

Tilburg University

Failure to transpose, quality of fresh waters needing protection or improvement in order to support fish life, quality required of shellfish waters

Somsen, H.

Publication date:
1997

[Link to publication in Tilburg University Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Somsen, H., (1997). *Failure to transpose, quality of fresh waters needing protection or improvement in order to support fish life, quality required of shellfish waters*, No. C-298/95, 4 p., Dec 12, 1996. (European Environmental Law Review; Vol. 6, No. p. 91-94).

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

ECJ Case Reports

Case C-298/95, Commission v Federal Republic of Germany: Failure to fulfil obligations; failure to transpose Directives 78/659/EEC and 79/923/EEC within the periods prescribed; quality of fresh waters needing protection or improvement in order to support fish life; quality required of shellfish waters; 12 December 1996 (not yet reported)

Judgment

By application lodged at the Court Registry on 15 September 1995, the Commission of the European Communities brought an action under Article 169 of the EC Treaty for a declaration that, by failing to adopt within the periods prescribed all the measures necessary to comply with Articles 3 and 5 of Council Directive 78/659/EEC of 18 July 1978 on the quality of fresh waters needing protection or improvement in order to support fish life (OJ 1978 L 222/1), and Articles 3 and 5 of Council Directive 79/923/EEC of 30 October 1979 on the quality required of shellfish waters (OJ 1979 L 281/47), the Federal Republic of Germany has failed to fulfil its obligations under the EC Treaty.

The aim of Directive 78/659 is to protect or improve the quality of those running or standing fresh waters which support or which, if pollution were reduced or eliminated, would become capable of supporting fish belonging to certain species.

According to Article 1(1) thereof, the directive applies to those waters designated by the Member States as needing such protection or improvement. Article 4(1) required Member States to designate salmonid and cyprinid waters, initially within a two-year period following notification of the directive. Member States were also required, under Article 3, to set, for the designated waters, values for the physical and chemical parameters listed in Annex I which were to be not less stringent than those listed in column I (mandatory values) of that annex, and to endeavour to respect the values in column G (guide values) of that annex. Member States were also required, under Article 5, to establish programmes to reduce pollution and to ensure that designated waters would, within five years following their designation, conform to the values which they had set for the parameters. Finally, Articles 6 and 7 of Directive 78/659 state the frequency with which samples should be taken, where samples should be taken, and the analysis method for determining whether designated waters comply with those parameters.

Under Article 17 of Directive 78/659, Member States were required to bring into force the laws, regulations and administrative provisions necessary to comply with the directive within two years of its notification and forthwith to inform the Commission thereof. Since Directive 78/659 was notified on 20 July 1978, that period expired on 20 July 1980.

Directive 79/923, according to Article 1 thereof, seeks to protect and improve the quality of coastal and brackish waters in order to support shellfish life and growth, and thus to contribute to the high quality of shellfish products directly edible by man.

ECJ Case Reports

Articles 3 to 5 of Directive 79/923 transposed to shellfish waters, *mutatis mutandis*, the provisions contained in Articles 3 to 5 of Directive 78/659, described above, with the exceptions of Article 3(3), concerning certain effluents discharged into the aquatic environment, and Article 5, which allowed Member States a period of six years, instead of five, to ensure that designated waters conformed to the values set by Member States for the parameters indicated in the annex to Directive 79/923.

Under Article 15, Member States were required to bring into force the laws, regulations and administrative provisions necessary to comply with the directive within two years of its notification and forthwith to inform the Commission thereof. Since the directive was notified on 5 November 1979, that period expired on 5 November 1981.

Since it took the view that, according to the information available to it, the Federal Republic of Germany had not taken all the measures necessary to transpose Articles 3, 4, 5 and 7(1) of Directive 78/659 and Articles 3, 4 and 5 of Directive 79/923, the Commission, on 21 April 1992, gave the German Government notice to submit its observations within a period of two months.

By letter of 9 September 1992, the German Government put in issue the need to transpose the directives by formal legislation and the obligation to draw up specific programmes for protecting the waters concerned. It also requested an additional period for designating waters and provided further information concerning the sampling provided for by Directive 78/659.

The Commission took the view that those explanations did not alter its position regarding the alleged infringements and so, on 13 January 1994, it sent to the German Government a reasoned opinion requesting it to adopt all the measures necessary to comply with Articles 3, 4, 5 and 7(1) of Directive 78/659 and Articles 3, 4 and 5 of Directive 79/923, within a period of two months.

In a letter of 3 May 1994, the German Government accepted that it was necessary to transpose Articles 3 and 4 of the directives by means of binding legislation, and notified the measures adopted by a number of *Länder* to transpose those provisions and designate the waters supporting fish life, together with sampling data. However, the German Government continued to insist that it was not necessary to adopt specific programmes under Article 5 of the two directives.

