

Public Consultation on the EU environment policy priorities for 2020: Towards a 7th EU Environment Action Programme

The purpose of this consultation is to collect the views of all stakeholders, at EU and national level, and the public at large on the environment policy priorities up to 2020. Informed opinions are sought on the priority areas to be addressed and on the most effective tools for the EU to employ in addressing the challenges described in this consultation document.

The European Commission has consulted stakeholders recently on a number of themes addressed in the background document of this consultation, including resource efficiency, 2050 low-carbon economy, biodiversity, water, air and sustainable consumption and production. Although some overlap between these various consultations is inevitable, in order to avoid duplication the questions set out in the questionnaire are deliberately broad and strategic in nature.

Please read carefully **the background document** before filling in the questionnaire. Only one reply per organisation is accepted.

The questionnaire needs to be filled in on-line in one single session. This means that the respondent cannot save incomplete questionnaires. We strongly recommend to first save the questionnaire text, in order to examine the questions and elaborate the replies before starting an on-line session. The full questionnaire can be seen **here**.

Please note that after 90 minutes of inactivity the session will automatically expire and the replies will be lost.

Most questions adopt a “multiple choice” approach. In most cases, the respondent is requested to express his/her opinion on a graduated scale concerning levels of agreements, importance or expected effectiveness of policy options. In these cases, the respondent is invited to fill in all the options that a question proposes.

The questionnaire also includes some open questions, for which a limit in length (number of characters) is foreseen.

Enjoy the questionnaire and thank you for your input.

Questions marked with an asterisk * require an answer to be given.

1. Identification

Please answer the following questions about your profile.

1.1. Are you answering as an individual or on behalf of an organisation or institution? *

- ☐ I am answering as an individual
- ☐ I am answering on behalf of an organisation or institution (business, NGO, public authority,...)



1.2. Please enter your name *



1.3. Please select the option which best describes your organisation. *


- ☐ company/business association
- ☐ trade union
- ☐ law firm/consultancy
- ☐ national public authority
- ☐ regional/local public authority
- ☐ international organisation
- ☐ non-governmental organisation/association of NGOs
- ☐ think-tank
- ☐ academic organisation/association of academic organisations
- ☐ representative of religions, churches and communities of conviction
- ☐ other type of organisation



1.4. Please enter the name of your organisation. *


1.5. Please enter your e-mail address.

*

 1.6. Are you answering on behalf of an EU-wide organisation? *

☐ Yes

☐ No

 1.7. Please select your country from the list below *

☐ Austria

☐ Ireland

☐ Slovakia

☐ Belgium

☐ Italy

☐ Spain

☐ Bulgaria

☐ Latvia

☐ United Kingdom

☐ Cyprus

☐ Lithuania

☐ Croatia

☐ Czech Republic

☐ Luxembourg

☐ Iceland

☐ Denmark

☐ Malta

☐ Montenegro

☐ Estonia

☐ Netherlands

☐ Former Yugoslav Republic of
Macedonia

☐ Finland

☐ Poland

☐ Serbia

☐ France

☐ Portugal

☐ Turkey

☐ Germany

☐ Romania

☐ Other

☐ Greece

☐ Sweden

☐ Hungary

☐ Slovenia

1.8. Unless you specify otherwise, your contribution will be published on the Commission's website together with your identity. Please indicate here if you wish your contribution to be anonymous. *

☐ Make this contribution anonymous.

☐ You can publish this contribution under the name given.

2. Added value of a new EAP and major challenges

Please rank the following statements from 1-6 (1 "I don't agree at all" and 6 "I agree very much")

[illegible]

2.1.6. By providing the long term certainty and a conducive framework for the private sector to invest in resource efficiency, low-carbon technology and eco-innovation

*



2.1.7. By defining a detailed list of actions to be implemented by 2020

*



2.1.8. By establishing environmental priority objectives for inclusion in the monitoring process of the EU semester *



2.1.9. A new EAP has no added value

*



2.2. The final assessment of the 6th EAP has shown that a long term vision for Europe's environment would help in guiding the definition of priority objectives to be achieved by 2020. Bearing in mind the long term visions already set out in the Resource Efficiency Roadmap[1], the 2050 Low-Carbon Roadmap[2] and the EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020 [3], are there any elements you feel are missing?

[1] By 2050 the EU's economy has grown in a way that respects resource constraints and planetary boundaries, thus contributing to global economic transformation. Our economy is competitive, inclusive and provides a high standard of living with much lower environmental impacts. All resources are sustainably managed, from raw materials to energy, water, air, land and soil. Climate change milestones have been reached, while biodiversity and the ecosystem services it underpins have been protected, valued and substantially restored.

