The IEEP carried out analyses of the following parties: European Green’s Party (EGP), European Left (EL), European People’s Party (EPP), Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe (ALDE), Party of European Socialists (PES). Some measures from the manifestos of the European Spring and Volt were taken into account. In this segment we provide an overall summary analysis in assessing the parties’ commitments on environmental, climate and sustainability issues. Their commitments were compared with:

- 2014 manifestos
- Think 2030 recommendations
- International commitments of the EU including SDGs and Paris Agreement

Introduction
The 2019 European elections will be an essential moment to frame the post-2020 agenda as well as Europe’s Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) implementation strategy and its future environmental agenda (a potential 8th Environmental Action Plan).¹ As the European Commission did not provide a blueprint for the post-2020 agenda, the new European Parliament could play a key role in filling the void. In a context when the European Council is divided over the ambition of Europe’s future climate and environmental policies, the European Parliament will also bear particular responsibility in scrutinizing the Member States’ implementation of EU environmental law and in responding to the European citizens’ growing concern on climate change.

Top messages
The manifestos demonstrate that all parties are attempting to respond to the increased concern by citizens on climate change. However, the proposals they contain are unlikely to get Europe on a safe course to achieve climate neutrality by 2050. Most proposed actions still focus mostly on energy and transport. The other top priority issues that emerge from party manifestos are the circular economy, research and innovation for sustainability, environmental health and the need to link the social and environmental agendas.

There are clear dividing lines between the main parties on the need for greening Europe’s economic growth model, the usefulness of using the SDGs as a framework, the scale and financing of low-carbon investments, strategies for emissions reductions within transport, the potential transformation of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP), Better Regulation 2.0, environmental fiscal reform and trade.

While the manifestos of the Party of European Socialists and Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe are “greener” than in 2014, the EPP manifesto mostly restates existing policies and commitments. In fact, the marked difference between the EPP’s proposals and that of other parties (EGP, PES, ALDE and EL) on several key files could lead to difficult post-election negotiations around the Presidency of the

¹ You can find here more information on European environmental policy and the 7th EAP.
European Commission and its programme. If, as projected, the EPP has fewer seats, other parties could ask for greater climate and environmental ambition to be included within the programme of the new European Commission in return for their support to the president nominee. The impact of the potential surge of right-wing, Eurosceptic parties on environmental issues, is unclear at the moment.

Compared with evidence to date from the European Environment Agency (EEA) and recommendations from Think 2030 experts, manifestos from the main parties have a few major blind spots including biodiversity (except for the EGP), sustainable consumption policies, the bioeconomy, environmental governance and environmental security. This suggests that parties are either underestimating the importance of these issues or are unwilling to make them electoral issues.
In order to inform debates before the European elections, IEEP analyses the main European parties’ manifestos, to assess their commitments on sustainability, using the Think 2030 framework, which is based on the recommendations from more than 100 sustainability experts. Think 2030 calls for placing the well-being of European citizens at the heart of Europe’s post-2020 agenda, with supportive policy frameworks for prosperity, nature and peace and security, aligned with SDGs.

Will the new European Parliament’s agenda be greener?

What are citizens expecting from the EU on climate and environment?

According to the latest Eurobarometer survey, climate change has become one of the main issues of public concern at the European level: on average, 16% of European citizens thought that climate change is one of the two most important issues facing Europe, compared with 6% only in 2016. Although at a lower level, concern for the environment is also rising. This greater concern of citizens has also been made more apparent following recent youth demonstrations, which gathered over 1.4 million people worldwide, with a large contingent of participants from Europe, as well as a number of recent electoral successes by green parties at local or national level.
However, this heightened concern varies in magnitude across the Member States. While 44% of citizens in Sweden see climate change as one of the two most important issues facing the EU, this figure falls to 4% in Greece. The map below, also based on the 2018 Eurobarometer Survey, confirms that there is still a divide between the North and Centre of Europe compared with the South and the East of Europe on environmental issues. This could mean the continuation of tensions among Member States about the level of ambition of European environmental policies.

Source: Eurobarometer, 90, autumn 2018.
What are the responses from the main political parties?

