

Applicant Countries' Contribution to the 6th Environmental Action Programme

FINAL DRAFT

Oct. 9, 2000

Compiled for European Commission
DG Environment, Unit XI.B1



THE REGIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL CENTER
for Central and Eastern Europe

Executive Summary

This report represents the findings of the project “Applicant Countries' contribution to the 6th Environmental Action Programme,” commissioned by the European Commission’s DG Environment, Unit XI.B1 (Subv 00/193999). It was carried out by The Regional Environmental Center for Central and Eastern Europe (REC) between June and October 2000.

The main objective of the project was to help the Applicant Countries contribute effectively to the drafting of the 6th Environmental Action Programme (EAP), and specifically:

- To identify areas of the 6th EAP where Applicant Countries’ contributions could improve the document, and to solicit those contributions.
- To provide relevant expertise in synthesizing the contributions and in drafting the input to the 6th EAP, based on the guidance provided by the Applicant Countries.

Findings

From the perspective of the Applicant Countries the main messages for the 6th EAP are as follows:

- **Importance of the subsidiarity principle, adaptable policy making and framework legislation.** With the enlargement, the variety and complexity of environmental problems will increase, and the need for even more diversified policy approach will intensify. The role of the European Union (EU) will be to provide a framework for action and a level playing field – using horizontal legislation, framework legislation and common-market-related legislation. National and sub-national structures will have to be further empowered with responsibilities, capacities and resources in order to protect the quality of environment in specific geographic areas, such as watersheds, Natura 2000 sites or urban regions.
- **Fostering sectoral integration through enlargement.** The Applicant Countries are in an advantageous position to avoid some of the environmentally detrimental development paths that Western Europe took in the last 50 years – and to maximise the benefits of integrating environment into structural reform. In order to realise this advantage, the EU needs to provide practical solutions and leadership on integration of environmental considerations into sectoral policies for an enlarged Europe. The environment has to be seen as a factor of economic growth, prosperity and quality of life for citizens across Europe – not as an obstacle or unnecessary cost.
- **Deepening implementation.** The relative weakness of environmental institutions in the Applicant Countries, combined with the growing complexity of the environmental *acquis communautaire*, poses a threat to the effective implementation of this body of laws. Strengthening implementation should receive priority over developing further legislation. Crucial in determining the success in Applicant Countries will be the use of Structural and Cohesion Funds to promote innovative solutions, wide dissemination of these solutions and institutional strengthening.
- **Sustainable development through local action.** Applicant Countries’ main decisions in determining the direction of development over the next century will be made in the next ten years. Future development patterns of cities and the countryside in the Applicant Countries will be determined in the context of rapid development before and after their entry into the EU. These patterns will determine how the countries will be able to achieve their environmental objectives related to health, climate change, preservation of habitats, waste management and the general quality of life of citizens. This window of opportunity can be used for promoting sustainable development by supporting dissemination of successful models and local action for sustainability.

With respect to the areas proposed by the EC to be covered in the 6th EAP, the following should be considered:

- **Climate change.** While the Applicant Countries will have few problems in meeting their commitments under the Kyoto protocol between now and 2008, the levels of greenhouse gases in these countries has been rising steadily since mid '90s. The three most critical sectors are energy, transport and agriculture. In the short run, the liberalisation of energy and fuel prices in order to reach world market levels will provide an incentive for decrease of greenhouse gas emission. However, in the long run, structural changes in the economy will be required to achieve the objectives set after the Kyoto period. The process of EU accession provides a window of opportunity to start this change.
- **Nature protection/biodiversity.** The quality and quantity of EU biological and landscape diversity will increase with enlargement. Rich eco-systems with vast tracts of forests, wetlands, grasslands, mountains and traditional farming landscapes, supporting populations of many species that are endangered or extinct in Western Europe, will be integrated into EU. The management of habitats of such magnitude requires an integrated approach that will deliver conservation together with rural development.
- **Resources management/waste.** In addition to unsustainable consumption patterns and the ineffective use of land, which are problems affecting both the EU and the Applicant Countries, two problems specific to the Applicant Countries will require concentrated, EU-wide attention: the environmental liabilities from the past and the above-average contribution of heavy industry to creation of GDP, leading to a higher per-capita consumption of resources in the long term.
- **Environmental health.** The most important issue affecting the health of the population in the Applicant Countries are the "hot spot" areas, where life expectancy is well below the national and EU average. The solution to this problem will require structural assistance programmes to offset high costs of remediation that are blocking future economic and social development. Additional environmental health problems include urban air quality in larger settlements and insufficient access to safe water supply in some areas. The set of solutions ranges from awareness raising campaigns to better monitoring and early warning/response systems to integration of health considerations into policy planning.

List of Abbreviations

CEE: Central and Eastern Europe

CEEC: Central and Eastern European Country

CAP: Common Agricultural Policy

DG: Directorate General

EAP: Environmental Action Programme

EIA: Environmental Impact Assessment

EC: European Commission

EU: European Union

FCCC: Framework Convention on Climate Change

GDP: Gross domestic product

REC: Regional Environmental Center for Central and Eastern Europe

SEA: Strategic Environmental Assessment

Contents

<u>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</u>	2
<u>Findings</u>	2
<u>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</u>	4
<u>CONTENTS</u>	5
<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	7
<u>PART I: ENLARGEMENT</u>	8
<u>Key concepts for an enlarged Europe: The subsidiarity principle, adaptable policy making, framework legislation and stakeholder involvement</u>	8
<u>Issue: The demands on sub-national structures will intensify with enlargement.</u>	8
<u>Fostering sectoral integration through enlargement</u>	10
<u>Issue: The situation is ripe for greater sectoral integration in the Applicant Countries, but institutional barriers and a low awareness of the possible benefits for the economy and society pose a challenge.</u>	10
<u>Deepening implementation</u>	13
<u>Issue: The scope and complexity of environmental acquis makes it difficult for the Applicant Country institutions to implement.</u>	13
<u>Action at the local level will be the key to sustainable development</u>	15
<u>Issue: Near future city and countryside development patterns will determine how well the Applicant Countries will be able to achieve their environmental objectives and sustainable development.</u>	15
<u>PART II: COMMENTS TO PROPOSED SECTIONS OF THE 6TH EAP</u>	18
<u>Climate change</u>	18
<u>Issue: Greenhouse gas emissions are rising after a fall in the early '90s, despite commitments made under the Kyoto protocol.</u>	18
<u>Nature protection / biodiversity</u>	21
<u>Issue: Enlargement opens a window of opportunity to integrate biodiversity conservation into the reformed agricultural policy, providing benefits to nature, farmers and European citizens at the same time.</u>	21
<u>Resources management / waste</u>	23
<u>Issue: Resource intensity in Applicant Countries is significantly higher than in the EU and will remain above the EU average without policy intervention.</u>	23
<u>Environmental health</u>	25
<u>Issue: Addressing environmental “hot spots” will require special attention from the EU.</u>	25
<u>PART III: A LIST OF INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTIONS</u>	27
<u>Introduction</u>	27
Applicant countries Contribution to the 6th Environmental Action Programme (REC)	5

