



STAKEHOLDER

Newsletter N°3 of ECO, The Malta Ecological Foundation on EU Accession and the Environment

Intro

In this issue of STAKEHOLDER look out for Commissioner Wallström's responses to the questionnaire of environmental NGOs in Malta. We asked her during an interview.

If you thought that Maltese NGOs are not participating actively in the enlargement process, read the synopsis of the Case Study that is being carried out to find a possible case of downward harmonisation of environmental legislation in Malta.

Read about the Candidate Countries NGOs' reaction to the 6th EAP published by the Commission and as a stakeholder in this process, we look forward to receiving your reactions to the suggestions of the NGOs.

The MIC have contributed to this issue by given detailed information about the EEA, of which Malta has recently been accepted as a member.

Waste is the focus of this issue so you'll find basic information to help you develop a positive waste strategy - and whatever you do, do not allow the cartoon in Food for Thought to mislead you!

Contents

Intro 1

Special Focus

Interview:

Commissioner

Wallström 2-5

Case Study

Soft drink packaging 6

NGOs from Candidate

Countries respond

to the Commission's

6th EAP 7-9

The European

Environment Agency ..10-11

The Basics

Waste 12-15

Food for Thought 16



NGOs from Accession Countries Interview Commissioner Wallström

There seem to be two extreme schools of thought about the degree of importance environment should have in the EU enlargement process: on the one side there are those that are not in favour of any transition periods, and on the other side is a more pragmatic approach, claiming that accession to the EU should happen as soon as possible, and that the benefits of such an enlargement would also be reflected in a higher level of environmental protection. There is a thin line of balance where environment can be given just the right importance, without slowing down the process of accession, which could work against the primary objectives. Where do you see yourself in this division?

Personally I am usually in favour of pragmatic solutions, and in my opinion pragmatism is also the approach the Commission has chosen regarding the transition periods. We want the accession process to go on, but at the same time we have to acknowledge the specific problems the Candidate Countries are facing. We expect EU environmental legislation to be in place in the Candidate Countries by the accession, but we know that some of the laws require very heavy investments, and thus some extra time - transition periods - might be needed to implement them. Even if financing was not an issue, it would still sometimes be impossible to actually make the investments, for example build required wastewater treatment plants, in a very short period of time. However, no transition periods will be accepted for framework directives, nature protection, access to information or environmental impact assessment because of the particular importance of these pieces of legislation.

In addition, all requests for transition periods have to be properly justified and accompanied by detailed plans on the timetable and steps of implementation and financing. Transition periods will also have to be limited to the investment part of implementation, whereas transposition of legislation and administrative structures must be in place by accession. All requests for transition periods will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. The Commission will take into account specific local conditions and also how much transition time the Member States have been granted for the same piece of legislation.

I would like to stress that granting transition periods does not in any way imply that environmental questions would be overlooked in the accession process, quite the contrary. I think it is clear that environment should stay on top of the political agenda: compliance with the EU environmental norms will raise the level of overall environmental protection and in so doing improve the quality of life in the Candidate Countries.

The next step is to implement the strategies. The Council will have to adopt necessary decisions in this respect, including (at least indicative) targets, timetables and indicators. The Commission will also strengthen its internal mechanisms to make sure that environmental protection is taken into account when preparing other policy initiatives. The Community's sustainable development strategy currently under development should provide us with a vehicle to resolve inconsistencies in major policy areas. For the Candidate Countries the accession process creates a tremendous opportunity to take into account the environmental aspects before settling different policy areas. This way the countries have a chance to do it right from the start and to avoid correcting mistaken decisions afterwards.

A recent concrete integration achievement I would like to mention is that of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Poland: all four have started to implement the action programme for sustainable development adopted by all Baltic Sea countries.

Which are the weakest environmental issues in all accession countries? Which are their positive aspects? Could you point out the main differences among accession countries?

On the positive side, the Candidate Countries are very strong in nature protection. There is a variety of unique ecosystems, rare species and invaluable natural resources. The challenge will be to keep this richness from vanishing because of the demands of economic development.

The environmental problems are reflected by the difficulties the Candidate Countries have in complying with the EU air, waste and water legislation. For instance wastewater treatment, waste management or large combustion plants directive are areas needing substantial investments to achieve compliance. Most countries have requested transition periods also for implementing the directive on packaging waste.