European parties are starting to address rising public concerns regarding climate change. When looking at the manifestos, environment and climate change have risen in importance on the agenda of Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe and the Party of European Socialists while remaining central in the European Green Party’s manifesto. Outliers include the European Left and the European People’s Party with significantly fewer clear measures proposed. While the European People’s Party’s 2019 manifesto is also stronger on climate change than its 2014 predecessor, it speaks of ‘a Green narrow-mindedness that categorically rejects trade, hinders economic growth and fails to include large parts of our societies’, shedding doubt about the importance it places on protecting the environment. However, looking at the overall word cloud of the main European Parties (combining texts of the manifestos from ALDE, PES, EGP, EL and EPP), words linked to environmental issues do not feature amongst the most used words, suggesting that the environment might not yet be a top priority for Europe’s main parties. Notwithstanding, the main European parties are making a number of concrete proposals regarding climate change, food, health, biodiversity, circular economy and global challenges (see a comparison of the proposals in the annex to this document).
Social and economic issues are the most prominent, including jobs, citizens, economy, society, work, trade and tax. Defence, freedom, democracy and justice are also put forward (defence, rules, security, peace, fair and free). For the environment, the words climate (mentioned 36 times in the overall text) and environment (mentioned 50 times) are put forward in the word cloud, thus showing that an importance has been given to these issues as well.²

In light of voting projections, a relatively weakened EPP (181 seats compared with 217 in 2014) will have to find a majority by negotiating with parties on its left—from ALDE to the Socialists & Democrats—or on its right.

It is difficult at this stage to predict what parties might negotiate in return for supporting the Spitzenkandidat of the party which emerges with the most seats in the new European Parliament and whether climate and environmental issues will be part of anyone’s red lines. What is likely is that the PES (whose central doctrine seems to be now evolving towards a much greater emphasis on environmental issues), the EGP and ALDE will press for greater climate ambition than what the EPP currently offers, while parties on the right side of the spectrum (some of which do support climate action) are unlikely to make climate change their key bargaining chip in terms of a potential alliance with EPP.

² The word cloud analysis has been done based on the compiled text of the ALDE, PES, EGP, EL and EPP manifestos. Words such as Europe, European and Europeans have been removed to produce the image in order to have a clearer idea of the main policy themes covered by the manifesto. The word cloud was generated on https://www.wordclouds.com/
The likelihood of using the SDG framework as an overarching strategy, which would guarantee a greater balance between the social, environmental and economic dimensions of Europe’s post-2020 agenda, as proposed by the reflection paper of the European Commission and supported by the EGP and the PES, is low. ALDE’s manifesto does not provide any clear measures as how to implement the SDGs, while the EPP does not even mention the SDGs. Consequently, there is a risk of ending up with a very classical economic and social agenda, centred on growth, with climate change “bolted” on the side, as was already the case during the Junker Commission.

**What priority issues are emerging?**

As in 2014, the issue of climate change remains by far the environmental challenge most cited in the main parties’ manifestos. There is a step change in the language around climate ambition with some parties citing either the 1.5 degree Paris target (EGP, PES, European Spring), mentioning the twelve years left to fulfil the Agreement (Volt) and the IPCC recommendations through a Climate Pact 2030 (European Spring), climate neutrality by 2050 (ALDE) or a more ambitious 55% emissions reduction target for 2030 (ALDE, EGP, PES), or stating the need to fight climate change and defend the Paris Agreement, highlighting the EU’s global role and the need to strengthen the Emissions Trading System (ETS) (EPP). However, the new Parliament will have to face a split European Council over the issue of Europe’s long-term climate ambition, including the revision of the 2030 climate targets.
The **circular economy** was an issue raised in all manifestos (ALDE, EGP, PES, EPP, and Volt) except for that of the European Left, while the European Spring mentions a sustainable economy and resource scarcity as a challenge. This confirms that the high level of importance given to this file by the Junker Commission is likely to continue in the next legislature. However, there might be marked differences among parties over what a circular package 2.0 would entail.

