



2017/2003(INI)

9.3.2017

AMENDMENTS

1 - 152

Draft opinion

Merja Kyllönen

(PE597.749v01-00)

European Agenda for the collaborative economy
(2017/2003(INI))

Amendment 1
Deirdre Clune

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Welcomes the emergence of the collaborative economy in transport and tourism services, acknowledging that, with an appropriate regulatory framework in place, it has potential to provide **more varied and affordable** services to customers **and to boost new** forms of cooperative **exchanges** between citizens in the EU;

Amendment

1. Welcomes the emergence of the collaborative economy in transport and tourism services, acknowledging that, with an appropriate regulatory framework in place, it has **the** potential to provide **greater choice, affordability and more varied** services to customers **while providing greater opportunities for SME's and start-ups to support new and innovative** forms of cooperative **exchange** between citizens in the EU; **notes that the collaborative economy may serve to help facilitate the inclusion of people who may have been traditionally excluded from the labour market, it could be a point of entry for young people into their first job for example;**

Or. en

Amendment 2
Claudia Tapardel, Maria Grapini, István Ujhelyi, Lucy Anderson

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Welcomes the emergence of the collaborative economy in transport and tourism services, acknowledging that, with an appropriate regulatory framework in place, it has potential to provide more varied and affordable services to customers and to boost new forms of cooperative exchanges between citizens in the EU;

Amendment

1. Welcomes the emergence of the collaborative economy in transport, **accommodation** and tourism services, acknowledging that, with an appropriate regulatory framework in place, it has potential to provide more varied and affordable services to customers, **to offer new business opportunities for small and medium-sized enterprises** and to boost new forms of cooperative exchanges between citizens in the EU; **underlines the positive impact of collaborative platforms on the**

inclusion of women, youth, and on marginalised communities such as migrants, part-time employees as well as on the long-term unemployed to re-enter the job market.

Or. en

Amendment 3

Lucy Anderson, Olga Sehnalová, José Blanco López, Gabriele Preuß, Miltiadis Kyrkos

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. *Welcomes* the emergence of the collaborative economy in transport and tourism services, *acknowledging that, with an appropriate regulatory framework in place, it has* potential to provide more varied and affordable services to customers and to boost new forms of cooperative exchanges between citizens *in the EU*;

Amendment

1. *Notes* the emergence of the collaborative economy in transport, *accommodation* and tourism services, *acknowledges that the collaborative economy has the* potential to provide more varied and affordable services to customers, *to enhance economic growth, social welfare and environmental protection* and to boost new forms of cooperative exchanges between citizens *by opening new work opportunities and new models of business; stresses however that appropriate regulatory frameworks need to be put in place, to cover employment, health and safety, disability rights and competition issues that arise from the new models*;

Or. en

Amendment 4

Marie-Christine Arnautu

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. *Welcomes* the emergence of the collaborative economy in transport and tourism services, *acknowledging that, with*

Amendment

1. *Takes the view that* the emergence of the collaborative economy in transport and tourism services, with an appropriate

an appropriate regulatory framework in place, *it* has potential to provide more varied and affordable services to customers and to boost new forms of cooperative exchanges between citizens in the EU;

regulatory framework in place, has potential to provide more varied and affordable services to customers and to boost new forms of cooperative exchanges between citizens in the EU; *is concerned, however, about its adverse effects such as the rise in job insecurity in certain sectors, particularly transport and hotel accommodation;*

Or. fr

Amendment 5
Cláudia Monteiro de Aguiar

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Welcomes the emergence of the collaborative economy in transport and tourism services, acknowledging that, with an appropriate regulatory framework in place, it has potential to provide more varied and affordable services to customers and to boost new forms of cooperative exchanges between citizens in the EU;

Amendment

1. Welcomes the emergence of the collaborative economy in transport and tourism services, acknowledging that, with an appropriate, *simple and clear* regulatory framework in place, it has potential to provide more varied and affordable services to customers and to boost new forms of cooperative exchanges between citizens in the EU, *helping to promote growth and entrepreneurship and environmental, economic and social sustainability;*

Or. pt

Amendment 6
István Ujhelyi

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Welcomes the emergence of the collaborative economy in transport and tourism services, acknowledging that, with an appropriate regulatory framework in

Amendment

1. Welcomes the emergence of the collaborative economy in transport and tourism services, acknowledging that, with an appropriate regulatory framework in

place, it has potential to provide more varied and affordable services to customers and to boost new forms of cooperative exchanges between citizens in the EU;

place, it has potential to provide *easy access to* more varied and affordable services to customers *with a more diversified profile (including vulnerable consumers with weaker purchasing power)* and to boost new forms of cooperative exchanges between citizens in the EU;

Or. en

Amendment 7

Dominique Riquet, Izaskun Bilbao Barandica, Pavel Telička, Gesine Meissner

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Welcomes the emergence of the collaborative economy in transport and tourism services, acknowledging that, with an appropriate regulatory framework in place, it has potential to provide more varied and affordable services to customers **and** to boost new forms of cooperative exchanges between citizens in the EU;

Amendment

1. Welcomes the emergence of the collaborative economy in transport and tourism services, acknowledging that, with an appropriate regulatory framework in place, it has potential to provide more varied and affordable services to customers, to boost new forms of cooperative exchanges between citizens **and to actively promote the development of sustainable forms of mobility** in the EU;

Or. en

Amendment 8

Daniel Dalton

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Welcomes the emergence of the collaborative economy in transport and tourism services, **acknowledging that, with an appropriate regulatory framework in place, it has potential to provide more varied and affordable** services to customers **and to boost new forms of**

Amendment

1. Welcomes the emergence of the collaborative economy in transport and tourism services, **and its generation of new entrepreneurial opportunities, jobs and growth whilst providing more efficient, affordable and varied** services to customers;

cooperative exchanges between citizens in the EU;

Or. en

Amendment 9
Michael Cramer

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Welcomes the emergence of the collaborative economy in transport and tourism services, acknowledging that, with an appropriate regulatory framework in place, it has potential to provide more varied and affordable services to customers and to boost new forms of cooperative exchanges between citizens in the EU;

Amendment

1. Welcomes the emergence of the collaborative economy in transport and tourism services, acknowledging that, with an appropriate regulatory framework in place, it has potential to provide more varied and affordable services to customers, *to promote sustainable mobility* and to boost new forms of cooperative exchanges between citizens in the EU;

Or. de

Amendment 10
Dieter-Lebrecht Koch

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Welcomes the emergence of the collaborative economy in transport and tourism services, acknowledging that, with an appropriate regulatory framework in place, it has potential to provide more varied and affordable services to customers and to boost new forms of cooperative exchanges between citizens in the EU;

Amendment

(Does not affect the English version.)

Or. de

Amendment 11

István Ujhelyi

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1 a. Notes that the collaborative economy is developing against a background of rapid growth in international tourists arrivals in the EU (478 M international tourists in 2015 in EU-28), leading to increased demand for tourists services; notes therefore that the collaborative economy may help to respond better to peaks in demand for tourism services, for instance in big cities or in rural areas where during festivals or other special events there is sudden increase in demand for accommodation;

Or. en

Amendment 12

Lucy Anderson, Olga Sehnalová, José Blanco López, Gabriele Preuß, Miltiadis Kyrkos

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1 a. Urges the Commission to come up with appropriate measures to tackle the challenges that arise when European consumers are using online platforms headquartered outside the EU, in non-European cultural and regulatory contexts, particularly with regard to data protection, health and safety, taxation and employment laws;

Or. en

Amendment 13

Christine Revault D'Allonnes Bonnefoy

Draft opinion

PE601.112v01-00

8/78

AM\1119566EN.docx

Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Takes the view that there is a fundamental difference of nature between the collaborative economy, which is based on the sharing of transport costs, and the economy of intermediary platforms, which offer services in return for payment.

Or. fr

**Amendment 14
Maria Grapini**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)**

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Notes that the collaborative economy can help to develop new opportunities and business models in the fields of transport and tourism;

Or. ro

**Amendment 15
Daniel Dalton**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)**

Draft opinion

Amendment

1 a. Notes that customer satisfaction with collaborative economy transport and tourism services is much higher than with traditional services;

Or. en

**Amendment 16
Daniel Dalton**

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1 b. Welcomes the opportunities the collaborative economy provides to small businesses, local economies and rural areas, particularly in the tourism sector, but also notably in the transport sector as well; furthermore notes that travellers with lower incomes particularly benefit from the collaborative economy;

Or. en

Amendment 17
István Ujhelyi

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1 b. Highlights also the changes in tourist behaviour, especially the fact that tourists are more open to self-guided holidays, seeking more unique and personalized tourism experiences, look more at information from other tourists, use digital technology and social media to plan, purchase or review travel experiences;

Or. en

Amendment 18
István Ujhelyi

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1 c. Recalls that according to Commission estimates, peer-to-peer

accommodation is the largest collaborative economy sector on the basis of generated commerce, while peer-to-peer transportation is the largest by platform revenue;

Or. en

Amendment 19
Daniel Dalton

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1 c. Highlights that in the tourism sector home-sharing represents a great use of resources and under-used space, especially in areas that do not traditionally benefit from tourism;

Or. en

Amendment 20
Daniel Dalton

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 d (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1 d. Condemns, in this regard, regulations being imposed by some public authorities which seek to restrict the supply of tourist accommodation via the collaborative economy;

Or. en

Amendment 21
Daniel Dalton

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 e (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1 e. Welcomes the opportunities the collaborative economy offers for flexible working hours that fit around other commitments, helping to bring people left out of the workplace back into employment;

Or. en

Amendment 22

Luis de Grandes Pascual, Inés Ayala Sender

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 2**

Draft opinion

2. Notes that the Member States' response to the development of collaborative business models has so far been very fragmented; welcomes in this regard the Commission communication on a European agenda for the collaborative economy, but regrets that it fails to establish an explicit harmonised legal framework for the collaborative economy;

Amendment

2. Notes that the Member States' response to the development of collaborative business models has so far been very fragmented; welcomes in this regard the Commission communication on a European agenda for the collaborative economy, but regrets that it fails to establish an explicit harmonised legal framework for the collaborative economy; ***calls for use to be made of the interpretative criteria contained in the Commission communication to distinguish between simple intermediation through technological platforms and the provision of a service other than an information society service.***

Or. es

Amendment 23

Inés Ayala Sender

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 2**

Draft opinion

Amendment

2. Notes that the Member States' response to the development of collaborative business models has so far been very fragmented; welcomes in this regard the Commission communication on a European agenda for the collaborative economy, but regrets that it fails to establish an explicit harmonised legal framework for the collaborative economy;

2. Notes that the Member States' response to the development of collaborative business models has so far been very fragmented; welcomes in this regard the Commission communication on a European agenda for the collaborative economy, but regrets that it fails to establish an explicit harmonised legal framework for the collaborative economy; ***calls for use to be made of the interpretative criteria contained in the Commission communication to distinguish between simple intermediation through technological platforms and the provision of a service other than an information society service.***

Or. es

Amendment 24

Dominique Riquet, Izaskun Bilbao Barandica, Pavel Telička, Gesine Meissner

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Notes that the Member States' response to the development of collaborative business models has so far been very fragmented; welcomes in this regard the Commission communication on a European agenda for the collaborative economy, but regrets that it fails to establish an explicit harmonised legal framework for the collaborative economy;

Amendment

2. Notes that the Member States' response to the development of collaborative business models has so far been very fragmented ***and prevents the emergence of European champions, hampers the development of new initiatives and harms the interest of all actors (of supply and demand)***; welcomes in this regard the Commission communication on a European agenda for the collaborative economy, but regrets that it fails to establish an explicit harmonised legal framework for the collaborative economy ***and considers that a coordinated overall European-level action is needed***;

Or. en

Amendment 25

Nicola Caputo, Lucy Anderson

AM\1119566EN.docx

13/78

PE601.112v01-00

EN

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Notes that the Member States' response to the development of collaborative business models has so far been very fragmented; welcomes in this regard the Commission communication on a European agenda for the collaborative economy, but regrets that it fails to establish an explicit harmonised legal framework for the collaborative economy;

