally damaging industrialisation of agriculture and over-production. Support should be geared towards farming policies which are beneficial for nature and the environment, support farming and rural communities, and provide value for money for Europe's taxpayers.*
 3. *Promote strong and meaningful cross-compliance: all CAP payments should be subject to environmental standards that include at least all relevant EU legislation.*
 4. *Insist on the increase overall levels of funding for rural development measures with at least 20%, and ring-fence at least 50% of the Rural Development budget for agri-environment schemes.*
 5. *Base rural development on integrated (regional) programmes and a 'bottom-up' approach, with full stakeholder involvement.*
 6. *Link trade with sustainability. Export subsidies must be phased out from 2005.*
 7. *Introduce financial instruments to boost organic farming, including reduced VAT rates for organic food products and a levy on chemical pesticides and/or fertilizers, to ensure that 10% of the EU area is farmed organically by 2006.*
- **On prevention of GMO contamination**
 8. *Bring forward preventive measures, based on legislation, to avoid genetic contamination, safeguard the purity of our agricultural seed banks and ensure the survival of uncontaminated conventional and organic farming in Europe. The new legislation must establish the principle that those GM growers responsible for contamination pay the costs of anti-contamination measures. The moratorium on licenses for GMO use in agriculture should exist until four requirements are firmly established in practice: traceability, labelling, liability and protection against contamination.*
- **As regards the Strategy for Pesticide use**
 9. *Insist on the adoption of a strategy both to reduce and improve pesticide use, with mandatory targets to reduce pesticide use by 50% in 10 years. Safety measures for the*

application of pesticides should be improved. The substitution of hazardous pesticides with safer alternatives should be promoted.

- **As regards the Soil Protection Strategy**

10. Bring forward a Soil Protection Strategy that includes the following essential elements:

- a. An end to accumulation of pesticides in soils.*
- b. A reversal of soil erosion and compaction trends.*
- c. Compliance with soil protection objectives as prerequisite for EU subsidies.*

4. MAKE COHESION POLICY WORK FOR THE ENVIRONMENT

The EU's Cohesion Policy was introduced to reduce disparities in the levels of development between European regions and contribute to the social and economic cohesion of the Community.

However, the main tools for implementing the EU's Cohesion Policy - the structural funds and cohesion funds - have been heavily criticized by environmental organisations for their damaging impact on nature (flora, fauna and habitats) and sustainable rural development. For example, these funds have been used to build huge dam and irrigation projects with devastating effects on river and steppe ecosystems; tourism developments have been approved in areas protected by EU biodiversity legislation; and investment in Trans-European Transport Networks (TEN-T) has accelerated the growth of road and air transport.

Public pressure has brought about some improvements, but the funds continue to be misused. Currently the most obvious case is the Spanish National Hydrological Plan. According to a wide range of civil society organisations in Spain, this plan will have a devastating impact on the Spanish environment. Moreover, it will not solve problems regarding demand for water. The Plan conflicts with EU legislation, particularly the Habitats, Birds and Water Framework Directives. By splitting a large project into pieces and requesting EU assistance for non-controversial projects, it also demonstrates the weaknesses of the current environmental safeguards in the cohesion policy.

From 2007, a Strategic Environmental Assessment (as laid down in Directive 2001/42/EC) must be carried out on all plans and programmes for which EU funding is requested. This procedure must be undertaken in a serious, transparent and thorough manner at the start of the planning process.

The cohesion policy will be reviewed in the near future, as part of 'Agenda 2007'. This review should put an end to the misuse of EU funds once and for all.

THE NEXT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT SHOULD:

- 1. Ensure that structural fund plans, programmes, priorities and measures make clear reference to binding environmental commitments.*
- 2. Insist that the Commission facilitate environmental integration by issuing Strategic Environmental Assessment guidance for structural fund assistance.*
- 3. Ensure that the new structural fund regulations make explicit reference to the need to respect existing environmental law (e.g. Birds and Habitats Directives, Water*

Framework Directive, Environmental Impact Assessment Directive) and avoid environmental damage or biodiversity loss.

4. *Ensure that the new regulations identify a clear role for environmental authorities and NGOs in the preparation, negotiation and implementation of structural fund programmes.*
5. *Require the new structural fund regulations to establish strategic goals for environmental improvement*
6. *Insist that the structural funds be used to co-finance nature conservation and the enhancement of biodiversity.*
7. *Oppose the allocation of EU funds to the Spanish National Hydrological Plan, until it is drastically revised and aligned to European Community policies and environmental protection requirements in an open, transparent and participatory manner, with the active involvement of Spanish civil society.*

5. FROM TRANSPORT EXPANSION TO MOBILITY MANAGEMENT

The transport sector's unchecked expansion in Europe has led to environmental degradation, social injustice and economic inefficiency. It has also led to higher health costs for citizens, and a lower quality of life, particularly in cities. Meanwhile, the transport sector's greenhouse gas emissions continue to rise at an alarming rate, as other economic sectors strive to reduce their emissions and international organisations issue repeated warnings about the EU's ability to meet its Kyoto commitments. All of this is bad news for citizens, large and small towns and for business.

