

# Official Journal

## of the European Communities

ISSN 0378-6986

C 102

Volume 32

24 April 1989

English edition

## Information and Notices

Notice No	Contents	Page
	<b>I Information</b>	
	.....	
	<b>II Preparatory Acts</b>	
	<b>Economic and Social Committee</b>	
	<b>Session of February 1989</b>	
89/C 102/01	Opinion on the proposal for a Council Decision empowering the Commission to borrow under the New Community Instrument to stabilize the level of debt outstanding for the purpose of promoting investment within the Community	1
89/C 102/02	Opinion on the proposal for a Council Directive amending in respect of chromium Directive 86/278/EEC on the protection of the environment, and in particular of the soil, when sewage sludge is used in agriculture . . . . .	3
89/C 102/03	Opinion on the proposal for a Council Directive amending Directive 86/298/EEC on rear-mounted roll-over protection structures for narrow-track wheeled agricultural and forestry tractors . . . . .	5
89/C 102/04	Opinion on the proposal for a Council Directive amending Directive 87/402/EEC on roll-over protection structures mounted in front of the driver's seat on narrow-track wheeled agricultural and forestry tractors . . . . .	6
89/C 102/05	Opinion on the proposal for a Council Directive (EEC) amending Directive 77/536/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the roll-over protection structures of wheeled agricultural or forestry tractors	8
89/C 102/06	Opinion on the proposal for a Council Directive on the approximation of the laws of the Member States in respect of the trace elements boron, cobalt, copper, iron, manganese, molybdenum and zinc contained in fertilizers . . .	9

<u>Notice No</u>	<i>Contents (continued)</i>	<i>Page</i>
89/C 102/07	Opinion on the proposal for a Council Regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 3/84 introducing arrangements for movements within the Community of goods sent from one Member State for temporary use in one or more other Member States . . . . .	11
89/C 102/08	Additional opinion on the communication from the Commission to the Council and to the European Parliament concerning a programme of strategic research and technology in the field of aeronautics, pilot phase (1989/1990) . . . . .	12
89/C 102/09	Opinion on a proposal for a Council Decision adopting a research and training programme for the European Atomic Energy Community in the field of remote handling in nuclear hazardous and disordered environments (1989-1993) (TELEMAN) . . . . .	13
89/C 102/10	Opinion on the proposal for two Council Decisions concerning the conclusion on behalf of the European Economic Community and the approval, for the purposes of conclusion by the Commission on behalf of the European Atomic Energy Community, of the framework agreement for scientific and technical cooperation between the European Communities and the Republic of Iceland . . . . .	15
89/C 102/11	Opinion on the proposal for a Council Decision adopting a specific research and technological development programme in the field of marine science and technology (MAST) . . . . .	16
89/C 102/12	Opinion on the proposal for a Council Regulation (EEC) providing for the adjustment of the price applicable to table wines delivered for compulsory distillation in Spain . . . . .	19
89/C 102/13	Opinion on the proposal for a Council Decision (EEC) introducing a Community financial measure for the eradication of contagious bovine pleuropneumonia (CBPP) in Portugal . . . . .	20
89/C 102/14	Opinion on the proposal for a Council Directive amending Directive 64/432/EEC as regards administrative areas and a cessation of serological testing for brucellosis in certain types of swine . . . . .	21
89/C 102/15	Opinion on the proposal for a Council Decision adopting a research and technological development programme for the European Atomic Energy Community in the field of the decommissioning of nuclear installations . . . . .	22
89/C 102/16	Opinion on the proposal for a Council Regulation (EEC) amending Regulation (EEC) No 2727/75 on the common organization of the market in cereals . . . . .	25
89/C 102/17	Opinion on the proposal for a Council Directive on package travel, including package holidays and package tours . . . . .	27
89/C 102/18	Opinion on the proposal for a Council Regulation (EEC) amending Regulation (EEC) No 486/85 on the arrangements applicable to agricultural products and certain goods resulting from the processing of agricultural products originating in the African, Caribbean and Pacific States (ACP) or in the overseas countries and territories . . . . .	31

## II

*(Preparatory Acts)*

## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMITTEE

**Opinion on the proposal for a Council Decision empowering the Commission to borrow under the New Community Instrument to stabilize the level of debt outstanding for the purpose of promoting investment within the Community<sup>(1)</sup>**

(89/C 102/01)

On 14 December 1988 the Council decided to consult the Economic and Social Committee, under Article 198 of the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community, on the abovementioned proposal.

The Section for Economic, Financial and Monetary Questions, which was responsible for preparing the Committee's work on the subject, adopted its Opinion on 7 February 1989. The rapporteur was Mr Drago.

At its 263rd plenary session (meeting of 22 February 1989, the Economic and Social Committee unanimously adopted the following Opinion.

### 1. General comments

1.1. In endorsing the proposal, the Committee is pleased to note that the new Decision incorporates certain key principles and objectives proposed in earlier Committee Opinions on the New Community Instrument (NCI).

1.2. Prolonged use of the NCI, targeted on priority Community objectives and now backed by 'parallel action' from the European Investment Bank using its own resources, has provided significant help for the investment schemes of small firms in a variety of manufacturing sectors.

1.3. Assistance for small firms under NCI IV—which has cost the Community budget nothing—has been pooled together with the other financial instruments to support the cooperative growth strategy for more employment and extend the economic opportunities and development potential of small businesses.

The Committee therefore welcomes the fact that small firms will continue to have general priority for NCI loans. It also endorses the introduction of new complementary objectives and a new method.

1.4. The Committee endorses the extension of the NCI to cover the safeguarding of rural areas and helping small firms with innovation and new technologies.

The need to safeguard rural areas should be met by supporting all activities which, by diversifying the economies of rural areas throughout the Community, boost employment and regional product in a way which should also be beneficial for environment protection.

Support should therefore be extended to individual entrepreneurs, cooperatives, and associations of small firms (including craftsmen) engaged in agriculture and its various subsectors (including tourism), as well as to economic initiatives by workers made redundant by rationalization or restructuring.

1.5. The Committee also approves the fact that NCI financing for technology and innovation is to include

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 335, 30. 12. 1988, p. 8.

loans for a wide range of materials and products, as well as the financing of specific applications of research findings.

The assistance complements that granted under individual Community programmes over an extended period, and justifies the decision to accept educational and training costs as intangible investments.

1.6. The Committee supports the change of method, making the NCI a 'revolving fund' empowered to borrow and lend up to a ceiling formed by the amount of debt outstanding.

This ceiling—currently 5 865 million ECU—will allow new borrowings ranging from 500 million to 1 000 million ECU per year. As a result the Commission will no longer have to apply for renewed authorization and will be able to meet further requests.

The Committee considers that the Council's powers of information and monitoring are adequately guaranteed. However, the Committee should receive the same information as the European Parliament and, after three years, should also receive the Commission report and any new guidelines.

1.7. The Committee endorses the use of global loans, and agrees that the presence of intermediaries offers a useful guarantee which can encourage the use of financial engineering techniques. However, it feels that the interaction between the use of the 'rural' NCI and the Community structural funds is not defined clearly enough.

1.8. Furthermore, given the important role which cooperatives and other similar associations play in the expansion of small firms and craft businesses, the Committee asks the Commission to consider the potential for extending the role of bodies like the Italian *consorzi fidi* and *consorzi di garanzia* (associations of small firms who provide mutual guarantees for loans taken out by their members) in connection with the role of the financial intermediaries in the provision of global loans.

Lastly, the Committee asks the Commission to see that the financial intermediaries always highlight the fact that their loan operations involve the NCI, thus helping to spread awareness of this instrument.

## 2. Specific comments

### 2.1. Article 2

On the question of 'the priorities to be applied', the Committee asks the Commission to make an explicit reference here to the procedure outlined in Article 9.

The Committee also requests the deletion of the words 'where appropriate' in the second paragraph. This expression is inconsistent with the objectives, letter and spirit of the proposal.

### 2.2. Article 6

Although the formulation of the final paragraph is correct from the viewpoint of respect for Member States' monetary policies, it might appear inconsistent with the general Community interest and with the spirit of liberalization of the capital market.

The Committee suggests that the Commission redraft this paragraph.

Done at Brussels, 22 February 1989.

*The Chairman  
of the Economic and Social Committee*

Alberto MASPRONE

**Opinion on the proposal for a Council Directive amending in respect of chromium Directive 86/278/EEC on the protection of the environment, and in particular of the soil, when sewage sludge is used in agriculture<sup>(1)</sup>**

(89/C 102/02)

On 8 December 1988 the Council decided to consult the Economic and Social Committee, under Article 130S of the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community, on the abovementioned proposal.

The Section for Protection of the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Affairs, which was responsible for preparing the Committee's work on the subject, adopted its Opinion on 31 January 1989. The rapporteur was Mr Proumens.

At its 263rd plenary session (meeting of 22 February 1989) the Economic and Social Committee unanimously adopted the following Opinion.

**1. General comments**

1.1. The Committee welcomes the proposed Directive, which is a logical addition to the basic Directive (86/278/EEC)<sup>(2)</sup>. Values for chromium were not included at the time, since insufficient scientific data were available.

1.2. Research has now been completed, and conclusive findings obtained. The explanatory memorandum summarizes these findings very clearly.

1.3. It should be noted that there are differences in the limit values laid down by the Member States where legislation was passed or recommendations issued prior to the present draft Directive.

1.4. These Member States should not undermine the scientific report drawn up at the beginning of 1988 by breaking ranks.

1.5. The Committee was concerned about chromium permeating through to ground water and about traces of chromium in agricultural products which could find their way into the food chain. The scientific report drawn up for the Commission provides satisfactory answers to both questions.

1.6. The Committee also wondered what effect spreading sewage sludge might have on grazing land.

Directive 86/278/EEC says that at least three weeks must elapse between spreading sewage sludge and putting stock out to pasture. This period is fixed by the Member States and may in certain cases be extended to take account of particular weather conditions (i.e. hot, arid areas).