Amendment

2. Notes that the Member States' response to the development of collaborative business models has so far been very fragmented; welcomes in this regard the Commission communication on a European agenda for the collaborative economy, but regrets that it fails to establish an explicit harmonised legal framework for the collaborative economy; ***encourages a comprehensive assessment of collaborative economy, its macroeconomic and social implications and its long-term sustainability, in order to develop informed structural policies.***

Or. en

Amendment 26
Cláudia Monteiro de Aguiar

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Notes that the Member States' response to the development of collaborative business models has so far been very fragmented; welcomes in this regard the Commission communication on a European agenda for the collaborative economy, but regrets that it fails to establish an explicit harmonised legal framework for the collaborative economy;

Amendment

2. Notes that the Member States' response to the development of collaborative business models has so far been very fragmented, ***hampering the full development of the collaborative economy***; welcomes in this regard the Commission communication on a European agenda for the collaborative economy, but regrets that ***it fails to explain exactly how existing legislation addresses the needs of the collaborative economy and*** fails to establish an explicit harmonised legal framework for the collaborative economy;

Or. pt

Amendment 27
Henna Virkkunen

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Notes that the Member States' response to the development of collaborative business models has so far been very fragmented; welcomes in this regard the Commission communication on a European agenda for the collaborative economy, but regrets that it fails to establish an explicit harmonised legal framework for the collaborative economy;

Amendment

2. Notes that the Member States' response to the development of collaborative business models has so far been very fragmented; welcomes in this regard the Commission communication on a European agenda for the collaborative economy, but regrets that it fails to establish an explicit harmonised legal framework for the collaborative economy;
Stresses the importance of rapid clarification at European level of the applicable rules in order to limit the fragmentation of the internal market;

Or. en

Amendment 28
Marie-Christine Arnautu

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Notes that the Member States' ***response*** to the development of collaborative business models has ***so far been very*** fragmented; ***welcomes*** in this regard the Commission communication on a European agenda for the collaborative economy, ***but regrets that it fails to establish an explicit harmonised legal framework for the collaborative economy;***

Amendment

2. Notes that the ***response of*** Member States – ***as a result of their specific legal nature – and local authorities*** to the development of collaborative business models has, ***naturally, been*** fragmented; ***takes the view*** in this regard ***that*** the Commission communication on a European agenda for the collaborative economy ***puts forward, overall, a balanced approach to the development of the collaborative economy, traditional economic operators and the powers of national and local authorities;***

Or. fr

Amendment 29

István Ujhelyi

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Notes that the Member States' response to the development of collaborative business models has so far been very fragmented; welcomes in this regard the Commission communication on a European agenda for the collaborative economy, but regrets that it fails to establish an explicit harmonised legal framework for the collaborative economy;

Amendment

2. Notes that the Member States' response to the development of collaborative business models has so far been very fragmented ***which could create an important source of uncertainty and confusion, especially in the case of tourists from third countries***; welcomes in this regard the Commission communication on a European agenda for the collaborative economy, but regrets that it fails to establish an explicit harmonised legal framework for the collaborative economy;

Or. en

Amendment 30

Isabella De Monte, Nicola Caputo

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Notes that the Member States' response to the development of collaborative business models has so far been very fragmented; welcomes in this regard the Commission communication on a European agenda for the collaborative economy, ***but regrets that it fails to establish an explicit harmonised legal framework for the collaborative economy***;

Amendment

2. Notes that the Member States' response to the development of collaborative business models has so far been very fragmented; welcomes in this regard the Commission communication on a European agenda for the collaborative economy ***and stresses the importance to create a common and harmonized EU regulatory framework for the collaborative economy that promotes a coherent approach at all levels of government according to the principles of subsidiarity***;

Or. en

Amendment 31
Claudia Tapardel, Maria Grapini, István Ujhelyi

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Notes that the Member States' response to the development of collaborative business models has so far been very fragmented; welcomes in this regard the Commission communication on a European agenda for the collaborative economy, but regrets that it fails to establish ***an explicit harmonised*** legal framework for the collaborative economy;

Amendment

2. Notes that the Member States' response to the development of collaborative business models has so far been very fragmented ***and has, on some occasions, allowed for protectionist measures at local level***; welcomes in this regard the Commission communication on a European agenda for the collaborative economy, but regrets that it fails to establish ***clear steps towards a*** legal framework for the collaborative economy ***across the European Union***;

Or. en

Amendment 32
Dieter-Lebrecht Koch

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Notes that the Member States' response to the development of collaborative business models has so far been very fragmented; welcomes in this regard the Commission communication on a European agenda for the collaborative economy, but regrets that it fails to establish an explicit harmonised legal framework for the collaborative economy;

Amendment

2. Notes that the Member States' response to the development of collaborative business models has so far been very fragmented; welcomes in this regard the Commission communication on a European agenda for the collaborative economy, but regrets that it fails to establish an explicit harmonised legal framework for the collaborative economy ***and calls therefore for such a framework to be created by 2018 at the latest***;

Or. de

Amendment 33
Mark Demesmaeker

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Notes that the Member States' response to the development of collaborative business models has so far been very fragmented; welcomes in this regard the Commission communication on a European agenda for the collaborative economy, ***but regrets that it fails to establish an explicit harmonised legal framework for the collaborative economy;***

Amendment

2. Notes that the Member States' response to the development of collaborative business models has so far been very fragmented; welcomes in this regard the Commission communication on a European agenda for the collaborative economy;

Or. nl

Amendment 34
Jill Seymour

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Notes that the Member States' response to the development of collaborative business models has so far been very fragmented; ***welcomes*** in this regard the Commission communication on a European agenda ***for the collaborative economy, but regrets that it fails to establish an explicit harmonised legal framework*** for the collaborative economy;

Amendment

2. Notes that the Member States' response to the development of collaborative business models has so far been very fragmented; ***deplores*** in this regard the Commission communication on a European agenda for the collaborative economy;

Or. en

Amendment 35
Daniel Dalton

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Notes that the Member States'

PE601.112v01-00

Amendment

2. Notes that the Member States'

18/78

AM\1119566EN.docx

response to the development of collaborative business models has so far been very fragmented; welcomes in this regard the Commission communication on a European agenda for the collaborative economy, *but regrets that it fails to establish an explicit harmonised legal framework for the collaborative economy*;

response to the development of collaborative business models has so far been very fragmented; welcomes in this regard the Commission communication on a European agenda for the collaborative economy, *alongside the sharing of best practices, encourages the Commission and Member States to ensure the full implementation of existing rules*;

Or. en

Amendment 36
Karima Delli

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Notes that the Member States' response to the development of collaborative business models has so far been very fragmented; welcomes in this regard the Commission communication on a European agenda *for* the collaborative economy, but regrets that it fails to establish an explicit harmonised legal framework for the collaborative economy;

Amendment

2. Notes that the Member States' response to the development of collaborative business models has so far been very fragmented; welcomes in this regard the Commission communication on a European agenda *and its attempt to define* the collaborative *economy by opposition to the platform* economy, but regrets that it fails to establish an explicit harmonised legal framework for the collaborative economy;

Or. en

Amendment 37
Kosma Złotowski, Tomasz Piotr Poręba

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Notes that the Member States' response to the development of collaborative business models has so far been very fragmented; welcomes in this regard the Commission communication on

Amendment

2. Notes that the Member States' response to the development of collaborative business models has so far been very fragmented; welcomes in this regard the Commission communication on

a European agenda for the collaborative economy, *but regrets that it fails to establish an explicit harmonised legal framework for the collaborative economy;*

a European agenda for the collaborative economy *that provides much needed legal guidance and policy orientation to public authorities, market operators and citizens;*

Or. en

Amendment 38
Andor Deli

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Notes that the Member States' response to the development of collaborative business models has so far been very fragmented; welcomes in this regard the Commission communication on a European agenda for the collaborative economy, *but regrets that it fails to establish* an explicit harmonised legal framework for the collaborative economy;

Amendment

2. Notes that the Member States' response to the development of collaborative business models has so far been very fragmented; welcomes in this regard the Commission communication on a European agenda for the collaborative economy, *notes that it doesn't establishes* an explicit harmonised legal framework for the collaborative economy;

Or. en

Amendment 39
Cláudia Monteiro de Aguiar

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 – indent 1 (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

- *Regrets that the legislation currently in force, notably Directive 2000/31/EC on electronic commerce and Directive 2006/31/EC on services, is not being correctly implemented; calls on the Commission and Member States to ensure that the legislation that is applied to collaborative economy models does not breach EU legislation and the principles of the internal market;*

Or. pt

Amendment 40
Cláudia Monteiro de Aguiar

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 – indent 2 (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

- *Points out that the collaborative economy makes a significant contribution to the sustainability of the tourism and transport sectors, making it possible to optimise existing resources by deploying underused assets and developing new services and products without large-scale investment; moreover, it encourages citizens to participate in these sectors and helps to ensure that the benefits of tourism are spread across all regions, including the outermost, mountain and rural regions;*

Or. pt

Amendment 41
Isabella De Monte, Nicola Caputo

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2 a. Underlines that collaborative economy could offer opportunities to reinvigorate the economy in less populated remote areas in sectors such as tourism; stresses that it would be vital to develop an effective regulatory framework and policies that enhance collaborative economy models in remote areas;

Or. en

Amendment 42
Christine Revault D'Allonnes Bonnefoy

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. *Considers that, since digital media are a tool that can help improve transport services, intermediate platforms in the transport sector provide services that should be governed by the rules applicable to transport companies.*

Or. fr

Amendment 43
Daniel Dalton

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2 a. *Recognises that no two collaborative economy business models are the same, that the diversity of the collaborative economy is one of its strengths, and that therefore any overarching regulation of the entire collaborative economy would not be practicable;*

Or. en

Amendment 44
Dominique Riquet, Izaskun Bilbao Barandica, Pavel Telička

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2 a. *Stresses the need for harmonisation between the collaborative economy and traditional economic forms in the field of training, professional qualifications and fiscal and social*

obligations;

Or. en

Amendment 45

Claudia Țapardel, Olga Sehnalová, Maria Grapini, István Ujhelyi, Lucy Anderson

Draft opinion Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Stresses that, in the context of the collaborative economy, issues related to consumer protection, liability allocation, insurance schemes, social protection of workers (whether they are employed or self-employed) and data protection are the most urgent ones, ***and expects a regulatory intervention in that regard***; emphasises that a regulatory framework should create a level playing field, foster innovations and contribute to the overall development and fulfilment of the EU transport policy goals, such as ***transport*** decarbonisation, territorial cohesion, affordability, accessibility and safety;

Amendment

3. Stresses that, in the context of the collaborative economy, issues related to consumer protection, liability allocation, insurance schemes, social protection of workers (whether they are employed or self-employed) and data protection are the most urgent ones, ***underlines the potential risks of creating unclear employment relations, unfair working conditions and non-compliance with worker's rights; as such, considers necessary the cooperation among all stakeholders, assuming their individual responsibilities, in parallel with regulatory intervention***; emphasises that a regulatory framework should create a level playing field, foster innovations and contribute to the overall development and fulfilment of the EU transport ***and tourism*** policy goals, such as decarbonisation, territorial cohesion, affordability, accessibility and safety; ***simultaneously, it argues that the Commission should ensure an ambitious enforcement framework and engage platforms to foster a culture of compliance as regards health, safety, security and taxation, while ensuring that any proposal put forward would mitigate the risk of creating monopolies.***

Or. en

Amendment 46

Lucy Anderson, Olga Sehnalová, José Blanco López, Nicola Caputo, Gabriele Preuß, Miltiadis Kyrkos

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Stresses that, in the context of the collaborative economy, issues related to consumer protection, liability allocation, insurance schemes, social protection of workers (whether they are employed or self-employed) and data protection are the most urgent ones, and expects a regulatory intervention in that regard; **emphasises** that a regulatory framework should create a level playing field, foster innovations and contribute to the overall development and fulfilment of the EU transport policy goals, such as transport decarbonisation, territorial cohesion, affordability, accessibility and safety;

