

# TRANNEWS

Newsletter from the European Parliament  
Committee on Transport and Tourism  
Number 63, 01 February 2010

questions & subscription:  
[ip-tran@europarl.europa.eu](mailto:ip-tran@europarl.europa.eu)

[Link to the Committee meeting documents can be found here.](#)

The TRAN website can be found [here](#).

Useful links: Videos of webstreamed Committee meetings can be found [here](#).

## TRAN Committee meeting 25-27 January 2010, Brussels

### Adoption of draft opinion

#### White paper on climate change Rapporteur: Ms Dominique Vlasto (EPP, FR) Opinion to ENVI Committee

Ms Vlasto gave an overview of the amendments submitted to her report. She highlighted a number of areas she was favourable to. She was positive towards amendments which stressed the importance of the integration of transport systems, research, the "polluter pays" concept as well as the protection of vulnerable areas and infrastructure. She underlined the importance of including all transport modes in considerations on adapting to climate change as well as the economic effect of adaptation. In conclusion, Ms Vlasto advised the Committee of three compromise amendments which had been discussed with other Members.

In their interventions, Members thanked the rapporteur for opinion for being proactive in discussing compromise amendments with them. On the whole, Members expressed support for the rapporteur's draft opinion and there was a broad agreement on many points. The European Commission hoped that the opinion would ensure the transport sector was fully considered in ENVI's own-initiative report.

During the vote, 23 amendments were adopted, including three compromise

amendments. The opinion itself was adopted almost unanimously and almost all the rapporteur's voting recommendations were followed by the Committee.

The report was adopted by 31: 0: 2.

Timetable foreseen:

- Adoption in ENVI: March 2010.

### Draft reports

#### Trans-European Network Rapporteur: Mr Brian Simpson (S&D, UK) Ordinary legislative procedure, first reading

In the first discussion in TRAN, the rapporteur informed Members of the draft proposal which is, technically speaking, a codification proposal. Nevertheless, the Commission had to use a recast procedure as the text contains minor modifications to the Annex.

The Council agreed on a text and a general approach was taken at the Council meeting of 18 December 2009. Council followed the Commission and did not substantially modify the text, introducing only some minor modifications in the recitals and some technical corrections in the map section.

The rapporteur asked his colleagues to agree on the text as modified by the Council and to conclude the file with a first reading agreement.

Most Coordinators agreed with the rapporteur's assessment of as well as his recommendations.

Timetable foreseen:

- Adoption in TRAN: February 2010.
- Adoption in plenary: March/April 2010.

#### Reporting formalities for ships Rapporteur: Mr Dirk Sterckx (ALDE, BE) Ordinary legislative procedure, first reading

The rapporteur welcomed the Commission's proposal as a contribution to redressing the current imbalance between shipping, subject to checks when travelling between EU ports, and road freight, which benefited from the single economic space. He suggested that an integrated approach, covering not only transport but also customs, public health and safety, was required and that the administrative procedures should not just be simplified but also harmonised. The draft report also calls for a report on the extension of the simplified regime to cover inland waterway transport.

Members endorsed the rapporteur's approach while raising certain questions on the proposed language and informatics regimes as well as the situation of smaller ports. The Commission representative also welcomed the draft report and, in particular, the rapporteur's intention to defend the 2013 start date in face of reluctance from Council. Mr Sterckx concluded that he would continue contacts with shadow rapporteurs, Council and Commission with a view to making progress as quickly as possible.

Timetable foreseen:

- Adoption in TRAN: March 2010.
- Adoption in Plenary: May/June 2010.

