

**SUIVI ACCORDÉ PAR LA COMMISSION AUX AVIS DU**

**COMITÉ ÉCONOMIQUE ET SOCIAL EUROPÉEN**

**RENDUS AU COURS DU 3<sup>ème</sup> BIMESTRIEL 2014**

**(Juin et Juillet 2014)**

N°	Titre	Références	Mois plénière
<b>DG MARKT</b>			
1.	<b>Déclaration et transparence des opérations de financement sur titres</b>  Proposition de règlement du Parlement européen et du Conseil relatif à la transparence des opérations de financement sur titres  Rapporteur: M. Edgardo Maria IOZIA (GRIT-IT)	COM(2014) 40 final - 2014/0017 COD  CESE 1466/2014 fin - 2014/0017 COD  INT/738	juillet
2.	<b>Financement participatif dans l'UE (communication)</b>  Communication de la Commission au Parlement européen, au Conseil, au Comité économique et social européen et au Comité des régions - Libérer le potentiel du financement participatif dans l'Union européenne  Rapporteur: M. Juan MENDOZA CASTRO (GRIT-ES)	COM(2014) 172 final  CESE 2102/2014 fin  INT/741	juillet
3.	<b>Engagement à long terme des actionnaires</b>  Proposition de directive du Parlement européen et du Conseil modifiant la directive 2007/36/CE en vue de promouvoir l'engagement à long terme des actionnaires, et la directive 2013/34/UE en ce qui concerne certains éléments de la déclaration sur la gouvernance d'entreprise  Rapporteur: M. Michael SMYTH (GRIT-UK)	COM(2014) 213 final -2014/0121 COD  CESE 2817/2014 fin - 2014/0121 COD  INT/745	juillet
4.	<b>Financement à long terme - Suivi (communication)</b>  Communication de la Commission au Parlement européen et au Conseil sur le financement à long terme de l'économie européenne  Rapporteur: M. Michael SMYTH (GRIT-UK) Corapporteur: M. Vincent FARRUGIA (GRIT-MT)	COM(2014) 168 final  CESE 2476/2014 fin  ECO/365	juillet

5.	<b>Réforme structurelle des banques de l'UE</b>  Proposition de règlement du Parlement européen et du Conseil relatif à des mesures structurelles améliorant la résilience des établissements de crédit de l'UE  Rapporteur: M. Edgardo Maria IOZIA (GRIT-IT)	COM(2014) 43 final - 2014/0020 COD  CESE 1791/2014 fin - 2014/0020 COD  INT/717	juillet
6.	<b>Institutions de retraite professionnelle (refonte)</b>  Proposition de directive du Parlement européen et du Conseil concernant les activités et la surveillance des institutions de retraite professionnelle  Rapporteur: M. Krzysztof PATER (GRIT-PL) Corapporteur: M. Petru Sorin DANDEA (GRIT-RO)	COM(2014) 167 final - 2014/0091 COD  CESE 2354/2014 fin - 2014/0091 COD  SOC/509	juillet
7.	<b>Livraison de colis (communication)</b>  Communication de la Commission - Feuille de route pour l'achèvement du marché unique concernant la livraison de colis - Instaurer la confiance dans les services de livraison et favoriser les ventes en ligne  Rapporteur: M <sup>me</sup> Daniela RONDINELLI (GRIT-IT)	COM(2013) 886 final  CESE 759/2014 fin  INT/727	juillet
8.	<b>Financement des entreprises: recherche de nouveaux mécanismes financiers</b>  Rapporteur: M. Michael SMYTH (GRIT-UK)	CESE 1346/2014 fin  ECO/361  avis d'initiative	juillet
<b>DG JUST</b>			
9.	<b>Future politique de l'UE en matière de justice (communication)</b>  Communication de la Commission au Parlement européen, au Conseil, au Comité économique et social européen et au Comité des régions - L'agenda de l'UE en matière de justice pour 2020 - Améliorer la confiance, la mobilité et la croissance au sein de l'Union  Rapporteur: M. Xavier VERBOVEN (GRIT-BE)	COM(2014) 144 final  CESE 1943/2014 fin  SOC/506	juillet
<b>DG MOVE</b>			

10.	<b>Mobilité urbaine compétitive et économe en ressources (communication)</b>  Communication de la Commission au Parlement européen, au Conseil, au Comité économique et social européen et au Comité des régions - Ensemble vers une mobilité urbaine compétitive et économe en ressources  Rapporteur: M. Edgardo Maria IOZIA (GRIT-IT)	COM(2013) 913 final  CESE 1042/2014 fin  TEN/546	juin
<b>DG CLIMA (DG ENER co-lead)</b>			
11.	<b>Un cadre d'action 2020-2030 en matière de climat et d'énergie (communication)</b>  Communication de la Commission au Parlement européen, au Conseil, au Comité économique et social européen et au Comité des régions - Un cadre d'action en matière de climat et d'énergie pour la période comprise entre 2020 et 2030  Rapporteuse: M <sup>me</sup> Ulla SIRKEINEN (GRI-FI)	COM(2013) 169 final COM(2014) 15 final  CESE 917/2014 fin  NAT/636	juin
12.	<b>Système d'échange de quotas d'émission de l'UE</b>  Proposition de décision du Parlement européen et du Conseil concernant la création et le fonctionnement d'une réserve de stabilité du marché pour le système d'échange de quotas d'émission de gaz à effet de serre de l'Union et modifiant la directive 2003/87/CE  Rapporteur: M. Antonello PEZZINI (GRI-IT)	COM(2014) 20 final - 2014/0011 COD  CESE 800/2014 fin - 2014/0011 COD  NAT/637	juin
<b>DG ENER</b>			
13.	<b>Prix et coûts de l'énergie (communication)</b>  Communication de la Commission au Parlement européen, au Conseil, au Comité économique et social européen et au Comité des régions - Prix et coûts de l'énergie en Europe  Rapporteur: M. Richard ADAMS (GRIT-UK)	COM(2014) 21 final  CESE 1113/2014 fin  TEN/547	juin

DG ENTR			
14.	<b>Produits industriels (communication)</b>  Communication de la Commission au Parlement européen, au Conseil et au Comité économique et social européen - Une vision pour le marché intérieur des produits industriels  Rapporteur: M. Denis MEYNENT (GRII-FR)	COM(2014) 25 final  CESE 719/2014 fin  INT/731	juin
15.	<b>Équipements de protection individuelle</b>  Proposition de règlement du Parlement européen et du Conseil relatif aux équipements de protection individuelle  Rapporteuse: M <sup>me</sup> Emmanuelle BUTAUD-STUBBS (GRI-FR)	COM(2014) 186 final - 2014/0108 COD  CESE 2799/2014 fin - 2014/0108 COD  INT/742	juillet
16.	<b>Installations à câbles</b>  Proposition de règlement du Parlement européen et du Conseil relatif aux installations à câbles  <b>Rapporteur: M. Jan SIMONS (GRI-NL)</b>	COM(2014) 187 final - 2014/0107 COD  CESE 2911/2014 fin - 2014/0107 COD  INT/743	juillet
DG ECFIN			
17.	<b>Achever l'Union économique et monétaire – Les propositions du Comité économique et social européen pour la prochaine législature européenne</b>  Rapporteurs: M. Joost VAN IERSEL (GRI-NL) M. Carmelo CEDRONE (GRII-IT)	CESE 7057/2013 fin  ECO/357  avis d'initiative	juillet
DG EMPL			
18.	<b>Mesures en faveur de l'emploi des jeunes - Meilleures pratiques</b>  Rapporteuse: M <sup>me</sup> Christa SCHWENG (GRI-AT)	CESE 474/2014 fin  SOC/503  avis exploratoire à la demande de la présidence grecque	juin

19.	<b>EURES</b>  Proposition de règlement du Parlement européen et du Conseil relatif à un réseau européen des services de l'emploi, à l'accès des travailleurs aux services de mobilité et à la poursuite de l'intégration des marchés du travail  Rapporteuse: M <sup>me</sup> Vladimíra DRBALOVÁ (GRI-CZ) Corapporteur: M. Luis Miguel PARIZA CASTAÑOS (GRII-ES)	COM(2014) 6 final - 2014/0002 COD  CESE 518/2014 fin - 2014/0002 COD  SOC/500	juin
20.	<b>Cadre de qualité de l'Union européenne pour l'anticipation des changements et des restructurations (communication)</b>  Communication de la Commission au Parlement européen, au Conseil, au Comité économique et social européen et au Comité des régions sur le cadre de qualité de l'Union européenne pour l'anticipation des changements et des restructurations  Rapporteur: M. Joost VAN IERSEL (GRI-NL) Corapporteur: M. Thomas STUDENT (Cat. 2-DE)	COM(2013) 882 final  CESE 217/2014 fin  CCMI/124	juillet
<b>DG MARE</b>			
21.	<b>Croissance et emploi dans le tourisme côtier et maritime (communication)</b>  Communication de la Commission au Parlement européen, au Conseil, au Comité économique et social européen et au Comité des régions - Une stratégie européenne pour plus de croissance et d'emploi dans le tourisme côtier et maritime  Rapporteur: M. Paulo BARROS VALE (GRI-PT)	COM(2014) 86 final  CESE 2242/2014 fin  INT/740	juillet
<b>DG AGRI</b>			
22.	<b>Fruits et lait dans les établissements scolaires</b>  Proposition de règlement du Parlement européen et du Conseil modifiant le règlement (UE) n° 1308/2013 et le règlement (UE) n° 1306/2013 en ce qui concerne le régime d'aide à la distribution de fruits et légumes, de bananes et de lait dans les établissements scolaires  Rapporteur: M. Adalbert KIENLE (GRI-DE)	COM(2014) 32 final - 2014/0014 COD  CESE 1559/2014 fin - 2014/0014 COD  NAT/642	juillet

