



Brussels, 18 May 2020  
(OR. en)

7759/1/20  
REV 1

PUBLIC 34  
INF 92

## NOTE

---

Subject: MONTHLY SUMMARY OF COUNCIL ACTS - APRIL 2020

---

This document lists the acts<sup>1</sup> adopted by the Council in April 2020.<sup>23</sup>

It provides information on the adoption of legislative and non-legislative acts, including:

- the date of adoption,
- the relevant Council session,
- the number of the document adopted,
- the Official Journal reference,
- reference to the minutes of the Council session when the act was adopted.

---

<sup>1</sup> For easy reference, the "short titles" as mentioned in the Council's agendas are also indicated (see in italics).

<sup>2</sup> With the exception of certain acts of limited scope such as procedural decisions, appointments, specific budgetary decisions, etc.

<sup>3</sup> In the case of legislative acts adopted in the ordinary legislative procedure, there may be a difference between the date of the Council's meeting where the legislative act is adopted and the actual date of the act in question, since legislative acts adopted in the ordinary legislative procedure are only considered to have been adopted after signature by both the President of the Council and the President of the European Parliament and the Secretaries-General of the two institutions.

This document is also available on the Council's website at:

[Monthly summaries of Council acts \(acts\) - Consilium](#)

Documents listed in the summary may be obtained from the public register of Council documents at: [Documents and publications - Consilium](#).

If not directly available, a request for access to documents can be submitted at:

<https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/documents-publications/public-register/request-document/>

It should be noted that this document is exclusively for information purposes - only Council minutes are authentic. These are available on the Council's website at: [Council Minutes - Consilium](#)

---

**INFORMATION ON THE ACTS ADOPTED BY THE COUNCIL IN APRIL 2020**

<b>Written procedure completed on 2 April 2020</b>	<b>CM 1983/20</b>
<i>Council Decision appointing the European Union Special Representative for the Belgrade-Pristina Dialogue and other Western Balkan regional issues</i>	6754/20
Council Decision (CFSP) 2020/489 of 2 April 2020 appointing the European Union Special Representative for the Belgrade-Pristina Dialogue and other Western Balkan regional issues <a href="#">OJ L 105, 3.4.2020, p. 3–6</a>	6831/20
<i>Council Regulation amending Regulation (EU) No 1352/2014 concerning restrictive measures in view of the situation in Yemen</i>	
Council Regulation (EU) 2020/488 of 2 April 2020 amending Regulation (EU) No 1352/2014 concerning restrictive measures in view of the situation in Yemen <a href="#">OJ L 105, 3.4.2020, p. 1–2</a>	<b>CM 1868/20</b>
<b>Written procedure completed on 3 April 2020</b>	
<i>Council Decision on the existence of an excessive deficit in Romania</i>	
Council Decision (EU) 2020/509 of 3 April 2020 on the existence of an excessive deficit in Romania <a href="#">OJ L 110, 8.4.2020, p. 58–59</a>	6304/20
<b>Written procedure completed on 3 April 2020</b>	
<i>Council Recommendation with a view to bringing an end to the situation of an excessive government deficit in Romania</i>	
Council Recommendation of 3 April 2020 with a view to bringing an end to the situation of an excessive government deficit in Romania 2020/C 116/01 <a href="#">OJ C 116, 8.4.2020, p. 1–3</a>	<b>CM 1868/20</b>
	6305/20
<b>Written procedure completed on 7 April 2020</b>	
<i>Council Decision on the signing, on behalf of the European Union and its Member States, of the Protocol to the Cooperation Agreement on a Civil Global Navigation Satellite System (GNSS) between the European Community and its Member States and Ukraine to take account of the accession of the Republic of Bulgaria, the Republic of Croatia and Romania to the European Union</i>	
Council Decision (EU) 2020/520 of 18 November 2019 on the signing, on behalf of the European Union and its Member States, of the Protocol to the Cooperation Agreement on a Civil Global Navigation Satellite System (GNSS) between the European Community and its Member States and Ukraine to take account of the accession of the Republic of Bulgaria, the Republic of Croatia and Romania to the European Union <a href="#">OJ L 117, 15.4.2020, p. 1–2</a>	<b>CM 2020/20</b>
	13318/19

<p><b>Written procedure completed on 7 April 2020</b></p>	<p><b>CM 2013/20</b></p>
<p><i>Council Decision on the position to be taken on behalf of the European Union within the Regional Steering Committee of the Transport Community as regards certain budgetary matters in relation to the implementation of the Treaty establishing the Transport Community</i></p> <p>Council Decision (EU) 2020/522 of 7 April 2020 on the position to be taken on behalf of the European Union within the Regional Steering Committee of the Transport Community as regards certain budgetary matters in relation to the implementation of the Treaty establishing the Transport Community</p> <p><a href="#">OJ L 117, 15.4.2020, p. 9–9</a></p>	<p>6432/20 6534/20</p>
<p><b>Written procedure completed on 7 April 2020</b></p>	<p><b>CM 2006/20</b></p>
<p><i>Council Decision amending Decision 2011/235/CFSP concerning restrictive measures directed against certain persons and entities in view of the situation in Iran</i></p> <p>Council Decision (CFSP) 2020/512 of 7 April 2020 amending Decision 2011/235/CFSP concerning restrictive measures directed against certain persons and entities in view of the situation in Iran</p> <p><a href="#">OJ L 113, 8.4.2020, p. 22–37</a></p>	<p>6113/20</p>
<p><i>Council Implementing Regulation implementing Regulation (EU) No 359/2011 concerning restrictive measures directed against certain persons, entities and bodies in view of the situation in Iran</i></p> <p>Council Implementing Regulation (EU) 2020/510 of 7 April 2020 implementing Regulation (EU) No 359/2011 concerning restrictive measures directed against certain persons, entities and bodies in view of the situation in Iran</p> <p><a href="#">OJ L 113, 8.4.2020, p. 1–17</a></p>	<p>6115/20</p>
<p><i>Council Decision amending Decision (CFSP) 2017/1869 on the European Union Advisory Mission in support of Security Sector Reform in Iraq (EUAM Iraq)</i></p> <p>Council Decision (CFSP) 2020/513 of 7 April 2020 amending Decision (CFSP) 2017/1869 on the European Union Advisory Mission in support of Security Sector Reform in Iraq (EUAM Iraq)</p> <p><a href="#">OJ L 113, 8.4.2020, p. 38–40</a></p>	<p>6270/20</p>

<p><b>Written procedure completed on 7 April 2020</b></p> <p><i>Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulations (EC) No 1071/2009, (EC) No 1072/2009 and (EU) No 1024/2012 with a view to adapting them to developments in the road transport sector</i></p> <p><i>- Adoption of the Council's position at first reading and of the statement of the Council's reasons</i></p> <p>Position of the Council at first reading with a view to the adoption of a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulations (EC) No 1071/2009, (EC) No 1072/2009 and (EU) No 1024/2012 with a view to adapting them to developments in the road transport sector - Adopted by the Council on 7 April 2020</p>	<p>CM 1987/20</p> <p>5115/20</p>
<p>Statement of the Council's reasons</p> <p><b>Statement by Belgium</b></p> <p>Belgium has taken note of the results of the provisional agreement reached on December the 11th between the European Parliament and the Council on the social and market pillar of Mobility Package I.</p> <p>Belgium welcomes the substantial improvement in the working conditions of truck drivers, in particular by prohibiting weekly rest in the cabin, and by applying posting to cabotage operations. A better level playing field should be reached in the future, through the integration of light commercial vehicles within the scope of the entire Mobility package, the return of trucks every 8 weeks to the base, and the ambitious timetable for the deployment of new smart tachographs that will allow a better enforcement of the existing and new rules.</p> <p>Therefore, Belgium considers it is incoherent to further restrict access to the market by imposing a cooling-off period of 4 days on cabotage, while at the same time the European Union will ensure upward social convergence.</p> <p>To our understanding, the cooling-off period is a trade barrier contrary to the spirit of the internal market, and to the efficiency of the logistics chain, since cabotage operations makes it possible to avoid empty journeys.</p> <p>We regret as well, the inclusion of a proposal on long-term posting, which did not appear in the Commission proposal neither in the agreements of the two co-legislators, and hasn't been carefully assessed yet.</p> <p>Despite the positive social elements contained in the Package, Belgium will therefore abstain on the agreement.</p>	<p>5115/1/20</p> <p>REV 1 ADD 1</p>

**Statement by Bulgaria, Cyprus, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland and Romania**

Bulgaria, Cyprus, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland and Romania express deep concerns that the provisional agreement on Mobility Package I contradicts the basic freedom to provide services on the Single Market, the principle of free movement of workers, as well as the key EU policies and goals on climate.

In particular, the requirement to return heavy vehicles to the Member State of establishment at least once every 8 weeks contradicts the EU ambitious climate goals, set out by the European Commission in the new Green Deal on December 11, 2019. Such an obligation, if adopted, will result in a major increase in the number of empty runs of trucks on the European roads and, subsequently, in a substantial increase of CO2 emissions from the transport sector. This sector already accounts for approximately a quarter of GHG emissions in the EU.