**2. Specific comments**

*2.1. Assessment of limit values*

2.1.1. Three types of limit value have been fixed, as in Directive 86/278/EEC:

- a) heavy metal concentrations in soil;
- b) heavy metal concentrations in sludge for use in agriculture;
- c) amounts of heavy metals which may be added annually to agricultural land.

2.1.2. The limit values for concentrations of chromium in soil range from 100 to 200 mg/kg of dry matter.

2.1.3. The limit values for concentrations in sludge range from 1 000 to 1 750 mg/kg of dry matter.

2.1.4. The limit value for the amount of chromium which may be added annually to agricultural land is 4,5 kg per hectare per annum.

2.1.5. It should be pointed out that the upper limit values for concentrations in sludge are very high and would not necessarily be acceptable for continuous use over a long period. The introduction of limit values for annual amounts will at least allow a standard approach.

2.1.6. The ranges in limit values specified in 2.1.2 and 2.1.3 allow Member States some leeway. It is up to the Member State to decide what is the best limit value for the country or region according to soil type, climate and farming practices.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 307, 2. 12. 1988, p. 9.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ No L 181, 4. 7. 1986.

Given the hazardous nature of hexavalent chromium, derived from the oxidation of trivalent chromium,

which is predominant in sludge and soil, an important criterion in the evaluation of soil type should be the soil's capacity to oxidize chromium.

## 2.2. *Application of the Directive*

2.2.1. The Committee had wondered whether the deadline of 1 January 1990 was realistic.

The basic Directive is to be applicable in the Member States by July 1989. However, as it is simply a question of adding limit values for chromium, without amending any other part of the Directive, the date set seems not only realistic but highly desirable.

Nevertheless, the Commission must ensure that the basic Directive is properly implemented, and that the necessary tracking mechanisms are set up.

2.2.2. Sewage treatment plants, equipped to monitor the presence of heavy metals, should be made responsible for measuring the chromium content of sludge in accordance with Article 10 of Directive 86/278/EEC and on the basis of a specific administrative procedure.

The effectiveness of this procedure has yet to be proven, however, as it will remain theoretical until the framework Directive comes into force.

2.2.3. If limit values are exceeded, sludge should be disposed of by treatment plants in one of three ways:

- a) it may be incinerated;
- b) it may be disposed of in a site designated for hazardous waste (though such sites are unfortunately becoming fewer and further between);
- c) it may be spread on land which is not used to produce food.

2.2.4. However, these disposal methods (with the possible exception of incineration) are experimental, unsatisfactory and could be harmful to the environment.

The Commission should urge Member States to issue recommendations for industries which emit chromium and should seek to minimize such emissions in the light of available technologies.

## 2.3. *Impact statement*

2.3.1. The impact statement basically concerns agricultural holdings (a matter for DG VI) rather than small and medium-sized firms *per se*, although many farm holdings are small or medium-sized firms.

2.3.2. DG VI was consulted on the question of spreading sewage sludge and advised DG XI to tighten the rules slightly, which was done.

2.3.3. Cooperation was therefore effective, respecting not only the need for good farming practices, but also taking account of possible environmental problems.

Done at Brussels, 22 February 1989.

*The Chairman*  
*of the Economic and Social Committee*  
Alberto MASPRONE

**Opinion on the proposal for a Council Directive amending Directive 86/298/EEC on rear-mounted roll-over protection structures for narrow-track wheeled agricultural and forestry tractors <sup>(1)</sup>**

(89/C 102/03)

On 8 december 1988 the Council decided to consult the Economic and Social Committee, under Article 100 A of the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community, on the abovementioned proposal.

The Section for Industry, Commerce, Crafts and Services, which was responsible for preparing the Committee's work on the subject, adopted its Opinion on 1 February 1989. The rapporteur was Mr Wick.

At its 263rd plenary session (meeting of 22 February 1989) the Economic and Social Committee adopted the following Opinion by a unanimous vote.

**Gist of the Commission proposal**

The proposed amendments to Council Directive 86/298/EEC lay down provisions for an additional dynamic test if the first impact test causes significant tearing or cracking of the roll-over protection structure.

The Committee on the adaptation to technical progress of Directives on the removal of technical barriers to trade in the agricultural and forestry tractors sector is also to become an advisory committee.

**I. GENERAL COMMENTS**

**1. Technical amendments**

1.1. The proposal to add a test to the dynamic test procedure derives from the fact that at the time of the Directive's adoption in May 1986 the Council decided in Article 13 that a further Directive based on a Commission proposal should lay down provisions for an additional dynamic impact test.

1.2. The Commission has carried out detailed tests in specially equipped laboratories to check the reliability of its originally proposed test method. It concludes that this test method complies with safety requirements and is entirely adequate. For this reason it is resubmitting the originally proposed text in order to make the static and dynamic test procedures equivalent, thus eliminating the present imbalance.

1.3. The Committee endorses the inclusion of the additional test in the dynamic test procedure.

**2. Amending the procedure for adapting the Directive to technical progress**

2.1. The Committee acknowledges the Commission's efforts to lay down a suitable procedure for adapting the provisions contained in the Annex to Council Directive 86/298/EEC to technical progress. Hitherto the procedure laid down in Directive 74/150/EEC has been applied in accordance with Article 13 of Directive 86/298/EEC. Under this procedure the Committee on the adaptation to technical progress of Directives on the removal of technical barriers to trade in the agricultural and forestry tractors sector delivers its Opinion on Commission drafts.

2.2. The Commission adopts the planned measures if they accord with this Committee's Opinion. If they do not, the Commission presents the Council without delay with its proposal for the measures to be taken, and the Council acts by a qualified majority.

2.3. This procedure for the adaptation of Community Directives has in the past proved its worth in connection with the Directives now under consideration and the motor vehicle sector in general, and has not hampered the adaptation of the Directives' Annexes to technical progress. There is therefore no need to switch to a committee with only an advisory role.

2.4. The Committee would also point out that a Commission proposal of 19 January 1987 on amending Article 13 of Directive 74/150/EEC was unanimously rejected by the Internal Market Council on 5 March 1988. The Council adopted a common position on this matter on 30 November 1987 stating that 'it was very widely felt that the procedure currently in force operated satisfactorily in the sector concerned and that there were therefore no grounds for altering it'.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 324, 17. 12. 1988, p. 14.

## II. SPECIFIC COMMENTS

## Article 1(2) and (3)

The Committee rejects the introduction of a new procedure giving the adaptation Committee a purely advisory role. The adaptation Committee procedure used to date has achieved results and in particular has provided considerable expertise during the preparation of Community legislation. This procedure should be retained for the sake of its clarity, simplicity and speediness.

## Article 1(4)

The Committee advocates the proposed amendments which are designed to put an end to the present imbalance between the static and dynamic test procedures.

## Article 2

The Committee would point out that Community Directives usually enter into force eighteen months after adoption and publication in the Member States. The 1 October 1989 deadline seems to the Committee to be unrealistic. Bearing in mind the facts, it therefore proposes that the Directive enter into force one year after adoption and publication in the Member States.

Done at Brussels, 22 February 1989.

*The Chairman  
of the Economic and Social Committee*

Alberto MASPRONE

---

**Opinion on the proposal for a Council Directive amending Directive 87/402/EEC on roll-over protection structures mounted in front of the driver's seat on narrow-track wheeled agricultural and forestry tractors<sup>(1)</sup>**

(89/C 102/04)

On 8 December 1988, the Council decided to consult the Economic and Social Committee, under Article 100 A of the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community, on the abovementioned proposal.

The Section for Industry, Commerce, Crafts and Services, which was responsible for preparing the Committee's work on the subject, adopted its Opinion on 1 February 1989. The rapporteur was Mr Wick.

At its 263rd plenary session (meeting of 22 February 1989) the Economic and Social Committee adopted the following Opinion by a unanimous vote.

**Gist of the Commission proposal**

The proposed amendments to Council Directive 86/298/EEC lay down provisions for an additional

dynamic test if the first impact test causes significant tearing or cracking of the roll-over protection structure.

The Committee on the adaptation to technical progress of Directives on the removal of technical barriers to trade in the agricultural and forestry tractors sector is also to become an advisory committee.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 311, 6. 12. 1988, p. 9.



## I. GENERAL COMMENTS

### 1. Technical amendments

1.1. The Commission has carried out detailed tests in specially equipped laboratories to check the reliability of the test method proposed back in May 1986, albeit for roll-over protection structures mounted behind the driver's seat. It concludes—and this also applies to the amendment proposed here for structures mounted in front of the driver's seat—that this test method complies with safety requirements and is entirely adequate. For this reason it is resubmitting the originally proposed text in order to make the static and dynamic test procedures equivalent, thus eliminating the present imbalance.

1.2. The Committee assumes that the results of the tests carried out on rear-mounted structures are applicable.

1.3. The Committee endorses the inclusion of the additional test in the dynamic test procedure.

### 2. Amending the procedure for adapting the Directive to technical progress

2.1. The Committee acknowledges the Commission's efforts to lay down a suitable procedure for adapting the provisions contained in the Annex to Council Directive 86/298/EEC to technical progress. Hitherto the procedure laid down in Directive 74/150/EEC has been applied in accordance with Article 13 of Directive 86/298/EEC. Under this procedure the Committee on the adaptation to technical progress of Directives on the removal of technical barriers to trade in the agricultural and forestry tractors sector delivers its Opinion on Commission drafts.

2.2. The Commission adopts the planned measures if they accord with this Committee's Opinion. If they do not, the Commission presents the Council without delay with its proposal for the measures to be taken, and the Council acts by a qualified majority.

2.3. This procedure for the adaptation of Community Directives has in the past proved its worth in connection with the Directives now under consideration

and the motor vehicle sector in general, and has not hampered the adaptation of the Directives' Annexes to technical progress. There is therefore no need to switch to a committee with only an advisory role.