EU transport needs better technical standards. But more importantly, the EU desperately needs to break the transport expansion habit. There should be less transport to fulfil the same functions, not more. For example, not only is developing new transport infrastructure expensive, it is damaging to the environment and health, frequently involves social injustice and often does not deliver what it is supposed to.

The Treaty requires transport to be environmentally sound. Europe's heads of state and government have repeatedly called for the integration of environmental concerns into the transport sector, and for specific policies to improve the transport sector's environmental performance. They insist on a 'significant decoupling of transport growth and GDP growth'. However, we have seen few positive developments in the last years. The Commission has failed to respond to the expectations of the European Council and citizens of the EU in this area.

THE NEXT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT SHOULD:

1. *Ensure that transport policies fulfil environmental objectives – including biodiversity protection. Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEA) should be fully implemented before the adoption of transport plans to ensure the achievement of these objectives.*
2. *Insist that the next Commission does what the current Commission promised, including introducing a framework Directive on infrastructure pricing, development of quantitative environmental targets for the transport sector, on the basis of the indicators work conducted by the European Environment Agency (EEA), and taking real steps to decouple transport growth from economic growth.*

3. *Promote a review of the role of transport and mobility in the European integration process. This should include a revision of the role of the Trans-European Transport Networks (TEN-T) in the Treaty. SEA should be applied to the TEN-T and its extension to Central and Eastern European countries (TINA).*
4. *Promote the adoption of a set of social indicators for the transport sector at EU level to measure transport's contribution to problems such as social injustice.*
5. *Raise questions about the development of the Hydrogen economy. At present, it appears as if the EU is in danger of rushing to support this promising technology before having a clear idea of its potential pitfalls.*
6. *Ensure that the health aspects of transport receive sufficient regulatory attention. This is particularly important in two areas: the negative effect of particulate matter on public health, especially from diesel engines, and noise, one of the issues of greatest concerns to citizens, which has a range of negative health effects, particularly on the young and the infirm.*
7. *Insist that European Commission consults with all stakeholders, including environmental NGOs, when developing transport policy*

6. SECURE EU LEADERSHIP IN COMBATING CLIMATE CHANGE

Climate change from global warming pollutants such as carbon dioxide (CO₂) presents a key challenge to global sustainable development. If emissions of global warming gases continue to increase by about 1-2% per year, many valuable ecosystems will suffer, such as the Arctic, Nordic and tropical forests, tropical coral reefs and mangroves. At the same time, poor and exposed communities across the globe will face increased weather extremes such as hurricanes, flooding, drought and heatwaves. Such changing weather patterns can severely affect food security, health and living conditions. If climate change is not tackled effectively, low-lying island nations in the Pacific and the Caribbean may entirely disappear because of rising sea levels.

So far, the EU has taken the lead among industrialised nations in pushing for commitments and targets under the Kyoto protocol, which binds the EU to a reduction in global warming gases of about 8% below the level of 1990 by 2012. But this target is not enough! International scientists have stated that radical CO₂ emissions cuts must be agreed in the future in order to limit damage from weather-related disasters and ensure that the climate change problem does not become worse.. In order to avoid a major disaster, a long-term limit on global warming of 2 degrees Celsius over pre-industrial times must be agreed. Currently the increase has already reached 1 degree Celsius.

Energy consumption in the EU is growing at a rate of 1% a year. Major changes are therefore needed to reach long-term CO₂ emissions reductions of about 30% by 2020 and 60-80% by the middle of this century.

THE NEXT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT SHOULD:

1. *Strongly support a long-term, ecologically sound, fair and equitable climate change agreement that goes well beyond the present 2012 deadline, within the framework of respecting a long-term limit on global warming of below a 2 degrees Celsius warming over pre-industrial times.*

2. *Ensure that any new legislation in the field of energy, transport and climate change helps the EU to achieve its present Kyoto commitment and introduces timetables for further reductions beyond 2020 .*
3. *Insist on an increase in the use of clean renewable energy sources to 25% of overall energy consumption by 2020.*
4. *Insist on a goal of a 1% annual decrease of overall energy consumption.*
5. *Insist that the EU fulfils its commitments to assisting developing countries, in particular the poorest countries, to adapt to the impacts of climate change and grow in a way that is compatible with sustainable development. Funds pledged to these ends under the UNFCCC and in Marrakech must be clearly additional.*
6. *Resist the abuse of climate change as a reason for the promotion of nuclear energy.*

7. FROM WASTE TO RESPONSIBLE USE OF RESOURCES

The Johannesburg Summit reconfirmed that the main task for industrialised countries is to put an end to unsustainable consumption and production patterns. We are dramatically overusing the natural resources available, causing excessive stress on the carrying capacity of the EU and the wider world.

