

TRANNEWS

Newsletter from the European Parliament
Committee on Transport and Tourism
Number 89, 25 November 2011

questions & subscription:
tran-secretariat@europarl.europa.eu

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

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

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

TRAN Committee meeting 21-23 November 2011, Brussels

Adoption of draft recommendation

Memorandum of Cooperation between the EU and the International Civil Aviation Organisation

Rapporteur: Brian Simpson (S&D, UK)
Consent procedure

The Memorandum of Cooperation is intended to formalise and enhance relations and cooperation between the EU and ICAO. In particular, it seeks to ensure greater harmonization of standards and closer coordination of their respective activities. The Committee recommended concluding the Memorandum.

Timetable foreseen:

- Vote in plenary: January 2012.

Adoption of draft report

White Paper on the Future of Transport Rapporteur: Mathieu Grosch (EPP, BE)

Own-initiative report

Overall the Committee welcomed the White Paper and approved the ten goals for a competitive and resource efficient transport system as well as the targets set in the White Paper for 2050. However, it also set a series of intermediate targets. It called, for example, on the Commission to draw up legal rules to reduce CO2 and other greenhouse gas emissions by 20% compared to the 1990 reference figures and to set targets for the different modes of transport.

In addition the Committee specified deadlines for Commission proposals on issues including: the European Railway Agency (to be expected by 2012), social and working conditions and the 'Blue Belt' (both 2013), the internalisation of external costs for

all transport modes (2014) and urban mobility (2015).

Individual paragraphs set out priorities for the different modes of transport (road, shipping, air and rail) as well as major issues such as road safety, the internal market, efficient co-modality, trans-European networks, transport security, urban mobility, passenger rights, innovation and simplification.

Timetable foreseen:

- Vote in plenary: December 2011.

Adoption of draft opinions

Passenger Name Record data

Rapporteur: Eva Lichtenberger
(Greens/EFA, AT)

Opinion to LIBE Committee

Limiting considerably the scope of the proposed EU PNR system was the result of the Committee's deliberations and subsequent vote. A majority supported restricting the scope to the fight against terrorism and serious transnational crime. The latter was redefined to comprise only trafficking of human beings and illicit trafficking in narcotic drugs, weapons, munitions and explosives.

Further amendments limiting the scope of the PNR system in other respects were also adopted. These included the requirement for an order from a competent judicial authority for the processing of PNR data except in the case where there would be a danger in delay.

The Rapporteur's wish to shorten the data retention period to 30 days was approved. A series of compromise amendments dealing with air carriers' obligations and the push system were also adopted. These specify, for example, that the air carriers will not be required to collect any PNR data that they do not already collect and that they only push the PNR data specified in the Directive's annex to the passenger information unit of the relevant Member State. In that annex the data field "general remarks" was deleted.

Timetable foreseen:

- Vote in LIBE Committee: February 2012.

Taxation of energy products and electricity

Rapporteur: Sabine Wils (GUE/NGL, DE)
Opinion to ECON Committee

The taxation of energy and, in particular, of different fuels was at the heart of the debate when the Committee adopted its position on the revision of the Energy Taxation Directive. The Rapporteur had proposed abolishing the obligation for Member States to exempt fuel used for air and maritime navigation from taxation. During the debate and subsequent vote this idea did not receive majority support.

A further issue which was discussed concerned the differential treatment of commercial and non-commercial uses of gas oil used as propellant. While the Commission proposed to abolish this difference, several amendments reintroduced the concept. Finally, a compromise amendment was adopted which reintroduced the concept but made it subject to periodic review by the Commission with a perspective of ending it.

There was a large consensus on the issue of shore-side electricity. It was clarified that these provisions would apply to sea and inland ports. At the same time the limitation until 2020 for the exemption from taxation of shore-side electricity was deleted. A number of further amendments (covering provisions on taxis and on delegated acts amongst others) were also adopted.

Timetable foreseen:

- Vote in ECON Committee: January 2012.