2.4. The Committee would also point out that a Commission proposal of 19 January 1987 on amending Article 13 of Directive 74/150/EEC was unanimously rejected by the Internal Market Council on 5 March 1988. The Council adopted a common position on this matter on 30 November 1987 stating that 'it was very widely felt that the procedure currently in force operated satisfactorily in the sector concerned and that there were therefore no grounds for altering it'.

## II. SPECIFIC COMMENTS

### Article 1(2) and (3)

The Committee rejects the introduction of a new procedure giving the adaptation Committee a purely advisory role. The adaptation Committee procedure used to date has achieved results and in particular has provided considerable expertise during the preparation of Community legislation. This procedure should be retained for the sake of its clarity, simplicity and speediness.

### Article 1(4)

The Committee advocates the proposed amendments which are designed to put an end to the present imbalance between the static and dynamic test procedures.

### Article 2

The Committee would point out that Community Directives usually enter into force eighteen months after adoption and publication in the Member States. The 1 October 1989 deadline seems to the Committee to be unrealistic. Bearing in mind the facts it therefore proposes that the Directive enters into force one year after adoption and publication in the Member States.

Done at Brussels, 22 February 1989.

*The Chairman*  
*of the Economic and Social Committee*  
Alberto MASPRONE

**Opinion on the proposal for a Council Directive (EEC) amending Directive 77/536/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the roll-over protection structures of wheeled agricultural or forestry tractors**

(89/C 102/05)

On 5 December 1988, the Council decided to consult the Economic and Social Committee, under Article 100 A of the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community, on the abovementioned proposal.

The Section for Industry, Commerce, Crafts and Services, which was responsible for preparing the Committee's work on the subject, adopted its Opinion on 1 February 1989. The rapporteur was Mr Wick.

At its 263rd plenary session (meeting of 22 February 1989) the Economic and Social Committee adopted the following Opinion by a unanimous vote.

**Gist of the Commission proposal**

The maximum mass of the tractors to which the Directive applies is to be increased from 4,5 to 6 tonnes.

The Committee on the adaptation to technical progress of Directives on the removal of technical barriers to trade in the agricultural and forestry tractors sector is also to become an advisory committee.

**I. GENERAL COMMENTS**

**1. Technical amendments**

1.1. The Committee welcomes the extension of the Directive's scope to tractors with a mass of up to 6 tonnes. This will enable a larger number of agricultural tractors to benefit from the advantages of Community rules and regulations. The Committee assumes that the extension of the Directive's scope will not have any adverse effects on occupational or road safety.

**2. Amending the procedure for adapting the Directive to technical progress**

2.1. The Committee acknowledges the Commission's efforts to lay down a suitable procedure for adapting the provisions contained in the Annex to Council Directive 86/298/EEC to technical progress. Hitherto the procedure laid down in Directive 74/150/EEC has been applied in accordance with Article 13 of Directive 86/298/EEC. Under this procedure the Committee on the adaptation to technical progress of Directives on the removal of technical barriers to trade in the agricultural and forestry tractors sector delivers its Opinion on Commission drafts.

2.2. The Commission adopts the planned measures if they accord with this Committee's Opinion. If they

do not, the Commission presents the Council without delay with its proposal for the measures to be taken, and the Council acts by a qualified majority.

2.3. This procedure for the adaptation of Community Directives has in the past proved its worth in connection with the Directives now under consideration and the motor vehicle sector in general, and has not hampered the adaptation of the Directives' Annexes to technical progress. There is therefore no need to switch to a committee with only an advisory role.

2.4. The Committee would also point out that a Commission proposal of 19 January 1987 on amending Article 13 of Directive 74/150/EEC was unanimously rejected by the Internal Market Council on 5 March 1988. The Council adopted a common position on this matter on 30 November 1987 stating that 'it was very widely felt that the procedure currently in force operated satisfactorily in the sector concerned and that there were therefore no grounds for altering it'.

**II. SPECIFIC COMMENTS**

**Article 1(1)**

Approval is given to the extension of the Directive's scope to tractors with a maximum unladen weight of 6 tonnes. At present the limit is 4,5 tonnes.

This extension brings the Directive into line with the corresponding test code of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and standard 3463 of the International Organization for Standardization (ISO).

**Article 1(2) and (3)**

The Committee rejects the introduction of a new procedure giving the adaptation Committee a purely advisory

ory role. The adaptation Committee procedure used to date has achieved results and in particular has provided considerable expertise during the preparation of Community legislation. This procedure should be retained for the sake of its clarity, simplicity and speediness.

## Article 2

The Committee would point out that Community Directives usually enter into force eighteen months after adoption and publication in the Member States. The 1 October 1989 deadline seems to the Committee to be unrealistic. Bearing in mind the facts it therefore proposes that the Directive enter into force one year after adoption and publication in the Member States.

Done at Brussels, 22 February 1989.

*The Chairman  
of the Economic and Social Committee*

Alberto MASPRONE

---

### **Opinion on the proposal for a Council Directive on the approximation of the laws of the Member States in respect of the trace elements boron, cobalt, copper, iron, manganese, molybdenum and zinc contained in fertilizers<sup>(1)</sup>**

(89/C 102/06)

On 11 November 1988 the Council decided to consult the Economic and Social Committee, under Article 100 A of the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community, on the abovementioned proposal.

The Section for Industry, Commerce, Crafts and Services, which was responsible for preparing the Committee's work on the subject, adopted its Opinion on 1 February 1989. The rapporteur was Mr Proumens.

At its 263rd plenary session (meeting of 22 February 1989) the Economic and Social Committee adopted the following Opinion unanimously.

#### **1. General comments**

1.1. The Committee welcomes this proposal for a Directive. It notes that the essential aim of the proposal is to harmonize the composition and the levels of trace elements in fertilizers.

1.2. This is therefore not an environmental protection Directive, although environmental protection is involved (see, in particular, the end of Article 4, and Article 5).

#### **1.3. It should be noted that:**

- trace elements are important for the quality of crops and influence their quantity,
- they should, however, be carefully dosed, to avoid residues which might find their way into the food chain.

1.4. The introduction of 'complexed' trace elements is interesting in that the combination of these with chelating agents of organic origin makes it possible to reduce the dose of these trace elements significantly while increasing their effectiveness.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 304, 29. 11. 1988, p. 8.

1.5. It is of course important that the chelating and complexing agents should not also have properties which might entail an environmental or health hazard.

1.6. It should be remembered that fertilizers have been subject to a variety of rules for nearly a century. The European Commission has been harmonizing these rules for about 25 years.

This draft Directive is the fourth for this purpose.

## 2. Specific comments

2.1. Article 2 of the draft Directive states that EEC fertilizers complying with the provisions of Article 1 shall be packaged. The Committee takes the view that the idea of such products being sold in bulk should be accepted, since this practice is spreading (particularly in agricultural cooperatives), although its desirability is rather questionable.

However, the invoice and/or the accompanying documents should in that case clearly indicate the composition, as laid down in Article 3. The invoice and/or accompanying documents should also include recommendations for use—either compulsory or optional, but at all events corresponding to those on the packages referred to.

2.2. The last paragraph of Article 3 might seem to be too lax. In fact the Commission intends the optional declaration to apply more particularly to traces which are so to speak always present in the raw materials. As these traces are difficult to measure, the declaration, while recommended, remains optional to avoid creating difficulties for small or medium-sized enterprises.

2.3. In the paragraph of Article 4 beginning with 'The trace element content...', the Committee suggests the addition of: 'In the case of products sold in liquid form, the trace element content in kilograms per 100 litres at a temperature of 20 °C shall also be stated.'

2.4. At the end of Article 4, the term 'recognized need' in the proposed instructions should, in the Committee's view, be changed. The following wording is preferred: 'To be used only in the case of a deficiency or specific needs. Do not exceed the appropriate dose rates.'

2.5. Article 5: this Article would enable the Member States to authorize the inclusion of additional information useful to the farmer, without such information being made compulsory or becoming an obstacle to free movement.

2.6. The Committee wonders whether the Commission should not add to this Article a provision to the effect that the Member States should encourage those responsible for the marketing of the fertilizer on their territory to make maximum use of this possibility, provided of course that no marketing barriers are created.

## 3. Examination of the Annex

3.1. In view of the complexity of the annex and of the changes which may be made to it, the Committee feels that its content should be dealt with by the experts of the Commission, the Member States and industry.

3.2. However, it is important that this expert clarification should adhere to the general lines of the Directive.

## 4. Specific cases

4.1. The list of chelating agents as given in Chapter E of the Annex does not include every category of chelating agents widely used at European level. The following are omitted:

- hydroxyethylidene diphosphonic acid (HEDP) =  $C_2H_8O_7P_2$ ,
- nitrilotriacetic acid (NTA) =  $C_6H_9NO_6$ ,
- the polyamines =  $C_nH_m(NO_2)_p$ .

It is therefore important for the Commission to include them in this new list before the final changes are made to the present text of the proposal.

4.2. Since the development of trace elements in complexed or chelated form is desirable, the list in Chapter E of the Annex will probably require subsequent revision. The matter is important:

- for the industry, which is developing new products,
- for users and consumers, in terms of ensuring that the organic chelating or complexing agents are non-toxic.

This is why the Committee would suggest that the Commission on adaptation to technical progress (CATP) should have its powers extended to include the toxicological examination of chelating and complexing agents.

4.3. Once the CATP had these new responsibilities, it would be possible to make purely technical changes to the current list, without amending the basic Directives.

Done at Brussels, 22 February 1989.

*The Chairman*  
*of the Economic and Social Committee*  
Alberto MASPRONE

---

**Opinion on the proposal for a Council Regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 3/84 introducing arrangements for movement within the Community of goods sent from one Member State for temporary use in one or more other Member States<sup>(1)</sup>**

(89/C 102/07)

On 5 December 1988 the Council decided to consult the Economic and Social Committee, under Article 100 A of the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community, on the abovementioned proposal.

The Section for Industry, Commerce, Crafts and Services, which was responsible for preparing the Committee's work on the subject, adopted its Opinion on 1 February 1989. The rapporteur was Mr Broicher.

