



Brussels, 28 May 2015  
(OR. en)

9859/15

PE 111  
TRANS 206

#### NOTE

---

From: General Secretariat of the Council  
To: Delegations

---

Subject: Partial summary record of the meeting of the **Committee on Transport and Tourism (TRAN)** of the European Parliament, held in Brussels on 28 May 2015  
Chair: Mr CRAMER (G/EFA, DE)

---

**The item was not originally scheduled, but as the trilogue from the previous day on EFSI was conclusive, TRAN discussed its outcome at length.**

**The Committee also considered the amendments to the Implementation of the 2011 White Paper on transport and discussed for the first time the own-initiative report on Sustainable Urban Mobility.**

#### **1. Outcome of the trilogue on the European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSI)**

Rapporteurs RIQUET (ALDE, FR) and AYALA SENDER (EPP, ES) presented the outcome of the trilogue fairly positively, although they were critical of the Commission playing along the Council's lines. In particular, they highlighted the following EP achievements:

- cuts from Connecting Europe Facility (CEF) and Horizon 2020 were only EUR 5 billion instead of EUR 6 billion;
- financial instruments could be used at the same time as subsidies;
- turning EUR 500 million from the financial instruments into subsidies;
- insertion of some conditionality in the criteria;
- EP's right to monitor all processes through its participation (budgetary procedure, annual verification and involvement in different committees);
- insertion of the reference to the Stability Pact.

In general, Members needed more information about the technical details and practical implications of the agreement. Several were sceptical about giving the green light. They felt it was crucial to know to what extent the CEF criteria would apply and whether the 'lost' CEF funds would be allocated to the transport area. Others said that a different agreement could not have been expected and advocated greater focus on scrutiny of what would happen with the transport projects and the EFSI implementation. They considered that the Commission should come and report to the EP. Some enquired about Article 5.2, the geographic dimension and related sectoral and proportional cuts.

For the Commission, Mr ONIDI, Director (DG MOVE), called on Members to look beyond the transport sector and see the wider economic context. He stated that the instrument was solid and paid tribute to the rapporteurs for their work. He highlighted the fact that the EP had succeeded in securing EUR 1 billion for CEF projects, which was highly appreciated. The priority now was the best use of funds.

Concerning financing, Mr RQUET recalled that in future, within the framework of the annual budgetary procedure, the margins could be used to a greater extent and the MFF midterm review would bring the possibility to reopen other budget chapters. He could not predict whether the 'lost' funds from CEF would go back to the transport area through EFSI, but he believed so.

## **2. Implementation of the 2011 White Paper on Transport: taking stock and the way**

### **forward towards sustainable mobility**

TRAN/8/02476, 2015/2005(INI)

Rapporteur: Wim van de Camp (EPP, NL)

The rapporteur gave a general overview of 625 amendments that had been tabled. In particular, he highlighted those concerning sustainability, co-modality and modal shift, social issues, intelligent transport systems and monitoring parking spaces. Doubling public transport in cities generated a lot of support, but it could raise concerns over subsidiarity, as well as cycling and walking. On the other hand, he would welcome more interest in the earning capacity of transport.

During the discussion, Members highlighted the modal shift and co-modality and made reference to physical and digital infrastructure in this context. In addition, the right balance was needed between different transport modes so as not to penalise roads. They also emphasised the social dimension and felt that the transport system should be organised around passengers and users. Moreover, they insisted on the protection of workers, working conditions and gender equality, and called for social dumping to be tackled. A lack of consistency in passengers' rights in different transport modes also had to be addressed. Other Members underlined the need for fair competition as key to economic development and were against national protectionism. In this area, they also mentioned third countries' arrangements in the aviation area. A concept of smart transport was highlighted, including accessibility, digitalisation and sustainability. Members called for progress on interoperability of national railways systems. Many also mentioned the environmental aspects, highlighting the need for energy efficiency and to reduce the use of fossil fuels. For some Members, alternative fuels, such as shale gas, should be taken into account. Other issues raised included the cohesion aspect, a special fund for financing public transport, doubling the number of people using public transport, cycling and walking, European added value as a criterion for funding, reindustrialisation and implementation of existing legislation.

For the Commission, Mr ONIDI, Director (DG MOVE), noted that the amendments showed dedication to sustainable mobility. He reiterated that the internalisation of external costs was a sensitive issue and needed strong political support. Regarding road transport, he saw it as an opportunity to reconcile the market with social provisions. Urban policy was crucial. Ports deserved to be more at the centre of a broad policy, as many aspects were related to them, not only the regulation. As to digitalisation, he acknowledged the need for help to set up priorities. Interoperability was a challenge, together with responding to automation and the shared economy, and the collective means of transport. These should have a technological angle. In the area of digitalisation, he pointed to a lot of resistance in terms of access to data.

### **3. Sustainable Urban Mobility**

TRAN/8/02299, 2014/2242(INI), COM(2013)0913

Rapporteur: Karima Delli (Greens/EFA, FR)

The objective of the report was to re-orient mobility towards sustainable transport and address the challenges of climate change and urban pollution. To that end, the rapporteur called for reducing and eventually banning the use of cars running on traditional fuels in urban areas. Priority should be given to clean modes of transport and promotion of intermodality, including doubling the number of cyclists and public transport usage. She suggested that urban mobility funding should be conditional for the adoption of sustainable urban mobility plans (SUMP) by local authorities. Moreover, she called for a reduction of the speed limit in cities to 30km/h and introducing a European plan to reform freight transport. Given the need for investment in the area, she proposed that 50% of Eurovignette revenues should be used to improve urban mobility.

In general, Members were in favour of improving urban mobility as such, but considered that it should not be dealt with at EU level. Moreover, they were against bans, restrictions or any hierarchy of transport means. Moreover, a one-size-fits-all approach was not a good solution given national and regional differences (also in terms of SUMP). The report was also lacking sufficient emphasis on integrated ticketing, smart transport, accessibility, social dialogue and tourism. On the other hand, Members agreed that urban planning should be more powerful in terms of land planning, but that land use was only part of the solution. They saw a role for walking and cycling, but cars should not be forgotten, as they were necessary. They agreed that there was a need for intelligent transport systems (ITS), and some highlighted digitalisation. Transport modes should target low emissions, but this should be done in a technologically neutral way.

Referring to the need to act at all levels, Ms KOPCZYNSKA, Director (Commission DG MOVE) clarified that different activities had to be undertaken, with different levels of responsibility and governance. Concerning the involvement of cities, the Commission was working with them already in the framework of many networks. With regard to urban planning, the level of understanding of how to use it was not the same. As to the funding, an appropriate level needed to be provided by all levels of governance. In the current framework, funds were not ring fenced for urban transport.

*Deadline for amendments: 4 June; vote in TRAN: 14 July; vote in plenary: September 2015*

\*\*\* Electronic vote \*\*\*

**Delivering multimodal integrated ticketing in Europe**

TRAN/8/02305, 2014/2244(INI)

Rapporteur: Dieter-Lebrecht Koch (EPP, DE)

The draft report was adopted as amended (40 votes in favour, 0 against, 4 abstentions).

\*\*\* *End of electronic vote* \*\*\*

**Next meetings**

Monday 15 June 2015, 15.00 – 18.30 (Brussels)

Tuesday 16 June 2015, 9.00 –12.30 and 15.00 – 18.30 (Brussels)

---