In terms of key instruments, ALDE, PES and the EGP put a strong emphasis around the need for **investment in research and innovation** to drive the sustainability transformation through eco-innovation. The EPP highlighted the need for innovation in tackling climate change, for instance by developing low-carbon mobility solutions. The EGP and the European Spring call for a Green New Deal which would be underpinned by investments in research, eco-innovation and the greening of manufacturing an infrastructure. ALDE’s investment plans focused primarily on smart mobility; including trans-European networks and innovations towards zero-emission vehicles as well as fostering research in low emission technologies. The European Spring also promotes a Green Investment Plan, as well as green bonds from European investment banks to fund the Green New Deal. This confirms that the parliament will most likely support the proposed increase in funding for Horizon Europe.

The **interface between environmental and social policies** is rising on the agenda with the need for socially fair environmental policies and for a just transition highlighted by PES’s proposal for a Just Transition Fund and EGP’s proposal for a special European scheme to support social security as part of a Just Transition in a Green New Deal. Just transition is also mentioned by European Left, however without a clear proposal. The European Spring mentions a link between social exclusion and food insecurity, but also the need to take into account that some regions are carbon dependent and that a compensation between fossil fuel-related jobs and jobs in the green industry should be ensured. Few links are made between core social policies (under the social pillar of rights) and the environment. Rather, the issue is addressed through specific policy proposals (housing, transport), a proposed transition fund or potential compensation schemes for carbon taxation.

**Health** is becoming a more prominent issue, with air pollution, chemicals and pesticides within food being the most cited challenges. EPP, the European Spring and ALDE and also mention antimicrobial resistance, with the European Spring highlighting pharmaceutical pollution as a cause. Notwithstanding, beyond calling for a ban on certain pesticides, no party has a comprehensive approach to environmental health, and tackle air, water, noise, soil and food pollution.
Potential dividing lines

There is no agreement across parties on whether responding to climate change and other environmental crises warrants a new growth model. While the EPP keeps putting growth and competitiveness at the core of its vision, they mention that green policies can hinder economic development. Beyond mentioning the need for sustainable growth, ALDE’s manifesto lacks clear measures. Volt seeks to boost growth, develop a green economy and leave no one behind. Other parties (EGP, PES, EL and European Spring) emphasize the need for a different approach to growth including an end to austerity with a Green new deal, austerity, an inclusive economic development model, and a Just Transition (EGP and PES).

While there is a rising concern about transport emissions, consistent with EEA’s analysis regarding the causes of EU’s recent rising emissions, parties have a different view of priorities, policies and instruments to achieve a more sustainable transport sector. The EGP and ALDE highlight aviation, proposing to end fuel tax exemptions for international aviation by updating the Chicago Convention and implementing a tax on aviation. The EGP and ALDE also propose an improvement in the connection of countries with an improved train network. The EPP, EGP, PES, European Spring, Volt and ALDE all propose improvements in low carbon mobility with the EGP going as far as to proposing a ban on the sale of cars using fossil fuels after 2030. This contrasts with the EPP, which only highlights that all transport must help to reduce greenhouse gases, and proposes the development of e-mobility.

Environmental fiscal reform (carbon tax, ending tax exemptions for aviation fuel or fossil fuel subsidies etc.) are present in all manifestos with the exception of the EPP, which instead proposes to rely on an ETS and “other incentives” to achieve effective carbon pricing. Despite a reference to the need to fight against new market-based measures to reduce carbon emissions, the European Left made no proposals on environmental tax reform. The PES and the EGP advocate for a tax on CO₂ to be implemented in a socially fair way as part of a proposed Just Transition. The EGP provide a comprehensive list of policy solutions proposing an ecological tax reform: ‘to tax more what we want less of (pollution, resource overuse) and tax less what we want more of (jobs)’; proposals range from taxing extracted and imported material to non-recyclable plastics.

A key theme at the start of the Juncker Commission was that of removing the so-called “red-tape” through better regulation. This will probably continue to be a divisive issue in the new European Parliament. The EPP and ALDE highlighted their respective commitments to ‘reduce red tape’ and move away from ‘burdensome bureaucracy and over-regulation’. The EGP and Volt warn that taking this line of action could clash with the need to maintain and strengthen environmental laws and standards. The European Left and PES call for more regulation, but not necessarily in relation to the environment.