At its 263rd plenary session (meeting of 22 February 1989) the Economic and Social Committee unanimously adopted the following Opinion.

The Committee supports the Commission's proposal for a change in the procedure for the temporary use of goods.

It sees in the expansion of the range of goods covered, the simplification of the procedures and the abolition of controls an exemplary step towards completion of the internal market.

Regardless of the objective of complete abolition of internal frontiers as from 1993, it is important that the public should be offered now substantial facilities which should not pose any serious problems for the Member States.

Done at Brussels, 22 February 1989.

*The Chairman*  
*of the Economic and Social Committee*  
Alberto MASPRONE

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 324, 13. 12. 1988, p. 8.

**Additional Opinion on the communication from the Commission to the Council and to the European Parliament concerning a programme of strategic research and technology in the field of aeronautics, pilot phase (1989/1990) <sup>(1)</sup>**

(89/C 102/08)

On 24 January 1989 the Bureau of the Economic and Social Committee, acting under the third paragraph of Article 20 of the Rules of Procedure, decided that the Committee should draw up an additional Opinion on the communication from the Commission.

The Section for Industry, Commerce, Crafts and Services, which was responsible for preparing the Committee's work on the subject, adopted its Opinion on 1 February 1989. The rapporteur was Mr Flum.

At its 263rd plenary session (meeting of 22 February 1989), the Economic and Social Committee adopted the following Opinion by a unanimous vote.

**1. Preliminary comments**

1.1. The Economic and Social Committee has already delivered a detailed Opinion on the Commission's communication, in which it approved the communication's general thrust and substance <sup>(2)</sup>. The Committee would refer to the comments made in that Opinion.

1.2. The Commission has since amended its proposals in response to the European Parliament and the Council <sup>(2)</sup> has decided as a result to incorporate this aeronautical programme in the BRITE/EURAM programme for 1989-1992. Thus, a fifth area of research —specific activities relating to aeronautics has been added to this programme's four initial areas.

1.3. A sum of 35 million ECU has been set aside for the aeronautical programme's two-year pilot phase.

1.4. The findings are due to be appraised in the course of the second year.

**2. Specific comments**

2.1. The Economic and Social Committee basically welcomes the inclusion of the proposal in the BRITE/EURAM programme. This will make it possible to make an early start on the work.

2.2. It regrets the cuts in the funds initially earmarked for the pilot programme, and trusts that at the end of the two-year programme the funds provided for the main programme will be commensurate with the project's great economic and technological importance for Community industry.

2.3. A check should be made to see whether the topics hit by the cuts could not receive aid from the BRITE/EURAM programme's other areas, if they can be accommodated in these areas.

**3. Final comment**

The content of the Committee's Opinion of 14 December 1988 on the aeronautical programme still applies in full to the BRITE/EURAM programme's fifth area of research.

<sup>(1)</sup> Doc. CES of 14 December 1988 (OJ No C 54, 6. 3. 1989).

<sup>(2)</sup> Common position of the Council of 15 December 1988.

Done at Brussels, 22 February 1989.

*The Chairman*  
*of the Economic and Social Committee*  
Alberto MASPRONE

**Opinion on a proposal for a Council Decision adopting a research and training programme for the European Atomic Energy Community in the field of remote handling in nuclear hazardous and disordered environments (1989-1993) (TELEMAN) <sup>(1)</sup>**

(89/C 102/09)

On 23 November 1988, the Council of the European Communities decided to consult the Economic and Social Committee, under Article 170 of the Treaty establishing the European Atomic Energy Community on the abovementioned proposal.

The Section for Energy, Nuclear Questions and Research, which was responsible for preparing the Committee's work on the subject, adopted its Opinion on 3 February 1989. The rapporteur was Mr Campbell.

At its 263rd plenary session (meeting of 22 February 1989) the Economic and Social Committee adopted the following Opinion unanimously.

The Committee welcomes and supports the Commission's proposal to allocate resources for research work in the field of remote handling in nuclear hazardous and disordered environments. This support is based on the considerations set out below.

## **1. Introduction**

1.1. Chapter 5.1 of the framework programme for Community activities in the field of research and technological development (1987-1991) <sup>(2)</sup>, under the heading 'Fission: nuclear safety', has provided for a new activity on remote handling in nuclear hazardous and disordered environments.

1.2. Its main objective is the development of manipulation and guidance systems which can operate in the rigorous environment of a nuclear plant; such extreme conditions involve combinations of the following: radiation, heat/cold, humidity, smoke and dust, darkness and corrosive fumes.

1.3. The programme will be implemented through shared cost contracts with a financial appropriation, from the Community budget of 19 million ECU over the five years 1989-1993, and will cover four areas of research:

- components and sub-system development,
- environmental tolerance,
- research machine projects,
- product evaluation and studies.

## **2. General comments**

2.1. The Committee can see great benefit from this programme, particularly in reducing the risks of radi-

ation exposure of workers in the nuclear industry by removing man from potentially radioactive environments.

2.2. The development and application of advance remote handling technology will also enhance the ability of nuclear plant operators to deal with consequences of mishaps and malfunctions.

2.3. The availability of remotely operated equipment should also contribute to increasing the number of routine operations which can be carried out in hazardous environments and their effectiveness.

2.4. The programme is to be devoted to the development of handling devices, control mechanisms and programmes capable of operating in both normal environment of nuclear operations and under special conditions of disruption.

2.4.1. In view of the relatively small budget appropriation to the programme, these are essentially specialist 'add-on' features to the large variety of robotic type of plant which has already been developed and is being further developed both at Community level, with research programmes like ESPRIT, and at national level, in industry.

2.5. In fact, there is already in progress a wide range of projects, either under Community research programmes within the framework programme or under national programmes, which are relevant to nuclear tele-operation covered by the TELEMAN programme. Some of these projects, of which a list and a detailed description has been provided to the Committee, are directly concerned with tele-operator development, others will lead to the creation of relevant technology useful for nuclear remote handling, for instance under the ESPRIT and the BRITE/EURAM programmes.

2.5.1. Therefore, cooperation, coordination and consultation will continue to be of prime importance, not

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 311, 6. 12. 1988, p. 6.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ No L 302, 24. 10. 1987, p. 1.

only between the Commission services concerned but also with all those involved in this type of research at national level in industry, universities, research institutes and laboratories. Expert workers engaged in the nuclear industry should also be involved. Only by such action can the results of the TELEMAR programme be maximized and nuclear safety improved.

2.5.2. In addition, the Committee calls for appropriate arrangements to be made to allow the transfer of relevant results achieved under other programmes to TELEMAR in order to get maximum benefit of the small Community financial allocation to it.

2.6. The Committee notes that the Commission proposal for a 'Council Decision adopting a research and technological development programme in the field of the decommissioning of nuclear installations' (1989-1993) <sup>(1)</sup>, on which it is also consulted, provides for an allocation of 1,8 million ECU to research into the qualification and adaptation of remote-controlled semi-autonomous manipulators systems.

2.6.1. Considering the close affinity between this work and the TELEMAR programme there will have to be particularly close coordination mechanisms and procedures to get best value for money. It may, in fact, be preferable to combine the resources of both programmes for certain projects.

2.7. Research and development programmes, such as the TELEMAR programme, appear to be eminently

appropriate for the participation of small and medium-sized enterprises (SME) in high technology fields both at the research stage and the application of its results. Therefore the Committee hopes that measures will be taken to encourage and facilitate the participation of SME also to this programme.

2.8. The Committee understands that restricting Community involvement and funding to precompetitive research should not appear to be an inhibition in this programme. Most of the successful results which will be achieved will be tested on existing or adapted machines and will be eventually available for application in production machines on a competitive basis.

2.9. Given the relatively small allocation of funds to the programme, the Committee asks for a most rigorous selection of the most worthwhile projects.

2.10. The Committee stresses the need to ensure that successful results of the TELEMAR programme are made known widely both within the nuclear industry and in industries with similar problems, as for instance the chemical industry through appropriate arrangements. Ideally, there should be a central Community register of available equipment and a procedure for making it available rapidly when mishaps occur.

2.11. Finally, it regrets that, yet once again, it is necessary to draw attention to the omission of the Economic and Social Committee from Article 4 of the Commission's proposal, dealing with the review of the programme and the evaluation of the results. This is in the Committee's view a deliberate omission and will not be accepted, since the Committee will be required to give an opinion on any future extension of the TELEMAR under the Euratom Treaty provisions.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 250, 24. 9. 1988, p. 7.

Done at Brussels, 22 February 1989.

*The Chairman  
of the Economic and Social Committee*

Alberto MASPRONE



**Opinion on the proposal for two Council Decisions concerning the conclusion on behalf of the European Economic Community and the approval, for the purposes of conclusion by the Commission on behalf of the European Atomic Energy Community, of the framework agreement for scientific and technical cooperation between the European Communities and the Republic of Iceland<sup>(1)</sup>**

(89/C 102/10)

On 24 October 1988, the Council of the European Communities decided to consult the Economic and Social Committee, under Article 130Q (2) of the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community on the abovementioned proposal.

The Committee instructed its Section for Energy, Nuclear Questions and Research to prepare its work on the matter. The Section adopted its Opinion on 3 February 1989 (rapporteur acting alone: Mr Preben Nielsen).

The Committee unanimously adopted the following Opinion at its 263rd plenary session (meeting of 22 February 1989).

## 1. Background

1.1. In recent years the EC has concluded framework agreements with the individual countries of the European Free Trade Association (EFTA) on scientific and technical cooperation. These framework agreements have in turn led to a large number of specific research agreements with each of these countries. In addition, EFTA bodies and firms take part in numerous research projects implemented as part of specific research and technological development programmes (e.g. BRITE, EURAM, ESPRIT and RACE).

1.2. The Economic and Social Committee was not consulted on these framework agreements but has now—as a result of the Single Act—been asked to deliver an Opinion on the latest proposal for an agreement between the EC and Iceland.