23.	<b>Nouvelle stratégie de l'UE pour les forêts (communication)</b>  Communication de la Commission au Parlement européen, au Conseil, au Comité économique et social européen et au Comité des régions - Une nouvelle stratégie de l'UE pour les forêts et le secteur forestier  Rapporteur: M. Seppo KALLIO (GRIII-FI) Corapporteur: M. Brendan BURNS (GRI-UK)	COM(2013) 659 final  CESE 7442/2013 fin  NAT/624	juillet
DG ENV			
24.	<b>Exploration d'hydrocarbures par fracturation (communication)</b>  Communication de la Commission au Parlement européen, au Conseil, au Comité économique et social européen et au Comité des régions relative à l'exploration et à la production d'hydrocarbures (tels que le gaz de schiste) par fracturation hydraulique à grands volumes dans l'Union européenne  Rapporteur: M. Josef ZBOŘIL (GRI-CZ) Corapporteur: M. Sorin IONIȚĂ (GRIII-RO)	COM(2014) 23 final/2  CESE 1320/2014 fin  NAT/629	juin
25.	<b>Trafic d'espèces sauvages (communication)</b>  Communication de la Commission au Conseil et au Parlement européen sur l'approche adoptée par l'UE en matière de lutte contre le trafic d'espèces sauvages  Rapporteur: M. Antonio POLICA (GRII-IT)	COM(2014) 64 final  CESE 1723/2014 fin  NAT/643	juin

26.	<p><b>Programme "Air pur pour l'Europe"</b></p> <p>Proposition de décision du Conseil relative à l'approbation de l'amendement au protocole de 1999 à la Convention de 1979 sur la pollution atmosphérique transfrontière à longue distance relatif à la réduction de l'acidification, de l'eutrophisation et de l'ozone troposphérique</p> <p>Communication de la Commission au Parlement européen, au Conseil, au Comité économique et social européen et au Comité des régions - Un programme "Air pur pour l'Europe"</p> <p>Proposition de directive du Parlement européen et du Conseil relative à la limitation des émissions de certains polluants dans l'atmosphère en provenance des installations de combustion moyennes</p> <p>Proposition de directive du Parlement européen et du Conseil concernant la réduction des émissions nationales de certains polluants atmosphériques et modifiant la directive 2003/35/CE</p> <p>Rapporteur: M. Antonello PEZZINI (GRI-IT)</p>	<p>COM(2013) 917 final - 2013/0448 NLE</p> <p>COM(2013) 918 final</p> <p>COM(2013) 919 final - 2013/0442 COD</p> <p>COM(2013) 920 final - 2013/0443 COD</p> <p>CESE 637/2014 fin - 2013/0448 NLE, - 2013/0442 COD, - 2013/0443 COD</p> <p>NAT/634</p>	juillet
<b>DG TRADE</b>			
27.	<p><b>Les relations commerciales transatlantiques et le point de vue du CESE sur l'amélioration de la coopération et un éventuel accord de libre-échange entre l'UE et les États-Unis</b></p> <p>Rapporteur: M. Jacek KRAWCZYK (GRI-PL) Corapporteur: M. Sandy BOYLE (GRII-UK)</p>	<p>CESE 5469/2013 fin</p> <p>REX/390</p> <p>avis d'initiative</p>	juillet
<b>DG COMP</b>			
28.	<p><b>Aides d'État aux aéroports et aux compagnies aériennes</b></p> <p>Révision des lignes directrices communautaires sur le financement des aéroports et les aides d'État au démarrage pour les compagnies aériennes au départ d'aéroports régionaux</p> <p>Rapporteur: M. Jacek KRAWCZYK (GRI-PL) Corapporteur: M. Nico WENNMACHER (GRII-LU)</p>	<p>C(2014) 963 final</p> <p>CESE 1544/2014 fin</p> <p>CCMI/125</p>	juillet



DG HOME			
29.	<b>Une Europe ouverte et sûre (communication)</b>  Communication de la Commission au Parlement européen, au Conseil, au Comité économique et social européen et au Comité des régions – Faire de l'Europe ouverte et sûre une réalité  Rapporteur: M. José Isaías RODRÍGUEZ GARCÍA-CARO (GRI-ES)	COM(2014) 154 final  CESE 1800/2014 fin  SOC/505	juillet
30.	<b>Politique européenne d'immigration et relations avec les pays tiers</b>  Rapporteur: M. Panagiotis GKOFAS (GRIII-EL) Corapporteur: M. Luis Miguel PARIZA CASTAÑOS (GRII-ES)	CESE 873/2014 fin  REX/398  avis exploratoire	juillet
DG CNECT			
31.	<b>Politique et gouvernance de l'internet: le rôle de l'Europe à l'avenir (communication)</b>  Communication de la Commission au Parlement européen, au Conseil, au Comité économique et social européen et au Comité des régions - Politique et gouvernance de l'internet: le rôle de l'Europe à l'avenir  Rapporteur: M. Antonio LONGO (GRIII-IT)	COM(2014) 72 final  CESE 1699/2014 fin  TEN/549	juillet
32.	<b>Cyberattaques dans l'UE</b>  Rapporteur: M. Thomas McDONOGH (GRI-IE)	CESE 1488/2014 fin  TEN/550  avis d'initiative	juillet
33.	<b>Société numérique: accès, éducation, formation, emploi, outils pour l'égalité</b>  Rapporteuse: M <sup>me</sup> Isabel CAÑO AGUILAR (GRII-ES)	CESE 773/2014 fin  TEN/548  avis d'initiative	juillet
DG ELARG			
34.	<b>Améliorer la transparence et le caractère ouvert des négociations d'adhésion à l'Union européenne</b>  Rapporteuse: M <sup>me</sup> Marina ŠKRABALO (GRIII-HR)	CESE 1609/2014 fin  REX/401  avis d'initiative	juillet

DG ECHO			
35.	<b>Hyogo post-2015 (communication)</b>  Communication de la Commission au Parlement européen, au Conseil, au Comité économique et social européen et au Comité des régions sur le cadre d'action de Hyogo post-2015: gérer les risques pour parvenir à la résilience  Rapporteur: M. Giuseppe Antonio Maria IULIANO (GRII-IT)	COM(2014) 216 final  CESE 2826/2014 fin  REX/407	juillet

<b>N°1</b>	<b>Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on reporting and transparency of securities financing transactions</b> <b>COM(2014) 40 final - EESC 1466/2014 fin - INT/738</b> <b>500<sup>th</sup> Plenary Session - July 2014</b> <b>Rapporteur: Mr Edgardo Maria IOZIA (GRIT-IT)</b> <b>DG MARKT – Commissioner BARNIER</b>	
	<b>Points of the EESC opinion considered essential</b>	<b>Commission position</b>
5.8  The EESC thinks it important for the principle of equivalence to be included in the proposal, in keeping with Article 13 of the European Market Infrastructure Regulation (EMIR), and asks the Commission to effect this.		The suggestion of the Committee will be taken into account in the framework of negotiations with other institutions.
5.10  The EESC endorses Article 15 in its entirety, but notes the risk of possible disputes between counterparties regarding the efficacy and equivalence of a system other than signature and suggests that at least some examples be given of these equivalent alternative mechanisms, for example registration by telephone or electronic certification.		The suggestion of the Committee will be taken into account in the framework of negotiations with other institutions.

<p><b>N°2 Crowdfunding in the EU</b>  <b>COM(2014) 172 final - EESC 2102/2014 fin – INT/741</b>  <b>500<sup>th</sup> Plenary Session – July 2044</b>  <b>Rapporteur: Mr Juan MENDOZA CASTRO (GR11-ES)</b>  <b>DG MARKT– Commissioner BARNIER</b></p>	
<b>Points of the EESC opinion considered essential</b>	<b>Commission position</b>
1.9. European legislation should only cover specific types of financial return crowdfunding, and not donations and other forms of non-profit sponsoring.	The Communication distinguishes between crowdfunding for financial returns and crowdfunding for non-financial returns. It explicitly mentions that at the time of scheduled reviews of existing legislation, the Commission will consider whether it may be appropriate to calibrate requirements to the specific features of crowdfunding with financial returns.
1.10. These rules should be based on achieving balance, protecting investors and avoiding excessive regulation. Nevertheless, the regulator's actions are crucial to fostering investor confidence.	As the Communication on crowdfunding already refers to it, the Commission will keep crowdfunding under close monitoring and will regularly assess the state of EU and domestic regulatory frameworks, and consider whether further EU action is necessary in order for crowdfunding to flourish while taking into account the interest of contributors.
1.13. The EESC suggests that the EU should supplement action taken by the Member States to support non-profit initiatives that promote values such as employment, solidarity, pluralism, democracy and freedom.	As the Communication also announced, the Commission will take soft measures to promote non-financial forms of crowdfunding. The European Crowdfunding Stakeholders Forum has among its tasks to help the Commission in raising awareness, providing information and training modules for project owners, promoting transparency and exchange of best practice.

