



**COUNCIL OF  
THE EUROPEAN UNION**

**Brussels, 16 April 2013**

**15920/12  
ADD 1**

**PV/CONS 57  
TRANS 382  
TELECOM 205  
ENER 446**

**ADDENDUM to DRAFT MINUTES**

---

Subject: **3196th** meeting of the Council of the European Union (**TRANSPORT,**  
**TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND ENERGY**), held in Luxembourg on  
29 October 2012

---

## PUBLIC DELIBERATION ITEMS<sup>1</sup>

Page

### "A" ITEMS list (doc. 15279/12 PTS A 87)

Item 1.	Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Directive 1999/32/EC as regards the sulphur content of marine fuels [First reading] (LA + S) .....	3
Item 2.	Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a single European railway area (Recast) [Second reading] (LA + S) .....	8

### AGENDA ITEMS list (doc. 15126/12 OJ CONS 56 TRANS 342 TELECOM 187 ENER 414)

Item 4.	Maritime Labour Convention enforcement package.....	11
Item 5.	Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on common rules for the allocation of slots at European Union airports (Recast) [First reading] .....	14
Item 7.	Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Council Regulation (EEC) No 3821/85 on recording equipment in road transport and amending Regulation (EC) No 561/2006 of the European Parliament and the Council ("Tachograph") [First reading] .....	14
Item 8.	Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on periodic roadworthiness tests for motor vehicles and their trailers and repealing Directive 2009/40/EC [First reading].....	15

\*  
\* \*

---

<sup>1</sup> Deliberations on Union legislative acts (Article 16(8) of the Treaty on European Union), other deliberations open to the public and public debates (Article 8 of the Council's Rules of Procedure).

## **LEGISLATIVE DELIBERATIONS**

*(public deliberation in accordance with Article 16(8) of the Treaty on European Union)*

### **"A" ITEMS**

**1. Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Directive 1999/32/EC as regards the sulphur content of marine fuels [First reading] (LA + S)**

PE-CONS 31/12 ENV 445 MAR 77 MI 393 CODEC 1493 OC 271  
+ COR 1 (ro)

The Council approved the amendment set out in the European Parliament's position at first reading and adopted the proposed act amended accordingly, the German Delegation voting against and the Estonian and Finnish delegations abstaining, pursuant to Article 294(4) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union. (Legal basis: Article 192(1) of the TFEU).

### **Statements by the European Commission**

**1. Recital 27. Commission statement on the revision of Directive 2000/59/EC on port reception facilities for ship-generated waste and cargo residues**

"The Commission recalls that the inclusion of scrubber waters collection in a future revision of Directive 2000/59/EC falls entirely under its exclusive right of initiative. While the Commission indeed intends to consider such inclusion, this in no way prejudices the result of its deliberations or the contents of a future proposal, in particular as regards whether or not for waste a 'no special fee policy' should be applied."

**2. Commission statement on the procedure of adoption of implementing acts**

"The Commission considers that in the case of no opinion, Article 5 paragraph 4, subparagraph 2, point a) of Regulation 182/2011 (OJ L 55 of 28.2.2011, p. 13) applies as the aim of the Directive is to protect human health and environment. Therefore, there is no need to make a reference to the fact that the draft implementing act may not be adopted by the Commission where no opinion is delivered."

**3. Commission statement concerning the use of dynamic reference to international agreements**

"The Commission considers that the dynamic reference on the establishment of new Sulphur Emission Control Zones (SECA) to the IMO decision through Art. 2(3e) of the Directive is not legally sound as it results in automatic acceptance of the IMO decision outside the scope of the ordinary legislative procedure."

**4. Commission statement concerning the use of implementing acts**

"The Commission considers that the measures for the frequency of sampling, the definition of a representative sample (Article 6(1b) points (a) and (c)), and the information to be included in a report (Article 7(1a)) are not of an implementing nature and thus shall not fall under Article 291 TFEU. The Commission is of the view that Article 290 is the appropriate procedure in relation to these issues given that they entail measures of general application which would modify or supplement the non-essential elements of the Directive. It reserves all its legal rights in that respect."

**5. Commission statement concerning the request to the Commission to develop new measures supporting the implementation of the Directive by end 2012**

"The Commission recalls that the Commission's Staff Working Paper on the sustainable waterborne transport toolbox was published in September 2011 and that this toolbox contained several measures that could be applied in the short, medium, and long-term and that meanwhile the Commission is actively pursuing further actions and has already moved forward on several actions including short term actions, for example by ensuring increased funding appropriations for existing programmes such as Marco Polo and TEN-T. The Commission considers that it is not realistic, credible, nor possible to develop and propose meaningful new initiatives in the few months remaining before the end of 2012. The Commission regrets that Council and EP rejected the Commission's proposal to report progress by mid 2013 so as to leave space for the Commission and Member States to work more on substance rather than on reporting only."