**Aviation security charges**  
**Rapporteur: Mr Jörg Leichtfried (S&D, AT)**  
**Ordinary legislative procedure, first reading**

The rapporteur explained that he largely supports the Commission proposal which seeks to establish a number of basic principles to be respected when determining security charges. These are: non-discrimination, consultation and remedy, transparency and cost-relatedness of security charges and the establishment of a supervisory authority. Nevertheless, he considered it important to table amendments on two specific topics:

1) Financing: Mr Leichtfried considers that this question was not sufficiently addressed in the Commission proposal, which simply stated that it is ultimately passengers who foot the bill for such measures. The Commission only attempts to restrict costs, or at least to make them transparent, through a new mandatory economic impact assessment of more stringent national measures. However, the rapporteur proposes that, where these more stringent measures result in additional costs, they should be borne by the Member States, making mandatory impact assessment unnecessary. His reasoning is that the Member State in question would think very hard about whether these measures were necessary or not if it was unable to pass the costs on to passengers.

2) Consumer protection and passenger rights: the Commission proposes that passenger and consumer protection organisations should take part in the consultations and thus gain an insight into the pricing of security measures which they can then check against the ticket price. The amended or new definitions of security charges and aviation security intend to show that airlines too take

security measures. Where airlines charge these security measures to passengers as additional costs, this information should be provided under the terms of Article 5 of the proposal for a Directive.

In the main, TRAN Members agreed to address the problem of financing as proposed by the rapporteur, but there were divergent views on the issue of passenger information. The rapporteur was open for compromise amendments on this issue.

Mr Daniel Calleja, Director for Air Transport, DG TREN, stated that the question of financing was pertinent but thought it very difficult to achieve a compromise with the Council. He promised to come back to the Committee with an inventory of the more stringent measures applied by Member States as soon as the entry into force of regulation 300/2008 by 29 April 2010 will facilitate the collection of this information.

Timetable foreseen:

- Adoption in TRAN: March 2010.
- Adoption in Plenary: April/ May 2010.

## Draft opinions

**Working time mobile road transport**  
**Rapporteur: Mr Saïd El Khadraoui (S&D, BE)**  
**Opinion to EMPL Committee**

The rapporteur for opinion reminded the Committee of the difficult history of this file; the original Commission proposal was rejected in plenary before the 2009 elections. He pleaded to find a middle way and presented his proposal as a possible compromise. His draft opinion includes self-employed workers in the working time provisions but gives the latter a more favourable regime in administrative terms than employed workers. They would be allowed to count a fixed amount of 1 hour working time per week for all other activities than driving and (un)loading.

Speakers from the EPP, ALDE and ECR groups did not agree with the proposed line. They argued that real self-employed drivers should not fall under the scope of the working time Directive. It would be difficult to enforce, moreover it would not lead to greater traffic safety, as this is mainly linked to driving hours. Some argued that the EU should not regulate self employed entrepreneurs and it does not do so in other sectors. Speakers from the Greens and GUE/NGL on the other hand

argued that there is a link between working time, fatigue and traffic safety, and that self employed drivers should therefore be included in the proposal. Speakers from all groups argued that the exclusion of small trucks lighter than 3.5 tonnes from the driving time Regulation was problematic and their inclusion should be studied. These speakers also agreed that this was a separate problem that could not be dealt with in this Directive.

The Commission pointed out that it was not so useful to have an "ideological debate" about the inclusion or not of self-employed drivers, but that one should instead concentrate on the problem of "false self-employed" drivers. This is a group of drivers who appear as independent but are in fact employed by a company. The Commission proposal was designed to solve this problem. As for trucks less than 3.5 tonnes, the Commission emphasized that a study was being done and its results should be awaited.

Timetable foreseen:

- Adoption in TRAN: February 2010.
- Adoption in EMPL (responsible): March 2010.

**Discharge agencies 2008**  
**Rapporteur: Ms Anne JENSEN (ALDE, DK)**  
**Opinion to CONT Committee**

Ms Jensen introduced her draft opinions for the four agencies falling within TRAN's responsibilities, noting that the Court of Auditors (ECA) had found various problems with their budgetary and planning processes. She recognised that some of these resulted from agencies still being in a start-up phase whilst others were inherent given difficulties in forecasting fee income. Nevertheless, it was time to address the ECA's criticisms, some of which had already been made in previous years.