An essential part of such a strategy is 'making the market work for the environment'. This includes effective rules on environmental liability and public procurement. Another major tool is environmental fiscal reform. We call for a shift in the tax-base of our societies of 10%, away from taxes on labour towards resource use. The Council and Commission have actually called for, and promised such a shift, e.g. in the Common Transport Policy White Paper of 2001. In addition, environmentally harmful subsidies must be phased out within the next five years.

Other tools are also needed in order to internalise environmental objectives in production and service processes. The Parliament made an important step forward by introducing the 'individual producer responsibility' concept in the Directive on Waste from Electric and Electronic Equipment (WEEE). Making producers directly responsible for waste management provides an ongoing incentive to rethink and redesign products and services, leading to a reduction in hazardous waste. In the coming period, a number of specific waste streams will be tackled, including used tyres, and construction and demolition waste. Producers should be obliged to bear the costs of the collection and recycling of these waste streams, and eliminate hazardous substances from used materials.

By 2005, the EU needs to agree two thematic strategies that will contribute substantially to a change in consumption and production patterns: one strategy will focus on resource efficiency, the other on waste prevention and recycling.

Both strategies must include clear and ambitious targets and timetables and an effective mechanism for delivery.

THE NEXT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT SHOULD:

1. *Insist on clear targets and timetables for a reduction in the use of natural resources and implement effective instruments to achieve such reduction.*

2. *Exert constant pressure on the Council to embark on a major environmental fiscal reform, including taxation shifts from labour to the environment and a phasing out of environmentally harmful (national and EU) subsidies.*
3. *Insist on ambitious waste prevention targets for priority waste streams in order to bring about to an overall reduction of those streams.*
4. *Insist on very clear definitions for waste recycling, recovery and disposal, creating a level playing field for the recycling industry.*

8. THE EU TAKING THE LEAD IN THE GLOBAL CONTEXT

- **Corporate Accountability**

Transnational corporations (TNCs) influence the environment and society at the local and global level in many different ways, and their role is critical in creating a shift towards sustainable development. Attempts by the business community to improve performance through voluntary initiatives have proved insufficient, and a United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) report published in 2002, assessing progress since Rio, notes 'a growing gap between the efforts of business and industry to reduce their impact on the environment and the worsening state of the planet'. A similar gap exists in the social dimension.

In September 2002, the global community recognised the need to address these problems at the World Summit on Sustainable Development and included text on the promotion of 'corporate responsibility and accountability' in its conclusions.

So far at EU level, the Commission has invested its hopes for progress on corporate reporting and accountability in a multi-stakeholder forum on Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), which has been mandated to discuss the voluntary measures at a European level over the next two years. The European Parliament has been supportive of a regulatory framework – especially for environmental and social reporting. On the other hand, the Parliament has not filled its seat in the multi-stakeholder forum and has not taken the opportunity to become more actively involved in this process.

- **Trade as function of sustainability, not a threat**

The EU is a key player in global trade negotiations in the World Trade Organisation (WTO). The EU is also in the process of setting up regional and bilateral trade and investment agreements.

In its current form, EU trade policy-making is often pursued in the interest of large European business rather than people, the environment and sustainable development. This needs to change. Trade must be seen as a means of promoting the overarching goal of sustainable development and not as an aim in itself.

In addition to promoting international agreements that progress the aim of sustainable development, the EU should also set a good example by seeking to tackle illegal trade. Illegal trade undermines the environment and creates social injustice in developing countries.

THE NEXT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT SHOULD:

- **On corporate accountability**

1. *Insist that the European Union, where many of the transnational corporations (TNCs) are based, demonstrates international leadership. Legally binding rules for TNCs must be set at the global and European level.*
2. *Insist that the Commission's CSR process leads to more than just voluntary initiatives and that its conclusions are integrated in an appropriate manner into the Commission's work programme..*