Food systems are mentioned in most manifestos. All parties, except for the European Left, call for a reform of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP). However, there is a marked difference between parties, with the EPP pushing a very classical agenda to make the CAP ‘fit for the 21st century’, which contrasts with other parties calling for a fundamental rethink of Europe’s agriculture to respond to societal concerns. Most references to CAP reform though remain unspecific. Given the lack of progress around debating the current proposal for CAP reform, this vagueness does not bode well for building a consensus around a
fundamentally new CAP. This is particularly concerning given the latest warnings from the scientific community regarding the impact of intensive farming on many environmental issues, including biodiversity.

Trade is likely to continue to be another issue of contention. The EPP criticises “green narrow mindedness” which hinders trade and growth, in their opinion. ALDE is also keeping its pro-trade stance, while mentioning the importance of the EU global role in setting standards. This contrast with other parties (EGP, PES, EL and European Spring), which call for a fundamental rethink of our trade policies, to promote higher norms in environmental protection, human and labour rights, animal welfare through trade agreements and to use defensive measures vis-à-vis other countries failing to protect the environment as well as being cautious on these issues while negotiating trade agreements.

The blind spots

Our analysis of blind spots is based on a comparison of the manifestos with the evaluation of Europe’s current Environmental Action Plan and Think 2030 conclusions.

The 7th Environmental Action Plan sets a number of objectives for Europe to be achieved by 2020. The European Environment Agency (EEA) recently produced an evaluation of the progress made to date, listing the key issues below as red flags because of insufficient progress. The analysis uses a track light system to show which ones are adequately covered in the manifestos.

Box 1: Analysis of the manifestos based on progress to date on the 7th Environmental Action plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>European environmental objectives unlikely to be met by 2020 (EEA, 2018)</th>
<th>ALDE</th>
<th>PES</th>
<th>EGP</th>
<th>EPP</th>
<th>EL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exposure of terrestrial ecosystems to eutrophication due to air pollution</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross nutrient balance on agricultural land: nitrogen</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land take</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status of marine fish and shellfish in European seas</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abundance and distribution of selected species</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Green: Relevant policy measures proposed for given environmental issue; Orange: Environmental issue identified as a problem without adequate solutions; Red: Environmental issue inadequately or not recognised at all.
In addition, we can identify a few key blind spots based on the conclusions of Think 2030. An issue central to Think 2030, but which is absent from most manifestos, is **sustainable consumption**. Though consumption is a core area of competence for the European Union since the formation of the single market, most parties seem to be unaware of the huge sustainability challenges that Europe faces in this area or are unwilling to inform the electorate. The Party of European Socialists do mention the need to move to a circular system of production and consumption, whilst the European Greens highlight the need to reduce meat consumption and to adopt healthier and plant-based diets. Sustainable consumption is also mentioned by Volt and the European Spring lists consumption, nutrition and housing as key elements for the transition and seeks to reach more sustainable lifestyles.

Most parties are not putting enough emphasis on **biodiversity** and have little to propose in a way of solutions beyond the obvious, e.g. increasing protected areas and broad principles such as “ensuring that European funding does not harm biodiversity”. ALDE is proposing a Paris agreement on biodiversity, but without clarifying what it means by this proposal. Other key issues linked with protecting Europe’s natural capital, such as water, soil, marine areas or land, are poorly covered within most manifestos, with the exception of EGP and European Spring. The latter calls for a Blue transition to protect oceans, requires a focus on Natura 2000 and High Natural Value areas in agriculture, and refers to the calls and warnings of the scientific community on mass extinctions. The lack of biodiversity measures in the other manifestos contrasts with the latest conclusions of scientists, who are warning against a “catastrophic collapse of nature’s ecosystems”. According to new studies, based on data from several regions of the world, including Europe, 40% of insects are rapidly declining, with an annual loss rate of 2.5% (The Guardian, 2019).
Environmental governance is another blind spot. No party is making a proposal that would improve the alignment of European policies to the latest science available. While the lack of implementation of existing legislation is highlighted as a central challenge by sustainability experts, this issue is not highlighted among governance proposals contained in the manifestos, with the exception of EGP. There are no concrete proposals regarding the role that the parliament could play in supporting greater implementation and accountability by Member States—an issue which has been central to the air pollution or the ‘Dieselgate’ crisis. While all parties mention the democratic deficit, there is little reference to the role that civil society, the private sector or local authorities could play in making Europe more sustainable, with the exception of EGP and the European Spring.

