



House of Commons

Environment, Food and Rural  
Affairs Committee

---

**Marine Environment:  
Government Reply to  
the Committee's  
Report**

---

**Tenth Report of Session 2003–2004**





House of Commons  
Environment, Food and Rural  
Affairs Committee

---

# Marine Environment: Government Reply to the Committee's Report

---

**Tenth Report of Session 2003–2004**

*Report, together with formal minutes*

*Ordered by The House of Commons  
to be printed 16 June 2004*

## Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Committee

The Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Committee is appointed by the House of Commons to examine the expenditure, administration, and policy of the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs and its associated bodies.

### Current membership

Mr Michael Jack (*Conservative, Fylde*) (Chairman)  
Ms Candy Atherton (*Labour, Falmouth and Camborne*)  
Mr Colin Breed (*Liberal Democrat, South East Cornwall*)  
David Burnside (*Ulster Unionist, South Antrim*)  
Mr David Drew (*Labour, Stroud*)  
Patrick Hall (*Labour, Bedford*)  
Mr Mark Lazarowicz (*Labour/Co-op, Edinburgh North and Leith*)  
Mr David Lepper (*Labour, Brighton Pavilion*)  
Mr Ian Liddell-Grainger (*Conservative, Bridgwater*)  
Mr Austin Mitchell (*Labour, Great Grimsby*)  
Diana Organ (*Labour, Forest of Dean*)  
Joan Ruddock (*Labour, Lewisham Deptford*)  
Mrs Gillian Shephard (*Conservative, South West Norfolk*)  
Alan Simpson (*Labour, Nottingham South*)  
David Taylor (*Labour, North West Leicestershire*)  
Paddy Tipping (*Labour, Sherwood*)  
Mr Bill Wiggin (*Conservative, Leominster*)

### Powers

The Committee is one of the departmental select committees, the powers of which are set out in House of Commons Standing Orders, principally in SO No. 152. These are available on the Internet via [www.parliament.uk](http://www.parliament.uk).

### Publications

The Reports and evidence of the Committee are published by The Stationery Office by Order of the House. All publications of the Committee (including press notices) are on the Internet at

[www.parliament.uk/parliamentary\\_committees/environment\\_\\_food\\_and\\_rural\\_affairs.cfm](http://www.parliament.uk/parliamentary_committees/environment__food_and_rural_affairs.cfm).

A list of Reports of the Committee in the present Parliament is at the back of this Report.

### Committee staff

The current staff of the Committee are Gavin Devine (Clerk), Fiona McLean (Second Clerk), Dr Kate Trumper and Jonathan Little (Committee Specialists), Andy Boyd and Louise Combs (Committee Assistants), Anne Woolhouse (Secretary) and Rebecca Flynn (Intern).

### Contacts

All correspondence should be addressed to the Clerk of the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Committee, House of Commons, 7 Millbank, London SW1P 3JA. The telephone number for general enquiries is 020 7219 3262; the Committee's e-mail address is: [efracom@parliament.uk](mailto:efracom@parliament.uk).

# Contents

---

<b>Report</b>	<i>Page</i>
<b>1 Report</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2 Appendix</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Formal minutes</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Reports from the Committee since 2001</b>	<b>16</b>



# 1 Report

---

1. The Committee published its report into the Marine Environment on 21 March 2004.<sup>1</sup> The Government reply was received on 24 May. Usually we would publish the reply as a Special Report, without comment. In this case, however, we have decided that to do so would not be appropriate.

2. We are extremely disappointed by the Government's response. We undertook a lengthy inquiry and published a report which made a number of important recommendations. We regret that the Government's response does not represent a serious attempt to advance policy in this area. **We invite the Government to reconsider its response, and to provide us with a more substantive document within six weeks. It should set out a more robust and urgent policy for dealing with the problems faced by the marine environment.**

---

<sup>1</sup> Sixth Report, HC (2003-04) 76





# Appendix: Government response

---

## Introduction

The Government welcomes this report. It has raised awareness of the threats that the marine environment faces and has added momentum to the Government's Marine Stewardship initiative. The Committee's report will help to determine next steps once a number of key reviews are completed, notably the Review of Marine Nature Conservation and the Review of Development in Marine and Coastal Waters.