<u>A list of individual contributions</u>	27
<u>Policy development, policy implementation, financing, institutions, tools and mechanisms</u>	27
<u>Sectoral integration, sustainable development</u>	28
<u>Public awareness, public involvement, public participation, civil society</u>	28
<u>Climate change / energy.</u>	28
<u>Nature conservation / biodiversity.</u>	29
<u>Environmental liability</u>	29
<u>Urban environment.</u>	29
<u>Transport</u>	29
<u>Agriculture and rural development</u>	29
<u>Business involvement</u>	30
<u>Transboundary pollution</u>	30
<u>Regional development</u>	30
<u>Local and regional environmental problems</u>	30
<u>Tax reform</u>	30
<u>Water and waste water</u>	30
<u>Waste</u>	30
<u>Genetically modified organisms</u>	31

Introduction

The relevance of the EU's 6th EAP for environmental policy in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) is significant for at least three reasons. First, the 6th EAP will become the backbone of future European environmental policy and as such it will, even before official accession, have a significant impact on the policy making in the countries of CEE. Second, once adopted, the implementation of the programme will most likely coincide with the period during which the first CEE countries will join the EU – so at least the Applicant Countries should have an opportunity to contribute to the 6th EAP's creation. Third, both the EU Council of Ministers and the European Parliament will formally adopt the 6th EAP, and the document will become legally binding for all Member States and a part of the *acquis communautaire*, to be transposed by the Applicant Countries.

These were among the reasons why the EC Commissioner for the Environment, Margot Wallström, invited the Applicant Countries to contribute to the drafting the 6th EAP. However, since at present the European Union structures and decision-making processes do not allow non-Member States to participate in EU policy making, a mechanism had to be found to make the contribution of the Applicant Countries to the 6th EAP effective.

In this situation, the EC's DG Environment, Unit XI.B1, has asked the REC to use its neutral position and unique capabilities to assist in facilitating the input of the Applicant Countries to the 6th EAP. This report is a result of that work, which was carried out during the summer months of 2000.

The main objective of this project was to help the Applicant Countries to contribute effectively to drafting of the 6th EAP. The specific objectives were:

- To identify areas of the 6th EAP where Applicant Countries' contribution could improve the document, and to solicit those contributions.
- To provide relevant expertise in synthesizing the contributions and in drafting the input to the 6th EAP, based on the guidance provided by the Applicant Countries.

The process of developing this input included:

- An informal meeting of experts from Applicant Countries on June 1, 2000, in Szentendre, Hungary.
- High level discussion at the Szentendre Ministerial Consultation on June 18-19, 2000.
- Visits to the Ministries of Environment in the Applicant Countries of the CEE.
- Internet discussion seeking the input of any interested stakeholders from the CEE.

We regard the possibility to contribute to the drafting of the 6th EAP a unique opportunity for all CEE stakeholders as it enables them to ensure that their priorities and needs are reflected in the future environmental policy of the EU. While the wishes of all those stakeholder groups run very broad, we hope that we have succeeded at making at least the most important main messages clear and useful for the EU to consider them in the upcoming 6th EAP.

Part I: Enlargement

Key concepts for an enlarged Europe: The subsidiarity principle, adaptable policy making, framework legislation and stakeholder involvement

With enlargement, the variety and complexity of environmental problems will increase, and the need for an even more diversified policy approach will intensify. The role of the EU will be to provide a framework for action and a level playing field – using horizontal legislation, framework legislation and common-market-related legislation. National and sub-national structures will have to be further empowered with responsibilities, capacities and resources in order to protect the quality of the environment in specific geographic areas, such as watersheds, Natura 2000 sites or urban regions.

Issue: The demands on sub-national structures will intensify with enlargement.

The diversity of environmental challenges faced by the European Union is large and will further increase with entry of new member countries. Attempts to address those challenges by prescribing a solution from the top will likely be futile. This problem was already recognised in the 5th EAP, which placed emphasis on the principle of subsidiarity, the promotion of negotiated agreements and environmental legislation that focuses on providing a framework for action.

In the Applicant Countries, various tasks and responsibilities, previously carried out by the national government, have been – or are now being – shifted to structures at the sub-national level, particularly to local governments and regional and local state administrations. Unfortunately, the expectations created by this process for the performance of the sub-national governance structures often remain unfulfilled. One problem is that the capacity of local governments and local state administration is limited, both in terms of their resources and expertise. Thus, policy making is often reduced to blind copying of examples in the advanced EU countries, without a clear understanding of the issues and without the capacity and resources to implement policies effectively and efficiently.

The implementation of the existing and future *acquis*, as a result of enlargement, will create increased pressure on the sub-national structures. Therefore, if the future enlarged EU is to cope with all its environmental problems effectively, it has to carefully designate the levels at which environmental problems are dealt with. EU-wide common-market-related environmental legislation can provide a clear framework for the business sector and thus reduce the pressure on the national and local government. At the same time, horizontal and framework legislation, such as Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) or Framework Water Directive, create a clear scope of action for the national and sub-national structures to apply creative solutions, instead of attempting to find the “one-and-only” solution that will work reasonably well under all circumstances.

What do we want to achieve?

With regards to the above, one objective of the 6th EAP should be to intensify the process of empowering and building capacity of sub-national structures so that their knowledge and resources are adequate for them to deal with environmental problems effectively. Another objective is to continue with the development of future policies in a way that ensures that specific conditions anywhere in the EU can be dealt with at the level that is best positioned to address them.

Policy approach

The national and supra-national legislation should provide an adequate mix of the following concepts: level playing field, flexibility and adaptability in choosing the right policy approaches at all levels of administration.

The current trend in EU legislation to provide a framework for action, and the recent developments in horizontal legislation (environmental impact assessment, strategic environmental impact assessment, access to information, public participation), are very positive and should continue in the future.

In relation to specific ecosystems, preference should be given to developing environmental management for geographic areas determined by common environmental interest, rather than by administrative borders. These include watershed under the Water Framework Directive, Natura 2000 sites and their surroundings, urban areas under the Framework Air Directive.

It is desirable to carry out further reforms at the sub-national level (particularly in the Applicant Countries) that would empower the local governments, regional and local state administration to fulfil their environmental responsibilities.

At the same time, it will be necessary to invest in extensive capacity building and experience-exchange programmes among policy makers at all levels.

Who is responsible?

