



**COUNCIL OF  
THE EUROPEAN UNION**

**Brussels, 21 February 2013**

**6782/13**

**PE 83  
ENER 55  
IND 46  
MI 140  
RECH 47  
PHARM 9  
SAN 66  
ENV 144  
ENT 58  
DATAPROTECT 23  
JAI 136  
COMPET 110**

**NOTE**

---

from: General Secretariat of the Council  
to: Delegations

---

Subject: Summary record of the meeting of the **Committee on Industry, Research and Energy (ITRE)**, held in Brussels on 20 February 2013

---

The meeting was chaired by Ms Sartori (chair) (EPP, IT).

- 1. Supplementary Research Programme for the ITER project (2014-2018)**  
ITRE/7/08406, 2011/0460(NLE), COM(2011)0931  
Rapporteur: Vladimír Remek (GUE/NGL, CZ)  
Opinion: BUDG

The rapporteur said that in his view research on fusion should continue, given the growing consumption of energy and the few available sources. He expressed his support for ITER and its supplementary research programme and said he considered that they should be funded under the MFF. Only then would the European Parliament have control over the programme and the EU's international credibility be maintained.

Members broadly supported the rapporteur's position drawing attention to the fact that ITER was an important example of international cooperation, encompassing excellence in research, technology, engineering and training, and stressing that the EU should maintain its leading role in this flagship project and ensure its success (Mr Albertini (EPP, IT). They also agreed that it should be funded under the MFF, but many raised concerns about jeopardising the financing of other projects (e.g. Horizon 2020, COSME, etc) were the funding to remain under Heading 1a (Mr Correia de Campos (S&D, PT), Ms Carvalho (S&D, PT), Ms Riera Madurell (EPP, ES)). Mr Ehler (EPP, DE) reiterated that the project needed EUR 4 billion, which had to be covered by the budget and outside Heading 1a. Only Ms Rivasi (Greens/EFA, FR) considered that ITER should be financed voluntarily by Member States outside the EU budget and raised the question of ITER's viability, stating that any commercial electricity would not be available before 2100.

The Commission representative reminded Members that cost containment was a priority and with a cost-cutting budget he saw no room for an additional allocation beyond the already agreed EUR 6.6 billion (including Member States' contributions).

Timetable: deadline for amendments: 28 February 2013, 12:00

## **2. Making the internal energy market work**

ITRE/7/11365, 2013/2005(INI), COM(2012)0663

Rapporteur: Jerzy Buzek (EPP)

Opinion: AFET, INTA, ECON, ENVI, IMCO, REGI

The rapporteur defined the internal energy market (IEM) as a priority for the completion of the single market. He said that the IEM should be customer-orientated (open to consumers and producers with secured supplies), competitive (with lower energy prices and supporting the transition to low emissions economy), well regulated (implementation of the third energy package remained urgent), and physically and technologically well connected. He considered that in the current situation more remained to be achieved than had already been done, and due to the persisting fragmentation of markets and limited competition, most investments depended on subsidies rather than market forces. He also highlighted the advantages of a well-functioning IEM, such as lower energy prices, better control of energy costs, attractiveness for new investment, creation of new jobs, high-end technology innovation and a strong negotiating position vis-à-vis external suppliers. He invited the Commission to propose practical measures to achieve the IEM.

Members supported the creation of the IEM and welcomed the Commission's acknowledgment of the power of consumers and its support for them to play an active role, as well as its focus on the most vulnerable consumers. They were critical of the cuts made to the energy sector and CEF in the context of the MFF. They pointed to the need for implementation of the third energy package and some called on the Commission to sanction those Member States that failed to do so. Competition, greater diversification of energy sources, security of supply, transparency and the fight against monopolies needed to be ensured, as well as abolition of regulated and long-term subsidised prices. Members emphasised the need for interconnections, smart transmission grids and intelligent meters, as these, when in place, could resolve the problem of high energy prices. Some inquired about measures to integrate renewables, research to avoid losses in transmission systems and research on conventional and non-conventional energy sources.

Timetable: presentation of report: March 2013  
deadline for amendments: 24 April 2013, 12:00

### **3. Presentation by Alberto Pototschnig (ACER): Opinion on Capacity Markets** ITRE/7/11853

In his presentation<sup>1</sup>, Mr Pototschnig addressed the future energy market design, the impact of a high share of renewable energy on new capacity, transmission and distribution needs, ways to reward flexibility in energy markets and the future of energy-only markets in a system of high renewable energy sources.