Despite our efforts to highlight these points and regardless of scientific evidence from studies on the impact of such an obligation on the increase of empty runs and CO2 emissions, there is no sensitivity for the expected impact of this provision and rational arguments are being dismissed. At the same time, even though the better regulation agenda requires impact assessment at EU level for all such measures, no such assessment has been presented yet.

Returning vehicles to the Member State of establishment is just one example of excessively restrictive and discriminatory measures proposed in Mobility Package I. We share similar concerns about the limitations on cabotage in the form of an excessive cooling off period. This cooling off period amounts to a protectionist measure, which will have a rather negative effect on the Single Market. The obligation for a truck to return as well as the restrictions imposed on cabotage operations, according to estimates of renowned research institutes, will generate additional millions of tons of CO2 emissions per year.

Another major point of concern is that the mandatory return of the vehicle will put in a disadvantaged position Member States which due to their geographical location will have substantial difficulties in providing truck transport services on the Single Market, as their vehicles will have to cover far greater distances and to overcome significant natural barriers, especially in the case of islands.

Unfair competition from third countries' operators is also a factor that has not been properly addressed. This is especially worrisome since the solution to be enacted will have long-term effects not only on the transport sector, but also on the EU economy as a whole.

The transport sector deserves a fair and robust EU legal framework, which will further stimulate its development, while ensuring realistic and enforceable rules. Instead of balanced provisions and a genuine compromise, the provisional agreement imposes restrictive, disproportionate and protectionist measures.

Mobility Package I is a crucial dossier for the European Single Market, as well as for the road transport sector. Today, more than ever, we need to preserve the smooth functioning of the Single Market and the economies of all Member States in the EU while being consistent with other EU policies.



**Statement by Bulgaria, Cyprus, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland and Romania**

Bulgaria, Cyprus, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland and Romania express their objection to the automatic inclusion of the subsidiarity and proportionality clause in the adopted political agreement on the three legal acts of the Mobility Package I during the technical revision of the texts by the lawyer linguists.

We acknowledge that the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality are of primary importance for the exercise of the EU's competences. Nevertheless, addition of such a clause at this late stage of legislative process is not a good practice in general and, in case of the Mobility Package I, it is especially difficult to accept due to the political sensitivity of the whole dossier and taking into account the long-term consequences of the proposed provisions for the functioning of the European road transport sector.

Regretfully, it also demonstrates that the speedy proceedings affected negatively the quality of the adopted legislation. Moreover, we would like to underline the lack of impact assessment of some key provisions of the political agreement. This fact has also been acknowledged by the Commission in their Statement presented at the Coreper I meeting on 20 December 2019, in which the Commission confirmed that some measures had not been part of the Commission's proposals presented on 31 May 2017 and had not been the subject of an impact assessment.

The lack of thorough analysis impedes a proper evaluation of measures proposed in the three legislative acts of the Mobility Package I in terms of their compliance with proportionality rule.

**Statement by Bulgaria, Cyprus, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland and Romania**

Bulgaria, Cyprus, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland and Romania, taking into account the unprecedented spread of the coronavirus COVID-19 that already impacts and will, unfortunately, continue to affect the road transport sector profoundly, call for the suspension of the work on the Mobility Package I until the pandemic is over. Therefore, we vote against adopting the file through a written procedure at this difficult time.

It is expected that most undertakings will suspend or close down operations, which will lead to a significant reduction in the supply of transport services and, therefore, in the delivery of goods to the detriment of the EU citizens and of the smooth functioning of the economy.

In view of the indispensable role of road transport for the post-COVID-19 outbreak recovery effort and the extensive losses, suffered by the sector in the course of handling the outbreak, the road transport and the economy of the EU will be in no position to sustain the unnecessary regulation-imposed shock to be caused by Mobility Package I. In this context we need to bear in mind that the vast majority of road transport undertakings in the European Union are small and medium-size enterprises, which are especially vulnerable.

In the current circumstances, the adoption of the Mobility Package I in its current form is neither reasonable nor justified. We would like to stress that the economic landscape of the EU when the coronavirus crisis is over will be completely different and we believe that the road transport sector will need new solutions addressing this new reality.

Having in mind the above-mentioned situation, we are convinced that the solutions envisaged in Mobility Package I need to be reshaped to be able to account for the new economic reality. Therefore, we propose to suspend the further works on this dossier until the pandemic is over.



### **Statement by Estonia**

Estonia fully supports the objectives of the original proposals of the social and market pillar of Mobility Package I , which were intended to pave the way towards clear road transport rules. Estonia believes that the international road haulage market in the European Union must be in line with the general principles of the Single Market, open to competition, efficient and environmentally friendly. Estonia believes that additional requirements must not impose an unreasonable administrative burden on businesses or public sector authorities or conflict with the objectives of the European Union's climate policy.

During the negotiations of the Package, Estonia adopted a constructive approach by striving to take into account and support proposals that would improve the working conditions for drivers, combat illegal market practices and reduce the negative effects for the environment. However, the negotiations resulted in an agreement that puts Estonian carriers in a competitive disadvantage, notably by imposing an obligation for road transport undertakings to organise their fleet's activity in such a way as to ensure its vehicles to return to the Member State of establishment within 8 weeks after leaving it ("return of the vehicle obligation"). This obligation was not part of the original package. It has not been subject to a substantive impact assessment, which raises concerns about its relationship with the Interinstitutional Agreement of 13 April 2016 on Better Law-Making . Secondly, having the vehicles returning to the Member State of establishment limits the geographical area of operations for road transport undertakings of that Member State and as such, it is not in line with the aim of Mobility Package I to ensure a level playing field.

Thirdly, as this obligation increases the number of empty runs and additional CO2 emissions, Estonia is of the position that this requirement contradicts the EU's climate policy objectives and the Paris Agreement goals. It is not in line with the Conclusions of 12 December 2019 of the European Council .

Moreover, Estonia considers this requirement disproportionate as the agreement already contains measures to fight against the phenomenon of so-called "letterbox companies". The return of the vehicle obligation will potentially incentivize such practices and, in addition, encourages road transport undertakings from peripheral Member States to relocate, causing a decrease in jobs and tax revenues.

Finally, as the measure can potentially increase traffic volumes, Estonia is concerned about its impact on road safety. Consequently, and yet again stressing its support to the objectives of the original proposals of the social and market pillar of Mobility Package I, Estonia regrets the inclusion of the return of the vehicle obligation in the agreement. In the context outlined above, Estonia will vote against said agreement.

### Statement by Hungary

Hungary would like to reiterate deep concern on the harmful, market-distorting and negative climate effects of different components of the First Mobility Package and expresses severe dissatisfaction with the lack of proper and extensive impact assessments that run counter to the initial objectives of the First Mobility Package.

Hungary has always showed readiness towards the fight against fraud, abuses and unfair practices as well as addressing the social conditions of drivers in the road transport sector. Whilst tackling these issues, we should avoid any fragmentation, protectionism and imposing excessive administrative burden for European transport undertakings, operating fairly on the internal market of road transport. For us, preserving the effective functioning of our internal market is non-negotiable, as it will lead to more jobs and competitiveness for Europe in an era of increasing global economic tensions.

Therefore, with this package, we should have ensured that the future EU legal framework allows competitive advantages to be exploited at their full potential while safeguarding fair competition and an adequate level of working conditions for drivers. Rather, the final agreement does not strike this balance and favours only one approach based on national protectionism and unenforceable rules in the sector.

Namely and in particular, we are convinced that specific rules for posting drivers in the road transport sector (“lex specialis”) constitutes an unjustified restriction on the fundamental freedoms and as a result, is distorting the level-playing field within the EU. We note that the final agreement justifies our misgivings about splitting the issue of road transport from the amendment to the Directive on posting of workers [Directive (EU) 2018/957]. In particular, the introduced split model regarding the posting of drivers was not part of the Commission’s proposal, and as such was not subjected to an impact assessment.

Secondly, we also find it highly problematic that the full ban on taking weekly rest in the cabin does not take into account the shortage of suitable rest areas within the EU with proper accommodation for drivers. Thus, such a ban would constitute an EU provision, which could not be enforced, putting in question its legality.

Thirdly, as regards our climate goals, an obligation for the vehicle to return to the Member State of establishment at least once every 8 weeks contradicts the ambitious EU climate goals which were presented by the European Commission in the European Green Deal on December 11, 2019. Such measure, if adopted, will result in an increased number of empty runs of trucks on European roads and subsequently, a growth of CO2 emissions originating from the road transport sector.

The risk of creating an unfair competitive advantage for third country operators is also a factor that is not taken properly into account in the final agreement. In addition, the mandatory replacement of high-cost tachographs brings with it a competitive advantage for third-country carriers, as the date of installation smart tachographs for AETR-based undertakings’ s vehicles is uncertain.