<p><b>N°3 Proposal for a Directive as regards the encouragement of long-term shareholder engagement</b>  <b>COM(2014) 213 final – EESC 2817/2014 fin – INT/745</b>  <b>500<sup>th</sup> Plenary Session - July 2014</b>  <b>Rapporteur: Mr Michael SMYTH (GR11-UK)</b>  <b>DG MARKT – Commissioner BARNIER</b></p>	
<b>Points of the EESC opinion considered essential</b>	<b>Commission position</b>
Overall positive opinion	
Point 4.1 The administrative burden on companies is not disproportionate, but the Commission should evaluate the impact on SMEs from this perspective earlier than after five years of the entry into force of the Directive.	The scope of the Directive is listed companies, and no specific difference exists as far as the size of the listed company is concerned. The proposed rules which represent an administrative burden for companies - including for SMEs - are subject to discussions with the co-legislators, therefore it seems premature to have a position on texts which have not yet been agreed. However, the Commission will consider the possibility of an earlier review in order to evaluate the impact of the Directive on SMEs.
4.6 Long-term shareholder engagement should involve all stakeholders, including employees, the Commission should reflect on how better to involve employees in the building of long-term value.	The proposal aims at fostering more responsible share ownership, and it is focussing on the role of shareholders and how they could play a more important role in creating value by controlling the management better and improving corporate governance. The proposal incentivises shareholders to monitor companies better and improve their performance, including non-financial (social, environmental, etc.) performance. This would benefit employees as well. In the future, the Commission could consider reflecting on how better to involve employees in

	<p>the building of long-term value. Besides, the Commission is already working on the issue of employee share ownership. The current work on this issue within the Commission follows the 2012 Action Plan on European company law and corporate governance, in which the Commission committed to take appropriate action to encourage employee share ownership throughout the Union. In this context, a Pilot Project was launched in September 2013 with the support of Parliament (which adopted a formal resolution on this subject in January 2014) and with the help of an external contractor. The interim report was presented at a public conference in January 2014 and the draft final report will be published before the end of 2014.</p>
--	--

N°4	<p><b>Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on Long-Term Financing of the European Economy</b>  <b>COM(2014) 168 final – EESC 2476/2014 fin - ECO/365</b>  <b>500<sup>th</sup> Plenary Session – July 2014</b>  <b>Rapporteur: Mr Michael SMYTH (GRIII-UK)</b>  <b>Co-rapporteur: Mr Vincent FARRAGUIA (GRI-MT)</b>  <b>DG MARKT – Commissioner BARNIER</b></p>	
	<p><b>Points of the EESC opinion considered essential</b></p>	<p><b>Commission position</b></p>
	<p>There is, for example, in many Member States a bias in fiscal systems in favour of debt financing of business which incentivises companies to utilise debt rather than equity as a source of funding. For a more diversified and stable long term financing of business, Member States need to be encouraged to promote greater use of equity investment.</p>	
	<p>To the extent that no approximation of Member States' tax laws has taken place Member States are free to establish their own tax rules in line with their different policy objectives as long as those rules do not infringe the provisions of the Treaties.</p> <p>As set out in the Communication, the Commission will continue, through country specific recommendations in the European semester process, to incentivise equity investment in particular for Member States with high debt bias in corporate taxation.</p>	
	<p>New instruments for long term investment (such as EU 2020 Project Bonds) are needed now and the EESC urges the Commission to move rapidly to implementation.</p>	
	<p>As set out in the Communication, the Commission is assessing a number of improvements to the Project Bond Initiative (PBI), following the interim report of the pilot phase (COM(2013) 929final) and the possible extension of project bond solutions to other infrastructure sectors, including sustainable transport, renewable generation and smart grid assets. In particular, practical arrangements for possible contributions under the European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF) in line with the respective regulations may be examined.</p>	

<p>The EESC welcomes the commitment from the Commission to investigate the fragmented cross-border flows of savings and also to assess the feasibility of developing an EU-wide savings product.</p>	<p>The Commission will undertake by the end of 2014 a study of possible market failures and other shortcomings regarding cross-border flows of savings, including an overview of national savings account models and an assessment of the opportunity of introducing an EU savings account.</p>
<p>The EESC recommends that the Commission also undertakes a feasibility study of utilising sovereign funds alongside more mainstream long term sources such as pension funds and the big insurers.</p>	<p>The Communication already anticipates a number of actions which could attract institutional investors, such as pension funds and insurers, to become involved in public private partnerships (PPPs) to co-invest in European projects.</p>
<p>The EESC urges the Commission to tackle these national informational/confidentiality issues (the lack of adequate, comparable, reliable and readily available credit information on SMEs, and the fragmented nature of national sources of such information) as a matter of urgency.</p>	<p>The Commission will undertake in 2014 a mapping of the EU and national legislation and practices affecting the availability of SME credit information, with a view to considering possible EU approaches to the credit scoring industry and assessing the feasibility of harmonising/increasing the comparability of SME data across the EU.</p>
<p>The EESC sees merit in giving a role to Regional Development Agencies (RDA) in the assessment of SME riskiness.</p>	<p>The role of Regional Development Agencies could be considered in the mapping exercise of EU and national legislation and practices affecting availability of SME credit information.</p>
<p>There is also a commitment by the Commission to resume the dialogue between banks and SMEs with a view to improving the latter's financial literacy, particularly with regards to the feedback provided by banks on loan applications. The Institute of International Finance (IIF)</p>	<p>The Commission is tackling the issue through a number of actions aside of the Communication. To complement the services provided at Member State and local level, the Commission is reinforcing the financial advisory capacity of the Enterprise Europe</p>



<p>study goes further and recommends the education of SMEs on available alternative funding options and the benefits of participating in alternative funding programs. The EESC endorses this view.</p>	<p>Network as a tool to improve SME financial literacy, also with regards to bank feedbacks. Moreover, a web portal (<a href="http://www.access2finance.eu">www.access2finance.eu</a>) provides a full overview of EU financing options for SMEs.</p>
---	---

N°5	<b>Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on structural measures improving the resilience of EU credit institutions COM(2014) 43 final – EESC 1791/2014 fin - INT/717</b> <b>Rapporteur: Mr Edgardo Maria IOZIA (GRII-IT)</b> <b>DG MARKT – Commissioner BARNIER</b>	
	<b>Points of the EESC opinion considered essential</b>	<b>Commission position</b>
	<p>1.4. The Committee expresses doubts about the decision to allow the coexistence of various national regulations and, at the same time, the EU regulation. The EESC believes that such a framework might not guarantee the uniform application of the new rules. It welcomes the fact that this derogation has been established solely for legislation that pre-exists the proposal for a regulation, provided that complete equivalence with the regulation under consideration is guaranteed.</p>	<p>EU action is necessary to ensure that divergent national solutions do not create fault-lines in the Banking Union or undermine the functioning of the single market.</p> <p>The derogation in Article 21 has been framed very carefully by applying strict criteria for application. It will apply only to institutions in those Member States that have adopted laws meeting the objective criteria before the EC proposal was made (i.e. 29/01/2014); it will be made only on a case-by-case, bank-by-bank basis and subject to the Commission's approval, and the EBA consultation.</p>
	<p>1.6. The EESC stresses that the impact of the proposed legislation on jobs has not been given appropriate consideration. Hundreds of thousands of jobs could be lost due to the overall regulation of financial services and it is unacceptable that no measures have been planned to reduce the substantial direct and indirect social impact. This regulation may have a limited direct impact but the influence it could have on the assets of businesses would reverberate throughout the financial system. However, it has to be acknowledged that the reduced banking risk would benefit the real economy as a</p>	<p>The Commission does not share the assessment that "hundreds of thousands of jobs could be lost" which is not in any way substantiated.</p> <p>The financial crises led to millions of job losses and the Commission brought this legislation forward to avoid similar catastrophes in the future. The Commission estimates that the broader impact on employment would be actually positive due to the reduced probability and impact of the possible financial crisis in the future and also due to greater incentives for banks to engage in traditional customer-oriented</p>

<p>whole, with unquestionable benefits for employment in general.</p>	<p>activities, thus promoting lending to the real economy, in contrast to risky transactions-oriented activities.</p>
<p>5.14 The EESC has expressed its reservations about the use of delegated acts on many previous occasions. Although it acknowledges the importance of adapting legislation over the years, the EESC points out that the use of delegated acts introduces elements of uncertainty that are inadvisable in this area.</p>	<p>The Commission has ensured that the use of delegated acts has been kept to the very minimum. This is a new area of regulation, where appropriate calibration of the details is particularly important, also to respect the principle of proportionality.</p> <p>This suggestion of the Committee is expected to be raised during the negotiation process by the co-legislators.</p>