Presentation of draft report

Agreement on certain aspects of air services between the EU and the Republic of Indonesia **Rapporteur: Brian Simpson (S&D, UK)** **Consent procedure**

The main goal is to bring the existing 19 bilateral Agreements concluded between Member States and Indonesia in line with EU law. Thus, the Agreement amends the bilateral Agreements in the areas falling under EU competence. These are: an EU designation clause ensuring equal treatment of EU carriers irrespective of the nationality of their owners, safety provisions, a fuel tax provision and rules on competition.

The Rapporteur and Shadow Rapporteurs recommended giving consent to the conclusion of the Agreement.

Timetable foreseen:

- Vote in TRAN Committee: December 2011
- Vote in plenary: January 2012.

Presentation of draft opinion

Sulphur Content of marine fuels **Rapporteur: Vilja Savisaar-Toomast (ALDE, ET)** **Opinion to ENVI Committee**

The Rapporteur noted that the International Maritime Organisation had fixed a 0.1% limit for Sulphur Emission Control Areas (SECAs) from 2015. Without action there was a risk that maritime sulphur emissions would exceed those from land-based sources. A reduction in emissions would save thousands of lives per year; the benefits therefore exceeded the costs.

Nonetheless Ms Savisaar noted that there was concern about the availability of suitable fuel, the risk of goods being transported by land rather than

sea ("modal shift") and the possibility of a distortion of competition between northern seas, subject to the 0.1% limit, and southern ones that would not be subject to a 0.5% limit before 2020. She favoured an extension of the SECA regime to all European seas, at least within the 12 nautical mile limit.

Other Members broadly endorsed the Rapporteur's approach. Some considered that problems of fuel supply and the risk of modal shift justified delaying the 0.1% limit to 2020. Others favoured assistance to shippers who wished to use Liquefied Natural Gas or install emission reduction devices ("scrubbers"). There were also calls for extending SECAs to cover Member States' territorial waters and for passenger ships to be subject to the 0.1% limit from 2015 (rather than 2020).

The Commission representative welcomed the draft opinion, emphasising that lower shipping emissions offered the most cost-effective way to meet air quality standards. The proposal offered benefits of up to €25 for every Euro that was invested. The Commission would review the case for additional SECAs and would monitor to see if modal shift occurred. Short sea shipping was the sector most likely to be affected. State aid to support early adopters could help here.

Timetable foreseen:

- **Deadline for amendments: 29 November**
- Vote in TRAN Committee: December 2011
- Vote in ENVI Committee: January 2012.

Presentation of study

Economic aspects of sustainable mobility

The Committee held an exchange of views with Werner Rothengatter (Karlsruher Institut für Technologie) and Wolfgang Schade (Fraunhofer Gesellschaft, ISI) following the presentation of their study on "Economic aspects of sustainable mobility" requested by the Committee in 2010.

After a brief introduction, the authors focused on four blocks of measures described in the study and relevant conclusions and recommendations. The most important eco-innovations identified by the authors were setting CO2 emission standards for road vehicles, internalising the external costs of transport and using carbon neutral fuels. These eco-innovations were complemented by others more specific to urban transport (walking and cycling, as well as a new multi-modal seamless passenger transport alternative presented as "the fifth mode"), to freight transport (eco-driving, adapted operation control systems, cooperative/collaborative logistics and freight intermodality) and lastly to modal specific instruments (high-speed rail back-bone with regional access and clean maritime shipping).

According to the study, these measures would all affect transport, the environment, the removal of market failures and, as a result, the economy. However, assessing the latter in quantitative terms proved to be difficult so the study presented very few figures. This was partly due to the existing literature not offering a critical mass of adequate resources and often being subject to caveats (e.g.

focusing solely on user cost or neglecting the impact of a sustainable transport system on the long-term adjustment of economic structures).

Overall, the study advocated a policy of fostering the measures that had been presented so as to realise their long-run benefits in terms of both sustainability and the economy.