[2] By 2050, the EU should cut its domestic greenhouse gas emissions by 80% compared to 1990 and all the sectors of the economy – power sector, industry, transport, agriculture, residential and tertiary should contribute to a varying degree and pace.

[3] By 2050, European Union biodiversity and the ecosystem services it provides — its natural capital — are protected, valued and appropriately restored for biodiversity's intrinsic value and for their essential contribution to human wellbeing and economic prosperity, and so that catastrophic changes caused by the loss of biodiversity are avoided.

*
(maximum 500 characters)

2.3 In your view, how important is it for the EU to address the following environmental challenges?

- a: Very Important
- b: Important
- c: Somewhat Important
- d: Not at all Important
- e: No opinion

	a	b	c	d	e
2.3.1. Unsustainable consumption patterns *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2.3.2. Unsustainable production patterns *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

2.3.3. Resource over-consumption, potential
scarcity and price volatility *



2.3.4. Pollution from hazardous chemicals *



2.3.5. Insufficient water quantity *



2.3.6. Water pollution *



2.3.7. Outdoor air pollution *



2.3.8. Indoor air pollution *



2.3.9. Biodiversity loss and degradation of
ecosystem services *



2.3.10. Deforestation *



2.3.11. Climate change
mitigation/greenhouse gas reductions *



2.3.12. Adaptation to the impacts of climate
change *



2.3.13. Marine pollution *



2.3.14. Marine resource exploitation *



2.3.15. Competing uses of land leading to
environmental degradation *



2.3.16. Soil degradation and pollution *



2.3.17. Generation and proliferation of waste
*



2.3.18. Environmental challenges linked to
food *



2.3.19. Environmental challenges linked to housing*					
2.3.20. Environmental challenges linked to mobility*					
2.3.21. Environmental challenges linked to the urban environment*					
2.3.22. Environmental challenges linked to energy production and use*					
2.3.23. Noise*					
2.3.24. Major industrial accidents*					

2.4 Which of the following best describes what needs to be done as a priority to address each of these challenges?

- a: Fill policy gaps (e.g. through new policy/legislation)
- b: Improve implementation of existing policy and legislation
- c: More use of Market-based Instruments (cap and trade, taxation, subsidies, incentives)
- d: Strengthen mainstreaming of environmental considerations in other policies
- e: No need for further action
- f: No opinion

[illegible]

2.4.5. Insufficient water quantity *



2.4.6. Water pollution *



2.4.7. Outdoor air pollution *



2.4.8. Indoor air pollution *



2.4.9. Biodiversity loss and degradation of ecosystem services *



2.4.10. Deforestation *



2.4.11. Climate change mitigation/greenhouse gas reductions *



2.4.12. Adaptation to the impacts of climate change *



2.4.13. Marine pollution *



2.4.14. Marine resource exploitation *



2.4.15. Competing uses of land leading to environmental degradation *



2.4.16. Soil degradation and pollution *



2.4.17. Generation of proliferation of waste *



2.4.18. Environmental challenges linked to food *



2.4.19. Environmental challenges linked to housing *



2.4.20. Environmental challenges linked to mobility *

2.4.21. Environmental challenges linked to the urban environment *

2.4.22. Environmental challenges linked to energy production and use *

2.4.23. Noise ^{*}

2.4.24. Major industrial accidents

2.5 In your view, which of the following policies hold the greatest potential for improving the quality of the environment? (1 least potential - 5 greatest potential)

- a: 1
- b: 2
- c: 3
- d: 4
- e: 5
- f: No opinion

a b c d e f

2.5.1. Agriculture and rural development policy *

2.5.2. Climate change policy *



2.5.3. Competition policy (state aid) *

2.5.4. Consumers and health policy *



2.5.5. Development cooperation policy *



2.5.6. Economic and financial policy
(including taxation) *

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

2.5.7. Education and culture policy *



2.5.8. Employment policy *



2.5.9. Energy policy *



2.5.10. Enterprise and SMEs policy *



2.5.11. External relations policy *



2.5.12. Maritime and fisheries policy *



2.5.13. Products/services standards *



2.5.14. Public procurement policy *



2.5.15. Regional policy



2.5.16. Research and innovation policy *



2.5.17. Trade policy *



2.5.18. Transport policy *



2.5.19. Other



2.6. If other, please specify (max 100 characters) (maximum 100 characters)

2.7 In your view, which of the following policies hold the greatest potential for contributing to meeting our climate objectives? (1 least potential - 5 greatest potential)

- a: 1
- b: 2
- c: 3
- d: 4
- e: 5
- f: No opinion

[illegible]