N°6	<p><b>Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the activities and supervision of institutions for occupational retirement provision (recast)</b>  <b>COM(2014) 167 final – EESC 2354/2014 fin – SOC/509</b>  <b>500<sup>th</sup> Plenary Session - July 2014</b>  <b>Rapporteur: Mr Krzysztof PATER (GRIII-PL)</b>  <b>Co-rapporteur: Mr Petru Sorin DANDEA (GRII-RO)</b>  <b>DG MARKT - Commissioner BARNIER</b></p>	
	<b>Points of the EESC opinion considered essential</b>	<b>Commission position</b>
	The Committee supports most of the proposals set out in the European Commission's documents on the draft IORP II directive	The Commission welcomes the EESC's support for the IORP II proposal.
	The EESC disagrees with the approach to IORPs as purely financial market institutions, which fails to acknowledge and respect their specific circumstances. IORPs are institutions which perform an important social function. The proposed directive must take account of the key role played by the social partners in establishing and managing programmes and the fact that the underlying principles of their operations have to reflect national social security and labour law.	The Commission fully supports the EESC's view that IORPs are not only financial institutions. The requirements that social partners have to meet have not changed since IORP I; they have only been clarified in the interest of member protection. For this purpose, a new article was introduced, Article 25(3), with the aim of protecting the role of social partners in the management of IORPs.
	A one-size-fits-all approach is not the right way of achieving the Commission's objectives given the numerous fundamental differences between pension schemes in individual Member States and occupational pension schemes.	The Commission shares the opinion of the EESC that Member States should retain full responsibility for the organisation of their pension systems. At the same time, Member States and the European Parliament have agreed in June 2003 that the EU Single Market can add value to policy undertaken at the national level. This is why Directive 2003/41/EC on the activities and supervision of institutions for occupational retirement provision was adopted. IORP II updates and clarifies

	<p>already existing rules and enhances member and beneficiary protection.</p>
<p>The EESC is at the same time firmly opposed to the European Commission proposal that "Member States shall not prevent institutions from ... investing in instruments that ... are not traded on regulated markets, multilateral trading facilities or organised trading facilities".</p>	<p>The Commission believes that the proposal strikes the right balance between allowing investment freedom for IORPs and strengthened governance and risk management requirements to ensure that IORPs are managed prudently.</p> <p>Investments in instruments that are not traded on regulated markets would have to remain prudent but will allow IORPs to diversify across different asset classes.</p>
<p>The Committee would like to see the introduction of possible exemptions from the scope of this directive in the initial phase of an IORP (up to 12 months).</p>	<p>The Commission would not be favourable to this proposal. Once an employer decides to create an IORP, that new IORP will have to be registered/authorised and will therefore have to meet the full criteria.</p>
<p>The Committee welcomes the introduction of the possibility to transfer pension schemes to other institutions in other Member States,</p>	<p>The Commission welcomes the EESC's support for the possibility to transfer pension schemes.</p>
<p>The Committee is in favour of measures to support cross-border aspects of IORP activity, and emphasises that it is very important to promote and propagate IORPs in countries where this form of pensions scheme is non-existent or is only just beginning to emerge, if the occupational pension sector is to make significant progress</p>	<p>The Commission welcomes the EESC's support on cross-border aspects of the Proposal.</p> <p>The Commission believes that a more harmonised and robust EU regulatory framework for the supervision of occupational pension funds can pave the way for the development of occupational pension funds in those Member States where they are currently underdeveloped or non-existent. The revision of the Directive is also expected to facilitate cross-border activity by removing some uncertainties about the applicable legal framework and reducing costs.</p>

<p>The Committee proposes that the skills assessment carried out for managers be applied to the entire managing or supervisory body, and not individual people.</p>	<p>The fit and proper requirements in Article 23 currently apply to both persons effectively running the institution as well as those having key functions in it. The Commission is open to distinguishing the requirements for these categories.</p>
<p>The Committee has serious doubts as to whether the proposed idea of having a two-page statement of standardised information with a clear layout for the recipient is a feasible one. Different occupational pension schemes involve different types of risk for their members, who also have differing expectations of future pensions.</p>	<p>Introducing a "pension benefit statement" (PBS) standardised at the EU level is one of the main improvements of the Proposal. The Commission is of the view that members in the accumulation phase of a pension fund must receive clear, understandable information in order to be able to take informed decisions about their investments (where relevant) and ultimately their future retirement planning. A concise, standardised PBS would be able to offer that information, in a comparable way, while allowing Member States to go further and specify country-related information in addition to the standardised PBS.</p>
<p>The Committee believes that ultimately there should be at least two information templates - one for schemes based on defined contributions and one for schemes based on defined benefits.</p>	<p>The Commission would like to avoid having different templates for the PBS, as this would dilute its effectiveness and comparability. In the Commission's view, the PBS accommodates the difference between defined benefit (DB) and defined contribution (DC) schemes sufficiently by allowing IORPs to leave text boxes empty if the provision of the information is not relevant.</p> <p>The delegated act foreseen in the proposal will build on good practice for this purpose and will aim to reflect the differences in information provision between DC and DB schemes.</p>

<p>In addition, each Member State must have the possibility to supplement this template with several pieces of information which are vital for scheme members or beneficiaries, based on the specific nature of national rules.</p>	<p>The Commission entirely agrees with the EESC on this point and would like to confirm that the PBS will follow a layered approach where the inclusion of additional national information will be possible.</p>
---	--

<p><b>N°7 Commission Communication on A Roadmap for Completing the Single Market for Parcel Delivery: Build Trust in Delivery Services and Encourage Online Sales</b>  <b>COM(2013) 886 final – EESC 759/2014 fin – INT/727</b>  <b>500<sup>th</sup> Plenary Session - July 2014</b>  <b>Rapporteur: Mr Daniela RONDINELLI (GR11-IT)</b>  <b>DG MARKT – Commissioner BARNIER</b></p>	
<b>Points of the EESC opinion considered essential</b>	<b>Commission position</b>
<p>The EESC welcomes the roadmap for completing the single market in delivery of products sold online, which has great potential for growth and jobs. Efficient, reliable delivery services constitute an essential pillar for promoting e-commerce and strengthening trust between sellers and purchasers.</p> <p>In the EESC's view, protection and actual availability require: shared responsibilities, tracking and tracing, and interoperability; access to the widest possible choice throughout the EU including the island territories; certainty of rights and responsibilities of those involved – particularly SMEs and consumers – especially as regards complaints and returns; simple and comparable data collection; and a strong social and educational dimension.</p>	<p>In line with the Commission's Green Paper - An integrated parcel delivery market for the growth of e-commerce in the EU (COM(2012) 698 final) and Communication from the Commission – A roadmap for completing the single market for parcel delivery: Build trust in delivery services and encourage online sales (COM(2013) 886 final).</p> <p>The opinion further highlights and builds on the fact that delivery services represent one of the fundamentals for the further growth of e-commerce markets in the EU.</p>
<p>In the EESC's opinion objectives ought to be based not just on voluntary agreements and codes, desirable though these are, but also on a minimum European regulatory</p>	<p>The Commission appreciates the EESC opinion. A broad discussion on self-regulation versus additional legislation had taken place during the parcel</p>

---

<sup>1</sup> ODR: online dispute resolution; ADR: alternative dispute resolution directive.



<p>framework, which can respond efficiently and in a flexible way to the unresolved shortcomings in the market which discourage consumers and SMEs from buying online, and could resolve problems relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• shared responsibility of operators along the entire online supply chain;</li> <li>• traceability of deliveries;</li> <li>• explicit compliance with the European rules on protection of personal data;</li> <li>• a clear choice between several delivery options;</li> <li>• common definitions of concepts and full interoperability;</li> <li>• access to a universal service at an affordable cost;</li> <li>• collection of comparable statistical data, simplified for smaller operators;</li> <li>• a requirement for uniform application of VAT procedures;</li> <li>• mutual cross-border acceptance of network systems of the national problem solving centres and ODR/ADR systems<sup>1</sup>;</li> <li>• the obligation to guarantee fair working conditions;</li> <li>• transparency regarding the conditions and pricing of the service;</li> <li>• continuing vocational training of staff;</li> <li>• penalties for non-compliance with requirements relating to the RAPEX-IMI alert system<sup>1</sup>;</li> </ul>	<p>initiative process. The Commission is of the opinion that the self-regulatory approach of the roadmap has already led to a number of improvements and has thus proven to be the right approach so far, it nevertheless appreciates the proposals in the Committee's opinion which go beyond self-regulation. These will be a valuable contribution in the follow-up and future discussions, where the large majority of industry/stakeholders are expected to oppose further policy action in the area of e-commerce related parcel delivery.</p> <p>Concerning the section on financial support, the Commission has taken note of the instruments and initiatives listed by the EESC; these are fully coherent with the roadmap and are thus taken into account respectively.</p>
---	---

<sup>1</sup> IMI: Internal Market Information System.