1.3. Previous framework agreements—like the proposed new agreement with Iceland—provide for three forms of cooperation, viz.:

1.3.1. In the first form, the EFTA country concerned takes on rights and obligations similar to those of the EC Member States. It contributes to the funding of the programme or sub-programme with an amount proportional to the ratio of its gross domestic product to that of the EC. This financial contribution covers the research costs and the management and administrative operating expenditure for the Community programme or sub-programme.

1.3.2. The EFTA country is represented in the management and coordination advisory Committee (CGC) which assists the Commission in the implementation of the Community programme or sub-programme. It is entitled to receive any information concerning the execution of the programme and any information resulting from its implementation. Organizations from the country concerned may conclude research contracts with the Commission under the same terms and conditions as those from the EC Member States.

1.3.3. In the second form (participation in the projects within a programme), organizations or firms in the EFTA countries may participate in specific projects in association with bodies situated in the Member States. There is no transfer of funds to cover the research costs, but a modest financial contribution is requested to cover a part of the costs incurred by the Commission in managing the research contracts. Transfer of information is very restricted and consists essentially of the information required to carry out the project or information resulting from it. Representatives of the EFTA countries cannot participate in the CGC or other management bodies for the programmes.

1.3.4. The third form covers essentially the exchange of information and concertation between a Community programme and a national programme in an EFTA country. Non-confidential information is exchanged in order to increase the efficiency of both programmes; it may relate to the planning of programmes, the intended research proposals, current research contracts and the results obtained.

1.3.4.1. The costs arising from the implementation of the cooperation concern exclusively travel and subsistence costs to attend meetings, seminars etc. and are defrayed by each of the contracting parties for the amount which concerns it.

## 2. Comments

2.1. The Committee warmly welcomes the gradual conclusion of framework agreements with the individual EFTA countries and the large number of specific agreements that have already resulted. It therefore also approves the current proposal for an agreement with Iceland, subject to the following comments:

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 273, 22. 10. 1988, p. 4.

2.2. The Committee observes that each specific agreement is governed by stringent formalities and concluded at top level—like more far-reaching agreements between the EC and non-member countries.

2.3. Similarly, the annual joint committee meeting takes place at the very top level.

The Committee wonders whether a more appropriate and flexible solution might not be to have only one agreement with each country and to attach specific

agreements to this framework agreement along the lines of appendices, thereby providing greater scope for prompt, smooth adjustments to the provisions.

2.4. The Committee also considers that each EFTA country could attach an expert to the relevant Commission departments to achieve more effective cooperation. The aim should, needless to say, not be to give the EFTA countries special privileges at the expense of other non-member countries but to promote cooperation to mutual benefit.

Done at Brussels, 22 February 1989.

*The Chairman  
of the Economic and Social Committee*

Alberto MASPRONE

---

**Opinion on the proposal for a Council Decision adopting a specific research and technological development programme in the field of marine science and technology (MAST)<sup>(1)</sup>**

(89/C 102/11)

On 15 November 1988, the Council of the European Communities decided to consult the Economic and Social Committee, under Article 130 Q (2) of the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community on the abovementioned proposal.

The Section for Energy, Nuclear Questions and Research, which was responsible for preparing the Committee's work on the subject, adopted its Opinion on 3 February 1989. The rapporteur was Mr Campbell.

At its 263rd plenary session (meeting of 22 February 1989), the Economic and Social Committee adopted the following Opinion unanimously.

The Committee supports the Commission's proposal. This support is based on the considerations set out below.

**1. Introduction**

1.1. Chapter 7.1 of the framework programme for Community activities in the field of research and technological development (1987-1991)<sup>(2)</sup> has provided for the marine science and technology (MAST) programme.

Its broad objectives are 'to contribute to establishing a scientific and technological basis for the exploration, exploitation, management and protection of the European coastal and marginal seas' and 'to introduce the necessary Community dimension to various on-going research activities'.

1.2. The Committee wishes to emphasize that for some Member States (for example Ireland and Portugal with its outlying islands) the economic and social implications of marine studies are not limited to marginal

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ N° C 298, 23. 4. 1988, p. 15.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ N° L 302, 24. 10. 1987, p. 1.

coastal seas, but will require investigations of the waters of parts of the North Atlantic Ocean.

1.3. The four main headings covered by the programme are:

- basic and applied marine science (modelling oceanography),
- coastal zone science and engineering,
- marine technology (instrumentation for science, generic enabling technologies, design aspects of large facilities),
- supporting initiatives.

1.4. The total cost anticipated over the three years of the programme amounts to about 96 million ECU: 50 million ECU from the Community budget and approximately 46 million ECU from other sectors at national level, through shared-cost contracts.

1.5. Administrative and staff costs are estimated to amount to 8,2 % of total expenditure.

## 2. General comments

2.1. A great deal of marine and oceanographic research is already being carried by the Member States. In financial terms, the MAST programme will contribute only a small amount to the total national expenditure in this field, probably no more than an additional 5 %.

2.2. The Commission has identified significant gaps in research and there is underutilization of knowledge and facilities. In the Committee's view the MAST programme, despite its limits, can contribute, as a catalyst, to filling these gaps, improving productivity and disseminating information in this very extensive field of research, whilst acknowledging that there are a number of intergovernmental and institutional agencies exchanging information about marine science.

2.3. The MAST programme is concerned with the acquisition of fundamental understanding of marine matters which provide a firm foundation for other specific research programmes being undertaken, firstly, and of greatest importance, in the field of environmental protection of the seas together with other important areas of research, such as fisheries, hydrocarbons exploration, renewable energies and waste dumping.

2.4. The potential for projects under the four main areas of work covered by the MAST programme is very great and this is confirmed in a Commission working document which gives a more detailed description of its technical content and has been prepared after a large consultation.

2.5. The Committee is satisfied that most potential areas for research projects have been considered in this document. Nevertheless, having regard to the diverse nature of projects, the limited finance available and the need for commitment by the end of 1990, the Committee has some concern on the following points:

- the Committee is not aware of any inventory of research work being carried out in the Member States together with the specific Community research programmes referred to in 2.3 above. Such an inventory is required to be able to place the MAST programme in the context of a Community strategy in the field of marine science research,

- it is not clear what specific criteria will apply for selecting projects. There should be a limited number of projects, within financial constraints, which are feasible, useful and contribute not only to fundamental understanding but wherever possible to specific applications in the field of protection of the environment, and in industry, in particular,

- whilst the machinery for coordination exists both in the Commission and through international bodies, there is no clear indication that the necessary positive decision-making can be exercised in such a diverse field of activity to ensure success of the MAST programme.

2.6. The Committee takes note that within Part I of the programme, under the heading 'Basic and applied marine science', some priorities for work have already been identified: ecosystem models, modelling coordination, biogeochemical cycles and fluxes and biological processes. It also notes that this is supported by Crest, of which an *ad hoc* working group on marine science and technology has been assisting the Commission in defining the technical content of the programme.

2.7. Part II, under the heading 'Coastal zone science and engineering', is concerned to a greater extent with physical works and is closely linked to the research

work proposed under part I. The Committee considers these two parts as being complementary and that there should be no unnecessary rigidity in the boundary between them.

2.8. The Committee was concerned that the constraints of restricting community involvement and funding to precompetitive research would limit work under this programme to the theoretical studies without the prospect of rapid practical use. 'However, it is assured that one of the criteria for the selection of projects will be the potential for industrial or other practical applications.'

2.9. The Committee is also assured that this restriction will not be a constraint when selecting the projects, particularly under part III of the programme—marine technology—bearing in mind the close liaison with the EUROMAR project, launched under the EUREKA initiative. This project is concerned with the development and application of modern technologies for the exploration of ecological relations and cause-and-effect chains in the seas of Europe.

2.10. Part III of the programme presents, in addition, the opportunity for projects related to the development of instruments and equipment for measurement and data collection. In recent years many small and medium-sized enterprises have developed their expertise in this high-tech field and it is to be hoped that they can play a major role in this part of the programme, as well as in other projects.

2.11. Part IV of the programme-supporting initiatives will not be the subject of calls for project proposals but the Committee hopes that it will be used by the Commission to break down the barriers which prevent good communication, to optimize the use of existing and new data banks throughout the Community and of other expensive equipment between Member States, and to foster advanced specialists training courses where there is a proven need.

2.12. The Committee has no specific comments on the Articles of the proposal, with the exception of Article 4. Once again, the Council having sought the Opinion of the Economic and Social Committee, the Commission presumes that the Committee has no further interests or rights. This is of course not so and it insists on progress reports and evaluation reports, placing the Community programme in the wider context of national research in this field, to be forwarded to it, when available, before considering any proposal for modification or prolongation of the programme. The Committee asks that Article 4 of the Commission's proposal be modified accordingly.

2.13. Finally, the Committee wishes to state that the seas within and surrounding the Member States of the Community do not respect State boundaries. They have a profound effect on coastal areas of all countries. Therefore it is important that the resources allocated to the MAST programme are used to maximize the total research potential of the Community across State boundaries to protect the ever changing balance between land, air and sea.

Done at Brussels, 22 February 1989.

*The Chairman*  
*of the Economic and Social Committee*  
Alberto MASPRONE

**Opinion on the proposal for a Council Regulation (EEC) providing for the adjustment of the price applicable to table wines delivered for compulsory distillation in Spain <sup>(1)</sup>**

(89/C 102/12)

In accordance with Article 198 of the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community, the Council decided on 8 December 1988 to exercise its option to ask the Economic and Social Committee for an Opinion on the abovementioned proposal.

The Economic and Social Committee decided to appoint Mr Riera-Marsa as rapporteur-general with the task of preparing its work on the subject.

At its 263rd plenary session (meeting of 22 February 1989) the Economic and Social Committee adopted the following Opinion unanimously.

The Committee approves the Commission's proposal to extend to Spanish wines delivered for compulsory distillation for the marketing years 1988/1989 to 1990/1991 the same reduction of the purchase price as that provided for other Community Member States by Regulation (EEC) No 1441/88.