There are of course differences between the countries on how far and on which fields they have advanced in compliance. For example Latvia has made good progress in environmental information, nature protection and waste management. Slovenia, for its part, has made substantial progress in the formal alignment of national legislation especially in the areas of horizontal legislation, waste and chemicals. It has also adopted several rules on waste and hazardous waste management in order to complete transposition of the relevant Community framework directives.

However, all applicants, including Slovenia, still need to work on implementation and enforcement of the environmental legislation. They will also have to make further efforts for the strengthening of their administrative capacity.

How and where would you place the environmental NGOs in the accession process?

The environmental NGOs are an essential link between the Commission, the national authorities and civil society. In society in general as well as in the accession process specifically, you should act as environmental watchdogs: your help is needed to keep the environment high up on the political agenda through lobbying Governments and Parliaments in your country and through information and awareness raising activities.

continued overleaf



For the private sector, modern technology will reduce the input of raw material and allow savings in energy consumption. The implementation of EU water directives will decrease production costs significantly in water intensive industries, by reducing the need for pre-treatment of water, and will decrease maintenance costs. This is also the case for the implementation of air directives such as air quality and Large Combustion Plants, which increase labour productivity and the attractiveness for foreign investors. The directive on Integrated Pollution Prevention Control (IPPC) creates a transparent and predictable system of a single permit for different aspects such as air, water and waste, which can cover an extended number of years. Finally, the EU environmental acquis (all EU directives and regulations) provide a single and coherent environmental regulation across the Internal Market. In other words, high environmental standards lead to important benefits for the public sector in terms of improved public health and, for the private sector, clearly make commercial sense.

The EU has not decided on the date of the next enlargement, but most often years 2003 and 2004 are quoted. Do you think this is a realistic time frame from the point of view of environment?

The Commission's Enlargement Strategy, which the European Council endorsed in Nice in December, states that the countries fulfilling all the membership criteria could join the EU from 2003. From the environmental point of view the most advanced countries could reach this deadline, but for some 2003 or 2004 would seem to be too early. I think that these countries are generally aware of the remaining problems and have therefore themselves set later accession target dates, which are more realistic.

In most accession countries we are seeing harmonisation upwards, toward higher environmental standards. There are some exceptions, however. We witnessed a recent case in Slovenia with regulations on emissions from incineration of municipal waste, where in order to harmonise with an EU directive of 1989, standards were reduced considerably. Could you explain how accession countries can maintain higher levels of environmental protection than those defined in respective EU legislation?

Member States and Candidate Countries are allowed to provide stricter requirements than in the EU legislation when this is not part of the EU internal market legislation. In these cases the countries are free to go further than the minimum requirements given by the directives, and the Commission can even encourage them to do so. However, there are certain restrictions to this depending on the legal basis on which the environmental legislation has been adopted. If the law is part of the internal market legislation, then stricter requirements are not allowed, as they will hamper the proper functioning of the internal market, and as a consequence also affect fair competition.

The so called »moving targets« present some difficulties to accession countries as well. In order to fulfill EU requirements to comply with all existing directives, the country must adopt the law, which will be changed in near future. Is it necessary to follow such a rigid system?

The problem with the "moving targets" is the reason why the Commission is urging the Candidate Countries to transpose directly the most recent legislation and to take into consideration forthcoming new legislation. Another aspect of this problem is that the legislative process of the European Union is usually quite long and complex with several actors involved; there is always a possibility that the text in revision is changed at the last minute. Therefore, to avoid mistakes, it is better to wait that the directive is actually finally adopted before transposing it.

No doubt that the implementation and enforcement are the weakest points in accession countries. But they are a considerable problem in member states as well. You have emphasised the importance of implementation many times. How can member states and candidate countries best overcome these problems? Is there any progress made in the EU?

We are working very hard to improve the compliance rates in the Member States, which is not a small task: about 30 percent of all EU law infringement cases concern environmental directives. The Commission's new 6th Environmental Action Programme tackles the issue by setting the full application, enforcement and implementation of all existing legislation as a strategic priority. The Programme lists several means to encourage the Member States to respect their legal obligations. The infringement procedures and court actions will continue, but we have also introduced more positive ways to speed up the implementation. First of all, we need to be transparent and share among the Member States the examples of good cases where the implementation has been especially successful. Our "Name, Shame and Fame" strategy will go on for certain directives - next campaign will take place in March on urban wastewater treatment. We will also make the access to updated information on implementation easier by presenting it in the form of scoreboard. Finally, the network of Member States' implementing authorities IMPEL will continue to receive support for exchanging best practices.

