



Brussels, 23 July 2015
(OR. en)

11183/15

PE 133
TRANS 248

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 13 - 14 July 2015 Chair: Mr CRAMER (G/EFA, DE)

TRAN held an exchange of views with the Minister for Sustainable Development and Infrastructure of Luxembourg, Mr BAUSCH, on the Presidency's priorities. Members supported the focus on the completion of the 4th railway package and progress on aviation files that are currently blocked. They also highlighted the importance of social aspects, unfair competition and the scrutiny of EFSI projects. Diverse views were expressed on cycling: for some it was important to tackle this overlooked topic; for others the effort should be more targeted and focus on areas of EU competence.

The Committee also discussed for the first time the own-initiative report on the safe use of drones.

The report on the implementation of the 2011 White Paper on Transport was adopted, as well as two opinions on the Energy Union Package.

1. Towards a new international climate agreement in Paris
TRAN/8/03302, 2015/2112(INI), COM(2015)0081
Rapporteur for the opinion: Bas Eickhout (Greens/EFA, NL)
Committee responsible: ENVI

The rapporteur informed Members that seven compromise amendments covered more or less all amendments tabled and most groups (except for ECR, EFDD and ENF) could support them. Compromises called for transport to be taken more into consideration in the framework of COP21 discussions and clarified the roles of the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO) and the International Maritime Organisation (IMAO) in dealing with CO₂ emissions reduction. Moreover, they raised the issues of energy mix in the transport sector, pricing and the future approach towards transport.

EPP, S&D, ALDE, Greens/EFA and GUE Members supported the compromise amendments. Mr ZŁOTOWSKI (ECR, PL) stated that his group could not do so and would vote against. The Commission representative acknowledged that the draft report did not reflect the transport sector enough and supported the draft opinion. Transport was an important area in terms of energy and its import dependency. Moreover, CO₂ emissions coming from the sector should be reduced. He underlined the need to focus on energy efficiency, renewables and the selection of efficient modes of transport.

Vote in ITRE: 22-23 September

2. Presentation by Luxembourg Minister for Transport, Mr Bausch, on Luxembourg Presidency priorities

The main dossiers highlighted during the discussion were as follows:

From the Presidency

- **4th railway package** – the Presidency's flagship priority. The focus would be on the details of the political pillar (governance of the system and public service obligations) with the aim of reaching an agreement by the October or at the latest by the December TTE Council, taking into account the specificities of individual member states. The objective was greater use of railways, better-quality services and higher performance in the sector.

- **Aviation.** There were difficulties in moving forward due to the 'general policy issue'. Nevertheless, work could continue informally on all aviation files; given the political concerns, priority would be given to air passengers' rights. An informal Council meeting on aviation would take place in January 2016 under the NL Presidency.
- **White paper on transport.** The Minister welcomed the own-initiative report on the mid-term review that was just adopted. A debate on the mid-term review was planned for the October TTE Council and could perhaps be followed by a joint statement with the European Parliament. In this context, the Minister also mentioned road safety, and hoped it would be incorporated into the debate.
- **Urban mobility and cycling.** The October informal Council would address the important and overlooked issue of cycling and urban mobility. The Minister invited the MEPs to attend.
- The Presidency also mentioned **Inland waterway vessels** (aim: get through the negotiations quickly and reach agreement); **Investments in infrastructure** (the Presidency, in the context of EFSI, was aware of the EP's strong position and planned to work on it. Investment needs in the sector were significant); **Environmental issues in the field of transport** (COP21 would send a very strong signal to the sector to increase its efforts to cut CO2 emissions); **Port services** (If the EP report was available as scheduled by mid-December, the Presidency was prepared to organise a meeting in December. The December TTE Council would focus on social issues, to look at how to implement the existing rules more effectively).

From the MEPs

- **4th railway package.** General agreement across the political spectrum to focus on this issue. Members enquired about possible compromises on remaining problems in the political pillar. High quality was needed as incomplete liberalisation had an impact on cross-border transport. Social dumping should be avoided (Mr TURMES (Greens, LU)). Specific features of member states were raised (Mr ERTUG (S&D, DE), Ms KYLLONEN (GUE, FI), Ms ŁUKACIJEWSKA (EPP, PL), Ms BILBAO BARANDICA (ALDE, ES)), together with the need to ensure that opening up the market would not undermine regions and the viability of routes, and that social standards and protection of workers would be maintained (Ms REVAULT D'ALLONNES-BONNEFOY (S&D, FR)).