The Committee has rightly noted that the issues surrounding marine environmental policy are varied and complex. This holds true both from the conservation perspective and in terms of sustainable development and management of the seas. In particular, the current regulatory and institutional regime is intricate and fragmented. In addition, relatively little is known about the marine environment compared with the terrestrial environment.

Several Government Departments and the devolved administrations have responsibility for activities that take place at sea. This response has been agreed with other Government departments with an interest in the marine environment and the devolved administrations.

## Conclusions and Recommendations

### Recommendation 1

**In view of the delays in concluding the Review of Development in Marine and Coastal Waters, the Marine Environment High Risk Areas exercise and other initiatives, and given the need for urgent action, the Government should immediately publish a timetable for the delivery of the reviews and other initiatives it has underway. (Paragraph 41)**

The Government recognises the need for urgent action and the importance of targets and timescales against which progress can be measured. Annex A to Defra's written evidence to the Committee set out the targets and timescales the Government is working to for a large number of key initiatives and reviews. This updated the targets and timescales set out in the first Marine Stewardship Report and recorded progress made since publication of the report in May 2002.

The Government does not propose to publish a more detailed timetable for delivery to that which it submitted in its evidence. It would rather focus on concluding the reviews and initiatives currently underway. The Government acknowledges that there have been delays to some, but not all, initiatives. This has meant that progress has not been as quick in some areas as the Government would have liked. These delays reflect the complexity of the reviews and initiatives underway, unforeseen circumstances and competing priorities, and the need to consult stakeholders.

Work is proceeding on a further draft of a document which will announce the location of the Marine Environmental High Risk Areas (MEHRAs) and consult on proposals for protective measures associated with the MEHRAs. The Government expects to issue this document in July. The Government will make an announcement on the direction of longer-term reform of the current consenting regime as part of its Review of Development of Marine and Coastal Waters as soon as this has been agreed interdepartmentally.

In addition, the Irish Sea Pilot project undertaken as a key element of the Review of Marine Nature Conservation has been completed on schedule. The intention is to publish the final report of the Review of Marine Nature Conservation Working Group, and submit it to Government, around the end of June.

## **Recommendation 2**

**The Government should review the international agreements on the marine environment to which the United Kingdom is a signatory to ensure that they are not just fine words but that they contain practical measures that contracting parties will implement. (Paragraph 42)**

The Government attaches considerable importance to ensuring that the international agreements it signs up to contain practical steps to deliver tangible outcomes. For example, the UK has implemented numerous decisions and recommendations through the OSPAR Commission for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North East Atlantic to help meet the goals of OSPAR's longer-term strategies. OSPAR's current work programme was submitted as evidence to the Committee.

In addition, the Government has prepared a delivery plan to meet the commitments and targets on oceans that were agreed at the World Summit on Sustainable Development. Further, the Seventh Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) met in February and agreed a decision on marine and coastal biodiversity. This was accompanied by a specific and detailed work programme to turn the commitments made into firm outcomes.

The Government keeps progress made through all marine conventions to which it is a Party under review. A review along the lines of those suggested by the Committee would be a useful exercise, not least to check that the commitments that emerge from different international fora are consistent. However, it would be resource-intensive and divert resources away from implementing measures to deliver the commitments made at international environment meetings. Consequently the Government does not propose to undertake such a review in the short term.

## **Recommendation 3**

**As soon as possible after the conclusion of the two marine reviews now underway, the Government should produce a paper outlining what changes are needed to the present**

**regime, and to what extent these changes can be made within the framework of existing legislation. If the changes cannot be made within the existing framework, the Government should publish a consultation paper exploring the desirability of a Marine Act. (Paragraph 43)**

The Government agrees with the thrust of this recommendation. The Government is committed to consulting on its recommendations from the Review of Development in Marine and Coastal Waters. It will also publish a formal response to the recommendations of the Review of Marine Nature Conservation. Both reviews are examining whether new arrangements, including new legislation, are required to deliver the Government's vision for the marine environment.