**6. Commission statement concerning ongoing work in the context of reviewing the EU Thematic Strategy on Air Pollution**

"Without prejudice to the ultimate outcome of the review, the Commission confirms that it is assessing, amongst several scenarios, the costs and benefits of additional measures to reduce air pollution from shipping, including the impacts of applying a maximum fuel sulphur standard of 0.1% in territorial waters."

**Statement by Poland**

"In principle, Poland supports the initiative to review the Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Directive 1999/32/EC as regards the sulphur content of marine fuels with regard to include IMO regulations in the EU law.

However, it is being estimated that both the revised MARPOL Annex VI and the revised directive will lead to significant rise in fuel price and distortions in competitiveness between SECA and non SECA regions. The issue of the competitiveness of maritime transport as an environmentally friendly alternative to the road transport and possible modal shift are of great concern to Poland.

Therefore, the elaboration of the Staff Working Paper “Pollutant emission reduction from maritime transport and the sustainable waterborne transport toolbox” (*The Toolbox document* – art. 7 para. 3), financial measures as in the art. 4f, as well as future legislative proposals (as in art. 7 para. 2) in favour of operators affected by this directive are of very high importance.

Additionally, Poland is of the opinion that the word "operators" covers both ship operators and port operators as ports will be equally affected by the above-mentioned distortions and therefore eligible for financial aid."

### **Statement by Germany**

Germany welcomes the proposal, which brings European law into line with Annex VI of MARPOL as revised by the International Maritime Organization in 2008 (MARPOL Resolution MEPC.176 (58)).

In the interests of marine protection and air quality, in the IMO negotiations Germany voiced strong support for the limits laid down in Annex VI of MARPOL. This particularly applies to the maximum sulphur content of marine fuels which may be used on board ships within sulphur emission control areas (SECAs). This is why Germany transposed the requirements of the revised Annex VI into national law in 2010.

In the negotiations of the Commission's proposal for reasons of environmental protection and to avoid distortions of competition, Germany argued for uniformly applying the SECA limits to the territorial seas and exclusive economic zones of all the Member States.

In addition, due to reasons of air quality and also with a view to compliance with the binding European limit values for particulate concentrations (PM 10) Germany proposed to align the limit value for the sulphur content of marine fuels used by sea-going vessels operating on inland waterways to the limit value for the sulphur content of fuels for inland waterway vessels.

Germany welcomes that the IMO global standard of 0.5% will apply in 2020 in Europe, regardless of the 2018 IMO review.

However, stricter fuel standards for passenger ships, especially for passenger ships on a regular service, which operate mostly in ports or close to shore, would ensure improvement of air quality in coastal areas. Germany finds it regrettable that the requirements for passenger ships in the compromise are not ambitious.

Germany also objects that the possibility of granting state aid is no longer strictly linked to exceeding the requirements of the directive. Germany therefore considers that state aid may only be granted in cases where the standards laid down in the directive are implemented at a considerably earlier stage, or where the sulphur content is significantly lower than the prescribed maximum. In Germany's view, the fact that meeting the required limit values for sulphur can lead to reductions of other emissions cannot be used to justify the granting of state aid.

Therefore, taken as a whole, Germany does not support the proposal."

### **Statement by Finland**

"Finland welcomes the Directive on the sulphur content of marine fuels as well as the revised MARPOL Annex VI in order to improve air quality and gain positive impacts on health and environment. However, the new rules will have a severe effect on the shipping sector and industries relying on sea transportation, due to the estimated costs of low-sulphur fuel and vessel conversions when abatement technology is installed.

The geographical location of Finland within the SECA area, but very far from the main European market area, together with the timetable for implementation constitute a huge challenge in respect of the new rules.

Finland therefore considers it of utmost importance for the Member States to be able to adopt financial measures, in an interim period, to reduce the negative impact on operators affected in order to avoid competition distortion otherwise caused by the new rules. These measures should be in line with the state aid rules applicable and to be adopted by the Commission in this area as stated in article 4f of the Directive. Also, the elaboration of the Staff Working Paper "Pollutant emission reduction from maritime transport and the sustainable waterborne transport toolbox" (*The Toolbox document*– art. 7 para. 3) is paramount."