Amendment

3. Stresses that, in the context of the collaborative economy, issues related to consumer protection, liability allocation, insurance schemes, social protection of workers (whether they are employed or self-employed) and data protection are the most urgent ones, and expects a regulatory intervention in that regard; **underlines particularly the risks of unclear employment relations, unfair working conditions and non-compliance with workers' rights; stresses that there is a strong need to clarify the working relationship between workers and collaborative platforms;**

3a Emphasises that a regulatory framework should create a level playing field, foster innovations and contribute to the overall development and fulfilment of the EU transport policy goals, such as transport decarbonisation, territorial cohesion, **modernisation of all urban and rural infrastructures also linked to public transport services**, affordability, accessibility **for all users** and safety;

Or. en

Amendment 47
Daniel Dalton

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Stresses that, in the context of the collaborative economy, issues related to consumer protection, liability allocation, insurance schemes, social protection of workers (whether they are employed or self-employed) and data protection are **the most urgent ones, and expects a**

Amendment

3. Stresses that, in the context of the collaborative economy, issues related to consumer protection, liability allocation, insurance schemes, social protection of workers (whether they are employed or self-employed) and data protection are **highly relevant, though not exclusive to**

regulatory intervention in that regard; emphasises that a regulatory framework should create a level playing field, foster innovations and contribute to the overall development and fulfilment of the EU transport policy goals, such as transport decarbonisation, territorial cohesion, affordability, accessibility and safety;

collaborative business models; emphasises that any new proposals for regulation in these areas should follow an evidence-based approach, including examination of whether existing rules are being properly implemented, and should not be exclusive to collaborative business models, but rather on a sectoral basis; the regulatory framework in the EU transport sector should ensure a level playing field, foster innovations and contribute to the overall development and fulfilment of the EU transport policy goals, such as transport decarbonisation, territorial cohesion, affordability, accessibility and safety;

Or. en

Amendment 48
Karima Delli

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Stresses that, in the context of the collaborative economy, issues related to consumer protection, liability allocation, insurance schemes, social protection of workers (whether they are employed or self-employed) and data protection are the most urgent ones, and expects a regulatory intervention in that regard; emphasises that a regulatory framework should create a level playing field, foster innovations and contribute to the overall development and fulfilment of the EU transport policy goals, such as transport decarbonisation, territorial cohesion, affordability, accessibility and safety;

Amendment

3. Stresses that, in the context of the collaborative economy, issues related to consumer protection, liability allocation, insurance schemes, *service provider obligations, necessary differentiation between individual service providers and professional ones*, social protection *and fiscal conditions* of workers *in the case of the latter* (whether they are employed or self-employed), *reliability of the evaluation system*, and data protection are the most urgent ones, and expects a regulatory intervention in that regard; emphasises that a regulatory framework should create a level playing field, foster innovations and contribute to the overall development and fulfilment of the EU transport policy goals, such as transport decarbonisation, territorial cohesion, affordability, accessibility and safety, *infrastructure optimisation and eventually*

Amendment 49
Deirdre Clune

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Stresses that, in the context of the collaborative economy, issues related to consumer protection, liability allocation, insurance schemes, social protection of workers (whether they are employed or self-employed) and data protection are the most urgent ones, and expects a regulatory intervention in that regard; emphasises that a regulatory framework should create a level playing field, foster innovations and contribute to the overall development and fulfilment of the EU transport policy goals, such as transport decarbonisation, territorial cohesion, affordability, accessibility and safety;

Amendment

3. Stresses that, in the context of the collaborative economy, issues related to consumer protection, liability allocation, insurance schemes, social protection of workers (whether they are employed or self-employed) and data protection are the most urgent ones, and expects a regulatory intervention in that regard; emphasises that a regulatory framework should create a level playing field, foster innovations and contribute to the overall development and fulfilment of the EU transport policy goals, such as transport decarbonisation, territorial cohesion, affordability, accessibility and safety; ***stresses that, while providing clarity for consumers and business, any regulatory framework should help facilitate and enable the growth of the collaborative economy and take care not to inhibit digital innovation;***

Amendment 50
Cláudia Monteiro de Aguiar

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Stresses that, in the context of the collaborative economy, issues related to consumer protection, liability allocation, insurance schemes, social protection of

Amendment

3. Stresses that, in the context of the collaborative economy, issues related to consumer protection, liability allocation, insurance schemes, social protection of

workers (whether they are employed or self-employed) and data protection are the most urgent ones, and expects ***a regulatory intervention in that regard***; emphasises that a regulatory framework should ***create a level playing field, foster innovations and contribute to the overall development and fulfilment of the EU transport policy goals, such as transport decarbonisation, territorial cohesion, affordability, accessibility and safety***;

workers (whether they are employed or self-employed) and data protection are the most urgent ones, and expects ***the Commission to provide further guidance to Member States to avoid fragmentation and encourage Member States to share best practice and reduce legislative burden; highlights that, in many cases, collaborative economy applies self-regulatory measures and facilitates trust mechanisms among consumers***; emphasises that a regulatory framework should ***be adequate (by taking into account whether services are provided by professionals or peers), should not hamper innovation and create burdensome obstacles for entrepreneurship in the EU***;

Or. en

Amendment 51 **Jill Seymour**

Draft opinion **Paragraph 3**

Draft opinion

3. Stresses that, in the context of the collaborative economy, issues related to consumer protection, liability allocation, insurance schemes, social protection of workers (whether they are employed or self-employed) and data protection are the most urgent ones, and ***expects a regulatory intervention in that regard; emphasises that a regulatory framework should create a level playing field, foster innovations and contribute to the overall development and fulfilment of the EU transport policy goals, such as transport decarbonisation, territorial cohesion, affordability, accessibility and safety***;

Amendment

3. Stresses that, in the context of the collaborative economy, issues related to consumer protection, liability allocation, insurance schemes, social protection of workers (whether they are employed or self-employed) and data protection are the most urgent ones, and should ***stay as the competence of the Member State***;

Or. en

Amendment 52
Gesine Meissner

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Stresses that, in the context of the *collaborative economy*, issues related to consumer protection, liability allocation, insurance schemes, social protection of workers (whether they are employed or self-employed) and data protection are ***the most urgent ones, and expects a regulatory intervention in that regard***; emphasises that a regulatory framework should create a level playing field, foster innovations and contribute to the overall development and fulfilment of the EU transport policy goals, such as transport decarbonisation, territorial cohesion, affordability, accessibility and safety;

Amendment

3. Stresses that, in the context of the ***Commission communication "A European agenda for the Collaborative Economy"***, issues related to consumer protection, liability allocation, insurance schemes, social protection of workers (whether they are employed or self-employed) and data protection are ***currently investigated by an in-depth analysis and should be followed by more detailed recommendations from the Commission, if deemed necessary*** ; emphasises that a regulatory framework should create a level playing field, foster innovations and contribute to the overall development and fulfilment of the EU transport policy goals, such as transport decarbonisation, territorial cohesion, affordability, accessibility and safety;

Or. en

Amendment 53
Wim van de Camp

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Stresses that, in the context of the *collaborative economy*, issues related to consumer protection, liability allocation, insurance schemes, social protection of workers (whether they are employed or self-employed) and data protection ***are the most urgent ones, and expects a regulatory intervention in that regard***; emphasises that a regulatory framework should create a level playing field, foster innovations and contribute to the overall development and

Amendment

3. 3. Stresses that, in the context of the ***Commission communication "A European agenda for the Collaborative Economy"***, issues related to consumer protection, liability allocation, insurance schemes, social protection of workers (whether they are employed or self-employed) and data protection ***should give rise to an in-depth analysis and, if necessary, be concluded with proportionate regulatory steps from the***

fulfilment of the EU transport policy goals, such as transport decarbonisation, territorial cohesion, affordability, accessibility and safety;

Commission; emphasises that a regulatory framework should create a level playing field, foster innovations and contribute to the overall development and fulfilment of the EU transport policy goals, such as transport decarbonisation, territorial cohesion, affordability, accessibility and safety

Or. en

Amendment 54
Merja Kyllönen

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Stresses that, in the context of the collaborative economy, issues related to consumer protection, liability allocation, insurance schemes, social protection of workers (whether they are employed or self-employed) and data protection are the most urgent ones, and expects a regulatory intervention in that regard; emphasises that a regulatory framework should create a level playing field, foster innovations and contribute to the overall development and fulfilment of the EU transport policy goals, such as transport decarbonisation, territorial cohesion, affordability, accessibility and safety;

Amendment

3. Stresses that, in the context of the collaborative economy, issues related to consumer protection, liability allocation, insurance schemes, social protection of workers (whether they are employed or self-employed) and data protection are the most urgent ones, and expects a regulatory intervention in that regard; emphasises that a regulatory framework should ***strive to put the customer at the center of the activities and*** create a level playing field, foster innovations and contribute to the overall development and fulfilment of the EU transport policy goals, such as transport decarbonisation, territorial cohesion, affordability, accessibility and safety;

Or. en

Amendment 55
Andor Deli

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Stresses that, in the context of the
AM\1119566EN.docx

Amendment

3. Stresses that, in the context of the

29/78

PE601.112v01-00

collaborative economy, issues related to consumer protection, liability allocation, insurance schemes, social protection of workers (whether they are employed or self-employed) and data protection **are the most urgent ones, and expects** a regulatory intervention in that regard; emphasises that a regulatory framework **should** create a level playing field, foster innovations and contribute to the overall development and fulfilment of the EU transport policy goals, **such as** transport decarbonisation, territorial cohesion, affordability, accessibility and safety;

collaborative economy **there are several urgent areas to address, such as** issues related to consumer protection, liability allocation, insurance schemes, social protection of workers (whether they are employed or self-employed) and data protection, **therefore there might be a need for** a regulatory intervention in that regard; emphasises that a regulatory framework **could** create a level playing field, foster innovations and contribute to the overall development and fulfilment of the EU transport policy goals, **connected to** transport decarbonisation, territorial cohesion, affordability, accessibility and safety;

Or. en

Amendment 56 Mark Demesmaecker

Draft opinion Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Stresses that, in the context of the collaborative economy, issues related to consumer protection, liability allocation, insurance schemes, social protection of workers (whether they are employed or self-employed) and data protection are the most urgent ones, **and expects a regulatory intervention in that regard**; emphasises that a regulatory framework should create a level playing field, foster innovations and contribute to the overall development and fulfilment of the EU transport policy goals, such as transport decarbonisation, territorial cohesion, affordability, accessibility and safety;

Amendment

3. Stresses that, in the context of the collaborative economy, issues related to consumer protection, liability allocation, insurance schemes, social protection of workers (whether they are employed or self-employed) and data protection are the most urgent ones; emphasises that a regulatory framework should create a level playing field, foster innovations and contribute to the overall development and fulfilment of the EU transport policy goals, such as transport decarbonisation, territorial cohesion, affordability, accessibility and safety; **hopes that the collaborative economy will be fully incorporated into the EU's tourism policy**;

Or. nl

Amendment 57
PE601.112v01-00

30/78

AM\1119566EN.docx

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Stresses that, in the context of the collaborative economy, issues related to consumer protection, liability allocation, insurance schemes, social protection of workers (whether they are employed or self-employed) and data protection are the most urgent ones, and expects a regulatory intervention in that regard; emphasises that a regulatory framework should create a level playing field, foster innovations and contribute to the overall development and fulfilment of the EU transport policy goals, such as transport decarbonisation, territorial cohesion, affordability, accessibility and safety;

Amendment

3. Stresses that, in the context of the collaborative economy, issues related to consumer protection, liability allocation, **taxation**, insurance schemes, social protection of workers (whether they are employed or self-employed), **fair competition** and data protection are the most urgent ones, and expects a regulatory intervention in that regard; emphasises that a regulatory framework should create a level playing field, foster innovations and contribute to the overall development and fulfilment of the EU transport policy goals, such as transport decarbonisation, territorial cohesion, affordability, accessibility and safety;