<sup>2</sup> European Committee for Standardisation.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• creation of a European trust mark based on technical and regulatory standards, to be tasked to the CEN<sup>2</sup>, setting quality indicators;</li> <li>• measures favouring small and medium-sized enterprises in terms of simplifying access to the market and to web platforms on a level playing field.</li> </ul> <p>The opinion also mentions the need for guidance on relevant EU financial instruments when promoting interoperability, SMEs, the environment, territorial cohesion and employment, and lists a number of current programmes and initiatives, such as Horizon 2020, the Galileo and ISA programmes and the Digital Agenda; the 7th Environment Action Programme, the 2030 Energy and Climate Framework, and the EU Transport GHG: Routes to 2050 II programme; EIB support for innovative businesses, the COSME programme; new structural funds programming period 2014-2030 and support for island, rural and outermost regions; Agenda for new skills and jobs; the European Consumer Agenda – Boosting confidence and growth; Erasmus Plus 2014-2020; Education and Training).</p>	
<p>Two actions have been added:</p> <p>1) affordable market access and availability, both covering market access issues and access to service features (such as track and trace) and information tools. Affordable market access and availability should be guaranteed across the whole EU, in particular on islands and in remote territories.</p> <p>2) a broader European social dialogue including all social partners relevant for the e-commerce value chain which should</p>	<p>These had been discussed comprehensively at EESC working group study meetings where the Commission was present, and have been supported by the Commission.</p>

<p>address issues such as fair and decent pay and working conditions, so as to eliminate insecure and undeclared work, particularly in outsourced "last-mile" tasks and access to suitable opportunities for basic and further training</p>	
---	--

<b>N°8</b>	<b>Finance for business: an investigation of alternative supply mechanisms (own-initiative opinion)</b> <b>EESC 1346/2014 fin – ECO/361</b> <b>500<sup>th</sup> Plenary Session – July 2014</b> <b>Rapporteur: Mr Michael SMYTH (GR11-UK)</b> <b>DG MARKT – Commissioner BARNIER</b>
<b>Points of the EESC opinion considered essential</b>	<b>Commission position</b>
<p>To date, the response from EU policymakers has not been proportionate to the problem and there is some evidence that the effects of enhanced EU and international banking regulation may have exacerbated the business lending problem by making banks more risk averse.</p>	<p>Over the past five years, more than 40 proposals have been tabled by the European Commission (many of which are already in force). They aimed at restoring market confidence, financial stability, and the integrity and efficiency of the European financial system. The first positive effects of the reformed financial system can already be observed and continue to unfold. Ongoing monitoring and review will be necessary to further evaluate the implementation and the overall impact and effectiveness of the reforms<sup>1</sup>.</p>
<p>Impediments to more accurate assessment of credit worthiness and risk by lenders usually revolve around the cost and lack of relevant financial information.</p> <p>National repositories of credit risk data should be consolidated with the European Data Warehouse, eventually leading to a European central credit registry.</p>	<p>Under the Commission Communication on long-term financing of the European Economy (COM (2014)168final), the Commission will undertake in 2014 a mapping of the EU and national legislation and practices affecting the availability of SME credit information, with a view to considering possible EU approaches to the credit scoring industry and assessing the feasibility of harmonising/increasing the comparability of SME data across the EU.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Commission will</p>

---

<sup>1</sup> COM(2014) 279, A reformed financial sector for Europe.

	<p>evaluate in 2014 the feasibility to voluntarily make available, where possible by way of a single portal, existing information on infrastructure investment plans and projects by national, regional and municipal authorities.</p> <p>The Commission will also assess in 2014 the feasibility and practical arrangements of collecting and, where possible, making available comprehensive and standardised credit statistics on infrastructure debt within a single access point. This exercise would support the work done in the Financial Stability Board (FSB) and the G20 context and could involve the European Investment Bank (EIB), the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), NPBs and institutional investors.</p> <p>The AnaCredit project run by the European Central Bank (ECB) also aims at harmonising data on, for example, cross-border loans to assess the creditworthiness of borrowers, by mainly leveraging on data available at national central credit registers level.</p>
<p>Other proposals to improve the flow of finance to SMEs include: (...) - providing incentives to private equity and venture capital investors to expand investment in SMEs and address gaps in funding;</p>	<p>The recent European Venture Capital regulation (EUVeCa) makes it easier for venture capitalists to raise funds across Europe for the benefit of start-ups and SMEs. The regulation lays down a uniform "single rule book" governing the marketing of funds under the designation "European Venture Capital Funds".</p> <p>The 2014-2020 EU programmes COSME and Horizon 2020 include a risk capital facility which will provide venture capital financing to SMEs and</p>

	small mid-caps, by leveraging the participation of private sector investors.
<p>Other proposals to improve the flow of finance to SMEs include:</p> <p>(...)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- educating SMEs about alternative funding options and the relative benefits of alternative funding mechanisms;</li> </ul>	<p>To complement the services provided at Member State and local level, the Commission is reinforcing the financial advisory capacity of the Enterprise Europe Network as a tool to improve SME financial literacy, also with regards to bank feedbacks. Moreover, a web portal (<a href="http://www.access2finance.eu">www.access2finance.eu</a>) provides a full overview of EU financing options for SMEs.</p>
<p>The EESC believes that a similar scheme to the Funding for Lending Scheme (FLS) should be implemented across the euro area. A euro area FLS-type scheme could, over a limited period of up to two or three years, contribute to a restoration of finance for business to more normal levels while facilitating the ongoing deleveraging process.</p> <p>( ...) The EESC believes that EU policymakers should do more to provide shorter term solutions such as the incentive schemes (FLS or Longer-Term Refinancing Operation (LTRO)) outlined above.</p>	<p>As the EESC report points out, the ECB announced on 5 June 2014 liquidity measures to boost bank lending to SMEs, including the Targeted Longer-Term Refinancing Operations (TLTROs).</p> <p>In the context of the 2014-2020 Multi Annual Financial Framework, the EU has put in place a set of programmes aimed at addressing the SME financing needs. In particular, COSME and Horizon 2020 include a loan guarantee facility aimed at channelling more credit to SMEs and small mid-caps, also for their working capital needs, by leveraging the role of credit institutions.</p>

Nº9	<p><b>Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions – The EU Justice Agenda for 2020 – Strengthening Trust, Mobility and Growth within the Union</b></p> <p><b>COM(2014) 144 final - EESC 1943/2014 fin – SOC/506</b></p> <p><b>500th Plenary Session - July 2014</b></p> <p><b>Rapporteur: Mr Xavier VERBOVEN (GR11-BE)</b></p> <p><b>DG JUST – Commissioner REICHERTS</b></p>
Points of the EESC opinion considered essential	Commission position
<p>With regard to the policy objective of "enhancing mutual trust", the Committee considers this to be an appropriate policy priority that is in line with the provisions of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (hereinafter TFEU) under the heading Justice.</p>	<p>The Commission welcomes the fact that the Committee shares its view with regard to the importance of enhancing mutual trust.</p>
<p>With regard to the policy objective "supporting economic growth", the Committee notes that striving for economic growth is recognised as an important priority, albeit on condition that sustainable growth is meant. Economic growth cannot, however, in itself be viewed as a policy objective of a justice policy that, having regard to the TFEU, is to be aimed at achieving a high level of security and easy access to justice, which cannot be subordinated to economic growth. This does not take away the fact that a properly functioning justice system within the Member States of the European Union can have a positive effect on sustainable economic growth within the Union, (...).</p>	<p>The Commission appreciates that the Committee recognises that properly functioning justice systems within Member States can have a positive effect on growth within the Union. In fact, in its EU Justice Agenda for 2020, the Commission stated that over the past years, notably under the impression of the financial and sovereign debt crisis and in line with the Europe 2020 strategy, EU Justice policy has become <i>also</i> a <i>support</i> for economic recovery, growth and structural reforms. “Growth” is one of three major challenges identified in the Commission Communication and the Commission stressed that EU Justice policy should continue to <i>support</i> economic recovery, growth and tackling unemployment.</p>
<p>With respect to the policy objective "supporting mobility", the Committee</p>	<p>The Commission shares the Committee’s view that mobility is</p>

<p>points out that supporting mobility within the European Union, in particular by ensuring that citizens of the Union can exercise their rights everywhere, can be linked to the objective set out in the TFEU of facilitating access to justice.</p>	<p>linked to the need to ensure that citizens can exercise their rights all over the EU. Europeans are increasingly taking advantage of the rights conferred on them by the EU Treaties. Despite progress in the enjoyment of their rights, EU citizens still face some obstacles. The EU needs to address these obstacles with determination.</p>
<p>The Committee also notes that the Commission's Communication fails to mention a number of things that could contribute to achieving an area of freedom, security and justice.</p>	<p>The Commission takes note of the Committee's view and the examples mentioned in this context. The Commission would like to refer to the conclusions of its Communication where it says that the EU <i>Justice Agenda</i> for 2020 sets out the Commission's <i>orientations</i> for the political direction for the EU's work in the years to come.</p>



