

SUIVI ACCORDÉ PAR LA COMMISSION AUX AVIS DU
COMITÉ ÉCONOMIQUE ET SOCIAL EUROPÉEN
RENDUS AU COURS DU 4ème TRIMESTRE 2007

(octobre et décembre 2007)

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

PARTIE A : Avis exploratoires¹

N°	TITRE	RÉFÉRENCES	DG RESP.	P.
39 3 ^{ème} trim 07	Santé et migration Rapporteur: M. SHARMA (Act. Div./UK) Corapporteur: Mme CSER (Trav./HU)	Demande de la présidence PT CESE 550/2007	JLS	7
7.	L'évolution de l'industrie du ciment européen Rapporteur: M. KRZAKLEWSKI (Trav./PL)	CESE 1041/2007	ENTR	11
8.	Le secteur automobile en Europe: situation actuelle et perspectives d'avenir Rapporteur: M. ZÖHRER (Trav./AT)	CESE 1065/2007	ENTR	13
11.	Maltraitance des personnes âgées Rapporteur: Mme HEINISCH (Act. Div./DE)	CESE 1465/2007	EMPL	15
14.	Bilan de santé et futur de la PAC après 2013 Rapporteur: M. KIENLE (Empl./DE)	CESE 1457/2007	AGRI	16

PARTIE B : avis faisant l'objet d'une réponse substantielle

N°	TITRE	RÉFÉRENCES	DG RESP.	P.
5.	Commercialisation des produits/accréditation et surveillance du marché – Code commun pour la commercialisation des produits – Produits commercialisés/règles nationales à appliquer dans un autre Etat membre Rapporteur: M. PEZZINI (Empl./IT)	COM(2007) 37 fin COM(2007) 53 fin COM(2007) 36 fin CESE 1693/2007	ENTR	18
9.	Sécurité sociale des travailleurs (salariés ou non) et de leurs familles Rapporteur: RODRIGUEZ GARCIA-CARO (Empl./ES)	COM(2007) 159 fin CESE 1464/2007	EMPL	19
10.	Le crédit et l'exclusion sociale dans la société de l'abondance M. PEGADO LIZ (Act. Div./PT)	Avis d'initiative CESE 1459/2007	EMPL	20

¹ Les n° de la colonne de gauche correspondent aux n° de la liste de demande de contributions (note SC(2008) 3) du 11 janvier 2008.

12.	Promouvoir la solidarité entre générations Rapporteur: M. JAHIER (Act. Div./IT)	COM(2007) 244 fin CESE 1711/2007	EMPL	22
15.	Organisation commune du marché vitivinicole Rapporteur: M. KIENLE (Empl./DE)	COM(2007) 372 fin CESE 1703/2007	AGRI	24
25.	Amélioration ds pratiques de démantèlement des navires (livre vert) Rapporteur: M. ADAMS (Act. Div./UK)	COM(2007) 269 fin CESE 1701/2007	ENV	26
26.	Adaptation aux effets négatifs du changement climatique (livre vert) Rapporteur: M. OSBORN (Act. Div./UK)	COM(2007) 354 fin CESE 1702/2007	ENV	28
30.	Livre vert – l'espace européen de la recherche Rapporteur: M. WOLF (Empl./DE)	COM(2007) 161 fin CESE 1440/2007	RDT	30
31.	Initiative technologique sur les systèmes informatiques embarqués/Création entreprise commune (ARTEMIS) Rapporteur: M. DANTIN (Trav./FR)	COM(2007) 243 fin CESE 1442/2007	INFSO	32
35.	Protection des consommateurs/Utilisation de biens à temps partagés Rapporteur: M. PEGADO LIZ (Act. Div./PT)	COM(2007) 303 fin CESE 1445/2007	SANCO	34
39.	Impact de la territorialité des législations fiscales sur les mutations industrielles Rapporteur: M. SCHADECK (Trav./LU)	Avis d'initiative CESE 1708/2007	TAXUD	38
40.	Politique communautaire d'immigration et coopération avec les pays d'origine Rapporteur: M. PARIZA CASTAÑOS (Act. Div./ES)	Avis d'initiative CESE 1461/2007	JLS	39
41.	Migration et développement: opportunités et défis Rapporteur: M. SHARMA (Act. Div./UK)	Avis d'initiative CESE 1713/2007	JLS	40

PARTIE C: avis faisant l'objet d'un autre type de réponse

a) Accord entre la Commission et le CESE

N°	TITRE	RÉFÉRENCES	DG RESP.	P.
6.	Unités de mesures Rapporteur: M. CASSIDY (Empl./UK)	COM(2007) 510 final CESE 1694/2007	ENTR	42
20.	Contrôle des transports de marchandises par route – compétence d'exécution	COM(2007) 509 final CESE 1453/2007	TREN	42
37.	Dispositions temporaires TVA Rapporteur: M. BURANI (Empl./IT)	COM(2007) 381 final CESE 1467/2007	TAXUD	42

b) Avis pour lesquels la Commission formule certaines remarques

N°	TITRE	RÉFÉRENCES	DG RESP.	P.
2.	Le rôle des conseils nationaux du développement durable Rapporteur: M. HAKEN (Act. Div./CZ)	Avis d'initiative CESE 1700/2007	SG	43
21.	Utilisation des biocarburants/progrès accomplis Rapporteur: M. IOZIA (Trav./IT)	COM(2006) 845 final CESE 1449/2007	TREN	45
22.	Réduction des émissions de gaz à effet de serre/transport routiers Rapporteur: M. OSBORN (Act. Div./UK)	COM(2007) 18 final CESE 1454/2007	ENV	48
23.	Réduction des émissions de CO ² des voitures et véhicules commerciaux légers Rapporteur: M. RANOCCHIARI (Empl./IT)	COM(2007) 19 final CESE 1450/2007	ENV	50
28.	Initiative en matière de matière de médicaments innovants/création entreprise commune Rapporteur: M. DANTIN (Trav./FR)	COM(2007) 241 final CESE 1441/2007	RDT	52
29.	Création de l'entreprise commune Clean Sky Rapporteur: M. DANTIN (Trav./FR)	COM(2007) 315 final CESE 1443/2007	RDT	54

32.	Etablissement de l'entreprise commune ENIAC Rapporteur: M. DANTIN (Trav./FR)	COM(2007) 356 final CESE 1444/2007	INFSO	56
33.	Service mobiles par satellites Rapporteur: M. OPRAN (Empl./RO)	COM(2007) 480 final CESE 1452/2007	INFSO	58
34.	4ème rapport sur la cohésion économique et sociale Rapporteur: M. DERRUINE (Trav./BE)	COM(2007) 273 final CESE 1712/2007	REGIO	59
36.	Régime fiscal gazole Rapporteur: M. BURANI (Empl./IT)	COM(2007) 52 final CESE 1466/2007	TAXUD	65
38.	Instruments fondés sur le marché en faveur des objectifs environnementaux (livre vert) Rapporteur: M. RIBBE (Act. Div./DE)	COM(2007) 140 final CESE 1697/2007	TAXUD	70
43.	Les relations UE-Moldavie Rapporteur: Mme PICHENOT (Act. Div./FR)	Avis d'initiative CESE 1714/2007	RELEX	72
44.	Statistiques communautaires de santé publique et de santé et sécurité au travail Rapporteur: M. RETUREAU (Trav./FR)	COM(2007) 46 final CESE 1463/2007	ESTAT	75

c) Avis pour lesquels, en l'état, la Commission n'est pas en mesure de formuler des remarques

N°	TITRE	RÉFÉRENCES	DG RESP.	P.
1.	Esprit d'entreprise et le programme de Lisbonne Rapporteur: Mme SHARMA (Empl./UK) Co-Rapporteur: M. OLSSON (Act. Div./SE)	Avis d'initiative CESE 1460/2007	SG	76
3.	Mise en œuvre de la stratégie de Lisbonne Rapporteur: M. VAN IERSEL (Empl./NL)	Avis d'initiative CESE 1715/2007	SG	76
13.	Evolution de l'indemnité compensatoire pour les zones défavorisés à partir de 2010 Rapporteur: M. KIENLE (Empl./DE)	Avis d'initiative CESE 1456/2007	AGRI	77

16.	La main d'œuvre agricole transfrontalière Rapporteur: M. SIECKER (Trav./NL)	Avis d'initiative CESE 1698/2007	EMPL	77
17.	La situation de l'emploi dans l'agriculture (supplément d'avis) Rapporteur: M. WILMS (Trav./DE)	Avis d'initiative CESE 1699/2007	AGRI	77
18.	Perspectives d'avenir de l'agriculture dans les zones à handicaps naturels spécifiques Rapporteur: M. BROS (Act. Div./FR)	Avis d'initiative CESE 1704/2007	AGRI	77
19.	Modification – application de certaines dispositions à l'Estonie	COM(2007) 411 final CESE 1451/2007	TREN	77
24.	Le changement climatique et la stratégie de Lisbonne Rapporteur: M. EHNMARK (Trav./SE)	Avis d'initiative CESE 1458/2007	SG	77
27.	Impact des règles européennes en matières d'environnement sur les mutations industrielles Rapporteur: M. PEZZINI (Empl./IT)	Avis d'initiative CESE 1709/2007	ENV	78
42.	La Croatie sur la voie de l'adhésion Rapporteur: Mme SIGMUND (Act. Div./AT)	Avis d'initiative CESE 1468/2007	ELARG	78

PARTIE A : Avis exploratoires

<p>39. Health and Migrations 3è Exploratory opinion requested by PT Presidency – EESC 1001/2007 – trim July 2007 Rapporteur: Mr SHARMA (Var. Int./UK) Corapporteur: Mrs CSER (Work./HU) DG SANCO and JLS – Mrs VASSILIOU and Mr BARROT</p>	
Main Points of the EESC Opinion	Commission Position
<p>Recommendation 1.1.1: Foster cooperation concerning information on health and social care for migrants.</p>	<p>The Commission White Paper “Together for Health: A Strategic Approach for the EU 2008-2013 of 23.10.2007 (COM (2007) 630) recognises migration as one of the issues that EU Health systems need to address.</p> <p>The Commission is funding projects through the public health programme (2003-2008) relating to information on health and social care for migrants.</p>
<p>1.1.2 Member States and the EU should step up cooperation with international organisations on immigrant health and monitoring and assessing problems and benefits on local, regional , national and European levels.</p>	<p>Ongoing cooperation with relevant international organisations is taking place. The Commission participated in the Council of Europe Ministerial Conference 'People on the Move' in November 2007. At the WHO Executive Board in January 2008, the Commission worked with Member States to support, strengthen and adopt a draft resolution on migrants' health. The Slovenian Presidency made a statement on behalf of EU27 plus 10 candidate, EFTA and ENP countries. Funding through the public health programme is being provided to the International Organization for Migration and other partners for work on health aspects of border control</p>
<p>Recommendation 1.1.3: taking minority cultures into consideration in education.</p>	<p>In line with the Commissions "<i>Common agenda for integration</i>" (COM 2005(389)).</p> <p>The European Integration Fund 2007-2012 (Decision 435/2007 of 25 June</p>

	2007) provides for possibilities for co-financing related activities.
1.1.4 A Special Compensation Fund should be set up, together with programmes for training, resettlement and cooperation between host countries and countries of origin.	<p>The impact of recruitment of health professionals on the health economies of the countries of origin will be one of the issues for consultation in the proposed Green Paper on Health Professionals which the European Commission plans to publish towards the end of 2008.</p> <p>See also answer on point 1.1.8</p>
Recommendation 1.1.5: Provide access to medical treatment to all migrants	<p>Access of third-country nationals to health care in Member States is an important core issue of the EU legal framework adopted so far in the field of immigration and asylum and expressly covered by EC Directives regulating the status of third country long-term residents; victims of trafficking, third country researchers; asylum seekers and refugees.</p> <p>The currently discussed proposal for a Directive on a common set of rights for third country workers (COM (2007) 638) as well as the proposal for a Directive on common standards for returning illegally staying third country nationals (COM(2005) 391) also contain relevant provisions.</p>
1.1.6 Confidentiality clauses between patients and medical institutions should be introduced to ensure that information about a person's immigration status cannot be disclosed to third parties and therefore should not deter migrants from seeking medical care and treatment especially in case of irregular migration.	The introduction of such confidentiality clauses is primarily a matter for Member States. However Member States are required to respect their obligations under Directive 95/46, in particular, with regard to the prohibition on subsequent incompatible processing.
1.1.7 Member States and the EU should cooperate to improve data collection and research on migration and health throughout the EU	The Public Health Programme (2002-2007) is supporting work to improve information on migrant health.
1.1.8 Health should be included as an essential dimension of migration	The Commission is committed to ensuring that health considerations are

	<p>included in its migration policies. In its 5 December 2007 Communication "Towards a Common Immigration Policy" (COM(2007) 780), the Commission expressed renewed commitment to develop a common immigration policy which is closely linked with the external agenda including development. It also committed itself to ensure policy consistency between all relevant policy fields.</p>
<p>1.1.9 Health impact assessments should evaluate the potential impact on both health and non-health policies on the health of migrants</p>	<p>Health impact assessment and the assessment of the differential impact of policies on social inclusion, on equality of treatment and discrimination and on social rights and standards is part of impact assessment obligations for all EU policy actions.</p>
<p>1.1.10 MS that traditionally offer specialist tropical medical services must offer their expertise to all EU residents and continue to undertake high quality research into treatments for tropical illnesses, particularly malaria</p>	<p>Seventh research framework programme provides opportunities for research in these areas.</p>
<p>1.1.11 Improved mechanisms are needed to assess and provide for the health needs of all categories of migrants as soon as possible after arrival. Enhanced cooperation is required between the EU and MS to provide for the immediate needs of migrants arriving with urgent medical need, particularly through the provision of interpreters.</p>	<p>See also answer on point 1.1.5</p>
<p>1.1.12 Health of migrants at work should be prioritised. This should involve cooperation by social partners and the competent authorities to ensure that high standards of occupational health and safety are maintained in sectors in which migrants are commonly employed. Workplace based health promotion programmes should also be further developed in cooperation with community based services to help meet the needs of migrant workers and their families.</p>	<p>The Community Strategy on Health and Safety at Work 2007-2012 (COM (2007) 62 final) contains important measures to strengthen cooperation by social partners and competent authorities to ensure high standards of occupational health and safety are maintained across all relevant sectors – including those which have a high proportion of migrant workers. The strategy also includes a commitment to further develop workplace based health</p>

	promotion.
1.1.13 School based health promotion programmes should also be considered as a way of providing for the health needs of migrant children. Health of migrant children is a particular priority. Pre-School and school-based health services must meet the needs of children from all backgrounds, including the children of migrants, with particular emphasis on new arrivals.	Positive. However principle responsibility rests with Member States.
1.1.14 Health care and preventive services should be developed with are culturally appropriate and sensitive without making any concessions to the ban on female genital mutilation.	<p>Positive. In line with the Commissions "<i>Common agenda for integration</i>" (COM 2005(389)).</p> <p>Action to support the prevention of major diseases of particular significance forms an important part of the community health programme (20-08-2013).</p> <p>The European Community addresses the issue of female genital mutilation (FGM) in its strategy to fight violence against children, young people and women. Since 1997 around 10 projects to combat female genital mutilation have received EU funding through the Daphne programme. There is a specific commitment to prevent FGM included in the Cotonou Agreement with 79 African, Caribbean and Pacific countries.</p>
1.1.16: Promote ethical recruitment of health professionals and foster circular migration	<p>The European Commission plans to publish a Green Paper on health professionals towards the end on 2008. The consultation will help to define the scope and elements of future European policy with regard to the effects of healthcare workforce mobility and ethical recruitment.</p> <p>See also answer on point 1.1.8</p>
1.1.17: The role of the authorities controlling public health should be enhanced and the exchange of good	The community health programme (2008-2013) provides funding to support cooperation to enhance the

practices should be encouraged and here EU authorities should play a coordinating role.	application of best practice within Member States, including,
1.1.18: Enhance intercultural dialogue – focusing on the state of health and health care ² .	The European Integration Fund 2007-2012 (Decision 435/2007 of 25 June 2007) provides for possibilities for co-financing related activities.
1.1.19: Implement ILO Conventions on migrants	The currently discussed proposal for a Directive on a common set of rights for third country workers (COM (2007) 638) already covers several core aspects of these Conventions.

<p>7. The development of the European cement industry EESC 1041/2007 – December 2007 Rapporteur: Mr KRZAKLEWSKI (Work./PL) DG ENV – Mr DIMAS</p>	
Main points of the EESC Opinion	Commission Position
(B) The EESC's CCMI calls on the European Commission to amend the European CO ₂ emissions policy, in particular by including more detailed references to the specifics of the cement sector and by taking greater account of the global context.	On 23 January 2008, the Commission adopted a Climate Change and Renewable Energy Package. One element in the package is a proposal for the revision of Directive 2003/87/EC on Emissions Trading. The proposal includes amongst others provisions on allocation of allowances for free. The proposed Articles 10(a) and 10(b) differentiate between three groups of installations: electricity generators, all other installations, and within the latter those installations in sectors exposed to a significant risk of carbon leakage. At the latest by 30 June 2010, the Commission shall determine which sectors or sub-sectors fall within the latter category. Installations in these sectors will receive up to 100% of their

²

See the EESC opinion of 20.04.2006 on the "Proposal for a Decision of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue (2008)" - COM(2005) 467 final – 2005/0203 (COD), rapporteur Ms Cser (OJ C 185, 8.8.2006).