The Government will take a decision on whether new legislation is needed, and what form this should take, once it has seen the recommendations of these reviews. If these reviews conclude that new legislation is required, a comprehensive Marine Bill would be one option that the Government would want to consider. The Government would wish to consult on any proposed changes before bringing forward any legislation.

#### **Recommendation 4**

**At present, the different Departments involved do not appear to have a common approach to sustainable development in the marine environment and there is no formal arrangement allowing them to come together. Given the complexity of this area of policy, the Government should put in place a clearly defined co-ordinating mechanism to bring together, on a regular basis, the key parties with a role in protecting the marine environment. Ideally, there should be a Cabinet sub-committee to deal with marine issues. The Government should consider whether a co-ordinating agency should be established to ensure that the links are made between all the many activities that may affect the marine environment. (Paragraph 44)**

In May 1999, the Government published *A better quality of life, a strategy for sustainable development for the UK* [Cm 4345]. This was agreed across all Government departments. The strategy identified a set of headline and core indicators to provide an overview for measuring progress in the subsequent annual reports. The baseline assessment of these indicators was made in the quality of life counts in 1999 and was updated this year. It includes five indicators on the seas, oceans and coasts to provide a common approach to measuring progress towards sustainable development in the marine environment. The Government, together with the devolved administrations, published a consultation paper in April to develop an updated sustainable development strategy for the UK.

The Government is of the view that there is an important distinction between a co-ordinating mechanism to bring parties together to discuss issues and a co-ordinating mechanism to take decisions where there is apparent conflict. Many good examples of the former already exist. For example, the Marine Pollution Advisory Group (MPAG) has proved successful in exchanging views and assisting policy development on live issues.

Representation includes different Government departments and a wide range of non-governmental organisations.

Another example is the Fisheries and Offshore Oil Consultative Group, which has been in place for over 29 years and has proved a useful and effective consultative tool for different Government departments and the oil and fisheries industries. In addition, the Review of Marine Nature Conservation Working Group has brought together representation from different Government Departments with a responsibility for marine issues and the devolved administrations.

For policy co-ordination and decision-making, ENV Committee and DA Committee are already well-placed to coordinate and resolve cross-cutting marine issues. On this basis a new Cabinet sub-committee or agency to deal with marine issues would need careful consideration. Decisions on the establishment, membership and remit of committees such as ENV and DA are for the Prime Minister to take. However, the Government will consider whether improved arrangements are needed to provide greater co-ordination in taking forward the recommendations of the cross-cutting marine reviews that are currently underway.

### **Recommendation 5**

**We are particularly concerned that there is insufficient knowledge of the effects of deep sea trawling on marine ecosystems and in particular on the sea bed. Additional research to improve our knowledge of such effects needs to be undertaken urgently in order to be able to reach a conclusion about what restrictions on deep sea trawling might be desirable. (Paragraph 45)**

It is true that knowledge of the impact of trawling on the sea bed is less well developed than the impact of trawling on fish populations. The Government agrees that further research to improve knowledge of the effects of deep sea trawling would be useful. It should be noted that such work is extremely resource intensive and consequently there is a limit to what can be achieved.

The International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) has an Advisory Committee on Ecosystems. This is chaired by a UK scientist and is helping to improve knowledge of the ecosystem impacts of fishing. In particular, it is undertaking useful work in responding to requests from the European Commission to review information on the distribution of sensitive habitats such as cold water coral reefs and in identifying areas which may need to be closed to protect them from the impact of trawling.

This work provided the scientific justification for the recently agreed permanent closure by Council Regulation of an area of around 1,400 km<sup>2</sup> known as the Darwin Mounds which had been identified by the UK as extremely vulnerable to the impact of bottom trawling. These permanent measures follow the introduction, at the UK's request, of emergency measures under the Common Fisheries Policy for the protection of the area.

The ICES work also underpins a recent proposal for the closure of similar areas of cold water coral around the Azores, Madeira and Canary Islands. This shows a welcome commitment on the part of the Community to assist Member States such as the UK in the protection of vulnerable habitats from the impact of trawling.