Done at Brussels, 22 February 1989.

*The Chairman*  
*of the Economic and Social Committee*  
Alberto MASPRONE

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 329, 22. 12. 1989, p. 5.

**Opinion on the proposal for a Council Decision (EEC) introducing a Community financial measure for the eradication of contagious bovine pleuropneumonia (CBPP) in Portugal**

(89/C 102/13)

On 29 December 1988 the Council decided to consult the Economic and Social Committee, under Article 198 of the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community, on the abovementioned proposal.

The Economic and Social Committee decided to appoint Mr Storie-Pugh as rapporteur-general with the task of preparing its work on the subject.

At its 263rd plenary session (meeting of 22 February 1989) the Economic and Social Committee adopted the following Opinion unanimously.

The Committee agrees with the Commission's proposal and makes the following comments:

1. Because of the occurrence of disease in frontier areas, it is recommended that an investigation should be carried out in bordering countries to determine the existence or non-existence of contagious pleuropneumonia.
2. The time span for eradication is optimistic. Five years would seem to be a better and more realistic estimate.

Done at Brussels, 22 February 1989.

*The Chairman  
of the Economic and Social Committee*

Alberto MASPRONE

---

**Opinion on the proposal for a Council Directive amending Directive 64/432/EEC as regards administrative areas and a cessation of serological testing for brucellosis in certain types of swine**

(89/C 102/14)

On 9 February 1989 the Council decided to consult the Economic and Social Committee, under Article 198 of the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community, on the abovementioned proposal.

The Economic and Social Committee decided to appoint Mr Storie-Pugh as rapporteur-general with the task of preparing its work on the subject.

At its 263rd plenary session (meeting of 22 February 1989) the Economic and Social Committee adopted the following Opinion unanimously.

The Committee agrees with the Commission's proposal.

Done at Brussels, 22 February 1989.

*The Chairman  
of the Economic and Social Committee*

Alberto MASPRONE

---

**Opinion on the proposal for a Council Decision adopting a research and technological development programme for the European Atomic Energy Community in the field of the decommissioning of nuclear installations**

(89/C 102/15)

On 19 September 1988 the Council, acting in accordance with Article 170 of the Treaty establishing the European Atomic Energy Community, asked the Economic and Social Committee for an Opinion on the abovementioned proposal.

The Committee instructed its Section for Energy, Nuclear Questions and Research to prepare its work on the matter. The Section adopted its Opinion on 3 February 1989 (rapporteur: Mr von der Decken).

The Committee adopted the following Opinion, by a unanimous vote, at its 263rd plenary session (meeting of 22 February 1989).

The Committee approves the draft Council Decision but wishes to make the remarks set out below:

## 1. Introduction

1.1. The proposed programme is part of the overall research work on the safety aspects of nuclear fission. Under the framework programme of Community activities in the field of research and technological development (1987-1991) <sup>(1)</sup> the main aim of this research is to reinforce the scientific and technical base necessary to strengthen the safety of nuclear power stations and other nuclear activities.

1.2. In addition to the decommissioning of nuclear plant, these research activities involve the safety of reactors, the management of radioactive waste and the surveillance of fissile materials, which are covered by separate programmes.

1.3. The Committee welcomes the Commission's desire to pursue and indeed to extend its research work in the field of decommissioning nuclear plant and it has noted with considerable interest the results already obtained from the 1984-1988 programme <sup>(2)</sup>.

1.4. In its Opinion of 27 November 1986 <sup>(3)</sup> on the Commission proposal with regard to the framework programme, the Committee underlined the fact that the Chernobyl accident had led to a state of emergency in the field of nuclear safety and called for an intensification of research and development work.

1.5. It should also be pointed out that since the EC research work on the decommissioning of nuclear installations began in 1979, the number of nuclear power stations which have been definitively closed down has increased from five to seventeen.

1.5.1. The main reason for decommissioning is that the nuclear plant concerned has come to the end of its specified operating life. Alternatively, particularly in the case of the older plant, the cost of making safety modifications necessary to bring it into line with the state of the art is so expensive that its continued operation is no longer justified.

1.5.2. It is estimated, on this basis, that by the year 2000 or thereabouts the figure will increase to fifty, even without counting nuclear fuel-cycle facilities, reprocessing installations and research reactors which are closed down.

1.6. Thus, despite the fact that the level of technical knowledge in the field of the decommissioning of nuclear plant has been increasing over the last ten years, the number of major nuclear installations which have been shut down and the 'considerable' number of forthcoming closures referred to by the Commission will mean that the dismantling of the installations will be a particularly acute problem.

1.7. In the Committee's view the decommissioning of nuclear plant provokes considerable public attention and concern. It is thus very important for the continued acceptability of nuclear plant that decommissioning operations be carefully carried out and be trouble-free.

## 2. General comments

2.1. The Committee underlines the fact that no appraisal of the programme proposed by the Commission can disregard the basic aim of the programme, namely to reinforce in the Community the scientific and technical basis necessary to strengthen safety and afford increased protection to people and the environment against the dangers of ionising radiation, both during and after the decommissioning and final dismantlement of the nuclear plant concerned.

2.1.1. In the Committee's view these safety provisions do not apply just to the general public; they cover, in particular, persons involved in the decommissioning work and the handling of waste products. The

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No L 302, 24. 10. 1987, p. 1.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ No L 36, 8. 2. 1984, p. 23.

<sup>(3)</sup> OJ No C 333, 29. 12. 1986, p. 45.



training and staff exchange measures proposed by the Commission are welcomed.

2.2. The Committee considers that the activities set out in the proposed 1989-1993 programme, which includes the majority of the subjects covered by the current programme due to expire on 31 December 1988, are in line with the abovementioned aim and meet the needs of the situation described in points 1.5 and 1.6 above.

2.3. The Committee would also draw attention to the importance of the additional aims which, in the Commission's view, the proposed programme should help to achieve, namely:

- extending the data bases for decommissioning cost estimates and, where possible, helping to reduce these costs. Through its participation in associated R & D projects the EC is meeting the commitment set out in point 2.1 above. The Committee considers that the Commission should draw attention in the programme to the additional obligation on the part of the operators of nuclear plant to make financial provision for the decommissioning of their plant. The experience gained through the operation of the programme should also, in the Committee's view, be used in order to help establish a unified method for assessing decommissioning costs,
- speeding up the achievement of a consensus on a Community policy for decommissioning in order to provide the bases for a 'decommissioning industry' in the Community.

2.4. The Committee also considers that the Commission should draw up Directives on radiation protection and, in particular, limit values for radiation protection to be observed in the decommissioning of nuclear plant and the storage or release of radioactive waste. These limit values must be binding upon all EC Member States.

2.5. The Committee therefore reiterates the Committee's support for the research programme on the decommissioning of nuclear installations, as last expressed in its Opinion of 23 November 1983<sup>(1)</sup>. The Committee also gives its general approval to the contents of the proposed programme.

2.6. The Committee does, however, regret that there is still no overall survey of the work being carried out in this field at national level, a shortcoming already highlighted in the abovementioned Committee Opinion. In the absence of such a survey it is not possible to give an opinion on the extent to which national and EC activities are complementary or even on the extent to which there may be duplication.

2.6.1. The same applies also to the remaining research projects in other fields with similar objectives,

in particular the TELEMAT programme<sup>(2)</sup> on which the Committee was asked to give a separate Opinion. The Committee calls upon the Commission to maintain appropriate intercommunication and, at all events, to avoid duplication.

2.7. The Committee regards the proposed significant increase in the funding for the programme as justified and gives its approval to the proposal. It is proposed to increase the funding from the 12,1 million ECU allocated under the current programme (1984-1988) to 31,5 million ECU for the period 1989-1993.

2.8. As the programme is essentially to be implemented by means of shared-cost contracts, the overall funding should be of the order of 60 million ECU.

2.9. The Committee fully recognizes the fact that the public is badly acquainted or totally uninformed about matters relating to the decommissioning of nuclear plant. For this reason the Committee considers that more publicity should be given to decommissioning work.

2.10. In this connection support should be given to a recommendation made by the Scientific and Technical Committee (STC) in its Opinion which is appended to the draft Council Decision. The STC calls upon the Commission to ensure 'the widest possible dissemination of both results from its own programme and, as far as it can do so, the other programmes being carried out by the Member States'. It is also essential that this information be provided in a comprehensible form.

### 3. Specific comments

#### 3.1. *Guideline breakdown of appropriations*

3.1.1. As was the case with the previous programme, the proposed new programme comprises three sections covering the same subjects. The guideline breakdown of appropriations is as follows:

- Section A: research projects: 7,2 million ECU,
- Section B: identification of guiding principles: 0,3 million ECU,
- Section C: testing of new techniques in practice: 21 million ECU.

A sum of 3 million ECU has also been set aside to cover administrative and staff costs.

3.1.2. The Committee wonders why such a small sum has been set aside for Section B in the proposed breakdown of appropriations. Section B covers the areas in which the Commission proposes to identify guiding principles. These principles will be of particular importance in respect of the aims of the programme, both as regards nuclear safety and the definition of an EC policy on decommissioning.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 23, 30. 1. 1984, p. 8.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ No C 311, 6. 12. 1988, p. 6.

3.1.3. As it has already stressed in point 2.4 above, the Committee attaches particular importance to the introduction of generally applicable Directives. The sum which has been provisionally allocated in this field therefore appears to be inadequate and it should be increased.

### 3.2. *Testing of new techniques in practice*

3.2.1. The Committee approves the emphasis which the proposed programme places on field testing of new techniques, and the proposed sum set aside.

3.2.2. The funds are to be concentrated on four selected pilot projects. In the Committee's view it is important that these funds are used exclusively for the purpose of tackling key problems and/or for field testing of newly developed processes. Use of the funds as a demolition grant should be avoided.

3.2.3. The Committee also welcomes the proposal to earmark part of the funds for the testing of newly developed alternative techniques.