Or. es

Amendment 58
Michael Cramer

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Stresses that, in the context of the collaborative economy, issues related to consumer protection, liability allocation, insurance schemes, social protection of workers (whether they are employed or self-employed) and data protection are the most urgent ones, and expects a regulatory intervention in that regard; emphasises that a regulatory framework should create a level playing field, foster innovations and contribute to the overall development and fulfilment of the EU transport policy goals, such as transport decarbonisation, territorial cohesion, affordability, accessibility and safety;

Amendment

3. Stresses that, in the context of the collaborative economy, issues related to consumer protection, liability allocation, insurance schemes, social protection of workers (whether they are employed or self-employed) and data protection are the most urgent ones, and expects a regulatory intervention in that regard; emphasises that a regulatory framework should create a level playing field, foster innovations and contribute to the overall development and fulfilment of the EU transport policy goals, such as transport decarbonisation, **reduction of pollutant emissions and noise**, territorial cohesion, affordability,

accessibility and safety;

Or. de

Amendment 59
Isabella De Monte, Nicola Caputo

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Stresses that, in the context of the collaborative economy, issues related to consumer protection, liability allocation, insurance schemes, social protection of workers (whether they are employed or self-employed) and data protection are the most urgent ones, and expects a regulatory intervention in that regard; emphasises that a regulatory framework should create a level playing field, foster innovations and contribute to the overall development and fulfilment of the EU transport policy goals, such as transport decarbonisation, territorial cohesion, affordability, accessibility and safety;

Amendment

3. Stresses that, in the context of the collaborative economy, issues related to consumer protection, liability allocation, **tax compliance**, insurance schemes, **transparency**, social protection of workers (whether they are employed or self-employed) and data protection are the most urgent ones, and expects a regulatory intervention in that regard; emphasises that a regulatory framework should create a level playing field, foster innovations and contribute to the overall development and fulfilment of the EU transport policy goals, such as transport decarbonisation, territorial cohesion, affordability, accessibility and safety;

Or. en

Amendment 60
Inés Ayala Sender

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Stresses that, in the context of the collaborative economy, issues related to consumer protection, liability allocation, insurance schemes, social protection of workers (whether they are employed or self-employed) and data protection are the most urgent ones, and expects a regulatory intervention in that regard; emphasises that

Amendment

3. Stresses that, in the context of the collaborative economy, issues related to consumer protection, liability allocation, **taxation**, insurance schemes, social protection of workers (whether they are employed or self-employed), **fair competition** and data protection are the most urgent ones, and expects a regulatory

a regulatory framework should create a level playing field, foster innovations and contribute to the overall development and fulfilment of the EU transport policy goals, such as transport decarbonisation, territorial cohesion, affordability, accessibility and safety;

intervention in that regard; emphasises that a regulatory framework should create a level playing field, foster innovations and contribute to the overall development and fulfilment of the EU transport policy goals, such as transport decarbonisation, territorial cohesion, affordability, accessibility and safety;

Or. es

Amendment 61
Tania González Peñas

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Stresses that, in the context of the collaborative economy, issues related to consumer protection, liability allocation, insurance schemes, social protection of workers (whether they are employed or self-employed) and data protection are the most urgent ones, and expects a regulatory intervention in that regard; emphasises that a regulatory framework should create a level playing field, foster innovations and contribute to the overall development and fulfilment of the EU transport policy goals, such as transport decarbonisation, territorial cohesion, affordability, accessibility and safety;

Amendment

3. Stresses that, in the context of the collaborative economy, issues related to consumer protection, liability allocation, **taxation**, insurance schemes, social protection of workers (whether they are employed or self-employed) and data protection are the most urgent ones, and expects a regulatory intervention in that regard; emphasises that a regulatory framework should create a level playing field, foster innovations and contribute to the overall development and fulfilment of the EU transport policy goals, such as transport decarbonisation, territorial cohesion, affordability, accessibility and safety;

Or. en

Amendment 62
Dominique Riquet, Gesine Meissner, Pavel Telička, Gesine Meissner

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. *Stresses that, in the context of the*
AM\1119566EN.docx

Amendment

3. *Emphasises that a regulatory*

33/78

PE601.112v01-00

collaborative economy, *issues related to consumer protection, liability allocation, insurance schemes, social protection of workers (whether they are employed or self-employed) and data protection are the most urgent ones, and expects a regulatory intervention in that regard; emphasises* that a regulatory framework should *create a level playing field, foster innovations and contribute to the overall development and fulfilment of the EU transport policy goals, such as transport decarbonisation, territorial cohesion, affordability, accessibility and safety;*

framework for the collaborative economy should create a level playing field, foster innovation and contribute to the overall development and fulfilment of the EU transport policy goals, such as transport decarbonisation, territorial cohesion, affordability, accessibility and safety. Stresses that a regulatory framework should *address, where necessary, issues related to consumer protection, liability allocation, insurance schemes, social protection of workers (whether they are employed or self-employed) and data protection;*

Or. en

Amendment 63 **Dieter-Lebrecht Koch**

Draft opinion **Paragraph 3**

Draft opinion

3. Stresses that, in the context of the collaborative economy, issues related to consumer protection, liability allocation, insurance schemes, social protection of workers (whether they are employed or self-employed) and data protection are the most urgent ones, and expects a regulatory intervention in that regard; emphasises that a regulatory framework should create a level playing field, foster innovations and contribute to the overall development and fulfilment of the EU transport policy goals, such as transport decarbonisation, territorial cohesion, affordability, accessibility and safety;

Amendment

3. Stresses that, in the context of the collaborative economy, issues related to consumer protection, liability allocation, insurance schemes, social protection of workers (whether they are employed or self-employed) and data protection are the most urgent ones, and expects a regulatory intervention in that regard; emphasises that a regulatory framework should create a *fair* level playing field, foster innovations and contribute to the overall development and fulfilment of the EU transport policy goals, such as transport decarbonisation, territorial cohesion, affordability, accessibility and safety;

Or. de

Amendment 64 **Henna Virkkunen**

Draft opinion

PE601.112v01-00

34/78

AM\1119566EN.docx

Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Stresses that, in the context of the collaborative economy, issues related to consumer protection, liability allocation, insurance schemes, social protection of workers (whether they are employed or self-employed) and data protection are the most urgent ones, and expects a regulatory intervention in that regard; emphasises that a regulatory framework should ***create a level playing field***, foster innovations and contribute to the overall development and fulfilment of the EU transport policy goals, such as transport decarbonisation, territorial cohesion, affordability, accessibility and safety;

Amendment

3. Stresses that, in the context of the collaborative economy, issues related to consumer protection, liability allocation, insurance schemes, social protection of workers (whether they are employed or self-employed) and data protection are the most urgent ones, and expects a regulatory intervention in that regard; emphasises that a regulatory framework should ***ensure fair competition***, foster innovations and contribute to the overall development and fulfilment of the EU transport policy goals, such as transport decarbonisation, territorial cohesion, affordability, accessibility and safety;

Or. en

Amendment 65

Kosma Zlotowski, Tomasz Piotr Poręba

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Stresses that, in the context of the collaborative economy, issues related to consumer protection, liability allocation, insurance schemes, social protection of workers (whether they are employed or self-employed) and data protection are the most urgent ones, ***and expects a regulatory intervention in that regard***; emphasises that ***a*** regulatory framework should create a level playing field, foster innovations and contribute to the overall development and fulfilment of the EU transport policy goals, such as ***transport decarbonisation***, territorial cohesion, affordability, accessibility and safety;

Amendment

3. Stresses that, in the context of the collaborative economy, issues related to consumer protection, liability allocation, insurance schemes, social protection of workers (whether they are employed or self-employed) and data protection are the most urgent ones, ***that deserve closer attention of the regulators***; emphasises that ***any*** regulatory framework should create a level playing field, foster innovations and contribute to the overall development and fulfilment of the EU transport policy goals, such as ***sustainability***, territorial cohesion, affordability, accessibility and safety;

Or. en

Amendment 66
Marie-Christine Arnautu

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Stresses that, in the context of the collaborative economy, issues related to consumer protection, liability allocation, insurance schemes, social protection of workers (whether they are employed or self-employed) **and data protection** are the most urgent ones, and expects a regulatory intervention in that regard; emphasises that a regulatory framework should create a level playing field, **foster innovations and contribute to the overall development and fulfilment of the EU transport policy** goals, such as **transport decarbonisation**, territorial cohesion, affordability, accessibility **and safety**;

Amendment

3. Stresses that, in the context of the collaborative economy, issues related to consumer protection, liability allocation, insurance schemes, social protection of workers (whether they are employed or self-employed), **data protection and tax rules**, are the most urgent ones, and expects a regulatory intervention in that regard, **in full compliance with the principle of subsidiarity**; emphasises that a regulatory framework should create a level playing field, **while fostering innovation and contributing towards achieving** goals such as territorial cohesion, affordability, accessibility, **safety and reducing pollution**;

Or. fr

Amendment 67
Cláudia Monteiro de Aguiar

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 – indent 1 (new)

Draft opinion

- **Highlights the need to foster coexistence between traditional tourist accommodation and short-term accommodation, bearing in mind that collaborative accommodation services attract new tourists, bolster individual incomes and the local economy and complement traditional accommodation; stresses that Member States should avoid legislative or administrative measures that hamper the development of collaborative accommodation;**

Amendment

Or. pt

Amendment 68
Christine Revault D'Allonnes Bonnefoy

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Stresses the legal and social risks of circumventing the rules governing employment contracts, social-security contributions and the social entitlements resulting from business models underpinned by the use of 'bogus self-employment' arrangements by intermediate platforms, even though there is an employer-employee relationship between the driver and the platform. Invites, therefore, the Commission to take account of national court rulings seeking to redefine the nature of the employment relationship between platform and driver.

Or. fr

Amendment 69
Inés Ayala Sender

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Condemns the use by certain transport operators of 'bogus self-employed workers' and other arrangements such as the use of 'bogus private individuals' with the intention of circumventing legislation so as, first and foremost, to offer services more cheaply, which equates to 'social dumping' vis-à-vis competitors complying with social, employment and tax rules.

Or. es

Amendment 70
Isabella De Monte, Nicola Caputo

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3 a. *Emphasises that the economic model of collaborative economies is based on users' trust, particularly in online comments; stresses the importance of allowing users to have reliable and fair information on the quality of the services offered on collaborative platforms;*

Or. en

Amendment 71
Inés Ayala Sender

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3b. *Stresses the importance for any transport or accommodation service provider to have compulsory insurance covering liability in respect of users and third parties. Draws attention to the legal vacuum concerning certain forms of the sharing economy in the transport and tourist accommodation sectors that provide services without any form of insurance, with the attendant risks for people, potentially leaving them defenceless in the event of accident or abuse. Believes that all collaborative service providers should therefore be obliged to take out a mandatory liability insurance policy so as to ensure they compete on a level playing against regulated transport services and the hotel sector. Points out how difficult it is to check compliance with this obligation, given that there is often no register of the*

private individuals offering such services; calls, therefore, on the relevant authorities to monitor both sectors more effectively.