Members broadly endorsed concerns about the recurrent nature of some criticisms whilst noting particular circumstances affecting one or other agency. In reply the Commission representative said that the Maritime Safety Agency would finalise its multiannual plan in March 2010 while the Aviation Safety Agency was reviewing its fees and charges regulation.

Timetable foreseen:

- Adoption in TRAN: February 2010.
- Adoption in CONT: March 2010.

**Discharge Commission**  
**Rapporteur: Ms Inés Ayala Sender (S&D, ES)**  
**Opinion to CONT Committee**

Ms Ayala Sender highlighted the underutilisation of various budget lines including political priorities such as passenger rights, Marco Polo and Galileo. She asked the Commission for a full explanation of why the amounts provided had not been used and what steps it would take to avoid a repetition of the problem. Other Members shared this concern and recalled that, in the past, the Committee had asked for an annual report on expenditure against each budget line.

The Commission representatives explained that the criteria for Marco Polo funding had been eased and that take up had improved; 2008 had been a transitional year for Galileo but in 2009 there was 100% execution; while, for passenger rights, an awareness campaign had been postponed in view of legislative work concerning maritime and coach passengers.

Timetable foreseen:

- Adoption in TRAN: February 2010.
- Adoption in CONT: March 2010.

## Exchange of views

### Spanish Presidency (transport)

Placing EU transport policy in the general context of the economic crisis and the fight against climate change, Mr José Blanco López underlined that the EU should aim to develop a sustainable transport system with a focus on urban and metropolitan transport in a competitive and service-oriented environment.

The main priorities of the Spanish Presidency are:

#### TEN-T

The Spanish Presidency recalled Council's request to the Commission for a revision of the TEN-T guidelines by the end of 2010 and a proposal on methodology and criteria by the beginning of 2010. A ministerial meeting in Zaragoza in June will be held on TEN-T. The Presidency will focus on establishing a methodology which should orient the revision of the guidelines. The Minister welcomed Commissioner-designate Kallas' proposed transport investment fund and the idea of public-private-partnership financing. In his replies to Members' questions, in particular on the need of a Mediterranean corridor, he stressed that it is important to agree first on a methodology for the planning of the future work on TEN-T, this would make it easier to begin the debate on the revision of the TEN-T guidelines. He supported the proposal to nominate Mr Secchi as European Coordinator

for the priority project no. 16 (freight railway axis Sines/Algeciras-Madrid-Paris).

#### *Passenger rights*

In the dossiers on passenger rights on bus and coaches as well as sea and inland waterways, Mr Blanco López considered that these files should be treated together, in line with the decision taken by the TRAN committee in December 2009. He would like to strengthen passenger information rights and protection in case of airline bankruptcy and invited the Commission to submit a proposal on the latter.

#### *Road safety and giganliners*

The Spanish Presidency expects the publication of the Road Safety Action Plan by the Commission for 2011-2020. In terms of road fatalities, he stated that Member States must reach their self-imposed targets. Questioned about "giganliners", the Minister considered that a wide consensus was needed and that numerous problems needed to be sorted out before a decision could be envisaged which reverses the existing approach; personally he seemed not to be in favour of moving in such a direction.

#### *Eurovignette Directive*

Questioned by several Members on the intentions of the Spanish Presidency on the Eurovignette Directive, Mr Blanco López took the view that each Member State should apply the "polluter pays" principle regarding reductions of air pollution and noise and he stressed that double taxation and unfair competition has to be avoided. To the disappointment of Members, he pointed out that this Directive will only be dealt with at a technical level by the Spanish Presidency as there are still problems concerning the calculation of external costs.

#### *Safety and security*

In his replies to Members on aviation security, the Minister underlined that there is a need to increase safety in all modes of transport. The incident in Detroit on 25 December demonstrated that the terrorist threat persists. The Spanish Presidency supports the extension of screening of liquids in hand luggage. On bodyscanners, he said that a common approach is necessary and new technologies have to be compatible with privacy rights and health.

