March 2016
Newsletter # 78
European Environmental Bureau

EUROPEAN ENVIRONMENTAL BUREAU

META MORPHOSIS

© photo: Colville-Andersen

TOWARDS A CLEAN BILL OF HEALTH FOR EUROPE

JEREMY WATES
EEB SECRETARY GENERAL

Editorial

People in the western world have never been so obsessed with or conscious of their health. From billboards to newspaper headlines, we are bombarded with messages about what to eat, what exercise we should take, or the launch of a new product that will miraculously shift those extra pounds. Despite all this, never have so many people been overweight and while we are living longer, many people are ending their lives with chronic health problems. Some of these issues are caused by poor lifestyle choices, but increasingly researchers are laying the blame for them at the door of environmental pollution. This is where the EU can make a real difference. By being tough on air pollution and hazardous chemicals and ridding Europe of dirty fossil fuels, EU leaders can save lives and help all citizens have a clean bill of health.

Despite some success in reducing emissions of some pollutants, the air in most European cities remains polluted and dangerous for our health. This situation has not been helped by car manufacturers cheating emissions tests and churning out more pollution than they should. The car industry is now under the spotlight to see whether or not manufacturers are willing to stick to the rules, but as the EU enters the final straights of updating air quality laws, there are worrying signs that some EU member states are still not ready to tackle other root causes of air pollution, notably emissions from intensive farming practices. Here, a mere 5% of EU farms cause a whopping 80% of ammonia emissions. And with emissions from other pollutants set to decrease significantly in the coming decades, ammonia from farming is becoming one of the biggest causes of loss of life and illnesses from dirty air.

The EEB, with other NGOs, is therefore continuing to push hard to mitigate the worst effects of the weak Environment Council position on the National Emission Ceilings (NEC) directive agreed last December (see page 7).

In addition to the air we breathe, the chemicals in the products that surround us in our daily lives, including those we put directly on our bodies, are another significant source of potential harm to human health. The EEB is concerned that the Commission could water down the hard-won victory represented by the EU chemicals legislation REACH by taking an

> Continued on page 2

> Continued from page 1

unbalanced pro-industry approach in the forthcoming Fitness Check of the legislation. As we mentioned in the last edition of Metamorphosis, research by the EEB shows that many substances of concern are still produced and used in the EU and that few of them have actually been regulated and are therefore in line to be phased out.

Rather than looking to make REACH and other rules pertaining to the protection of human health from harmful chemicals more business-friendly, the Commission should be looking at how to properly implement the regulation and make it fit for purpose to achieve its main goal of health and environmental protection. The Commission's continuing lack of action regarding endocrine disrupting chemicals is also extremely worrying (see page 3).

A third area that is key to Europe, and the world, to achieve a clean bill of health is the climate agreement that was agreed in Paris last December. If the necessary follow-up measures are taken, it will prove to be not merely a win for the environment but also for health, given that emissions from dirty fossil fuels continue to be a major source of health problems in many countries. In early March, the Commission came out with a Communication failing to confirm calls for higher emission reductions in light of the Paris Agreement. This is irresponsible and incomprehensible given that the EU took a leading role in Paris in driving the call to keep global warming below 1.5°C. Setting sufficiently ambitious targets under the forthcoming revised EU green energy and energy savings policies is now key to the EU doing its fair share.

The EEB is not only concerned about health issues inside Europe and on behalf of more than 30,000 indigenous people in the Amazon forest affected by one of the biggest oil-spills in history, the EEB recently launched a fundraising challenge at Grrrowd.org. (see below).

GRRROWD FUNDING FOR ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

On behalf of more than 30,000 indigenous people affected by one of the biggest oil spills in history, the EEB last month launched a fundraising challenge at Grrrowd.org. In 2013, the Supreme Court of Ecuador ordered Chevron to pay $9.5 billion to set up a health programme and clean up pollution in the Amazon rainforest for which it was responsible. So far, however, Chevron has refused to pay. To support the victims, the EEB is supporting a crowd-funding action that will allow the Ecuadorean lawyers to continue their work.