- **Aviation files.** Overall agreement that the files (such as the Single European Sky and air passengers' rights) needed to progress. Concerning Gibraltar, the focus should not be the issue of sovereignty, but access of all EU citizens to services (Ms MEISSNER (ALDE, DE)). Ms FOSTER (ECR, UK) said that the Gibraltar was part of the internal market and sovereignty was not up for negotiation. Mr MARINESCU (EPP, RO) invited the Presidency to apply the qualified majority, according to the Treaties. In this context, the pressure from third-country competitors was also raised (in connection with state aid and social dumping), and Members asked about the Presidency's intentions in that area. Interest was also expressed in the Commission's forthcoming aviation package. Many different components of the package seemed problematic, and the Presidency was invited to work seriously on its preparation (Mr ERTUG).
- **Social issues and social dumping, including the German minimum wage in road transport and Uber.** Asked about the minimum wage issue, the Minister said that the question should be addressed to the Commission. Asked about Uber, he noted that there was no EU regulation, and he personally was neither for nor against this innovative system, but pointed to the social and tax issues that needed to be discussed. He made an analogy with third-country competitors in the aviation sector, which could be discussed at EU level. As to the social questions concerning road transport, it was important to effectively implement and enforce the existing legislation.
- MEPs also mentioned: **EFSI** (scrutiny of projects, and, in the context of budget negotiations, need to cover the EFSI guarantee by other means than the CEF); **Cycling** (asked by MEPs, the Minister clarified that he did not intend to launch a debate on a new regulation on cycling, which was a national and regional competence, but the Presidency wanted to discuss this underestimated transport mode, which generated economic value. The cities that were leaders in urban mobility were bike-friendly); **Road safety**, including cuts in the number of fatalities and a target for reducing severe injuries.

3. Safe use of remotely piloted aircraft systems (RPAS), commonly known as unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs), in the field of civil aviation

TRAN/8/02303, 2014/2243(INI), COM(2014)0207

Rapporteur: Jacqueline Foster (ECR, UK)

The rapporteur informed Members that her report had already taken into account some aspects related to the work of the LIBE committee. Given the growth potential of the industry and the benefits it could generate, the challenge was how to regulate the market without overregulating it. She favoured a 'case-by-case' approach without being too prescriptive, or a 'group-by-group'/type-by-type' approach. Safety and safe use were key. The focus would be on regulating the manufacturing side, including standardisation, as well as on certification and operators' licences, including qualification and training. Concerning data protection and privacy issues, national and EU legislation was available and the Member States should comply with it. She reiterated the need to take an international approach to the sector.

During the discussion, Members agreed with the need to proceed rapidly and supported an EU approach, as a national patchwork should be avoided (Mr KOCH (EPP, DE)). Ms CLUNE (EPP, IE), on behalf of Mr MUSELIER (EPP, FR), saw a need for a European framework for all categories of drones and was concerned whether the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) had the capacity to fulfil any new missions. Mr ZEMKE (S&D, PL) was also in favour, as the lack of harmonised standards prevented cross-border operations and was complicating the procedures of mutual recognition of certificates. He also thought that ICAO should be given a more prominent role.

Many raised the issue of data protection and privacy. Mr ZEMKE saw no need for new legislation, but it was necessary to check whether the national legislation was suitable. Mr van MILTENBURG (ALDE, NL) called for building public support in relation to data protection. Ms SEHNALOVÁ (S&D, CZ) and Mr NILSSON (S&D, SE) were concerned about possible misuse. Members also thought that removing the 150 kg threshold was the best solution in terms of certifying competences.

Moreover, Ms CLUNE thought that it would be useful to mention the military aspects as well and supported the distinction made between commercial and recreational use of drones. She also thought that the future rules on drones (Article 19) should be more specific. Mr van MILTENBURG thought that the report did not sufficiently address the concept of operation (risk-based approach). The EASA approach should be mentioned more specifically. Concerning registration and traceability, the operator had to be responsible for the use of the drone at all times. He also saw a need to secure extra R&D funding for drones.