In response to Members' questions, he reiterated that the internal energy market (IEM) was a priority and that existing barriers needed to be removed. ACER had no powers to intervene directly in the way the markets worked, it could only monitor and issue opinion. He then said that next year's monitoring would focus on the barriers to the IEM. The IEM, when completed, would also guarantee a stable regulatory and policy framework which would render the energy sector attractive to private capital. Regarding the various support schemes, he added that the IEM should also deliver price convergence, but that that should not be an objective in itself. Concerning the calls for a European dimension for grids, Mr Pototschnig clarified that since the third energy package, network development plans had been developed at EU level; and with the adoption of the energy infrastructure package, the emphasis would be placed on projects of common interest (PCIs).

---

<sup>1</sup> The presentation can be found at:  
<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/document/activities/cont/201302/20130220ATT61413/20130220ATT61413EN.pdf>

As to the CEF, he had no expectations that its budget would fully cover investment needs, therefore it was necessary to mobilise private capital and ensure an efficient use of funds. With regard to the greater penetration of renewables in the energy market, he said that a demand-driven methodology became important when it came to operational reliability. Moreover, the renewables would most likely affect the gas sector, which in future would probably be used as a back-up technology. Flexibility in the gas market therefore became crucial.

#### **4. Modalities for reaching the 2020 target to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from new passenger cars**

ITRE/7/10168, 2012/0190(COD), COM(2012)0393  
Rapporteur for the opinion: Fiona Hall (ALDE, UK)  
Responsible: ENVI

The rapporteur gave a brief overview of tabled amendments. Concerning amendments in relation to the 2025 target, she mentioned various proposed figures, advocated a middle way and did not agree with proposals to wait for the new test cycle. Regarding the test cycle itself, she said that a wide range of amendments supported 2017, as proposed by the Commission. As to the super credits, she preferred the flexible mandate. She acknowledged that the industry needed incentives, but there was a problem with their unlimited use that could weaken the 95g CO<sub>2</sub>/km target. She also thought that the banking of credits was counterproductive. With regard to the utility parameter, she advocated using both footprint and mass metrics immediately.

All Members accepted the 2020 target and would not revise it. There were diverging views on super credits, where some Members saw them as incentives for the industry (Mr Březina (EPP, CZ), Mr Tošenovský (ECR, CZ), Mr Langen (EPP, DE), Mr Vidal-Quadras (EPP, ES), Mr Gierek (S&D, PL), Mr Remek (GUE/NGL, CZ)) and others as a measure that weakened the target (Ms Van Brempt (S&D, BE)). Mr Březina also thought that the rapporteur's approach favoured electric vehicles. The other issue with split opinions was the post-2020 target. One group called for postponing the decision (Mr Březina, Mr Tošenovský, Mr Langen, Mr Mészáros (EPP, SK)) or waiting until the new test cycle was available (Mr Vidal-Quadras). The other called for setting it up to ensure planning certainty for industry (Ms Van Brempt) and for a flexible approach to new market developments. Mr Kraemer (ALDE, DE) asked for prior impact assessment. He also pointed out that cars with low emissions did not necessarily have market success and overambitious goals might not be helpful for the industry.

Regarding super credits, the Commission representative thought that many of the amendments would potentially weaken the target and she was not in favour of generous schemes or banking. Concerning the test cycle, she saw no need to delay introduction of the new procedure, with 2017 as a feasible date. She assured Members that this would not add to the stringency of the target. As to the post-2020 target, the Commission advocated planning certainty and stuck to the proposed date of 2014. With regard to eco-innovations, procedures had been opened for review and the Commission was currently cooperating with stakeholders.

The rapporteur reiterated the broad consensus for the 2020 target. She could, if no compromise were reached on super credits, support the suggestion of supporting the Commission proposal. Concerning the 2025 target, she again pointed out the need for planning certainty and thought that the text should at least include some carefully-worded indication of the policy direction.