Modernising the European road transport sector, a crucial building block of the European economy is a necessity both from a social and competitiveness aspect. This goal cannot be achieved without full regard to preserving the achievements and the functioning of the internal market and without acting responsibly to meet ambitious climate goals.

<p><b>Written procedure completed on 7 April 2020</b></p> <p><i>Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulation (EC) No 561/2006 as regards minimum requirements on maximum daily and weekly driving times, minimum breaks and daily and weekly rest periods and Regulation (EU) No 165/2014 as regards positioning by means of tachographs</i></p> <p><i>- Adoption of the Council's position at first reading and of the statement of the Council's reasons</i></p> <p>Position of the Council at first reading with a view to the adoption of a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulation (EC) No 561/2006 as regards minimum requirements on maximum daily and weekly driving times, minimum breaks and daily and weekly rest periods and Regulation (EU) No 165/2014 as regards positioning by means of tachographs - Adopted by the Council on 7 April 2020</p>	<p>CM 1986/20</p> <p>5114/20</p>
<p>Statement of the Council's reasons</p> <p><b>Statement by Belgium</b></p> <p>Belgium has taken note of the results of the provisional agreement reached on December the 11th between the European Parliament and the Council on the social and market pillar of Mobility Package I.</p> <p>Belgium welcomes the substantial improvement in the working conditions of truck drivers, in particular by prohibiting weekly rest in the cabin, and by applying posting to cabotage operations. A better level playing field should be reached in the future, through the integration of light commercial vehicles within the scope of the entire Mobility package, the return of trucks every 8 weeks to the base, and the ambitious timetable for the deployment of new smart tachographs that will allow a better enforcement of the existing and new rules.</p> <p>Therefore, Belgium considers it is incoherent to further restrict access to the market by imposing a cooling-off period of 4 days on cabotage, while at the same time the European Union will ensure upward social convergence.</p> <p>To our understanding, the cooling-off period is a trade barrier contrary to the spirit of the internal market, and to the efficiency of the logistics chain, since cabotage operations makes it possible to avoid empty journeys.</p> <p>We regret as well, the inclusion of a proposal on long-term posting, which did not appear in the Commission proposal neither in the agreements of the two co-legislators, and hasn't been carefully assessed yet.</p> <p>Despite the positive social elements contained in the Package, Belgium will therefore abstain on the agreement.</p>	<p>5114/1/20</p> <p>REV 1 ADD 1</p>

### **Statement by Bulgaria, Cyprus, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland and Romania**

Bulgaria, Cyprus, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland and Romania express deep concerns that the provisional agreement on Mobility Package I contradicts the basic freedom to provide services on the Single Market, the principle of free movement of workers, as well as the key EU policies and goals on climate.

In particular, the requirement to return heavy vehicles to the Member State of establishment at least once every 8 weeks contradicts the EU ambitious climate goals, set out by the European Commission in the new Green Deal on December 11, 2019. Such an obligation, if adopted, will result in a major increase in the number of empty runs of trucks on the European roads and, subsequently, in a substantial increase of CO2 emissions from the transport sector. This sector already accounts for approximately a quarter of GHG emissions in the EU.

Despite our efforts to highlight these points and regardless of scientific evidence from studies on the impact of such an obligation on the increase of empty runs and CO2 emissions, there is no sensitivity for the expected impact of this provision and rational arguments are being dismissed. At the same time, even though the better regulation agenda requires impact assessment at EU level for all such measures, no such assessment has been presented yet.

Returning vehicles to the Member State of establishment is just one example of excessively restrictive and discriminatory measures proposed in Mobility Package I. We share similar concerns about the limitations on cabotage in the form of an excessive cooling off period. This cooling off period amounts to a protectionist measure, which will have a rather negative effect on the Single Market. The obligation for a truck to return as well as the restrictions imposed on cabotage operations, according to estimates of renowned research institutes, will generate additional millions of tons of CO2 emissions per year.

Another major point of concern is that the mandatory return of the vehicle will put in a disadvantaged position Member States which due to their geographical location will have substantial difficulties in providing truck transport services on the Single Market, as their vehicles will have to cover far greater distances and to overcome significant natural barriers, especially in the case of islands.

Unfair competition from third countries' operators is also a factor that has not been properly addressed. This is especially worrisome since the solution to be enacted will have long-term effects not only on the transport sector, but also on the EU economy as a whole.

The transport sector deserves a fair and robust EU legal framework, which will further stimulate its development, while ensuring realistic and enforceable rules. Instead of balanced provisions and a genuine compromise, the provisional agreement imposes restrictive, disproportionate and protectionist measures.

Mobility Package I is a crucial dossier for the European Single Market, as well as for the road transport sector. Today, more than ever, we need to preserve the smooth functioning of the Single Market and the economies of all Member States in the EU while being consistent with other EU policies.



**Statement by Bulgaria, Cyprus, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland and Romania**

Bulgaria, Cyprus, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland and Romania express their objection to the automatic inclusion of the subsidiarity and proportionality clause in the adopted political agreement on the three legal acts of the Mobility Package I during the technical revision of the texts by the lawyer linguists.

We acknowledge that the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality are of primary importance for the exercise of the EU's competences. Nevertheless, addition of such a clause at this late stage of legislative process is not a good practice in general and, in case of the Mobility Package I, it is especially difficult to accept due to the political sensitivity of the whole dossier and taking into account the long-term consequences of the proposed provisions for the functioning of the European road transport sector.

Regretfully, it also demonstrates that the speedy proceedings affected negatively the quality of the adopted legislation. Moreover, we would like to underline the lack of impact assessment of some key provisions of the political agreement. This fact has also been acknowledged by the Commission in their Statement presented at the Coreper I meeting on 20 December 2019, in which the Commission confirmed that some measures had not been part of the Commission's proposals presented on 31 May 2017 and had not been the subject of an impact assessment.

The lack of thorough analysis impedes a proper evaluation of measures proposed in the three legislative acts of the Mobility Package I in terms of their compliance with proportionality rule.

**Statement by Bulgaria, Cyprus, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland and Romania**

Bulgaria, Cyprus, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland and Romania, taking into account the unprecedented spread of the coronavirus COVID-19 that already impacts and will, unfortunately, continue to affect the road transport sector profoundly, call for the suspension of the work on the Mobility Package I until the pandemic is over. Therefore, we vote against adopting the file through a written procedure at this difficult time.

It is expected that most undertakings will suspend or close down operations, which will lead to a significant reduction in the supply of transport services and, therefore, in the delivery of goods to the detriment of the EU citizens and of the smooth functioning of the economy.

In view of the indispensable role of road transport for the post-COVID-19 outbreak recovery effort and the extensive losses, suffered by the sector in the course of handling the outbreak, the road transport and the economy of the EU will be in no position to sustain the unnecessary regulation-imposed shock to be caused by Mobility Package I. In this context we need to bear in mind that the vast majority of road transport undertakings in the European Union are small and medium-size enterprises, which are especially vulnerable.

In the current circumstances, the adoption of the Mobility Package I in its current form is neither reasonable nor justified. We would like to stress that the economic landscape of the EU when the coronavirus crisis is over will be completely different and we believe that the road transport sector will need new solutions addressing this new reality.

Having in mind the above-mentioned situation, we are convinced that the solutions envisaged in Mobility Package I need to be reshaped to be able to account for the new economic reality. Therefore, we propose to suspend the further works on this dossier until the pandemic is over.



### **Statement by Estonia**

Estonia fully supports the objectives of the original proposals of the social and market pillar of Mobility Package I, which were intended to pave the way towards clear road transport rules. Estonia believes that the international road haulage market in the European Union must be in line with the general principles of the Single Market, open to competition, efficient and environmentally friendly. Estonia believes that additional requirements must not impose an unreasonable administrative burden on businesses or public sector authorities or conflict with the objectives of the European Union's climate policy.

During the negotiations of the Package, Estonia adopted a constructive approach by striving to take into account and support proposals that would improve the working conditions for drivers, combat illegal market practices and reduce the negative effects for the environment. However, the negotiations resulted in an agreement that puts Estonian carriers in a competitive disadvantage, notably by imposing an obligation for road transport undertakings to organise their fleet's activity in such a way as to ensure its vehicles to return to the Member State of establishment within 8 weeks after leaving it ("return of the vehicle obligation").

This obligation was not part of the original package. It has not been subject to a substantive impact assessment, which raises concerns about its relationship with the Interinstitutional Agreement of 13 April 2016 on Better Law-Making.

Secondly, having the vehicles returning to the Member State of establishment limits the geographical area of operations for road transport undertakings of that Member State and as such, it is not in line with the aim of Mobility Package I to ensure a level playing field.

Thirdly, as this obligation increases the number of empty runs and additional CO2 emissions, Estonia is of the position that this requirement contradicts the EU's climate policy objectives and the Paris Agreement goals. It is not in line with the Conclusions of 12 December 2019 of the European Council.

Moreover, Estonia considers this requirement disproportionate as the agreement already contains measures to fight against the phenomenon of so-called "letterbox companies". The return of the vehicle obligation will potentially incentivize such practices and, in addition, encourages road transport undertakings from peripheral Member States to relocate, causing a decrease in jobs and tax revenues.