- **On trade**

3. *Promote a trade policy that supports sustainable development.*
4. *Insist that the EU stands at the forefront of advancing a global governance system that is based on a balanced and better-articulated relationship between the trade and the environmental and social regimes and effective compliance regimes for Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEA).*
5. *Insist that WTO rules and decisions do not have a 'chill' effect on EU environmental policy-making; and support, rather than interfere, with the objectives and effectiveness of the Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) as well as the precautionary principle, with provisions to ensure that this is not abused for protectionist ends.*
6. *Promote robust and stakeholder-oriented Sustainability Impact Assessments (SIAs), which should be conducted at the outset of trade and investment negotiations. Their policy recommendations should be fully integrated into bilateral, regional and global negotiations*
7. *Insist that the EU stops working on investment agreements at the WTO. Instead, duties on corporations should be enshrined in the UN and EU legal framework (see corporate accountability).*
8. *Insist that clear and strong across the board exceptions are adopted so that no environmental law or regulation can be undermined by the GATS rules. Any service related to natural resource extraction (water, energy, minerals, timber etc) should be excluded from trade negotiations.*
9. *Insist that agricultural dumping on the developing world, as well as biopiracy, are stopped and export subsidies eliminated.*
10. *Insist on improvements in transparency and accountability in all aspects of trade policy making. The European Parliament should be fully involved in the negotiation of trade agreements from the start. Parliamentary assent should also be required for the conclusion of agreements.*
11. *Insist on effective co-operation between Commission and Member States to stop illegal imports of tropical timber and implement systematic monitoring of their actions and impacts.*

9. IMPLEMENTATION AND ENFORCEMENT OF LEGISLATION

EU environmental legislation has been notoriously badly implemented by the Member States. Infringement cases relating to the environment consistently represent almost half of all pending infringement cases in the EU. The Sixth Community Action Programme establishes the effective implementation and enforcement of Community legislation on the environment as a key strategic objective. In the next Parliament, MEPs will have an important 'oversight' role vis-à-vis the Commission and Council on the implementation of environmental laws.

THE NEXT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT SHOULD:

1. *Organise regular debates with the Commission and Council on the progress of implementing environmental Directives in both the old and new Member States.*
2. *Ensure that adequate funding is available to assist the implementation of environmental Directives.*
3. *Insist that adequate resources are allocated to the relevant services of the Commission overseeing the implementation of environmental Directives.*
4. *Ensure that all EU policies assist, not hinder, the effective implementation of environmental legislation.*
5. *Allow NGOs access to judicial review of EU institution decisions in order to defend citizens' interests.*

10. THE ENVIRONMENT MUST BE FULLY INTEGRATED INTO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT'S WORK

The Parliament has become more influential over the years. Environmental organisations hope that the new Constitution will introduce 'co-decision' into important new areas such as agriculture, cohesion policies and trade. This however creates a new responsibility for the Parliament: to ensure that all EU's policies integrate environmental requirements, an obligation laid down in Article 6 of the current EC Treaty. For this purpose, the Parliament must introduce an internal mechanism to ensure that all its Committees perform this task systematically.

The Parliament should also regularly consult environmental citizens' organisations, which act as watchdogs of the EU's policies and practices. Civil society organisations can provide the Parliament with a clear picture of many people's expectations and innovative ideas and solutions.

THE NEXT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT SHOULD:

1. *Ensure that it has effective control over the integration of environmental requirements into all policies: a special structural organisational arrangement needs to be made at the beginning of the new Parliamentary term.*
2. *Apply the precautionary principle wherever relevant and necessary and refuse to delay where urgent action is needed. Question arguments about incomplete scientific information and cost-benefit analysis, where the benefits are systematically underestimated because of a lack of concrete information.*

To contact the Green 8:

BirdLife International

T +32 (0) 2 280 08 30
F +32 (0) 2 230 38 02
E bleco@birdlifeeco.net
W <http://www.birdlife.org>

Friends of Nature International

T +43 (1) 892 38 77
F +43 (1) 812 97 89
E nfi@nfi.at
W <http://www.nfi.at>

Climate Action Network Europe

T +32 (0) 2 229 52 20
F +32 (0) 2 229 52 29
E info@climnet.org
W <http://www.climnet.org>

Greenpeace International, European Unit

T +32 (0) 2 274 19 00
F +32 (0) 2 274 19 10
E european.unit@diala.greenpeace.org
W <http://eu.greenpeace.org>

European Environmental Bureau

T +32 (0) 2 289 10 90
F +32 (0) 2 289 10 99
E info@eeb.org
W <http://www.eeb.org>

European Federation for Transport and Environment

T +32 (0) 2 502 99 09
F +32 (0) 2 502 99 08
E info@t-e.eu
W <http://www.t-e.eu>

Friends of the Earth Europe

T +32 (0) 2 542 01 80
F +32 (0) 2 537 55 96
E martin.rocholl@foeeurope.org
W <http://www.foeeurope.org>

World Wild Fund for Nature, European Policy Office

T +32 (0) 2 743 8800
F +32 (0) 2 743 8819
E tlong@wwfepo.org
W <http://www.panda.org/epo>