	<p>share of allocations for free.</p> <p>Article 10b provides that the Commission will assess the situation with regards to energy-intensive sectors or sub-sectors in the light of the outcome of the international negotiations, and taking into account any binding sectoral agreements.</p> <p>Article 10(a)1 provides that any allocation for free will be based on Community wide and fully harmonised implementing measures.</p>
<p>(C) Regarding the above-mentioned CO₂ emissions policy and, in particular, the European Emissions Trading System (EST), the EESC's CCMI wishes to draw the attention of the Commission and the Council to the fact that data from recent years indicate that the high price of CO₂ emission rights can prove to be more of a lure than the production of greater volumes of cement, even for the most modern European cement plants which lead the way in the reduction of CO₂ emissions. Accordingly, the allocation of quotas should be preceded by an analysis to set sustainable goals, avert distortion of the market and motivate entrepreneurs to improve energy efficiency and thus further reduce CO₂ emissions. The findings of this analysis should be implemented with reference to the policies of both the EU and of the individual Member States, where the final decisions on limit allocations are taken.</p>	<p>The Commission conducted the appropriate impact assessments. With respect to the cement industry, these documents refer to several reports and studies that present a nuanced assessment of the risk of carbon leakage in the cement industry. Refer to p.17 of the Impact Assessment accompanying the Package of Implementation measures for the EU's objectives on climate change and renewable energy for 2020 - SEC(2008) 85 and section 5.6 of the Impact Assessment accompanying document to the proposal for amending Directive 2003/87/EC so as to improve and extend the EU greenhouse gas emission allowance trading system.</p>
<p>Point 1.7.3: (...) CO₂-allocation method, which should be based more on optimising efficiency in terms of CO₂ emissions than on absolute limits.</p>	<p>The Commission disagrees on this point. Absolute limits on emissions and allocations that are fixed before the start of the trading period are crucial elements for ensuring that the emission reduction targets will be achieved.</p>
<p>Point 2.3.5: (...) one must stress the need to introduce into the cement industry the same incentives for using biomass in the technological process which exist in the</p>	<p>The carbon price gives a strong and uniform incentive to use biomass in order to reduce emissions. The Commission would however disagree</p>

transport or power sectors.	to the recommendation in as far as further incentives are meant. In line with the State aid rules, incentives for the use of biomass should not go beyond the <i>extra</i> cost for the operator, which means that incentives must be differentiated according to the situation. Significant quantities of biomass are being used in the cement industry without further incentives.
The report discusses emissions other than CO2 from cement plants without specific recommendations.	Unfortunately, some technical errors still remain in the report. The Commission notes that operators in the cement industry have to respect the applicable rules, in particular those ensuing from Directive 96/61/EC concerning integrated pollution prevention and control and Directive 2000/76/EC on Waste Incineration Directive (Directive 94/67/EC on Hazardous Waste Incineration has been replaced). In addition, the Commission proposed a Directive on Industrial Emissions (COM (2007)844 final, 21.12.2007).

<p>8. The automotive sector in Europe: recent situation and prospects EESC 1065/2007 – December 2007 Rapporteur : Mr ZÖHRER (Work./AT) DG ENTR – Mr VERHEUGEN</p>	
Main points of the EESC Opinion	Commission Position
<p>1. The EESC's CCMI calls for a broad dialogue involving all stakeholders in the light of the need to reconcile individual mobility and goods transport with close to full capacity traffic volumes, environmental impacts, security risks and the scarcity of raw materials.</p>	<p>The Commission has already initiated the CARS 21 High Level Group to consider and address some of the issues outlined in the CCMI report through developing an integrated approach to industrial policy in the sector. The Commission notes the CCMI's position in the light of preparing for the mid-term review of CARS 21, which is due to take place in 2009.</p>
<p>2. The CCMI urges the Commission to carry out a more in-depth analysis of component-related (suppliers) fields and</p>	<p>The Commission shares the CCMI's view on this issue and has consequently launched several studies in 2007, which</p>

employment trends in the light of the current scarcity of statistical data.	<i>inter alia</i> , try to address component suppliers and employment. These studies will feed into the mid-term review of the CARS 21 exercise.
3. The CCMI suggests that the regulatory framework for the automotive sector should follow better regulation principles and involve good co-ordination between the different Commission DGs.	The CARS 21 exercise established the automotive sector as one of the flagships in terms of better regulation and the Commission believes that its policies for the sector are well co-ordinated between its different departments.
4. The CCMI concludes that the future of the European car industry lies primarily in competition based on innovation and calls for the creation of conditions which foster research and development.	Again, the Commission agrees with this position (as outlined in the CARS 21 Communication – COM(2007) 22) and is glad to note that the automotive sector is not only the largest private industrial R&D investor in Europe but is also highly involved in different Community research programmes and technology platforms.
5. The CCMI recommends that the Commission should contribute to and create the conditions for the development of partnerships between OEMs and component manufactures.	Although the Commission can hardly intervene in the commercial undertakings of private enterprises, it is trying to put in place an industrial policy framework which encourages the competitiveness of the industry as a whole. In this context, the Commission would note that value chain management is already one of the key competitive advantages of the European automotive industry.
6. The CCMI places considerable stress on the need to improve the qualifications of the workforce and to anticipate change in the sector.	The Commission shares this view and has organised a restructuring forum on the anticipation of change in the automotive sector as one of the follow-up actions to CARS 21. The Commission is also conducting ongoing work on the employment and restructuring of the automotive sector and has already approved several cases for the use of the Globalisation Adjustment Fund to manage change in this sector.

11. La maltraitance des personnes âgées
CESE 1465/2007 – Octobre 2007
Rapporteur : Mme HEINISCH (Act. Div./DE)

DG EMPL – M. ŠPIDLA	
Points de l'avis du CESE estimés essentiels	Position de la Commission
<p>1.3 : Élaborer, sur la base de la législation existante, une stratégie globale visant à empêcher la maltraitance des personnes âgées.</p>	<p>La Commission partage l'avis du CES que, dans le contexte du changement démographique, la protection des droits fondamentaux des personnes âgées, constituant un groupe particulièrement vulnérable, est une tâche primordiale pour les sociétés européennes. C'est pourquoi la Commission a l'intention d'adopter au cours de 2008 une communication sur la protection de la dignité des personnes âgées. L'objectif de cette communication sera de sensibiliser à la nécessité de mieux protéger les droits fondamentaux des personnes âgées. La communication présentera plusieurs domaines dans lesquels la Commission pourra soutenir les États membres dans leurs efforts de protéger la dignité des personnes âgées et d'empêcher leur maltraitance. Il appartient cependant aux États membres d'élaborer des stratégies globales.</p>
<p>1.3 : Effectuer une étude sur le thème de "La maltraitance des personnes âgées, et notamment des personnes en situation de dépendance" afin d'obtenir dans l'ensemble de l'UE des informations sur les taux de prévalence ainsi que sur les causes et les facteurs de risque.</p>	<p>La Commission partage l'avis du CESE que le phénomène de la maltraitance des personnes âgées devrait faire l'objet de plus de recherches. En principe, le 7^{ème} programme cadre de recherche et de développement technologique peut soutenir des projets de recherche liés à la maltraitance des personnes âgées.</p>

<p>14. Health Check of the CAP and its future after 2013 EESC 1457/2007 – October 2007 Rapporteur : Mr KIENLE (Empl./DE) DG AGRI – Ms FISCHER-BOEL</p>	
Main points of the EESC opinion	Commission position
<p>The EESC has made an exploratory opinion on the Health Check of the CAP and its future after 2013, upon request of the Commissioner. The opinion was adopted 25 October</p>	<p>Commission presented a Communication on the Health Check review of the Common Agricultural policy on 20th November 2007.</p>
<p>The health check should be a review of the extent to which the aims of the CAP reform are being achieved enabling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Easier and more straightforward implementation, and • Removal of obstacles to targeted implementation of reform measures which have already been agreed on. 	<p>Commission Communication acknowledges EESC statement that the HC scope should not be a fundamental reform of the CAP. In fact, the 2003 Reform was the first step to make the CAP fit for the 21st century. Consensus on all the elements of the 2003 Reform could not be reached in one go. Indeed, this is why a number of review clauses were already foreseen in the final agreement, as were in other subsequent reforms since 2003. These review clauses, without implying a fundamental reform of the existing policies, allow the possibility of further adjustments in line with market and other developments.</p>
<p>The EESC is opposed to an increase in mandatory modulation. The priorities for the health check should be a thorough review of the administrative rules for farm subsidies and cross-compliance.</p>	<p>The Commission understands EESC. However, the only way to provide sound funds for HC new challenges must be through a sound use of increased compulsory modulation.</p> <p>The review mentioned by EESC on cross compliance and direct payments will be followed as it is mentioned in the communication: the scope of the first will be analysed in terms of eligible criteria and number of provisions..</p>

<p>In connection with the debate about the future of the CAP after 2013, the EESC considers an adaptation of its aims (Article 33 of the EC Treaty) to today's circumstances and challenges to be necessary, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • counter the risks of increasing instability on agricultural markets; • guarantee that setting high standards for production is not rendered meaningless by allowing imports which do not comply with EU requirements and • help to ensure that a wide range of foodstuffs continues to be available in the future. 	<p>The Commission Communication took the risk management issue into account by identifying the types of risk and open the reflexion on the possibility of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • extend the use of part of modulation savings to allow risk management measures in the framework of RD policy, provided that they meet "green box" criteria; • examine on a case-by-case basis the need for additional measures in the context of future adjustments in market mechanisms and carry out, at a later stage, a more general examination of risk management for the period after 2013.
<p>In favour of substantial increase in funding for measures under the second pillar after 2013, making targeted use of current savings on export subsidies and other market-relief measures generated by the market situation</p>	<p>The Commission has already stated in different forums that this political decision of transferring unused funds in the first pillar to the second pillar would need an agreement by budgetary authority. That is why the modulation is a more pragmatic functional mean to provide additional funding for future CAP challenges.</p>

PARTIE B : avis faisant l'objet d'une réponse substantielle

5. Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council setting out the requirements for accreditation and market surveillance relating to the marketing of products
Proposal for a Decision of the European Parliament and of the Council on a common framework for the marketing of products
Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down procedures relating to the application of certain national technical rules to products lawfully marketed in another Member State and repealing Decision 3052/95/EC
COM(2007) 36 final - COM(2007) 37 final - COM(2007) 53 final
EESC 1693/2007 – December 2007
Rapporteur: Mr PEZZINI (Empl./IT)
DG ENTR -Mr VERHEUGEN

Main points of the EESC Opinion	Commission Position
<p>The EESC endorsed the basic principles of the three proposals and made, as regards the two first proposals set out above, general observations.</p>	<p>The Commission took into account the suggestions of the Committee during the co-decision procedure.</p>
<p>The EESC feels that high levels of transparency, legal certainty and simplification must be ensured in the application of common mutual recognition procedures, by means of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reversal of the burden of proof, and the possibility of recourse to national courts; • the possibility of out-of-court settlement of disputes at Product Contact Points, including on line; • provision of capable, competent national technical facilities which can produce any proof needed quickly – using emergency procedures where applicable; • an active role for regulatory bodies in producing a telematic guide making it possible to trace all existing legislation throughout the EU. 	<p>During the co-decision procedure, the Commission took account of almost all points raised by the EESC by supporting the amendments inspired by the concerns of the EESC.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the Commission believes that a list of products covered by the Regulation would be useful for the guides to which the EESC refers in points 5.1.9 and 5.1.11 of its opinion. Moreover, the Commission is convinced that it is important for the safety of consumer products to exclude the urgency procedure provided for in the General Product Safety Directive.</p>

<p>9. Proposition de règlement du Parlement européen et du Conseil modifiant le règlement (CEE) n° 1408/71 relatif à l'application des régimes de sécurité sociale aux travailleurs salariés, aux travailleurs non salariés et aux membres de leur famille qui se déplacent à l'intérieur de la Communauté (modifications diverses 2006) COM (2007) 159 final – CESE 1464/2007 – Octobre 2007 Rapporteur : M. RODRIGUÉZ GARCIA-CARO (Empl./ES) DG EMPL – M. ŠPIDLA</p>	
Points de l'avis du CESE estimés essentiels	Position de la Commission
<p>Le CESE appuie les modifications apportées par cette proposition de règlement aux annexes du règlement 1408/71.</p>	<p>La Commission prend note de l'avis favorable du CESE.</p>
<p>Le CESE invite le Parlement européen et le Conseil à accélérer au maximum le processus de prise de décisions et à faire en sorte que la nouvelle coordination des systèmes de sécurité sociale entre en vigueur dans les plus brefs délais.</p>	<p>La Commission est également soucieuse que les nouveaux règlements de coordination (règlement 883/2004 et règlement d'application) soient applicables dans les meilleurs délais. La Commission fera valoir ce point devant les deux institutions citées.</p>
<p>Le CESE insiste sur la nécessité, pour les pouvoirs publics nationaux, de diffuser de façon efficace à leurs citoyens des messages clairs et concis les informant sur leurs droits en matière de sécurité sociale lorsqu'ils circulent dans l'UE, quel que soit le motif de leur déplacement.</p>	<p>Il s'agit d'une compétence nationale. A son niveau, la Commission travaille dans le même sens par la mise à jour de sites internet et la diffusion de brochures dans toutes les langues officielles de la Communauté.</p>

<p>10. Le crédit et l'exclusion sociale dans la société de l'abondance Avis d'initiative – CESE 1459/2007 – Octobre 2007 Rapporteur: M. PEGADO LIZ (Act. Div./PT) DG EMPL – M. SPIDLA</p>	
<p>Points de l'avis du CESE estimés essentiels</p>	<p>Position de la Commission</p>
<p>6.3.1 Connaître le surendettement par une étude européenne qui apprécierait la dimension économique et sociale de l' "endettement excessif".</p>	<p>L'étude "Common operational European definition of over-indebtedness" (contract n° VC/2006/0308 du 19.12.2006) pose les bases d'une définition statistique harmonisée du surendettement. Le rapporteur du CESE a présenté l'avis lors de la conférence finale de cette étude, le 11 décembre 2007.</p> <p>Dans le cadre de sa grande enquête européenne sur le revenu et les conditions de vie des ménages (EU-SILC), Eurostat lance en 2008 un recueil (ponctuel) de données sur le surendettement et l'exclusion financière. Les résultats en seront disponibles en 2009.</p> <p>Ces résultats statistiques européens combinés aux propositions de l'étude pourront alimenter la révision de EU-SILC, prévue en 2011.</p>
<p>6.3.2 Prevenir le surendettement par :</p> <p>a- des mesures techniques législatives,</p> <p>b- la promotion de bonnes pratiques et des programmes d'éducation,</p> <p>c- la création d'un Observatoire européen de l'endettement.</p>	<p>a- Certaines des mesures concernées ont été discutées, sinon prises en compte, dans le cadre de l'élaboration de la prochaine directive sur le crédit à la consommation.</p> <p>D'autres propositions devront être prises en compte dans le cadre :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - des suites qui seront données au Livre blanc de la Commission du 18 décembre 2007 sur l'intégration du marché européen du crédit hypothécaire - de l'initiative visant à garantir que personne au sein de l'UE ne se voit

	<p>refuser le droit à un compte bancaire de base annoncée par la Commission dans le cadre du paquet Révision du marché intérieur</p> <p>b- la méthode ouverte de coordination pour la protection sociale et l'inclusion sociale promeut l'apprentissage mutuel entre toutes les parties prenantes. Plusieurs études et 'peer reviews' ont déjà eu lieu en matière de surendettement. La Commission a soutenu la création du 'European Consumer Debt Network' (ECDN). Une conférence co-organisée conjointement le 28 mai 2008 a examiné les prestations de services financiers dans une perspective d'inclusion sociale. Par ailleurs, un projet de développement de "budgets standards" pour les ménages a reçu le soutien du programme PROGRESS.</p> <p>c- la Commission est réticente à la création d'un nouvel organisme spécifique. Elle estime en revanche important de soutenir les initiatives existantes (soutien aux organismes rassemblant les praticiens ou chercheurs) et de mettre à l'agenda européen le surendettement, envisagé dans ses composantes financières et sociales.</p>
<p>6.3.3 Réparer le surendettement par la publication d'un livre vert proposant un ensemble de principes fondamentaux régissant les procédures de traitement des situations de surendettement</p>	<p>Cette proposition est intéressante et mérite un examen approfondi par la Commission. Elle devrait s'avérer complémentaire de la recommandation du Comité des ministres du Conseil de l'Europe sur le même sujet.</p>

12. Promouvoir la solidarité entre générations
COM (2007) 244 final – CESE 1711/2007 – Décembre 2007
Rapporteur : M. JAHIER (Act. Div./IT)
DG EMPL – M. SPIDLA