Or. es

Amendment 72
Isabella De Monte, Nicola Caputo

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3 b. *Calls on the Commission and Member States to ensure fairness and transparency between those working in the collaborative economy and traditional economic operators, and to ensure a high level of consumer protection, particularly as regards aspects related to safety, security, health, protection of privacy and accurate information;*

Or. en

Amendment 73
Michael Cramer

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

Amendment

4. Recalls the potential of collaborative economy models to improve the efficiency of the transport system and reduce undesired externalities of traffic such as congestion and emissions; emphasises the need to fully integrate collaborative transport services into the conventional transport system and to avoid administrative systems or legislative measures which might lead to exclusion of collaborative transport services from transport planning and operations, with a

4. Recalls the potential of collaborative economy models to improve the efficiency of the transport system, ***encourage changes in attitude away from owning and towards sharing*** and reduce undesired externalities of traffic such as congestion, ***the volume of space taken up*** and emissions; emphasises the need to fully integrate collaborative transport services into the conventional transport system and to ***develop them as a complement to non-motorised traffic and***

view to enabling the creation of smooth complete travel chains and the provision of new forms of sustainable mobility;

the public transport system; proposes that the space being made available through the new solutions should be used for measures to improve the quality of life (parks, green areas and water bodies, rest areas, pavements and pedestrianised areas, cycle paths, etc.); emphasises the need to avoid administrative systems or legislative measures which might lead to exclusion of collaborative transport services from transport planning and operations, with a view to enabling the creation of smooth complete travel chains and the provision of new forms of sustainable mobility; emphasises that the combination of collaborative and public transport services offers great scope for this, in particular in connecting up areas that hitherto have been poorly connected;

Or. de

Amendment 74
István Ujhelyi

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Recalls the potential of collaborative economy models to improve the efficiency of the transport system and reduce undesired externalities of traffic such as congestion and emissions; emphasises the need to fully integrate collaborative transport services into the conventional transport system and to avoid administrative systems or legislative measures which might lead to exclusion of collaborative transport services from transport planning and operations, with a view to enabling the creation of smooth complete travel chains and the provision of new forms of sustainable mobility;

Amendment

4. Recalls the potential of collaborative economy models to improve the efficiency of the transport system and reduce undesired externalities of traffic such as congestion and emissions; *notes also the positive impact new collaborative economy players can have on traditional ones in improving services, enabling innovation (e.g Izy by SNCF) and therefore favoring competition;* emphasises the need to fully integrate collaborative transport services into the conventional transport system and to avoid administrative systems or legislative measures which might lead to exclusion of collaborative transport services from transport planning and operations, with a view to enabling the creation of smooth complete travel chains and the provision of

new forms of sustainable mobility;

Or. en

Amendment 75
Deirdre Clune

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Recalls the potential of collaborative economy models to improve the efficiency of the transport system and reduce undesired *externalities of traffic such as* congestion and emissions; emphasises the need to fully integrate collaborative transport services into the conventional transport system and to avoid administrative systems or legislative measures which might lead to exclusion of collaborative transport services from transport planning and operations, with a view to enabling the creation of smooth complete travel chains and the provision of new forms of sustainable mobility;

Amendment

4. Recalls the potential of collaborative economy models to improve the efficiency of the transport system and reduce undesired traffic congestion and emissions; emphasises the need to fully integrate collaborative transport services into the conventional transport system and to avoid administrative systems or legislative measures which might lead to exclusion of collaborative transport services from transport planning and operations, with a view to enabling the creation of smooth complete travel chains and the provision of new forms of sustainable mobility; ***underlines that, in-line with the wider digitization of Europe's transport services, that high-speed wireless and fixed connectivity is essential for the further development of the collaborative economy;***

Or. en

Amendment 76
Inés Ayala Sender

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Recalls the potential of collaborative economy models to improve the efficiency of the transport system and reduce undesired externalities of traffic

Amendment

4. Recalls the potential of collaborative economy models to improve the efficiency of the transport system and reduce undesired externalities of traffic

such as congestion and emissions; ***emphasises the need to fully*** integrate collaborative transport services into the conventional transport system ***and to avoid administrative systems or legislative measures which might lead to exclusion of collaborative transport services from transport planning and operations***, with a view to enabling the creation of smooth complete travel chains and the provision of new forms of sustainable mobility;

such as congestion and emissions; ***calls on the relevant authorities to*** integrate ***true*** collaborative transport services into the conventional transport system, with a view to enabling the creation of smooth complete travel chains and the provision of new forms of sustainable mobility;

Or. es

Amendment 77
István Ujhelyi

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Recalls the potential of collaborative economy models to improve the efficiency of the transport system and reduce undesired externalities of traffic such as congestion and emissions; emphasises the need to fully integrate collaborative transport services into the conventional transport system and to avoid administrative systems or legislative measures which might lead to exclusion of collaborative transport services from transport planning and operations, with a view to enabling the creation of smooth complete travel chains and the provision of new forms of sustainable mobility;

Amendment

4. Recalls the potential of collaborative economy models to improve the efficiency of the transport system and reduce undesired externalities of traffic such as congestion and emissions; emphasises the need to fully integrate collaborative transport services into the conventional transport system and to avoid administrative systems or legislative measures which might lead to exclusion of collaborative transport services from transport planning and operations, with a view to enabling the creation of smooth complete travel chains and the provision of new forms of sustainable mobility; ***supports and encourages initiatives where traditional players cooperate with new ones (partnership Hilton Worldwide and Uber) finding complementarity between services;***

Or. en

Amendment 78
Luis de Grandes Pascual, Inés Ayala Sender

PE601.112v01-00

42/78

AM\1119566EN.docx

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Recalls the potential of collaborative economy models to improve the efficiency of the transport system and reduce undesired externalities of traffic such as congestion and emissions; ***emphasises the need to fully integrate collaborative transport services into the conventional transport system and to avoid administrative systems or legislative measures which might lead to exclusion of collaborative transport services from transport planning and operations***, with a view to enabling the creation of smooth complete travel chains and the provision of new forms of sustainable mobility;

Amendment

4. Recalls the potential of collaborative economy models to improve the efficiency of the transport system and reduce undesired externalities of traffic such as congestion and emissions; ***calls on the relevant authorities to integrate true collaborative transport services into the conventional transport system, with a view to enabling the creation of smooth complete travel chains and the provision of new forms of sustainable mobility***;

Or. es

Amendment 79
Andor Deli

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Recalls the potential of collaborative economy models to improve the efficiency of the transport system and reduce undesired externalities of traffic such as congestion and emissions; ***emphasises the need to fully integrate collaborative transport services into the conventional transport system and to avoid administrative systems or legislative measures which might lead to exclusion of collaborative transport services from transport planning and operations, with a view to enabling the creation of smooth complete travel chains and the provision of new forms of sustainable mobility***;

Amendment

4. Recalls the potential of collaborative economy models to improve the efficiency of the transport system and reduce undesired externalities of traffic such as congestion and emissions; ***with the view of creating complete travel chains and in order to foster sustainable mobility stresses the need to explore the possibilities of cooperation between conventional and collaborative transport services***;

Or. en

Amendment 80
Jill Seymour

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Recalls the potential of collaborative economy models to improve the efficiency of the transport system and reduce undesired externalities of traffic such as congestion and emissions; emphasises the need to fully integrate collaborative transport services into the conventional transport system and to avoid administrative systems or legislative measures which might lead to exclusion of collaborative transport services from transport planning and operations, with a view to enabling the creation of smooth complete travel chains and the provision of new forms of sustainable mobility;

Amendment

4. Recalls the potential of collaborative economy models to improve the efficiency of the transport system and reduce undesired externalities of traffic such as congestion and emissions; emphasises the need to fully integrate collaborative transport services into the conventional transport system and to avoid administrative systems or legislative measures which might lead to exclusion of collaborative transport services from transport planning and operations, with a view to enabling the creation of smooth complete travel chains and the provision of new forms of sustainable mobility. ***Insists on this that the Member States requirements are at all times adhered to and where necessary take precedence over those of the EU;***

Or. en

Amendment 81
Dominique Riquet, Izaskun Bilbao Barandica, Pavel Telička, Gesine Meissner

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Recalls the potential of collaborative economy models to improve the efficiency of the transport system and reduce undesired externalities of traffic such as congestion and emissions; emphasises the need to ***fully integrate*** collaborative transport services ***into the conventional transport system and*** to avoid administrative systems or legislative

Amendment

4. Recalls the potential of collaborative economy models to improve the efficiency of the transport system and reduce undesired externalities of traffic such as congestion and emissions; emphasises the need to ***have an integrated transport system where*** collaborative transport services ***are one amongst several services, beside to small*** transport

measures which might lead to exclusion of collaborative transport services from transport planning and operations, with a view to enabling the creation of smooth complete travel chains and the provision of new forms of sustainable mobility;

undertakings who maintain an important role to play, to avoid administrative systems or legislative measures which might lead to ***the*** exclusion of collaborative transport services from transport planning and operations, with a view to enabling the creation of smooth complete travel chains and the provision of new forms of sustainable mobility;

Or. en

Amendment 82
Karima Delli

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Recalls the potential of collaborative economy models to improve the efficiency of the transport system and reduce undesired externalities of traffic such as congestion and emissions; emphasises the need to fully integrate collaborative transport services into the conventional transport system and ***to*** avoid administrative systems or legislative measures which might lead to exclusion of collaborative transport services from transport planning and operations, with a view to enabling the creation of smooth complete travel chains and the provision of new forms of sustainable mobility;

Amendment

4. Recalls the potential of collaborative economy models to improve the efficiency of the transport system and reduce undesired externalities of traffic such as congestion and emissions; emphasises the need to fully integrate collaborative transport services into the conventional transport system and ***local mobility planification schemes, in order to find complementarities with public services and*** avoid administrative systems or legislative measures which might lead to exclusion of collaborative transport services from transport planning and operations, with a view to enabling the creation of smooth complete travel chains and the provision of new forms of sustainable mobility;

Or. en

Amendment 83
Tania González Peñas

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Recalls the potential of collaborative economy models to improve the efficiency of the transport system and reduce undesired externalities of traffic such as congestion and emissions; emphasises the need to fully integrate collaborative transport services into the conventional transport system and to avoid administrative systems or legislative measures which might lead to exclusion of collaborative transport services from transport planning and operations, with a view to enabling the creation of smooth complete travel chains and the provision of new forms of sustainable mobility;

Amendment

4. Recalls the potential of collaborative economy models to improve the efficiency of the transport system and reduce undesired externalities of traffic such as congestion and emissions; emphasises the need to fully integrate collaborative transport services into the conventional transport system and, ***while respecting the national subsidiarity principle***, to avoid administrative systems or legislative measures which might lead to exclusion of ***fair*** collaborative transport services from transport planning and operations, with a view to enabling the creation of smooth complete travel chains and the provision of new forms of sustainable mobility;

Or. en

Amendment 84

Isabella De Monte, Nicola Caputo

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Recalls the potential of collaborative economy models to improve the efficiency of the transport system and reduce undesired externalities of traffic such as congestion and emissions; emphasises the need to fully integrate collaborative transport services into the conventional transport system and to avoid administrative systems or legislative measures which might lead to exclusion of collaborative transport services from transport planning and operations, with a view to enabling the creation of smooth complete travel chains and the provision of new forms of sustainable mobility;

Amendment

4. Recalls the potential of collaborative economy models to ***make remote areas more accessible***, improve the efficiency of the transport system and reduce undesired externalities of traffic such as congestion and emissions; emphasises the need to fully integrate collaborative transport services into the conventional transport system and to avoid administrative systems or legislative measures which might lead to exclusion of collaborative transport services from transport planning and operations, with a view to enabling the creation of smooth complete travel chains and the provision of new forms of sustainable mobility;

Or. en

Amendment 85
Dieter-Lebrecht Koch

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Recalls the potential of collaborative economy models to improve the efficiency of the transport system and reduce undesired externalities of traffic such as congestion and emissions; emphasises the need to fully integrate collaborative transport services into the conventional transport system and to avoid administrative systems or legislative measures which might lead to exclusion of collaborative transport services from transport planning and operations, with a view to enabling the creation of smooth complete travel chains and the provision of new forms of sustainable mobility;

Amendment

4. Recalls the potential of collaborative economy models to improve the efficiency of the transport system and reduce undesired externalities of traffic such as congestion and emissions; emphasises the need to fully integrate collaborative transport services into the conventional transport system and to avoid administrative systems or legislative measures which might lead to exclusion of collaborative transport services from transport planning and operations, with a view to enabling the creation of smooth complete **door-to-door** travel chains and the provision of new forms of sustainable mobility;

Or. de

Amendment 86
Daniel Dalton

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Recalls the potential of collaborative economy models to improve the efficiency of the transport system and reduce **undesired externalities of traffic such as** congestion and emissions; emphasises the **need to** fully **integrate** collaborative transport services into the conventional transport system and to avoid administrative systems or legislative measures which might lead to exclusion of collaborative transport services from transport planning and operations, with a

Amendment

4. Recalls the potential of collaborative economy models to **significantly** improve the efficiency of the transport system and reduce congestion and emissions **from traffic**; emphasises the **benefits of** fully **integrating** collaborative transport services into the conventional transport system and **the need** to avoid administrative systems or legislative measures which might lead to exclusion of collaborative transport services from transport planning and

view to enabling the creation of smooth complete travel chains and the provision of new forms of sustainable mobility;

operations, with a view to enabling the creation of smooth complete travel chains and the provision of new forms of sustainable mobility;

Or. en

Amendment 87
Mark Demesmaeker

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. ***Recalls*** the potential of collaborative economy ***models to improve the efficiency of the transport system and reduce undesired externalities of traffic such as congestion and emissions***; emphasises the need to fully integrate collaborative transport services into the conventional transport system and to avoid administrative systems or legislative measures which might lead to exclusion of collaborative transport services from transport planning and operations, with a view to enabling the creation of smooth complete travel chains and the provision of new forms of sustainable mobility;

Amendment

4. ***Calls for*** the potential of ***the collaborative economy to be fully exploited in the transition to low-emission and inter-modular transport of persons and goods***; emphasises the need to fully integrate collaborative transport services into the conventional transport system and to avoid administrative systems or legislative measures which might lead to exclusion of collaborative transport services from transport planning and operations, with a view to enabling the creation of smooth complete travel chains and the provision of new forms of sustainable mobility;

Or. nl

Amendment 88
Inés Ayala Sender

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

4a. Warns that the unregulated growth of certain forms of the collaborative economy could be detrimental to collective public transport services and undermine their financial sustainability; adds, therefore, that

complementarity rather than substitution should be encouraged, particularly in areas of low population density and rural areas in which public transport services are often the only alternative to travelling by private vehicle .