Regarding implementation in the Candidate Countries, we are now putting more emphasis on enforcement issues rather than transposing legislation. The countries are required to draft directive specific implementation plans. In order to get transition periods or to be able to close negotiations the country has to prove that implementation is underway and that they have established clear phases and steps of how it will proceed. The implementation network for Candidate Countries, AC-IMPEL, will continue to provide assistance in practical implementation and enforcement.

In the next issue Commissioner Wallström answers the NGOs' questions on: the integration of environment in other sectorial policies, institutional strengthening, the main differences between accession countries from an environmental point of view and the role of NGOs in the accession process.



Case Study – Soft Drink Packaging in Malta by Julian Manduca

Malta's environment minister, Francis Zammit Dimech, has indicated that the Malta government will lobby to retain its law on the bottling of soft drinks when it negotiates to join the EU in the coming months. Although not referring directly to the negotiations, the Minister emphasized the importance of retaining the law.

While much of Malta's environmental law lags far behind EU standards and will have to be upgraded, Malta's environment has benefited from a regulation passed in 1994 which states that all soft drinks should be bottled in glass. Coke, Pepsi, etc cannot be bottled in aluminium or plastic in the Maltese islands and about 80 million glass bottles are sold annually.

The hot climate makes the Maltese one of the highest per capita consumers of soft drinks and the Maltese have a good record for returning their bottles. Most bottles are returned around 30 times and some have been known to remain in circulation for up to 10 years.

While the EU is a free trade zone and it may be argued that to regulate what the type of packaging is acceptable would go against free trade, the Malta government believes the island's circumstances warrant special treatment.

The outcome of the now famous "Danish bottlers court case" would indicate that Malta has a case. Denmark kept its obligation for beer and soft drinks to be distributed in refillable bottles. The EU Commission had claimed Danish law to be an infringement of EU regulations on free trade. However, the European Court of Justice decided in favour of the Danish government on the basis that its specific environment law took precedence over the more general EU Article 30 pertaining to the free market. The Court concluded that the protection of the environment is one of the EU's so-called 'mandatory requirements'.

Should Malta lose its environmentally friendly law, it will not only be exacerbating its already perilous waste situation, but the bottlers of the 80 million soft drinks have indicated that should soft drinks be imported, in what would probably be plastic containers, the several hundred workers working on the production line would find themselves without a job.

This is one of two case studies commissioned by ECO, that are being carried out with the aim of following the negotiations closely to ensure that the *acquis* is implemented for the benefit of the environment and to avoid downward harmonisation of environmental standards

NGO'S FROM CANDIDATE COUNTRIES RESPOND TO 6TH EAP

NGOs from 11 Accession Countries, held a meeting in Brussels recently, hosted by EEB and Milieucontact, to discuss the 6th Environmental Action Programme and these are the main suggestions which were also presented to Environment Ministers in a subsequent meeting

- NGOs from Accession countries welcome the four identified priority areas in the Programme (Climate Change; Nature and Biodiversity; Environment and Health; Natural Resources and Waste) which are well chosen and presented; however the interconnections between them are neglected which results in an approach of partial solutions, rather than a holistic one.
- Although the Programme recognises the opportunities of the Candidate Countries to make progress towards an economic development that is sustainable, it fails to offer any real actions for this opportunity to be actually seized, and for the whole EU to accept sustainable development as a challenge to the existing development model.
- We also support the importance given to consensus decision-making and voluntary agreements. It is a good concept, but its potential is overestimated especially owing to its limitations when faced with different cultures and traditions as well as unbalanced capacities within public institutions, civil society and the business sector.
- Whilst the Programme is very specific on the targets for green house gas emissions, reduction of waste and noise exposure, it remains very vague in the rest of the document, mostly specifying only general objectives, rather than specific targets. We propose that even if concrete target values are not specified, at least a methodology should be prescribed on how to arrive at them in the subsequent process of elaborating thematic strategies, legislation, etc. As an example, for resource use and environmental pollution the concepts based on carrying capacity should be applied.
- We support the integration of the concept of delinking economic growth and environmental pressures; however it needs to be further elaborated and defined, with a clear goal of real net reduction, not just slowing down of the increase of resources use and pollution. To establish the success of delinking of economic growth and environmental pressures requires the development of a new measure which discounts external costs from economic growth.
- It would be a good case of "leading by example" if a strategic environmental assessment was made of the Programme to show its actual expected impact on the environment.

continued overleaf...