For the Commission, Mr RAHUOJA (Director, DG MOVE) pointed to the need to reconcile safety, security, privacy and the environmental constraints. The question was how to keep the rules proportionate to the risk and to speed up the regulatory process, as harmonised rules were needed as soon as possible. He informed Members that the Commission was working on safety rules for drones within the framework of the aviation package to be adopted before the end of the year. Moreover, the EASA was also developing more detailed drone requirements and was proactive in the Joint Authorities for Rulemaking on Unmanned Systems (JARUS) in order to provide for global solutions. The first consultation on two concrete documents was scheduled before the summer break and the process should be finalised before the end of the year. At the same time, the Commission was coordinating with the industry in order to develop standards. Active cooperation with the ICAO was also ongoing. The harmonisation of the identification of drones and geo-fencing would contribute to safety, privacy, security and accountability. Concerning the financing, the SESAR Joint Undertaking would allocate EUR 40 million within the framework of its European ATM Master Plan.

Deadline for amendments: 22 July; vote in TRAN: 15 September; vote in plenary: October II.

4. Presentation by the Court of Auditors (CoA) of Special Report 1/2015 on inland waterways

Ms IVANOVA, CoA, presented the outcome of the performance audit, which assessed whether the inland waterway freight transport strategies had been implemented effectively. The conclusion was that the objective of shifting traffic from roads to inland waterway transport and improving navigability had not been achieved. Overall, the audited projects (12 projects from four Member States) had had a very limited impact on freight transport, as the nearby bottlenecks had not been eliminated. Concerning the EU strategies that had been analysed as well, the findings were that these were not based on a sufficiently robust analysis and did not fully address the following key obstacles: inconsistencies between the national strategies; the funding gap between the estimated costs to eliminate the identified bottlenecks and the limited EU funding available; insufficient consideration of the environmental needs and inadequate river maintenance. Consequently, two types of recommendations were issued. Firstly, to improve the effectiveness of the EU funding, the CoA recommended that the Member States prioritise the projects with the greatest and most immediate benefits and that the Commission should focus on those that had already advanced plans to eliminate bottlenecks.

Secondly, to improve coordination between the Member States, the Commission should analyse the potential market and benefits for different river segments, as well as coordinate the implementation of the core TEN-T network across the Member States. The Commission and the Member States should also agree on specific and achievable objectives to eliminate bottlenecks. Moreover, the Commission should strengthen the legal base to broaden the reporting requirements and require Member States to coordinate while drawing up their national maintenance plans.

On that basis, Members criticised the missing cross-border elements and called for common objectives. Some thought that bottlenecks resulted from the lack of cooperation and coordination between the Member States and called for the projects to be more related to the corridors or already approved national plans. They enquired absent what could help the modal shift.

For the Commission, Mr ONIDI, Director (DG MOVE), complained that the title of the report was unrelated. Very few audited projects were TEN-T and the main criticism about the lack of strategic thinking was no longer relevant. Currently, funding focused on the projects 'with a lot of sense'.

Ms IVANOVA clarified that the audit did not look only at TEN-T projects, but at ERDF projects too, mainly for the 2007-2013 programming period. In this context, she recalled that the 2010 TEN-T guidelines were not binding to the Member States, whereas the new 2013 guidelines imposed legal obligations. Consequently, further studies might be envisaged on the new developments. She found the missing common objectives/lack of an integrated approach to be a weakness of the system and acknowledged the lack of national cooperation and communication. She also agreed with the comments on the lack of network density. For that reason the report recommended giving priority to the projects with greatest and most immediate benefits.

*** *Electronic vote* ***

Implementation of the 2011 White Paper on Transport: taking stock and the way forward towards sustainable mobility

Rapporteur: Wim van de Camp (EPP, NL), TRAN/8/02476,2015/2005(INI)

The draft report was adopted as amended (38 votes in favour, 3 against, 5 abstentions).

Towards a European Energy Union

Rapporteur for the opinion: Henna Virkkunen (EPP, FI), TRAN/8/03301, 2015/2113(INI)

The draft opinion was adopted as amended (40 votes in favour, 6 against, 0 abstentions).

Towards a new international climate agreement in Paris

Rapporteur for the opinion: Bas Eickhout (Greens/EFA, NL), TRAN/8/03302, 2015/2112(INI)

The draft opinion was adopted as amended (40 votes in favour, 4 against, 2 abstentions).

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

Next meeting

- 31 August 2015, 17.00 – 18.30 (Brussels)
-