There is a consensus that the EU should play a key role at the international level on climate change, particularly in trade treaties. However, environmental security is barely mentioned in the manifestos. The EL and PES state that climate change is a cause for migration, while Volt suggest that climate migrants should be declared refugees under European law. However, all three fail to develop ideas on the links between environment, peace and security policies. The EGP links climate change and security, highlighting the need to prevent conflicts, but without mentioning what role environmental policies could play in peace. Therefore, the subject is barely mentioned overall and this is done in an uneven way across parties. The EU should play an important role in climate diplomacy.

Conclusions

To respond to peace, security, prosperity, wellbeing and natural environment challenges, Europe’s agenda needs to be based on a credible plan for a transition to greater sustainability, with one coherent framework. Post-2020 planning should be framed over a 2050 horizon and include:

- **Science-based targets**: Quantified targets must address all planetary boundaries and be supported by policies and sectoral strategies that fully integrate the social and economic dimensions of sustainability.
- **Immediate actions**, with an initial transition plan from now to 2030: acting with urgency is necessary, hence the importance of framing the current EU budgetary discussions within 2030 goals.
- **A stronger policy-science interface**: It might be time to build on the success of the IPCC model and establish a similar multidisciplinary body, dedicated to Europe, encompassing all SDGs.
- **Closing the gap**: finding new solutions to the persistent implementation gap affecting EU policies in the environmental field and the related accountability gap where delivery fails.
- **Reinventing the policy toolbox**: A new toolbox and decision-making process will be required incorporating a much wider and more target-oriented use of economic instruments.
- **A plan for sustainable consumption**, creating an EU policy and regulatory framework conducive to ambitious front-runner initiatives at Member State level.

The European Parliament has a special role to play in moving Europe towards greater sustainability:
· **Agenda setting**: The next European Parliament will face the challenge of framing one coherent agenda for 2030. This, in our view, requires a SDG implementation strategy, which could replace the present Europe2020 framework as the EU’s main strategy.

· **Law-making**: The European Parliament needs to support a more effective science-policy interface to ensure that the best available independent science and evidence is available to lawmakers. SDGs should be a key element in policymaking and policy analysis, as is already the case in several countries, such as Germany and Italy.

· **Implementation and enforcement**: The European Parliament will need to strengthen its role on the enforcement of European environmental law- not only by taking stock of the effectiveness of enquiry committees to date but also by exploring new means of engaging in this key topic.

· **Ways of working**: Addressing the current silos between policies has implications for committee structures, as well as for ways of working and structures across committees. Creating an inter-committee working group on SDGs would be a step in the right direction.

· **Citizen engagement**: As shifting consumption patterns will be key and high stakes decisions, for instance around technological choices, will be difficult, lawmakers could be pivotal in the making of a new narrative of sustainability. Finding a new modus operandi for citizen engagement, especially youth, will be essential, in a context of declining trust in the European project.
### Annexes: Key proposals: Comparison between manifestos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>ALDE</th>
<th>PES</th>
<th>EGP</th>
<th>EPP</th>
<th>EL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change</td>
<td>Strengthen more sectors incl. transport within ETS and put on end to fuel tax exemptions for international aviation by updating the Chicago Convention</td>
<td>A plan for affordable housing and clean public transport</td>
<td>New European Climate Law incl. emission reduction by at least 55% by 2030; building a net zero emissions economy; restoring carbon sinks.</td>
<td>Ensure an effective price on CO2 through well functioning ETS and further incentives to reduce emissions in the industrial and energy sectors.</td>
<td>Make public the production and distribution of energy and fight against market based solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target of 55% emissions reduction by 2030</td>
<td>EU-wide taxation of CO2 emissions in a socially fair way</td>
<td>Strong carbon-floor price in ETS; ban on sale of new fossil-fuel car sales after 2030; European flight tax</td>
<td>Enable investment and innovation in technological solutions to low-carbon mobility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Investment in smart mobility, cross border and sustainable infrastructure and research and development in low emission technologies, infrastructure and clean energy, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phasing out of coal by 2030 and other fossil fuels short thereafter, end to fossil and nuclear subsidies.</td>
<td>All forms of transportation contributing to the reduction of greenhouse gases.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete the Energy Union; straighter flight routes in European airspace; end to rail state monopolies</td>
<td></td>
<td>Investment in cross-border trains, renewable energy, sustainable innovation, just transition, especially in poorer Member States.</td>
<td>Build a true Energy Union which ensures affordable access to green energy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Establish European charging standards for cars</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Biodiversity Loss