Although it decided to abandon its allegations of breach of Article 4 of Directives 78/659 and 79/923 and of Article 7(1) of Directive 78/659, the Commission considered that it still did not have the information which would allow it to conclude that the Federal Republic of Germany had adopted the measures necessary to transpose Articles 3 and 5 of Directives 78/659 and 79/923. It was in those circumstances that the Commission decided to bring this action.

Article 3 of Directives 78/659 and 79/923

The Federal Republic of Germany did not deny that transposition of Article 3 of Directives 78/659 and 79/923, which, under the division of State powers, is the responsibility of the *Länder*, had not been accomplished in Germany by means of binding legislation, but pointed out that transposition was under way. The executive authorities of the *Länder*, which must be empowered by the legislatures to

adopt transposing regulations, had already been so empowered in six out of the sixteen *Länder*. A draft standard regulation transposing Directive 78/659 had also been drawn up for the *Länder*.

The Federal Republic of Germany also rejected the Commission's assertion that non-implementation of the measures required by Directives 78/659 and 79/923 could endanger human health. It maintained that there was no such danger in Germany since limit values for permitted residues were set in the Regulation of 1 September 1994 adopted pursuant to the *Lebensmittel- und Bedarfsgegenstandesgesetz* (German Law on Foodstuffs and Essential Commodities), as amended on 8 July 1993, and these determine whether or not fish from waterways are fit for consumption.

The Court noted that, as the Commission had pointed out, one of the purposes of the directives at issue is to protect human health through the monitoring of the quality of waters which support, or could support, fish suitable for human consumption, such as salmon, trout, pike or eel, mentioned in Article 1(4) of Directive 78/659, or shellfish "directly edible by man" in the words of Article 1 of Directive 79/923.

It emphasised that, in those circumstances, it was particularly important that directives should be transposed by measures which are indisputably binding. In all cases where non-implementation of the measures required by a directive could endanger human health, the persons concerned had to be in a position to rely on mandatory rules in order to be able to assert their rights (see, to this effect, Case C-361/88 *Commission v Germany* [1991] ECR I-2567, paragraph 16, Case C-59/89, *Commission v Germany* [1991] ECR I-2607, paragraph 19, and Case C-58/89, *Commission v Germany* [1991] ECR I-4983, paragraph 14).

In the present case, even if the amounts of residue permitted in foodstuffs were, under other national legislative provisions, subject to limit values, the Federal Republic of Germany had failed to demonstrate that, in the event of non-implementation of the measures required by Directives 78/659 and 79/923, consumption of fish or shellfish would not present any danger for human health.

In all events, as regards the procedural difficulties relied on by the German Government to explain the delay in transposing Directives 78/659 and 79/923, it was sufficient to recall that, as the Court had held repeatedly, a Member State may not plead provisions, practices or circumstances existing in its internal legal system in order to justify a failure to comply with the obligations and time limits laid down in a directive (see, in particular, Case C-47/94 *Commission v Spain* [1995] ECR I-1015, paragraph 5, Case C-259/94 *Commission v Greece* [1995] ECR I-1947, paragraph 5, and Case C-253/95 *Commission v Germany* [1996] ECR I-2423, paragraph 12).

It had accordingly to be held that, by failing to adopt within the periods prescribed all the measures necessary to comply with Article 3 of Directives 78/659 and 79/923, the Federal Republic of Germany had failed to fulfil its obligations under the Treaty.

Article 5 of Directives 78/659 and 79/923

As regards Directive 78/659, the German Government submitted that the action programmes existing in the *Länder*

ECJ Case Reports

since the mid-1950s for reducing water pollution were purification programmes which improve the quality of waters and could therefore be recognised as conforming to Article 5 of Directive 78/659. According to the German Government, protection of the quality of fresh waters supporting fish life could not be considered in isolation, but was part of the overall objective of protecting the quality of all waters, an objective pursued in Germany by the preventive and general establishment of minimum Federal standards designed to reduce pollution of water caused by effluent. The German Government added that, over the past two decades, the *Länder* had implemented those standards by adopting well-funded action programmes which had been particularly effective, as was evidenced by a significant improvement in the quality of fresh waters in Germany, particularly those covered by Directive 78/659, between 1976 and 1990.

As regards Directive 79/923, the German Government took the view that it was likewise unnecessary to establish specific programmes for reducing pollution, as the monitoring regularly carried out in the five zones requiring protection for shellfish waters along the North Sea showed that the parameters of the directive were being complied with and that purification measures were unnecessary. Transposition in the proper form was, however, planned or already under way in those *Länder* which have shellfish waters.

The Court noted that, it had to be held, first, that Article 5 of Directives 78/659 and 79/923 lay down an obligation for Member States to establish programmes in order to reduce pollution and to ensure that the designated waters conform, within, respectively, five and six years following their designation, to both the values set for the parameters indicated in the respective annexes and the notes contained in columns G and I thereof.

