



Council of the  
European Union

Brussels, 3 March 2015

6799/15

PE 39  
TRANS 73  
AVIATION 36

#### NOTE

---

from:	General Secretariat of the Council
to:	Delegations
Subject:	Summary record of the meeting of the <b>Committee on Transport and Tourism (TRAN)</b> of the European Parliament, held in Brussels on 23 and 24 February 2015 Chair: Mr CRAMER (G/EFA, DE).

---

**TRAN held a discussion with Deputy State Secretary Ms Zaiga LIEPINA on the Latvian Presidency's priorities in the field of tourism and had an exchange of views with Mr Christophersen, Mr Bodewig and Mr Secchi on new financial schemes for European transport infrastructure projects. The Committee also approved the draft recommendation for the second reading on weights and dimensions.**

#### 1. Towards an integrated approach to cultural heritage for Europe

TRAN/8/01786, 2014/2149(INI), COM(2014)0477

Rapporteur for the opinion: Miltiadis Kyrkos (S&D, EL)

The rapporteur underlined the link between cultural heritage and cultural tourism. He said that the quality of services and a high level of professional knowledge were key for Europe's competitiveness. Given the need for sustainable, responsible and quality tourism, he voiced his support for the authenticity of local culture while avoiding the negative consequences of mass tourism. He also stressed that SMEs needed to be given information and access to EU funds.

Coordinators broadly supported the draft opinion.

*Deadline for amendments: 13 March, 12:00*

## 2. **Presentation by the Commission, DG MARE, on maritime surveillance - COM(2014)0451**

The Commission representative explained the concept of CISE (Common Information Sharing Environment for the EU maritime domain). He saw a huge potential for interoperability of surveillance systems that would result in increasing knowledge about vulnerabilities, reducing duplication of information, designing a new generation of information services and improving further military-civilian cooperation. He stressed that CISE was not a new maritime surveillance system and assured Members that the EU was not taking any national responsibilities, nor ending the sectoral responsibility in the maritime domain. Concerning the planned actions, he drew attention to the CISE handbook, which contained best practices, and interoperability standards.

Mr van de CAMP (EPP, NL) raised the issue of the voluntary basis for cooperation and inquired whether there was room for more structured cooperation. Ms ANDERSON (S&D, UK) inquired about the involvement of social partners. Mr TAYLOR (Greens/EFA, UK) asked about transparency in terms of military surveillance. He also touched upon European Maritime Safety Agency (EMSA) funding.

Concerning the voluntary basis, the Commission representative explained that given the civilian-military aspect of the cooperation, it could not be regulated by EU legislation. EMSA would be supported in its tasks by additional information, not by additional funding.

## 3. **Presentation by Ms Zaiga LIEPINA, Deputy State Secretary at the Ministry of the Economy, on Latvian Presidency priorities on tourism**

Ms LIEPINA said the Latvian Presidency would focus on the following priorities:

- **maintaining and strengthening the EU's status as the leading tourist destination**, in particular by exchanging best practices, improving European branding and marketing the EU as a single tourist destination, facilitating cooperation between Member States and supporting cross-border projects and programmes;
- **developing innovative tourism products** with a focus on digital technologies, raising awareness among businesses, especially SMEs, and tailoring products to the needs of customers in line with recent trends (e.g. environmentally friendly products);

- **creating a sustainable regulatory framework for the sector**, ensuring that any new initiatives were SME-friendly and cutting red tape.

Concerning the on-going legislative files, the Presidency would like to finalise the trilogues on the Package Travel Directive by the beginning of the main tourism season. Ms LIEPINA also indicated that the Annual Forum of the EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region (15-16 June in Riga) would comprise a session dedicated to tourism.

During the discussion Members raised a variety of issues. Mr van de CAMP (EPP, NL) considered that the issue of security should be given greater attention. In this context, divergent views were expressed on the facilitation of the visa regime (Mr ERTUG (S&D, DE), Mr LUNDGREN (EFDD, SE) and Mr GOLLNISCH (NI, FR)). European branding generated a lot of interest (Ms TAPARDEL (S&D, PT), Mr UJHELYI (S&D, HU), Ms LUKACIJEWSKA (EPP, PL), Ms DE MONTE (S&D, IT)), with questions ranging from dedicated resources and institutions (Mr ZILE (ECR, LV)) to the rejection of harmonisation (Mr LUNDGREN).

Members highlighted the link between successful tourism and the need for adequate infrastructure and interoperability of transport modes. They were also interested in the seasonality, sustainability and financing of tourism. In this context, they highlighted the value and role of SMEs. Some Members inquired about accessibility, in particular for people with disabilities, and were concerned about tourism in less developed areas.

Regarding security aspects, Ms LIEPINA underlined that all dedicated institutions should cooperate to make tourism safe, reduce risks and focus on problems with the security situation. Preventive measures were needed and all sectors playing a role in these policy areas should be involved. Concerning the Visa Code, the Presidency would try to acquire a mandate to start discussions with the European Parliament. As for European branding, it was important to have one voice in attracting tourist flows and then to work on distributing them to showcase the diversity of the EU. The Latvian Presidency would host an EU tourism task force conference on 22 April to consider ways of making the EU more competitive and of addressing challenges posed by external players. Ms LIEPINA agreed that tourism aspects should be mainstreamed into transport, infrastructure, logistics, culture, etc. and that red tape should be reduced. With regard to funding, COSME and structural funds were available, but national funding should also be considered to supplement EU funding. Concerning the digital economy, she considered it important to analyse all new legislative acts from a digital perspective.