In addition NGOs pointed out the following weaknesses of the Programme:

- the Programme fails to offer fresh innovative solutions or instruments, which would have the ability to deal with the existing and emerging environmental problems. Despite the general recognition that the existing approaches of EU environmental policy and legislation, as defined in the 5th EAP, have not proven to be sufficient, the Programme basically proposes nothing new.
- the strategy for integration of environmental policy into other sectors as a prerequisite for sustainable development is not sufficiently elaborated (e.g. setting up cross-sectoral mechanisms would be required to ensure integration)
- the Programme delegates some major decisions on issues to later stages of the process (via thematic strategies) where we can expect a more limited input from the public and from the candidate countries.
- the lack of timetables for actions leaves the Programme without any sense of priorities, and makes monitoring of their implementation extremely difficult.

Enlargement Aspects

- The fact that the An enlarged European Union is placed in the chapter The EU in the wider world is a disappointment. Such an approach has already discouraged candidate countries from participation in preparing the new common European Programme for environment, even if some opportunities were offered.
- The Programme does not recognise the environmental policies of candidate countries as an integral part of the overall EU Programme, but treats them under "external relations". There are only two exceptions: agriculture in the Biodiversity chapter and importance of hotspots in the Health and Environment chapter where specific concerns of Candidate Countries are addressed. In both cases the issues are addressed in a superficial way, and no adequate actions are proposed.
- In particular we have concerns about the negative impact of the extension of the CAP to traditional farmers in Candidate Countries. To avoid this we support the development of a special policy for the Candidate Countries in advance of a major general reform of the CAP which will be attractive for the vast majority of their farmers focused on preventing deterioration of its biodiversity and the impoverishment of rural areas and further chemical exposure and promoting increase of water quality and quantity.

- In this section adoption and implementation of environmental legislation of Candidate Countries is over emphasized as the solution to the problems. Apart from integration of environment into economic sectors no other instruments are proposed. The above approaches should be complemented by stronger economic reforms, with instruments such as the greening of financial policy. This should be done parallel to harmonization of legislation, and not postponed until accession.
- The Programme offers candidate countries the concept of **sustainable economic development**, based on the principle of delinking economic growth from environmental impact. There are no concrete instruments and practical recommendations to turn it into a realistic model. Without these the concept is left at the level of a remote vision, reduced to cleaner technologies and environmental management.
- It is surprising and disappointing that in the Enlargement section the only two actions proposed are extended dialogue with administrations and co-operation with environmental NGOs and business. This is far from sufficient action to achieve a "sustainable, pleasant and prosperous" future for the Candidate Countries.
- **Transport:** here the Programme is encouraging a shift towards sustainable transport (even if not supported by any concrete actions), while in the main body of the Programme, transport is only addressed in the Climate chapter and not elaborated in an adequate way, especially keeping in mind that a 40% increase in greenhouse gasses is predicted for the transport sector in the next 10 years. A much stronger and innovative approach for transport would be required to reach the Kyoto target as well as to reduce the negative health and biodiversity impacts of transport.
- Under the title of **Awareness raising** the Programme is suggesting raising the awareness of the societies in Candidate Countries about the value of unspoiled landscapes and countryside. NGOs believe that such actions should be applied within the Union as much as in Candidate Countries.
- There is no mention in the Programme of the pre-accession funds that will lead to structural and cohesion funds after the accession of Candidate Countries. NGOs propose that, identified as an action, there is a critical review of the orientation of these funds in order to ensure a maximum contribution towards sustainable development and to prevent any negative impact on the environment. This includes: active participation of NGOs in decision-making; reorientation of ISPA towards urban public transport systems and the inclusion of smaller scale environment projects; reorientation of SAPARD towards environmental sound and biological forms of agriculture; within PHARE greater emphasis on supporting the pre-conditions for an effective environmental policy, based on able administrations and active NGOs.

In the next issue look out for the NGOs response to the **FOUR** priority areas



What is the European Environmental Agency - Malta EU Information Centre

The European Environmental Agency (EEA) is an EU institution which aims to serve the Community and the Member States with information to support policy making for environmental protection in the sustainable development perspective. Based in Copenhagen, the EEA was set up in 1990, initially established by the EU for its Member States. By time the EFTA countries - Iceland, Norway and Liechtenstein also joined as full members. Today, the family of members has grown and late last year welcomed within its fold a number of applicant countries, amongst which is Malta. In the words of Domingo Jimenez-Beltran, the EEA Executive Director, "the membership circle extends beyond EU borders, and the group of countries covered by the Agency's reporting will in some cases consist of what could be called the other EU', the Ecological Union, consisting of all European countries".