The presentation was followed by a lively debate. Members' questions included the feasibility of producing carbon neutral energy for transport purposes, the challenge of how to foster permanent cooperation between enterprises in order to rationalise logistics and to reduce emissions and the use of road charging to make transport more sustainable.

The experts underlined the long-term results to be expected for the economy and for job creation. The final version of the study will be circulated to Committee Members.

State of play

Statistical returns of goods carried by road

Rapporteur: Brian Simpson (S&D, UK)
Ordinary legislative procedure, first reading

The Rapporteur reported back to the Committee on the results of negotiations with Council and the Commission. A first reading Agreement had been reached. The main aspects of the compromise text are: the scope of and conditions to exercise powers delegated to the Commission with a view to amend certain non-essential provisions of the Regulation ("delegated acts"), implementing acts, a derogation for Malta and a review clause concerning the Regulation's implementation.

It was announced that the compromise text will be tabled to plenary by the Chair on behalf of the TRAN Committee. Members accepted the draft text.

Timetable foreseen:

- Vote in plenary: November II 2011.

Exchange of views

with TEN-T Coordinator Balázs

Péter Balázs reported that good progress has been made on most segments of the projects. Substantial sections have been commissioned or will be well developed at the end of the current funding period (2007-2013); others are on the way to completion by 2015.

In 2010, the Kehl Bridge was opened increasing efficiency on this section. Unfortunately the connecting section to Appenweier had been stopped. There has also been progress on the Munich-Salzburg section. Concerning the Vienna-Bratislava part, all works have started in Austria and should be completed by 2016.

The Coordinator called for greater intermodality and highlighted the importance of intermodal ticketing. The main issue seemed to be the Stuttgart 21 project which would be the subject of a referendum on 27 November 2011.

Further to Members questions about parallel connections in Germany and links to Bratislava's airport, in particular from Vienna airport, the Coordinator underlined that his mandate is limited to the priority project 17 and that he plans to visit and discuss with the new Slovak Minister of Transport after the Slovak elections in March 2012.

with TEN-T Coordinator Telička

Pawel Telička reported on the significant progress that had been made in implementing the project despite its complexity due to different terrain, track and operating systems characteristics and the economic recession that particularly affected the Baltic States.

In Estonia the work had practically been completed. The €2 million the government had saved was to be used to improve signalling. Latvia was also back on track and its recent decision to deploy €21.5 million to co-finance European funding gives hopes it can still meet previously agreed deadlines. In Lithuania, the project had been officially classified as of strategic national importance. This should facilitate timely implementation, especially as far as land expropriation was concerned. In addition, plans to build a logistic centre in Kaunas should further reinforce Lithuania's commitment.

Finally Poland, the only State that had opted to use its Cohesion Fund money rather than TEN-T funds, had decided to deviate from the originally planned route and to channel it through Elk, thus saving the environmentally precious Rospuda Valley. Although this decision will delay the project well beyond the next Financial Perspective, the Coordinator acknowledged there was a legitimate reason for Poland to have taken it.

Mr Telička informed Members that the feasibility study completed in 2011 advocated constructing a new 728 km electrified double track line, using the European gauge, between Tallinn and the Polish border. He added that the Baltic States welcomed the fact that Rail Baltica would be part of the TEN-T core network corridor linking the Baltic with the Adriatic Sea and that they were working together to create a joint venture to complete the project as soon as possible, with Poland and other States on this corridor invited to join.

Some Members criticised the project as being purely political. They requested information on the projected traffic demand and questioned the role of the Coordinator, seeing him as lacking the power to influence the Member States concerned. There were also concerns about additional funding for the project and the delay caused by the Polish decision. Mr Telička firmly defended his view that important progress had been made and stressed that future demand will originate not only in the Baltic States or in Poland but also elsewhere. Rail Baltica should be

seen as "key to the European competitiveness in the East".

with TEN-T Coordinator Brinkhorst

Laurens Jan Brinkhorst gave an overview of the current state of play of this 1 638 km long railway project. This was the only East-West corridor south of the Alps. Although it was still behind schedule due to little progress having been made up to mid 2010, significant steps had been taken during the report period 2010/2011, especially on the two key sections of PP 6 (Lyon-Turin with the 57km cross-border base tunnel and Trieste-Divača).