Inappropriate oil extraction by Texaco (now Chevron) in the former Lago Agrio oil field over a period of 31 years from 1964 to 1995 has left thousands of people exposed to contaminated water and lands. Chevron may have left Ecuador many years ago, but it "forgot" to take home the 16 billion gallons of toxic waste left behind in a biodiversity hotspot. Even today, that toxic waste continues to affect new victims.

In 1993, 30,000 people sued Chevron in a class-action lawsuit in New York. The case ended at the Supreme Court of Ecuador in 2013 (where Chevron had wanted the trial to be held), but Chevron has since refused to pay the fine it was awarded and stripped its assets in Ecuador. The victims are taking legal steps to order the seizure of Chevron assets in other countries, but Chevron is hitting back.

Pablo Fajardo, the Ecuadorean lawyer representing the victims, explained: "Instead of paying for the health programme and clean-up, Chevron hired an army of over 2,000 lawyers to accuse us of trying to extort money from them."
Julio Prieto, the Ecuadorean lawyer who coordinates the legal actions outside Ecuador added: "We convinced lawyers in Brazil, Argentina, and Canada—where Chevron has assets—to try to enforce the judgment in their countries."

The global scope and the counter-attack from Chevron have turned this into much more than a legal case about environmental liability. Steven Donziger, a US human rights lawyer representing the victims in the US, explained: "Chevron has created a new paradigm of corporate counterattack that is now increasingly used in the US: if you can't win a legal case on the merits of the case, use the shock-and-awe doctrine to try to eliminate the lawyers and advocates who represent and fight on behalf of your adversary."

That is why the EEB believes it is so important to make a stand on this case. Leida Rijnhout, Director for Global Policies and Sustainability at EEB said: "The EEB strives for environmental justice. The injustice is in Ecuador, but getting justice done in this particular case will have global implications. If governments and companies fail to protect the human right to a clean and healthy environment, the only option left to local communities is going to court to obtain justice. This is an expensive exercise that needs citizen support."

In February, the EEB therefore launched its campaign, which has already been picked up on social media by thousands of people and organisations, including Greenpeace International and several EEB members. Now is the time to turn these clicks and "likes" into donations for the Ecuadorian lawyers. The campaign will run until November 2016 and members are invited to join and become ambassadors for it. Please contact **Leida.Rijnhout@eeb.org** for more information. The short link to the campaign: **http://thndr.me/91M13w**

Nick Meynen,
Project Officer

COMMISSION IGNORES EDC LEGAL RULING

Last December, the EU General Court ruled that the European Commission should publish without further delay the scientific criteria identifying endocrine disrupters. However, several months down the line, this is still to happen as the EU executive continues to defy the ruling.

The ruling comes after Sweden (later backed up by other Member States, the Parliament and the Council) denounced the Commission for delaying the adoption of the criteria to identify EDCs. Without this definition the regulation of these toxic substances under the pesticides, biocides and REACH Regulations could not enter into force.

The deadline for the adoption of the definition, as stated in the Biocide Regulation was December 2013. Its development was the responsibility of DG Environment, which in November 2011 commissioned the work to an expert group coordinated by the European Commission's Joint Research Centre (JRC) and made up of around 40 experts nominated by Member States, industry and NGOs.

Earlier that year, the World Health Organization (WHO) together with the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) had presented a review of the scientific knowledge on endocrine disruption, authored by 25 world-leading scientists on endocrinology and endocrine disrupters. The report described a wide range of adverse effects to humans and wildlife related to exposure to EDCs and concluded that endocrine disrupters exert a special form of toxicity and that they represent a global threat that needs to be "resolved".