Finally, as the measure can potentially increase traffic volumes, Estonia is concerned about its impact on road safety.

Consequently, and yet again stressing its support to the objectives of the original proposals of the social and market pillar of Mobility Package I, Estonia regrets the inclusion of the return of the vehicle obligation in the agreement. In the context outlined above, Estonia will vote against said agreement.

### **Statement by Hungary**

Hungary would like to reiterate deep concern on the harmful, market-distorting and negative climate effects of different components of the First Mobility Package and expresses severe dissatisfaction with the lack of proper and extensive impact assessments that run counter to the initial objectives of the First Mobility Package.

Hungary has always showed readiness towards the fight against fraud, abuses and unfair practices as well as addressing the social conditions of drivers in the road transport sector. Whilst tackling these issues, we should avoid any fragmentation, protectionism and imposing excessive administrative burden for European transport undertakings, operating fairly on the internal market of road transport. For us, preserving the effective functioning of our internal market is non-negotiable, as it will lead to more jobs and competitiveness for Europe in an era of increasing global economic tensions.

Therefore, with this package, we should have ensured that the future EU legal framework allows competitive advantages to be exploited at their full potential while safeguarding fair competition and an adequate level of working conditions for drivers. Rather, the final agreement does not strike this balance and favours only one approach based on national protectionism and unenforceable rules in the sector.

Namely and in particular, we are convinced that specific rules for posting drivers in the road transport sector (“lex specialis”) constitutes an unjustified restriction on the fundamental freedoms and as a result, is distorting the level-playing field within the EU. We note that the final agreement justifies our misgivings about splitting the issue of road transport from the amendment to the Directive on posting of workers [Directive (EU) 2018/957]. In particular, the introduced split model regarding the posting of drivers was not part of the Commission’s proposal, and as such was not subjected to an impact assessment.

Secondly, we also find it highly problematic that the full ban on taking weekly rest in the cabin does not take into account the shortage of suitable rest areas within the EU with proper accommodation for drivers. Thus, such a ban would constitute an EU provision, which could not be enforced, putting in question its legality.

Thirdly, as regards our climate goals, an obligation for the vehicle to return to the Member State of establishment at least once every 8 weeks contradicts the ambitious EU climate goals which were presented by the European Commission in the European Green Deal on December 11, 2019. Such measure, if adopted, will result in an increased number of empty runs of trucks on European roads and subsequently, a growth of CO2 emissions originating from the road transport sector.

The risk of creating an unfair competitive advantage for third country operators is also a factor that is not taken properly into account in the final agreement. In addition, the mandatory replacement of high-cost tachographs brings with it a competitive advantage for third-country carriers, as the date of installation smart tachographs for AETR-based undertakings’s vehicles is uncertain.

Modernising the European road transport sector, a crucial building block of the European economy is a necessity both from a social and competitiveness aspect. This goal cannot be achieved without full regard to preserving the achievements and the functioning of the internal market and without acting responsibly to meet ambitious climate goals.

<p><b>Written procedure completed on 7 April 2020</b></p> <p><i>Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down specific rules with respect to Directive 96/71/EC and Directive 2014/67/EU for posting drivers in the road transport sector and amending Directive 2006/22/EC as regards enforcement requirements and Regulation (EU) No 1024/2012</i></p> <p>- <i>Adoption of the Council's position at first reading and of the statement of the Council's reasons</i></p> <p>Position of the Council at first reading with a view to the adoption of a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down specific rules with respect to Directive 96/71/EC and Directive 2014/67/EU for posting drivers in the road transport sector and amending Directive 2006/22/EC as regards enforcement requirements and Regulation (EU) No 1024/2012 - Adopted by the Council on 7 April 2020</p>	<p>CM 1985/20</p> <p>5112/20</p>
<p>Statement of the Council's reasons</p> <p><b>Statement by Bulgaria, Cyprus, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland and Romania</b></p> <p>Bulgaria, Cyprus, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland and Romania express deep concerns that the provisional agreement on Mobility Package I contradicts the basic freedom to provide services on the Single Market, the principle of free movement of workers, as well as the key EU policies and goals on climate.</p> <p>In particular, the requirement to return heavy vehicles to the Member State of establishment at least once every 8 weeks contradicts the EU ambitious climate goals, set out by the European Commission in the new Green Deal on December 11, 2019. Such an obligation, if adopted, will result in a major increase in the number of empty runs of trucks on the European roads and, subsequently, in a substantial increase of CO2 emissions from the transport sector. This sector already accounts for approximately a quarter of GHG emissions in the EU.</p> <p>Despite our efforts to highlight these points and regardless of scientific evidence from studies on the impact of such an obligation on the increase of empty runs and CO2 emissions, there is no sensitivity for the expected impact of this provision and rational arguments are being dismissed. At the same time, even though the better regulation agenda requires impact assessment at EU level for all such measures, no such assessment has been presented yet.</p> <p>Returning vehicles to the Member State of establishment is just one example of excessively restrictive and discriminatory measures proposed in Mobility Package I. We share similar concerns about the limitations on cabotage in the form of an excessive cooling off period. This cooling off period amounts to a protectionist measure, which will have a rather negative effect on the Single Market. The obligation for a truck to return as well as the restrictions imposed on cabotage operations, according to estimates of renowned research institutes, will generate additional millions of tons of CO2 emissions per year.</p>	<p>5112/1/20</p> <p>REV 1 ADD 1</p>

<p>Another major point of concern is that the mandatory return of the vehicle will put in a disadvantaged position Member States which due to their geographical location will have substantial difficulties in providing truck transport services on the Single Market, as their vehicles will have to cover far greater distances and to overcome significant natural barriers, especially in the case of islands.</p> <p>Unfair competition from third countries' operators is also a factor that has not been properly addressed. This is especially worrisome since the solution to be enacted will have long-term effects not only on the transport sector, but also on the EU economy as a whole.</p> <p>The transport sector deserves a fair and robust EU legal framework, which will further stimulate its development, while ensuring realistic and enforceable rules. Instead of balanced provisions and a genuine compromise, the provisional agreement imposes restrictive, disproportionate and protectionist measures.</p> <p>Mobility Package I is a crucial dossier for the European Single Market, as well as for the road transport sector. Today, more than ever, we need to preserve the smooth functioning of the Single Market and the economies of all Member States in the EU while being consistent with other EU policies.</p>	<p><b>Statement by Bulgaria, Cyprus, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland and Romania</b></p> <p>Bulgaria, Cyprus, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland and Romania express their objection to the automatic inclusion of the subsidiarity and proportionality clause in the adopted political agreement on the three legal acts of the Mobility Package I during the technical revision of the texts by the lawyer linguists.</p> <p>We acknowledge that the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality are of primary importance for the exercise of the EU's competences. Nevertheless, addition of such a clause at this late stage of legislative process is not a good practice in general and, in case of the Mobility Package I, it is especially difficult to accept due to the political sensitivity of the whole dossier and taking into account the long-term consequences of the proposed provisions for the functioning of the European road transport sector.</p> <p>Regretfully, it also demonstrates that the speedy proceedings affected negatively the quality of the adopted legislation. Moreover, we would like to underline the lack of impact assessment of some key provisions of the political agreement. This fact has also been acknowledged by the Commission in their Statement presented at the Coreper I meeting on 20 December 2019, in which the Commission confirmed that some measures had not been part of the Commission's proposals presented on 31 May 2017 and had not been the subject of an impact assessment.</p> <p>The lack of thorough analysis impedes a proper evaluation of measures proposed in the three legislative acts of the Mobility Package I in terms of their compliance with proportionality rule.</p>
--	---



**Statement by Bulgaria, Cyprus, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland and Romania**

Bulgaria, Cyprus, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland and Romania, taking into account the unprecedented spread of the coronavirus COVID-19 that already impacts and will, unfortunately, continue to affect the road transport sector profoundly, call for the suspension of the work on the Mobility Package I until the pandemic is over. Therefore, we vote against adopting the file through a written procedure at this difficult time.

It is expected that most undertakings will suspend or close down operations, which will lead to a significant reduction in the supply of transport services and, therefore, in the delivery of goods to the detriment of the EU citizens and of the smooth functioning of the economy.

In view of the indispensable role of road transport for the post-COVID-19 outbreak recovery effort and the extensive losses, suffered by the sector in the course of handling the outbreak, the road transport and the economy of the EU will be in no position to sustain the unnecessary regulation-imposed shock to be caused by Mobility Package I. In this context we need to bear in mind that the vast majority of road transport undertakings in the European Union are small and medium-size enterprises, which are especially vulnerable.

In the current circumstances, the adoption of the Mobility Package I in its current form is neither reasonable nor justified. We would like to stress that the economic landscape of the EU when the coronavirus crisis is over will be completely different and we believe that the road transport sector will need new solutions addressing this new reality.