Points de l'avis du CESE estimés essentiels	Position de la Commission
<p>Diffusion large par la Commission d'informations sur l'état d'avancement de la mise en œuvre des orientations de la Communication afin de garantir la participation la plus vaste possible au processus.</p>	<p>L'information sur les travaux du Groupe d'experts sur la démographie, les forums européens et les résultats des études se fera sur les pages 'Situation sociale et démographie' du portail de la DG Emploi de la Commission. Par ailleurs, le portail internet dédié à l'Alliance européenne pour les familles donnera de nombreuses informations sur les actions menées par l'UE et les Etats membres en matière de politiques familiales. Plusieurs conférences associant la société civile sont également prévues en 2008: outre celles citées ci-dessous sur les personnes âgées, un séminaire a été organisé en 2007 pour la présentation de la base de données OCDE et des travaux de la fondation de Dublin et un autre est prévu en 2008 sur l'évaluation des politiques familiales.</p>
<p>Préparation par la Commission d'un plan détaillé de forums nationaux et locaux.</p>	<p>L'organisation des forums nationaux et locaux dépend des initiatives des Etats membres et ne peut être planifiée par la Commission.</p>
<p>Concernant l'Observatoire des bonnes pratiques en matière de politiques familiales confié à la fondation de Dublin, invitation à ne pas se limiter uniquement aux questions liées à la vie professionnelle, mais appel à établir une identification précise des besoins de la famille et de toutes les générations, ainsi que de l'offre et de l'investissement destinés à protéger et à promouvoir le développement d'une nouvelle solidarité entre les générations. Invitation également à une consultation étroite des acteurs de la société civile, à tous les stades du processus.</p>	<p>La Commission a exprimé une demande en ce sens. Il reste cependant à clarifier le financement de cette activité qui ne devrait pas se substituer à d'autres activités de la Fondation.</p>

<p>Développement de la recherche dans de nombreux domaines: rôle et impact des politiques fiscales, participation active des seniors à la société, soutien à l'autonomie des personnes âgées, perspective du cycle de vie, pauvreté infantile, familles en difficulté, obstacles rencontrés par les jeunes en matière d'indépendance et fondation d'une famille.</p>	<p>Une série d'études récentes ou en cours permettra de répondre en grande partie aux demandes exprimées. Par ailleurs le 7ème programme de recherche de la Commission intégrera ces préoccupations dans ses appels d'offre et des analyses approfondies et revues par les pairs sur la pauvreté infantile et les services aux personnes âgées ont été conduites dans le cadre de la MOC (Méthode ouverte de coordination) sur les politiques d'inclusion sociale en 2007.</p>
<p>Réduction des taux de TVA pour les articles de la première enfance, à commencer par les couches pour bébé.</p>	<p>La réduction de TVA n'est pas la mesure la plus adaptée aux besoins des familles, d'autant qu'elle pose des problèmes de mise en œuvre (où commencent et où s'arrêtent les produits pour enfants) et requiert l'unanimité des Etats membres.</p>
<p>Mainstreaming des politiques familiales dans l'ensemble des politiques communautaires et relance d'un groupe interservices spécifique sur les politiques familiales.</p>	<p>Le groupe interservices sur la démographie examine notamment les initiatives relatives aux familles et enfants, et il n'est donc pas envisagé de créer un groupe spécifique sur les politiques familiales.</p>
<p>Orientations complémentaires à donner sur les politiques de logement et la prise en charge des personnes handicapées et dépendantes</p>	<p>Plusieurs initiatives sont lancées par la Commission en 2008 pour améliorer la prise en charge des besoins des personnes âgées (communication sur les besoins des personnes âgées) et des personnes dépendantes: conférence européenne et communication sur la maltraitance des personnes âgées; conférence de la présidence slovène sur la solidarité intergénérationnelle et les soins de longue durée. La question de l'accès au logement fait l'objet d'une priorité des Etats membres dans les Plans d'action nationaux du programme 2008-2010 de la MOC inclusion sociale, et la Commission leur apportera un soutien dans le cadre du programme Progress (échange entre Etats membres et étude prévus sur le logement des sans abris en 2008).</p>
<p>Recours au CESE pour consulter la société civile sur les initiatives européennes concernant les politiques familiales</p>	<p>Les membres du CESE sont invités à participer aux forums et conférences organisés sur la démographie et les politiques familiales. Le CESE a été consulté en 2006 par la Commission européenne et la présidence allemande sur la famille et</p>

	l'évolution démographique, en 2007 par la Commission pour la préparation de la communication sur la maltraitance des personnes âgées et il le sera en 2008 pour celle concernant les besoins d'une société vieillissante.
--	---

<p>15. Proposal for a Council Regulation on the common organisation of the market in wine and amending certain Regulations COM(2007) 372 final – EESC 1703/2007- December 2007 Rapporteur Mr KIENLE (Empl./DE) DG AGRI – Mrs FISCHER-BOEL</p>	
Main points of the EESC opinion	Commission position
The EESC broadly endorses the objectives of the European Commission proposal, especially the one related to improving the competitiveness of European wines and winning back market shares.	The Commission acknowledges and welcomes the general support of the EESC to the reform of the CMO in wine.
The EESC considers the European Commission's proposal to provide the wine-producing Member States with an individual national budget envelope as an important fillip to subsidiarity and consideration of regional differences. However, the list of support instruments must be extended if the objectives of the reform are to be achieved.	The Commission welcomes the support of the EESC concerning the introduction of this new policy tool. Concerning the list of measures contained in the menu, the Commission has finally agreed with the decision of the Council to extend the list of eligible measures.
The EESC is pleased that the European Commission has modified its proposal for a grubbing-up programme. However, it would make sense for these measures to be carried out under regional or national structural programmes	The Commission believes that the decision to grub-up should be taken by the producer rather than programmed by the national/regional authorities. Within this general rule, exceptions and guarantees can be applied by Member States to safeguard environmentally sensible areas or to avoid excessive abandonment in a single area. The Council largely supported the Commission approach.
The EESC welcomes the fact that the EU Commission has placed considerable emphasis on export promotion measures within the national budget envelope.	The Commission welcomes the support of the EESC concerning the introduction of the new promotion and information measures. Information on the internal market can be

<p>Measures are also needed to inform consumers in the internal market about wine-growing and in particular about the advantages of moderate wine consumption and the dangers of alcohol abuse.</p>	<p>made within the limits of the budget reserved for this purpose.</p>
<p>The EESC pleads for a phasing-out period in the new CMO, in particular for market measures.</p>	<p>The Commission has accepted the idea of a transitional period before the complete abolition of certain market measures, as it was recently also for the reform of the fruit and vegetable sector. It could therefore agree with the Council decision in this respect.</p>
<p>The EESC is opposed to the liberalisation of planting rights, even at a later point, since this would jeopardise the economic, social, environmental and landscape maintenance objectives of the wine-market reform.</p>	<p>The Commission has considered some concerns of the EESC regarding the liberalisation of planting rights; therefore it showed flexibility to give more time to the sector to prepare for the liberalisation. However, this measure was considered as an irremissible element to boost the competitiveness of the wine sector.</p>
<p>The EESC is opposed to transfer from the CMO to the second pillar.</p>	<p>The Commission has taken into account the position of the EESC on this point and has agreed with the Council decision to reduce the size of the transfer to the Rural Development.</p>
<p>The EESC is opposed to changes in the status quo on enrichment.</p>	<p>The Commission has acknowledged the big concerns of Northern Member States concerning the ban on chaptalisation; therefore it was ready to step back from this proposal. However, since the status quo on wine enrichment was unsustainable, the compromise solution adopted by the Council consisted in the generalised reduction of the enrichment limits and the phasing out of the must aid.</p>
<p>The EESC is opposed to transfer of competencies from the Council to the Commission for winemaking practices.</p>	<p>Given on the one hand the high political sensitivity of winemaking practices, and on the other hand the need for the wine sector to have quite rapid decisions on this issue, the Commission supported the compromise solution consisting in attributing the competence for winemaking practices to a Regulatory Committee rather than to the Management Committee.</p>

<p>25. Green paper on better Ship Dismantling COM(2007) 269 final – EESC 1701/2007 – December 2007 Rapporteur: Mr ADAMS (Var. Int./UK) DG ENV- Mr DIMAS</p>	
<p>Main points of the EESC Opinion</p>	<p>Commission Position</p>
<p>(1.1) The Committee welcomes the Commission’s proposal for action at both the international and regional level to change, as soon as possible, current unacceptable ship dismantling practices.</p>	<p>The Commission is grateful for the support provided by the Committee on its work towards an EU strategy on better ship dismantling.</p>
<p>(1.6) The Committee recognizes that the dismantling of end-of-life vessels is a complex issue involving an important contribution in jobs and raw material resources which accrue to the developing countries offering low-cost dismantling. At the same time, the Committee acknowledges that structural poverty and other social and legal problems in some areas of South Asia is strongly linked to the absence or non-implementation of even minimum standards of safety at work, minimum labour standards and environmental protection.</p>	<p>The Commission agrees to the Committee's assessment of the complexity of the issue and of the need to pursue the objective of improving ship dismantling conditions in a wider framework. The EU policy especially towards the poorest of the recycling states should thus be linked to the general development policy of the EU.</p>
<p>(1.7) A strong international regime for the identification, control and disposal of end-of-life ships should be established through the IMO. This regime must have an equivalent level of control as that found in the Basel Convention: incorporate all relevant International Labour Organisation (ILO) standards; not allow exemptions and prevent end-of-life ships with hazardous waste going to countries that are not party to the convention and which have inadequate facilities</p>	<p>The Commission essentially agrees with the Committee's recommendation concerning the envisaged IMO Ship Recycling Convention. An EU assessment of the levels of control and enforcement to be found in the Basel Convention and in the draft IMO Convention has been agreed on with the Member States in January 2008 and submitted to the Secretariat of the Basel Convention. In essence, it comes to the conclusion that the draft Convention is meant to provide a comprehensive system of control and enforcement, but that its effectiveness might be increased by additional elements such as non-compliance mechanisms, the auditing of ship recycling facilities and more transparency of recycling practices. An incorporation of ILO standards appears</p>

	<p>to be ensured by the current draft of the Convention.</p> <p>Although it is probable that the Ship Recycling Convention - like all IMO conventions - will contain an exemption for warships and other vessels in government service, the Commission will use best endeavours to limit exemptions to a minimum and make them dependent on strict conditions.</p>
<p>(1.8) As implementation of the IMO Convention will take several years, the Committee recommends interim measures such as support for effective voluntary programmes by ship owners, unequivocal enforcement of the Waste Shipment Regulation, and the development by the EU of a third party certification and auditing scheme for ship dismantling facilities.</p>	<p>The Commission welcomes the Committee's recommendations and will study them carefully. In the development of the envisaged Communication on an EU strategy for better ship dismantling it will be assessed how best to encourage voluntary action by ship owners. It is intended also to draft a guidance document on the application of waste shipment law to ships. The options for a third party certification and audit scheme for ship recycling facilities are currently the subject of a study launched by the European Maritime Safety Agency (EMSA) in November 2007.</p>
<p>(1.9) The EESC strongly supports encouraging best-practice ship recycling and the pre-cleaning of ships from gas and toxic waste within the EU. A commitment by member states to deal with all state-owned ships in this way and binding end-of-life clauses when such ships are sold to third parties are initial crucial steps in support of such an approach. A pre-cleaning guidance document should be developed for this purpose.</p>	<p>The Commission agrees that pre-cleaning of ships is a requirement under the Waste Shipment Regulation and a necessity especially where the final recycling facility is not capable of managing certain hazardous materials. It is intended to make proposals for Member States' ships in the context of the envisaged Communication from the Commission. Work on a pre-cleaning guidance document will be considered, taking into account also the guidance documents that exist already at national level.</p>
<p>(1.10) Providing financial and technical assistance to South Asian countries to improve their facilities – at a minimum converting beach operations to contained</p>	<p>The Commission will look into possibilities of providing technical assistance to South Asian countries to improve ship recycling facilities there,</p>

<p>pier or dry-dock handling and providing better safety and downstream waste management facilities – will mitigate some of the worst problems.</p>	<p>taking into account also the diversity of these countries and the wider development needs they might have.</p>
<p>(1.11) The Committee supports proposals by the Commission for mechanisms to ensure that provision for dismantling costs become part of the normal operating costs of shipping. In particular further action is urged by the IMO and ship owners, to provide every ship with a recycling fund, either built up over its working life or established as a bond when it is launched. Various financial institutions are well-placed to structure and operate such measures. If such a fund is not made possible, the EU should look into regional mechanisms such as port state taxes or similar.</p>	<p>The Commission intends to look into sustainable funding systems to ensure clean ship dismantling in the context of a study that is to be launched in 2008.</p>
<p>(1.12) Recycling-aware design, identifying existing hazards and substituting as much toxic material as possible from ships when they are built will, in the long term, have a positive effect and the EESC supports efforts, both through the EU, IMO and by ship owners and builders.</p>	<p>The envisaged international Ship Recycling Convention aims at a "cradle-to-grave" approach and at the substitution of hazardous materials in the design, construction and operation of ships. The Commission will, in its Communication, propose measures to implement these objectives at EU level.</p>

<p>26. Green Book on 'Adapting to climate change' COM(2007) 354 final – EESC 1702/2007– December 2007 Rapporteur: Mr OSBORN (Var. Int./UK) DG ENV – Mr DIMAS</p>	
<p>Main points of the EESC Opinion</p>	<p>Commission Position</p>
<p>(1.2) The EESC recommends that an over-arching European adaptation strategy should now be put in place as a framework, outlining the actions that will need to be taken at European level, at national level, and by other actors.</p> <p>(2.6) In the EESC's view there is now a strong case for the establishment of an over-arching European framework</p>	<p>The Commission is in agreement with the Committee. As a matter of fact the White Paper on adaptation to climate change will examine which areas require action at which level. The White Paper's primary goal however is to investigate the needs for adaptation action at European level</p>

<p>strategy dealing with the whole range of adaptation issues, and outlining the actions that will need to be taken at European level, at national level and by other actors.</p>	
<p>(1.3) - Strategies should deal with planning for all the topics identified in the Green Paper including coast protection, floods and droughts, water resources, fires, public health, agriculture and biodiversity, land-use and infrastructure planning, building and construction etc.</p>	<p>The Commission, as promised in the Green Paper, will examine all relevant fields. The White Paper will deal with the most important as a matter of urgency.</p>
<p>(1.3) - The need for adaptation should take a much larger share of European budgets in future programmes, and should be built into the criteria for assessment of programmes and projects.</p> <p>(4.11) EU Budget – In the annual budget, the EESC recommends that the heading "adaptation" should appear for the policy areas where immediate investments will be needed (e.g. energy, research, agriculture, transport, building standards, natural disaster assistance, biodiversity protection, public health policy, etc.). The next Financial Framework should give a much higher share of available resources to programmes concerned with mitigation and adaptation to climate change. Member States should make similar changes in their own national budgets and spending programmes.</p>	<p>The Commission foresees for the budget review the inclusion of climate change.</p> <p>The Commission will take the Committee's conclusion into account as much as possible. However the Commission is not in the stage when the concrete form of adaptation financing would be clear.</p>
<p>(1.3) - European research into adaptation climate change impacts and adaptation should be substantially increased.</p>	<p>The Commission agrees with the Committee on the necessity for research. Already as of now there are large research projects in Europe working on adaptation, e.g. the ADAM project to name one. The White Paper will help us also to see where we face further knowledge gaps.</p>
<p>(4.12) Structural Funds - In the European Regional Development Fund, the Cohesion Fund and the IPA (Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance) there are criteria to support environment projects,</p>	<p>The Commission is examining the regional policies in this sense.</p> <p>The two environmental assessment directives (SEA and EIA) can assist us</p>

<p>but nothing is explicitly mentioned about adaptation to climate change and often the impact assessments are not adequate (many transport and energy projects are clearly harmful to the environment and the climate). In the next reviews of all these programmes much larger percentages of the available funds should be devoted to supporting measures for the mitigation of climate change and adaptation to it.</p>	<p>"Climate proofing" the public spending.</p>
<p>(4.15) Developing countries - Many developing countries will have more serious adaptation problems than Europe and fewer resources to deal with them.... They will need support from the developed world, including human, technical and financial resources to help them adapt appropriately. Europe should take a leading role both in providing additional resources for adaptation measures within its own collective and national development assistance programmes, and in helping the international financial community to adjust to the adaptation challenge.</p>	<p>The Commission fully agrees with the Committee's evaluation. External adaptation action is one of the pillars of EU adaptation action. In the international fore the EU supported the creation of and making operational the Adaptation Fund. Furthermore adaptation is one of the main building blocks of the EU post-2012 climate strategy.</p>

<p>30. Green Paper The European Research Area: New Perspectives COM(2007) 161 final - EESC 1440/2007 – October 2007 Rapporteur: Mr WOLF (Empl./DE) DG RDT – Mr POTOENICK</p>	
<p>Main points of the EESC Opinion</p>	<p>Commission Position</p>
<p>Welcomes the Commission's intention to strengthen and expand the European Research Area and broadly agrees with the objectives defined and proposals made, with some nuances (see below).</p>	<p>Welcomes the support of EESC.</p>
<p>Calls on the Member States and relevant social partners to improve contract conditions, salaries, portable social security cover and family-friendly careers for researchers.</p>	<p>Agree.</p>