EU:

- Continue the current trend in EU legislation that focuses on providing a framework for action and on developing horizontal legislation.
- Define checks and controls and measures of success.
- Provide capacity building, technical assistance and transfer of experience and expertise.

Member States:

- Set a policy framework; develop incentives and instruments.
- Ensure appropriate institutional framework; define structures and responsibilities.
- Build capacity at all levels of state administration and self-government.
- Provide resources, technical and methodological assistance as needed.
- Disseminate information and increase awareness.

Fostering sectoral integration through enlargement

The Applicant Countries are in an advantageous position to avoid some of the environmentally detrimental development paths that Western Europe took in the last 50 years and to maximise benefits of integrating environment into structural reform. In order to realise this advantage, the EU needs to provide practical solutions and leadership on integration of environmental considerations into sectoral policies for an enlarged Europe. The environment has to be seen as a factor of economic growth, prosperity and quality of life for the citizens across Europe, not as an obstacle or unnecessary cost.

Issue: The situation is ripe for greater sectoral integration in the Applicant Countries, but institutional barriers and a low awareness of the possible benefits for the economy and society pose a challenge.

The rapid transformation process in the Applicant Countries is creating a number of “win-win” opportunities for integrating environmental concerns into the development of sectoral policies. These opportunities bring mutual benefits to the environment, as well as the economy and society. There are many well-documented cases where environmental policies have had positive impact on employment trends. Empirical evidence suggests that areas with better environmental quality, or areas with previously damaged but now reconstructed environment, are experiencing faster economic growth than areas that are environmentally damaged. Long term benefits of a clean environment on the health of the population, and positive effects of green recreation areas on the recovery of economic productivity, of individuals are also substantial.

The Cardiff process within the EU opened the discussion about the environmental performance of various sectors, future institutional structure, legal framework, policy development and decision-making processes in the EU, many of which will undergo – or, are already undergoing – substantial changes. This opens an opportunity for better integration of environmental considerations into sectoral policies.

In the Applicant Countries, two problems currently hamper a more efficient integration of environmental considerations into sectoral policies. The first one has to do with the fact that the environment has not yet made it into “mainstream politics” and is still marginalized as a result of poor understanding among key stakeholder groups. While the key stakeholders do not dispute the importance of environmental protection, many of them still see the environment as a sector that constitutes a continuous drain on country resources and provides no measurable benefits for the economy and society.

The second problem is the lack of accountability of polluting sectors for environmental protection and remediation. Traditional distribution of responsibilities among the individual sectors meant that production sectors – such as industry, energy, agriculture, transport, etc. – assume responsibility for producing, while the environment sector takes responsibility for environmental protection and cleanup. Until both of these problems are addressed, effective integration of environmental considerations into sectoral policies will remain a challenge.

At the same time, the Applicant Countries are tending to copy existing policies and approaches in the Member Countries rather than to anticipate future policy developments (the “moving target problem”). This means that some of the policies that are already being changed in the EU may still have a negative environmental impact in the Applicant Countries. The most obvious such examples include the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) and Trans European Networks that encourage Applicant Countries to increase the subsidy driven production of agricultural products, in spite of surpluses, and to invest into long distance road infrastructure while scaling back public transport and railways.

If nothing is done about this situation, the entry of new countries into the EU will further exacerbate the already difficult problems in the current EU Member States, such as nutrient pollution, loss of habitats, road congestion, noise, etc.

What do we want to achieve?

One objective of the 6th EAP should be to provide clear signals regarding future environmental objectives – and constraints on various economic sectors – in the Applicant Countries, especially with regards to agriculture, transport and energy, in order to avoid unnecessary costs of reverting the trends at a later stage.

The existing sectoral integration processes (Cardiff Process and Sustainable Development Strategy) inside the EU should move quickly to take the advantage of the window of opportunity created by the restructuring taking place in the Applicant Countries.

It is important to raise the awareness of decision makers about the synergies between environmental protection and economic and social development.

It is also important to promote the use of tools for sectoral integration, such as SEA, economic instruments, negotiated agreements, etc.

Ensure that the emerging development plans and other policies in Applicant Countries take environmental considerations into account.

Policy approach

The Cardiff process, and the decision to prepare an EU sustainable development strategy, are important developments that haven't been quite understood in the Applicant Countries yet. In order to take full advantage of this process, it is important that the 6th EAP clearly describes what its relationship is with the sustainable development strategy and how these two documents will work together during the implementation phase.

The reform of the CAP should continue as a matter of priority – to avoid unnecessary environmental and social costs in the Applicant Countries as well as a fiscal burden on the Community Budget. The Community Transport policy needs to attach clear priority to promoting public transport in cities and the liberalisation and further development of the railway system, in order to make these a viable alternative to the road transport.

One of the most promising tools for the integration of environmental considerations into sectoral policies is SEA. The new EU Directive on SEA should ensure that not only all major plans and programs, but also all principal sectoral policies and strategies, undergo a thorough process of strategic environmental assessment, including public participation. As experience with the application of SEA as a tool for sectoral integration grows, relevant guidelines should be developed for each particular sector to take maximum advantage of this valuable tool. The existing approach to SEA of the Development Plans for the Structural Funds in the Applicant Countries should be continued and further strengthened, through preparation of guidelines for such SEAs.

Individual sectors – such as industry, agriculture, energy, transport, etc. – should bear greater responsibility for environmental protection, particularly in areas where their activity possesses a threat to the environment. At minimum, clear environmental objectives with quantified targets and indicators of success should be set for/by each sector. The environment sector would continue to provide methodological support, but the accountability for meeting the targets would be with the respective sectors. This would create a bigger pressure on relevant sectors to seriously take into account environmental considerations.

Awareness raising about the benefits of integrating environmental considerations into planning and policy making should be carried out on a wide scale. Two main groups of stakeholders should be targeted: the general public and politicians and decision makers. It is critical that these two groups

have sufficient understanding of the benefits that sectoral integration could have for the economy and society, in both the short and long run.

Who is responsible?

EU:

- Apply the new SEA Directive on all major policies, plans and strategies; develop guidelines and test their implementation.
- Develop and implement the EU Sustainable Development Strategy.
- Speed up the reform of the CAP, transport policy and other relevant policies.
- Provide research and technical assistance on the benefits of environmental integration and calculating the full costs of production.

Member States:

- Initiate reform that would transfer greater responsibility for a clean environment to the polluting sectors.
- Continue research into the benefits of sectoral integration from economic and social points of view.
- Carry out nation-wide awareness raising campaigns; build capacity of key politicians and decision makers and the general public.
- Implement pilot projects, including SEA and other new instruments.
- Provide methodological support on environmental integration to other sectors.