Having in mind the above-mentioned situation, we are convinced that the solutions envisaged in Mobility Package I need to be reshaped to be able to account for the new economic reality. Therefore, we propose to suspend the further works on this dossier until the pandemic is over.

### **Statement by Estonia**

Estonia fully supports the objectives of the original proposals of the social and market pillar of Mobility Package I , which were intended to pave the way towards clear road transport rules. Estonia believes that the international road haulage market in the European Union must be in line with the general principles of the Single Market, open to competition, efficient and environmentally friendly. Estonia believes that additional requirements must not impose an unreasonable administrative burden on businesses or public sector authorities or conflict with the objectives of the European Union's climate policy.

During the negotiations of the Package, Estonia adopted a constructive approach by striving to take into account and support proposals that would improve the working conditions for drivers, combat illegal market practices and reduce the negative effects for the environment. However, the negotiations resulted in an agreement that puts Estonian carriers in a competitive disadvantage, notably by imposing an obligation for road transport undertakings to organise their fleet's activity in such a way as to ensure its vehicles to return to the Member State of establishment within 8 weeks after leaving it ("return of the vehicle obligation").

This obligation was not part of the original package. It has not been subject to a substantive impact assessment, which raises concerns about its relationship with the Interinstitutional Agreement of 13 April 2016 on Better Law-Making .

Secondly, having the vehicles returning to the Member State of establishment limits the geographical area of operations for road transport undertakings of that Member State and as such, it is not in line with the aim of Mobility Package I to ensure a level playing field.

Thirdly, as this obligation increases the number of empty runs and additional CO2 emissions, Estonia is of the position that this requirement contradicts the EU's climate policy objectives and the Paris Agreement goals. It is not in line with the Conclusions of 12 December 2019 of the European Council .

Moreover, Estonia considers this requirement disproportionate as the agreement already contains measures to fight against the phenomenon of so-called "letterbox companies". The return of the vehicle obligation will potentially incentivize such practices and, in addition, encourages road transport undertakings from peripheral Member States to relocate, causing a decrease in jobs and tax revenues.

Finally, as the measure can potentially increase traffic volumes, Estonia is concerned about its impact on road safety.

Consequently, and yet again stressing its support to the objectives of the original proposals of the social and market pillar of Mobility Package I, Estonia regrets the inclusion of the return of the vehicle obligation in the agreement. In the context outlined above, Estonia will vote against said agreement.



### Statement by Hungary

Hungary would like to reiterate deep concern on the harmful, market-distorting and negative climate effects of different components of the First Mobility Package and expresses severe dissatisfaction with the lack of proper and extensive impact assessments that run counter to the initial objectives of the First Mobility Package.

Hungary has always showed readiness towards the fight against fraud, abuses and unfair practices as well as addressing the social conditions of drivers in the road transport sector. Whilst tackling these issues, we should avoid any fragmentation, protectionism and imposing excessive administrative burden for European transport undertakings, operating fairly on the internal market of road transport. For us, preserving the effective functioning of our internal market is non-negotiable, as it will lead to more jobs and competitiveness for Europe in an era of increasing global economic tensions.

Therefore, with this package, we should have ensured that the future EU legal framework allows competitive advantages to be exploited at their full potential while safeguarding fair competition and an adequate level of working conditions for drivers. Rather, the final agreement does not strike this balance and favours only one approach based on national protectionism and unenforceable rules in the sector.

Namely and in particular, we are convinced that specific rules for posting drivers in the road transport sector (“lex specialis”) constitutes an unjustified restriction on the fundamental freedoms and as a result, is distorting the level-playing field within the EU. We note that the final agreement justifies our misgivings about splitting the issue of road transport from the amendment to the Directive on posting of workers [Directive (EU) 2018/957]. In particular, the introduced split model regarding the posting of drivers was not part of the Commission’s proposal, and as such was not subjected to an impact assessment.

Secondly, we also find it highly problematic that the full ban on taking weekly rest in the cabin does not take into account the shortage of suitable rest areas within the EU with proper accommodation for drivers. Thus, such a ban would constitute an EU provision, which could not be enforced, putting in question its legality.

Thirdly, as regards our climate goals, an obligation for the vehicle to return to the Member State of establishment at least once every 8 weeks contradicts the ambitious EU climate goals which were presented by the European Commission in the European Green Deal on December 11, 2019. Such measure, if adopted, will result in an increased number of empty runs of trucks on European roads and subsequently, a growth of CO2 emissions originating from the road transport sector.

The risk of creating an unfair competitive advantage for third country operators is also a factor that is not taken properly into account in the final agreement. In addition, the mandatory replacement of high-cost tachographs brings with it a competitive advantage for third-country carriers, as the date of installation smart tachographs for AETR-based undertakings’ s vehicles is uncertain.

Modernising the European road transport sector, a crucial building block of the European economy is a necessity both from a social and competitiveness aspect. This goal cannot be achieved without full regard to preserving the achievements and the functioning of the internal market and without acting responsibly to meet ambitious climate goals.

<b>Written procedure completed on 7 April 2020</b>	<b>CM 1981/20</b>
<i>Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on electronic freight transport information</i> – <i>Adoption of the Council's position at first reading and of the statement of the Council's reasons</i> Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on electronic freight transport information (first reading)	5142/20
Statement of the Council's reasons	5142/1/20 REV 1 ADD 1
<b>Written procedure completed on 7 April 2020</b>	<b>CM 1977/20</b>
<i>Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on minimum requirements for water reuse</i> – <i>Adoption of the Council's position at first reading and of the statement of the Council's reasons</i> Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on minimum requirements for water reuse (first reading)	15301/19 REV 1
Statement of the Council's reasons	15301/1/19 REV 1 ADD 1
<b>Statement by Greece</b> Greece supports the "Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on minimum requirements for water reuse". The establishment of an integrated, stable and commonly accepted regulatory framework at EU level will contribute significantly to dealing with drought and water scarcity which are likely to be more severe in the future, due to the climate change. However, Greece maintains that the dilution of reclaimed water, by itself must not be considered as a water treatment option, i.e. food business operators or farmers should not be allowed to dilute reclaimed water of any quality class and subsequently use it as being of a higher (cleaner) quality class. Greece is among the Member States that have already in force such a regulatory framework which includes even stricter provisions. It goes without saying that health protection is fundamental to us and therefore we reserve our right to adopt additional provisions and implement further measures at a national level, in line with the precautionary principle.	

### **Statement by the Slovak Republic**

The Slovak Republic is aware of the fact that some Member States have to face the problem of water scarcity and droughts as a result of climate change. However, according to the reports of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, climate change affects the spread and multiplication of various diseases, harmful substances and pathogens transmitted through water, food, eg Salmonella, which affect the health of the population. Therefore, the use of such reused water for agricultural irrigation must not endanger the health of the final consumer as a result of insufficient water quality criteria on reused water and must take into account the future development.

During the negotiations on this reused water, we have consistently called for an ambitious proposal with regard to the objective of ensuring the efficient and equal functioning of the internal market (movement of goods) by imposing uniform requirements for reused water for all Member States and with regard to the objective of protecting the environment, human and animal health. We regret that this was not reflected in the final text.

We are also disappointed that the proposal on mandatory labelling has not been incorporated, which we regard as misleading the end consumer and suppressing his right to information. This goes against the principle of transparent information to the final consumer and in particular against various vulnerable groups, eg elderly people, children, people with weak immune system.

Similarly, our proposals to tighten the quality parameters of the Regulation as regards the inclusion of several quality parameters such as Salmonella have not been accepted. We emphasized the high level of health protection, food quality and strictly set criteria in the Annex. In the current wording, we do not consider the protection of the health of the final consumer to be sufficiently addressed.

At the same time, we have reservations on the wording of Article 2.2, which does not allow a Member State to apply for a derogation on a neutral way on the basis of one or more of the criteria set out in the Regulation. The current wording gives the European Commission too much discretion to decide on a derogation on the basis of all the criteria mentioned in the Regulation.

Given our health and food concerns, we are not in a position to agree with this regulation and therefore we abstain from voting.