<p>Calls on the Member States and the Council to take all measures necessary to achieve the Barcelona goal of approaching 3% of GDP for R&D expenditure, including by raising the EC research funding, the use of structural funds for research (notably research infrastructures) and of the EIB.</p>	<p>Agree on the need for action from the Member States and the Council, as well as on the need to examine the issue of EC research funding in the context of the forthcoming mid-term reviews of the Framework Programme and Financial Perspectives.</p>
<p>Calls on improving the attractiveness of the ERA for the best researchers worldwide.</p>	<p>Agree.</p>
<p>Favours the open coordination method and rejects any "detailed top-down coordination of European research in a bid to secure general standardisation and penetrating research organisations and companies".</p>	<p>Agree. The Commission's intention is to establish a stronger partnership with Member States, local and regional authorities and stakeholders, ensuring sufficient space for "a plurality of methods, approaches and choices", and by no means to introduce central management of European research.</p>
<p>Calls on all decision levels to cut red tape.</p>	<p>Agree. Streamlining is a major priority for the Commission.</p>
<p>Recommends that the European Research Area be complemented by a European Knowledge Area involving also education, training and innovation.</p>	<p>Agree. This is the approach taken by the Commission with the Lisbon strategy for Growth and Jobs.</p>
<p>Recommends that "clear and comprehensible rules be developed" for the use and the management of the various Community instruments for promoting and coordinating R&D.</p>	<p>Agree. This is linked to the simplification efforts mentioned above and to the various internal and external evaluations of specific instruments, whose lessons will be drawn notably in the context of the Framework Programme's mid-term evaluation.</p>

<p>31. "ARTEMIS Joint Undertaking" to implement a Joint Technology Initiative in Embedded Computing Systems COM(2007) 243 final - EESC 1442/2007 - October 2007 Rapporteur: Mr DANTIN (Work./FR) DG INFSO – Mrs REDING</p>	
<p>Main Points of the EESC Opinion</p>	<p>Commission Position</p>
<p>(1.3) The EESC welcomes the proposal that an annual report on ARTEMIS' results be produced. However, the Committee regrets the absence of a detailed assessment of the operation and the results achieved by the former European Technology Platforms.</p>	<p>The Commission follows closely the work of European Technology Platforms and has outlined the new role of the European Technology Platforms in a broad-based innovation strategy for the EU (Communication "Roadmap for a more innovative Europe" (COM (2006)502 of 13.9.2006)). The Commission regularly provides information on the current status and planned future activities of many of the European Technology Platforms (the Third Status report was published in March 2007).</p>
<p>(1.5) In the light of this innovative collaborative structure, which may become complicated when it comes to using the products of the research to be carried out, the EESC welcomes the importance and the detail accorded to intellectual property in Article 24 of the joint undertaking's statutes.</p>	<p>The Commission welcomes this comment as this Article illustrates the collaboration effort of the public and the private stakeholders to provide an appropriate framework at European level for the intellectual property rights.</p>
<p>(1.6) Finally, the Committee considers the following to be necessary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a genuine simplification of procedures, not least because of the negative impact that red tape had on previous R&D programmes; 	<p>The Commission will make the efforts to ensure for the ARTEMIS Joint Undertaking to establish a lean structure for decision-making and financial and administrative operations, using where possible the existing administrative procedures at national level. This approach simplifies administrative procedures for public authorities (EU or national) and for private parties, compared to the current intergovernmental (Eureka) arrangements. In particular, :</p>

match the jobs created by ARTEMIS, with the aim of creating the necessary conditions for providing the industrial leadership in this strategic sector.	Commission will encourage concrete actions for the development of skills in the area of Embedded Systems.
--	---

<p>35. Proposal for a Directive on the protection of consumers in respect of certain aspects of timeshare, long-term holiday products, resale and exchange COM (2007) 303 final – EESC 1445/2007 – October 2007 Rapporteur: Mr PEGADO LIZ (Var. Int./PT) DG SANCO - Mrs KUNEVA</p>	
Main points of the EESC Opinion	Commission Position
3.1.3. The legal base should also be Art. 153 of the Treaty since is not a matter that concerns the single market alone; it is also an issue of consumer protection.	Rejected. The objective of this proposal is the the establishment and functioning of the internal market, taking as a base the full harmonization of the measures on consumer protection at a high level.
3.1.8. A more detailed definition of the nature, limitations and effects of the right of withdrawal, termination and cancellation.	Rejected. The right of of withdrawal is an issue of cross-cutting nature and should be dealt with in the context of the general review of the Acquis. It will be subject to an impact assessment and coherent solutions taking into account the different areas for which a right of withdrawal is provided will be proposed in the forthcoming proposal for a Framework directive on Consumer Contractual Rights, to be adopted by the end of 2008.
3.1.9.1. To determine and define the legal nature of timeshare rights.	Rejected. For reasons of subsidiarity this matter should be the competence of the Member States.
3.1.11. To lay down a clause (containing a definition of key aspects) to facilitate adaptation of future products that might be placed on the market.	Rejected. It is not necessary. The definitions are already wide enough to cover future products for which particular consumer protection should be granted in this sector of holiday products.
3.1.12. Articles 5(5) and 5(6) of the	Rejected. See comments to 3.1.8.

proposal should be deleted, to ensure that the consumer does not have to pay anything.	
3.1.14. The minimum clause of the proposal is too restrictive, being limited to only certain aspects. Art 11 of the present Directive, providing minimum harmonisation for all aspects should be retained.	Rejected. By fully harmonising the rules, the proposal will provide a high level of consumer protection and at the same time legal certainty for consumers and businesses. Minimum harmonisation should be limited to those aspects which should be dealt with in the general review of the Acquis.
3.1.15. To provide a system of sanctions.	Rejected. The appropriate mix and nature of sanctions should be left for Member States, and the effect of Regulation 2006/2004 should be assessed before considering further measures.
3.2.1. The definition of "ancillary contract" is too restrictive. The term "subordinated" should be replaced by "complementary".	Reservation in view of the negotiations with other institutions. The term "complementary" is too wide and would cover contracts concluded with third parties who have no link to the main contractual parties. However the Commission will reflect whether the term "subordinated" could be replaced with alternative language.
3.2.2. Art. 3 (2): The provision by the trader of written information only to the consumer <u>requesting it</u> does not provide sufficient protection, it should be compulsory.	The suggestion will be taken into account in the negotiations with the other institutions.
3.2.3. The language regime of the present directive should be maintained.	The suggestion will be taken into account in the negotiations with the other institutions
3.2.4. Art. 4 (2): To delete the sentence "unless the parties expressly agrees otherwise"	Rejected. Would interfere disproportionately with the parties freedom to agree on the terms of the contract.
3.2.4.1. Art. 4 (2): To clarify the sentence "circumstances beyond the trader's control".	Rejected. The wording permits an appropriate assessment of the actual situations.

3.2.4.2. Art. 4 (2): Method of communicating the written information.	The suggestion will be taken into account in the negotiations with the other institutions
3.2.5. Article 4 (3): To clarify the sentence "the trader shall explicitly draw the consumer's attention".	Rejected. The exact content of this obligation should depend on the situation, e.g. if the negotiations take place face-to-face or by exchange of written documents. The wording is appropriate and flexible to cover different cases situations
3.2.6. Article 5 (1): To lay down only one provision giving the consumer the right to withdraw up to 14 days after signing the final contract ...	Rejected. See comments to 3.1.8
3.2.7. To define the nature of the communication informing of the right to withdraw.	Rejected. See comments to 3.1.8
3.2.8. Article 8: The heading should be replaced by "Mandatory nature of the rights".	The suggestion will be taken into account in the negotiations with the other institutions
3.2.9. Article 9: the wording of Articles 11 and 12 of the UCP Directive should be reproduced.	Reservation in view of the negotiations with other institutions. The enforcement system established by the UCP Directive may not be appropriate for timeshare.
Issues not covered by the proposal	
a) the system of burden of proof	Rejected. It is more appropriate to regulate this issue in national law.
b) preventing the risk of non-compliance or limited compliance with the contract.	Rejected. The proposal ensures core consumer rights in this area. Due to the large variety of products offered and their different legal nature in the Member States, issues such as non-compliance are better dealt with in the context of national legislation, such as general contract law, company law and laws on real estate.

<p>c) establishing a restriction on the use of timeshare (accommodation) contracts to buildings and parts of buildings used for tourist or leisure activities, thus contributing to higher quality and avoiding the misuse of such contracts in the property sector ;</p>	<p>Rejected. Such matters, which relate to planning regulations, are Member State competence.</p>
<p>d) establishing rules on licensing and authorisation to operate in this sector, with applicants having to prove their technical and financial capacity;</p>	<p>Reservation in view of the negotiations with other institutions. The current Directive has worked well for the timeshare sector reducing consumer detriment dramatically. There are no indications that it would not do the same for the new areas covered. Introduction of a licence system would impose a disproportionate administrative burden on business and Member States</p>
<p>e) establishing a system of financial guarantees to safeguard against potential insolvency or bankruptcy;</p> <p>f) establishing a system of prior registration in the country in which the business is marketed and/or in the Member State in which the company's head office is located ;</p> <p>g) establishing a European-level system of certification for traders in this field and at the same time ensuring the existence of an early-warning system between Member States, aimed at reporting infringements that could result in loss of certification and at informing consumers ;</p>	<p>Reservation in view of the negotiations with other institutions. See comment to d)</p>
<p>h) establishing in the Annexes the requirement to provide information on any charges and obligations, to prevent consumers from losing their right, for example, in the event of foreclosure of a mortgage</p>	<p>The suggestion will be taken into account in the negotiations with the other institutions</p>
<p>i) establishing in Annex II consumers' right to inspect a property, should this be an immovable property, in order to ensure that it complies with the building plans;</p>	<p>Reservation in view of the negotiations with other institutions.</p>

j) establishing the protection of personal data when the rights are transferred to third parties.	Rejected. This issue should be dealt by horizontal measures.
---	--

39. Impact of the territoriality of tax law on industrial change Own initiative opinion -EESC 1708/2007 – December 2007 Rapporteur : Mr SCHADECK (Work./ LU) DG TAXUD - Mr KOVÁCS	
Main points of the EESC Opinion	Commission Position
<p>Tax competition is one of the aspects of the single market that can lead to distortions of competition. Need for transparency rules and identification of abuses and harmful tax practices.</p> <p>Coordinating tax provisions across the various governments can be beneficial to the internal market. Lack of co-ordination is leading to non-taxation, abuse and other distortions.</p> <p>Fight against tax fraud must be a priority.</p> <p>The committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - supports commitment by Member States to eliminate harmful tax practices - calls for the introduction of a Common Consolidated Tax Base (which would enable maximum benefits from the Internal Market). Concerning the implementation of the CCCTB, the Committee is of the opinion that it should be optional in a transitional implementing phase and that ultimately Member States should apply a CCCTB to all tax payers. - call for a minimum corporate tax rate (fixed just below the current level of the average EU rate) in order to avoid the risk of increasing dispersion of tax rates. 	<p>The Commission shares these concerns and continues its policy against harmful tax competition (Code of Conduct on business taxation) and in favour of more transparency both inside the EU and worldwide (good governance).</p> <p>The Commission shares these concerns and is pursuing its policy on tax co-ordination on a number of selected areas: exit taxation, withholding taxation, inheritance taxation, anti abuse measures.</p> <p>The Commission shares the position of the Committee. In fact combating tax fraud is one of its priorities in the tax area.</p> <p>The Commission generally welcome the support of the Committee for its taxation policy.</p> <p>Concerning the call for a minimum corporate tax rate in the EU, the Commission is of the opinion that the present tax and economic situations do not justify such a proposal. The Commission</p>

	stresses that under the CCCTB proposal, Member States will continue to be free to fix the appropriate level of their national corporate tax rates.
--	--

40. Immigration and Cooperation for development Own-initiative Opinion - EESC 1461/2007 - October 2007 Rapporteur Mr PARIZA CASTAÑOS (Work./ES) DG JLS - Mr BARROT	
Main points of the EESC Opinion	Commission Position
<p>It is surprising that EU Member States have yet to ratify the <i>International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of all Migrant Workers and Members of their Families</i>, which was adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations in Resolution 45/158 of 18 December 1990 and which has been in force since 1 July 2003. The EESC³ once again proposes that the EU and its Member States ratify the Convention. In line with the objectives of the Tampere and Hague European Councils, the Committee believes that respect for human rights and equal treatment should form the basis of the European immigration policy.</p>	<p>The Commission agrees wholly with the committee that respect for human rights and equal treatment should form the basis of the European immigration policy and this has been indeed integrated in all the Commission's proposals in this domain. Thus, for example, the recent Commission proposal for a Directive on a single work and residence permit and a minimum set of rights for all legal migrants will help achieve significant progress in this area</p>
<p>The EESC emphasises the importance of agreements and associations with countries of origin.</p>	<p>The Commission agrees with this proposal.</p>
<p>The EESC urges the EU and the Member States to agree circular migration procedures with the countries of origin, to promote migration mobility through flexible, transparent procedures.</p>	<p>The Commission welcomes the Committee's support to the further development of circular migration.</p>
<p>The Committee believes that Community funding available under the thematic programme on migration and asylum will be inadequate, and therefore proposes to the Commission, the Parliament and the Council that this funding should be significantly</p>	<p>The Commission will bear this recommendation in mind when discussing the revision of the financial perspectives.</p>

³ EESC own-initiative opinion of 30 June 2004 on the *International Convention for Migratory Workers* (rapporteur: Mr Pariza Castaños (OJ C 302 of 7.12.2004).

increased in the future.	
Proposal for a Directive on the admission of seasonal migrants : the Committee recommends that a multi-annual residence/work permit be created for seasonal migrants, allowing them to come back for five years in succession, which may be extended for a further five years, to do seasonal work.	The Commission will reflect on this recommendation in the context of drawing up its proposal.
Circulation of expertise requires resolution of one of the main problems facing many immigrants in Europe, namely non-recognition of educational and occupational qualifications.	The Commission agrees on the importance of this dimension. It will look at ways in which this could be achieved, while paying due attention to the division of competences between the Community and Member States in this area.

41. Migration And Development : Opportunities and Challenges Own-initiative Opinion - EESC 1713/2007 - December 2007 Rapporteur : Mr SHARMA (Var. Int./UK) DG JLS - Mr BARROT	
Main points of the EESC Opinion	Commission Position
Regularising the status of undocumented migrants remains a human imperative, as well as an economic and social necessity.	The Commission believes that the issue of regularisation needs to be looked at carefully, as it can act as a pull factor for irregular migrants. In this respect, the Commission is conducting work with a view to assessing the impacts of regularisations.
The Committee recognises that South-South migration is the most common form of international migration. Neighbouring countries or the immediate region are the most chosen destinations for international migrants ⁴ . Moreover, when considering the fact that migration involves risk-taking and requires financial resources, skills and networks, it becomes obvious that, especially for poor people, movement	The Commission agrees with this recommendation. The dialogue on migration which the Community has opened up with various countries and organisations, notably in Africa, also pays attention, where relevant, to issues related with internal and regional migration and to the challenges and opportunities it can create.

⁴

Especially South Africa bears the extra burden of being an often sought immigration country to the whole region.

<p>within national borders is by far the most prevalent form of migration⁵. Therefore, a comprehensive approach to Migration and Development policy must also consider the potential impact of regional and internal migration on poverty reduction and economic development</p>	
<p>Lowering the costs of remittances is a necessary first step to enhancing their developmental impact. Facilitating the flow is a second step. Destination countries should therefore build remittance partnerships with source countries that receive large volumes of remittances. These partnerships could appropriately facilitate measures to improve access for poor people to banking institutions, strengthen the ability of financial service providers to facilitate remittance flows, and to create incentives for using formal transfer channels.</p>	<p>The Commission would be ready to support such efforts by destination and origin countries in partnership. In this context, a new EU-Africa Institute on Remittances is to be established with the support of the World Bank. Vice-President FRATTINI launched this idea during the EU-Africa Ministerial Conference, which was held on 22 and 23 November 2006 in Tripoli.</p>
<p>The Committee supports the creation of a specific Migration and Development Fund to enable the abovementioned development activities.</p>	<p>Creating a new fund would be difficult. However, the Commission would like to indicate that it is about to launch, in the framework of the thematic programme on migration and asylum, a €15 million initiative to be managed by UNDP that will allow local partners in Member States and priority third countries to implement jointly small scale projects related to the migration and development dimension.</p>
<p>One option is to build a human capital surplus which opens the possibility to pursue an export-oriented (human) development strategy. These training efforts could be financed by exit taxes for highly skilled professionals who chose to migrate. These taxes might be levied on the emigrant or the destination country.</p>	<p>The Commission is not convinced by the question of exit taxes; imposing such taxes raises a number of very serious issues and would risk discouraging people in poor countries from engaging in advanced education.</p>

⁵ See DFID report: "Moving out of poverty – making migration work better for poor people" (<http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/migration-policy-paper-draft.pdf>).