Deepening implementation

The relative weakness of environmental institutions in the Applicant Countries, combined with growing complexity of the environmental *acquis communautaire*, poses a threat to its effective implementation. Efforts to strengthen the implementation should receive priority over development of further legislation. Crucial in determining the success of implementing the *acquis* in Applicant Countries will be the use of community financial instruments such as LIFE, Structural and Cohesion Funds to promote innovative solutions, the wide dissemination of these solutions and institutional strengthening, as well as effective mechanisms for capacity building and exchange of experience among environmental institutions in European countries.

*Issue: The scope and complexity of environmental *acquis* makes it difficult for the Applicant Country institutions to implement.*

The current body of EU legislation – *acquis communautaire* – has grown to more than 300 pieces and several thousands pages of text, in the environment sector alone. It is one of the most advanced environmental legislation systems in the world.

On the other hand, the complexity of the environmental *acquis communautaire* creates serious budgetary and institutional demands for the legislations' effective implementation. As a result, all Member States experience a certain degree of difficulty with effective implementation and enforcement. The challenge that the Applicant Countries are facing is much more serious than for the current Member States, as they have committed themselves to implement the entire current *acquis communautaire* in a short period of time before accession. Even the transition periods requested for the most difficult directives are considered very demanding. This situation creates the risk of a growing gap between the legal requirements and their practical implementation, especially if a lot of new EU legislation comes into force in the coming years. The apparent implementation gap in the current Member States as indicated by the growing number of court cases related to environmental directives is also not very helpful in setting the Applicant Country priorities for rapid full implementation.

It appears that, instead of pushing for further development of environmental legislation at a rapid pace, a more beneficial impact on the environment in the medium term could be achieved by concentrating on strengthening the implementation of the current environmental legislation – and on missing horizontal measures, such as SEA and environmental liability.

What do we want to achieve?

The objective of the 6th EAP should be to strengthen the capability of the current and future Member States to implement the existing requirements of the *acquis communautaire* through a range of mechanisms, such as exchange of experience (IMPEL and AC - IMPEL), capacity building, joint development of implementation guidelines, community financial instruments (LIFE, Cohesion Fund), etc.

Policy approach

The experience in the transition process has demonstrated that the quality of institutions and their expertise is crucial to the process of implementation. Successful models of developing the institutional capacity through technical assistance and exchange of experience have been developed in the Environment for Europe process that provided the context for the cooperation of the EU with the CEE countries over the last decade. Some of these models are supported by the Multi-country PHARE Programme. Examples of such cooperation include the IMPEL and AC-IMPEL networks of environmental inspectors that are supported by the EC.

In the future more programmes to build the capacity of environmental institutions should be developed, with particular emphasis on difficult and investment heavy directives.

Most importantly, the direction provided by the Member States for the use of EU financing instruments will determine to what extent the implementation of environmental *acquis communautaire* will be successful. While the EU *acquis communautaire* does not, in general, dictate the use of specific policy approaches, the EU financing instruments implicitly or explicitly predetermine the solutions. The use of EU financing instruments should be made much more flexible in order to speed up implementation through the use of innovative solutions.

Similarly, the technical assistance and expertise of the EU should continue to be shared across the Union, as widely as possible, to help develop new and innovative approaches.

Finally, sufficient emphasis should be put on identifying low-cost solutions and policy approaches.

Who is responsible?

EU:

- Make EU financing instruments (Structural and Cohesion Funds) more flexible and innovation oriented.
- Provide technical and expert assistance, develop programmes for exchange of experience and expertise between the EU Member States.

Member States:

- Develop innovative solutions for effective implementation of the environmental *acquis communautaire*.
- Sponsor research projects and pilot projects.

Action at the local level will be the key to sustainable development

The Applicant Countries' main decisions determining the direction of development over the next century will be made in the next ten years. Future development patterns of cities and the countryside in the Applicant Countries will be determined in the context of rapid development before and after their entry into the EU. These patterns will determine how the countries will be able to achieve their environmental objectives related to health, climate change, preservation of habitats, waste management and the general quality of life of citizens. This window of opportunity can be used for promoting sustainable development by supporting dissemination of successful models and local action for sustainability.

Issue: Near future city and countryside development patterns will determine how well the Applicant Countries will be able to achieve their environmental objectives and sustainable development.

The cities and countryside in Applicant Countries are currently undergoing fundamental transformation, which involves a decline of old industry and traditional farming, an increasing demand for road infrastructure and high quality housing and rapid development of new commercial facilities and infrastructure. The patterns that are developing in this period will, to a large extent, determine future land use, energy intensity and sources, modes of transport and demand for environmental services and clean-up.

Cities in Applicant Countries still have extensive public transport infrastructure and a more favourable modal split between public and personal transport. But this public transport infrastructure, having suffered from under-investment in the past, is lagging behind road infrastructure in investment plans in the face of a rapid increase in car ownership.

Pressures for urban sprawl – which includes low density residential areas and commercial investments – are mounting, compounded by the ambition of the population to move out of low quality flats in panel buildings and with the complex nature of inner city renewal and re-use of historic industrial sites. At the same time, urban biodiversity is still noticeably higher in the urban areas of the Applicant Countries.

The worst environmental conditions affecting human health are concentrated in the so called “hot-spots” – towns or regions with mining and heavy industry that are faced with a combination of problems, including high levels of contamination, industrial pollution, a risk of environmental emergencies and a low living standard of the local population, due to economic decline of the main industries.

Meanwhile, the rural areas with the most valuable biological and landscape diversity also suffer economic decline, brought on in part by the breakdown of the old model of agriculture. This economic pressure generates strong incentives for the unsustainable use of land, forest, protected species and other assets that are available.

What we want to achieve:

The 6th EAP should provide a framework and incentives for making development sustainable early in the process of integration of the Applicant Countries into the EU.

Specific measures that should be supported include:

- Use of urban planning and local environmental action plans for management of sustainability of cities and towns.
- Preserving modal split between public and personal transport by promoting investment in public transport infrastructure and services.
- Designing new developments in such a way that they can be served by public infrastructure in transport, heating, etc.

- Providing incentives for re-use of industrial sites (brownfields), including solving the issues of past environmental liability and cleanup, while creating disincentives for greenfield investments.
- Addressing the problems of derelict industrial regions to achieve environmental, economic and social objectives simultaneously.
- Providing possibilities for rural populations to benefit economically from nature and landscape conservation and management of renewable resources, through visitor management, energy production from biomass and wind and other activities.
- Biodiversity preservation planning should be tied into the sustainable development of urban areas.
- Improve the existing urban areas' housing stock through initiatives to increase “quality of life” and raise health and environmental conditions (particularly through promoting energy savings).

Policy approach

Clear visions of sustainable local communities from large cities to rural areas should be developed in a participatory process across the EU. This should be done by involving the local communities in Sustainable Cities campaigns and other similar initiatives.