## **Recommendation 6**

**We recommend that the Defra produce a paper detailing how the marine stewardship and ecosystem approach outlined in Safeguarding our Seas will be delivered in practice and by what mechanisms the often competing demands of habitat protection and expanding marine industries and energy extraction will be reconciled. (Paragraph 46)**

The Government's response to its Seas of Change consultation paper was published on 31 March. It set out how the Government proposes to develop the concept of marine stewardship in a way that provides for the principles and elements of the ecosystem approach to be applied as a package in a way that should ensure that the total is more than the sum of the individual elements.

The Government response to Seas of Change set out a roadmap for practical implementation. It included asking its statutory nature conservation advisors, including English Nature, Scottish Natural Heritage and the Countryside Council for Wales, to consider what more needs to be done to implement the ecosystem approach and develop a "toolkit" to deliver practical application. A number of the initiatives underway such as the Review of Marine Nature Conservation should also help to identify solutions to overcome barriers to practical application.

For all marine Natura 2000 (N2K) sites, marine industries and those who authorise them will have to take account of the provisions of the Birds and Habitats Directives. In particular, Article 6 of the Habitats Directives governs the management of activities that affects these sites. Case law has demonstrated that the selection of N2K sites can only be based on scientific information and no account should be taken of socio-economic factors. There can be no guarantee that an activity that takes place in, or affects a site at the time of its selection can continue in the same manner after selection, and no such undertaking is given by the Government.

However, sites have been selected with many activities already taking place and it is recognized that these are normally compatible with the conservation interest at their current levels. The Government considers that, particularly in the marine environment, a management scheme is the most appropriate mechanism for relevant authorities to deliver the requirements of the Habitats Directive to conserve the species and habitats of the designated areas.

As soon as possible after a marine site is selected, the nature conservation body will establish conservation objectives for that site, and identify any operations that could cause deterioration of the habitat. The purpose of the management scheme will be to provide a

mechanism by which authorities can undertake their activities to meet the conservation objectives of the site. Only those activities that would cause deterioration or disturbance to the features for which a site has been designated need to be subject to restrictions under a management scheme. The purpose of the management scheme is not to exclude human activities from marine sites, but rather to ensure that they are undertaken in ways that do not threaten the nature conservation interest.

All new plans and projects that, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects, could have a significant effect on a N2K site will be subject to an appropriate assessment in line with Articles 6(3) and (4) of the Habitats Directive. Existing consents that could also have a significant effect on the site will also need to be reviewed. If, following the assessment, there are negative implications for the site, the plan or project can only proceed if:

- a) There is an absence of alternative solutions;
- b) The plan or project must be carried out for imperative reasons of overriding public interest (which may be social or economic in nature); and
- c) All compensatory measures are undertaken to ensure the coherence of the N2K network.

## Recommendation 7

**On land, people can see the impact of human activity on the environment, but at sea, pollution, damage to fish stocks, degradation of habitats and declines in biodiversity are less immediately apparent. As a result, concern is often restricted to those individuals and bodies that have a keen and direct interest in the oceans and public pressure for urgent action may be lacking. Furthermore we know comparatively little about what impact we have on the sea and conclusive evidence may only come when the damage is irreparable. Government, then has a particular responsibility to take the initiative to protect our oceans and to act with all urgency. (Paragraph 47)**

The Government agrees with this recommendation. Through its Marine Stewardship initiative, it has raised awareness of the threats that the marine environment faces and is taking measures to protect the seas at home, within Europe and globally. This demonstrates the Government's commitment to better manage and protect the seas as a matter of urgency. In particular, the Review of Marine Nature Conservation has looked at how to better understand the impacts of human activities on the marine environment and how to limit impacts to ensure that the most important biodiversity is conserved.