Industry was concerned both with the WHO report and the outcome of the expert group coordinated by the JRC and successfully lobbied DG Sante to commission a similar task to the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA). This agency designated a panel of 18 experts (none of them had expertise in human endocrinology and eight of the 18 had conflicts of interest) who presented their opinion in March 2013. They concluded that EDCs could be treated in the same way as any other chemical through the normal risk assessment procedure and, as industry wanted, not only hazard properties, but also potency and other factors affecting the risk should be used when regulating them.

The JRC presented the conclusions of its expert group two months later. It proposed to identify EDCs on a hazard basis taking into account the unique properties of these substances. On the basis of these conclusions DG Environment developed a proposal for criteria to identify EDCs in order to comply with the legal deadline.

However, only a couple of weeks after the publication of the JRC-coordinated expert group's conclusions, industry convened a group of 18 editors of toxicological journals (16 of whom had conflicts of interest) to publish an editorial heavily criticising the results of the JRC expert group. The editorial was titled: "Scientifically unfounded precaution drives European Commission's recommendations on EDC regulation, while defying common sense, well-established science and risk assessment principles".

As the report A Toxic Affair by French investigative journalist Stéphane Horel shows, industry was able to "manufacture doubt" on the issue and give Commission staff an excuse to delay the adoption of the criteria.

Catherine Day, Commission Secretary General, at the time, decided in July 2013 that given the lack of scientific consensus on the issue and the possible impacts on certain industrial sectors, the development of the criteria should be put on hold until an impact assessment had been performed. The results of this study were foreseen for 2017.

The Court's ruling of last December obliges the Commission to publish the scientific criteria, independent of the outcome of the impact assessment. EU health commissioner Vytenis Andriukatis told the European Parliament last month that the impact assessment processes will now be sped up in order to have the results ready by the spring. These could then be incorporated in the criteria, which Andriukatis now says will be published this summer.

This, if it happen, is clearly better than 2017, but nonetheless means that the Commission is openly flouting the Court of Justice ruling and thus not complying with EU law. A sobering thought, when one considers that the Commission is supposed to be the guardian of the EU treaties.

Dolores Romano,
Senior Policy Officer
Chemicals and Nanotechnology

In this issue

p. 1 Editorial
p. 2 Grrrowd funding for environmental justice
p. 3 Commission ignores EDC legal ruling
p. 4 Member Focus
Success Corner
p. 5 Lighting time-warp
p. 6 EU sustainable development goals coalition goes live
p. 7 Commission mercury proposal puts EU on path from hero to zero
EU member states threaten to undermine EU clean air law
p. 8 Events – Featured Publication – Coming and Going

EEB MEMBER FOCUS

News from EEB members and working groups

POLLINATION – THE KEY TO PRESERVING LIFE

Over 70% of human nutrition and food depends on the work of natural pollinators such as bees and other pollinating insects. They are the key link in the ecosystem, without which life on Earth would become impossible for the majority of its inhabitants. Besides being food sources for most living creatures, plants absorb carbon dioxide, levels of which have constantly growing during the past two centuries because of human activity.

Wild and managed pollinators are seriously in danger because of, among other factors, an increasingly intensive use of agrochemicals and a decrease in natural and semi-natural habitats. Recent scientific studies have shown that modern intensive agriculture leads to a decrease in the pollination of crops, fruits, vegetables and wild flowers as bees and other pollinators lose their habitats and access to natural food sources. Indeed, monoculture planting is one of the main reasons why the honey bee is increasingly malnourished.

A move to environmentally-friendly agriculture, which includes organic farming methods, biodiversity conservation and the restoration of habitats, is feasible and is the best way of safeguarding pollinators from the effects of toxic chemicals.

EEB member organisation "Europe and We" from Bulgaria is working to promote green agriculture practices: minimising the use of agrochemicals; protecting wild and managed pollinators; and preserving biodiversity and global food safety. It plans a series of international activities around this theme, including a study about nectariferous and melliferous plants in the Strandzha mountain region on the border of Turkey and Bulgaria; information campaigns; capacity building events for farmers, beekeepers, policy- and decision-makers; and beekeeping courses for schools.