Community financial instruments, such as Structural Funds, Cohesion Funds and Agricultural Subsidies, should actively promote the implementation of these visions for sustainable development.

The legislation needs to provide for management of specific issues in the appropriate geographical units. For instance, river basins should be managed as a unit, according to the Framework Water Directive; and cities should become individual units, under the Air Quality Directive.

The environmental liability regime needs to be set in a transparent and predictable way, in order to promote re-use and rehabilitation of abandoned industrial sites as opposed to greenfield investments.

Who is responsible?

EU:

- Develop integrated policies targeting urban and rural areas, such as the European Spatial Perspective.
- Set specific environmental and sustainability objectives in the community financial instruments.
- Use EU financing mechanisms to actively promote solutions leading to sustainability at the local level.
- Support the networking of local communities and NGOs in the framework of the Sustainable Cities Campaign.
- Support capacity building and research and development in local communities.
- Develop a transparent and predictable environmental liability regime.
- Support the development and re-development of integrated public transport systems in urban areas.
- Allocate increased structural funds for sustainable urban renewal, possibly in the form of a City Challenge scheme or support to allow home owners to improve energy efficiency.

Member States:

- Develop national spatial and infrastructure plans in such a way that they promote sustainable development.
- Develop schemes for promotion of brownfield development and hot-spot rehabilitation, including, where appropriate, taking the responsibility for clean-up and environmental liability.

- Develop Local Agendas 21 and similar visions for local development.
- Use physical planning and other policy tools at the local level to secure sustainable development.
- Raise awareness and support for consumption and living patterns compatible with sustainable development among citizens.

Part II: Comments to Proposed Sections of the 6th EAP

Climate change

While the Applicant Countries will have little problems meeting their commitments under the Kyoto protocol between now and 2008, the levels of greenhouse gases produced in the area are rising steadily since mid '90s. The three most critical sectors are energy, transport and agriculture. In the short run, the liberalisation of energy and fuel prices in order to reach world market levels will provide an incentive for a decrease of greenhouse gas emission. However, in the long run, structural change in the economy will be needed to meet the standards that will be required after 2008. The process of accession to the EU provides a window of opportunity to begin this change.

Issue: Greenhouse gas emissions are rising after a fall in the early '90s, despite commitments made under the Kyoto protocol.

The drop in industrial output in the Applicant Countries, and related decline in production of greenhouse gases after the collapse of communism in 1989, means that most of the Applicant Countries will have little difficulty in meeting their commitments under the Kyoto protocol between now and 2008.

At the same time, however, the emissions of greenhouse gases have been rising consistently since the mid '90s. Therefore, the question for most Applicant Countries is not whether they will be able to meet their international commitments under the Kyoto protocol, but whether they are going to reverse the upward trend in greenhouse gas generation.

The energy consumption per unit of GDP in Applicant Countries is still considerably higher than the EU average. One of the reasons for this is that Applicant Countries' energy prices are still below world market levels, due to regulation and subsidies. Another reason may be the continued important share of resource intensive industry and inelastic structure of electricity production, which – with few exceptions – relies mostly on fossil fuels and nuclear energy. So far there has been little progress in promoting renewables, which have even less competitive prices than in the EU.

While the greenhouse gas emissions from stationary sources remain more or less stable, the uncontrolled growth of road transportation across all Applicant Countries is rapidly increasing the emissions from mobile sources. This negative trend is expected to get even worse with enlargement, as the most common way of transporting goods in the EU is the use of trucks.

Furthermore, production of methane from agriculture, mainly from cattle, may increase with accession if agriculture is intensified.

There remain significant unused opportunities for major improvements in energy efficiency through the restructuring of industry with new technologies, upgrading of the housing stock, better management of energy supply systems – in particular the extensive district heating systems – and through efforts aimed at preserving the public transport and railway infrastructure.

At the moment no part of the EU *acquis communautaire* relates to climate change, so apart from political discussions, this issue is not a matter of accession negotiations. For this reason, no EU assistance programmes target this area systematically, although there is a growing set of experiences with Activities Implemented Jointly under the Framework Convention on Climate Change (FCCC).

What do we want to achieve?

The objective should be to use the accession related restructuring and investments to achieve further major reduction of greenhouse gas emissions in Applicant Countries and hence in the EU as a whole in the FCCC budget periods after 2008-2012.

The strategy of achieving these reductions, as well as of achieving Kyoto targets in cooperation between EU and Applicant Countries, should be defined very soon, in order to send the appropriate policy signals to the governments and investors in the Applicant Countries.

Policy approach

The Applicant Countries should be involved in the design of the EU Climate Change strategy from the early stages. Even though their emission reductions will not be part of the burden sharing in the first budget period from 2008 to 2012, they would benefit from a harmonised approach to monitoring, permitting and reporting, as well as national emission trading systems. Such harmonisation and cooperation in capacity building would also facilitate Joint Implementation Projects and International Emissions Trading that several current EU Member States are interested in, and could speed up the increase of energy efficiency. An important issue to be tackled will be how to treat financial assistance to Applicant Countries in cases of investments with positive climate impact.

In the field of energy policy, fossil fuel subsidies in the Applicant Countries should be phased out, in order to reach world prices as quickly as possible, taking into account existing social and economic factors. The future prices of energy should be set so that external market factors are internalised into the prices. As a medium-longer term objective, a strategy for the phase out of fossil fuels should be developed and research into viable technological alternatives to replace internal combustion engines intensified.

Applicant Countries should start their own programs of promoting renewable energy sources, such as wind, biomass and solar energy – based on their specific circumstances.

In the area of transport policies, the efficiency of public transportation services and rail networks should be increased. A possible use of subsidies and other market mechanisms should be considered to help these means of transportation compete with road transportation. Fast trains and fast-train rail networks should be widely promoted as a solution over air transportation for inter-city travel.

An awareness raising campaign should be intensified to help increase the general public and industry's understanding of issues related to climate change and available solutions.

Climate change requirements should be identified and introduced into city and land-use planning, to minimise their impact on production of greenhouse gases.

Sustainable agriculture, good farming practices and organic agriculture should be widely promoted. Whenever possible, agricultural land should be turned into forests, and sustainable forest management should be implemented. Subsidies should be considered as a means of achieving this goal.

Who is responsible?

EU:

- Include the Applicant Countries in the preparation and implementation of any mechanism set up to achieve the Kyoto targets, taking into account that they cannot be a part of burden sharing in the first budget period.
- Develop a strategy for medium- to long-term greenhouse gas reduction in an enlarged EU and use the accession related assistance to achieve the objectives of this strategy.

Member States:

- Develop the institutional capacity for monitoring, permitting, transactions, verification and reporting of greenhouse gas emissions and their reduction.

- Introduce climate considerations into energy, transport and agriculture policies as a matter of priority.
- Raise awareness of the industry and the public.
- Promote good practices and introduce climate change standards and requirements at the local level.