2.7.13. Products/services standards *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2.7.14. Public procurement policy *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2.7.15. Regional policy *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2.7.16. Research and innovation policy *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2.7.17. Trade policy *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2.7.18. Transport policy *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2.7.19. Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

2.8. If other, please specify (maximum 100 characters) (maximum 100 characters)
<div></div>


3. New integrated approaches to improve competitiveness and enhance ecological and societal resilience

Food, housing and transport are responsible for more than two-thirds of major worldwide life-cycle environmental pressures from consumption in Europe. (SOER 2010)


3.1. In your view, what are the 3 most important initiatives that should be taken at EU level to reduce the environmental impact of food production and consumption? (maximum 800 characters):* (maximum 800 characters)

A large, empty rectangular text box with a thin grey border, intended for the user's response to question 3.1.

3.2. In your view, what are the 3 most important initiatives that should be taken at EU level to reduce the environmental impact of housing? (maximum 800 characters)* (maximum 800 characters)

A large, empty rectangular text box with a thin grey border, intended for the user's response to question 3.2.

3.3. In your view, what are the 3 most important initiatives that should be taken at EU level to reduce the environmental impact of mobility? (maximum 800 characters)* (maximum 800 characters)

A large, empty rectangular text box with a thin grey border, intended for the user's response to question 3.3.

3.4 Sustainable land use has been identified as a major environmental challenge. In relation to this, how important do you consider the following areas to tackle the issue at EU level?

- a: Very important
- b: Important
- c: Somewhat important
- d: Not at all important
- e: No opinion

	a	b	c	d	e
3.4.1. Desertification *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3.4.2. Deforestation *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3.4.3. Conversion of agricultural land to urban land *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3.4.4. Conversion of grassland to cropland *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3.4.5. Conversion of land for energy crop cultivation *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3.4.6. Other land use changes *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3.4.7. Land fragmentation *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

3.5 In your view, how important are the following additional measures to the Soil Thematic Strategy for reducing, directly or indirectly, soil degradation?

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not at all important	No opinion
3.5.1. Reinforce existing legislation to improve the application of the 'polluter pays' principle to address soil degradation *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3.5.2. Establish a soil monitoring scheme to measure and/or evaluate progress towards less soil degradation *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3.5.3. Set binding targets to reduce soil degradation *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3.5.4. Provide platforms for exchanging best practice *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3.5.5. Promote greater public awareness of the role played by soil as a resource in the environment and the economy *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

3.6 Scientific evidence points to a certain number of environment-related impacts on human health. In your view, how well does EU policy currently address the following environment & health related challenges?

- a: Very well
- b: Well
- c: Somewhat well
- d: Not well at all
- e: No opinion

	a	b	c	d	e
3.6.1. Endocrine disruptors *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3.6.2. Nanomaterials *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3.6.3. Combined effects of chemicals *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3.6.4. Harmful chemicals in products *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3.6.5. Outdoor air pollution *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3.6.6. Indoor air pollution *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3.6.7. Water pollution *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3.6.8. Noise *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3.6.9. Climate change *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3.6.10. Nuclear radiation *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3.6.11. Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

3.7. If other, please specify (maximum 100 characters) (maximum 100 characters)

3.8 In determining whether cities are sustainable, attractive and clean places to live, what is important for you? The list reflects the 12 criteria identified for the **European Green Capital Award**

- a: Very important
- b: Important
- c: Somewhat important
- d: Not at all important
- e: No opinion

	a	b	c	d	e
3.8.1. Local contribution to global climate change *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3.8.2. Local transport *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3.8.3. Green urban areas incorporating sustainable land use *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3.8.4. Nature and biodiversity *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3.8.5. Quality of local ambient air *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3.8.6. Noise pollution *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3.8.7. Waste production and management *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3.8.8. Water consumption *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3.8.9. Waste water treatment *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3.8.10. Eco innovation and sustainable employment *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3.8.11. Environmental management of the local authority *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3.8.12. Energy performance *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

4. Making Change Happen

4.1. In your view, does the type of EU climate and environment legislation (Regulations, which have direct effect, vs. Directives, which need to be transposed into national law) make a difference in terms of delivering environmental benefits, and if so, why? (max 800 characters) *

(maximum 800 characters)

4.2. On a scale of 1-5 (1=least, 5=most), how would you rate the usefulness of increasing the information being actively disseminated on-line by Member States and the Commission and how EU environment legislation is being implemented? *

☐ 1

☐ 2

☐ 3

☐ 4

☐ 5

4.3 What contribution do you think the following could make at EU level to strengthen the correct implementation of EU environment law by Member States and ensure a level playing field?