Other topics mentioned were rail freight corridors, the Spanish Presidency aims to reach a second reading agreement, international aviation agreements, in particular with the US, maritime transport, accident and incident investigations in aviation as well as the implementation of the Single European Sky legislation.

Members raised a wide range of issues such as an integrated maritime policy, the strengthening of the internal market (harmonisation of rules, cabotage), the reduction of CO2 emissions, the increase of rail infrastructure financing, alcohol and speed limits on the road, integrated ticketing for transnational rail travel, the ratification of the Alpine Convention, measures in support of inland shipping, the Danube strategy and further criteria for defining road safety targets for children and injured travellers.

#### **Spanish Presidency (tourism)**

The Spanish Secretary of State, Mr Joan Mesquida Ferrando, presented the ambitions of the Spanish Presidency in the field of tourism, which is a new competence of the European Union under the Lisbon Treaty. Mr Mesquida Ferrando recalled the economic importance of tourism in Europe, as this horizontal sector represents 4% of EU GDP and accounts for 4% of the EU work force. The European Union is the most successful tourist area in the world, but has had to face recent changes in tourism, for example low-cost carriers and new technologies as well as new individual behaviour which are changing the tourism.

Mr Mesquida Ferrando defined two axes for a European tourism policy, which should be research and innovation on the one hand, and sustainability on the other. He argued that tourism should be more integrated in other EU-policies (transport, environment, social, etc.). The Spanish Secretary of State also insisted on the exchange of good practices and on the promotion of social tourism: he highlighted the Spanish example of the "Senior Tourism Programme" which encourages tourism by handicapped and elderly people during low season. Several meetings will be held during the Spanish Presidency at international level: with Latin America, the World Tourism Organisation and also the Euromed Conference.

Members welcomed the ambitions of the Spanish Presidency; however, certain Members stated that the competences of the European Union were secondary with regard to tourism. They made the link with the mobility issues in transport and argued that transport and tourism are very strongly connected. They also made the link with cultural diversity in the European Union. Several Members felt the example of the "Senior Tourism Programme" was a good one. Some Members believed that tourism can also have a negative impact on the environment and sustainable forms of tourism, such as rural tourism, should be supported. Furthermore, attention should

not just be focussed on zones which already have a well developed tourism industry.

### **Swedish Presidency**

Ms Torstensson presented the results achieved during the Swedish Presidency, including with regard to their priorities: passenger rights, logistics and intelligent transport systems (ITS). The Minister stressed the importance of the development of integrated and effective transport systems and their role in the single market. On ITS, the efforts made brought scope for an agreement with the Parliament. On the future of transport, she recalled the challenges of climate change and the current economic crisis and acknowledged the difficulty in reaching a consensus on Council's conclusions concerning this matter.

According to the Minister, on passengers rights for buses and coaches as well as for sea and inland waterways, concrete progress was made, and the Union was therefore close to extending the protection of people with reduced mobility, which already exists in other modes of transport. The Presidency had also made progress with the files on reporting formalities for ships, the Transport Community Treaty with the Western Balkans and the EU strategy for the Baltic Sea region.

During the debate, several Members recognized the progress made on passenger rights, ITS, rail corridors and the Baltic Sea region, while others criticized the Presidency's lack of ambition, notably on the revision of the Eurovignette Directive. The issue of gicaliners was debated extensively and Members held different views regarding their access to European roads.

Other topics discussed included the adoption of the Alpine Convention, CO2 emissions from transport, rail freight corridors, aviation security and the TEN-T programme. Members requested more information about the adaptation of comitology procedures after the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty, in particular concerning delegated acts contained in the ITS and passengers' rights files.

### **Aviation security measures**

Against the background of the recent incidents in December and January and the ensuing discussion in Member States as well as the media coverage of bodyscanners, the TRAN committee invited Members of the LIBE committee for an exchange of views on aviation security.

Members of TRAN and LIBE held a lively joint debate about aviation security and in particular the possible use of bodyscanners at airports. Members across political groups insisted that privacy and health must be taken into account and the right balance between these issues and security must be reached. A majority of Members also pleaded for a European approach. Some Members were critical about bodyscanners and questioned their effectiveness. They argued instead for other approaches such as profiling.