#### **4. Presentation by European Environment Agency Executive Director, Mr BRUYNINCKX, of Report No 7/2014 - Focusing on environmental pressures from long-distance transport**

Mr BRUYNINCKX said that the environmental performance of transport was improving. Nevertheless, due to increased demand, it was the only sector where greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions had increased. Freight and long-distance transport accounted for up to three-quarters of transport's GHG emissions. To reach the targets, re-thinking of transport systems (from efficiency to transition), urban planning and adaptation of transport to climate change were advisable.

Many Members commented on urban mobility, and stressed the importance of town planning and smart transport systems. They also inquired about how to ensure that the investment plan could be beneficial for public and rail transport in this context. Others mentioned the implementation of the Single European Sky, environmental performance and subsidies in different transport modes.

Regarding urban transport, Mr BRUYNINCKX had no clear answer in terms of measures to be taken. He said they should be context-specific, and depending on the existing infrastructure should be coupled with public transport connections and facilities provided by organisations and companies (parking, showers, etc.). In this context, pricing mechanisms could have an enormous impact on the result. He advised against investing in things that could lead to a lock-in into long-term unsustainability.

#### **5. Scrutiny of Commission's implementing powers - Presentation by the Commission, DG MOVE, on aviation security**

The Commission representatives presented the main policy goals for aviation security. They gave details about the EU's regulatory framework, the content and construction of supplementing and implementing acts and the involvement of stakeholders. They stressed that aviation security regulation needed to be sustainable and was not designed to address temporary or very specific threats. They presented what had already been achieved, as well as the ongoing work and next steps (risk-based security design measures more tailored to threat and risk). They noted that the Commission was preparing an aviation strategy covering aviation security.

Members inquired about the TSA PreCheck and global entry programme used in the US, the advanced baggage procedure, "one-stop shop" security, liquids and data protection in the context of screening of on-board luggage.

The Commission representative said that measures facilitating the experience of passengers would be further developed in the forthcoming aviation strategy. The pre-check concept was an interesting one and merited being thought through. If well-prepared and implemented correctly, it could be a good qualitative improvement. Concerning liquids, he underlined that the continuous ban was substantiated by sound facts. To lift it, the conditions needed to be right, including the implementation of the necessary technology at all airports. As for the screening of baggage, he pointed out that no information was retained about the cabin baggage.

#### **6. Presentation by the European Court of Auditors (ECA) of SR 1/2014 on the effectiveness of EU-supported public urban transport projects**

Ms IVANOVA, ECA, presented the outcome of the performance audit, which assessed whether the projects had been implemented as planned, whether the services provided met users' needs and whether they were used as much as expected. In general, projects had been implemented in accordance with the specifications, but some had been affected by significant delays and cost overruns. Almost all projects met users' needs, but two thirds of them were underused. On this basis, the ECA presented its recommendations, in particular on enhancing the monitoring tools and on linking the funding to a sound mobility policy.

On the basis of the report, many Members thought that some sort of framework regarding urban transport should be introduced (taking into account the principle of subsidiarity), including the exchange of best practices for sustainable urban mobility.

#### **7. Presentation by the Commission, DG MOVE, of the Christophersen-Bodewig-Secchi report on new financial schemes for European transport infrastructure projects**

Mr Christophersen (former Commission Vice-President) and Professors Bodewig and Secchi presented this interim report identifying the projects along the TEN-T corridors that could be financed by innovative financial schemes, as well as the obstacles to private investor participation. The final report should be available in June 2015. They noted that the report reflected their personal views.

During the discussion, Members asked about the selection criteria for projects to be financed by the European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSI), cross-financing and blending, leverage expected from the EFSI, proposed cuts in the CEF budget, and about the barriers for private investors (including the non-financial). They were also interested in why investors would choose to invest in non-profitable projects. The exclusion of projects from national deficits was also mentioned.

The authors reiterated that their role was to issue recommendations about the problems linked to the proper implementation of projects and that they could not enforce anything on Member States. Some barriers were national, but others, such as state aid rules and standards, were an EU responsibility. They could not comment on the expected leverage of 15 %; everything depended on the project. Pooling of projects was possible if properly implemented, but the rules on cross-financing were necessary. The involvement of investment and pension funds was actually not a new idea; they were already investing in the infrastructure.

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

**Maximum authorised dimensions in national and international traffic and the maximum authorised weights in international traffic for certain road vehicles circulating within the Community**

Rapporteur: Jörg Leichtfried (S&D, DE), 2013/0105(COD)

The draft recommendation was approved (41 votes in favour, 0 against, 0 abstentions).

**Discharge 2013: European Maritime Safety Agency**

Rapporteur for the opinion: Dominique Riquet (ALDE, FR), 2014/2105(DEC)

The draft opinion was adopted as amended (37 votes in favour, 6 against, 0 abstentions).

**Discharge 2013: European Aviation Safety Agency**

Rapporteur for the opinion: Dominique Riquet (ALDE, FR), 2014/2106(DEC)

The draft opinion was adopted as amended (38 votes in favour, 5 against, 0 abstentions).

**Discharge 2013: European Railway Agency**

Rapporteur for the opinion: Dominique Riquet (ALDE, FR), 2014/2111(DEC)

The draft opinion was adopted as amended (37 votes in favour, 6 against, 0 abstentions).

**Discharge 2013: SESAR - Safety of air navigation**

Rapporteur for the opinion: Dominique Riquet (ALDE, FR), 2014/2130(DEC)

The draft opinion was adopted as amended (38 votes in favour, 5 against, 0 abstentions).

## **Discharge 2013: EU general budget - European Commission**

Rapporteur for the opinion: Georgi Pirinski (S&D, BG), [2014/2075\(DEC\)](#)

The draft opinion was adopted as amended (37 votes in favour, 6 against, 0 abstentions).

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

### **Next meeting**

- 16 March 2015, 09.00-12.30 (Brussels)
  - 17 March 2015, 09.00-12.30 and 15.00-18.30 (Brussels)
-