The actions are aimed at raising awareness about the importance and benefits of pollination for the present and future of the planet, and at developing environmentally-friendly behaviour among the general public, in particular among agriculture producers and young people.

Maria Velikova, Project Manager
"Europe and We" Bulgaria and beekeeper

SUCCESS CORNER

News from EEB members and working groups

PVC BANNED FROM ECO-LABELLED FOOTWEAR AND FURNITURE

In a sudden burst of good news for the EU Ecolabel, experts agreed last month that footwear and furniture products coveting the environmental excellence label must be PVC-free. This is an important step, not just for these products, but for the Ecolabel as a whole, showing that it is making a serious effort to remove toxic chemicals from EU consumer goods.

The environmental community has widely applauded the decision. Indeed, PVC is not allowed in other national Ecolabels, such as the Nordic Swan and the Blue Angel, due to its harmful impacts on the environment and health throughout its lifecycle. However, its exclusion from the EU Ecolabel has always been difficult because of strong lobbying by the PVC industry. An earlier process to set EU Ecolabel criteria for furniture failed over a decade ago because of a lack of agreement regarding the exclusion of PVC.

However, pressure for change is growing as citizens in Europe become more aware of the impacts of their consumption on the environment and their health. Nine out of ten EU citizens believe that buying environmentally-friendly products can make a difference and at least one-third is concerned about hazardous chemicals in products.

Public authorities must therefore fight greenwashing and help consumers to make informed choices. With three quarters of products on the market containing environmental claims, trust and understanding of environmental information is difficult for a majority of citizens. Robust and reliable labelling is therefore crucial.

The EU Ecolabel, displayed on more than 44,700 products and services in the EU, has strong legal provisions to reduce the products' main environmental impacts and substitute hazardous chemicals, and environmental NGOs and consumer organisations have a say in criteria development. Public authorities must also ensure that the process is not guided by vested interests, but this is not always an easy task given the active participation of the chemicals industry wanting to push its own agenda.

The exclusion of PVC in the EU Ecolabel is an important step to encourage the substitution of toxic chemicals, paving the way for products which are safer for consumers and can be recycled more easily without re-injecting toxic chemicals into the production cycle and contributing to a more sustainable and circular economy.

Blanca Morales,
EU Ecolabel Coordinator

LIGHTING **TIME-WARP**

The EEB is bracing itself for another battle to keep Europe on the road to super-efficient lighting technologies. With lights consuming about the same amount of electricity as the entire residential consumption of France, the UK, the Netherlands, Portugal and Italy combined, it is a battle we need to win.

Draft European Commission plans are set to allow highly inefficient, poor quality office and street light technologies back onto the market, reversing bans that have been in place for years. If approved, offices could reintroduce cheap lighting models that are 15% darker and breach European light quality and comfort standards. Street lighting could go backwards too, saving money in the short-term but reducing light quality and locking public authorities to higher energy bills for years.

The EEB's Coolproducts campaign raised the alarm [**http://www.coolproducts.eu/blog/lighting-timewarp**] in early February, highlighting a Commission proposal tabled in December.

The Commission is merging various regulations agreed under the Ecodesign Directive, which phases out inefficient lighting in TVs, fridges and other appliances. But its one-size-fits-all proposal is too simplistic and will lower energy efficiency standards for commercial and public space lighting. The proposal is at an early stage in the regulatory process, can still be amended by the Commission and would need to pass a vote by member states before becoming law.

If approved, the new rules would, from September 2018, let property managers across Europe reintroduce wasteful halophosphate fluorescent lights in our offices, schools, libraries etc, technology phased out in 2010. Municipal authorities would be free to reintroduce the least efficient street lighting: low efficiency versions of the orange-coloured high-pressure sodium lamps, as well as white-coloured mercury-vapour high-intensity discharge lamps and metal halide lamps that were banned between 2012 and 2015. The last three technologies are also used to floodlight sport stadiums and large indoor space like arenas and shopping malls.