- a: Very significant
- b: Significant
- c: Somewhat significant
- d: Not significant
- e: No opinion

	a	b	c	d	e
4.3.1. More extensive criteria on how Member States should undertake inspections and surveillance *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4.3.2. Complementing national inspections and surveillance with enhanced capacity at EU level to ensure consistency and effectiveness of implementation *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4.3.3. Criteria on complaint-handling systems in each Member State or similar alternative dispute resolution mechanisms *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4.3.4. Legislation to ensure better access to national courts *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4.3.5. Support for experts' networks, e.g. inspectors, prosecutors and judges to share best practice and develop projects of common interest *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4.3.6. Implementation plans that target resources at solving environmental problems *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

4.4. Science provides the evidence-base underpinning the development and implementation of climate and environment policy. On a scale of 1-5 (1= insufficient, 5=excellent), how would you rate the environmental data currently available to you? *

<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	<input type="radio"/> No opinion
-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------------------

4.5 How would you consider the potential of the following measures to strengthen the knowledge base for environment policy?

a: Very high potential

b: High potential


c: Some potential

d: Low potential

e: No opinion

	a	b	c	d	e
4.5.1. Give to citizens a greater role in monitoring environmental data (e.g. through new media tools such as 'eye on earth') *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4.5.2. Improve data collection on and analysis of compliance and enforcement within each Member State *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4.5.3. Improve the science-policy interface and ensure that scientific environmental data are accessible and user-friendly *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4.5.4. Fill existing research gaps (e.g. ecological thresholds, environmental tipping points, impacts of new technologies, etc.) *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4.5.5. Improve knowledge on consumers' perceptions, values and their actual behaviour *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4.5.6. Improve EUs international research cooperation on global environmental issues (i.e. biodiversity, climate change) *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4.5.7. Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

4.6. If other, please specify (max 100 characters) (maximum 100 characters)

A large, empty rectangular box with a thin grey border, intended for the user to specify other information within the 100-character limit.

4.7 How potentially effective do you consider the following initiatives to be in encouraging environmentally-friendly behaviour?

- a: Very effective
- b: Effective
- c: Somewhat effective
- d: Not effective at all
- e: No opinion

	a	b	c	d	e
4.7.1. Provide more detailed information to consumers through more detailed labels *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4.7.2. Increase consumers' education and awareness through general awareness-raising campaigns *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4.7.3. Increase consumers' education and awareness through targeted actions and on-the-spot information *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4.7.4. Provide examples of positive/successful behaviours to consumers *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4.7.5. Reward environmentally-friendly behaviours *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4.7.6. Discourage environmentally-damaging behaviours *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4.7.7. Apply different approaches for each specific context via "behavioural experiments" *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

4.8 How significant do you consider each of the following actions to be for strengthening the external dimension of EU environment policy?

- a: Very significant
- b: Significant
- c: Somewhat significant
- d: Not at all significant
- e: No opinion

	a	b	c	d	e
4.8.1. Strengthening International Environmental Governance *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4.8.2. Strengthening the EU leadership in Multilateral Environmental Agreements *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4.8.3. Leading by example - EU leadership through setting unilateral targets and commitments *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4.8.4. Ensuring that the EU consistently speaks with one voice in international fora *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4.8.5. Enhancing the integration of environment in the EU's external policies *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4.8.6. Promoting EU environmental standards abroad *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4.8.7. Engaging bilaterally with key partners to address global environmental challenges *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4.8.8. Building alliances with other countries in line with our environmental objectives *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4.8.9. Enhancing the effectiveness of environment and climate-related EU development cooperation assistance *	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4.8.10. Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

4.9. If other, please specify (maximum 100 characters) (maximum 100 characters)

4.10. If you have further comments on this consultation or suggestions please write them in the box below (optional) (max 1000 characters) (maximum 1000 characters)

Useful links

European Environment Agency's State of the Environment Report 2010: <http://www.eea.europa.eu/soer>

Commission Communication on the 6th EAP Final Assessment :

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52011DC0531:EN:NOT>

6th EAP external assessment : <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/newprg/final.htm>

Progress Report on the implementation of the European Environment and Health Action Plan 2004-2010:

http://ec.europa.eu/health/healthy_environments/policy/health_environment/actionplan_en.htm

Europe 2020 Strategy : http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/index_en.htm

Roadmap for a 7th Environment Action Programme :

http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/planned_ia/docs/2012_env_013_7th_environmental_action_programme_en.pdf

2011 stakeholder consultation meeting on the final assessment of the 6th Environment Action Programme and the next steps : http://ec.europa.eu/environment/newprg/consult_2011.htm

Background documents

7EAP background consultation document in EN: http://www.ec.europa.eu/environment/consultations/7eap_en.htm