<p><b>N°10</b></p>	<p><b>Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: Together towards competitive and resource-efficient urban mobility</b>  <b>COM(2013) 913 final – EESC 1042/2014 fin – TEN/546</b>  <b>499th Plenary session – June 2014</b>  <b>Rapporteur: Mr Edgardo Maria IOZIA (GRIT-IT)</b>  <b>DG MOVE - Vice President KALLAS</b></p>
<p><b>Points of the EESC opinion considered essential</b></p>	<p><b>Commission position</b></p>
<p>1.1 The EESC endorses the Commission Communication of 17 December 2013 and attaches great importance to the continuation of programmes that support the development of effective and sustainable urban mobility such as CIVITAS, IEE, etc.</p>	<p>As outlined in the Urban Mobility Package, the Commission will continue to reinforce relevant activities, e.g. the CIVITAS initiative will be continued until at least 2020. There are also new opportunities e.g. financing the urban nodes of the TEN-T network. A significant share of the European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF) is expected to be used for sustainable urban mobility measures.</p>
<p>1.2 The EESC considers it essential to...harness the principle of subsidiarity, just as the Commission has wisely struck a balance between the various levels of responsibility, particularly by actively involving the Member States.</p>	<p>The Commission welcomes the EESC support for the proposed approach – in particular the need to engage the Member States.</p>
<p>1.2 The EESC considers it essential to manage public-private complementarity.</p>	<p>Achieving systemic improvements in the transport sector requires joint efforts of public actors across all levels of governance, as well as private sector involvement, in the following areas highlighted by the 2011 White Paper on Transport: more action on urban logistics, smarter urban access regulations and road user charging, coordinated deployment of urban Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS) and urban road safety. The proposed approaches are set out in detail in the</p>

	accompanying Commission Staff Working Documents.
1.8 The Commission should ensure that the Member States guarantee this fundamental European right – the right to mobility – for all citizens, without discrimination.	The Commission will reflect on the attention given to vulnerable groups in the implementation of the urban mobility policy.
1.10 The EESC draws attention to the potential of urban logistics as an element of improved efficiency and sustainability. Urban logistics should therefore be given adequate attention in urban planning and in cooperation projects. The EESC also welcomes the initiatives planned by the Commission in this field.	The Commission welcomes EESC's support for the attention given to urban logistics and the planned initiatives.
1.11 The EESC calls on the Commission to draw together all initiatives and policies in the field of urban mobility into a single instrument. There are currently at least five portals dedicated to this issue, which represents a drain on resources and their effectiveness	The Commission agrees that coordinated action on urban mobility is needed – both at EU level and in the Member States. Hence the Urban Mobility Package sets out a proposal for joint action across the different layers of government and in various urban mobility-related areas. The Commission is also working to consolidate relevant platforms for information exchange, e.g. the Platform on Sustainable Mobility Plans which will replace several project-related websites by a "one-stop shop".
1.13 ICT, urban innovation and local initiatives are making it possible to improve mobility and to make cities more liveable for future generations.	The application of ICT to transport, to develop ITS, can bring tremendous benefits in terms of safety, network efficiency and minimise detrimental environmental impacts of transport.
2.11 The EESC stresses the importance of focussing on reducing road accidents and improving people's health by adopting long-term strategies.	The Commission welcomes the EESC statement on the importance of road safety and agrees that saving lives must remain a priority.
4.6 Working together: the Commission puts forward a set of specific recommendations to leverage coordinated action across all	The commonly used acronym related to the usage of smart solutions in urban transport is ITS. Using other acronyms

<p>levels of government and between the public and private sectors on four aspects:....□ the deployment of urban Smart Transport System (STS) solutions, and....</p>	<p>often contributes to confusion.</p>
--	--

<p><b>N°11</b></p> <p><b>Policy Framework for Climate and Energy 2020-2030</b></p> <p><b>COM(2014) 15 final – EESC 917/2014 fin – NAT/636</b></p> <p><b>499th Plenary Session – June 2014</b></p> <p><b>Rapporteur: Ms Ulla SIRKEINEN (GRI-IT)</b></p> <p><b>DG CLIMA – Commissioner HEDEGAARD</b></p>	
<p><b>Points of the EESC opinion considered essential</b></p>	<p><b>Commission position</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The EESC supports:</li> <li>– the proposal to set the target for reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by 2030 at 40%, because this is in accordance with the target of a 80-95% reduction by 2050 while still being ambitious,</li> <li>– the proposal for a common target of at least 27% for the share of renewable energy sources, but in contrast to the Commission proposal considers it necessary to fix specific national targets,</li> <li>– the Commission’s intention to present new proposals on energy efficiency after its assessment of present measures later this year, and</li> <li>– the proposal for a new iterative governance method.</li> </ul>	<p>The Commission thanks the EESC for their comprehensive consideration of the 2030 climate and energy policy framework and welcomes the support for its main components.</p> <p>Renewable energy has to continue to play a key role in the transition towards a competitive, secure and sustainable energy system. The Commission therefore proposed a binding target of increasing the share of renewable energy to at least 27% of the EU's energy consumption by 2030. Unlike in the current framework, the EU target for the share of renewable energy consumed in the EU would not be translated into national targets via EU legislation. This leaves greater flexibility for Member States and gives them the possibility to take advantage of the most cost-effective means of achieving a more sustainable, secure and competitive energy system. This increased flexibility will be combined with a strong European governance framework meant to ensure overall consistency and coherence with the wider principles of European energy policy.</p> <p>Following the review of the Energy Efficiency Directive, the Commission also proposes a 30% energy savings target at EU level for 2030.</p> <p>The strengthened system of collective</p>

	governance will ensure that delivery of these objectives is effective and fair.
<p>1.3 The EESC recommends</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– using the most cost-effective measures for implementation in order to diminish harmful consequences and protect the most vulnerable energy users,</li> <li>– consideration of sectoral targets for energy efficiency, for instance in the building sector, in order to tap the huge potential of this most promising way towards energy policy goals in a cost-effective manner,</li> <li>– developing methods of drawing up and implementing the proposed national plans with the genuine involvement of civil society and making consultation of neighbouring countries mandatory before national decisions with far-reaching consequences,</li> <li>– taking a decisive step towards a real European Energy Community by coordinating national plans, particularly with a view to securing the EU's energy supply,</li> <li>– pursuing decisive action to decrease the EU's very high dependence on energy from unreliable sources, including by setting binding national targets for renewables expansion,</li> <li>– providing stronger assistance for associated countries covered by the European Neighbourhood Policy in developing a low-carbon economy,</li> <li>– providing more information on plans to step up action in the non-ETS sector,</li> </ul>	<p>The Commission agrees that cost-effectiveness at EU level should be the main principle for EU climate and energy policies.</p> <p>Concerning efforts in non-ETS sectors, the 40% greenhouse gas emission reduction target would need to be translated into national targets for the non-ETS sectors, amounting to overall emission reductions for the EU of about 30% by 2030 as compared to 2005, while the proposed governance system should also allow for information on how this non-ETS target will be attained in an integrated manner.</p> <p>With regards to energy efficiency, the Commission recently adopted the Energy Efficiency Communication (COM(2014) 520 final) that includes next steps with relation to addressing the savings potential in the building sector.</p> <p>Concerning the implementation of national plans, the new European governance system will facilitate the coordination of national energy policies with neighbouring countries, foster regional cooperation between Member States and increase transparency.</p> <p>Regarding the issue of the EU's energy security, the Commission issued on 28 May 2014 the European Energy Security Strategy (COM(2014)330) that proposes actions in five key areas to address medium and long-term security of supply challenges. In particular, the strategy fully recognizes energy efficiency and renewables as key drivers to further lower the EU's energy dependence and insists on the diversification of supplier countries and</p>

<p>particularly in the transport, agriculture and land use sectors,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– providing more information on achievements in the creation of green jobs,</li> <li>– ensuring sufficient measures to avoid carbon leakage in energy intensive industries,</li> <li>– taking radical action on innovation and research as the providers of real solutions to the challenges, in combination with measures to promote the manufacture of equipment for the low carbon economy, while ensuring that delivery by industry is supported by better training, and</li> <li>– making the international development of climate policies the top priority and in parallel paying more attention to adaptation to climate change. This also means representing the legitimate interests of European industrial sectors under pressure from international competition due to stricter European energy and climate policies, in the WTO negotiations as well as the TTIP.</li> </ul>	<p>routes as well as on the completion of the internal energy market and the reinforcement of energy infrastructures.</p> <p>Concerning more information on green jobs, on 2 July 2014 the Commission adopted a Communication outlining the employment challenges and opportunities of the transition towards a green, low carbon, energy and resource-efficient economy, which contains further information and figures on the potential for creation of new jobs in various sectors.</p> <p>As to energy intensive industries, the Commission is conducting extensive stakeholder consultations on possible carbon leakage provisions under the EU Emissions Trading System (ETS) after 2020, involving a broad range of stakeholders. Moreover the 2030 Framework introduces a set of key energy indicators, such as on energy price differential between the EU and major trading partners. This is important to measure progress towards a more competitive and secure energy system in a 2030 perspective and provide a facts base for policy action over time, as appropriate.</p> <p>The Commission agrees that EU efforts on innovation and research will have to be stepped up to support the 2030 climate and energy framework and is reflecting on how to best approach this and what the priorities should be.</p> <p>In view of the ongoing international climate negotiations, it is imperative for the EU to come forward with its pledge at the latest by March 2015 to raise awareness among its international partners on the importance the EU attaches to the attainment of an international climate agreement in Paris in 2015.</p>
--	---



<b>N°12 EU Emissions Trading Scheme</b> <b>COM(2014) 20 final – EESC 800/2014 - NAT/637</b> <b>499<sup>th</sup> Plenary Session - June 2014</b> <b>Rapporteur: Mr Antonello PEZZINI (GRI-IT)</b> <b>DG CLIMA – Commissioner HEDEGAARD</b>	
<b>Points of the EESC opinion considered essential</b>	<b>Commission position</b>
<p>– The EESC supports the proposal to establish a market stability reserve at the beginning of the next Emissions Trading System (ETS) trading period in 2021, as a possible measure to deal with post-2020 ETS price volatility.</p>	<p>The Commission thanks the European Economic and Social Committee for their comprehensive consideration of the issue and welcomes their subsequent support for the market stability reserve proposal.</p> <p>The market stability reserve addresses the current imbalance between supply and demand in the European carbon market and makes the ETS more robust for the future.</p>