Or. es

Amendment 89

Luis de Grandes Pascual, Inés Ayala Sender

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Calls for the conditions governing independent service provision in regulated sectors such as urban and inter-urban passenger road transport to be overhauled to establish a single regulatory framework combining conditions of access to the profession in compliance with EU law with a regime that ensures continuous and stable provision of services so as to avoid situations of unfair competition.

Or. es

Amendment 90

Claudia Țapardel, Maria Grapini, István Ujhelyi, Lucy Anderson

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4 a. Recalls that the collaborative economy has opened new opportunities for growth in the tourism sector, increasing and diversifying both demand and offer, but expresses concern as regards the impact on communities' way of life, public safety and the environment.

Or. en

Amendment 91

Dominique Riquet, Izaskun Bilbao Barandica, Pavel Telička, Gesine Meissner

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4 a. Believes that collaborative business models constitute a major resource for the sustainable development of connections in outlying, mountainous and rural regions, while these areas are not naturally conducive to the development of the collaborative economy;

Or. en

Amendment 92

Olga Sehnalová

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Points out that the collaborative economy can have a positive impact on the mobility of people with disabilities and the elderly provided that it is properly adapted to their needs;

Or. cs

Amendment 93

Daniel Dalton

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4 a. Welcomes the fact that the digital revolution has enabled seamless

multimodal ticketing and travel in a single journey for transport users with collaborative economy apps;

Or. en

Amendment 94
Inés Ayala Sender

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4b. Takes the view, moreover, that certain collaborative transport services can lead to additional traffic congestion problems in large urban areas by fragmenting the range of services available, thereby increasing CO₂ emissions and leading to other negative externalities.

Or. es

Amendment 95
Dominique Riquet, Izaskun Bilbao Barandica, Pavel Telička, Gesine Meissner

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4 b. Invites the Commission to integrate the collaborative economy into its work on new technologies in transport (connected vehicles, autonomous vehicles, integrated digital ticketing, intelligent transport systems) because of their strong interactions and natural synergies;

Or. en

Amendment 96
Inés Ayala Sender

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4c. *Calls for the conditions governing independent service provision in regulated sectors such as urban and inter-urban passenger road transport to be overhauled to establish a single regulatory framework combining conditions of access to the profession in compliance with EU law with a regime that ensures continuous and stable provision of services so as to avoid situations of unfair competition.*

Or. es

Amendment 97

Dominique Riquet, Izaskun Bilbao Barandica, Pavel Telička, Gesine Meissner

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4 c. *Stresses, in the field of transport, the significant contribution of the collaborative economy to safety and security (clear identification of the parties, reciprocal evaluation, trusted third parties, verification of the specifications)*

Or. en

Amendment 98
Deirdre Clune

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

Amendment

5. *Urges the need to clearly distinguish between legitimate ride-*

deleted

sharing and the provision of commercial transporting services (i.e. ‘non-professional’ vs ‘professional’ service provision) in EU terminology, and urges the Commission to come up with proposals to adapt Union legislation accordingly; considers the monetary threshold to be one advisable way to make this distinction;

Or. en

Amendment 99

Claudia Tapardel, Maria Grapini, István Ujhelyi

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Urges the need to clearly distinguish between *legitimate* ride-sharing and the provision of commercial transporting services (i.e. ‘non-professional’ vs ‘professional’ service provision) in EU terminology, and urges the Commission to come up with proposals to adapt Union legislation accordingly; considers *the monetary threshold* to be one advisable way to make this distinction;

Amendment

5. Urges the need to clearly distinguish between *the provision of regulated commercial transport services* and ride-sharing, which could be defined as the shared use of a vehicle by a private individual, with one or more passengers, in order to share costs in the context of an existing trip the driver had already planned, and urges the Commission to come up with proposals to adapt Union legislation accordingly; considers *that thresholds which are representatives of Member States' different economic realities and purchasing power* could be one of the advisable ways to make this distinction, and recommends the Commission to launch a study on the role of thresholds in the collaborative economy.

Or. en

Amendment 100

Lucy Anderson, Olga Sehnalová, José Blanco López, Nicola Caputo, Gabriele Preuß, Miltiadis Kyrkos

Draft opinion

AM\1119566EN.docx

53/78

PE601.112v01-00

EN

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Urges the need to clearly distinguish between legitimate ride-sharing and the provision of commercial transporting services (i.e. 'non-professional' vs 'professional' service provision) in EU terminology, **and** urges the Commission to come up with proposals to adapt Union legislation accordingly; ***considers the monetary threshold to be one advisable way to make this distinction;***

Amendment

5. Urges the need to clearly distinguish between legitimate ride-sharing and the provision of commercial transporting services (i.e. 'non-professional' vs 'professional' service provision) in EU terminology; ***believes that all work in the collaborative economy should be classified accordingly, avoiding the spontaneous creation of new hybrid categories for workers;*** urges the Commission to come up with proposals to adapt Union legislation accordingly, ***assessing the possibility to extend traditional protections and social security protections established at national level by the Member States, to all workers in the collaborative economy;***

Or. en

Amendment 101

Nicola Caputo, Lucy Anderson

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Urges the need to clearly distinguish between legitimate ride-sharing and the provision of commercial transporting services (i.e. 'non-professional' vs 'professional' service provision) in EU terminology, and urges the Commission to come up with proposals to adapt Union legislation accordingly; considers the monetary threshold to be one advisable way to make this distinction;

Amendment

5. Urges the need to clearly distinguish between legitimate ride-sharing and the provision of commercial transporting services (i.e. 'non-professional' vs 'professional' service provision) in EU terminology, and urges the Commission to come up with proposals to adapt Union legislation accordingly; considers the monetary threshold to be one advisable way to make this distinction; ***invites to digitalise and standardize the formal procedures needed for the undertaking of professional activities (i.e. authorizations, licenses, social service), in order to ease both the access and the exit from collaborative economy;***

Amendment 102**Jill Seymour****Draft opinion****Paragraph 5***Draft opinion*

5. ***Urges*** the need to clearly distinguish between legitimate ride-sharing and the provision of commercial transporting services (i.e. ‘non-professional’ vs ‘professional’ service provision) ***in EU terminology, and urges the Commission to come up with proposals to adapt Union legislation accordingly; considers the monetary threshold to be one advisable way to make this distinction;***

Amendment

5. ***Acknowledges*** the need to clearly distinguish between legitimate ride-sharing and the provision of commercial transporting services (i.e. ‘non-professional’ vs ‘professional’ service provision);

Or. en

Amendment 103**Cláudia Monteiro de Aguiar****Draft opinion****Paragraph 5***Draft opinion*

5. ***Urges*** the need to clearly distinguish between ***legitimate ride-sharing*** and the provision of commercial transporting services (i.e. ‘non-professional’ vs ‘professional’ service provision) in EU terminology, and urges the Commission to come up with proposals to adapt Union legislation accordingly; ***considers the monetary threshold to be one advisable way to make this distinction;***

Amendment

5. ***Points out that the great diversity of collaborative economy models and the variety of products and services offered in different sectors, each with its own market characteristics, makes it difficult to classify activities;*** ***urges*** the need to clearly distinguish between ***private individuals*** and the provision of commercial transporting services (i.e. ‘non-professional’ vs ‘professional’ service provision) in EU terminology, and urges the Commission to come up with proposals to adapt Union legislation accordingly;

Or. pt

Amendment 104
Marie-Christine Arnautu

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Urges the need to clearly distinguish between legitimate ride-sharing and the provision of commercial transporting services (i.e. ‘non-professional’ vs ‘professional’ service provision) in EU terminology, and urges the Commission to come up with proposals to adapt Union legislation accordingly; considers ***the monetary threshold to be one advisable way to make this distinction;***

Amendment

5. Urges the need to clearly distinguish between legitimate ride-sharing and the provision of commercial transporting services (i.e. ‘non-professional’ vs ‘professional’ service provision) in EU terminology, and urges the Commission to come up with proposals to adapt Union legislation accordingly; considers ***in this regard that the Commission should take account of recent court rulings in some Member States and judgments in cases pending before the Court of Justice of the European Union;***

Or. fr

Amendment 105
Luis de Grandes Pascual, Inés Ayala Sender

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Urges the need to clearly distinguish between legitimate ride-sharing and the provision of commercial transporting services (i.e. ‘non-professional’ vs ‘professional’ service provision) in EU terminology, and urges the Commission to come up with proposals to adapt Union legislation accordingly; considers the monetary threshold ***to*** be one advisable way to make this distinction;

Amendment

5. Urges the need to clearly distinguish between legitimate ride-sharing and the provision of commercial transporting services (i.e. ‘non-professional’ vs ‘professional’ service provision) in EU terminology – ***with the understanding that similar obligations should apply to the provision of comparable services by transport companies*** – and urges the Commission to come up with proposals to adapt Union legislation accordingly; considers the monetary threshold ***could*** be one advisable way to make this distinction;

Amendment 106
Inés Ayala Sender

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Urges the need to clearly distinguish between legitimate ride-sharing and the provision of commercial transporting services (i.e. ‘non-professional’ vs ‘professional’ service provision) in EU terminology, and urges the Commission to come up with proposals to adapt Union legislation accordingly; considers the monetary threshold **to** be one advisable way to make this distinction;

Amendment

5. Urges the need to clearly distinguish between legitimate ride-sharing and the provision of commercial transporting services (i.e. ‘non-professional’ vs ‘professional’ service provision) in EU terminology – ***with the understanding that similar obligations should apply to the provision of comparable services by transport companies*** – and urges the Commission to come up with proposals to adapt Union legislation accordingly; considers the monetary threshold **could** be one advisable way to make this distinction;

Or. es

Amendment 107
Tania González Peñas

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Urges the need to clearly distinguish between legitimate ride-sharing and the provision of commercial transporting services (i.e. ‘non-professional’ vs ‘professional’ service provision) in EU terminology, and urges the Commission to come up with proposals to adapt Union legislation accordingly; considers the monetary threshold to be one advisable way to make this distinction;

Amendment

5. Urges the need to clearly distinguish between legitimate ride-sharing and the provision of commercial transporting services (i.e. ‘non-professional’ vs ‘professional’ service provision) in EU terminology ***taking into account that equivalent services provision must be subject to equivalent regulatory standards***, and urges the Commission to come up with proposals to adapt Union legislation accordingly; considers the monetary threshold to be one advisable

way to make this distinction;