The Commission thanked Members for their views and said it would take all concerns into account. It explained that it would proceed as follows:

1. It will come up with a report on health and privacy, as promised a year ago, by the end of March/beginning of April;
2. It will enter into discussions with Parliament and Council about the results of the report;
3. It will propose draft measures, probably under comitology, before the summer.

### **Inland shipping**

On the initiative of some Members, the TRAN Committee had an exchange of views with the Commission on the impact of the economic crisis on inland shipping. Mr Paquet, acting Director for Transport logistics, DG TREN, informed Members about the situation in inland waterways transport and the impact of the economic crisis. Inland shipping represents a modest share of transport in Europe (5% of the land transport), however its importance is recognised in the White Paper on Transport and it will be one of the important aspects of the revision of the TEN-T policy. Mr Paquet stated that inland shipping represents 1% of the total CO2 emissions of transport, making inland waterways a cost-efficient and environmentally friendly mode of transport.

On the economic crisis, Mr Paquet mentioned that inland shipping, like other modes of transport, went into recession: 60% of Dutch companies are currently facing payment problems for example. The impact of the crisis was aggravated by the fact that the sector is largely composed of SMEs which have difficulties accessing credits. The impact is different depending on the types of transport as well as the countries concerned. The main activities in terms of inland shipping are in the Netherlands, Germany, Belgium, France and Austria. The major impacts of the crisis were mostly observed in these countries, Netherlands being the most affected one.

The Commission has worked together with Member States to analyse the situation and organised a hearing in November 2009. Commission and Member States shared the view that the crisis is a short-term rather than a structural one. Mr Paquet also announced that a working group has been created to see which measures could be taken to help the sector. In February, the Commission will work with the Dutch authorities in order to complete the analysis of the current situation and to develop a fully fledged support plan from the Netherlands.

Most of the Members criticised the Commission's lack of reaction and underlined the urgent need to take concrete measures aiming to solve the economic problems faced by the sector. Members agreed that most of the companies are SMEs but they did not share the view that the crisis was structural, as the ships have a long working life. MEPs also asked for an adaptation of existing programmes such as Naiades or Marco Polo to help the sector.

**Social rules in road transport**  
**Rapporteur: Ms Hella Ranner (EPP, AT)**  
**Own-initiative report**

The rapporteur presented a working document summarising the Commission Communication which analyses the penalties for serious infringements against the social rules in road transport provided for in the legislation of the Member States.

Ms Ranner recalled that this report was published in May 2009 as required by Article 10 of Directive 2006/22/EC on minimum conditions for the implementation of social legislation relating to road transport. She underlined the main conclusions of the report on the important variations in the level and type of sanctions. The level of fine can vary considerably between different Member States from 400 to 4000 Euros for the same type of infringement; such a variation leads to great uncertainty for drivers and transport companies with cross border activities.

The rapporteur regretted that some data from several Member States was missing in the report. This prevented it from giving a complete picture of the situation across the European Union. She criticised the fact that the report arrived before the Member States could implement the new Annex III of Directive 2006/22 providing guidelines on the categorisation of infringements.

Ms Ranner finally concluded that there was a need for further harmonisation of categories of infringements, of the sanctions for these

infringements, as well as a need for better cooperation on road controls between Member States. This harmonisation should respect the principle of subsidiarity and the competences of Member States in this matter.

Members generally expressed their concerns on the diverging implementation of social rules in road transport by Member States. For some Members, such distortions can weaken the credibility of European legislation as well as the sanctions themselves. Several Members agreed that more effort should be made to harmonise sanctions in accordance with the subsidiarity principle, but that progress should be made also on the harmonisation of the frequency of controls. This problem is affecting the internal market and preventing equal and fair treatment of companies.

