



Brussels, 19 March 2015

7400/15

PE 52  
TRANS 104  
ECOFIN 218

**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 16 and 17 March 2015  
Chair: Mr CRAMER (G/EFA, DE).

---

**TRAN held its first exchange of views on the regulation setting up the European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSI) and discussed with European Investment Bank (EIB) representatives about lending in transport area, project selection and EFSI. It also examined the working document on the implementation of the 2011 White Paper on Transport.**

**1. Recommendations to the European Commission on the negotiations for the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP)**

TRAN/8/02371, 2014/2228(INI)

Rapporteur for the opinion: Wim van de Camp (EPP, NL)

There were 76 amendments to the draft opinion and a compromise text was drafted. The rapporteur considered that general TTIP subjects should not be dealt with in the framework of the TRAN opinion, but rather in the INTA report. However, he acknowledged that the issues of labour standards, social dumping and working conditions needed to be mentioned in the opinion as well.

He also tried to address the issue of ISDS by including it in recital 2, as dispute settlement, in particular in the context of public procurement in the US, was linked to TTIP.

Members discussed in particular the ISDS mechanism, the demand for greater transparency in negotiations, protectionism in the US and restrictions or discrimination in terms of market access for investment, public services, cabotage, and environmental and labour standards.

The Commission representative assured Members that the Commission was working on the ownership and control of airlines.

*Vote in TRAN: 26 March 2015; vote in plenary: May 2015*

## **2. European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSI)**

TRAN/8/02559, 2015/0009(COD), COM(2015)0010

Co-rapporteurs: Dominique Riquet (ALDE, FR) and Inés Ayala Sender (S&D, ES)

The rapporteurs welcomed the EFSI proposal, but expressed their concern about its implementation. In particular, they rejected cutting the Connecting Europe Facility (CEF) and Horizon 2020 budgets to finance EFSI and suggested using flexibility and allocated margins. Mr RIQUET called on Members to table amendments that respected the budgetary procedure. The European Parliament should be involved in project selection and monitoring. The selection criteria for EFSI should be as strict as for CEF projects.

Members broadly agreed that the CEF and Horizon 2020 budgets should not finance EFSI and called on the Commission to come up with alternatives. Some deplored the fact that these programmes were required to make sacrifices, while the margins in the general budget and the cohesion part of the budget remained untouched. As to the alternative funding, some voiced their reservations about financing EFSI from the annual re-allocation of resources within the EU budget. It would unnecessarily politicise decision-making and make the budget re-allocation unpredictable. Other issues raised were the timeframe for EFSI (temporary or permanent tool), the members of the selection committee, the involvement of the European Parliament and calls for Member States' contributions.

The Commission representative was concerned about the deletion of Articles 18 and 19 (CEF and Horizon 2020 cuts) for several reasons: if provision was not made for clear financing, the annual budget would be even more chaotic; more predictability was needed in managing the programmes, and there was a risk for the EU's trade rating. He suggested that Members come up with a

fully-fledged alternative proposal for financing. He also informed the meeting of five Member States that

intended to contribute to EFSI, giving a total of EUR 26 billion.

With regard the investment guidelines, these should be flexible, with no geographic or sectoral allocation. As to the investment committee, in order to ensure that investments were selected by independent experts, the European Parliament should not be associated with its work, nor should the EIB or the Commission.

*Deadline for amendments: 19 March; consideration of amendments: 26 March; vote in TRAN: 14 April; vote in plenary: May 2015.*

### **3. 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 presented the working document, which was a combination of "innovation and continuity". He explained that he had put less emphasis on sustainability and more on economic aspects. In this context, he also thought that sustainability should be achieved through incentives rather than through penalties. He highlighted the challenges that needed to be addressed: focusing on co-modality instead of the modal shift; developing, maintaining and upgrading of the transport infrastructure; maintaining the competitiveness of industry and focusing on innovation.

Members agreed that the focus should be on the actions needed to achieve the objectives of the White Paper and stressed that the existing legislation should be properly implemented. They discussed many issues, including the social dimension and improving working conditions, social dumping, mobility as an integrated service, co-modality, problems of congestion, application of the 'user pays' and 'polluter pays' principles with earmarking, protection of health and the environment, sustainability and decarbonisation, traffic and road safety, innovation, digitalisation and new technologies. In the context of the latter, some Members mentioned Uber, a question that required a proper debate.

*Presentation of draft report: 13-14 April; deadline for amendments: 20 April; vote in TRAN: 28 May; vote in plenary: July 2015*

#### **4. Procedures and practices regarding Commissioner Hearings, lessons to be taken from the 2014 process**

TRAN/8/02758, 2015/2040(INI)

Rapporteur for the opinion: Michael Cramer (Greens/EFA, DE)

The rapporteur underlined the fact that the timetable for setting up the new Commission was extremely tight. It should be improved to allow the European Parliament to have sufficient time to conduct the hearings properly. For instance, the previous Commission could remain in place until December to remove the time pressure. On the question of the Conference of Presidents setting the format, he thought that the Committees should be given more flexibility. He also noted that Ms BULC had very limited time to prepare herself. Moreover, he had not received a reply from Mr JUNCKER to his letter about Commissioner ŠEFČOVIČ.

Members agreed with the remarks regarding Ms BULC and the role of the Conference of Presidents. Some did not agree with the amendments concerning gender balance, stating that it was up to Member States to decide whom they would designate and up to the Commission President to ensure gender balance. Other issues were the deadlines for nominations and giving more attention to the D'Hondt points system.

*Deadline for amendments: 19 March, vote in TRAN: 14 April; vote in AFCO: 5 May; vote on plenary: May 2015*

#### **5. Presentation by the EIB, Director for Mobility Department, Ms THEANDER**

Ms THEANDER explained the lending process and project assessment in the transport area. She focused on the project cycles, including the eligibility criteria, selection procedures, monitoring and ex-post assessments. She emphasised that projects were selected not only on the basis of economic factors, but also based on their environmental and societal values and their European added value.

Members were mainly interested in the funding and risk of the EFSI (including the pooling of funds, necessary flexibility and the leverage effect) and its link to other financing instruments and regular EIB activities. They also asked whether the EIB would use the same selection criteria for EFSI as for the CEF and TEN-T. They shared the focus on European added value and cross-border and environmental aspects as the most important criteria for the selection process. On the other hand, some Members were concerned about projects that generated lower profit (e.g. inland

waterways). Moreover, urban projects funded by the EIB would be better addressed at national level (subsidiarity).

Ms BARRAGAN (Head of the EIB Institutional Strategy Division) explained that the EFSI would come on top of normal EIB activities. The main distinction would be the guarantee provided by the EFSI, which should allow the EIB to support projects with higher than usual risk. She also highlighted the increased eligibility for the EFSI compared with project bonds.

### **Next meeting**

- 26 March 2015, 09.00-12.30 (Brussels)
-