Why is the Commission doing this? Its well-intentioned simplification appears to have been badly handled. The unit responsible is understaffed and over-worked, despite the tremendous consumer and environmental benefits resulting from its work on the Ecodesign Directive, amounting to estimated energy bills savings for every home in Europe of €465 a year from 2020. Tabling its proposals in December, staff acknowledged they were lowering ambition. They also confirmed that consultants hired to assess the policy landscape failed to consider the possibility that property managers might switch back to cheaper old lighting technologies, a fatal error.

Ecodesign regulations are steadily eliminating the worst bulbs from the market, speeding a revolutionary rise in super-efficient LED technology whereby every week some new street, museum or sports stadium makes the switch. LEDs can consume just a tenth of the energy of inefficient alternatives, like halogens, and can last eight times as long. Europe's biggest stadium in Munich completed the switch last summer, while the Sistine Chapel went LED in 2014.

The Commission plan could slow that revolution, at least for office and street lighting. If approved, the new rules would come into force in September 2018. This is the second time in as many years that the Commission has gone backwards on lighting. In 2014 it proposed postponing a long-agreed ban on inefficient halogen bulbs, which was confirmed by member states in a vote in April 2015. In stark contrast, California recently put in place some of the most ambitious energy saving rules for lighting technology anywhere.

It is hard to predict what will happen next and when. The Commission could go ahead with its proposal and member states vote late in 2017, it could modify the proposal and member states vote early to mid 2018, or it could come up with an entirely new proposal that needs another round of feedback by stakeholders, likely mid 2017.

Jack Hunter,
EEB Senior Communications Officer

EU SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS COALITION GOES LIVE

Ahead of the adoption of the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda in September 2015, the EEB last June initiated the creation of a civil society coalition to push the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in Europe. This coalition is now up and running, though its official inauguration will not take place until the autumn.

The Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) are universal, meaning that all 17 goals and 169 targets have to be implemented in Europe. At the level of the EU and Member State institutions, this will require a more holistic approach than normal and require all relevant commissioners and ministries to work together as most of the goals are interlinked. Civil society organisations will also have to change their modus operandi and work more closely than they may be used to with other sectors to enable more coherent advocacy.

After much reflection and discussion, the group has developed a paper setting out the strategy and activities of the coalition, which already boasts more than 50 members and EU federations, including Social Platform, World Vision, GCAP, European Youth Forum, Concord, Climate Action Network Europe, trade unions, women's lobby groups and European cooperatives.

The coalition has decided to focus on four areas:

1. advocacy work to ensure that European and member state governance models are fit to enable a coherent implementation of the SDGs.

2. a review and follow up of all the goals on a European and national levels.

3. campaigning and capacity building around the SDGs.

4. innovation and research for a longer-term strategy and systemic change.

Since its inception the coalition has also sent two letters to Vice President Frans Timmermans, who is responsible for Sustainable Development in the European Commission. In the last letter (February 2016) we asked for:

- The EU and each Member State to develop an overarching Sustainable Development Strategy with a timeline of 2030 and a concrete implementation plan to coordinate ways to achieve the 17 goals, 169 targets and their indicators. This strategy must go beyond policy-as-usual and aim for the highest level of ambition for all the targets.
- The implementation plan to be based on the results of the European Commission's on-going gap analysis, where existing EU policies and processes will be scrutinised in light of the need to achieve the 2030 Agenda in its entirety. Detected gaps should be filled with new actions.
- The new EU Sustainable Development Strategy and associated implementation policies to be subject to broad consultation with all stakeholders through an institutionalised and inclusive process.
- Full advantage to be taken of the upcoming mid-term review of the Multiannual Financial Framework to ensure that funding mechanisms and budget lines for civil society organisations are aligned with the new needs of the global and European challenges, with space for long-term advocacy and holistic approaches.
- The Commission to urgently consider designing strong monitoring, review and accountability mechanisms. Accountability must also incorporate the concept of policy coherence for sustainable development.