Nature protection / biodiversity

The quality and quantity of EU biological and landscape diversity will increase with enlargement. Rich eco-systems with vast tracts of forests, wetlands, grasslands, mountains and traditional farming landscapes – supporting populations of many species that are endangered or extinct in Western Europe – will be integrated into the EU. The management of habitats of such magnitude requires an integrated approach that will deliver conservation together with rural development.

Issue: Enlargement opens a window of opportunity to integrate biodiversity conservation into the reformed agricultural policy, providing benefits to nature, farmers and European citizens at the same time.

One of the assets the Applicant Countries are bringing to the EU is a sizable amount of comparatively well preserved eco-systems and natural areas. The Accession Countries contain forests, wetlands, grasslands, mountains, coastlines and traditional cultural landscapes that are home to a large variety of fauna and flora, including many protected species. One reason these areas were preserved was tougher state control in the past, but preservation is also the result of a relative lack of resources for farming subsidies in comparison to those in the EU. Applicant Countries have protected a significant portion of their territories as parks or other types of preserved areas. The levels of conservation include sites under strict protection, as well as populated areas with landscape management and sustainable development objectives. Another portion of the unused land in the Applicant Countries was abandoned during the ten years of transition since 1990, either because of the restitution process or low competitiveness of farming under new circumstances. In other areas, low-input subsistence farming continues, because of growing prices of inputs such as energy, fertilisers or pesticides.

In the Applicant Countries, a higher proportion of the population lives on farms than in the current EU. This population is ageing, and their farms are usually far behind the modern West European farms in the level of investment and technology. This situation poses a daunting challenge to the CAP. If an unreformed CAP were applied indiscriminately, this would cause a wave of farm consolidation and rural unemployment. It would require tremendous resources for investments, which could only be shouldered by banks, or external investors and the growing intensity of farming would pollute the ground and surface waters and reduce the biological and landscape diversity. In addition to all this, it would generate additional surplus of agricultural products and would cost more than the current community budget can afford. On the other hand, traditional, low input farming and organic farming can provide equivalent livelihood to the farmers if supported by payments for landscape maintenance services and marketing infrastructure. Many areas in Applicant Countries would have a competitive advantage in the European market based on the level of land preservation, especially combined with other activities, such as forestry, forest products and tourism.

With the reform of CAP, and with the SAPARD regulation that applies to the Applicant Countries, the first steps have been taken to focus on the objective of sustainable rural development. Additionally, the market share of organic agricultural products is growing across the EU, and the farmers in Applicant Countries have a competitive advantage in this segment because of better preserved land and traditional farming methods.

On the other hand, the high level of biodiversity protection in the EU is perceived as a threat by the population who depend on farming and forestry in the Applicant Countries. This is already creating problems with support to EU enlargement in those countries where strict protection of EU protected species and habitats that meet Natura 2000 criteria would cause major changes in the use of land and species. A significant awareness raising and consensus building effort will be required to reconcile the ambitions of rural populations with the policy objectives of nature conservation at the EU level.

What do we want to achieve?

Objectives of the 6th EAP should include the preservation of biological and landscape diversity within and outside the Natura 2000 network of habitats, along with securing sustainable, high quality livelihoods for the rural population, who are the main stakeholder in the nature conservation efforts.

Policy approach

Significant territories within the Applicant Countries should be considered for designation as agri-environment areas, and the designation should be implemented wherever feasible. This would allow the Applicant Countries to cost-effectively achieve conservation, social and economic objectives while avoiding problems of implementing the classic CAP, which is unsustainable in the mid term.

Integrated rural development models that include nature protection through management and sustainable use of the land (e.g. IUCN category VI managed natural resource), should be developed.

Farming subsidies should be applied to target promotion of organic agriculture, energy crops, other land conservation services, development of non-farming activities on farms – and for compensation of damage caused by protected species. The SAPARD instrument is a good step in this direction and a follow up should be considered.

The definition and public perception of Natura 2000 sites should be extended from strict protection to include sustainable use in appropriate parts of the designated areas. In the case of certain grasslands, forests and wetlands, management intervention is required to maintain their biological diversity and carrying capacity for species.

Who is responsible?

EU:

- Further reform the agricultural policy in direction of rural development and sustainable land use.
- Integrate sustainable management and wise use into the protection of Natura 2000 habitats.
- Raise awareness of rural populations and conservation constituents about the synergies between sustainable rural development and conservation.

Member states:

- Designate the areas of high biodiversity value as Natura 2000 sites and as agri-environment areas. In Applicant Countries, this could represent the majority of their territory, as is the case in Austria.
- Create a vision of the development of local communities based on the needs of the population, benefits of conservation and sustainable use and future competitiveness.

Resources management / waste

In addition to unsustainable consumption patterns and the ineffective use of land – dilemmas that affect both the EU and the Applicant Countries – two problems specific to the Applicant Countries will require concentrated EU-wide attention: the environmental liabilities y from the past and the above-average contribution of heavy industry to creation of GDP, a situation which leads to higher per-capita consumption of resources in the long term.

Issue: Resource intensity in Applicant Countries is significantly higher than in the EU and will remain above the EU average without policy intervention.

The Applicant Countries were left with serious environmental liabilities as a “heritage” of the past regime. Most polluted sites are former industrial and military sites, all of which pose a significant risk to water and land. In the past ten years, these countries have dealt only with those sites with direct health impact and those that attracted political priority because of privatisation or some other reason, so the majority of these sites remain unimproved. In order to attract investors, many national and local governments have accepted these liabilities as their responsibility. Still, most investors prefer to build new facilities on “no-headache” greenfield sites, leaving the derelict industrial sites to their destiny. Thus, the national or local governments are left with environmental liabilities of significant proportions, incapable of dealing with them using their own resources.

Another troubling issue is land use. The problem here is well demonstrated in city planning, when many large urban areas are not prepared for the growth they are currently experiencing. This lack of preparedness has a negative impact on the environment and the use of resources. Additionally, erroneous past flood control management and river navigation have caused a lowering of the water table, decreased retention capability of the inundation areas, collapse of adjacent ecosystems, increased riverbed erosion, etc. All of these conditions contributed to the terrible floods of 1997 and 1998 in Central Europe.

One of the biggest challenges the Applicant Countries are currently facing is increased consumption and consumerism. This is a direct result of the shift from centrally planned economy towards market capitalism. In the euphoria that followed the fall of communism, consumerism became virtually a symbol of democracy and it could take many years to change this dangerous trend. A major environmental problem related to the growth in consumerism is the problem with waste, i.e. packaging waste as well as municipal solid waste.