### **Joint statement by Bulgaria, Spain, France, Greece, Italy, Malta, Portugal and Romania**

"Bulgaria, Spain, France, Greece, Italy, Malta, Portugal and Romania are prepared to endorse the compromise. We would however like to express our reservations regarding the 2013 review clause provided for in Article 7(2) and (3) of the revised Directive as well as regarding the new recital concerning air quality policy review in 2013, that specifically targets the issue of air pollution in EU territorial waters.

We feel that before embarking on any form of review process it is essential to evaluate initial results from the implementation of the new standards, which are only due to come into force in the SECAs as of 2015.

The chosen date of 2013 is highly premature and we would like to emphasise that we are opposed to the principle of a new legislative initiative that would go against the European Commission's "better regulation" strategy, and the objectives of legal certainty and proportionality.

This premature measure would in fact disturb the stability of the legal framework that is needed by maritime operators and industrial stakeholders in marine fuel supply so that they can make the necessary investments.

We would like to highlight that should the IMO make use of the 2018 review clause on justified grounds, in particular technical ones, such as a compliant fuel not being available, in view of current supply and demand on the global fuel market, market trends or any other relevant factors, the European Union will have to take into account this particular situation if it wants to preserve the competitiveness of the European maritime industry. In this instance, the Commission should propose relevant provisions including the necessary development of the legal framework and its implementation schedule."

### **Joint statement by France, Italy and Malta**

"In the context of intermodal competition, France, Italy and Malta feel that care should be taken to ensure that the European maritime transport sector is not excessively weakened.

We therefore call on the Commission to develop its work on the toolbox, in particular incorporating European financial instruments and the legal monitoring framework for State aid into its reflection."

### **Statement by Latvia and Sweden**

"Latvia and Sweden recognize the importance in achieving the compromise on the draft Directive to align the European Union law with the Annex VI of MARPOL as revised by the International Maritime Organization in 2008.

In the negotiations Latvia and Sweden argued for uniformly applying the requirements applicable within sulphur emission control areas (SECAs) to the territorial seas and exclusive economic zones of all the Member States. Such an approach would have ensured significant environmental and human health benefits, as well as would have helped to avoid potential distortion of competition. Latvia and Sweden are also of the opinion that for reasons of environmental protection and to avoid distortions of competition further work is necessary in supporting the establishment of new SECAs within the framework of the International Maritime Organization.

Latvia and Sweden support the adoption of the draft Directive since it provides the framework for further consideration of the potential economic impact of the requirements of the draft Directive, especially in relation to the distortion of competition and potential risk of modal backshift from sea to land based transport resulting in an increased harm to the environment.

In order to avoid the above mentioned risks, Latvia and Sweden would like to invite the European Commission to pay particular attention to the elaboration of the appropriate measures which would substantially minimize the negative impacts and closely cooperate with Member States in this regard."

### **Statement by Estonia**

"Estonia supports the aim of the Directive on the sulphur content of marine fuels and the revised MARPOL Annex VI. Estonia welcomes the steps taken to improve air quality and strengthen marine protection. We believe that policies outlined in the Directive will have significant positive impact both on human health and the environment. Good ecological status and adequate protection of the Baltic Sea area are of particular interest for Estonia.

However, Estonia stresses that these important policy objectives must be realistic and achievable. We are concerned about the ambitious timetable set in the Directive in the context of the remaining issues of fuel availability and technological challenges. We are confident that the Directive will accelerate much needed technological innovation, but it will take time for the results to emerge. Therefore, it has been Estonia's position during the negotiations that 2020 would be a more appropriate deadline for the new rules to enter into force.

In addition, Estonia supports uniform application of the requirements applicable within the sulphur emission control areas (SECAs) to the territorial seas and exclusive economic zones of all the Member States. This would have significantly increased the positive impact of the Directive both in terms of health and environmental benefits. It would also have ensured fairer competition conditions all over the European Union."

**2. Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a single European railway area (Recast) [Second reading] (LA + S)**

PE-CONS 44/12 TRANS 238 CODEC 1861 OC 398

+ REV 1 (lv)

+ REV 2 (sv)

+ REV 3 (da)

The Council approved the European Parliament's amendment to the Council's position at first reading with the German, Luxembourg and Austrian delegations voting against and the Estonian, Polish and Slovak delegations abstaining. The Directive is deemed to have been adopted in the form of the Council's position at first reading thus amended, pursuant to Article 294(8)(a) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union. (Legal basis: Article 91 of the TFEU).