Timetable:            vote in ITRE:                            19 March 2013

#### **5. Modalities for reaching the 2020 target to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from new light commercial vehicles**

ITRE/7/10176, 2012/0191(COD), COM(2012)0394

Rapporteur for the opinion: Markus Pieper (EPP, DE)

Responsible: ENVI

Mr Langen (EPP, DE), on behalf of the rapporteur, said that the amendments regarding the 2020 target, the test cycle and supporting measures could be endorsed. He was against the amendments tabled by Ms Van Brempt (S&D, BE) and the Greens/EFA group, which in his view were divergent from the majority position, such as tightening up of the 2020 target, the 2025 target, mandatory super credits and speed limits.

The debate tackled the same issues as for the previous item and Members expressed similar positions. There was an agreement on the 2020 target, with no adjustments. Concerning super credits, Ms Van Brempt thought that they could perhaps be dealt with in the same way as for passenger cars. They should stimulate innovation and not undermine targets and create loopholes. She also underlined the effect of speed reduction on emissions. Mr Kraemer (ALDE, DE), supported by Mr Tošenovský (ECR, CZ), thought that super credits were actually more useful for commercial vehicles than passenger cars. Together with Mr Vidal-Quadras (EPP, ES), he thought that the 2025 target should not be set yet at this stage. He added that the new test cycle should be in place before the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions were calculated and before values were established.

Mr Vidal-Quadras called on the Commission to consider a change from a tail-pipe approach to a life-cycle approach, taking into account emissions at all stages of a vehicle's life.

Concerning super credits, the post-2020 target and the new test cycle, the Commission representative repeated what was previously said with regard to passenger cars. She added that speed limits were dealt by the transport white paper as a tool which the Commission was looking at. She agreed with the correlation between emission and speed limits.

Timetable:            vote in ITRE:                            19 March 2013

**6.    Clinical trials on medicinal products for human use, and repeal of Directive 2001/20/EC**

ITRE/7/10165, 2012/0192(COD), COM(2012)0369

Rapporteur for the opinion: Michèle Rivasi (Greens/EFA)

Responsible: ENVI

The rapporteur focused on the issues of access to data and data transparency, the role of ethics committees and their harmonisation, definitions and low-intervention trials.

Members agreed with the need to improve access to data, but this should not be hinder competitiveness in medical research. Ethics committees were also discussed, as Members thought that the Commission defined their role only vaguely. They thought that the subsidiarity principle should be respected in this area. There were also calls for better definitions and the proposed deadlines were judged too rigid. Some concerns were voiced on the rapporteur's intention to remove the concept of low-intervention clinical trials. Other issues mentioned were rare diseases, clinical trials conducted in third countries and tacit clinical trials.

The Commission representative said that low-intervention trials were internationally accepted (refinement of treatment with existing medicines). He disagreed with Members that ethics committees were not included in the proposal. He said that they differed from one Member State to another and that it was not possible to harmonise them. Concerning the transparency of trial data in general, he fully supported their publication after market authorisation had been granted. He hoped that the file would be concluded in the current parliamentary term.

Timetable:            deadline for amendments:    26 February 2013, 12:00

## 7. Feedback from ongoing trilogues (Rule 70.4)

Mr Belet (EPP, BE), Mr Marinescu (EPP, RO), Ms Riera Madurell (S&D, ES), Ms Carvalho (EPP, PT) and Mr Ehler (EPP, DE) briefed Members about the ongoing trilogues for their respective reports on the safety of offshore drilling, the European satellite navigation system and Horizon 2020.

Mr Creutzmann 's (ALDE, DE) brief on COSME was postponed until the next meeting.

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

## 8. European Network and Information Security Agency (ENISA)

ITRE/7/04134, 2010/0275(COD), COM(2010)0521

Rapporteur : Giles Chichester (ECR)

Opinions: BUDG, IMCO, LIBE

The draft report was adopted as amended (47 votes in favour, 1 against, 0 abstentions). The legislative resolution was adopted (48 votes in favour, 2 against, 0 abstentions).

## 9. Protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data, and the free movement of such data (General Data Protection Regulation)

ITRE/7/08788, 2012/0011(COD), COM(2012)0011

Rapporteur for the opinion: Seán Kelly (EPP)

The draft opinion was adopted as amended (33 votes in favour, 24 against, 1 abstention).

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

### Next meeting(s)

- 18 March 2013, 15.00 – 18.30 (Brussels)
- 19 March 2013, 9.00 – 12.30 and 15.00 – 18.30 (Brussels)