As the Advocate General had observed in point 17 of his Opinion, Directives 78/659 and 79/923 set out, in their respective annexes, some 14 and 12 precise physical and chemical parameters for which Member States set values. Article 6 of each of those directives also determines, for the purpose of implementing Article 5, the percentages of samples which must comply with those values in order for the designated waters to be regarded as satisfying the directives' requirements.

It followed clearly from the wording of Article 5 of Directives 78/659 and 79/923, as well as from the detailed arrangements for monitoring water quality laid down by those directives, that Member States have an obligation to establish specific programmes in order to reduce pollution of fresh waters and shellfish waters within five and six years respectively.

As regards Directive 78/659, general water purification programmes, such as those relied on by the German Government, could not therefore be regarded as constituting an adequate transposition of Article 5.

The Court also stressed that the objective of reducing water pollution caused by effluent pursued by such general programmes does not necessarily correspond to the more specific objective of Directive 78/659, which is to improve the quality of fresh waters in order to support fish life.

As regards Directive 79/923, the fact that shellfish waters meet the requirements of the directive, as the German

Government had claimed, likewise could not exempt it from the obligation to establish specific programmes in accordance with Article 5 of that directive.

The results notified by the German Government relate to samples taken only in the *Land* of Lower Saxony in 1991 and provided no evidence whatever that the shellfish waters in the *Länder* concerned meet the requirements of Directive 79/923.

In any event, the fact that samples taken in a single *Land* at a particular time meet the requirements of Directive 79/923 could not release a Member State from the obligation under Article 5 of that directive to establish specific programmes applicable to all designated shellfish waters, with the aim of reducing pollution in those waters within six years.

It therefore had to be held that, by failing to adopt within the periods prescribed all the measures necessary to comply with Article 3 of Directives 78/659 and 79/923, the Federal Republic of Germany had failed to fulfil its obligations under the Treaty. On those grounds, the Court (Fifth Chamber):

Declared that, by failing to adopt within the periods prescribed all the measures necessary to comply with Articles 3 and 5 of Council Directive 78/659/EEC of 18 July 1978 on the quality of fresh waters needing protection or improvement in order to support fish life and with Articles 3 and 5 of Council Directive 79/923/EEC of 30 October 1979 on the quality required of shellfish waters, the Federal Republic of Germany had failed to fulfil its obligations under the EC Treaty;

Ordered the Federal Republic of Germany to pay the costs.

Comment

All three cases deal with instances where Member States have failed to adopt the necessary formal measures (laws, regulations or administrative action) to comply with EC environmental directives. There already exists an abundance of case law establishing beyond doubt that the requirement formally to implement EC environmental directives by means of formal and binding national laws is a strict one. Administrative practice, for example, even if of a relatively formal nature and accompanied by some procedural guarantees, will not normally pass this stringent test (see, for example, Case C-361/88 [1991] ECR I-2567 and Case C-59/89 [1991] ECR I-2607). It is not surprising, therefore, that *a fortiori*, the complete absence of national implementing rules is not tolerated by the Court, as becomes particularly clear from the judgments against Belgium.

The Court's justification for what has sometimes been considered an unacceptable encroachment on Article 189 – which, after all, appears to leave Member States rather more discretion in choosing “forms and methods” of implementing rules – is the principle of legal certainty and the legal protection of individuals. Thus, especially in the case of directives which have as one of their objectives the protection of human health – which, as a quick examination of EC environmental laws shows, is the case with a large proportion of EC environmental law – individuals should be in a position to enforce such norms in their national courts by relying on national implementing rules.

ECJ Case Reports

This consideration is also relevant in the case of the shellfish and fresh water fish directives, which seek to protect not only the species concerned, but also human health. The mere fact that the directives are complied with in practice (which the Court in any event refused to accept on the basis of data collected in merely one *Land*) does not free the national administration from adopting clear and precise implementing rules.

This is not to say that such national implementing rules become less important when no individual rights such as health are at stake. In the context of the implementation of Directive 79/409 on the protection of wild birds, for example, the Court has on numerous occasions reiterated that faithful implementation becomes especially important in cases where Member States are entrusted with the protection of the common heritage. Precise national

implementing rules are important in these cases, *inter alia*, to avoid the granting of derogations from the prohibition on killing wild birds on a wider scale than foreseen by the directive.

It is only when no (proper) national implementing rules exist that the doctrine of direct effect and non-contractual State liability may become important. In this context, too, the distinction between directives which address human health issues (and hence are clearly intended to endow individuals with rights) and those which are predominantly intended to preserve or protect the environment may not be without significance, given the importance of the notion of "individual rights" in both the doctrine of direct effect and – in particular – the doctrine of non-contractual State liability (see, Somsen, H, *Protecting the European Environment: Enforcing EC Environmental Law*, Blackstone Press, 1996).