Another problem related with resource use is the continued development of heavy industry, which is being gradually phased out in the EU. This development is encouraged by historical tradition, the presence of skilled labour and salaries that are currently lower than in the EU. Although the technologies used in the newly developed facilities are modern and less polluting than the old ones used in former factories, their resource use will continue to be significant. With the emphasis on heavy industry as a major source of GDP, it will be difficult – if not impossible – for the Applicant Countries to achieve levels of consumption of resources and energy per capita comparable to the EU average. It seems that, in the future EU, a substantial amount of heavy industrial production will be concentrated in the now-Applicant Countries, thus leading to uneven distribution of resource utilisation among the future Member States. This means that environmental problems linked to resource intensive industry, such as mining and metallurgy, will be more concentrated in the current Applicant Countries.

What do we want to achieve?

The policy approaches should promote the sustainable use of resources and the recovery and reuse of historic industrial sites as opposed to greenfields.

Resource intensity and waste minimisation have to be a high priority in developing the future industrial policies of the Applicant Countries.

Policy approach

A working solution to the problem of past environmental liabilities should be found. Based on experience, economic development can be jumpstarted in areas where polluted brownfields are effectively cleaned up. It is recommended that either the use of market control mechanisms, such as subsidies, or the use of EU financing instruments, including the Structural Funds, be considered to deal with this problem.

Land use planning should take into account the concerns of sustainability. Emphasis should be placed on maintaining and designing energy and transport efficient settlements and limiting habitat fragmentation. Policy should also give preference to reuse of existing industrial land and housing areas over new developments.

Within watershed management under the Framework Water Directive, there is a need for programs that take into account the security of existing settlements and are aimed at renaturation of riverbeds and floodplains, to reduce the growing flood risks, which will further increase with climate change.

An opportunity for increasing overall resource efficiency exists in shifting production from industry to services. This should be accompanied by programmes for re-qualification of the workforce and production of a positive environment for entrepreneurs.

Who is responsible?

EU:

- Integrate a mechanism to provide finances for clean up of brownfields into the Structural Funds.
- Provide for the exchange of experience and expertise in dematerialisation, including BAT and BATNEEC.
- Continue research into consumer patterns and develop effective policy responses to address the problem.
- Establish a programme to support those countries with higher-than-average industrial production per capita, to secure a comparable level of environmental protection.

Member States:

- Promote resource efficient industry and shift from industrial production towards services.
- Increase consumer awareness about the use of resources, particularly in packaging.
- Implement riverbed and floodplain renaturation programs.

Environmental health

The most important issue affecting the health of the population in Applicant Countries is the existence of “hot-spot” areas, where life expectancy is well below national and EU average. The solution to this problem will require structural assistance programmes to offset high costs of remediation that are blocking future economic and social development. Additional environmental health problems include urban air quality in larger settlements and insufficient access to safe water supply in some rural areas. The set of solutions includes awareness raising campaigns, better monitoring and early warning/response systems and integration of health considerations into policy planning.

Issue: Addressing environmental “hot spots” will require special attention from the EU.

Most of the Applicant Countries have areas where environmental degradation caused by past economic activity, such as mining, has reached levels dangerous to human health. These so-called “hot spots” constitute a major threat to the affected populations. If the negative health impacts are to be minimised, each of the hot spots will require a specific approach and the commitment of substantial financial and expert resources. In many cases, however, these resources are beyond the reach of the Applicant Countries’ capacity.

Another set of health problems has to do with the inadequate quality of urban air. While smaller towns and settlements suffer due to exhaust from individual coal heating units, especially during winter months, bigger towns and cities feel increasing pressure on their populations’ health resulting from transport. Ineffective traffic management and the use of inner city circles, as well as an overall increase in the number of cars per capita, contributes to the worsening of air quality in towns and cities.

Finally, negative effects to public health can occur in areas with no access to a safe drinking water supply. In areas where sewage services are missing and the drinking water comes from poorly maintained waterworks or individual wells, the danger of spread of infectious diseases is higher. There are areas with higher than average occurrence of water borne hepatitis in some of the Applicant Countries.

What do we want to achieve?

The objective of the 6th EAP should be to systematically address the environmental hot spot areas with significant health concerns to eliminate the impacts of environmental pollution on human health and to improve the overall quality of life in urban settlements and remote rural areas.

Policy approach

A programme for the reconstruction and rehabilitation of the environment in the identified hot spots should become an integrated part of the Structural Funds. A successful example of such a programme is the Black Triangle programme under Phare.

Human health impacts should be an important criterion in decisions regarding the priorities and allocation of Cohesion Funds for environmental infrastructure.

Health considerations should be integrated into planning and policy development at all levels, including the local and regional ones. One of possibilities for this is the process of SEA.

Monitoring, information and early warning systems should be developed and implemented in each area with increased pollution levels. The information about air and water pollution that can affect human health should systematically be provided to the public, along with awareness raising campaigns to increase the understanding of the negative impacts of pollution on human health.

Considerations of air quality in towns and settlements should become a part of traffic management and transport city planning. Guidelines for planners and policy makers should be developed.

Who is responsible?

EU:

- Establish a programme to assist the Applicant Countries in environmental reconstruction of hot spots.
- Continue developing guidelines for health impact assessment and integration of health considerations into planning and policy development.
- Ratify and implement the Aarhus Convention.

Member States:

- Continue awareness raising of the general public about the negative impacts of economic activities on human health.
- Establish monitoring, information and early warning systems for the whole population.
- Develop and deploy effective response systems for areas under the threat of environmental accident or hazard.

Part III: A list of individual contributions

Introduction

This part of the report provides a list of the issues mentioned by the various stakeholders in the Applicant Countries. The list below was compiled as a result of the following activities:

- Meeting of the representatives of the Applicant Countries' governments to discuss the 6th EAP, held on June 1, 2000 in Szentendre, Hungary.
- Visits to the Applicant Countries conducted by the project team.
- Contributions received by the project team through the project website, via e-mail and other means of communication.

While reviewing the list below, it is important to consider the following facts:

- The list cannot be regarded as all-inclusive, as not all the stakeholders have had the possibility to contribute (This problem is exacerbated by the fact that the project implementation period ran through the summer months, when many people take vacations.)
- It is loosely grouped into areas, but these are in no order of priority, thus issues mentioned later may be of an equal relevance to issues mentioned on the top.
- No consensus among the stakeholders was sought. Thus the list is only indicative and cannot represent the opinion of all stakeholders in the Applicant Countries.
- Many of the points were mentioned by more than one person and in number of countries. Other points were mentioned only once.
- Since the project team did not attempt to seek consensus, and the opinion of various stakeholders was in some cases different, some points might contradict others.