The Agency's instrumental pillars

The EEA has three instrumental pillars: networking, monitoring and reporting and acting as a reference centre. Since the Agency's work is project oriented, the activities organised fall within the actions of these pillars and are sub-divided into five programme areas:

- Topic databases and reporting
- Integrated assessment
- Periodical reporting
- Reporting system support
- Service and network infrastructure

Instrumental Pillar 1: Networking

The EEA is a central node of an extended network, the European Environment Information and Observation Network (EIONET). The present EIONET institutions are as follows:

- 18 National Focal Points (NFP): centres responsible for national co-ordination of activities related to the EEA work programme
- 195 Main Component Elements (MCE): main institutions which are regular collectors and suppliers of environmental data
- 285 National Reference Centres (NRC): institutions which co-operate on specific topics
- 8 European Topic Centres (ETC): consortia contracted by the EEA to execute tasks in the Work Programme. The Centres cover air emissions & quality; inland waters; land cover; marine and coastal environment; nature conservation; soil; waste; catalogue of data sources.

Instrumental Pillar 2: Monitoring and Reporting

The main activity of the EEA is to offer a reliable, simple and routine monitoring and reporting system on the environment. The EEA's publications cover a wide range of topics and are intended for different user groups. The reports are grouped into four different series, namely:

Environmental Assessment Reports - comprehensive reports which provide key information giving a broad overview of the state of the environment, of what the trends in the past have been and of what the future might look like. Such publications have been The Dobbris Assessment (1995) and Europe's Environment: the Second Assessment (1998).

Environmental Issue Reports - reports that provide background knowledge and analysis of a particular environmental issue. The reports are an overview and introduction to the subject matter for specific audiences such as civil servants and interested political decision-shapers and makers. These reports are also accessible to interested non-specialists.

Topic Reports - reports resulting from the monitoring and data collection activities of the EEA. They are intended as a reference information source for both specialists and scientists as well as for a broader audience on certain topics.

Technical Reports - as the name suggests, these reports are highly specialised and are aimed at the specialists in environmental institutions.

Instrumental Pillar 3: A Reference Centre

The EEA facilitates environmental action through acting as the clearing house centre for all environmental data. Harmonisation of collection of data is encouraged so as to provide uniform assessment criteria. General information is readily available through the EEA's website (www.eea.eu.int).

Conclusion

Thus these three instrumental pillars together help make sure that all information needed by policy-makers in the European institutions and in the EEA member states will be readily available.

As mentioned at the start of the article, Malta too is a member of this Environmental Union. We formally signed our membership form in October 2000 and started our venture in this wide network as of January of this year. Being part of this Union should be of benefit to us as a nation both for the environment in general and for the Maltese citizens to be in a better position to know more on the environmental status of the country and Europe in general



WASTE – by Damian Spiteri

Towards a coherent waste policy – a European perspective

In a 'Millenium Tree Manifestation', which was recently organised by ECO - The Malta Ecological Foundation, in liaison with the St. Patrick's Craft Centre at St. Andrew's and the Education Division, children and young teenagers were asked to list what concerned them mostly about the Maltese environment. They were also asked to make recommendations about how they thought that these concerns could be best attended to. The responses that they presented were attached to a 'tree', made up of recyclable materials. A small ceremony was held to mark this manifestation. Dr. Francis Zammit Dimech, the Minister for the Environment, and Dr. Louis Galea, the Minister for Education attended this event and both remarked positively about the dedicated input of all the Maltese students.

The issue of waste management featured prominently with over 30% of the replies pointing at discontent with either the rubbish dump at Maghtab or with the one at Xaghra.

CARTOON WASTE

PART 1 AND 2

Concern over waste management at a European Union level however is far removed from being a recent concern. Although it is true to allege that the 1957 Treaty of Rome did not include a chapter on environmental legislation and thereby had no mandate for adopting environmental legislation, references to waste policy have been regularly made by the Commission since the early 1970s. Before this time, it nevertheless remains possible that most governments may have tended to view waste management more as a local matter than as one that was regional or that needed to be addressed by instigating the effective and purposeful collaboration of different governments.