At the end of September 2011, France and Italy considerably advanced their negotiations on a new bilateral Agreement by solving the question of the distribution of the costs. They were expected to sign it in the coming weeks. The cross-border section between Italy and France has also seen some progress with the three exploratory tunnels already completed in France and the preparation of the construction site for the La Maddalena exploratory and access tunnel near Chiomonte in Italy. Mr Brinkhorst praised the work of the Italian Observatory which facilitated and organised a structured dialogue with the local population in the Susa Valley.

Furthermore, the Coordinator mentioned the kick-off meeting of the 'Lyon-Turin Corridor Platform (CPLT)', which brought together all concerned key players for the first time. He also referred to the progress on the Trieste-Divača corridor for which Italy and Slovenia had adopted the preferred route. In addition both countries had agreed on the establishment of a common promoter for organisational reasons.

Some Members welcomed the Coordinator's efforts and the resulting progress of PP 6. Others, by contrast, referred to the Coordinator's statement on the Transport Observatory and criticised the lack of dialogue on the base tunnel with local citizens in the Susa Valley. They thought the tunnel project should be abandoned and alternatives sought - also because, in their view, Italy was not currently able to finance all major TEN-T projects. This provoked an intense debate amongst Members. Other questions revolved around the significantly delayed Venice-Trieste section.

In his reply, the Coordinator stressed that the Lyon-Turin section was supported by all Italian governments over the last 15 years, including the new government of Mr Monti. He also stressed that the majority of municipalities are in favour of the project - including in the region directly affected - and that this democratic majority should be respected. On the Venice-Trieste section, he agreed with Members that progress should be made in order for the Trieste-Divača corridor to make sense. He shared Members' view that linking this project with other Priority Projects in Budapest would be crucial for the new Member States.

with TEN-T Coordinator Cox

Pat Cox reported considerable progress, in particular with regard to its centrepiece, the Brenner Base Tunnel. The most important event of this reporting period has been the decision of April 2011 to launch the main works on the base tunnel, the so-called Phase III, which marks not only a point of departure but also a point of no return for the project. This decision followed the Agreement between Austria and Italy on the total costs (€7 460 million).

According to the revised Austrian construction plan, the works on the two main tunnel tubes could start in 2011 and be completed in 2025. Progress was already made on the exploratory and access tunnels sections.

There was also a considerable progress on the northern and southern access routes to the Brenner Base Tunnel. North of the Brenner Corridor, the sections between Berlin and Halle/Leipzig and between Nuremberg and Munich have entered service. South of the Brenner Corridor the section between Verona/Milan and Naples/Salerno has become operational in its entirety. However, Mr Cox stressed that much remains to be done in order to avoid bottlenecks on these access routes when the base tunnel becomes operational in 2026.

On the northern access to the Brenner Base Tunnel, the 41 km long Lower Inn Valley route will become operational by the end of 2012. For the section between Munich-Rosenheim-German/Austrian border-Kundl/Radfeld, Germany and Austria are preparing a ministerial Agreement foreseen to be signed in January 2012. However, the construction is not expected to start before 2020.

The realisation of the southern access between Fortezza and Verona had been considerably delayed. Nevertheless, the Coordinator reported significant progress regarding the financial commitment (€1.6 billion) on the functional construction lot between Fortezza-Ponte Gardena (one of five construction lots in this section). In addition, Mr Cox mentioned several coordination and communication platforms along this corridor and stressed that more communication was needed in order to establish a real dialogue with stakeholders and local citizens.

He then referred to cross-financing schemes on the Italian side, namely the public tender for the new concession, through which cross-financing will continue to be guaranteed on the A22. According to the Italian Budget Law, the next A22 concessionaire has to reserve a minimum €34 million per annum for cross-financing the Brenner Base Tunnel and the southern access.