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The EESC calls for:</li> <li>– predefined automatic adjustment mechanisms able to withstand serious shocks with no margin for discretion or interference;</li> <li>– system transparency, predictability and simplicity;</li> <li>– limited transition costs;</li> <li>– predictable investment prospects;</li> <li>– certainty of stable objectives over the long term;</li> </ul>	<p>The Commission agrees that the rules for the operation of the reserve should be automatic, on the basis of predefined rules with no discretion for Member States or other bodies.</p> <p>This will give the market participants the predictability and certainty needed to make long-term investment decisions, as well as limit transaction costs.</p>
<p>1.8 In the Committee's view, the emission allowance trading system overlaps with other European and national policies in the area of environment, climate, energy and industrial development that should be more closely coordinated in order to generate a positive impact: the EESC therefore calls for the revision of the system to be seen in closer association with the other rules affecting greenhouse gas emissions and energy costs for industrial purposes.</p>	<p>There is clearly an interaction between the EU ETS and other policies, in particular renewables and energy efficiency policies. However, this interaction was taken into account when the 2020 package was prepared and adopted in 2008.</p> <p>The proposal to establish a market stability reserve aims at making the supply of allowances in the system more flexible. This also allows capturing changes in the demand due to possible other factors than changes in the economic activity, such as the impact of complementary policies.</p> <p>The framework to 2030 also foresees a simplification of the European Policy framework while improving complementarity and coherence between objectives and instruments.</p>
<p>4.4 The EU ETS should be remodelled in order to fully compensate for the direct and indirect costs of reducing carbon emissions, as a result of EU climate policies, for sectors</p>	<p>The Commission considers having a robust carbon leakage regime already in place. Sectors and sub-sectors deemed to be exposed to a significant</p>

<p>exposed to global competition.</p> <p>4.8 The ETS should provide a common legislative framework for the energy sector and to monitor carbon leakage and speeding up the implementation for further improvements in non-ETS sectors, which account for more than half of current CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in the EU, especially in sectors with real energy efficiency potential such as construction and transport.</p>	<p>risk of 'carbon leakage' receive a higher share of free allowances in the third trading period between 2013 and 2020.</p> <p>With regard to the period post-2020, the Commission acknowledged in its Communication on a policy framework for climate and energy from 2020 to 2030 that as long as there are no comparable efforts [to the EU ETS] undertaken in other major economies, similar policies (including an improved system of free allocation of allowances with a better focus) will also be needed to ensure the competitiveness of Europe's industries. The Commission is currently consulting stakeholders on how to best address competitiveness concerns in view of a decision on the climate and energy policy framework for 2030 by the European Council in October 2014. Any decision in this regard will, however, be separate from the legislative proposal to establish a market stability reserve.</p>
--	---

<p><b>N°13</b></p> <p><b>Energy prices and costs</b></p> <p><b>COM(2014) 21 final – EESC 1113/2014 fin - TEN/547</b></p> <p><b>499<sup>th</sup> Plenary Session - June 2014</b></p> <p><b>Rapporteur: Mr Richard ADAMS (GR11-UK)</b></p> <p><b>DG ENER – Commissioner NELLI FEROCI</b></p>	
<p><b>Points of the EESC opinion considered essential</b></p>	<p><b>Commission position</b></p>
<p>The opinion adopted by the EESC largely shares the conclusions of the Commission Communication on energy costs and prices.</p> <p>It calls for a programme for a "European Energy Dialogue" with all relevant stakeholders including those at local and regional level.</p> <p>It also flags up concern about reconciling policies for promoting affordable and competitive energy prices with climate and energy security policy, but also points out that competitiveness analysis requires more than looking at the impacts of energy prices (e.g. intensity and share of costs).</p> <p>It specifically underlines the need for governmental commitments to be consistent with the Internal Energy Market (IEM) which needs to be completed on the basis of a clear common direction and a genuine coordination of national policies. In this context the development of liquid gas hubs is recommended.</p>	<p>The Commission shares the Committee's view that active involvement of civil society within existing energy fora (e.g. the Citizen Energy Forum in London) is paramount to successful energy policy making. EESC Members have indeed been invited to and have attended the last two meetings of the London Forum. The Commission is continuously reflecting on how to make this involvement even more fruitful and effective.</p> <p>As far as the 2030 Climate and Energy Framework is concerned, the Commission has already proposed to involve the European Parliament, Member States and stakeholders in the development of the new governance structure.</p> <p>The Commission also agrees that tools to address the lack of retail market data and the introduction of market-based instruments are essential to facilitate the proper functioning of the internal energy market. The Commission intends to publish a follow-up communication on energy prices and costs in 2016 which could address some of these issues. In the same vein, the proposed 2030 Climate and Energy Framework foresees a new set of key indicators, including on energy price differentials, and anticipates the</p>

	<p>introduction of new periodic reporting systems. The Commission also plans to address the ongoing transformation of the internal retail energy market in a communication in the coming months.</p> <p>The Commission also takes note of the Committee's emphasis on the central importance of a functioning wholesale market in order to effectively address the concerns underlined in the Communication. The Commission agrees that the internal energy market is not complete yet and that a deep and functioning market is a fundamental instrument to keep prices in check. The Commission welcomes in particular the notion that any possible governmental measures must be consistent with the internal energy market and that liquid gas markets can reduce gas prices. The Commission is working hard, together with Member States, to create such a deep energy market by making sure the rules and spirit of the Third Energy Package are applied everywhere in Europe.</p>
--	--

<p><b>N°14    A vision for the internal market for industrial products</b>  <b>COM(2014) 25 final - EESC 719/2014 fin – INT/731</b>  <b>499<sup>th</sup> Plenary Session - June 2014</b>  <b>Rapporteur: Mr Denis MEYNENT (GRII-FR)</b>  <b>DG ENTR – Commissioner NELLI FEROCI</b></p>	
<b>Points of the EESC opinion considered essential</b>	<b>Commission position</b>
The EESC opinion largely supports the vision for the internal market for industrial products put forward by the Commission in its Communication	The Commission welcomes the EESC opinion and its support to the ideas included in the Communication. The Commission also welcomes the reflections included in the EESC opinion in this respect, such as comments made in points 1.1 to 1.6, 1.9, 1.12 or 1.13. As indicated in the Communication, the Commission will continue to work towards ensuring that industrial product legislation continues evolving to keep pace with the technological and societal changes, focusing on consolidating legislation and strengthening enforcement mechanisms.
In the EESC's opinion, technical standards for industrial products must be subject to open, democratic, transparent regulation with wide-ranging stakeholder involvement embracing, at the very least, businesses (including SMEs), employees or their representatives, consumers, and environmental protection NGOs. In order to put this opening up of the process into practice, it is justifiable to provide public support to help stakeholders that do not have the resources to take part in the work.	The Commission provides public support to stakeholders representing consumers, SMEs, environmental interests and workers' interests. This is clearly said in the Regulation 1025/2012 on European standardisation (see Article 5 of this Regulation). The annual budget available for these activities is close to EUR 4 million.
The EESC believes that abstracts of standards should be made available free of charge to any interested party, including SMEs.	In this regard, there is a problem of copyright. Standards bodies are private organisations and the Commission has hardly any influence on their internal

	<p>rules on copyrights. Nevertheless, the Commission is aware of the problem, in particular with regard to SMEs. Therefore, the Commission is always pleading and promoting the availability of standards free of charge.</p>
<p>The EESC suggests that the Commission should use a dedicated communications budget to disseminate widely – in the internal market and third-country markets – information on the quality and high standards of products that meet European standards, with the involvement of the stakeholders listed in point 1.2.</p>	<p>Standardisation is an issue for industry and the private sector. The Commission's opportunities to influence the standardisation process are, apart from the entitlements stipulated in Regulation (EC) No 1025/2012, very limited. In addition, it has to be kept in mind, that both the Council and the European Parliament, for the budgetary year 2014, have reduced the budget available for standardisation activities by 25% compared to the previous years.</p>
<p>The EESC is in favour of establishing a centralised electronic database disseminating standards information relevant to a given product.</p>	<p>Such a database should be established within the European Standardisation Organisations, since standardisation is in the first line a matter of industry and the private sector which have the copyright for standards. Nevertheless, the Commission shares the opinion of the EESC and will continue to do its utmost to make standards available to a broad public.</p>