The Commission representative recognised the incompleteness of the data but insisted that the purpose of the report was to highlight the major distortions between Member States. The Commission regretted the existence of such differences and declared that it had already provided some solutions by adopting Directive 2009/5 on the categorisation of infringements. It argued that Member States were the reason for there being no real harmonisation of sanctions.

Timetable foreseen:

- Adoption in TRAN: April 2010.
- Adoption in plenary: May 2010.

**SESAR**

Mr Patrick Ky, Executive Director of the Single European Sky Air Traffic Management Research Programme (SESAR), explained that air traffic controllers were still using technology developed in the 1950s while air routes were sub-optimal in both economic and environmental terms. SESAR was the technical component of the Single European Sky project and sought to reduce the average environmental impact of a flight by 10 per cent and the average cost of air traffic management by half. It had been established as a public private partnership with the EU budget, Eurocontrol and a group of fifteen industrial players each contributing €700 million.

He emphasised that the EU and US were competing on setting new standards and that the first to develop them would have a clear advantage. Now was the time to start thinking about the implementation phase, its funding and governance, if SESAR was to contribute effectively to a European innovation society.

Members welcomed potential environmental benefits, while noting that these could be

offset by increased air traffic. Concern was expressed about the speed of progress towards a Single European Sky and the difficulties the European Rail Traffic Monitoring System had encountered in the implementation phase. Other questions included the extent of cooperation between public bodies, airports and private industry as well as the different approaches adopted by the EU and US.

Mr Ky replied that the partnership was working extremely well at the research stage but discussions with the likes of Airbus would be needed regarding deployment. The US had the advantage of a single decision maker; the EU's requirements and organisation were different but the two systems would be interoperable.

### Study on Eurovignette

DG TREN and the Joint Research Centre of Seville carried out a study<sup>1</sup> assessing direct and indirect effects of the existing proposal of revision of Directive 1999/62 on road infrastructure charging, which is currently blocked in Council after the European Parliament had delivered its first reading almost one year ago.

The study was requested by the Council in order to make sure that the proposed measure meets the policy objective of reducing the external costs of freight transport, while minimising the negative impact for the economy. The report was published in October and discussed at the Council working group meeting in December 2009, this debate being the unique one under the Swedish Presidency on the pending Eurovignette proposal.

Coordinators decided to have a presentation of the study on Eurovignette in order to stay updated on the latest developments. The study was presented by Mr Grillo Pasquarelli, Director for inland transport, DG TREN.

Mr Grillo Pasquarelli explained that the objectives of the study are to estimate the cost impact of external cost charges on cross-border road freight transport operations and on final product prices and to highlight the benefits of external cost charging. In order to pursue this objective, the study makes by using the TRANSTOOLS model an estimation of the external costs (noise, air pollution and congestion charges) of road haulage as

<sup>1</sup>

<http://ipts.jrc.ec.europa.eu/publications/pub.cfm?id=2779>

proposed by the European Commission for a representative set of six corridors in the EU.

On the outcome, the study concluded to the following impacts on the costs:

- The average charge over the 6 corridors is about 4 €cent per vehicle-km for a Euro IV truck;
- On average 3 % increase of transport costs (increase varies from 1.8% to 5.2% across the corridors);
- Existing tolls (10-30 €cent per vehicle-km) increase by about 25%;
- Very small impact on final product prices: 0.34% for tuna fish or 0.03% for a pair of jeans.

Concerning the benefits of such an EU wide internalisation, the study underlined:

- Efficiency improvements (less empty returns and shift to cleaner vehicles) in road transport and modal shift;
- Positive changes on the long-term perspective of logistics behaviour and business processes;
- 8% reduction of CO2 emissions and fuel consumption in road transport;
- Congestion reduction of 7% on motorways and between 10-30% on local roads;
- € 2.3 billion annual net welfare gain;
- € 10-30 billion of revenue for sustainable mobility.