The Committee is right to highlight that we know relatively little about the marine environment when compared with the terrestrial environment. The Government's forthcoming State of the Seas report will be the first analysis of the national marine monitoring data sets. It will set out what we do know about the state of the marine environment and will provide a framework for future research and monitoring. Defra has an



extensive research and monitoring programme to meet a range of policy development needs. Research to improve our understanding of the marine environment is also funded through the Natural Environmental Research Council (NERC). The Government is now working more closely with NERC and its marine institutions to ensure that research undertaken enables us to make informed policy decisions. In addition the Government applies the precautionary principle, which sensibly errs on the side of caution where scientific evidence is not conclusive.

### **Recommendation 8**

**While we welcome the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive, and commend the Department of Trade and Industry's early work on implementing it, we share our witnesses' concerns that adequate assessment and mitigation of the cumulative impacts of different activities is still lacking. Unlike the situation on land, where a single Department – the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister – has responsibility for planning issues, development at sea is regulated by many Departments and agencies. It is possible that marine spatial planning could overcome these problems, but it is not yet clear how such planning would work in practice. In particular, we see limited use for a plan that ignores shipping and fishing, areas which are outside the Government's direct control. The powers and remit of any planning authority would need to be carefully framed to ensure that any plan drawn up could be implemented in practice. Wherever in Government the authority was based, it would need to ensure that the concerns of all users of the sea were taken in account. (Paragraph 54)**

The Government agrees with this recommendation. It highlights the complexity of the marine environment and multiple use of the sea, which is the norm. The Government recognises that marine spatial planning has the potential to be a useful tool to better manage conflicting uses of the sea, address cumulative effects of human activities and enable a longer-term view of managing the marine environment to be taken.

As proposed in the Government's response to Seas of Change, the Government will undertake a pilot project to test out ideas and options for developing, implementing and managing a marine spatial plan. This is with a presumption in favour of developing a marine spatial plan if a plan is practicable. The pilot will explore, inter alia, the appropriate scale of a plan, who would own the plan, the information and data needed to prepare a plan, how different stakeholders should be involved in its preparation, how conflicting uses of the sea would be resolved and issues relating to enforcement and monitoring.

The Government would seek to include fishing and shipping within the scope of any plan but, as the Committee notes, managing these activities does not fall directly to the Government. Whilst the UK cannot apply domestic law to international shipping, we can regulate international shipping through the International Maritime Organization. Similarly the UK can work to through the Common Fisheries Policy to minimize the impact of fishing activities on the wider marine environment.

## Recommendation 9

**The Government must ensure that it makes best use of the scientific expertise and knowledge within United Kingdom institutions. We recommend that Defra encourage collaborative research between fisheries scientists and those researching the wider marine ecosystem. The Government should also examine the future funding of marine science to ensure that centres of excellence in marine research can continue their work. (Paragraph 55)**

Scientists from the Centre for Environment Fisheries and Aquaculture Science (CEFAS) working on fisheries, environment and ecology matters are engaged in a wide range of scientific research. This is contributing to the development and application of the ecosystem approach both nationally and internationally through, for example, the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES). Such work involves collaboration with a range of research institutions.

Defra also encourages collaborative research between fisheries scientists and those researching the wider marine ecosystem through jointly funded projects with other sponsors. For example Defra is the major funder of the Continuous Plankton Recorder operated by the Sir Alistair Hardy Foundation for Oceanographic Science (SAHFOS). SAHFOS also receives funding from NERC, as well as other national and international sponsors, and is providing an insight into how changes in oceanographic conditions can influence fish stock abundance.

Defra is also part of a consortium of organisations funding and supporting the Marine Biodiversity Climate Change (MarClim) initiative. This is aimed at assessing and predicting the influence of climate on the marine environment.

NERC and Defra, together with other government departments, are seeking to establish a joint venture to tackle critical issues in the area of sustainable exploitation of marine bioresources. The aim of this new initiative is to jointly fund basic science that will contribute to better delivery and influence of fisheries policy.

## Recommendation 10

**The survey work undertaken as part of the DTI's Strategic Environmental Assessment exercise is welcome, as is the Government's promise to make the resulting data freely available. However, the Government should consider funding further geological, hydrographic and biological survey work to better inform selection of protected areas and marine ecosystem management. (Paragraph 56)**

The Government agrees with this recommendation. Whilst additional survey work is being undertaken, the Government notes that marine survey work can be extraordinarily expensive and must therefore be a collaborative effort. For example the DTI's offshore SEA programme has a spend of £2.5 million per annum on data collection.