We plan to officially launch the coalition plans on 24 September, a year after the adoption of the global Sustainable Development Goals.

If your organisation is interested in joining this coalition, please do not hesitate to contact Leida Rijnhout, Director Global Policies and Sustainability, **leida.rijnhout@eeb.org**

Leida Rijnhout,
Global Policies Director

COMMISSION MERCURY PROPOSAL **PUTS EU ON PATH FROM HERO TO ZERO**

The European Commission quietly launched its new mercury package on 2 February, moving the EU a step closer towards ratifying the Minamata Convention on Mercury. The EEB welcomes the fact that the package has finally been launched, but its content reflects a minimalistic approach and fails to meet even the lowest of expectations.

The package sets out plans to update existing EU law in line with the internationally-agreed goals to limit mercury supply, use and emissions under the treaty. The EU played a leading role in drawing up the Minamata Convention, but the plan to put it into practice appears to have fallen victim to the EU's Better Regulation agenda, putting the EU on an embarrassing path 'from hero to zero' in addressing the global mercury crisis.

The proposal follows the lowest-cost approach across the board rather than promoting higher levels of environmental protection. It effectively ignores the outcome of a public consultation, calls from progressive industry voices, and even the scientific findings of its own impact assessment. Further, supposedly 'new' proposals are simply a repackaging of measures already required under existing EU legislation, and some of the treaty requirements seem not to be covered by the proposal at all. The package was already late, pushing back the UN treaty ratification process, and this final lack of ambition is hugely disappointing.

The EEB is therefore asking the European Parliament and EU Member States to recognise the gravity of the situation and adopt measures that will reduce and eliminate all unnecessary uses and releases of mercury. This includes the need to rapidly proceed with the ratification of the Minamata Convention, without compromising the proposed regulation on mercury, and to strengthen the Commission's proposal.

Mercury and its compounds are highly toxic to humans, especially to the developing nervous system. Mercury transforms to neurotoxic methylmercury, which has the capacity to collect in organisms and to concentrate in food chains, especially in the aquatic food chain, thereby polluting fish, the basic food source for millions of people.

Recent studies indicate that mercury levels are increasing in tuna by 4% per year, correlating with the continuing rise in mercury in the global environment. If steps are not taken to reduce global mercury pollution, levels of mercury are expected to double by 2050.

Elena Lymberidi-Settimo,
Zero Mercury Campaign Project Manager

EU MEMBER STATES **THREATEN TO UNDERMINE EU CLEAN AIR LAW**

Forget Delhi and Beijing – for a short time in March 2015, Paris found itself unhappily top of a global air pollution index. A year later, with Europe still reeling from the Volkswagen scandal, it could be presumed that pressure is on EU leaders to clean up their citizens' air. Unfortunately, however, this is far from a given and as the EU enters the final straights of updating key air quality laws, the EEB is working hard to persuade Member States of just what is at stake.

Last December, EU environment ministers agreed a **weak position** on the National Emissions Ceilings (NEC) directive, pushing for limits for the pollutants covered by the directive to be weakened as compared with the Commission proposal. This included downgrading ambition to reduce emissions of PM2.5, fine particulate matter which causes respiratory and cardiovascular problems, and to slash limits for ammonia.

The decision on the latter was the result of strong lobbying from the industrial agriculture sector. Analysis by the EEB suggests that relaxing limits for ammonia will cause around 30,000 more deaths by 2030 than the original Commission proposal. France, Germany and the UK were particularly forceful in pushing for relaxed national ammonia limits.

Member States also opted to exclude methane entirely from the NEC directive.

All in all, we believe that the Environment Council's position would lead to approximately 130,000 more premature deaths by 2030 than if the EU executive's proposals were implemented.

And if this were not enough, loopholes, so-called 'flexibilities', now form a key plank of the Council's negotiating position towards a final deal. These would mean that Member States would be able to exceed pollution limits without punishment.

A full list of the flexibilities is **available here** [**bit.ly/1pcsgjJ**].