	CM 2019/20
<b>Written procedure completed on 14 April 2020</b>	
EU statement for the International Monetary and Financial Committee (IMFC) spring meeting on 16 April 2020	6560/20
<b>Written procedure completed on 14 April 2020</b>	CM 2029/20
<i>Council's position on DAB No 1/2020: Assistance to Greece in response to increased migration pressure - Immediate measures in the context of the COVID-19 outbreak -Support to post-earthquake reconstruction in Albania - Other adjustments</i> Council Decision of 14 April 2020 adopting the Council's position on draft amending budget No 1 of the European Union for the financial year 2020 2020/C 123 I/01 <a href="#">OJ C 123I, 16.4.2020, p. 1–2</a>	7149/20
<i>Decision of the European Parliament and of the Council on the mobilisation of the Flexibility Instrument to finance immediate budgetary measures in the context of the COVID 19 outbreak and a reinforcement of the European Public Prosecutor's Office, related to DAB No 1/2020</i> Decision (EU) 2020/545 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 April 2020 on the mobilisation of the Flexibility Instrument to finance immediate budgetary measures in the context of the COVID-19 outbreak and a reinforcement of the European Public Prosecutor's Office <a href="#">OJ L 125, 21.4.2020, p. 1–2</a>	7151/20
<i>Council Regulation activating the emergency support under Regulation (EU) 2016/369, and amending its provisions taking into account the COVID 19 outbreak</i> Council Regulation (EU) 2020/521 of 14 April 2020 activating the emergency support under Regulation (EU) 2016/369, and amending its provisions taking into account the COVID- 19 outbreak <a href="#">OJ L 117, 15.4.2020, p. 3–8</a>	7169/20
<i>Council's position on draft amending budget No 1 to the general budget of the Union for 2020 (DAB No 1/2020)</i> Council Decision of 14 April 2020 adopting the Council's position on draft amending budget No 2 of the European Union for the financial year 2020 2020/C 123 I/02 <a href="#">OJ C 123I, 16.4.2020, p. 3–3</a>	7201/20
<i>Decision of the European Parliament and of the Council on the mobilisation of the Flexibility Instrument to finance immediate budgetary measures in the context of the COVID 19 outbreak</i> Decision (EU) 2020/546 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 April 2020 on the mobilisation of the Flexibility Instrument to finance immediate budgetary measures in the context of the COVID-19 outbreak <a href="#">OJ L 125, 21.4.2020, p. 3–4</a>	7203/20
<i>Decision of the European Parliament and of the Council on the mobilisation of the Contingency Margin in 2020 to provide emergency assistance to Member States and further reinforce the Union Civil Protection Mechanism/rescEU in response to the COVID-19</i>	7204/20

<p><i>outbreak</i> Decision (EU) 2020/547 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 April 2020 on the mobilisation of the Contingency Margin in 2020 to provide emergency assistance to Member States and further reinforce the Union Civil Protection Mechanism/rescEU in response to the COVID-19 outbreak <a href="#">OJ L 125, 21.4.2020, p. 5–6</a></p>	
<p>Council Regulation amending Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 1311/2013 laying down the multiannual financial framework for the years 2014–2020 as regards the scope of the Global Margin for Commitments <i>Council Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2020/538 of 17 April 2020 amending Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 1311/2013 laying down the multiannual financial framework for the years 2014–2020 as regards the scope of the Global Margin for Commitments</i> <a href="#">OJ L 119I, 17.4.2020, p. 1–3</a></p>	7170/20



<p><b>Written procedure completed on 15 April 2020</b></p> <p><i>Regulation of the European parliament and of the Council on the establishment of a framework to facilitate sustainable investment, and amending Regulation (EU) 2019/2088</i></p> <p>– <i>Adoption of the Council's position at first reading and of the statement of the Council's reasons</i></p> <p>Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the establishment of a framework to facilitate sustainable investment, and amending Regulation (EU) 2019/2088 (2018/0178 COD) Outcome of the written procedure initiated by CM 2005/20 – Adoption of the Council's position at first reading and of the statement of the Council's reasons</p>	<p>CM 2023/20</p> <p>5639/20 REV2</p>
<p>Statement of the Council's reasons</p> <p><b>Statement by Germany supported by Hungary</b></p> <p>We share the objective to establish a credible taxonomy that will guide investors in identifying environmentally sustainable activities. However, with a view to the inclusion into the taxonomy of sectors for which the EU does not have competence to regulate, we have strong concerns regarding the use of delegated acts. As regards the forestry sector, we stress that the formulation of forest policies is the competence of the Member States. The use of delegated acts to define sustainability criteria in relation to the forestry sector should not prejudice any shift of competence from the Member States to the EU in this policy domain.</p> <p>In addition, as to “sustainable forest management” Germany is of the opinion that the definition as contained in FOREST EUROPE Resolution “General Guidelines for the Sustainable Management of Forests in Europe”, as unanimously adopted by the Member States and the European Union in 1993, should be regarded as the basis.</p>	<p>5639/2/20 REV 2 ADD 1</p>
<p><b>Statement by Luxembourg</b></p> <p>The taxonomy should be an essential instrument to guide investors in identifying environmentally sustainable activities. Luxembourg recalls that nuclear energy is not a safe nor a sustainable energy source. A credible taxonomy does consequently not allow for nuclear power generation and nuclear fuel cycle projects of any kind to qualify as sustainable activities.</p> <p>In that regard, the reinforcement of the "do no significant harm" principle in the final version of the regulation shall safeguard the credibility of the taxonomy in the eyes of a broad range of European investors and of the EU population. We rely on the European institutions to ensure that this principle is applied in a strict and unambiguous manner. Any different application of this principle, in particular when it comes to nuclear energy, would risk creating long-term “lock-in effects” into such technologies, thereby generating an undeterminable amount of additional costs, and would hence run counter the overall objective of the sustainable finance agenda.</p>	



**Statement by the Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia and Slovenia**

The Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia and Slovenia appreciate the endurance and the efforts of the Presidency dedicated to the taxonomy proposal. In view of further work as regards the energy related provisions, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia and Slovenia stress the need to respect technological neutrality as one of the underlying principles of the proposal.

The Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia and Slovenia acknowledge that climate change needs to be tackled swiftly, while safeguarding the security, stability, and affordability of the energy supply in the long term. Achieving climate neutrality requires low-carbon as well as transitional energy sources and infrastructure and we welcome that this is now clearly enshrined in the taxonomy framework. It is well acknowledged by the world's expert community that the nuclear energy is necessary to tackle climate change. The Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia and Slovenia consider nuclear energy as a sustainable and safe energy source in the long term. The maintaining of current nuclear capacities and their future development, while respecting the high safety and security standards, is the basic precondition for reaching climate neutrality not only in the Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia and Slovenia, but also at the EU level. This is confirmed also by IPCC and international energy organizations and reflected in the documents of the Commission as well. We rely on the Commission to ensure a fully transparent process of elaboration of the relevant Delegated Acts – a credible, evidence-based process based on expertise, scientific inputs and proper Member States involvement in order to undertake a fully informed and objective assessment of sustainability of all available energy technologies on a non-discriminatory basis. The Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia and Slovenia support the objective of climate neutrality of the EU by 2050. In order to achieve this goal, Member States need to have all necessary tools to reach this ambitious objective in a cost-effective way and ensure credibility of our climate efforts.

**Statement by Austria**

We share the objective to establish a credible taxonomy that will guide investors in identifying environmentally sustainable activities. We still believe that the taxonomy should be adopted as quickly as possible. Substantial progress was already achieved within the trilogue. However, any taxonomy that would allow for nuclear power to be qualified as sustainable, or even as a “transition” or “enabling activity”, would be inherently flawed and could give rise to severe criticism, as it would send the wrong signals and incentives to financial market participants and investors. The outcome of the negotiations is not able to remove our concern that the proposed framework could leave the door open to diverting financial resources away from environmentally sustainable activities and into technologies that cannot be considered either safe or sustainable, such as nuclear power.

**Statement by Poland**

Poland fully supports the objectives of the regulation, in particular, the support for informed business decisions for investments in environmentally sustainable activities. We are on the position that the current text leaves too much room for interpretation on key issues. They are left to be decided in Level 2 acts, which will also be adopted with too little involvement of the Member States. We take a negative view of the fact that there is no guarantee in the regulation that natural gas is recognized as a transition activity. Poland points out that natural gas is an essential bridge fuel used to replace coal and, at the same time, to secure the dynamic development of renewable energy sources. What is more, the practical implementation of the principle of 'leaving no one behind' in Poland nowadays are investments in natural gas. Without these investments, Poland's energy transformation will slow down significantly, to be potentially harmful to the EU's climate policy.

The text of the regulation does not directly reflect the role of nuclear energy. Nuclear energy is essential to achieve climate neutrality, which has been confirmed both by reports and analyses of recognized international organizations and above all by documents of the European Commission or by the latest resolution of the European Parliament on COP 25 (rec. 59). Moreover, considering the controversial issue of nuclear power within the framework of negotiations on the text of the regulation, the decision on its inclusion in the taxonomy should not be left to the lower level acts.

Poland expects that in the light of the compromise which was adopted in the field of nuclear energy and gas, the principle of technological neutrality will be respected in the works on delegated acts and EU taxonomy will not exclude technologies indispensable to achieve climate neutrality. TEG Report on Taxonomy has formulated a recommendation to set up an expert group to examine the environmental impact of spent fuel and radioactive waste management. It is our expectation that delegated acts, especially on mitigation activities, will not be adopted unless such objective analysis is carried by independent experts, nor will it ignore data provided by leading international fora and organisations (IPCC, OECD).

Poland agrees with the idea of creating legal framework that would encourage financing sustainable growth. However, in our view such actions should be consistent with other actions undertaken at the European Union level as well as they should ensure proportionality.