A list of individual contributions

Policy development, policy implementation, financing, institutions, tools and mechanisms

- The 6th EAP should promote a switch from a technical approach to EU legislation towards an approach focusing on environmental effects, including sustainable development and sectoral integration.
- More flexibility should be granted for the implementation of EU financing mechanisms, to better address the country specific needs and priorities and promote least-cost solutions.
- The 6th EAP should pay sufficient attention to describing the instruments to be used for implementation, including economic, legal, institutional, educational, informational, etc., and ensure that a proper mix of those instruments exists to assure that the environmental policy goals and objectives are implemented effectively.
- Approaches that are too heavy on management and technology costs should be avoided, and new, cheaper mechanisms should be sought.
- The focus of future policy planning should be more on the use of economic instruments and less on the use of legal instruments. In other words, the use of legal and other instruments should be more balanced.
- Responsibilities should be shifted to the level of administration that is best positioned to deal with the respective problems. Capacity of the structures at those levels should be built up.
- EU financing mechanisms should be more flexible in choosing the policy approach.

- Emphasis should be put on building strong institutions and on their capacities. Staffing of environmental institutions is insufficient compared to needs. Gaining public acceptance and financing for strengthening institutions is important.
- Particular attention should be given to building strong institutions at the local and regional level.

Sectoral integration, sustainable development

- Benefits of the environment to other sectors (such as job creation, increased competitiveness) should be studied, better understood and widely promoted.
- SEA should be established as a binding tool for integrating environmental considerations into sectoral policies. Economic instruments are more widely used in CEE and this experience should be made available to the EU. Consider adopting carbon tax on an EU level. Physical planning has a long tradition in applicant countries and this experience could be used across Europe.
- A process of cross-sectoral discussion on an EU-wide level can help sectoral integration in the individual countries.
- Integration of environmental considerations into sectoral policies should also be reflected in budgetary approvals of the government.
- An approach should be found to implement the Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control Directive effectively and cost-efficiently.
- Sustainable development should be better stimulated through development of strategies, institutional development and new tools and instruments.
- Impact of environment on health, the social sphere and the economy should be studied and better understood.
- New management systems for sustainable development should be developed, tested and applied in practice.
- The 6th EAP and the Sustainable Development Strategy should be closely integrated.

Public awareness, public involvement, public participation, civil society

- Emphasis should be placed on raising the awareness of the public about the benefits of EU Environmental policies and the involvement of the public in government decision making.
- One of the key components of successful environmental policy making is thorough implementation of the principle of public participation. The Aarhus Convention should, therefore, be implemented as soon as possible.
- Continued democratisation, participation in environmental decision making, community activism, etc. are key building blocks of effective environmental policy making.
- Information systems for the public and information awareness campaigns should be widely supported.

Climate change / energy.

- Greater use of renewable sources of energy, energy efficiency and implementation plans for reducing greenhouse gases should be promoted.
- Even in the absence of well-defined implementation mechanisms for Kyoto protocol, there exist already working solutions, such as the Carbon Protocol Fund. These solutions should be identified and implemented.
- Flexible mechanisms for Kyoto protocol implementation should be allowed.

- The mention of nuclear energy in the 6th EAP should be avoided.
- The use of renewable energy resources should be promoted as much as possible.
- The future of nuclear energy in Europe should be clearly determined.
- A carbon tax should be introduced.

Nature conservation / biodiversity.

- An approach should be found, that reflects specific needs of the Applicant Countries to preserve their natural heritage and maintain biodiversity while addressing the rural populations' aspirations for prosperity.
- The current EU legislation does not reflect the needs of all countries. There appears to be a need for more flexibility in implementing the existing legislation. A possibility to grant derogation/exceptions for certain species and habitats, normally protected in the EU but common in a given country, seems to be a way forward.

Environmental liability

- The problem of environmental liability and contaminated sites in the Accession Countries may require exceptional solutions, including, for example, a Superfund-like approach or an exception from the new landfill directive.
- Policies should clearly promote the re-utilisation of abandoned industrial land (brownfields) as opposed to greenfields.
- The possibility of establishing duty-free trade zones should be studied in environmentally damaged areas.

Urban environment.

- Issues of urban air quality, particularly with regards to transport and local industry, should be addressed. Public transport should be actively promoted.

Transport

- Priority should be given to public transportation and rail (consider subsidies) and balancing of modal splits.
- In territories with low population density, but with prospects for population growth, urban and physical planning should carefully outline the courses of future development. With the increase of economic power and living standards, some Applicant Countries experience a tendency for the more affluent inhabitants to move out of city centres. This has a negative impact on the increase of traffic between city centres and suburbs.
- Existing public transportation services in urban areas should be subsidised. Incentives should be provided to shift more transportation from roads to rails.

Agriculture and rural development

- Blind copying of the CAP would result in serious social and environmental problems.
- A code of good environmental practice should be implemented as soon as possible. A focus on organic and sustainable agriculture should be promoted. Attestation of organic products for the market should be established. Promote a shift from agriculture to services, including agro-tourism. Poor soil should be reforested.

Business involvement

- Businesses should be involved in dialogue with governments and other stakeholders. Concepts of environmental management in enterprises should be promoted.

Transboundary pollution

- A strong emphasis should be placed on making the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) procedure work internationally, to allow for cases with possible negative transboundary environmental impacts.
- A better way to implement international agreements should be found in cases where sensitive issues of national sovereignty are concerned, perhaps, through an international oversight committee.

Regional development

- Physical planning should be at the top of the planning hierarchy in the region. An example of successful integration of ecological and environmental considerations into physical planning is the Spatial Systems of Ecological Stability in the Czech Republic and Slovakia.
- Empirical evidence suggests that areas with clean environment or areas previously devastated, but now reconstructed, experience higher economic growth than polluted areas. Thus, plans for economic development of the region should integrate environmental protection policies.

Local and regional environmental problems

- So-called hot spots are regarded as more important priorities in environmental policy making. Thus, the national policies should allow for sufficient flexibility for local problem solving.

Tax reform

- Ecological tax reform should be pursued as an option. Ideally, tax reform would be harmonised internationally.

Water and waste water

- As most of the territory in the Applicant Countries belongs to either the Baltic Sea catchment area or to the Black Sea or Adriatic Sea catchment areas, all of which are under the threat of eutrophication, the whole territory could be theoretically designated as sensitive area from the point of view of the WWT Directive.
- Since the implementation of water directives is perhaps the most expensive part of environmental approximation in the Applicant Countries, one of the key priorities of the 6th EAP should be water management.
- A set of policies with well-defined instruments should be implemented with the goal to reduce the production of drinking and other waters.

Waste

- More emphasis should be put on waste minimisation.
- In order to better utilise existing capacities for recycling or waste liquidation, transboundary movement of waste should be allowed, with a well functioning control mechanism.
- The possibility of introducing a tax on the production of waste should be studied.

Genetically modified organisms

- An international agreement on genetically modified organisms should be reached between the EU and other countries worldwide.