Much geological, hydrographic and biological data has been collected over the years. The Government recognises that there is scope for making better use of existing data. Unfortunately the disparate existing data sets are not suitable for establishing a temporal baseline. A number of projects, including EU work, have been initiated to look at the best techniques for wide scale (national) seabed habitat mapping. In addition CEFAS is investigating the business case for undertaking a national survey as a collaborative venture. It is envisaged that this will include further survey work to better inform policy-making concerning the stewardship of the marine ecosystem.

### **Recommendation 11**

**Effective management of existing information is as important as collecting new data. We recommend that Defra draw up proposals for a harmonised management system for data held by publicly funded research institutions and consult on these as soon as possible. (Paragraph 57)**

The Government agrees with the thrust of this recommendation. Defra has been leading the drive for harmonized marine data management and a data expert group has recently been formed. This has proposed that a marine data partnership be formed to provide a framework for long term data stewardship. This is an initiative through the Inter-Agency Committee on Marine Science and Technology (IACMST). A paper on the proposed way forward will be issued IACMST shortly. Defra will ensure that marine environmental data is managed, stored and accessible to the same standards as terrestrial environmental data.

### **Recommendation 12**

**The episode of the Darwin Mounds showed the limitations of the Habitats Directive in protecting special features of the offshore environment. Although we understand that the European commission may address some of the problems in its thematic strategy, which is due to be published in 2005, we urge Government to begin immediate work with the Commission to ensure the Habitats Directive covers all necessary species and habitats, to strengthen protection of the marine environment and to ensure that conflicts between the demands of the Directive and the Common Fisheries Policy are resolved as a matter of urgency. In the meantime, the Government should report on the effectiveness of conservation measures for marine species that are not protected under the EU Habitats and Birds Directives. (Paragraph 58)**

Whilst the discovery of the Darwin Mounds showed the limitations of the Habitats Directive, it has shown the capacity, within the revised Common Fisheries Policy, to provide both emergency and permanent protection to vulnerable marine ecosystems in the offshore environment.

In establishing the Review of Marine Nature Conservation, the Government recognised that the mechanisms available for protecting important conservation features in the marine environment had not proved as effective as originally hoped. The Review was charged with

examining the effectiveness of existing mechanisms and developing practical and proportionate proposals for improving them.

The Review's Working Group report to Government will include a number of recommendations aimed at enhancing the protection available to features of nature conservation importance, including consideration of the need for changes to existing legislative, governance and enforcement mechanisms. These proposals will consider features not already provided for by the Habitats and Birds Directives.

The UK has also played a lead role in OSPAR to develop a criteria to identify species and habitats in need of priority conservation action. In parallel, an initial list of Threatened and/or Declining Species and Habitats was agreed at the OSPAR/HELCOM Ministerial Meeting in 2003. This will supplement the habitats and species identified in the Annexes to the Habitats and Birds Directives. The commitment made in OSPAR 2003 to achieving by 2010 an ecologically coherent network of well-managed marine protected areas across the OSPAR maritime area will also build on the protection provided by the Habitats and Birds Directives.

Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs  
May 2004

# Formal minutes

---

**Wednesday 16 June 2004**

Members present:

Mr Michael Jack in the Chair

Mr Colin Breed	Mr David Lepper
David Burnside	Joan Ruddock
Mr David Drew	Alan Simpson
Patrick Hall	David Taylor
Mr Mark Lazarowicz	Mr Bill Wiggin

The Committee deliberated.

Draft Report [*Marine Environment: Government reply to the Committee's Report*], proposed by the Chairman, brought up and read.

*Ordered*, That the draft Report be read a second time, paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraphs 1 and 2 read and agreed to.

*Resolved*, That the Report be the Tenth Report of the Committee to the House.

*Ordered*, That the Chairman do make the Report to the House.