In our opinion introducing the additional disclosure obligations with regard to sustainability in the Taxonomy regulation, which are parallel to those foreseen in disclosure regulation, without conducting any deep analysis when preparing legislative proposal by the European

<p>Commission, can result in raising the capital outside capital market. Therefore, such situation can be contradictory to the actions foreseen within Capital Markets Union. Moreover, the adopted approach concerning regulating disclosures obligation with regard to sustainability simultaneously in two legal acts (Taxonomy and disclosure regulation) leads to the lack of the transparency of the provisions and to the interpretational doubts on the side of entities to whom the provisions are directed.</p> <p>Considering the above, we call on the European Commission to take duly into account, while adopting delegated acts, the rules of proportionality and coherence in order to ensure as well fulfilling the goals of Capital Markets Union. We also call on the European Commission to take into account, when undertaking legislative proposals in the future, the existing connection between this regulation and disclosure regulation.</p> <p>In view of the above, Poland does not oppose the adoption of the Regulation on Sustainable Finance - taxonomy, but cannot support it.</p>	
<p><b>Statement by Sweden</b></p> <p>Sweden would like to recall its concerns in relation to the treatment of sustainable forest management and forest policy in the Taxonomy Regulation. Throughout the negotiations, we have persistently called for a clear and unambiguous reference to Forest Europe’s definition of ‘sustainable forest management’. We regret that this was not maintained in the final compromise text. Forest Europe’s internationally agreed, well-recognized and acknowledged definition of sustainable forest management has helped to promote a pan-European common understanding of sustainable forest management for almost 30 years. The final compromise struck by the co-legislators introduces a different notion of sustainable forest management that may diffuse the common understanding among the 47 Forest Europe signatories, including the EU and its Member States. It is paramount to maintain this agreed definition in the development and application of the Taxonomy Regulation. Departing from this common understanding could lead to incoherent use and application of sustainable forest management.</p> <p>We would also like to recall what the Council of the European Union has stated twice this year<sup>1</sup>: that although the EU has a variety of forest-related policies, the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union makes no reference to a common EU forest policy, that the responsibility for forests lies with the Member States, and that all forest-related decisions and policies in the EU must respect the principle of subsidiarity and Member States’ competence in this field.</p> <p>As the final text was not deemed acceptable in relation to the treatment of sustainable forest management and forest policy, Sweden is not in a position to support the adoption of the regulation. We urge the Commission and future expert groups to take the above-stated into consideration when developing technical screening criteria and secondary legislation.</p> <p><sup>1</sup> Conclusions of the Council and of the Governments of the Member States sitting in the Council on the Communication on Stepping Up EU Action to Protect and Restore the World’s Forests (adopted 16 December 2019) Council Conclusions on the progress on the implementation of the EU Forest Strategy and on a new strategic framework for forests (adopted 15 April 2019).</p>	

<p><b>Statement by Czech Republic and Slovakia</b></p> <p>We, the delegations of Czech Republic and Slovakia, appreciate the effort of the Presidency to reach an agreement with the European Parliament on the taxonomy dossier. In view of the work ahead of us, we find it necessary to make two remarks in relation to sustainable forest management and forest policy.</p> <p>Throughout the negotiations on the taxonomy, we have persistently called for a clear and unambiguous reference to Forest Europe’s definition of ‘sustainable forest management’. We regret that this was not maintained in the final compromise text.</p> <p>Forest Europe’s internationally agreed, well-recognized and acknowledged definition of sustainable forest management has helped to promote a pan-European common understanding of sustainable forest management for almost 30 years. The final compromise struck by the co-legislators introduces a different notion of sustainable forest management that may diffuse the common understanding among the 47 Forest Europe signatories, including the EU and its Member States. It is paramount to maintain this agreed definition in the development and application of the Taxonomy Regulation. Departing from this common understanding could lead to incoherent use and application of sustainable forest management.</p> <p>We would also like to recall what the Council of the European Union has stated twice this year*: that although the EU has a variety of forest-related policies, the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union makes no reference to a common EU forest policy, that the responsibility for forests lies with the Member States, and that all forest-related decisions and policies in the EU must respect the principle of subsidiarity and Member States’ competence in this field.</p> <p>We urge the Commission and future expert groups to take the above-stated into consideration when developing technical screening criteria and secondary legislation.”</p> <p>* Conclusions of the Council and of the Governments of the Member States sitting in the Council on the Communication on Stepping Up EU Action to Protect and Restore the World’s Forests (adopted 16 December 2019); Council Conclusions on the progress on the implementation of the EU Forest Strategy and on a new strategic framework for forests (adopted 15 April 2019).</p>	<p><b>Statement by Hungary</b></p> <p>We would like to express concerns with the significant widening of the material and personal scope of the Regulation. Extending the scope to products that do not pursue any kind of environmental, social or governance aim would only add to the administrative burden of market participants without providing further useful information to investors.</p> <p>Moreover, extending the scope to companies within the scope of article 19a and article 29a of Directive 2013/34/EU is also not appropriate. The non-financial reporting requirements are subject to fitness check conducted by the European Commission and the revision of the requirements are also foreseen, therefore any new requirement in this field should have been introduced after thorough assessment with the relevant experts.</p>
---	---



<b>Written procedure completed on 15 April 2020</b>	<b>CM 2000/20</b>
Multi-party interim appeal arbitration arrangement pursuant to Article 25 of the DSU – Approval	7112/20
<b>Written procedure completed on 15 April 2020</b>	<b>CM 2057/20</b>
Management Board of the European Agency for Safety and Health at Work - Appointment of Ms Gintarė BUŽINSKAITĖ alternate member for Lithuania, in place of Ms Viliija KONDROTIENĖ, who has resigned	6514/20
<b>Written procedure completed on 15 April 2020</b>	<b>CM 2056/20</b>
Management Board of the European Agency for Safety and Health at Work - Appointment of Ms Aggeliki MOIROU alternate member for Greece, in place of Mr Georgios GOURZOULIDIS, who has resigned	6513/20
<b>Written procedure completed on 15 April 2020</b>	<b>CM 2055/20</b>
Management Board of the European Institute for Gender Equality - Appointment of Ms Kaija GERSTMANN, alternate member for Austria, in place of Ms Eva-Maria BURGER, who has resigned	6154/20
<b>Written procedure completed on 15 April 2020</b>	<b>CM 2054/20</b>
Advisory Committee for the Coordination of Social Security Systems - Appointment of Ms Anna SVÄRD, member for Sweden, in place of Ms Johanna MÖLLERBER, who has resigned	6600/20
<b>Written procedure completed on 16 April 2020</b>	<b>CM 2048/20</b>
<i>Council Decision extending the mandate of the Head of Mission of the European Union Advisory Mission in support of Security Sector Reform in Iraq (EUAM Iraq)</i> Council Decision (CFSP) 2020/530 of 16 April 2020 extending the mandate of the Head of Mission of the European Union Advisory Mission in support of Security Sector Reform in Iraq (EUAM Iraq) <a href="#">OJ L 120, 17.4.2020, p. 1–2</a>	6917/20

<b>Written procedure completed on 16 April 2020</b>	<b>CM 2048/20</b>
<i>Syria restrictive measures - pre-notifications</i> Notice for the attention of certain persons and entities subject to the restrictive measures provided for in Council Decision 2013/255/CFSP and Council Regulation (EU) No 36/2012 concerning restrictive measures in view of the situation in Syria 2020/C124/02 <a href="#">OJ C 124, 17.4.2020, p. 2-2</a>	6940/20
<b>Written procedure completed on 17 April 2020</b>	<b>CM 2062/20</b>
<i>Council Regulation amending Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 1311/2013 laying down the multiannual financial framework for the years 2014- 2020 as regards the scope of the Global Margin for Commitments</i> Council Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2020/538 of 17 April 2020 amending Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 1311/2013 laying down the multiannual financial framework for the years 2014-2020 as regards the scope of the Global Margin for Commitments <a href="#">OJ L 119L, 17.4.2020, p. 1-3</a>	7170/20
<b>Written procedure completed on 17 April 2020</b>	<b>CM 2061/20</b>
Approval of transfer of appropriations No DEC 03/2020 within Section III - Commission - of the general budget for 2020	7116/20
<b>Written procedure completed on 21 April 2020</b>	<b>CM 2076/20</b>
<i>Council Decision extending the temporary derogation from the Council's Rules of Procedure introduced by Decision (EU) 2020/430 in view of the travel difficulties caused by the COVID-19 pandemic in the Union</i> Council Decision (EU) 2020/556 of 21 April 2020 extending the temporary derogation from the Council's Rules of Procedure introduced by Decision (EU) 2020/430 in view of the travel difficulties caused by the COVID-19 pandemic in the Union <a href="#">OJ L 128L, 23.4.2020, p. 1-1</a>	7337/20