Or. en

Amendment 108
Henna Virkkunen

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. *Urges* the need to clearly distinguish between legitimate ride-sharing and the provision of commercial transporting services (i.e. ‘non-professional’ vs ‘professional’ service provision) in EU terminology, and urges the Commission to come up with proposals to adapt Union legislation accordingly; considers the monetary threshold to be one advisable way to make this distinction;

Amendment

5. ***Calls on the Commission to draw up definitions for car-pooling and car-sharing;*** urges the need to clearly distinguish between legitimate ride-sharing and the provision of commercial transporting services (i.e. ‘non-professional’ vs ‘professional’ service provision) in EU terminology, and urges the Commission to come up with proposals to adapt Union legislation accordingly; considers the monetary threshold to be one advisable way to make this distinction;

Or. en

Amendment 109
Dieter-Lebrecht Koch

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Urges the need to clearly distinguish between legitimate ride-sharing and the provision of commercial transporting services (i.e. ‘non-professional’ vs ‘professional’ service provision) in EU terminology, and urges the Commission to come up with proposals to adapt Union legislation accordingly; ***considers the monetary threshold to be one advisable way to make this distinction;***

Amendment

5. Urges the need to clearly distinguish between legitimate ride-sharing and the provision of commercial transporting services (i.e. ‘non-professional’ vs ‘professional’ service provision) in EU terminology, and urges the Commission to come up with proposals to adapt Union legislation accordingly;

Amendment 110

Daniel Dalton

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. *Urges the need to clearly distinguish between legitimate ride-sharing and the provision of commercial transporting services (i.e. ‘non-professional’ vs ‘professional’ service provision) in EU terminology, and urges the Commission to come up with proposals to adapt Union legislation accordingly; considers the monetary threshold to be one advisable way to make this distinction;*

Amendment

5. *Notes the need for clear definitions to provide legal certainty, and in the context of transport to differentiate between carpooling on the one hand and sharing of costs in the context of an existing trip the driver planned for his own purpose, and regulated passenger transport services;*

Or. en

Amendment 111

Gesine Meissner

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. *Urges the need to clearly distinguish between legitimate ride-sharing and the provision of commercial transporting services (i.e. ‘non-professional’ vs ‘professional’ service provision) in EU terminology, and urges the Commission to come up with proposals to adapt Union legislation accordingly; considers the monetary threshold to be one advisable way to make this distinction;*

Amendment

5. *Stresses the need to better understand, whether a distinction within commercial transporting services (‘non-professional’ vs ‘professional’ service provision) in EU terminology should apply, and urges the Commission to ensure that any such distinction is fit for the type of services concerned;*

Or. en

Amendment 112

Dominique Riquet, Izaskun Bilbao Barandica, Pavel Telička

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Urges the need to clearly distinguish between *legitimate ride-sharing and the provision of commercial transporting services (i.e. ‘non-professional’ vs ‘professional’ service provision) in EU terminology*, and urges the Commission to come up with proposals to adapt Union legislation accordingly; considers the monetary threshold to be one advisable way to make this distinction;

Amendment

5. Urges the need to clearly distinguish between *cost-sharing services and commercial transporting services in EU terminology to facilitate compliance by all parties with their fiscal and social obligations and ensure consumer protection*, and urges the Commission to come up with proposals to adapt Union legislation accordingly; considers the monetary threshold to be one advisable way to make this distinction;

Or. en

Amendment 113

Karima Delli

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Urges the need to clearly distinguish between legitimate *ride-sharing* and the provision of commercial transporting services (i.e. ‘non-professional’ vs ‘professional’ service provision) in EU terminology, and urges the Commission to come up with proposals to adapt Union legislation accordingly; considers the monetary threshold to be one advisable way to make this distinction;

Amendment

5. Urges the need to clearly distinguish between legitimate *cost sharing* and the provision of commercial transporting *and touristic* services (i.e. ‘non-professional’ vs ‘professional’ service provision) in EU terminology, and urges the Commission to come up with proposals to adapt Union legislation accordingly; considers the monetary threshold to be one advisable way to make this distinction;

Or. en

Amendment 114

Kosma Złotowski, Tomasz Piotr Poręba

Draft opinion

PE601.112v01-00

60/78

AM\1119566EN.docx

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Urges ***the need*** to clearly distinguish between legitimate ride-sharing and the provision of commercial transporting services (i.e. 'non-professional' vs 'professional' service provision) in EU terminology, and ***urges*** the Commission to come up with proposals to adapt Union legislation accordingly; considers the monetary threshold to be one advisable way to make this distinction;

Amendment

5. Urges to clearly distinguish between legitimate ride-sharing and the provision of commercial transporting services (i.e. 'non-professional' vs 'professional' service provision) in EU terminology, and ***if needed invites*** the Commission to come up with proposals to adapt Union legislation accordingly; considers the monetary threshold to be one advisable way to make this distinction;

Or. en

Amendment 115

Merja Kyllönen

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5 a. Notes that the data is the most fundamental tool when reforming the transport sector to comply with the digital era and recognizes the significance of the ownership and access to the data; calls, therefore, on the Commission to publish, without any further delay, a roadmap to the liberation the public-funded transport data and harmonized standards of the transport data and programming standards in order to boost the data-intensive innovations and provisions of new transport services; asks Commission to explore the possibilities of so called data-led regulatory approach where the sharing and platform economy companies could be exempted to apply certain heavy regulation if they provide sufficient data to control for the delivery of public policy objectives.

Or. en

Amendment 116
Daniel Dalton

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. *Calls on the Member States to establish measures to reduce the risk and possibility of the occurrence of grey economy activities and tax avoidance in accordance with collaborative economy services, and invites the Commission to facilitate an exchange of best practises between tax authorities and stakeholders with a view to developing appropriate solutions for payments of taxes in the sharing economy;*

Amendment

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 117
Claudia Țapardel, István Ujhelyi, Maria Grapini

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Calls on the Member States to establish measures to reduce the risk and possibility of the occurrence of grey economy activities and tax avoidance in accordance with collaborative economy services, and invites the Commission to facilitate an exchange of best practises between tax authorities and stakeholders with a view to developing appropriate solutions for payments of taxes in the sharing economy;

Amendment

6. Calls on the Member States to establish measures to reduce the risk and possibility of the occurrence of grey economy activities and tax avoidance in accordance with collaborative economy services, and invites the Commission to facilitate an exchange of best practises between tax authorities and stakeholders with a view to developing appropriate solutions for payments of taxes in the sharing economy, *in line with the principle that taxes should be paid where profits are generated; recommends that Member States, under the guidance of the European Commission, clarify what they consider taxable profit and what they view as tax-exempt cost-sharing activities.*

Or. en

Amendment 118

Lucy Anderson, José Blanco López, Nicola Caputo, Gabriele Preuß

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Calls on the Member States to establish measures to reduce the risk and possibility of the occurrence of grey economy activities and tax avoidance in accordance with collaborative economy services, and invites the Commission to facilitate an exchange of best practises between tax authorities and stakeholders with a view to developing appropriate solutions for payments of taxes in the sharing economy;

Amendment

6. Calls on the Member States to establish measures to reduce the risk and possibility of the occurrence of grey economy activities and tax avoidance in accordance with collaborative economy services, and invites the Commission to facilitate an exchange of best practises between tax authorities and stakeholders with a view to developing appropriate solutions for payments of taxes in the sharing economy; ***is of the opinion that online platforms already operating in the EU, although headquartered outside of it, could be invited to appear in the extended TAXE II committee of the EP in relation to their tax arrangements;***

Or. en

Amendment 119

István Ujhelyi

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Calls on the Member States to establish measures to reduce the risk and possibility of the occurrence of grey economy activities and tax avoidance in accordance with collaborative economy services, ***and*** invites the Commission to facilitate an exchange of best practises between tax authorities and stakeholders with a view to developing appropriate solutions for payments of taxes in the sharing economy;

Amendment

6. Calls on the Member States to establish measures to reduce the risk and possibility of the occurrence of grey economy activities and tax avoidance in accordance with collaborative economy services; ***underlining the potential of collaborative platforms in improving tax transparency through the use of digital infrastructure and electronic payment methods in industries where cash payments historically prevail;*** invites the Commission to facilitate an exchange of

best practises between tax authorities and stakeholders with a view to developing appropriate solutions for payments of taxes in the sharing economy;

Or. en

Amendment 120
Daniel Dalton

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. ***Calls on the Member States to establish measures*** to reduce the risk and possibility of the occurrence of grey economy activities and tax avoidance in accordance with collaborative economy services, ***and invites the Commission to facilitate an exchange of best practises between tax authorities and stakeholders with a view to developing appropriate solutions for payments of taxes in the sharing economy;***

Amendment

6. ***Encourages the sharing of best practices between Member States*** to reduce the risk and possibility of the occurrence of grey economy activities and tax avoidance in accordance with collaborative economy services;

Or. en

Amendment 121
Cláudia Monteiro de Aguiar

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. ***Calls on the Member States to establish measures to reduce*** the risk and possibility of the occurrence of grey economy activities and tax avoidance ***in accordance with collaborative economy services, and*** invites the Commission to facilitate an exchange of best practises between tax authorities and stakeholders with a view to developing appropriate solutions for payments of taxes in ***the***

Amendment

6. ***Points out that collaborative platforms promote the effectiveness and transparency of tax collection services and the security of transactions, through digitisation, reducing*** the risk and possibility of the occurrence of grey economy activities and tax avoidance; invites the Commission to facilitate an exchange of best practises between tax authorities and stakeholders ***in the***

sharing *economy*;

collaborative economy with a view to developing appropriate solutions for payments of taxes in *these sharing models, without creating unnecessary obstacles*;

Or. pt

Amendment 122
Merja Kyllönen

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Calls on the Member States to establish measures to reduce the risk and possibility of the occurrence of grey economy activities and tax avoidance in accordance with collaborative economy services, and invites the Commission to facilitate an exchange of best practises between tax authorities and stakeholders with a view to developing appropriate solutions for payments of taxes in the sharing economy;

Amendment

6. Calls on the Member States to establish measures to reduce the risk and possibility of the occurrence of grey economy activities and tax avoidance in accordance with collaborative economy services, and invites the Commission to facilitate an exchange of best practises between tax authorities and stakeholders with a view to developing appropriate solutions for payments of taxes in the sharing economy; ***calls on Member States to clarify what they consider taxable profit and what they consider tax-exempt cost-sharing activities***;

Or. en

Amendment 123
Tania González Peñas

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Calls on the Member States to establish measures to reduce the risk and possibility of the occurrence of grey economy activities and tax avoidance in accordance with collaborative economy services, and invites the Commission to facilitate an exchange of best practises

Amendment

6. Calls on the Member States to establish measures to reduce the risk and possibility of the occurrence of grey economy activities and tax avoidance in accordance with collaborative economy services, and invites the Commission to facilitate an exchange of best practises

between tax authorities and stakeholders with a view to developing appropriate solutions for payments of taxes in the sharing economy;

between tax authorities and stakeholders with a view to developing appropriate solutions for payments of taxes in the sharing economy; ***recalls that taxes and social protection obligations must be paid in the place where the services are performed.***

Or. en

Amendment 124
Michael Cramer

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Calls on the Member States to establish measures to reduce the risk and possibility of the occurrence of grey economy activities and tax avoidance in accordance with collaborative economy services, and invites the Commission to facilitate an exchange of best practises between tax authorities and stakeholders with a view to developing appropriate solutions for payments of taxes in the sharing economy;

Amendment

6. Calls on the Member States to establish measures to reduce the risk and possibility of the occurrence of grey economy activities and tax avoidance in accordance with collaborative economy services, and invites the Commission to facilitate an exchange of best practises between tax authorities and stakeholders with a view to developing appropriate solutions ***and technological solutions (inspired, for example, by experience with the digital tachograph)*** for payments of taxes in the sharing economy;

Or. de

Amendment 125
Karima Delli

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Calls on the Member States to establish measures to reduce the risk and possibility of the occurrence of grey economy activities and tax avoidance in accordance with collaborative economy