### 3.3. *Removal and storage of radioactive waste*

3.3.1. The removal and storage of radioactive waste is an issue which is very closely bound up with dismantling.

3.3.2. The Committee recognizes that the removal and storage of radioactive waste comes under a separate research programme currently being implemented. The Committee is, however, surprised that the Commission does deal with this issue in any detail but merely draws attention to the need to develop strategies for the man-

agement of radioactive waste produced as a result of the dismantling of nuclear installations, in the light of the existing or projected reprocessing and final storage facilities available in the Member States.

3.3.3. The Committee calls upon the Commission to give detailed consideration to this matter and, if necessary, to draw up proposals, bearing in mind the wide-ranging implications not only for the programme under review but also for the protection of human beings and the environment in general.

### 3.4. *Forwarding to the Economic and Social Committee of the results of the review of the programme and the evaluation report*

3.4.1. Under Article 4 of the draft Decision the Commission is to undertake a review of the programme in its third year of operation and to report to the Council and the European Parliament on the results of the review. Here, once again, no mention is made of the Economic and Social Committee. Reports on the evaluation of the results of the programme are likewise to be forwarded only to the Council and the European Parliament.

3.4.2. The Committee therefore reiterates the request which it has already made on many earlier occasions that express provision be made in the Commission documents for both of the abovementioned reports to be transmitted to the Economic and Social Committee, especially in view of the fact that the first and second paragraphs of Article 4 are not in accordance with Article 7 of the Euratom Treaty, which forms the legal basis for the draft Decision. It is stated in the fifth paragraph of Article 7 of the Euratom Treaty that 'the Commission shall keep the Economic and Social Committee informed of the broad lines of Community research and training programmes'.

Done at Brussels, 22 February 1989.

*The Chairman  
of the Economic and Social Committee*

Alberto MASPRONE

**Opinion on the proposal for a Council Regulation (EEC) amending Regulation (EEC)  
No 2727/75 on the common organization of the market in cereals<sup>(1)</sup>**

(89/C 102/16)

On 8 December 1988, the Council decided to consult the Economic and Social Committee, under Article 198 of the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community, on the abovementioned proposal.

The Section for Agriculture and Fisheries, which was responsible for preparing the Committee's work on the subject, adopted its Opinion on 2 February 1989. The rapporteur was Mr Droulin.

At its 263rd plenary session of 22/23 February 1989 (meeting of 23 February) the Economic and Social Committee adopted the following Opinion by a large majority, with 3 dissenting votes and 2 abstentions.

## 1. Introduction

1.1. The Commission is proposing to introduce a premium for cereals used in animal feed as a means of stabilizing supply and demand in the cereals sector.

To enable arrangements to be reviewed (if necessary) in the light of experience gained, it is proposed that application be limited initially to the 1989/1990 marketing year.

1.2. In the absence of effective mechanisms for restricting imports of cereal substitutes and with a view to increasing the use of cereals in animal feed, the Committee approves the premium in principle.

1.3. However, the scheme will only be acceptable to users if it helps even out differences in animal feed costs between countries and regions. As costs are higher for users who are not within easy reach of a port and who incorporate a low proportion of cereal substitutes and a high proportion of cereals in their feed, the premium should in particular enable such operators to continue using a high cereals component. In this context the Community must avoid any discrimination between users in surplus regions and those in deficit regions, which might result from disparities in the costs of the cereals incorporated.

## 2. General comments

2.1. The Committee endorses the Commission's approach, viz. 'for the 1989/1990 marketing year, a premium may be granted for cereals used in animal feed above a quantitative threshold to be determined'.

2.2. The Committee will set out its position by dis-

cussing the criteria most conducive to fulfilling the aims of the premium as it sees them.

2.3. The size of the premium should be calculated on the basis of the following:

- a minimum incorporation rate, below which no premium is granted,
- a progressive premium in relation to increasing incorporation rates, to be granted for the additional use of cereals above the minimum incorporation rate,
- a maximum incorporation rate, above which a flat-rate premium is granted.

2.4. The Committee notes that, according to the Commission's estimates, the cost of each additional tonne of cereals used would be less than the average cost of export refunds. Consequently, there might well be a slight reduction in the amount of spending of the European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund (EAGGF) in the cereals sector. But this should not in principle affect future arrangements.

2.5. The Committee would however like further information on variations in the cost of feed to livestock farmers once the scheme has been introduced, according to whether feed initially has a high or a low cereals component.

## 3. Specific comments

3.1. The following comments refer to the general conditions of eligibility for the premium, the amounts eligible for the progressive premium and the flat-rate premium, and the size of these premiums.

### 3.2. General conditions of eligibility

3.2.1. The Committee recognizes the need to establish a minimum threshold in order to encourage a

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 328, 21. 12. 1988, p. 9.

significant rate of cereal incorporation. The minimum rate should not be too high, however, as this might automatically exclude too high a proportion of operators. A 20 % rate would seem satisfactory.

3.2.2. The Committee approves the principle of extending the scheme to all operators, including live-stock producers. Moreover, stock records are indispensable to the proper running of the scheme.

3.2.3. The Committee would point out that the Council has already delayed considerably in examining the premium; furthermore it did not take a decision before 31 October 1988, as it was required to do by the compromise on farm prices for the 1988/1989 marketing year. The Committee feels that it is important to introduce the scheme in the 1989/1990 marketing year.

3.3. *Progressive premium for the additional use of cereals*

3.3.1. The average amount (roughly 45 ECU/t) proposed for this premium should be an effective incentive

to operators to increase their use of cereals given the present situation on the world market. The amount may have to be changed in line with market trends.

3.3.2. The fact that this premium operates on a sliding scale according to incorporation rates should help reduce disparities in the feed costs of farmers. The steeper the scale, the easier it will be to achieve this objective.

3.4. *Flat-rate premium*

3.4.1. The Committee endorses in principle a flat-rate premium for amounts of cereals between the minimum incorporation rate and the reference rate.

3.4.2. However, it wonders whether the proposed minimum rate and size of premium will have sufficient impact as they stand.

Done at Brussels, 23 February 1989.

*The Chairman  
of the Economic and Social Committee*

Alberto MASPRONE

---

# Opinion on the proposal for a Council Directive on package travel, including package holidays and package tours <sup>(1)</sup>

(89/C 102/17)

On 7 April 1988 the Council decided to consult the Economic and Social Committee, under Article 100 A of the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community, on the abovementioned proposal.

The Committee instructed its Section for Protection of the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Affairs to prepare its work on the matter. The Section adopted its Opinion on 31 January 1989 (rapporteur: Mr Vassilaras).

At its 263rd plenary session (meeting of 23 February 1989) the Economic and Social Committee adopted by 78 votes for, 5 against and 5 abstentions, the following Opinion.

## 1. General comments

1.1. The Committee endorses the draft Directive as being in line with the 'new impetus for consumer protection policy' and as a step in a series of directives and regulations which will be needed to ensure consumer protection on the establishment of a just equilibrium between the interests of consumers and those of the travel trade.

1.2. The Committee is particularly pleased to note that many points from its earlier Opinions, (a) on initial guidelines for a Community policy on tourism <sup>(2)</sup> and (b) on Community action in the tourism sector <sup>(3)</sup> have been taken into account.

1.3. The Committee recognizes that the present proposal is deliberately restricted to the protection of the consumer in the context of package travel, but draws attention to the necessity of a more thorough examination of related problems when drawing-up Opinions on future referrals, for example that on 'Tourism—5-year action programme' which is expected shortly.

1.4. Specifically the Committee considers that the following points require examination:

- the need for common standards not only for package travel but also for the full range of tourist activities as is shown by an examination of the summary of legislation in the Member States set out in the Commission document, and in particular the legislation governing the organizers and retailers of package travel, the problem of overbooking, and the position of the hotelier who is at the end of the chain in any given tour arrangement, and the difficulties caused by the development of the so-called 'bucket-shop' operators,

- the need to dispense justice expeditiously to the consumer/tourist on the one hand, and the organizer/retailer on the other, and indeed to the parties to disputes within the travel trade itself,
- the coverage of professionals in the travel trade who are currently subject to existing, non harmonized, contract law in the different Member States,
- the introduction of a simpler procedure under the Hague Convention to facilitate international access to the courts approved by the Committee in 1987 <sup>(4)</sup>,
- the possibility of introducing a voluntary code of practice in the field of tourism within the spirit of the Committee's Opinion on the producer-consumer dialogue <sup>(5)</sup>, even though such codes should be watched carefully as existing codes in this field have been subject to criticism,
- on examination of what steps might be taken to ensure fair competition within the travel trade itself,
- the establishment of a guarantee fund at Community level, as the operation of such funds in certain Member States is generally considered to be satisfactory.

1.5. The Committee emphasizes that continuous research will be needed to ensure that equitable solutions are found to problems set out above and to ensure that the whole process of harmonization takes place within the context of the achievement of the internal market by 1992, and in the light of the estimate that by the year 2000 tourism will constitute one of the more important economic activities of the Community.

1.6. The Committee also draws attention to the Commission's current aim to ensure that consumer and environment policies are integrated into other Community policies as set out in the relevant Commission documents <sup>(6)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 96, 12. 4. 1989, p. 5.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ No C 358, 31. 12. 1983.

<sup>(3)</sup> OJ No C 328, 22. 12. 1986.

<sup>(4)</sup> OJ No C 83, 30. 3. 1987.

<sup>(5)</sup> OJ No C 206, 6. 8. 1984.

<sup>(6)</sup> (i) New impetus for consumer protection policy (COM(85) 314 final); (ii) 4th environment action programme 1987-1992 (OJ No C 328, 7. 12. 1987).

1.6.1. In the context of tourism, therefore, the Commission should note that package travel must be seen as a factor which must interface with the rights and obligations of both tourism professionals and the tourist as consumer e.g. with consumer safety, with the prevention of damage to tourist facilities.

1.6.2. The Commission should also concern itself with the need to prevent environmental and cultural damage through tourism, e.g. damage to beaches and to water, damage to historical monuments.