PARTIE C: avis faisant l'objet d'un autre type de réponse

a) Accord entre la Commission et le CESE

6. Unités de mesures
COM(2007) 510 final - CESE 1694/2007 – Décembre 2007
Rapporteur: M. CASSIDY (Empl./UK)
DG ENTR – M. VERHEUGEN

La Commission estime qu'il n'est pas approprié de donner une suite à cet avis, vu l'accord du Comité avec la position de la Commission.

20. Contrôle des transports de marchandises par route – compétence d'exécution
COM(2007) 509 final - CESE 1453/2007- Octobre 2008
DG TREN – M. TAJANI

Aucun suivi ne sera donné à cet avis, étant donné l'accord du CESE sur les propositions de la Commission.

37. Proposal for a Council Directive amending Directive 2006/112/EEC with regard to certain temporary provisions concerning rates of value added tax
COM(2007) 381 final - EESC 14566/2007 – October 2007
Rapporteur: Mr BURANI(Empl/IT)
DG TAXUD – Mr KOVACS

The Commission takes note of the full support of the EESC.

b) Avis pour lesquels la Commission formule certaines remarques

<p>2. The Role of National Councils for Sustainable Development Own-initiative Opinion - EESC 1700/2007 - December 2007 Rapporteur: Mr HAKEN (Var. Int./CZ) SG – Mr President BARROSO</p>	
Main points of the EESC Opinion	Commission Position
<p>3.2 Four main tasks of NCSDs can be identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • advising government bodies • monitoring progress • encouraging dialogue and consultation with civil society • communication <p>3.2.1 These four tasks are not being fulfilled by councils in all Member States. In some Member States, councils may be given an early input into the national SD strategy while in others their input is sought at a very late stage, if at all. The number of reports produced varies from zero to over 10 reports per year.</p>	<p>It is for each Member State to define the tasks of the NCSD, where it exists. The Commission understands that each NCSD has a remit which is relevant and suitable to each Member State. In general the framework established for a NCSD includes provisions with respect to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Official status • Objectives and targets • High impact agenda • Composition • Effective participation • Suitable sectoral, geographical and resource scope • Monitoring and reporting.
<p>3.3 The NCSDs vary in size and composition. A number of civil society representatives have voiced discontent about the insufficient involvement of civil society in their national Council and in SD processes in general.</p> <p>4.2.6 Promoting the engagement of civil society on sustainable development issues: One important role of NCSDs is to increase public awareness.</p>	<p>The 2006 EU Sustainable Development Strategy states that "National Councils in SD are meant to increase the involvement of civil society in SD matters and contribute to better linking different policies and policy levels." It is for each Member State to decide how this can best be achieved.</p> <p>The Commission agrees that it is important to raise the level of public awareness with respect to SD issues and that the NCSDs could play an important role in this activity. This could consist of active participation by various actors, including, public sector, businesses, education and the media in each of the</p>

	Member States.
3.9 The full potential of NCSDs is not exploited in all Member States.	Each Member State is responsible for their own NCSD and for its remit. The most important tasks and objectives of the NCSDs are well understood but are defined by each Member State itself. It is for each Member State to ensure that the potential of its NCSD is effectively utilised.
4.2.4 Scope: NCSDs should, from an early stage, play an important part in the development of sustainable development (and related) strategies and in monitoring their implementation.	It is for the Member States to ensure that NCSDs are involved in the development of SD strategies in the Member States and in the monitoring of their implementation.
4.2.7 Resources: The EESC calls on the Member States to ensure sufficient funding of NCSDs so that they are able to fulfil their tasks and provide real added value to the debates and the decision-making process on sustainability issues.	The funding of the NCSD is a matter for the Member States.
4.3 The EESC also recommends that NCSDs seek to step up their capacity to engage individually and collectively with the European institutions on European aspects of sustainable development policy from the perspective of civil society. The EESC (and specifically the Sustainable Development Observatory) could play a useful role here in facilitating stronger engagement by NCSDs on European sustainability issues. The EESC could seek to engage with the EEAC and its members, on a regular basis on upcoming issues. It could seek to support EU-wide comparative studies on such topics, focusing particularly on the input and role of civil society. It could also seek to highlight and publicise examples of best practice.	The 2006 EU SDS states that the "EU institutions should improve internal policy co-ordination between different sectors." The Commission welcomes the EESC's intention to facilitate a stronger engagement by NCSDs on European sustainability issues through the Sustainable Development Observatory.

21. Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament - Biofuels Progress Report: Report on the progress made in the use of biofuels and other renewable fuels in the Member States of the European Union
COM(2006) 845 final - EESC 1449/2007 - October 2007
Rapporteur : Mr IOZIA (Work./IT)
DG TREN – Mr PIEBALGS

Main points of the EESC Opinion	Commission Position
<p>The use of biofuels raises ethical issues, such as food-fuel competition, which the Commission seems to minimise. The Committee underlines the need for closer cooperation with global institutions and agencies working in the sphere of agriculture and food, such as the FAO and the WFP (World Food Programme).</p> <p>The Committee agrees with the EP resolution on a strategy for biomass and biofuels, which calls on the Commission to introduce a mandatory and comprehensive certification scheme allowing the sustainable production of biofuels at all stages, and to support the development and use of the Global Monitoring for Environment and Security (GMES) system to monitor land use in the production of bioethanol so as to prevent the destruction of rainforests and other negative impacts on the environment.</p> <p>(Paragraphs 1.4 and 1.17)</p>	<p>The Commission in the proposed new directive on the promotion of energy from renewable sources of January 2008⁶ recommends to regularly monitor and report on the food security impacts taking into account input from intergovernmental organisations, scientific studies and any other relevant pieces of information.</p> <p>The Commission asks Member States to report regularly on land use changes within the Member States associated with its increased use of biomass and other forms of energy from renewable sources.</p> <p>The Commission agrees on the need to ensure sustainability of biofuels. Therefore a sustainability scheme is proposed in the new directive. The proposed criteria include a minimum level of greenhouse gas savings and that biofuels should not be produced from raw material cultivated on land converted from high-carbon-stock or high-biodiversity uses. Biofuels made from raw material produced in the EU should comply with EU environmental requirements for agriculture.</p> <p>Only biofuels that meet these criteria will count towards the 10% target .</p> <p>The Commission is planning to adopt a Communication setting out the practical</p>

⁶ COM(2008) 19 final

	measures for the implementation of the environmental sustainability scheme as well as the monitoring of certain environmental issues related to the biofuel policy covering land use change effects.
Given the energy required to convert biomass into biofuel, it would be far more efficient to use biomass directly to produce electrical energy or heating, or for maritime or urban public transport. (Paragraph 1.6)	Greenhouse gas savings in transport are expensive, whatever the means that is chosen. But even if it is more "cost-efficient" in the short term to focus on other sectors, the Commission has decided that transport should also do its share. This is the logic behind the CO ₂ and cars legislation and, equally, behind support for biofuels.
The Committee urges the Commission and all the European institutions to focus closely on water consumption in the production of biofuels. (Paragraph 1.11)	The proposed new directive asks Member States to report regularly the estimated impact of biofuel production on water resources and water quality.
The Committee believes that further support should be given to research and development of second- and even third-generation biofuels such as biobutanol. (Paragraph 1.12)	<p>The proposed new directive includes a measure to promote 2nd generation biofuels.</p> <p>The Strategic Energy Technology Plan adopted by the Commission in November 2007 enumerates the promotion of 2nd generation biofuels as one of the key EU technology challenges for the next 10 years to meet the 2020 targets. The Commission is planning to adopt a communication on the financing of the measures proposed in the SET-Plan.</p>

<p>The opportunities that the farming sector detects in the development of biofuels should be encouraged, insofar as farmers also undertake to help protect primary environmental assets and safeguard shared resources, such as water and food for human and animal consumption. (Paragraph 1.14)</p>	<p>To streamline and further modernise the European Union's Common Agricultural Policy the "Health Check" of the CAP assess how to confront new challenges, like climate change, biofuels, water management and protection of biodiversity.</p> <p>The targets of 20% GHG emissions reduction, 20% renewable energy and 10% biofuels to 2020 as endorsed by European Spring Council 2007 are likely to have a significant impact on EU agriculture. At the same time the primary vocation of European agriculture will continue to be the production of food and feed.</p> <p>The foreseeable demand and supply situation for cereals, including the demand linked to the fulfilment of the biofuel target set by the EU, argues for mobilising land which is presently kept out of production through the compulsory set aside scheme.</p>
<p>The transport sector, for its part, is not subject to the emissions quotas system. The Committee suggests that the Commission examine the possibility of extending the emissions certificates system to transport, as they may provide a further spur to enhance efficiency in the search for new solutions to reduce harmful emissions. (Paragraph 1.16)</p>	<p>The EU climate and energy package adopted on 23 January seeks to deliver on the European Union's agreed target to reduce greenhouse gases by at least 20% by 2020. Building on the EU ETS, the Commission proposes to strengthen the single, EU-wide carbon market which will include more greenhouse gases (currently only CO₂ is included), and involve all major industrial emitters.</p> <p>In sectors not covered by the ETS such as buildings, transport, agriculture and waste, the EU will reduce emissions to 10% below 2005 levels by 2020. For each Member State the Commission is proposing a specific target by which it must reduce or, in the case of new Member States, may increase its emissions up to 2020.</p>

<p>The Committee urges the Commission to keep the 10% target under continuing review, and to be ready to bring forward proposals to modify it if the problems cannot be resolved in a satisfactory and sustainable way. (Paragraph 1.18)</p>	<p>The Commission does not question the 10% mandatory target for biofuels. An environmental sustainability scheme is put in place including reporting and monitoring tools in order to ensure biofuels to be produced in an environmentally friendly way and to propose, if necessary, corrective action.</p>
--	---

<p>22. Proposal for a Directive amending Directive 98/70/EC as regards the specification of petrol, diesel and gas-oil and introducing a mechanism to monitor and reduce greenhouse gas emissions from the use of road transport fuels and amending Council Directive 1999/32/EC, as regards the specification of fuel used by inland waterway vessels and repealing Directive 93/12/EEC COM(2007) 18 final – EESC 1454/2007 – October 2007 Rapporteur: Mr OSBORN (Var. Int./UK) DG ENV – Mr DIMAS</p>	
<p>Main points of the EESC opinion</p>	<p>Commission Position</p>
<p>1.1 The EESC strongly supports the Union's plans to tackle climate change by reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. In the transport sector the Committee believes that action must start at the fundamental level of tackling the pressures that have led to a continuous growth of traffic of all kinds over many years.</p>	<p>The Commission acknowledges the important contribution of transport to the EU's greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The Commission has therefore, in addition to the current proposal, also made a proposal for a Directive to include aviation within the Emission Trading Scheme (COM(2006) 81). It has also been studying possible action to address GHG emissions from maritime and heavy duty vehicle transport. The Commission also supports research, development and demonstration activities in areas such as mobility management and the promotion of less energy intense transport modes.</p>
<p>1.2 The Committee also believes that there is still substantial scope for improving energy efficiency in the performance of all kinds of transport. The Committee deplores the apparent weakening of the Commission's original intentions in relation to efficiency of car engines, thus relieving the pressure on the</p>	<p>The Commission agrees that there is substantial scope for improving energy efficiency in transport. It has therefore, in addition to the current proposal, also made a proposal for a Regulation on new Car Efficiency (COM(2007)856). It is also working on measures in relation to car labelling, tyre rolling resistance and</p>

<p>car industry to achieve higher standards.</p>	<p>air conditioning efficiency. In addition, the Commission has presented a revised proposal for a directive on the promotion of clean and energy efficient road transport vehicles (COM(2007)817).</p>
<p>1.3 The Committee endorses in principle the expansion of biofuels in the Union. It believes however that the overall CO₂ impact of biofuels needs very careful assessment, and that the pace and balance of expansion needs to be kept under review.</p>	<p>The Commission's proposal to modify Directive 98/70 would require the calculation of the life cycle GHG emissions for all fuel supplied within the scope of the Directive. This will enable the GHG performance of biofuels to be scrutinised.</p>
<p>1.4 Specifically, the European Commission should specify how it expects to achieve the target for 10% use of biofuels by 2020 bearing in mind the conditions attached to the achievement of that target by the Council, and should be prepared to modify the approach if it appears to be less effective in carbon reduction than has been hoped, or is having other undesirable effects on the structure of world agriculture or on biodiversity.</p>	<p>The Commission has adopted a proposal for a Directive on the promotion of Renewable Energy (COM(2008)019). This sets out the Commission's proposed approach to implementing the 10% biofuel target as well as ensuring the sustainability of biofuel production.</p>
<p>The Committee strongly supports the proposal to require the fuel industry to monitor and report the life-cycle GHG emissions from the fuels it places on the market, and that they should be required to reduce those emissions by 1% per annum from 2010 to 2020. The Committee sees a strong case for this to be operated at European level, rather than being left to the Member States.</p>	<p>The Commission welcomes the EESC's support for the mechanism in Article 7a of the proposal. It is foreseen that the appropriate methodology would be developed at EU level, however in view of the fact that the measure is a Directive, it would be necessary for Member States to implement the requirements on fuel suppliers.</p>

<p>23. Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament – Results of the review of the Community Strategy to reduce CO2 emissions from passenger cars and light-commercial vehicles - COM(2007) 19 final– EESC 1450/2007 – October 2007 Rapporteur: Mr RANOCCHIARI (Empl./IT) DG ENV- Mr DIMAS</p>	
<p>Main Points of the EESC Opinion</p>	<p>Commission Position</p>
<p>1.5 The EESC therefore recommends commissioning a full and detailed impact assessment, to establish the costs/benefits of the various options, ranging from work on vehicle technology to other possible instruments: adjustments to infrastructure, alternative fuels, tax incentives, information through various forms of education for eco-driving (needed most of all in large urban areas) and guiding demand by means of taxation targeting CO2 emissions. The EESC also feels that among future measures, consideration should be given to the use of low rolling resistance tyres which, according to industry data, can reduce consumption by 3-4%. The Commission's suggestion to introduce tyre pressure monitoring systems is a step in the same direction.</p>	<p>The Communication COM(2007) 19 was accompanied by an impact assessment (SEC(2007) 60) which analysed in some detail the options of a reduction of CO₂ emissions from passenger cars (M1 vehicles); fuel-efficient mobile air conditioning systems; low-rolling resistance tyres; tyre pressure monitoring systems; low-friction lubrication oils; an increased use of biofuels; reduced emissions from light commercial vehicles (N1); fuel-efficient driving; CO₂-based car taxation; and improved CO₂ labelling. The impact assessment also addressed the topic of fuel-efficient driving.</p>
<p>1.7 The EESC also hopes that the impact of the legislative instrument chosen will be as neutral as possible when it comes to competition between manufacturers, not imposing binding limits on the models they can put on the market, but rather guiding consumer demand towards lower emission models. The CO2 reduction targets must correlate with the existing differences within the product ranges, using those parameters judged to be most informative and proportionate to their CO2 emissions.</p>	<p>On 19 December 2007 the Commission presented a proposal on a Regulation on the CO₂ emissions from light-duty vehicles (COM(2007)856). The accompanying impact assessment (SEC(2007)1723) addressed the principles, conditions and considerations on which the future legislative proposal to achieve the 130 g CO₂/km target for passenger cars was to be designed. These are as follows: "<i>...the legislative framework implementing the average new car fleet target will be designed so as to ensure competitively neutral and socially equitable and sustainable reduction targets which are equitable to the diversity of the European automobile manufacturers and avoid any unjustified distortion of competition</i></p>

	<i>between automobile manufacturers...".</i>
1.8 It is extremely important that the parameters chosen act as an instrument to guide consumers towards types of vehicle that respond to their real needs, avoiding consumption and emission levels that go beyond their everyday needs.	The impact assessment of the strategy (SEC(2007) 60) identified several regulatory options which were analysed in more detail in the impact assessment of the legislative proposal (SEC(2007) 1723). The chosen option is one in which the limit value is expressed as a sloped line depending on a utility parameter. Several options for that utility parameter were discussed in detail. The parameter retained is vehicle mass. The proposed slope of the limit value curve is such that heavier vehicles will have to improve more than lighter vehicles, which impacts on the price and acts as a disincentive to buy larger vehicles.
1.9 Before a decision is taken, the EESC recommends that the Commission conduct an impact assessment based on an up-to-date survey of light commercial vehicle emissions, something that is not currently available.	The December proposal COM(2007) 856 concerns passenger cars only. The Commission intends to present a proposal on light commercial vehicles after additional study and accompanied by an impact assessment in this area.
1.10 Lastly, the EESC believes that the Member States should develop activities in a wider range of areas than in the past (roads, intelligent traffic lights, etc.), not least by buying environmentally-sound vehicles for their own public transport fleets and committing themselves to both building infrastructure networks that can give access to the distribution of fuels of a lower environmental impact, such as natural gas, and facilitating the purchase of vehicles using natural gas or LPG, a matter on which the EESC has already expressed its view in previous opinions .	<p>In the Communication COM(2007)19 the Commission has referred to the important role of Member States in areas such as CO₂ related taxation and other fiscal incentives, use of public procurement, traffic management, infrastructure, etc.</p> <p>On 19 December 2007 the Commission has presented a revised proposal for a directive on the promotion of clean and energy efficient road transport vehicles (COM(2007) 817).</p> <p>As part of the integrated approach, the Commission has proposed a revision of the fuel quality Directive (COM(2007) 18). This proposal includes the introduction of an obligation for fuel suppliers to reduce the greenhouse gas emissions that their fuels cause over their life-cycle, i.e. when they are refined, transported and used. From</p>