<p><b>Written procedure completed on 22 April 2020</b>  <i>Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulations (EU) No 1301/2013 and (EU) No 1303/2013 as regards specific measures to provide exceptional flexibility for the use of the European Structural and Investments Funds in response to the COVID-19 outbreak</i>  Regulation (EU) 2020/558 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 April 2020 amending Regulations (EU) No 1301/2013 and (EU) No 1303/2013 as regards specific measures to provide exceptional flexibility for the use of the European Structural and Investments Funds in response to the COVID-19 outbreak  <a href="#">OJ L 130, 24.4.2020, p. 1–6</a></p>	<p>CM 2041/20 7/20 REV1</p>
<p><b>Statement by Greece</b>  We need to emphasize that it is of outmost importance to extend the reallocation of available resources (between Funds and between categories of regions) for the years before 2020 (i.e. 2017-2019), as this additional flexibility for the 2017-2019 annual commitments will allow Greece to respond more efficiently to this unprecedented in scale crisis. Moreover it is important to allow support irrespective of the size of the enterprise especially for the use of financial instruments.</p>	
<p><b>Statement by Spain</b>  Spain appreciates the flexibility provided by the CRII + and asks the Commission to continue adapting the European structural and investment fund regulations to grant legal certainty to national and regional authorities. Elements such as flexibility in the use of the 2017, 2018 and 2019 annual commitments and in the deadlines for carrying out controls and audits and greater legal certainty in the definition of “force majeure” should be taken into account in the next modification.</p>	
<p><b>Statement by Latvia</b>  We note that the 1/3 share of the Cohesion Fund for Member States that joined on or after 2004 will not have to be respected in accordance with the second paragraph of new Article 25a, and allocations may be transferred between the ERDF, the ESF and the Cohesion Fund. Point 6 of Annex VII of the Common Provisions Regulation is not relevant in this respect. Flexibility of transfers between funds is important to counter the immediate health crisis and to ensure an effective investment mix that supports a quick economic recovery.</p>	

<p><b>Written procedure completed on 22 April 2020</b>  <i>Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulation (EU) No 223/2014 as regards the introduction of specific measures for addressing the outbreak of COVID-19</i>  Regulation (EU) 2020/559 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 April 2020 amending Regulation (EU) No 223/2014 as regards the introduction of specific measures for addressing the outbreak of COVID-19  <a href="#">OJ L 130, 24.4.2020, p. 7–10</a></p>	<p><b>CM 2042/20</b>  8/20 REV1</p>
<p><b>Written procedure completed on 22 April 2020</b>  <i>Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulation (EU) 2017/745 on medical devices as regards the dates of application of certain of its provisions</i>  Regulation (EU) 2020/561 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 April 2020 amending Regulation (EU) 2017/745 on medical devices, as regards the dates of application of certain of its provisions (Text with EEA relevance)  <a href="#">OJ L 130, 24.4.2020, p. 18–22</a></p>	<p><b>CM 2063/20</b>  10/20 REV1</p>
<p><b>Written procedure completed on 22 April 2020</b>  <i>Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulations (EU) No 508/2014 and (EU) No 1379/2013 as regards specific measures to mitigate the impact of the COVID-19 outbreak in the fishery and aquaculture sector</i>  Regulation (EU) 2020/560 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 April 2020 amending Regulations (EU) No 508/2014 and (EU) No 1379/2013 as regards specific measures to mitigate the impact of the COVID-19 outbreak in the fishery and aquaculture sector  <a href="#">OJ L 130, 24.4.2020, p. 11–17</a></p>	<p><b>CM 2064/20</b>  <b>REV1</b>  9/20 REV1</p>

<p><b>Statement by Sweden</b> Sverige är principiellt emot lagringsstöd och att öronmärkta medel från datainsamling och kontroll tillgängliggörs för andra åtgärder, men Sverige kan acceptera det som undantag givet de exceptionella omständigheterna. Sverige anser att principen bör vara att dessa åtgärder inte förlängs efter december 2020.</p>	
<p><b>Statement by the Commission</b> The Commission welcomes the swift adoption by the European Parliament and Council of its proposal to modify the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund to mitigate the impact of the COVID-19 outbreak and help our fishermen and –women and aquaculture producers. The Commission wishes to underline that fisheries control and the collection of scientific data are of great importance for the sustainable management of fish stocks on the basis of the best available scientific advice and reliable enforcement. The reduction of financial resources thereto should not lead to deterioration of the outcome of these essential elements of the Common Fisheries Policy. The Commission wishes to stress that its proposal, as well as the amendments made to it, address the unique crisis situation caused by the COVID-19 outbreak and the exceptional and immediate need for support to address the consequences of that outbreak. They cannot prejudice the future Regulation on the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund.</p>	

	CM 2082/20
<p><b>Written procedure completed on 22 April 2020</b></p> <p><i>Council Decision amending Decision 2013/184/CFSP and Council Implementing Regulation implementing Regulation (EU) No 401/2013 concerning restrictive measures in respect of Myanmar/Burma</i></p> <p>Council Decision (CFSP) 2020/563 of 23 April 2020 amending Decision 2013/184/CFSP concerning restrictive measures against Myanmar/Burma</p> <p><a href="#">OJ L 130, 24.4.2020, p. 25–26</a></p>	6888/20
<p><i>Council Implementing Regulation implementing Regulation (EU) No 401/2013 concerning restrictive measures in respect of Myanmar/Burma</i></p> <p>Council Implementing Regulation (EU) 2020/562 of 23 April 2020 implementing Regulation (EU) No 401/2013 concerning restrictive measures in respect of Myanmar/Burma</p> <p><a href="#">OJ L 130, 24.4.2020, p. 23–24</a></p>	6890/20
<p><i>Council Decision and Implementing Regulation concerning restrictive measures against Myanmar/Burma - draft notices</i></p> <p>Notice for the attention of the persons subject to the restrictive measures provided for in Council Decision 2013/184/CFSP, as amended by Council Decision (CFSP) 2020/563, and in Regulation (EU) No 401/2013, as implemented by Council Implementing Regulation (EU) 2020/562 concerning restrictive measures against Myanmar/Burma 2020/C 133/02</p> <p><a href="#">OJ C 133, 24.4.2020, p. 2–3</a></p>	6986/20
<p><i>Council Decision amending Decision (CFSP) 2018/298 on Union support for the activities of the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organisation (CTBTO)</i></p> <p>Council Decision (CFSP) 2020/564 of 23 April 2020 amending Decision (CFSP) 2018/298 on Union support for the activities of the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization (CTBTO) in order to strengthen its monitoring and verification capabilities and in the framework of the implementation of the EU Strategy against Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction</p> <p><a href="#">OJ L 130, 24.4.2020, p. 27–27</a></p>	7270/20
<p><b>Written procedure completed on 24 April 2020</b></p> <p><i>Council Decision on the signing, on behalf of the European Union, and provisional application of the Agreement on civil aviation safety between the European Union and Japan</i></p> <p>Council Decision on the signing, on behalf of the European Union, and provisional application of the Agreement on civil aviation safety between the European Union and Japan</p> <p>Agreement on civil aviation safety between the European Union and Japan</p>	<p><b>CM 2040/20</b></p> <p>15259/19</p> <p>15260/19</p>

<b>Written procedure completed on 24 April 2020</b>	<b>CM 2038/20</b>
<i>Agreement between the European Union and the Republic of Korea on certain aspects of air services</i>	15079/19 15082/19
Council Decision on the signing, on behalf of the Union of the Agreement between the European Union and the Republic of Korea on certain aspects of air services	
<b>Written procedure completed on 27 April 2020</b>	<b>CM 2110/20</b>
<i>Council Decision on the position to be taken on behalf of the European Union within the Joint Customs Cooperation Committee established under the Agreement between the European Union and New Zealand on cooperation and mutual administrative assistance in customs matters as regards the adoption of the internal rules of procedure of the Joint Customs Cooperation Committee</i>	6882/20
Council Decision on the position to be taken on behalf of the European Union in the Joint Customs Cooperation Committee established under the Agreement between the European Union and New Zealand on cooperation and mutual administrative assistance in customs matters as regards the adoption of the internal rules of procedure of the Joint Customs Cooperation Committee	
<i>Decision of the European Union-New Zealand Joint Customs Cooperation Committee adopting its Rules of Procedure</i>	6932/20
Decision of the European Union-New Zealand Joint Customs Cooperation Committee adopting its Rules of Procedure	
<b>Written procedure completed on 28 April 2020</b>	<b>CM 2115/20</b>
<i>Council Decision appointing the members of the Scientific and Technical Committee</i>	6602/20
Council Decision of 28 April 2020 appointing the members of the Scientific and Technical Committee 2020/C 145/01 <a href="#">OJ C 145, 30.4.2020, p. 1–1</a>	
<b>Written procedure completed on 30 April 2020</b>	<b>CM 2128/20</b>
Council Decision on the position to be taken on behalf of the European Union within the Joint Implementation Committee established pursuant to Article 18 of the Voluntary Partnership Agreement between the European Union and the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam on forest law enforcement, governance and trade as regards the adoption of the rules of procedure of the Joint Implementation Committee	15095/19 7027/20
<b>Written procedure completed on 30 April 2020</b>	<b>CM 2126/20</b>
Council Decision appointing the Secretary-General of the Council of the European Union for the period from 1 July 2020 to 30 June 2025	7570/20