## 2. Specific comments

### 2.1. Article 1

The proposal does not specifically explain what distinctions (if any) exist in its application to the following categories of package travel:

- travel originating in a Member State but with a destination outside the EC,
- travel originating in a non-EC country but with a destination within the EC,
- travel originating in a non-EC country with a destination in another non-EC country, but advertized within the EC (e.g. travel from America to Australia advertized within the EC).

The Committee is concerned that, if this subject is not clarified, there is a risk of distortion of competition.

### 2.2. Article 2

- a) The Committee agrees with the definitions of 'package', 'retailer', 'consumer' and 'the contract'.
- b) The Committee is not satisfied with the definition of the term 'organizer' as it does not include non-professional organizers such as private clubs, as is indicated by the phrase in the definition that the organizer is 'the person who in the course of his business organizes the package ...'. The fact that this definition is that used in the Brussels Convention of 1970 is counterbalanced by the fact that this Convention has only been ratified by two Member States (Belgium and Italy) and is described in the original Commission Guidelines on tourism as 'inadequate'. The Committee would like to see this definition re-examined. Further, the words 'to the public generally' should be deleted as they would exclude from the scope of the Directive package tours marketed to particular age or interest groups.
- c) The Committee also suggests that the Commission consider preparing and including a definition of

'destination', which would cover the total of welcome services provided at the place to which the tourist/consumer is travelling.

### 2.3. Article 3

2.3.1. The Committee considers that the proposed Directive should make it clear whether it applies to all package tours whether publicly advertized or not.

2.3.2. Where the package tour is advertized the Committee regards it as necessary for the Member States to ensure that all descriptive matter published or publicized by the organizer or the retailer concerning a package holiday etc. is legible, understandable and accurate and contains the necessary clear up-to-date information specified in paragraphs (a) to (f) of this Article. Any exceptional obligations for tourists (e.g. on the admission of pets) should also be specified. The Committee regards tourist organizations and the relevant interest groups, including consumer organizations, as well as governments, as the most suitable bodies to check on such descriptive matter. As far as TV publicity is concerned, the Committee requests the Commission to examine the legal implications of selling package travel by teleshopping and specifically in the context of its previous work on doorstep selling.

### 2.4. Article 4(3)

2.4.1. This paragraph provides for the transfer of bookings from one consumer to another for certain specified 'serious reasons' (such as sickness and bereavement).

However, the Committee is of the opinion that it should be possible to transfer bookings from one tourist/consumer to another provided that all additional costs actually incurred are compensated for.

### 2.5. Article (4)(a)

Under the heading 'Exchange rates', the Committee is aware that tourist/consumers feel particularly aggrieved in respect of price increases due to exchange rate and rises in fuel costs and notes that these are never applied in the consumer's favour. It urges the Commission to reexamine this subject and put forward proposals to ensure greater transparency and equitable solutions for both organizer/retailer and tourist/consumer. Perhaps the use of the ECU as a basis might offer a solution.

### 2.6. Article 4(5)

2.6.1. As indicated in paragraph 2.5 the Committee believes that price increases are rarely if ever justifiable and would expect some modification of item (a) in the

light of the Commission's further examination of the matter.

2.6.2. Item (b) should be worded in a less general way and should permit the consumer to withdraw from the contract if changes are made prior to departure and without his consent to important clauses of the contract, such as departure or return dates, the departure airport or the resort or hotel category originally booked.

2.6.3. The Committee agrees with clause (c) whereby the consumer is entitled to withdraw without penalty from the contract 'if there is an unreasonable delay in departure, howsoever caused, otherwise than by his own fault'. However it will be necessary for Member States' legislation, and therefore for the Council Directive, to stipulate more precisely the manner in which this principle should be applied. Possibly a delay in departure in excess of 24 hours would be sufficient to justify withdrawal from the contract while delays of between 12 and 24 hours might be the subject of monetary compensation. The Committee recognizes that this may be to the disadvantage of the organizer, but considers that in such circumstances the organizer should be enabled to claim against the carrier.

Also, the Commission would need to check the wording of the Article in the different language versions. In some, the word 'unreasonable' appears as 'unjustifiable'.

## 2.7. Article 4(6)

### 2.7.1. First indent

This indent should be revised to read as follows (revision in bold type):

'If the ... organizer cancels the package before the agreed date of departure, the consumer is entitled **at his option:** ...'

### 2.7.2. Article 4(6) (II)

*Force majeure* has little significance in the laws of the Member States and must be defined in the Directive.

### 2.7.3. Article 4 (8)

The following phrase should be inserted as subparagraph (8) at the end of Article 4:

'That there should be a recognized scale of compensation, within agreed Community limits, due to the traveller if changes are made to booked arrangements and that the scale should be published in the brochure.'

## 2.8. Article 5(2)

### 2.8.1. Article 5

The Committee welcomes the proposal that tour operators accept liability and responsibility for the quality of their services as manufacturers and/or retailers already do for their goods.

The Committee recognizes that simple consumer access to justice is essential for the completion of the internal market and notes that the tour operator is in a much stronger position than the individual holiday maker to recover damages from hotels or transport carriers, particularly where health and safety are concerned.

2.8.2. The Committee nonetheless feels that Article 5(2) should make it clear to the consumers where liability lies in individual cases.

Further, the Committee regrets that neither in Article 5 nor in the explanatory memorandum does the Commission address the important associated questions of limitation of liability (whether by reference to the contract of carriage or a single maximum figure) and the relevance or otherwise of fault or negligence on the part of the tour operator or his subcontractors.

2.8.3. Under Article 5, 'Commentary on the Articles', it is stated that an organizer is expected to use 'proper care and skill' in selecting an agent in a non-EEC country. In some cases the organizer may be limited in his choice (e.g. Intourist in USSR) and it is not clear from the Directive what remedies an EC organizer would have against such an organization.

## 2.9. Article 6

2.9.1. The Committee recognizes that the concept behind Article 6 providing for the redress of consumers' complaints was originally suggested by the Committee itself in an earlier Opinion.

2.9.2. On reflexion, however, the Committee now feels that a corresponding right of defence should be allowed to the organizer/retailer, and asks the Commission to put forward proposals for international arbitration, perhaps through an independent ombudsman which would be available to both sides in a dispute, but nevertheless taking into account existing arbitration procedures at Member State level, and recommending that local tourist authorities should be extended or established to investigate complaints. However, the Committee would stress that the individual traveller should not be placed at a disadvantage by limited financial resources.

## 2.10. Article 7

2.10.1. The Committee welcomes the proposal in Article 7 that Member States shall ensure that organ-

izers cover by insurance that part of their liability which is insurable.

Could the Commission define more precisely what is or is not insurable and what is the position of the organizer in respect of the non-insurable part of his liability?

2.11. (a) The Committee points out that package travel has developed into a major business because it gives value for money over a range of options; it should continue to flourish if it continues to give good value and be well organized.

(b) The Committee notes that the Commission estimates the cost of insuring for liability under the current proposal is minimal but points out that while consumers may be willing to pay such minimal additional charges

necessary to cover essential consumer protection, there is as yet no recognized standard as to what constitutes 'minimal' cost. The Commission should investigate this matter further before taking definite conclusions.

2.12. The Committee recognizes the possibility that package travel might price itself out of the market by excessive increases in costs which might restrict tourism within the Community and have the effect of diverting mass tourism away from the EEC to destinations outside the Community, but does not consider this an argument for depriving the tourist/consumer of the protection envisaged in the current proposal.

2.13. Finally, the Committee hopes that the actions envisaged during the forthcoming European tourism year will lead to greater transparency for consumer problems and to their eventual solution.

Done at Brussels, 23 February 1989.

*The Chairman  
of the Economic and Social Committee*

Alberto MASPRONE

---



**Opinion on the proposal for a Council Regulation (EEC) amending Regulation (EEC) No 486/85 on the arrangements applicable to agricultural products and certain goods resulting from the processing of agricultural products originating in the African, Caribbean and Pacific States (ACP) or in the overseas countries and territories <sup>(1)</sup>**

(89/C 102/16)

On 14 December 1988 the Council decided to consult the Economic and Social Committee under Article 198 of the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community, on the abovementioned proposal.

The Economic and Social Committee decided to appoint Mr Clavel as rapporteur-general with the task of preparing its work on the subject.

At its 263rd plenary session (meeting of 23 February 1989) the Economic and Social Committee adopted the following Opinion unanimously.

The Committee approves the Commission proposal.

It would, however, point out that the difference between the producer price and the consumer price in the EEC means that it is doubtful whether exemption from duties (loss of revenue for the EEC) will lead to a lower price which encourages consumption or establishes a preference for ACP products.

Done at Brussels, 23 February 1989.

*The Chairman  
of the Economic and Social Committee*

Alberto MASPRONE

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 4, 6. 1. 1989, p. 7.

**EUROPEAN FOUNDATION FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF LIVING AND WORKING  
CONDITIONS**

**NEW TECHNOLOGY IN MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY**

This information brochure is based on 26 case-studies conducted in Belgium, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Italy and the United Kingdom on behalf of the European Foundation. The studies concentrate on the following areas:

- technological state of development of CNC machines, CAD/CAM systems and the degree of integration of design, planning and manufacturing;
- extent of introduction of integrated CAD/CAM systems;
- potential impact on manufacturing industry in economic and organizational terms;
- impact on the interaction between man, machine and work organization;
- development of a dynamic staff policy within the company, and its connection with training, skills and career development;
- impact on the 'users' of the system, and the interaction between those users;
- impact on employment in manufacturing industry.

56 pp.

Published in: ES, DA, DE, GR, EN, FR, IT, NL, PT.

Catalogue number: SY-50-87-291-EN-C      ISBN: 92-825-7804-6

Price (excluding VAT) in Luxembourg:

ECU 4,60      IRL 3,60      UKL 3,20      USD 5,20      BFR 200



OFFICE FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES  
L-2985 Luxembourg