A Paper was ordered to be reported to the House.

*Ordered*, That the Appendix to the Report be reported to the House.-(*The Chairman.*)

The Committee further deliberated.

[Adjourned till Wednesday 30 June at a quarter past Two o'clock.

## Reports from the Committee since 2001

---

### Session 2003–04

Ninth Report	Milk Pricing	HC 335
Eighth Report	Gangmasters (follow up)	HC 455
Seventh Report	Implementation of CAP Reform in the UK	HC 226-I
Sixth Report	Marine Environment	HC 76
Fifth Report	The Foods Standards Agency and Shellfish ( <i>Reply, HC 601</i> )	HC 248
Fourth Report	Environmental Directives ( <i>Reply, HC 557</i> )	HC 103
Third Report	Caught in the net: Cetacean By-catch of dolphins and porpoises off the UK coast ( <i>Reply, HC 540</i> )	HC 88
Second Report	Annual Report of the Committee 2003 HC 225	
First Report	Water Pricing ( <i>Reply, HC 420</i> )	HC 121

### Session 2002–03

Eighteenth Report	Conduct of the GM Public Debate ( <i>Reply HC 443 Session 2003-04</i> )	HC 220
Seventeenth Report	Biofuels ( <i>Reply, HC 88 Session 2003-04</i> )	HC 929-I
Sixteenth Report	Vets and Veterinary Services	HC 703
Fifteenth Report	New Covent Garden Market: a follow-up ( <i>Reply, HC 123 Session 2003-04</i> )	HC 901
Fourteenth Report	Gangmasters ( <i>Reply, HC 122 Session 2003-04</i> )	HC 691
Thirteenth Report	Poultry Farming in the United Kingdom ( <i>Reply, HC 1219</i> )	HC 79-I
Twelfth Report	The Departmental Annual Report 2003 ( <i>Reply, HC 1175</i> )	HC 832
Eleventh Report	Rural Broadband ( <i>Reply, HC 1174</i> )	HC 587
Tenth Report	Horticulture Research International ( <i>Reply, HC 1086</i> )	HC 873
Ninth Report	The Delivery of Education in Rural Areas ( <i>Reply, HC 1085</i> )	HC 467
Eighth Report	The Future of Waste Management ( <i>Reply, HC 1084</i> )	HC 385
Seventh Report	Badgers and Bovine TB ( <i>Reply, HC 831</i> )	HC 432
Sixth Report	Rural Payments Agency ( <i>Reply, HC 830</i> )	HC 382
Fifth Report	The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 ( <i>Reply, HC 748</i> )	HC 394
Fourth Report	Water Framework Directive ( <i>Reply, HC 749</i> )	HC 130
Third Report	The Mid-term Review of the Common Agricultural Policy ( <i>Reply, HC 615</i> )	HC 151
Second Report	Annual Report of the Committee 2002	HC 269
++First Report	Reform of the Common Fisheries Policy ( <i>Reply, HC 478</i> )	HC 110

### Session 2001–02

Tenth Report	The Role of Defra ( <i>Reply, HC 340, Session 2002-03</i> )	HC 991
Ninth Report	The Future of UK Agriculture in a Changing World ( <i>Reply, HC 384, Session 2002-03</i> )	HC 550
Eighth Report	Hazardous Waste ( <i>Reply, HC 1225</i> )	HC 919
Seventh Report	Illegal Meat Imports ( <i>Reply, HC 1224</i> )	HC 968
Sixth Report	Departmental Annual Report 2002 ( <i>Reply, HC 1223</i> )	HC 969
Fifth Report	Genetically Modified Organisms ( <i>Reply, HC 1222</i> )	HC 767
Fourth Report	Disposal of Refrigerators ( <i>Reply, HC 1226</i> )	HC 673
Third Report	Radioactive Waste: The Government's Consultation Process ( <i>Reply, HC 1221</i> )	HC 407
Second Report	The Countryside Agency ( <i>Reply, HC 829</i> )	HC 386
First Report	The Impact of Food and Mouth Disease ( <i>Reply, HC 856</i> )	HC 323