In contrast, the European Parliament's position is much more favourable to Europeans' health.

The European Union institutions will meet again in April for the next round of negotiations, with a final agreement expected in June, in time for the case to be finalised by the end of the Dutch EU Presidency.

Louise Duprez,
Senior Policy Officer Air and Noise

COMING AND GOING

FOND FAREWELL

Regina Schneider, Head of Membership and Enforcement, will leave the EEB at the end of the month after a long career in the organisation. She told Meta how she feels:

"It is a strange feeling to leave the EEB after so many years. I have plenty of ideas what to do with the free time and look forward to it, but I am also sad and will miss the people and the organisation to which I am very attached.

I joined the EEB some time at the end of the 1980s and since then I've seen the EEB grow in size and importance, with regard to the number of members, the geographical area they come from, the work areas the EEB covers and very recently the inclusion of EU network representatives in the Board. And obviously in order to cope with the growing demands, the EEB staff has increased from a mere 1.5 people plus some volunteers when I first joined to the 30-people strong, dedicated international team of today.

The current politically difficult times with high-level EU officials trying to sideline the environment remind me of the roll-back at the end of the 1990s, with attempts to re-nationalise competences and to replace hard laws with voluntary agreements. Back then the Commission installed the so-called 'Molitor group' to analyse the costs of environmental laws to industry. This seems very similar in many ways to the current Commission's Better Regulation agenda.

Indeed, political developments seem to happen in waves.

The EEB has always stood up against such attempts to weaken environmental policies and over the decades become a strong and respected partner in the EU decision-making processes. It has been a privilege to be part of a team and an organisation that fights for objectives that are close to my heart. I care for the environment and many of the people in the EEB member organisations have become friends, two good reasons to stay in touch.

I wish the EEB good luck, a lot of energy and the right inspiration in its fight to protect the environment and our health."

And we wish Regina every happiness in her retirement.

CONGRATULATIONS!

Tatiana Santos, EEB Senior Policy Officer on Chemicals and Nanotechnology, gave birth to a baby boy last month. Felicitaciones! She will be replaced during her maternity cover by fellow Spaniard Dolores Romano. Prior to joining the EEB team Dolores has been following REACH legislation for the EEB on a consultancy basis and has been working for several other CSOs on chemical risk prevention.

NEW RURAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS & THE ENVIRONMENT: THE HIDDEN TRUTH

Analysis from the EEB and BirdLife Europe has revealed a reduction in the amount of Rural Development funding which directly benefits the environment on farmland when compared with the previous funding period. The findings also highlight that the environmental quality of some measures is very poor and in several of the cases analysed it is not properly targeted.

Link: **http://bit.ly/1NZsFur**

SAVE THE DATE!

This year the EEB's Annual Conference will be hosted by our Austrian member Umweltdachverband in Vienna, on Monday 26 September 2016. It will be followed by our Annual General Meeting (members only) on Tuesday 27 and Wednesday 28 September (half-day). The meetings will be organised in close cooperation with our Slovak member the Society for Sustainable Living.

More information about the Annual Conference will follow on our conference website **www.eebconference.eu** in the coming months.

This newsletter is produced by the European Environmental Bureau (EEB). The EEB is the largest federation of environmental citizens' organisations in Europe. It groups together more than 150 member organisations from 33 countries.

Editor responsible: Jeremy Wates, EEB Secretary General
Editor: Philippa Nuttall Jones, EEB Communications Manager

EEB: Boulevard de Waterloo 34 - 1000 Brussels - Belgium -
Tel: +32 289 1090 - Fax: +32 2 289 1099 -
Email: eeb@eeb.org - www.eeb.org - www.participate.org -
www.springalliance.eu - www.zeromercury.org

Publication free of charge.
Printed on FSC certified, 100% recycled,
chlorine-free paper using vegetable ink.
Production : www.backgroundstories.com

The EEB gratefully acknowledges the financial assistance for this newsletter from the European Commission. This publication reflects the authors' views and does not commit the donor.