Amendment

6. Calls on the Member States to ***controlle users' activities and*** establish measures to reduce the risk and possibility of the occurrence of grey economy activities and tax avoidance in accordance

services, and invites the Commission to facilitate an exchange of best practises between tax authorities and stakeholders with a view to developing appropriate solutions for payments of taxes in the sharing economy;

with collaborative economy services, and invites the Commission to facilitate an exchange of best practises between tax authorities and stakeholders with a view to developing appropriate solutions for payments of taxes in the sharing economy;

Or. en

Amendment 126

Christine Revault D'Allonnes Bonnefoy

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Calls on the Member States to establish measures to reduce the risk and possibility of the occurrence of grey economy activities and tax avoidance in accordance with collaborative economy services, **and** invites the Commission to facilitate an exchange of best practises between tax authorities and stakeholders with a view to developing appropriate solutions for payments of taxes in the sharing economy;

Amendment

6. Calls on the Member States to establish measures to reduce the risk and possibility of the ***advent of 'bogus self-employed workers,'*** the occurrence of grey economy activities and tax avoidance in accordance with collaborative economy services; invites the Commission to facilitate an exchange of best practises between tax authorities and stakeholders with a view to developing appropriate solutions for payments of taxes in the sharing economy;

Or. fr

Amendment 127

Jill Seymour

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Calls on the Member States to establish measures to reduce the risk and possibility of the occurrence of grey economy activities and tax avoidance in accordance with collaborative economy services, and invites the ***Commission*** to facilitate an exchange of best practises

Amendment

6. Calls on the Member States to establish measures to reduce the risk and possibility of the occurrence of grey economy activities and tax avoidance in accordance with collaborative economy services, and invites the ***Member States if they so wish*** to facilitate an exchange of

between tax authorities and stakeholders with a view to developing appropriate solutions for payments of taxes in the sharing economy;

best practises between tax authorities and stakeholders with a view to developing appropriate solutions for payments of taxes in the sharing economy;

Or. en

Amendment 128
Marie-Christine Arnautu

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Calls on the Member States to establish measures to reduce the risk and possibility of the occurrence of grey economy activities *and tax avoidance* in accordance with collaborative economy services, *and* invites the *Commission* to facilitate an exchange of best practises between tax authorities and stakeholders with a view to developing appropriate solutions for payments of taxes in the *sharing* economy;

Amendment

6. Calls on the Member States to establish measures to *combat tax evasion and* reduce the risk and possibility of the occurrence of grey economy activities in accordance with collaborative economy services; invites the *Member States* to facilitate an exchange of best practises between *their* tax authorities and stakeholders with a view to developing appropriate solutions for payments of taxes in the *collaborative* economy;

Or. fr

Amendment 129
Dieter-Lebrecht Koch

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

6a. Calls for barrier-free accessibility so as to ensure that the elderly and people with disabilities can also have access to the various resources available in the collaborative service economy;

Amendment

Or. de

Amendment 130
Mark Demesmaecker

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Warns of the danger that, without an appropriate legal framework, intermediation platforms might serve as a suitable seedbed for new monopolies, and therefore asks the Commission to monitor the development of the market and, where needed, to propose measures to protect the competitiveness of European companies in a European market;

Amendment

deleted

Or. nl

Amendment 131
Dominique Riquet, Izaskun Bilbao Barandica, Pavel Telička

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Warns of the danger that, without an appropriate legal framework, intermediation platforms might serve as a suitable seedbed for new monopolies, and therefore asks the Commission to monitor the development of the market and, where needed, to propose measures to protect the competitiveness of European companies in a European market;

Amendment

7. Welcomes the fact that intermediation platforms have brought into play the idea of challenging each other, the existing operators and the corporatist structures and undermining existing monopolies; warns however of the danger that, without an appropriate legal framework, intermediation platforms might serve as a suitable seedbed for new monopolies, and therefore asks the Commission to monitor the development of the market and, where needed, to propose measures to protect the competitiveness of European companies in a European market;

Or. en

Amendment 132
Karima Delli

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Warns of the danger that, without an appropriate legal framework, intermediation platforms might serve as a suitable seedbed for new monopolies, and therefore asks the Commission to monitor the development of the market and, where needed, to propose measures to protect the competitiveness of European companies in a European market;

Amendment

7. Warns of the danger that, without an appropriate legal framework, intermediation platforms might serve as a suitable seedbed for new monopolies, and therefore asks the Commission to monitor the development of the market and, where needed, to propose measures to protect the competitiveness of European companies in a European market, ***with a particular focus on the inclusion of micro, small and medium sized enterprises;***

Or. en

Amendment 133
Daniel Dalton

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. ***Warns of the danger that, without an appropriate legal framework, intermediation platforms might serve as a suitable seedbed for new monopolies, and therefore asks the Commission to monitor the development of the market and, where needed, to propose measures to protect the competitiveness of European companies in a European market;***

Amendment

7. ***Recognises there might be a potential risk of*** intermediation platforms ***encouraging*** new monopolies, and therefore ***reminds Member States and the Commission of the need to monitor the development of the market and address clear market failures when they occur;***

Or. en

Amendment 134
Maria Grapini

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Warns of the danger that, without an appropriate legal framework, intermediation platforms might serve as a suitable seedbed for new monopolies, and therefore asks the Commission to monitor the development of the market and, where needed, to propose measures to protect the competitiveness of European companies in a European market;

Amendment

7. Warns of the danger that, without an appropriate legal framework, intermediation platforms might serve as a suitable seedbed for new monopolies, and therefore asks the Commission to monitor the development of the market and, where needed, to propose measures to protect the competitiveness of European companies, **particularly SMEs**, in a European market;

Or. ro

Amendment 135
Marie-Christine Arnautu

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Warns of the danger that, without an appropriate legal framework, intermediation platforms might serve as a suitable seedbed for new monopolies, **and** therefore asks the Commission to monitor the development of the market and, where needed, to propose measures to protect the competitiveness of European companies in a European market;

Amendment

7. Warns of the danger that, without an appropriate legal framework, intermediation platforms might serve as a suitable seedbed for new monopolies; therefore asks the Commission **and the Member States** to monitor the development of the market and, where needed, to propose measures to protect the competitiveness of European companies in a European market;

Or. fr

Amendment 136
Cláudia Monteiro de Aguiar

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. **Warns of the danger** that, **without** an appropriate legal framework, **intermediation platforms might serve as a suitable seedbed for** new monopolies, and

Amendment

7. **Notes** that, **with** an appropriate legal framework, **it is possible to prevent intermediation platforms from creating** new monopolies, and therefore asks the

therefore asks the Commission to monitor the development of the market and, where needed, to propose measures to protect the competitiveness of European companies in a European market;

Commission to monitor the development of the market and, where needed, to propose measures to protect the competitiveness of European companies in a European market;

Or. pt

Amendment 137

Cláudia Monteiro de Aguiar

Draft opinion

Paragraph 7 – indent 1 (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

- *Supports the rapid development of the collaborative economy and urges the Commission to carry out studies observing the market dynamic and assessing the economic and social impact of the collaborative economy in the tourism and transport sector;*

Or. pt

Amendment 138

Cláudia Monteiro de Aguiar

Draft opinion

Paragraph 7 – indent 2 (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

- *Takes the view that start-ups in the tourism and transport sectors should be supported, in particular through training; stresses the need for specific training to enable professionals to develop e-skills geared to collaborative economy models, taking account of the new requirements and consumer expectations;*

Or. pt

Amendment 139
Inés Ayala Sender

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7a. Takes the view in this connection that certain operators and intermediaries in the collaborative economy are pursuing an aggressive pricing policy, often offering services at below cost price, in an attempt to seize market share and eliminate their competition before raising prices. Calls on the European Commission and the Member States' competition authorities to keep a close eye on these anti-competitive practices, to monitor developments in the price of transport and accommodation services, and to take action to address any monopolistic practices.

Or. es

Amendment 140
Isabella De Monte, Nicola Caputo

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7 a. Encourages the Commission to create a level playing field among collaborative platforms and to closely monitor the development of the market with regard to the emergence of innovative intermediation services and, where justified, to take appropriate action with the aim to strengthen competition and consumer choice;

Or. en

Amendment 141

Daniel Dalton

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7 a. Recognises the role that collaborative platforms self-governing capacities can take in the ongoing improvement of the regulatory environment by correcting market failures themselves which have traditionally been addressed through regulation;

Or. en

Amendment 142
Daniel Dalton

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7 b. Stresses that while online intermediaries are subject to and need to comply with all laws of the European Union, including consumer protection and competition, the liability safe harbours of intermediaries are essential to the protection of the openness of the internet, fundamental rights, legal certainty and innovation in the transport sector;

Or. en

Amendment 143
Isabella De Monte, Nicola Caputo

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7 b. Stresses the importance to

guarantee the free flow of data, data portability and interoperability between the market platforms;

Or. en

Amendment 144
Isabella De Monte, Nicola Caputo

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7 c. Calls on the Commission to support the economic growth of the collaborative economy by measures aiming to reduce the administrative burden on individuals and businesses;

Or. en

Amendment 145
Isabella De Monte, Nicola Caputo

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 d (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7 d. Underlines the importance, for the fast-growing of this sector, of ensuring easier access to funding through various channels such as risk capital and crowdfunding;

Or. en

Amendment 146
Cláudia Monteiro de Aguiar, Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Calls on the Commission to include representatives of the collaborative economy in stakeholder dialogues *and impact assessment procedures*.

Amendment

8. Calls on the Commission to include representatives of the collaborative economy in stakeholder dialogues, *using as an example the series of workshops held by DG Growth the short-term accommodation rental services, in order to facilitate the exchange between representatives of national and EU institutions, industry and civil society and to provide guidance for national regulations inspired by best practices in the field of collaborative transport services regarding issues such as the improvement of market access, urban mobility or tax transparency*.

Or. en

Amendment 147

Lucy Anderson, Lucy Anderson, José Blanco López, Lucy Anderson, Gabriele Preuß

Draft opinion

Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. *Calls* on the Commission to include representatives of the collaborative economy in stakeholder dialogues and impact assessment procedures.

Amendment

8. *Encourages the Member States and the Commission to support initiatives and actions to favour more research and fact-funding on the development and the impact of the collaborative economy in EU transport policy*; calls on the Commission to include representatives of the collaborative economy in stakeholder dialogues and impact assessment procedures.

Or. en

Amendment 148

Maria Grapini

Draft opinion

Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Calls on the Commission to include representatives of the collaborative economy in stakeholder dialogues and impact assessment procedures.

Amendment

8. Calls on the Commission to include representatives of the collaborative economy in stakeholder dialogues and impact assessment procedures ***in order to protect industrial competition for the benefit of both users and service providers in the fields of transport and tourism.***

Or. ro

Amendment 149
Karima Delli

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Calls on the Commission to include representatives of the collaborative economy in stakeholder dialogues and impact assessment procedures.

Amendment

8. Calls on the Commission to include representatives of the collaborative economy in stakeholder dialogues and impact assessment procedures ***as well as to integrate users and environmental NGO's and trade unions.***

Or. en

Amendment 150
Marie-Christine Arnautu

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Calls on the Commission to include representatives of the collaborative economy in stakeholder dialogues and impact assessment procedures.

Amendment

8. Calls on the Commission, ***the Member States and local authorities*** to include representatives of the ***traditional and*** collaborative economy in stakeholder dialogues and impact assessment procedures.

Or. fr

Amendment 151

Daniel Dalton

Draft opinion

Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Calls on the Commission to include representatives of the collaborative economy in stakeholder dialogues and impact assessment procedures.

Amendment

8. Calls on the Commission **and the Member States** to include representatives of the collaborative economy in stakeholder dialogues and impact assessment procedures.

Or. en

Amendment 152

Lucy Anderson, István Ujhelyi, Maria Grapini, Lucy Anderson

Draft opinion

Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Calls on the Commission to include representatives of the collaborative economy in stakeholder dialogues and impact assessment procedures.

Amendment

8. Calls on the Commission to include representatives of the collaborative economy **and beneficiaries** in stakeholder dialogues and impact assessment procedures.

Or. en