The first Environmental Action Programme was issued in 1972 to cover a three-year period. It was followed by further Environmental Action Programmes to regularly evolve an updated common environmental policy (and therefore waste management policy). The precautionary principle, the rectification of environmental damage at source, the prudent and rational utilisation of natural resources, and the polluter pays principle were consistently at the heart of these Environmental Action Programmes throughout their evolution. Whereas the First Environmental Action Programme essentially served to adopt a remedial approach to problems of waste disposal, and recommended such actions as harmonisation and the exchange of technical management, the Second Action Programme marked the prevention of waste becoming a policy priority.

This programme contained a detailed chapter on waste policy, and specified that priority should be primarily attributed to waste prevention and then, and only then, to recovery and disposal. In the subsequent Action Programmes, this preventive approach was further developed by encouraging the employment of adequate technologies and on the alteration of production and consumption patterns.

CARTOON WASTE

PART 3 AND 4

The development of core concepts in waste policy came to be further influenced by such measures as the adoption of the Single European Act of 1986. This promoted as one of its main objectives the prevention of environmental damage and the protection and improvement of the quality of the environment. The environmental competence of the European Union came to be most markedly expanded, however, with The Maastricht Treaty (1992). This placed economic protection and economic interests on equal footing. The Community (art.2) set as one of its tasks the promotion of 'sustainable and non-inflationary growth respecting the environment.' Such principles as the precautionary principle and the polluter-pays-principle, which had only been mentioned as concepts in the Single European Act, were now established, by means of the Maastricht Treaty as policy guidelines.

Despite these measures, however, in a 1996 review of the Community's Strategy for Waste Management, it was stated therein "the Community's achievements in the prevention of waste generation are not satisfactory". Indeed it argued, "waste quantities had, on average, continued to grow". The Commission thereby advocated that further Community action needed to be geared, on the one hand, to the implementation and enforcement of existing legislation, and to the use of non-legislative measures, on the other. It noted that for a waste strategy to be carried out successfully, there had to be co-operation between all entities including public authorities, private and public companies, environmental organisations, and individuals.

In its confirming of this review, the Council mentioned in particular the need for co-operation between Member states and fully augmented the principle of shared responsibility in the implementation of waste management strategies between all the different entities detailed above.

The EEB (European Environmental Bureau) of which ECO - The Malta Ecological Foundation is a member, nevertheless, argued that the Council could have attributed more weighting to such issues as rising waste quantities, waste toxicity and over exploitation of raw materials in its aspirations for a comprehensive waste strategy. Moreover, it constantly called for such a strategy to be constantly built upon the hierarchy of prevention, reuse and recycling of waste as well as the safe disposal of remaining residues.

In the light of this, the EEB cautions that such Directives as, for example, the Landfill Directive may be end-of-chain referents and therefore detract from the necessity of safer landfills at their very outset. It readily acknowledges that "the earlier and better different types of waste (paper, glass, plastics, hazardous materials, and so on) are separated and sorted, the better is the possibility of there being an effective final treatment and disposal." It fears that the Directive may give rise to increased incineration, which would result in increased environmental and economic problems, if the hierarchy, starting from the prevention, reuse and recycling of waste, is not fully implemented. It is already concerned by the fact that in Europe a large quantity of waste is incinerated, and notes that incineration is and can only be acceptable as a matter of last resort.

In Malta, as quite rightly pointed out by the participants in the ECO Millennium Tree Project referred to earlier on in this article, waste management remains an area of concern. This does not mean, however, that other problems cited (by the participants) such as air-pollution, water-pollution, industrial pollution, noise pollution and even pollutants attributable to such chemical accretions such as the fertilisers which are sometimes allegedly used in agriculture, do not also merit due consideration. The unwarranted disposal of litter in the Maltese countryside is a particular area where not only is appropriate enforcement of existing laws called for, but also education which is geared at making the individual conscious and responsible for his/her actions. ECO - The Malta Ecological Foundation calls for an effective waste management strategy to be adopted and implemented which - as an end-product - offers each and every person who so much as sets foot in this country an opportunity to be proud of the environmental consciousness that is forever prevailing locally.

Polidano Ad

STAKEHOLDER

Food for Thought

STAKEHOLDER

is a publication of ECO, The Malta Ecological Foundation and forms part of the project

Towards Information, Integration and Implementation in EU Accession

All correspondence is to be sent to ECO, P.O.Box 322 Valletta CMR 01 MALTA

www.ecomalta.org

eco@ecomalta.org