**Commission statement**

"The Commission underlines that it is contrary to the letter and to the spirit of Regulation 182/2011 (OJ L 55 of 28.2.2011, p. 13) to invoke Article 5(4), 2), point b) in a systematic manner. Recourse to this provision must respond to a specific need to depart from the rule of principle which is that the Commission may adopt a draft implementing act when no opinion is delivered. Given that it is an exception to the general rule established by Article 5(4) recourse to subparagraph 2, point b), cannot be simply seen as a "discretionary power" of the legislator, but must be interpreted in a restrictive manner and thus must be justified.

While the Commission supports the agreement reached by the European Parliament and the Council on the recourse to this provision in nine specific cases which they have justified by reasons of their potential impact on the functioning of the rail market and public finances, it regrets that such justification is not reflected in a recital."



### **Statement by Germany**

"The provision in Article 32(4) continues to make a binding differentiation between charges for railway lines in order to give incentives to trains equipped with the ETCS. Germany is opposed to Member States taking over any "liability" for financial deficits incurred by rail infrastructure managers as a result of this price differentiation between railway lines.

Germany assumes that the statement made by the European Commission in the Council meeting on 16 June 2011 in connection with the adoption of the general approach on the proposed Directive still stands, namely, that the budget reservations (recitals 10 and 37) specifically apply to Article 8(4).

Germany also assumes that the third subparagraph of Article 31(5) does not limit the introduction of a noise-differentiated railway line price component within the meaning of subparagraph 1 only in order to finance the equipping of freight wagons, but that this provision can provide a general incentive on noise reduction and does not exclude other measures.

Germany would point out that subparagraph 2 of Article 13(3) provides for the introduction of separate balance sheets and profit and loss accounts for "all service facilities referred to in (...) Annex II", and that the definition of service facilities in Annex II includes storage sidings, for instance. Germany assumes that the intention of subparagraph 2 of Article 13(3) is not to prescribe separate balance sheets and profit and loss accounts for every single service facility, but rather to separate service facilities into different categories."

### **Joint statement by Poland and the Slovak Republic**

"Poland and the Slovak Republic attach high importance to the development of the rail sector. Poland and the Slovak Republic are in the process of conducting difficult and expensive restructuring process of the infrastructure manager. Poland and the Slovak Republic will also gradually increase the investments in the rail infrastructure within the financial capability.

*The Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a single European railway area* is an important document, constituting the basis for the development of rail transport. At the same time, it should take into account the difficult financial situation of the Member States and contain appropriate transitional periods.

Poland and the Slovak Republic make an assumption that obligations arising from the directive cannot be contradictory to the commitments resulting from the Stability and Growth Pact, in particular regarding the binding Excessive Deficit Procedure for some Member States. From this point of view, the transitional periods foreseen in the directive are not sufficient.

Moreover, Poland and the Slovak Republic believe that some of the directive's provisions should not apply to already existing lines used solely for freight operations, having untypical for the EU technical characteristics, and which connect only one Member State with a bordering 3rd country. However, adequate exclusion has not been included in the directive. Taking the foregoing into account, Poland and the Slovak Republic cannot support the directive and abstain from voting."

## **Statement by Latvia**

"Latvia fully supports the initiative to simplify, clarify and modernize the regulatory framework of the European railway area by recasting the first railway package.

Nevertheless, Latvia still maintains concerns regarding some provisions of the Directive:

- Article 7, point 1 sets an obligation for the Member States to show that the independence of essential functions of an infrastructure manager have been achieved. Lack of clearly defined criteria in the Directive and a general requirement for Member States to ensure that the essential functions are entrusted to bodies or firms that do not themselves provide any rail transport services gives possibility for a broad interpretation and will not decrease ambiguity and gaps of the current regulatory framework. Transposition of the current Directive and related infringement procedures prove that Member States have difficulties in this regard. Clearly defined criteria would have allowed a better transposition of the provisions of the Directive as well as ensured the railway sector that national measures are not excessive *vis-à-vis* regulatory framework of the European Union.

Latvia considers that the task given to the Commission in Article 63, point 1 to, if appropriate, propose legislative measures in relation to the opening of the domestic rail passenger market and to develop appropriate conditions to ensure non-discriminatory access to the infrastructure, building on the existing separation requirements between infrastructure management and transport operations while respecting the right of initiative is a step in the right direction, but at the same time does not ensure the necessary certainty that the issue will be solved in a future.