Members generally welcomed the progress on this Priority Project. Some critical questions were raised with regard to problems in Germany and concerning a study neglecting the economic benefits of the Brenner Base Tunnel. Furthermore, Members put forward questions on the impact of the difficult Italian financial situation for this project as well as on the status of the Messina Bridge.

In reply, Mr Cox stressed that Italy was clearly supporting the project but that the Messina Bridge

had already been cancelled by the previous government as part of its austerity measures. He also quite frankly acknowledged and criticised the difficulties with the German government regarding the construction of the access routes and the application of ERTMS.

with TEN-T Coordinator Peijs

Karla Peijs presented her Annual Activity Report on Inland Waterways (PP 18 and 30). After a brief introduction highlighting the fact that Inland Waterway Transport was gaining importance in the EU, the Coordinator treated each project separately.

PP 18

Ms Peijs focused on the complexities and progress within this long corridor, which connects the Belgian basin of the Meuse to the Black Sea through the German Rhine and Main Rivers and the international Danube River. With so many countries involved, keeping up with political changes could represent a challenge.

Although there was a real interest from all parties to develop a sustainable, effective and economically viable inland navigation, the Coordinator recognised that there are still several critical sections on the corridor that need more progress.

An interim report from the Monitoring Committee was expected in 2012. This would be followed by a conference to discuss these first results. The Coordinator was confident that getting all items on the table would contribute to achieving the objectives set out.

In response to some of the questions raised by the Members, Mrs Peijs confirmed that the European Commission is working on coordinating the TEN-T projects with the Danube Strategy (adopted by the Council on 24 June 2011). She also insisted that tourism represented a real opportunity for the corridor. This involved avoiding pollution and focusing on clean transport.

PP 30

This project connects the French network to the Belgian, Dutch and German networks and to the principal northern sea ports. The Coordinator was very pleased with the progress that had been made, especially in Belgium, where all projects were on schedule.

The highlight of the last year was when the competitive dialogue was launched by French President Sarkozy on 5 April 2011. This was a major political event that has a strong impact on the credibility of the project in terms of the clear commitment by the French government.

During the exchange of views with Members, the issue of tolls and maintenance charges was raised. The Coordinator recognised this as a core question and explained that steps were being taken to investigate the issue. Within the Intergovernmental Committee that will discuss the levying of tolls, not only would there be representatives from the

Commission and the different national Governments, but also a "User Committee". This would check that a certain toll level would not discourage the use of the corridor.

with TEN-T Coordinator Valente De Oliveira

Luis Valente de Oliveira said twelve projects were now underway while seven more could be funded under the current call for tender. This would produce a total investment of more than €1 billion. The Coordinator emphasised the importance of professional training, moving to paperless data transmission, ensuring the availability of alternative fuels such as Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) and improving port-hinterland connections.

Members shared Mr de Oliveira's concern about the need to improve training and to provide cleaner fuels. Questions were also raised about the impact of larger ships on port infrastructure, the involvement of islands, the lack of projects involving the Black Sea and the proposal to include only a limited number of ports in the future TEN-T core network.

In reply, Mr de Oliveira said LNG could be provided either from bunkers in ports or by barges. The Bosphorus represented a constraint when it came to the Black Sea although he was conscious this represented a missing area. He also spoke positively about the Italian "Eco-bonus" scheme for firms that switched freight from the road to waterways and suggested this might be extended to neighbouring countries.

with TEN-T Coordinator Savary

Gilles Savary reported that the main sections of the project in Germany, the Czech Republic, Austria, Hungary and Greece had already been completed. However, there were delays in Romania and Bulgaria. For that reason the need to create concrete governance structures between the Member States concerned and to monitor the progress on the territory every six months were of crucial importance.

Members raised questions on the German-Czech parts of the project, the co-financing rates (20% as being considered too low) and the equipment of the whole corridor with ERTMS as well as the need for better cooperation between national authorities.