In the debate following the presentation, some Members found that the study was another confirmation of the findings of different other studies, including the Commission impact assessment, and therefore again a proof that the revision of Eurovignette was necessary. They asked the Council to speed up their work on a common position. Some members voiced their doubts on the findings of the study and the necessity to include congestion charges; others stated however that the proposed allowed internalisation of external costs is too low. Different Members questioned the expected benefits of an EU wide internalisation; they feared that it would not create enough leverage as the impact on final product prices or as the potential savings generated by technological improvement was too limited. Mr Grillo Pasquarelli reiterated the scientific nature of the study by stressing that measures with limited microeconomic impact can have a substantive impact on macroeconomic level.

### New reports and opinions

#### Reports:

Integrated Maritime Policy (IMP) - request for authorisation of an own-initiative report, comprising:

Communication from the Commission: Towards an Integrated Maritime Policy for better governance in the Mediterranean - COM(2009)0466

Communication from the Commission: Developing the international dimension of the Integrated Maritime Policy of the European Union - COM(2009)0536

Communication from the Commission: Towards the integration of maritime surveillance: A common information sharing environment for the EU maritime domain - COM(2009)0538

Report from the Commission: Progress report on the EU'S integrated maritime policy - COM(2009)0540  
*ALDE*

#### **Opinions:**

Budget 2011 - Section III - Commission: Orientations for the budget 2011  
Budget 2011: consultation procedure before first reading  
*EPP*

### **TRAN Committee meeting 22-23 February, Brussels**

Provisional agenda:

#### **Monday, 22 February 2010, afternoon**

- Maritime policy until 2018/Van Dalen;
- Aviation security charges/Leichtfried;
- Working time mobile road transport activities/El Khadraoui;
- 2008 discharge Commission/Ayala Sender;
- 2008 discharges agencies/Jensen.

#### **Tuesday, 23 February 2010, morning**

- Trans-European network/Simpson **(vote)**;
- Working time mobile road transport activities/El Khadraoui **(vote)**;
- 2008 discharge Commission/Ayala Sender **(vote)**;
- 2008 discharge agencies/Jensen **(vote)**;
- Transportable pressure equipment/Simpson;
- Future of transport/Grosch;
- Baltic Sea Region/Kuhn;
- Implementation railway package/Simpson.

### **TRAN Committee meetings 2010, Brussels**

Monday, 1 March, 15.00-18.30

Monday, 22 March, 15.00-18.30  
Tuesday, 23 March, 9.00-12.30

Tuesday, 27 April, 15.00-18.30  
Wednesday, 28 April, 9.00-12.30

Wednesday, 28 April, 15.00-18.30

Monday, 3 May, 15.00-18.30  
Tuesday, 4 May, 9.00-12.30  
Tuesday, 4 May, 15.00-18.30

Monday, 31 May, 15.00-18.30  
Tuesday, 1 June, 9.00-12.30  
Tuesday, 1 June, 15.00-18.30  
Wednesday 2 June, 9.00-12.30

Monday, 21 June, 15.00-18.30  
Tuesday, 22 June, 9.00-12.30  
Tuesday, 22 June, 15.00-18.30  
Wednesday, 22 June, 9.00-12.30

Monday, 12 July, 15.00-18.30  
Tuesday, 13 July, 9.00-12.30  
Tuesday, 13 July, 15.00-18.30  
Wednesday, 14 July, 9.00-12.30

Thursday, 2 September, 9.00-12.30

Monday, 27 September, 15.00-18.30  
Tuesday, 28 September, 9.00-12.30  
Tuesday, 28 September, 15.00-18.30  
Wednesday, 29 September, 9.00-12.30

Tuesday, 26 October, 9.00-12.30  
Tuesday, 26 October, 15.00-18.30  
Wednesday, 27 October, 9.00-12.30  
Wednesday, 27 October, 15.00-18.30

Monday, 8 November, 15.00-18.30  
Tuesday, 9 November, 9.00-12.30  
Tuesday, 9 November, 15.00-18.30  
Tuesday, 30 November, 15.00-18.30

Wednesday, 1 December, 9.00-12.30  
Wednesday, 1 December, 15.00-18.30  
Thursday, 2 December, 9.00-12.30