- Latvia also maintains concerns with regard to the inclusion of the function of collection of infrastructure charges in the list of essential functions (Article 7, point 1). Latvia fully understands the necessity to protect the commercially sensitive information, however in case of Latvia this function would have to be transferred from the infrastructure manager, who at the same time is an owner of the infrastructure, to the performer of essential functions. Such an action would hinder the ability of the infrastructure manager to properly control its finances and would also have a negative impact on its existing or future financial obligations as well as financing of the infrastructure development.
- Latvia also believes that the solution to the issue raised by the European Parliament on Article 17, point 1 concerning licensing in respect of relations with third countries and on a network whose track gauge is different from the main rail network within the Union and which is either geographically detached or peripherally located from the Union is not sufficient, and still believes that clear rules for a possibility to apply limitations concerning railway undertakings which are directly or indirectly effectively controlled through the ownership shares of third country or nationals of third country should have been set in the main text of the Directive.

Notwithstanding the above mentioned concerns, Latvia understands the importance of advancing the creation of Single European Railway area and therefore expresses its support to the final compromise of the Directive, while calling on the European Commission to take the issues mentioned above into account when preparing future legislative acts in this area."

## Statement by Austria

In principle, Austria supports the initiative to recast the first railway package with the aim of simplifying the regulatory environment in the European railway sector. The competitiveness of rail transport as an environmentally friendly alternative to the road is of crucial importance to Austria.

For this reason, like many other Member States, Austria also fully supports the European objectives concerning the ETCS. At a national level, this is demonstrated by the Austrian ETCS migration plan and to an even greater extent by the Austrian support programme for equipping trains with ETCS Level Two. This scheme, which was notified and launched in 2011 and which corresponds to the version pursuant to Commission Decision 2008/386/EC already provides a direct incentive for equipping trains with ETCS Level Two.

In this context it should be emphasised that Article 32(4) can only be interpreted as meaning that Member States or infrastructure managers in Member States who have already launched an ETCS support programme for equipping trains with ETCS do not have the same obligation to differentiate the rail use charge on ETCS corridors pursuant to 2009/561/EC as those Member States that do not provide any direct incentives to rail companies for equipping trains with ETCS.

In general, at European level only the framework principles should be laid down for the sector and it should be left to states to organise their rail sector within the framework of the European objectives. Any mandatory separation of bodies, beyond separate accounts and balance sheets, leads to disproportionate additional financial and organisational burdens and to disproportionate interference in railway undertakings' freedom of economic decision making, which Austria does not support.

For this reason, Austria also rejects the wordings of Articles 13(3) and (6) and cannot accept the legislative act as it stands."

\*\*\*\*\*

## AGENDA ITEMS

### **4. Maritime Labour Convention enforcement package**

#### **(a) Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Directive 2009/16/EC on port State control [First reading]**

- General approach  
8239/12 MAR 37 TRANS 105 SOC 241  
13904/12 MAR 112 TRANS 297 SOC 754 CODEC 2163  
+ ADD 1

The Council reached a general approach on the text of the above proposed Directive, as set out in doc. 13904/12.

Austria presented a statement to be entered in these minutes, as set out hereafter.

### **Statement by Austria**

"Austria is aware of the significance of the Maritime Labour Convention, which is an important step towards improving the living and working conditions of seafarers on ships. Accordingly, Austria welcomes efforts made to implement the Maritime Labour Convention in the largest possible number of States.

On the other hand, maritime transport is less important to a landlocked state such as Austria, not least because the shipping register has been closed for commercial vessels. In this regard Austria is therefore no longer a flag State.

Austria would not wish to obstruct the other Member States in any way, should they ratify the Maritime Labour Convention within the meaning of the proposed Directives. As the implementation of this Convention requires a significant administrative and financial commitment, which is entirely disproportionate to the Convention's relevance for Austria, Austria does not intend to ratify the Maritime Labour Convention."

(b) **Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning flag State responsibilities for the enforcement of Council Directive 2009/13/EC implementing the Agreement concluded by the European Community Shipowners' Associations (ECSA) and the European Transport Workers' Federation (ETF) on the Maritime Labour Convention, 2006, and amending Directive 1999/63/EC [First reading]**

- General approach  
8241/12 MAR 38 TRANS 106 SOC 242  
14790/12 MAR 123 TRANS 327 SOC 816 CODEC 2348  
+ ADD 1  
+ ADD 2

The Council reached a general approach on the text of the above proposed Directive, as set out in doc. 14790/12.