Mr Savary made it clear that the Czech and German authorities were not able to agree on priorities on the track from the Czech border to Nuremberg. In view of the German government's reluctance to give priority to the missing links, he intended to establish a governance structure between Germany, the Czech Republic and Austria in order to overcome the persistent obstacles and make some progress.

Romania and Bulgaria tended to favour the development of their motorway networks given the fast growth in private car ownership. Regarding the rail infrastructure, both countries prioritised East-West investments rather than North-South links.

The Coordinator touched upon the question of how to adapt priorities, in the medium term, and to re-open the traditional Western Balkans route from Greece to Central Europe. This would shorten the Athens-Budapest route by 330 km compared to the present route.

He also pointed out that there was a need for more coordination, not only between national and European priorities but also between the European Investment Bank and the European Commission (DG MOVE and DG REGIO).

with TEN-T Coordinator Vinck

Karel Vinck presented the state of play of the deployment of ERTMS in Europe. Despite a difficult context for public finances there is progress. Some 6 900 kilometres of lines were currently equipped or financed in Europe, across 14 Member States.

However, despite some positive developments the role of ERTMS in achieving greater mobility by ensuring interoperability, as well as the technical and economic advantages which call for its deployment, have yet to convince certain railway decision-makers in order to reach the critical mass. The national homologation procedures are sometimes overly complicated, causing delays and increasing costs. Also, the tendency of national safety authorities to allow unilateral variations in ERTMS was creating barriers to interoperability. Harmonised ERTMS deployment needed to be guaranteed.

There was particular concern that the German government no longer felt bound by previous commitments to install ERTMS track-side equipment along the German stretches of the corridors by 2015. Potential major delays would call into question the concept of interoperability for the four corridors passing through Germany with the potential risk of a spill-over effect to neighbouring countries.

Therefore, for the Coordinator, the priorities were to:

1. Adopt a pragmatic approach, ensure that the commitments made in the European Deployment Plan are upheld and that legalisation of ERTMS Version 3 was achieved by the end of 2012;
2. Ensure the compliance of all ERTMS equipment with European interoperability standards and simplifying authorisation procedures by means of cross-acceptance Agreements between national safety authorities;
3. Ensure the coherence of ERTMS investments with the operational environment of corridors and to prevent other technical obstacles being artificially maintained;
4. Ensure harmonisation of technical standards other than ERTMS along corridors;
5. Secure European funding to equip an additional 19 000 kilometres of lines with an approximate cost of €3.8 billion, of which approximately €1.3 billion

would have to be provided from European joint funding.

Various Members expressed their concern about the risk of delays regarding the roll-out of ERTMS on the corridors passing through Germany and inquired about the underlying reasons and how doubts on the German side could be overcome. The Coordinator said that figures for the costs of the deployment of ERTMS circulating in Germany were far above the real costs. Technical difficulties with the GSM standard used for communications in ERTMS could be overcome while the German government had yet to offer a viable alternative to ensure interoperability.

with TEN-T Coordinator Secchi

Carlo Secchi defined the situation in 2011 as a success story, as there had been important achievements for PP3 and PP19 in the last year, notably the historical start-up of interoperable railway connections between the Iberian Peninsula and France.

On the Mediterranean branch the first interoperable link for both freight and passengers between the Iberian Peninsula and the rest of Europe became operational, with the Montpellier-Perpignan line remaining to be completed.

On the Atlantic branch, the Coordinator underlined that the contract for the concession of the line was the world's biggest railway contract and represented a remarkable example of large scale Public Private Partnership. The main remaining problems facing this branch were related to cross-border coordination, especially on the French side. The Coordinator hoped that a solution would be found next year.

On the Iberian branch, works were close to completion on the Extremadura line, but the situation in relation to Portugal might put a large amount of available funding at risk. Mr Secchi emphasized that Spain has been very active, managing available resources (including Cohesion Fund) in a remarkable way.

The Coordinator expected further improvements next year. Among the key points in need of reinforcement, Mr Secchi mentioned governance issues, which should include co-operation between the different levels of public administrations as well as a good communication campaign.