	<p>2011, suppliers would have to reduce emissions per unit of energy by 1% a year from 2010 levels. This would result in a 10% cut by 2020. This obligation will promote the further development of low-carbon fuels and other measures to reduce emissions from the fuel production chain, and will help ensure that the fuel sector contributes to achieving the EU's greenhouse gas reduction goals. This proposal is currently going through the co-decision procedure.</p>
--	---

<p>28. Proposal For A Council Regulation Setting Up The Innovative Medicines Initiative Joint Undertaking COM(2007) 241 final – EESC 1441/2007 – October 2007 Rapporteur : Mr DANTIN (Work./FR) DG RDT – Mr POTOENICK</p>	
Main Points of the EESC Opinion	Commission Position
<p>The EESC welcomes and supports the decision of the Commission, in particular the objectives of the IMI Joint Undertaking, and the involvement of public and private sectors in a "genuine partnership".</p>	<p>Point welcomed by the Commission.</p>
<p>The "EESC believes that it would be appropriate to better define the use and allocation of the end products of the research in question, in particular as regards intellectual property and the issue of patents".</p>	<p>This recommendation was welcomed <u>and the point it makes was already</u> taken ... in the Council's Decision of 20 December 2007.</p> <p>In particular, it was considered in the revised text of Article 15 of the Council Regulation on intellectual property:</p> <p><i>"The IMI Joint Undertaking shall adopt distinct rules governing the protection, use and dissemination of research results based on the principles of Regulation (EC) 1906/2006 as set out in Article 22 of the Statutes which ensure that, where appropriate, intellectual propriety generated in Research Activities under this Regulation is protected, and that research results are used and disseminated."</i></p>

	<p>The Statutes of the IMI Joint Undertaking have been annexed to the Council Regulation as part of it. Its Article 22 regarding Intellectual Property Policy defines the objective and the principles of the IMI Joint Undertaking IPR policy.</p> <p>In addition, the IPR policy is described in a document prepared jointly with industry and available on the website of the IMI Joint Undertaking: http://imi.europa.eu</p> <p>In the view of the Commission, the revised version of the Council Regulation setting up the IMI Joint Undertaking and the IPR policy document available on the website of the IMI Joint Undertaking contribute to a better definition of the use and allocation of the end products of the research.</p>
<p>3. The "EESC believes that it would be helpful to think about mechanisms conducive to returns on European investments. Similarly, it would be desirable to provide for the profits generated by research to be assigned to investments located within the EU."</p>	<p>This recommendation was welcomed.</p> <p>However, it should be noted that the objective of the IMI Joint Undertaking is not to produce new drugs but to develop new tools and methodologies to improve the drug development process. In addition, the IMI Joint Undertaking will not be the owner of the results of the research performed.</p> <p>In this perspective, it was taken into account that the IMI Joint Undertaking research activities developed under competitive call for proposals will be performed in Europe.</p> <p>With respect to the objectives Article 2 (a) and (d) states that the IMI Joint Undertaking shall:</p> <p><i>"a) support 'pre-competitive pharmaceutical research and development' in the Member States and countries associated to the Seventh Framework Programme ...</i></p> <p><i>d) be a public private partnership aiming at increasing the research investment in the biopharmaceutical sector in the Member States and Countries associated to the Seventh Framework Programme..."</i></p> <p>In addition, the European Federation of</p>

	<p>Pharmaceutical Industries Associations (EFPIA), our private partner, is a non-profit organization aiming to ensure and promote the technological and economic development of the pharmaceutical industry in Europe.</p> <p>Hence, the IMI Joint Undertaking will promote its research activities in Europe.</p>
--	--

<p>29. Proposal for a Council Regulation setting up the Clean Sky Joint Undertaking COM(2007) 315 final, EESC 1443/2007 – October 2007 Rapporteur : Mr DANTIN (Work. /Fr) DG RDT - Mr POTOČNIK</p>	
<p>Main points of the EESC Opinion</p>	<p>Commission Position</p>
<p>The Committee welcomes the decision on setting up the Clean Sky Joint Undertaking, and considers that this approach has the potential to overcome the current fragmentation of Community financing and coordinate research. The Committee feels that the strategy strongly supports the creation of a European research area and significantly contributes to the competitiveness of European businesses in the sector.</p>	<p>The Commission welcomes the opinion delivered by the EESC on the Clean Sky Joint Undertaking and its support for such a new instrument as a means to overcome the current fragmentation of Community financing, providing a solid basis for the creation of a European Research Area and a major contribution to the competitiveness of European industry.</p>
<p>The Committee welcomes the choice of this sector, which, at the same time as tying in with the Lisbon strategy, gives a new impetus to a technically innovative industry which generates large numbers of highly skilled jobs, and also contributes to much-needed progress in terms of environmental protection.</p>	<p>The opinion rightly recognises the major challenges – particularly environmental – which the aeronautics sector will face, and how Clean Sky will focus on investment in environmental technologies, leading to improvements in air quality, limiting noise near airports and improving travelling conditions for passengers.</p>
<p>In view of the multiplicity of sources of funding, the number of stakeholders, and the substantial Community resources involved, it is clear that the use and ownership of the final products of the research should be better defined, particularly with regard to intellectual property rights and patents.</p>	<p>With regard to the use and allocation of the end products of the research in question and patents and intellectual property, such aspects have been outlined by the Clean Sky consortium in a set of clear rules governing IPR, its use and rights. These principles follow the FP7 principles, but go further in ensuring that such rights are clearly respected.</p>
<p>The EESC wants to see a genuine</p>	<p>Regarding the streamlining of procedures,</p>

<p>simplification of procedures at every stage of the various R&D activities, from the selection of activities to the distribution of results, by giving Clean Sky the main responsibility for these tasks.</p>	<p>giving Clean Sky the main responsibility for such tasks, it should be noted that in Article 16 of the Regulation, the Commission is responsible for the establishment and initial operation of the Clean Sky JTI, until the JU has the operational capacity to implement its own budget.</p> <p>The Commission is currently in this interim phase and is putting the necessary procedures in place. Every effort is being made to ensure lean and efficient structures with well-defined bodies and decision-making procedures, while at the same time ensuring that correct controls and balances will be in place to ensure correct and transparent operation of Clean Sky. Furthermore, Clean Sky will facilitate a focused approach to research which complements and integrates national research efforts, thus allowing a streamlining of management.</p>
<p>The EESC considers an information campaign necessary to help utilise the requisite economic resources.</p>	<p>An information programme on the opportunities provided by Clean Sky and to mobilise the necessary economic resources has already been underway for some time. During 2007, a number of information meetings on Clean Sky were held in Brussels, but also at various locations around Europe.</p> <p>A major launch event, attended by over 600 participants was held in Brussels on 5 February 2008.</p> <p>A Clean Sky website is now operational which will contain up-to-date information on technology and funding opportunities within Clean Sky as these arise.</p> <p>A "National States" group has also been established, which will create a link between Clean Sky and national research programmes in Europe.</p>
<p>The EESC would like to see appropriate training programmes established to ensure that the skills of workers match to jobs created by "Clean Sky".</p>	<p>Regarding the need to establish appropriate vocational training programmes so as to create a highly skilled workforce with the necessary technical skills, it is not felt that this is an urgent, immediate need or priority. The green technologies which Clean Sky will stimulate in the aeronautics industry in</p>

	<p>Europe is already a development which the industry is embarked upon. Some areas, such as investment in new materials, may need new skills, and indeed the ACARE Technology Platform has established a group, especially involving the higher education sector, concentrating on future training and educational needs of the industry.</p>
--	---

<p>32. Setting up the ENIAC Joint Undertaking COM(2007) 356 final - EESC 1444/2007 - October 2007 Rapporteur: Mr DANTIN (Work./FR) DG INFSO – Mrs REDING</p>	
<p>Main Points of the EESC Opinion</p>	<p>Commission Position</p>
<p>(1.4) In the light of this innovative collaborative structure, which may become complicated when it comes to using the products of the research to be carried out by ENIAC and their industrial application phase, the EESC appreciates the attention which has been paid to intellectual property rules.</p>	<p>The Commission welcomes this comment as it appreciates the collaboration effort of the public and the private stakeholders to provide an appropriate framework at European level for the intellectual property rights.</p>
<p>(1.6 – first bullet) The EESC emphasizes the need for simplified procedures and the involvement of all parties in the choice of objectives and analysis of results</p>	<p>The Commission will make the efforts to ensure for the ENIAC Joint Undertaking to establish a lean structure for decision-making and financial and administrative operations, using where possible the existing administrative procedures at national level. This approach simplifies administrative procedures for public authorities (EU or national) and for private parties, compared to the current intergovernmental (Eureka) arrangements. In particular, :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Removing the budgetary uncertainty, through formal financial commitments by national authorities to the Calls for proposals launched by the Joint Undertaking. ➤ Avoiding the duplication of evaluation procedures that are currently applied at both national and

	<p>intergovernmental levels</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Reducing the time and costs involved in preparing R&D proposals ➤ Streamlining reporting procedures during project execution. Projects will report only once to the Joint Undertaking instead of reporting to Eureka and to all States providing financing.
<p>(1.6 – second bullet) The EESC is of the opinion that an information campaign is necessary to help mobilise the requisite economic resources</p>	<p>Several press releases have been produced, both by the Commission and the industrial association AENEAS to promote the launch of the initiative. Several events are planned in the first year of operation to inform potential stakeholders about the work programme and the rules for participation, including some targeted communication towards SME's. Regarding the appropriate level of public funding, the ENIAC Joint Undertaking has already 13 founding Member States and further Member States and Associated Countries have expressed their interest to join in the near future. National authorities have expressed in several occasions their commitment to fulfil their share of funding to the initiative (national funding should almost double the Community funding of 440 m€). Member States have informally communicated their expected national budget earmarking for ENIAC in 2008 which meet the necessary funding for the first Call for proposals.</p>
<p>(1.6 – third bullet) The EESC suggests the establishment of appropriate vocational training programmes to ensure that the skills of workers match the jobs created by ENIAC</p>	<p>Education and training activities are since the first release of the ENIAC Strategic Research Agenda an integral part of the proposed activities. This will be translated in concrete actions in the annual work programmes of the Joint Undertaking.</p>

<p>33. Mobile Satellite Services COM(2007) 480 final - EESC 1452/2007 - October 2007 Rapporteur : Mr OPRAN (Empl./RO) DG INFSO – Mrs REDING</p>	
<p>Main points of the EESC Opinion</p>	<p>Commission Position</p>
<p>(1.8) The EESC recommends that the decision be adopted in its proposed form, bearing in mind that with regard to the methodology for implementing the provisions on selection and authorisation, regulations must be set down to protect the individual interests of citizens and ensure the privacy of users of terminal equipment for satellite systems.</p>	<p>As providers of public communications networks the selected and authorised mobile satellite system operators will be bound by Directive 2002/58/EC on privacy and electronic communications. Moreover, the general Data Protection Directive 95/46/EC will be applicable in principle to data processing over MSS terminals.</p>
<p>(4.3) The EESC considers that the deadline for rolling out pan-European mobile satellite services for private and commercial clients, including high-speed Internet access, mobile multimedia, public protection, internal security and defence, should not exceed the first quarter of 2011.</p>	<p>The Commission intends to proceed as quickly as possible with the selection process. However, delays related in particular to the legislative process or the type of comitology procedure to be chosen by the co-legislators cannot be excluded.</p>
<p>(4.4) The EESC believes that the implementation and rollout of European global positioning systems should be dealt with as an absolute priority by the Commission.</p>	<p>This initiative to select and authorise mobile satellite system operators is separate from the GALILEO and EGNOS programs.</p>
<p>(5.2) The EESC recommends that the decision be adopted in its proposed form, bearing in mind that at the same time, procedures should be established regarding the primary assignment of the radio spectrum used by mobile satellite services in geographical areas where different communications systems coexist which can generate harmful interference.</p>	<p>The issue of harmful interference is expected to be largely resolved through the identification of particular radio frequency sub-bands to individual selected mobile satellite system operators, and the existing ITU Radio Regulations.</p>
<p>(5.3) The EESC considers that Commission Decision 2007/98/EC of 14 February 2007 on the harmonised use of radio spectrum in the 2 GHz frequency bands for the implementation of systems providing mobile satellite services will contribute significantly to the</p>	<p>Monitoring of the correct transposition and implementation of Decision 2007/98/EC has already been undertaken in the context of the Commission's usual activities aimed at ensuring implementation of the Community law.</p>

<p>achievement of the objectives of the proposal. In this context, in addition to the requirement that "Member States [...] make these frequency bands available to systems providing mobile satellite services in the Community as of 1 July 2007", procedures should be specified for monitoring and assessing the transposition of these measures.</p>	
---	--

<p>34. Fourth Report on Economic and Social Cohesion COM(2007) 273 – EESC 1712/2007 – December 2007 Rapporteur: Mr DERRUINE (VAR. INT./BE) DG REGIO – Ms HÜBNER</p>	
<p>Main points of the EESC Opinion</p>	<p>Commission Position</p>
<p>The EESC would point out that the EU budget, as approved in the agreement on the financial perspectives, is insufficient to match Europe's ambitions. With specific regard to structural policy, the same applies: 0.36% of GDP is insufficient to ensure economic, social and territorial cohesion in Europe.</p>	<p>A consultation is currently opened on the budgetary review that will be undertaken during 2008 and 2009. The Commission is convinced that this exercise must be conducted with "no taboos", including therefore the size of the EU budget.</p> <p>Despite it represents a relatively small part of the whole public investment in the Union, the Fourth Cohesion Report shows that the European cohesion policy has provided remarkable results in terms of convergence at national and regional level.</p> <p>While the Commission is convinced about the achievements of this policy and its usefulness for the European project, future funding of this policy must be justified in terms of European added value and concrete results.</p>
<p>The urgent need for territorial cohesion, which seems to be increasingly asserting itself as the very foundation of economic and social cohesion, to be fully recognised as a general EU objective.</p>	<p>Following the integration of the notion of territorial cohesion in the new Treaty, a Green Paper on this matter is scheduled. Its major objective will be to provide a clear and common understanding of this concept and its implications for the conception of the European cohesion policy. The Green Paper will launch a</p>

	<p>wide debate with the authorities at the different territorial levels and other relevant stakeholders.</p>
<p>The strategic guidelines directing regional policy are aligned with the Lisbon Strategy. The EESC proposes that regional policy take a more balanced approach to the Sustainable Development Strategy.</p>	<p>It is obvious that some of the major challenges to which the Union is confronted in the coming decades such as climate change and energy efficiency are at the heart of the Sustainable Development Agenda (Goteborg Agenda).</p> <p>The Commission recognises that a response to this phenomenon is necessary at European level. In any event, cohesion policy has to give a response founded on a solid ex-ante assessment and forecast indicating its regional impact. The public consultation on the future of European cohesion policy should provide some ideas how this policy could help to address this major challenge.</p> <p>In the current programming period 2007-2013, over EUR 50 billion have been allocated to investments related to the sustainable development.</p>
<p>The EESC reaffirms⁷ the importance of developing and implementing dual-level polycentrism in the context of harmonious development, in order to avoid the detrimental effects of polarisation⁸</p>	<p>The Fourth Cohesion Report suggests that economic prosperity in the EU is becoming less geographically concentrated: the traditional economic core of Europe (the so-called Pentagon) contributed a substantially smaller share of EU-27 GDP in 2004 than in 1995 while its share of population remained broadly stable.</p> <p>However, economic activity has become more concentrated in capital cities throughout the EU. This phenomenon has triggered some negative externalities (congestion, losses of time, pollution and so forth) that hinder an optimal allocation of resources and may hamper the</p>

⁷ See the EESC opinions on *European metropolitan areas: socio-economic implications for Europe's future*, OJ C 168, 20.7.2007, p. 10; on the *Impact and consequences of structural policies on EU cohesion*, OJ C 93, 27.4.2007, p. 6; and on the *Territorial Agenda*, OJ C 168, 20.7.2007, p. 16.

⁸ See in this regard the study drawn up by the European Parliament's REGI committee, *Regional disparities and cohesion: what strategies for the future*, May 2007.