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>ALDE</th>
<th>PES</th>
<th>EGP</th>
<th>EPP</th>
<th>EL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Paris Agreement on biodiversity</td>
<td>CAP meeting societal demands including protection of biodiversity</td>
<td>Expansion of protected natural areas</td>
<td>Not included</td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish an economic value for natural capital and ecosystem services</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marine protected areas to cover 20% of Europe’s seas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Heavy oil banned in the Arctic and Antarctic regions; control of sulphur emissions from shipping extended to all coasts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Payment to farmers linked to public goods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unsustainable and illegal logging to be sanctioned harder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fishing seasonal closures; imported fish to meet European conservation standards; end to deepsea bottom-trawling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>ALDE</td>
<td>PES</td>
<td>EGP</td>
<td>EPP</td>
<td>EL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastic pollution and ocean health</td>
<td>Not included</td>
<td>Not included</td>
<td>Ban or taxation of nonrecyclable plastics., development of alternatives and increase in recycling targets</td>
<td>Not included</td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ban poisonous pesticides and dangerous chemicals including glyphosate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low emissions zones in cities and promotion of cycling and walking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>ALDE</td>
<td>PES</td>
<td>EGP</td>
<td>EPP</td>
<td>EL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Challenges</td>
<td>Call on negotiators to preserve several principles including sustainability</td>
<td>Building social and environmental standards in trade agreements</td>
<td>Environmental conditionality within foreign policy and trade agreements</td>
<td>Global challenges described in isolation from environmental issues.</td>
<td>Global challenges described in isolation from environmental issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Paris Agreement on biodiversity</td>
<td>New partnership with Africa and a comprehensive European Investment plan for Africa</td>
<td>Agricultural trade rules to allow compensation of domestic producers for extra costs due to environmental, animal protection or public health standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strict limit in exporting waste and the introduction of taxes on the extraction and import of raw material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>ALDE</td>
<td>PES</td>
<td>EGP</td>
<td>EPP</td>
<td>EL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/Food systems</td>
<td>Call for a reform of the Common Agricultural Policy as an essential step to reach sustainability.</td>
<td>Call for a reform of the Common Agricultural Policy including emphasis on reduced food waste, better animal welfare and better nutrition.</td>
<td>Redirect subsidies towards healthy food production. Move from industrial agriculture and GMOs to more sustainable farming. Call for reduction of meat consumption and promote healthier plant based diets. Call for a ban on fur farming, transporting animals long-distances and animal testing.</td>
<td>Call for CAP to be designed to help mitigate climate change and food security.</td>
<td>Call to ensure food sovereignty with no concrete proposals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methodology

In order to contribute to inform debates before the European elections, IEEP analysed the European parties’ manifestos, to assess their commitments on sustainability, against the recommendations from more than 100 sustainability experts, which call for placing the well-being of European citizens at the heart of Europe’s post-2020 agenda, with supportive policy frameworks for prosperity, nature and peace and security, aligned with SDGs. The analysed manifestos include: European Green’s Party, European Left, European People’s Party, Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe, Party of European Socialists). The commitments were compared with: - 2014 manifestos - Think 2030 recommendations - International commitments of the EU including SDGs and Paris Agreement - The 7th Environmental Action Plan and the European Environment Agency environmental indicator report 2018.

We selected the manifestos based on the political groups present at the European Parliament that had a European party publishing a manifesto (ALDE group and party; PES for the S&D group; EGP for the Greens/UFA; European Left for GUE/NGL; and the EPP, group and party). ECR confirmed that Jan Zahradil’s manifesto was the candidate’s own manifesto and not ECR’s. ENF and EFDD did not provide a manifesto. We included in this overall analysis elements from transnational programmes, mainly the European Spring and Volt. We are aware that we might have missed European programmes for the European elections. In that case, we would welcome suggestions and update our analysis.
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