In reply to Members' questions about the financing (especially project bonds), Mr Secchi invited Members to attend the next TEN-T days in Antwerp, where this topic would be discussed in detail. He explained that it was easier to internalise costs than benefits. He concluded that profitability was one of the most important reasons behind the success of these projects. Even if, in some cases, this profitability was not so obvious initially, it could be improved so as to attract private investors.

**Votes in plenary
15, 16 and 17 November,
Strasbourg**

Single European Railway Area
Rapporteur: Debora Serracchiani (S&D, IT)
Ordinary legislative procedure, first reading

The resolution was adopted by 526:80:36.
Link to [press release](#)

Integrated Maritime Policy
Rapporteur: Georgios Koumoutsakos (EPP, EL)
Ordinary Legislative Procedure, first reading

The resolution was adopted by 541:33:14.
Link to [press release](#)

Athens Convention
Rapporteur: Brian Simpson (S&D, UK)
Consent procedure

The recommendation was adopted by 560:18:5.

Euro-Mediterranean aviation Agreement between the EU and Jordan
Rapporteur: Olga Sehnalová (S&D, CZ)
Consent procedure

The recommendation was adopted by a show of hands.

Common aviation air Agreement between the EU and Georgia
Rapporteur: Thomas Ulmer (EPP, DE)
Consent procedure

The recommendation was adopted by a show of hands.

**TRAN Committee meeting
19-20 December, Brussels**

Provisional agenda:

Monday, 19 December, afternoon

- Air Passenger Rights/ Taylor
- Discharge 2010: EU General Budget, Section III Commission/ Ayala Sender
- Discharges 2010: Agencies/ Fleckenstein

Tuesday, 20 December, morning

- Air services Agreement EU - Indonesia/ Simpson
- Sulphur content of marine fuels/ Savisaar
- Exchange of views with EIB/ TEN-T
- Phasing-in of double-hull or equivalent design requirements for single-hull oil tankers/ Riquet
- Exchange of views with Commissioner Kallas

Tuesday, 20 December, afternoon

- Digital Tachograph: Mini Hearing
- Study on State Aids to Seaports
- AOB

**TRAN Committee meetings 2012,
Brussels**

Monday, 23 January, 15.00-18.30
Tuesday, 24 January, 09.00-12.30
Tuesday, 24 January, 15.00-18.30
Wednesday, 25 January, 09.00-12.30

Monday, 6 February, 15.00-18.30

Monday, 27 February, 15.00-18.30
Tuesday, 28 February, 09.00-12.30
Tuesday, 28 February, 15.00-18.30
Wednesday, 29 February, 09.00-12.30
Wednesday, 29 February, 15.00-18.30

Monday, 26 March, 15.00-18.30
Tuesday, 27 March, 09.00-12.30
Tuesday, 27 March, 15.00-18.30

Monday, 23 April, 15.00-18.30
Tuesday, 24 April, 09.00-12.30
Tuesday, 24 April, 15.00-18.30
Wednesday, 25 April, 09.00-12.30

Monday, 7 May, 15.00-18.30
Tuesday, 8 May, 09.00-12.30

Tuesday, 29 May, 15.00-18.30
Wednesday, 30 May, 09.00-12.00
Wednesday, 30 May, 15.00-18.30
Thursday, 31 May, 09.00-12.30

Monday, 18 June, 15.00-18.30
Tuesday, 19 June, 09.00-12.30
Tuesday, 19 June, 15.00-18.30
Wednesday, 20 June, 09.00-12.30
Wednesday, 20 June, 15.00-18.30

Monday, 9 July, 15.00-18.30
Tuesday, 10 July, 09.00-12.30
Tuesday, 10 July, 15.00-18.30

Thursday, 6 September, 15.00-18.30

Monday, 17 September, 15.00-18.30
Tuesday, 18 September, 09.00-12.30
Tuesday, 18 September, 15.00-18.30

Full list of 2012 meetings available at <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/document/activities/cont/201109/20110919ATT26938/20110919ATT26938EN.pdf>