	<p>sustainable development of these areas.</p> <p>Cohesion policy may provide a response to address these negative externalities stemming from polarisation while bearing in mind that many developed urban areas are facing very significant problems in terms of poverty and social exclusion.</p>
<p>"In the Committee's view [a view that has been echoed by the European Parliament in its recent reports], cohesion should not be understood solely in terms of GDP. It therefore calls for a 'more representative indication of cohesion [which should include] in addition to GDP, parameters such as employment and unemployment levels, the extent of social protection, the level of access to general interest services etc.⁹". These indicators should also be complemented by indicators of income inequality (Gini coefficient or inter-quintile ratio) and of CO₂ emissions (per inhabitant or change since 1990). In general terms, it is vital to build up the EU's statistical tools, particularly at NUTS level, and to forge closer links between Eurostat and national statistics offices in order to gain access as soon as possible to the most comprehensive and accurate data available¹⁰.</p>	<p>Indeed the Fourth Cohesion Report provides an detailed analysis of economic, social and territorial disparities using a wide set of indicators to capture the dimension of the existing inequalities such as employment, demographic trends, dependency rate, accessibility, health services and so forth.</p>
<p>Not all EU regions will be capable of being at the leading edge of the knowledge economy for want of infrastructure or human capital, or because their size prohibits economies of scale. These regions will have to position themselves in relation to neighbouring metropolitan areas by developing their residential economy or by specialising in areas with less marked agglomeration effects or where a lower critical mass is required.</p>	<p>The Commission agrees that regional specialisation is an important dimension to foster economic and social cohesion. Identifying and exploiting the comparative advantage is a challenge for the development of each territory. This is one of the reasons why the role of local and regional authorities will be even more important in the increasing globalised context by providing tailor-made solution in accordance with the comparative</p>

⁹ See paragraph 1.3 of the EESC opinion on the *Impact and consequences of structural policies on EU cohesion*, OJ C 93, 27.4.2007, p. 6.

¹⁰ *When it relaunched the Lisbon strategy in March 2005, the European Council reaffirmed that the strategy was to be seen in the wider context of sustainable development whereby present needs should be met without compromising the ability of future generations to meet theirs. The European Council reiterates its attachment to sustainable development as a key principle governing all the Union's policies and activities'. Conclusions of the European Council of June 2005.*

	advantage of the region.
The EESC shares the view of ESPON ¹¹ that the consequences of climate change will vary across the regions, requiring differentiated responses.	Some regions in Europe are more vulnerable to climate change and will be more severely affected than others (see above for further information on the Commission's approach on sustainable development).
The EESC proposes complementing and bolstering the budget of the Solidarity Fund, which currently provides rapid aid in the event of a natural disaster. In order to further emphasise the EU's commitment to combating climate change, which requires longer term measures, the EESC proposes that henceforth the Solidarity Fund should also co-finance preventive risk management projects.	<p>The Solidarity Fund was never designed to support preventive measures. The Fund is a refinancing instrument for specific types of expenses incurred by the public authorities for emergency operations following a disaster. The proposal for a revised Solidarity Fund regulation, adopted on 6 April 2005, maintains this principle.</p> <p>At EU level, prevention and reconstruction measures are supported by the Structural Funds and the Cohesion Fund or by agricultural funds. In fact, risk prevention is one of the priorities of the ERDF for the period 2007 – 2013. In addition, rural development measures under the EAGGF can finance the restoration of agricultural production potential damaged by natural disasters and the introduction of appropriate prevention instruments.</p>
As regards the outermost regions, <i>"the EESC welcomes the Commission's intention, within the convergence objective, to set up a specific compensation mechanism covering all the handicaps of the outermost regions, as well as regions with permanent structural handicaps"</i> ¹² . The EESC believes that <i>"a European policy for regions with permanent handicaps should be based on three major principles"</i> , namely: 1) permanence (the <i>catch-up</i> concept not being relevant to these regions), 2) positive discrimination, designed to bring about real parity with the	<p>The new Treaty to be ratified by Member States confirms that outermost regions are affected by a number of natural constraints and, therefore, specific measures must be adopted at European level.</p> <p>The general Regulation governing the functioning of the Structural funds and the Cohesion Fund recognises these handicaps and gives a response to offset them by providing an additional allocation</p>

¹¹ ESPON: *Scenarios on the territorial future of Europe*, May 2007.

¹² EESC opinion on the *Third report on economic and social cohesion – A new partnership for cohesion: convergence, competitiveness, cooperation*, OJ C 302, 7.12.2004, p. 60.

<p>other regions and 3) proportionality, to take account of the diversity of the geographic, demographic and environmental characteristics of the regions as well as the constraints that they face.</p>	<p>to these territories equivalent to EUR 35 per inhabitant per year. This allocation is added to any funding for which these regions are otherwise eligible.</p>
<p>It would be worth considering setting up a <i>demographic fund</i>. It would be aimed at supporting national efforts to promote higher birth rates and female participation in the labour market by making more EU funds available for investment in facilities for childcare and care of the elderly as well as in the renovation/modernisation of schools, particularly in rural areas.</p>	<p>In the light of global developments cohesion policy is no longer just a tool to help regions to catch-up but also a proactive instrument helping regions to cope with anticipated changes. It is obvious that one of the most relevant forthcoming challenges is demographic change. The EU's population is projected to decline by around 2023. It means that a shrinking workforce may reduce the overall level of employment acting as a possible break for growth in the Union.</p> <p>The Commission recognises that a response to this phenomenon is necessary at European level. In any event, cohesion policy has to give a response founded on a solid ex-ante assessment and forecast indicating its regional impact. The public consultation on the future of European cohesion policy should provide some ideas how this policy could help to address this major challenge.</p>
<p>The EESC would firmly reiterate its opposition to any attempt to renationalise Cohesion Policy, which incontestably provides European added value in terms of solidarity, growth and jobs, and whose impact on the ground is visible to the European public.</p>	<p>The European Commission agrees that the European cohesion policy has provided an added value in terms of solidarity, growth and jobs with a relatively small budget in terms of EU GDP.</p> <p>In addition, it has developed an original system of multi-level governance developing partnership between the different levels of the administration and a culture of cooperation with social partners and other relevant stakeholders. The European cohesion policy has also provided a significant contribution to the development of the administrative capacity and the efficiency in the functioning of the public administration.</p> <p>Finally, another response against renationalisation is that the European cohesion policy is not a mere</p>

	redistributive mechanism but aims at enhancing the endogenous capacity of development of each European territory and at providing a number of European public goods.
The EESC points out that, according to the Treaty (Articles 2, 158 and 159), all policies – EU, national, horizontal and sectoral – must contribute to the objective of cohesion. Therefore, it is important that cohesion, and particularly its territorial dimension, be taken into account in the integrated guidelines and impact analyses ¹³ .	The Commission is convinced that further reflection is needed to strength synergies and coherence between the European cohesion policy and EU sectoral policies and national policies.
The provisions set out in the Charter of Fundamental Rights, recognised in the Treaty on European Union (Article 6) must also be taken into consideration in defining and implementing the structural policies.	The Commission welcomes that the Charter of Fundamental Rights will become a part of the primary law of the European Union. Already some of the rights recognised in the Charter such as, <i>inter alia</i> , equality between women and men or the integration of disabled people are already fully integrated in the design and implementation of programmes financed by the Structural Funds and the Cohesion Fund.

¹³

EESC opinion on the *Impact and consequences of structural policies on EU cohesion*, OJ C 93, 27.4.2007, p. 6.

36. Proposal for a Council Directive amending Directive 2003/96/EC as regards the adjustment of special tax arrangements for gas oil used as motor fuel for commercial purposes and the coordination of taxation of unleaded petrol and gas oil used as motor fuel
COM (2007) 52 final – EESC 1466/2007 – October 2007
Rapporteur : Mr BURANI (Empl/ IT)
DG TAXUD – Mr KOVACS

Main points of the EESC Opinion	Commission Position
<p>(2.5) The proposal's scope with regard to competition is fairly limited, always bearing in mind that the Commission has no authority to impact on other fuel-price components. Nevertheless, even in this light, the proposal seems incomplete. It would be appropriate to consider adopting a maximum excise rate as well. This measure would make it possible over time to discourage the shifting of consumption from one country to another. The EESC has supported this approach in the past, and more recently in its opinion on the approximation of the rates of excise duty on alcohol¹⁴ - a subject whose treatment bears a number of similarities to the present proposal.</p>	<p>The results of the impact assessment did not support sufficiently an option of setting a maximum tax rate, which would unnecessarily interfere with the policy of the Member States and would substantially depart from the existing approach in the excise duty area since the beginning of the 1990s: harmonisation by means of setting the minimum rates only.</p>
<p>(2.7) The additional distance driven (millions of kilometres!) produces an increase in fuel consumption and a corresponding increase in pollution. Eliminating incentives to resort to "fuel tourism" would eliminate detours and result in a corresponding reduction in pollution. This is an appealing and undoubtedly popular theory, but it is not entirely in line with reality, at least in the case of the example cited.</p>	<p>The problem with the "fuel tourism" was analysed carefully in the Impact assessment accompanying the Proposal. The Commission also took into consideration several external studies acknowledging the existence of the phenomenon as well.</p>
<p>(3.2.1) While the data and the econometric studies consulted by the Commission are not in question, it should nevertheless be noted that the considerable cost divergence between the various countries (and particularly with the newest Member</p>	<p>The purpose of the Commercial diesel proposal is to maintain the real value of the minimum levels of taxation which are set in absolute terms per volume units and thus, without regular updates, their value is eroded over time.</p>

14

Opinion CESE 789/2007 on the "Approximation of the rates of excise duty on alcohol".

<p>States) means that the relative impact of fuel costs as a factor in those differences is shrinking. Essentially the accession of the new countries may have increased the variations, but the relative value of the "fuel" factor has fallen. In such circumstances, the directive's ability to create more uniform conditions for competition would fail to meet expectations. The Commission does not share this view, believing that fuel costs have come to play an important role in competition distortion between old and new Member States. The EESC notes that, if this is the case, serious thought is needed regarding the wisdom of increasing the costs for growing economies.</p>	<p>With the enlargement the difference in fuel taxes across the internal market increased significantly and inevitably contribute to the other elements that lead to differences in costs and this distort the internal transport market. Further approximation of excise duty rates is thus one of the elements that at least contribute to reductions of such distortions. Action of this kind lies within the very rationale of Article 93 of the Treaty.</p>
<p>(3.2.2) Even if it were possible to attain a levelling out of fuel costs, which is not the case owing to additional duties that differ from one country to another, non-fuel haulage costs are many and substantial and none of them could be harmonised, in the near future at least. In addition to the three elements mentioned in the French study, there is the cost of vehicles (with differences of up to 20%), road taxes, insurance, the price of buildings and equipment, and others. In view of all these differences, the contribution that harmonising excise duties on gas oil can make to reducing disparities in competition becomes somewhat modest.</p>	<p>The Proposal only tries to keep up with the expected inflation of 2.2% until 2017. It has to be stressed that such an increase – which is anyway proposed to enter into effect from 2014 only – would only partially take into account all the losses of the real value of the EU minimum levels if taxation as they were fixed in 2003.</p>
<p>(3.2.5) Further doubts are raised by the measure underpinning the refund mechanism, whereby taxation may be below the specified level if the Member State introduces, or has already introduced, road user charges for heavy vehicles (or in more explicit terms: tolls or tax discs). Both approaches would result in a clear loss for the tax authorities: tolls and tax discs are to the advantage of motorway operators or other government budget headings. In short, the moderating effect would not benefit the hauliers (tolls will balance out the lower increases in taxation) or the tax authorities. Worse still, the</p>	<p>The objective of the proposal is not to introduce a new special treatment of diesel fuel used by the hauliers, the objective of the proposal is to make operational a provision which already exists in Community legislation. In any event, it is for Member States to decide whether they want to use this possibility and offer more favourable tax treatment to diesel used by hauliers, or not. It is clear that granting a favourable tax rate always generates certain administrative burden, both for the tax authorities and for the beneficiary. It is for Member States to</p>

<p>introduction of or increase in tolls would affect all other road users unless separate levels of taxation or special tax discs were introduced, which would create administrative complications that would be even more of a burden on transit vehicles from other Member States.</p>	<p>consider the pros and cons of such an option. The purpose of the Commission proposal is only to make the already existing provision more operational and to ensure that when Member States apply it, the application is as uniform as possible in accordance with the needs of the internal market (that is why the Commission decided to include a uniform refund mechanism into the proposal).</p>
<p>(3.3) The EESC wishes to make a more general point of some importance. The proposed measures are to be phased in over a seven-year period, and in some Member States, over a ten-year period. There is no sign of improvement in the international situation regarding the price, quantity and supply of crude oil. Under these circumstances, a programmed increase in fuel costs seems ill-advised and could have a negative impact on transport costs within the European Union. Nor would it bring real benefits in terms of the fight against pollution given that, according to the Commission itself, fuel consumption is not set to decrease (the subject of detours from set routes has already been discussed when considering fuel tourism).</p>	<p>The proposal contains an important element which can positively impact on the situation on the fuel market. By aligning the minimum levels of taxation of petrol and diesel, the proposal addresses a long term distortion on the European fuel market experiencing excessive demand for diesel. As explained in the impact assessment, long-term favourable tax treatment of diesel, which cannot be justified in any terms (in particular not in environmental terms), contributed to this imbalance on the European fuel market. From this point of view, the proposal intends to improve the EU security of diesel supply.</p> <p>The impact assessment also shows that the proposal has positive impacts in terms of reduced fuel consumption as is confirmed in the impacts assessment.</p>
<p>(3.4) Precisely because we are referring to the future, one important aspect to bear in mind is the growing introduction of alternative fuels, which are being generally promoted as viable alternatives to conventional fuels from an environmental perspective and as a means of reducing Europe's dependence on external energy sources. An increase in conventional fuel prices might encourage research into and the production of alternative fuels, but only if the uniform fiscal policy to be adopted is already known. The various countries do not currently take a uniform approach,</p>	<p>Tax treatment of alternative fuels is outside the scope of this proposal, which only deals with the tax treatment of petrol and diesel. Possibility to grant favourable tax treatment to certain alternative fuels is already part of Community acquis. More coherent approach towards tax differentiation in favour more environmental friendly fuels was raised by the Commission in its green paper on market-based instruments (COM (2007) 140) and might be subject to follow up in the appropriate context. It has to be noted, nevertheless, that the higher the tax</p>

<p>although there is a general consensus on the need to encourage this type of production. In other words, the Commission and governments should go beyond general words of encouragement and make it clear whether they intend to adopt uniform fiscal and non-fiscal policies on biofuels and whether they would then treat them as useful "competitors" with traditional fuels, or whether alternative fuels will be treated in the same way as other fuels and taxed in the same way. The automotive industry and the market should not be left with uncertainty.</p>	<p>applied on conventional fossil fuels, the higher would be the incentive to switch to non-taxed or lower taxed alternative fuels. From this point of view, the proposal could indeed encourage research and production of alternatives, as suggested by the EESC.</p>
<p>(3.5) Finally, the picture would not be complete if it did not include globalisation. Irrespective of considerations relating to internal competition, the European Union should focus more attention on its competitiveness vis-à-vis the most industrialised and emerging countries. As previously stated, the average pump price of fuel in the EU is much higher than in most other countries. A measure designed to reduce – with uncertain consequences - internal competition, but which would result in an overall increase in costs, would defeat the more important objective of improving our already precarious competitive position.</p>	<p>The Community taxation policy must ensure that there is no distortion in the internal market. Taxation of motor fuels is an important source of revenue for EU Member States. Taxes on motor fuels represent in the EU Member States on average almost three quarters of revenues from environment related taxes and thus have served in the past as basis for environmental tax reforms carried out by several Member States. This allowed EU Member States to reduce the tax burden to the benefit of both their environment and their economies. Given that revenues from motor fuel taxes are an important source of income for public budgets, should the real value of these revenue fall down (e.g. because the real value of EU minima is diminished), Member States would need to raise other taxes instead or reduce spending.</p>

(4.1) The draft directive is in line with EU policies on **equal conditions for competition**, and as such cannot be opposed. It should be borne in mind however that **this solution does not deliver fundamental value**, inasmuch as the difference in haulage companies' costs in the various countries will remain substantial owing to differences in other charges over which the Commission has no power.

(4.2) The Commission focuses closely on the **fight against pollution** as a collateral but important effect of reducing the "fuel tourism" phenomenon. The EESC considers that this effect has been largely over-estimated. While on the one hand demand for fuels will remain unchanged, even now detours from normal routes to take advantage of reduced prices are not a critical factor.

(4.3) As a consequence "fuel tourism" will expand and spread, turning from an internal problem of the EU (Germany, France and Belgium) into an external problem (for Austria, Hungary, Slovenia, Estonia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Bulgaria and Greece).

(4.4) The tax revenue benefits for Member States, meanwhile, would be considerable. For the 2007-2030 period, the Commission has estimated them at EUR 35.6 billion for the 25-member EU. This is a significant figure, which will strengthen and expand the redistributive role of the administration and explains the positive reaction of the tax authorities in many Member States. However, it also offers self-evident proof of the burden of costs that would fall on companies and consumers in contradiction with the EU policy for red-tape reduction.

(1) Firstly, the Commission proposal is not introducing a new provision into Directive 2003/96, it is making more operational an existing provision which allows Member States to grant more favourable tax treatment to diesel used by commercial transport.