Slovenia abstained and presented a statement to be entered in these minutes, as set out hereafter. Austria also presented a statement to be entered in these minutes, as set out hereafter.

### **Statement by Austria**

"Austria is aware of the significance of the Maritime Labour Convention, which is an important step towards improving the living and working conditions of seafarers on ships. Accordingly, Austria welcomes efforts made to implement the Maritime Labour Convention in the largest possible number of States.

On the other hand, maritime transport is less important to a landlocked state such as Austria, not least because the shipping register has been closed for commercial vessels. In this regard Austria is therefore no longer a flag State.

Austria would not wish to obstruct the other Member States in any way, should they ratify the Maritime Labour Convention within the meaning of the proposed Directives. As the implementation of this Convention requires a significant administrative and financial commitment, which is entirely disproportionate to the Convention's relevance for Austria, Austria does not intend to ratify the Maritime Labour Convention."

### **Statement by Slovenia**

"The Republic of Slovenia maintains a general reservation on the proposal, in particular on the issue of the chosen legal basis and the mechanism for implementation.

The Republic of Slovenia argues that since the proposed Directive aims to implement or rather to supplement Directive 2009/13/EC (adopted on the basis of Article 139(2) of the EC Treaty, now Article 155(2) TFEU), which in turn enforces and supplements an agreement between the social partners implementing MLC 2006, it would have been more logical to amend Directive 2009/13/EC on that same legal basis, or at least to amend Directive 2009/21/EC on compliance with Flag State requirements.

In the view of the Republic of Slovenia such an approach would be more in line with the principles guiding the choice of legal basis and of better regulation, simplification and transparency.

The Republic of Slovenia believes that the approach adopted in the general approach does not solve the issue adequately and that Member States will face difficulties when transposing the Directive into their own national legal systems."

**5. Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on common rules for the allocation of slots at European Union airports (Recast) [First reading]**

- General approach  
18009/11 AVIATION 257 CODEC 2289  
+ REV 1 (en)  
15282/12 AVIATION 158 CODEC 2455

The Council reached a general approach on the Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on common rules for the allocation of slots at European Union airports (Recast) as set out in doc. 15442/12.

The Presidency presented a statement to be entered into these minutes, as set out hereafter.

**Statement by the Presidency**

"The Presidency suggests, in order to allow the UK and Spain more time to reach an understanding on the Gibraltar question, to park the matter for now.

In order to reflect this "parking" in our text the Presidency suggests to leave out entirely from the text the references to Gibraltar (in Recital 29 and Article 1) and replace footnotes 7 and 9 with a text reflecting that the matter has been parked in this way for the time being".

**7. Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Council Regulation (EEC) No 3821/85 on recording equipment in road transport and amending Regulation (EC) No 561/2006 of the European Parliament and the Council ("Tachograph") [First reading]**

- Political agreement  
13195/11 TRANS 222 CODEC 1274  
13725/12 TRANS 292 CODEC 2124  
+ ADD 1

The Council reached a political agreement on the above proposal, as it appears in doc. 13725/12.

The Commission presented a statement to be entered into these minutes, as set out hereafter.

### **Statement by the Commission**

"The Commission considers that the political agreement does not offer sufficient guarantees to prevent fraud and misuse of the tachograph system since:

- The date foreseen to introduce the 'smart tachographs' is too late compared with the initial Commission's proposal (in Articles 4, 5 and 6);
- The Council deleted Article 27 on the merging of driver cards without offering long term alternatives to personalise the cards and reduce the misuse of cards;
- The new Article 21 (7a) introduced by the Council allows the issuance of cards to drivers who reside in territories of Member States where the Treaties do not apply, without sufficient legal guarantees that these drivers will respect the Regulation.

These weaknesses undermine one of the main goals of the initial Commission's proposal, which was to increase the security of the tachograph system and reduce the number of frauds.

The Commission calls on the Council and the European Parliament to further discuss the abovementioned issues and find appropriate solutions during the next steps of the ordinary legislative procedure."

### **8. Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on periodic roadworthiness tests for motor vehicles and their trailers and repealing Directive 2009/40/EC [First reading]**

- Orientation debate  
12786/12 TRANS 249 CODEC 1954  
+ REV 1 (cs, da, el, es, et, fi, ga, hu, it, lt, lv, mt, nl, pl, pt, sk, sl, sv, ro, bg)  
15093/12 TRANS 339 CODEC 2412

The Council held a policy debate on the above proposal.

=====