(2) Secondly, apart from that the proposal is aligning minimum levels of taxation for diesel and petrol. This might lead to greater approximation of the actual tax rates applied by Member States to petrol and diesel. In turn, this could reduce the distortions on the fuel market which are caused by the differentiated tax treatment between petrol and diesel.

(3) Thirdly, the proposal is merely keeping up with the expected inflation until 2017 (with a 2.2% rate). Thus the proposal in fact intends to maintain the real value of the minimum rates and thus to maintain the real value of Member States tax revenues.

<p>38. Green paper on market-based instruments for environment and related policy purposes COM (2007) 140 final – EESC 1697/2007 – December 2007 Rapporteur : Mr RIBBE (Var. Int./DE) DG ENV and DG TAXUD - Mr DIMAS - Mr KOVACS</p>	
<p>Main Points of the EESC Opinion</p>	<p>Commission Position</p>
<p>(1.4) MBI are a good way of tackling environmental issues in a cost-effective way. They are not, however, a panacea. The political discussion – and the Green Paper – should therefore address the relationship and interplay between, for instance, rules and bans, regulatory law and market-based instruments (such as taxes, charges, targeted subsidises and tradable permits). The Committee regrets, however, that the Commission Green Paper gives far too few pointers in this regard.</p>	<p>The Commission agrees with the Economic and Social Committee that market-based instruments are not a panacea and are not suitable to be used in all cases. In the green paper, the Commission pointed to areas where further use of market-based instruments, improvements of existing ones or introduction of new ones could be envisaged and invited comments concerning the options for doing that and the related pros and cons</p>
<p>(3.6) The content of the Green Paper does not go any further than what has long since been known, and been the subject of discussion, in the business community and in society. Nor does it address the question of who is to be the prime mover. The EU does not of course have equal responsibility for all possible instruments. In taxation matters, for example, it has only very limited powers. Moreover, at a policy level, it is not clear just what is supposed to happen in the wake of the publication of the Green Paper, whether, as is usual, a white paper is to follow or what conclusions are to be drawn from the exercise.</p>	<p>The green paper raises some more general and cross-cutting questions, like the role that taxation should play as market-based instrument in the areas of environment and energy. It also discusses some horizontal themes, like environmental tax reforms and options for their further progress. And finally, the green paper raises very specific questions related to further use of energy taxation on the one hand and to the use of market-based instruments (being it by the Community or by Member States) in several very specific areas of environmental policy.</p> <p>For each of these areas, the Commission will prepare follow up on the green paper, where appropriate.</p>
<p>(4.2) The "market-based" road-transport instrument, the Eurovignette, described in the Green Paper, is a good illustration of the problem, as this instrument, which is regarded as a suitable tool for integrating external costs, has in reality been used only very half-heartedly. The</p>	<p>Currently there is an analysis under way how to measures externalities of different modes of transport. This exercise may constitute a point of reference for further action. .</p>

<p>Commission itself writes that <i>"average charges can only cover infrastructure costs and thus exclude external costs"</i>. Initiatives are therefore needed which would, for example, integrate external costs using the Eurovignette..</p>	
<p>(4.6) The Commission must act without delay to remove the uncertainties thrown up by the Green Paper. It must clearly state just how it sees the various policy instruments being used in future. The EESC thus recommends that the Commission, in the context of the planned wide-ranging discussion on the subject, illustrate the possible policy options (with or without MBI) by means of a few practical examples drawn from different policy areas, e.g. energy and transport.</p>	<p>The green paper directly contributed to several ongoing activities, such as the ongoing implementation of the water framework directive or the revision of the Energy Taxation Directive scheduled for 2008.</p>
<p>(4.9) If the demarcation/linkage of regulatory law and MBI were made clearer by setting out specific options for action, this might also make the Green Paper's discussion of the use of MBI for the maintenance of biodiversity more comprehensible. In this area the EESC does not consider that the Commission has yet come up with any convincing ideas that might offer some hope of effectively combating the worrying decline in biodiversity.</p>	<p>The Commission has no definite view on the use of MBI for biodiversity. As one of the follow ups on the green paper, the Commission will soon launch a study on experiences with the use of market-based instruments in this field. . Results will feed into further political discussion.</p>
<p>(4.10) In its opinion on the Biannual Progress Report of the EU Sustainable Development Strategy¹⁵ the Committee called on the Commission to flesh out its very vaguely worded proposals for a new tax system based on sustainability indicators. According to Eurostat, revenue from environmental taxes amounts to some 7% of the total.</p> <p>(4.11) The EESC considers a debate on reducing the taxation of labour and compensating for this with revenues from the taxation of environmentally harmful activities to be overdue. This should be accelerated following submission of the</p>	<p>Generally speaking it is up to the Member States to decide on which sources they wish to put the accent in terms of tax income, in particular as regards labour on the one hand and (energy) consumption on the other hand. . However, the Commission expressed in the green paper its willingness to facilitate exchange of experience between Member States for example in the context of an MBI Forum the creation of which is suggested in the green paper.</p>

¹⁵

EESC opinion, CESE 994/2007, 11.7.2007 (NAT/348).

<p>Green Paper. However, it also needs to be made clear in this context how the EU envisages changes of this kind taking place, given that, under the Treaties, it has only a marginal influence on the tax policies of the Member States.</p>	
<p>(4.12) The EESC considers it extremely important that the promised survey of environmentally harmful subsidies be submitted without delay and that these subsidies be abolished as soon as possible. The Committee sees environmentally harmful subsidies as a significant distortion of competition and a completely unacceptable misallocation of public funds. MBI will only be effective as instruments to promote environmental protection once environmentally harmful subsidies have been completely eliminated.</p>	<p>The Commission is to present a roadmap for reform of the environmentally harmful subsidies still in 2008.</p>

<p>43. The EU's relations with Moldova: What role for organised civil society? Own initiative opinion – EESC 1714/2007 – December 2007 Rapporteur: Ms PICHENOT (Var. Int./FR) DG RELEX – Ms FERRERO WALDNER</p>	
<p>Main points of the EESC Opinion</p>	<p>Commission Position</p>
<p>The EESC stressed that the extent to which the EU-Moldova Action Plan would be successful depends on the ability to associate and involve civil society organisations in its implementation.</p>	<p>The European Commission welcomes the involvement of civil society in the reform process in Moldova and in the EU – Moldova dialogue. Promotion of cooperation with civil society is one of the objectives stipulated in the EU – Moldova ENP Action plan.</p>
<p>The EESC advocates that the Commission send out a clear signal by proposing criteria, procedures and instruments that would enable more effective involvement of civil society. Nonetheless, the EESC commends the efforts of the EU delegation in Chisinau, in its focus on increasing contacts with Moldovan civil society. This will pave</p>	<p>Moldovan civil society organisations are eligible to participate in programmes under the Thematic Programme for Non-State Actors and Local Authorities, and under the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights. In addition to this, in 2007 the EC committed to a €2 million project under the European Neighbourhood and</p>

<p>the way to a formal involvement of civil society representatives in the review of the action plan in April 2008 and in the next stages of an enhanced partnership.</p>	<p>Partnership Instrument (ENPI) for cooperation between civil society in the Transnistria region and in the rest of Moldova. This project is currently being further developed.</p> <p>The Commission welcomes civil society organisations monitoring the ENP Action Plan implementation. Several civil society organisations provided their contributions to the Progress Report, which is to be published in April 2008.</p>
<p>The EESC considers particularly important to promote links between civil society organization from Moldova and its break-away region Transnistria. At the same time the EESC encouraged the EU to sustain its efforts towards a solution to the Transnistrian conflict and to pursue the EU Border Assistance Mission (EUBAM).</p>	<p>The European Commission fully supports this idea. It is strongly engaged in the Transnistria settlement process and contact between civil society organizations from both sides can be a useful confidence building measure.</p> <p>The Commission is currently developing a €m project for civil society cooperation on both sides of the Nistru river.</p> <p>The EU Border Assistance Mission (EUBAM) has been in place since 1 December 2005 following a joint request of the Ukrainian and Moldovan Presidents. It had an initial duration of 2 years until end-November 2007 but all parties (Ukraine, Moldova and the Commission) have agreed to extend the EUBAM mandate for an additional two years until end-November 2009. One of the objectives of EUBAM is to provide a contribution to the Transnistria settlement process.</p>
<p>The EESC positively evaluated the EU – Moldova relations particularly in 2007, when a number of concrete achievements were realized.</p>	<p>The European Commission shares the EESC’s opinion. 2007 has been a very successful year for EU-Moldova relations with significant achievements delivered by the EU, in close cooperation with the Moldovan authorities, for the benefit of Moldovan citizens. The conclusion of Visa Facilitation and Readmission agreements, opening Common Visa Application Centre in Chisinau and granting Autonomous Trade Preferences</p>

	to Moldova (adopted by the Council in January 2008) are good examples of progress in EU-Moldova relations.
<p>In order to strengthen relations with Moldovan civil society, the EESC envisages organising a conference in Moldova with the aim to evaluate existing information and consultation mechanisms in Moldova including an assessment of the implementation of the EU-Moldova Action Plan. The conference would further focus on preparing and training civil society for pursuing the partnership after 2008 and prepare Moldovan civil society organisations to possible access to the EU's financial instruments.</p>	<p>The European Commission notes the EESC's initiative. DG RELEX and EC Delegation are in contact with the organizers in this regard.</p> <p>Before the planned conference with Moldovan active civil society representatives takes place, the EESC envisages organising a preparatory mission, to identify possible partners in Moldova. The European Commission will stay in close contact with the EESC and a first preparatory meeting has already been scheduled.</p>
<p>The EESC recommended broadening of access to the EU's programmes, particularly for young people by means of Erasmus Mundus. In this regard welcomed the conclusion of the Visa Facilitation and Readmission Agreements, which should enhance facilitation of people-to-people contacts between the EU and Moldova.</p>	<p>So far 19 post-graduate Moldovan students have benefited of the Erasmus Mundus programme (9 students in 2005, 5 in 2006 and 5 in 2007). No Moldovan institutions have been involved under the other action lines of the programme (Partnerships, Attractiveness).</p> <p>Moldova is also eligible under the newly-launched scheme - Erasmus Mundus External Co-operation Window. The cooperation projects established under this scheme support academic cooperation and student (at undergraduate, masters and doctoral level) and professor mobility. Under the 2007 call for proposals, a consortium coordinated by a Spanish university (Universidad Deusto) with an involvement of 2 Moldovan universities (Cahul State University "B.P.Hasdeu" Universitatea De Stat Din Moldova), was selected.</p>

<p>44. Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on Community statistics on public health and health and safety at work COM(2007) 46 final – EESC 1176/2007 – October 2007 Rapporteur : Mr RETUREAU (Var. Int./FR) DG ESTAT - Mr ALMUNIA</p>	
Main points of the EESC opinion	Commission position
<p>The Committee supports the proposed Regulation and its legal basis; the proposal complies with the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality, whilst allowing for the collection of statistics that are useful to the implementation of the Community strategy on health and safety at work, for which a clear legal framework has become necessary.</p>	<p>The Commission welcomes the very clear support of the European Economic and Social Committee.</p>
<p>It stresses the importance of common definitions and systems for recognition, not least because of the mobility of workers, as regards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - occupational accidents and commuting accidents; - occupational illnesses caused by working conditions and/or substances; - partial or permanent incapacity and invalidity caused by work-related accidents and illnesses, and the working days lost. 	<p>The Commission agrees on the importance of common definitions for statistical data collections. At the same time the Commission wants to underline, however, that this Regulation is only focused on statistical activities developed under article 285 of the Treaty establishing the European Community. Its aim is not on policy developments for the two areas of public health and health and safety at work. The Commission takes note of the point 2.1. of the EESC opinion, which recognises this restriction in the aims.</p>
<p>When collating statistics as to the number of people involved in each type of incident, the Committee believes that it would be helpful to take account of the gender and age of the victims and, as far as possible, the nature of their contractual relationship. Particular attention should be paid to the confidentiality of personal data collected.</p>	<p>The Commission agrees on that gender and age are key variables in all person-related statistics covered by the proposed regulation (whether victims, patients, health personnel, etc.). The European Parliament adopted an opinion on the Draft regulation, which included amendments underlining the importance of age and gender information in these statistics. The Commission agrees with these proposals. The Commission also agrees that the nature of the contractual relationship is also an important variable, which is already included in the ongoing statistical data collection on accidents at work under gentlemen's agreement.</p> <p>Confidentiality of the data during</p>

	transmission, treatment and dissemination will be governed by the provisions of Council Regulations (EC) No 322/97 and (Euratom, EEC) No 1588/90 as well as by Directive 95/46/EC.
The Committee believes that cooperation with the ILO and the WHO should be developed. In the Committee's view, the proposed regulation constitutes one of the most useful means of bringing about convergence of the nature of the definitions and data to be recorded, and the methods of collecting and analysing these data.	The Commission agrees with this argument and a specific paragraph in the Article concerning methodology will ensure that the statistical methodologies and data collections to be developed for the compilation of statistics on public health and health and safety at work at Community level shall take into consideration the need for coordination, whenever relevant, with the activities of international organisations in the field, with a view to ensure international comparability of statistics and consistency of data collections as well as to avoid duplication of efforts and of deliveries of data by Member States.

c) Avis pour lesquels, en l'état, la Commission n'est pas en mesure de formuler des remarques

<p>1. Esprit d'entreprise et le programme de Lisbonne Avis d'initiative - CESE 1460/2007 – Octobre 2007 Rapporteur: Mme SHARMA (Empl./UK) Co-Rapporteur: M. OLSSON (Act. Div./SE) SG – M. le Président BARROSO</p>

Le suivi de ce point est reporté au trimestre suivant.

<p>3. Mise en œuvre de la stratégie de Lisbonne: état actuel et perspectives d'avenir Avis d'initiative - CESE 1715/2007 – Décembre 2007 Rapporteur: M. VAN IERSEL (Empl./NL) SG – M. le Président BARROSO</p>

Le suivi de ce point est reporté au trimestre suivant.

13. Evolution de l'indemnité compensatoire pour les zones défavorisés à partir de 2010
Avis d'initiative - CESE 1456/2007 – Octobre 2007
Rapporteur: M. KIENLE (Empl./DE)
DG AGRI – Mme FISHER -BOEL

La Commission estime qu'il n'est pas approprié de donner une suite à cet avis.

16. La main d'œuvre agricole transfrontalière
Avis d'initiative - CESE 1698/2007 – Décembre 2007
Rapporteur: M. SIECKER (Trav./NL)
DG EMPL – M. SPIDLA

Le suivi de ce point est reporté au trimestre suivant.

17. La situation de l'emploi dans l'agriculture (supplément d'avis)
Avis d'initiative - CESE 1699/2007 – Décembre
Rapporteur: M. WILMS (Trav./DE)
DG AGRI – Mme FISHER -BOEL

Le suivi de ce point est reporté au trimestre suivant.

18. Perspectives d'avenir de l'agriculture dans les zones à handicaps naturels spécifiques (régions de montagne, insulaires et ultrapériphériques)
Avis d'initiative - CESE 1704/2007 – Décembre 2007
Rapporteur: M. BROS (Act. Div./FR)
DG AGRI – Mme FISHER -BOEL

La Commission estime qu'il n'est pas approprié de donner une suite à cet avis.

19. Modification – application de certaines dispositions à l'Estonie
COM(2007) 411 final - CESE 1451/2007 – Octobre 2007
DG TREN – M. PIEBALGS

Aucune suite ne sera donnée à cet avis.

24. Le changement climatique et la stratégie de Lisbonne
Avis d'initiative - CESE 1458/2007 – Octobre 2007
Rapporteur: M. EHNMARK (Trav./SE)
SG – M. le Président BARROSO

Le suivi de ce point est reporté au trimestre suivant.

<p>27. Impact des règles européennes en matière d'environnement sur les mutations industrielles Avis d'initiative - CESE 1709/2007 - Decembre 2007 Rapporteur: M. PEZZINI (Empl./IT) DG ENV- M. DIMAS</p>	
<p>Points de l'avis du CESE estimés essentiels</p>	<p>Position de la Commission</p>
<p>L'avis souligne l'importance d'une politique environnementale bien conçue pour les entreprises, notamment les petites et moyennes entreprises. L'avis insiste sur la nécessité pour l'industrie européenne de passer d'un comportement défensif et réactif à une attitude convaincue et proactive. L'avis aborde également la nécessité d'une réglementation simplifiée évitant la bureaucratie et les surcoûts, ainsi que l'importance de mesures d'accompagnements et de soutien permettant de libérer les capacités innovantes du monde industriel.</p>	<p>Cet avis d'initiative ne comporte aucune demande précise à l'adresse de la Commission qui ne soit pas déjà traitée dans le cadre d'initiatives en cours ou envisagées, indépendamment de cet avis.</p> <p>Aucun suivi spécifique n'y sera donc donné.</p>

<p>42. La Croatie sur la voie de l'adhésion Avis d'initiative - CESE 1468/2007 – Octobre 2007 Rapporteur : Mme SIGMUND (Act. Div./AT) DG ELARG – M. REHN</p>

La Commission ne compte pas donner de suivi à ce point, dont les conclusions sont en ligne avec la position de la Commission.