<p><b>N°15    Personal protective equipment</b>  <b>COM(2014) 186 final – EESC 2799/2014 fin – INT/742</b>  <b>500<sup>th</sup> Plenary Session - July 2014</b>  <b>Rapporteur: Ms Emmanuelle BUTAUD-STUBBS (GRI-FR)</b>  <b>DG ENTR – Commissioner NELLI FEROCI</b></p>	
<b>Points of the EESC opinion considered essential</b>	<b>Commission position</b>
<p>1.1 The EESC supports the European Commission's aim of replacing the 1989 Directive on personal protective equipment by a regulation in order to ensure uniform and compulsory application in all the Member States.</p>	<p>Account taken of the favourable opinion</p>
<p>1.3 However, the EESC questions whether some of the proposed changes are necessary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- inclusion of products for private use providing protection against heat, damp and water,</li> <li>- the variety of language requirements for different types of information that have to be communicated</li> </ul> <p>4.4 Articles 8.3, 8.7 and 8.10, Article 9.2 a), Article 10.3, 10.4 and 10.7, Article 11.2, Article 13, Article 15.1, Article 15 (15.2 and 15.3) and Annex II, point 2.12 set different language requirements for the various documents relating to Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) and their compliance with the applicable procedures.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Inclusion of such products in the PPE legislation will ensure consistency, as similar products for professional use are already considered as PPE. Less confusion and better information for consumers is expected, and the public consultation has shown wide support for this change.</li> <li>- The language requirements are in line with the New Legislative Framework (NLF) Decision No 768/2008/EC and other sector specific legislation in similar fields. The differences are explained by the different purpose and target groups of the various documents.</li> </ul>
<p>1.4 The EESC also considers that PPE use should be integrated into a general policy on risk prevention at work. In particular, such a policy could cover the following aspects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- accurately identifying risk factors,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The EU has developed a comprehensive policy on health and safety of the work place under Article 153 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU). Such elements are integral principles of this policy and are reflected in the relevant</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- adapting work stations in order to reduce exposure to risks,</li> <li>- changing the way in which work is organised,</li> <li>- training employees in risk prevention, ergonomics, and the wearing and use of PPE.</li> </ul> <p>3.4 In addition, the proposal for a regulation does not sufficiently address human aspects. PPE use should ideally be preceded by employee information and training sessions in order to raise awareness of risk, usage requirements, instructions and essential information. Pilot and test periods are also needed to adapt PPE to user morphology and work-stations (Annex II, Article 1.3 to be completed, above all on the basis of input from national experience).</p> <p>3.5 It is true that all of these aspects are relevant to the proposal for a Directive on health and safety of 12 June 1989 (89/391/EEC), intended to improve health and safety at work, which sets out employers' obligations together with employees' rights and duties.</p> <p>3.6 PPE policy is part of a general policy on reducing exposure to risks at company or sector level. Such a policy should build on accurate identification of risk factors, listing the steps needed to reduce or eliminate such factors, such as considering the option of air filtration systems before using respiratory equipment. Collective risk-prevention solutions should always be considered</p>	<p>legislation. There is already specific EU legislation dealing with safety at work and covering the aspects referred to.</p> <p>PPE are to be used when other solutions are not available, following the "hierarchy of hazard control" commonly used in the health and safety community.</p> <p>The PPE Regulation is complementary to this legislation and has the objective of ensuring the functioning of the internal market in the PPE sector.</p>
---	---



<p>before resorting to individual protection solutions.</p> <p>3.7 Risk evaluation should always be carried out in partnership with a company's in-house stakeholders such as staff representatives, staff representation bodies, health and safety committees, etc., as well as external partners such as occupational medicine specialists, consultants and public authorities responsible for improving working conditions.</p> <p>3.8 Particular attention should be paid to PPE maintenance, checking and review procedures to ensure that this equipment provides the highest possible level of protection from the risks which they were designed for. Maintenance includes inspection, care, cleaning, repair and suitable storage.</p> <p>3.9 The proposal for a regulation only partially addresses cases of exposure to multiple risks.</p> <p>3.11 Nor does the proposal for a regulation discuss the issue of persons whose capacity to wear PPE is limited - for medical reasons, in the case of some employees. In such rare but genuinely existing cases, how do employers meet their obligation to ensure general safety? For example by assigning the employee concerned to another post, or workstation adaptation.</p>	
<p>1.6 It is also a pity that there is no</p>	<p>- The proposed Regulation has</p>

<p>discussion at all on the economic aspects of the growing European PPE market, estimated at EUR 10 billion in 2010. This is a technologically innovative (new fibres, smart textiles, nanomaterials, etc.) market geared not only to meeting protection needs but also social expectations that equipment must be comfortable, easy to walk in, light and aesthetically appealing.</p> <p>3.2 It is a pity that the text fails to mention technological progress, a particular feature of the sector in areas such as textile fibres and materials (Teflon, latex, neoprene, nitrile, etc.), coating and filtration technology, as well as integrated micro-electronic sensors able to transmit information or energy (smart textiles) enabling superior risk protection performance.</p> <p>3.3 Nor is there any mention of this market's potential for European PPE sectors (textiles, clothing, footwear, accessories), despite the fact that in 2007 the European Commission identified it as a lead industrial market.</p>	<p>the objective to guarantee the functioning of the internal market of PPE. More general competitiveness aspects are dealt within the context of industrial policy. In the impact assessment, which contains an in depth analysis of the PPE market (volume, growth, competitiveness situation), the impacts of the proposal on the competitiveness of the sector have been carefully evaluated.</p> <p>The European Commission is promoting competitiveness and technological progress for European PPE sectors by other means, e.g. the lead market initiative for protective textiles and clothing.</p> <p>As an internal market, "new approach", legislation, the PPE legislation determines essential safety requirements without being prescriptive on the technology to be used to respect these requirements. It is then for economic operators to determine the best technological solutions in this context.</p> <p>Although being "technology-neutral", or rather because it is "technology-neutral", the EU PPE legislation is widely recognised as a strong contributor to the competitiveness of the EU PPE industry, as described in the Impact Assessment study.</p>
<p>1.7 The EESC is disappointed that PPE maintenance, checking and review procedures do not take account of the case of PPE used by several persons or second-hand PPE.</p> <p>3.10 It does not cover the issue of PPE</p>	<p>- The proposal is based on Article 114 TFEU. The proposed Regulation lays requirements for design and manufacture of PPE so that PPE can be freely marketed throughout the EU. Internal market legislation does however not extend to the use of products. Issues relating to use and</p>

<p>used by several different people (e.g. safety helmets on building sites). Hygiene specifications should be defined.</p> <p>4.2 Article 3: it would be useful to add definitions here of "second-hand PPE", the "market surveillance authorities" mentioned in articles 11 and 13, and the "notifying authorities" responsible at national level for notification of the bodies authorised to carry out checks on PPE compliance.</p>	<p>maintenance are covered by the legislation on health and safety of the workplace.</p> <p>In general, internal market legislation does not cover second-hand products (unless they are imported from outside the EU). According to Directive 2001/95/EC on general product safety, PPE that are consumer products must be safe when made available as second-hand products. Otherwise, the sale of second-hand PPE is covered by national law. The use of second hand PPE at the workplace is again subject to the legislation under Article 153 of the TFEU.</p>
---	---

<p><b>N°16 Cableway installations</b>  <b>COM(2014) 187 final – EESC 2911/2014 fin – INT/743</b>  <b>500th Plenary Session - July 2014</b>  <b>Rapporteur: Mr Jan SIMONS (GRI-NL)</b>  <b>DG ENTR – Commissioner NELLI FEROCI</b></p>	
<b>Points of the EESC opinion considered essential</b>	<b>Commission position</b>
1.3 The EESC urges that the terminology, particularly that used in the German-language version, as well as the definitions and the retention of parts of the existing Directive whose merit is uncontested – or elements arising from this Directive – be examined as closely as possible.	The Commission takes good note of the concerns of the EESC regarding the German-language version of the proposal. The different language versions will be re-examined within the process of inter-institutional negotiations.
4.1.1 Where monitoring of the regulation's implementation is assigned to the Member States, the Commission should ensure that it is carried out uniformly.	Under the Treaty (Article 258 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU)), the Commission is the ‘guardian of Union law’, consequently, the Commission will continuously monitor Member States' application and implementation of primary and secondary Union law.
4.2.3 The present draft regulation (Article 2(2)(a)) does not permit a clear delimitation between lifts (in particular inclined lifts) subject to Directive 95/16/EC and funiculars. The related information given in Recital 11 is insufficient and not suitable for an unambiguous classification in practice. It is important that it remains possible to build inclined lifts according to the Lift Directive for various applications in the open air (links between a car park below and a castle or old city centre above, links between ski runs, etc.).	Recital 11 aims at clarifying the borderline problem between inclined lifts (which fall under the Lifts Directive) and funiculars (which fall under the Cableways Directive). The required clarification implies changes in the Lifts Directive, in particular with respect to its scope and related definitions, and not a legislative modification of the Cableways legal framework. This will be taken into account in the next revision of the Lifts Directive.
4.2.4 Installations in which the users or their carriers are water-borne are excluded	Further clarifications are examined in the inter-institutional negotiation

<p>from the scope of the regulation under Article 2(2)(f). Recital 12 was added to avoid misunderstandings and different interpretations, but it does not aid understanding. Article 2(2)(f) should be made clearer by subdividing it into "cable-operated ferries" – as defined in Directive 2000/9/EC – and "water ski lifts".</p>	<p>process.</p>
<p>4.2.5 Cableway installations designed to carry persons – in contrast with other directives (such as the Machinery Directive) – are subject to regulated licensing procedures determined by the Member States. Accordingly, there is no need for the trade name and postal address to be marked on the safety components and subsystems, especially given that the EU statements of conformity, which include this information, must be available both at the installation and to the responsible authority. To give some idea of the financial scope of this article, the Committee notes here, by way of example, that a fixed-grip chair lift would require approximately 500 plates. Article 11 (Chapter II) should therefore be amended by deleting "on the subsystem or the safety component" and "or, where that is not possible, on the packaging and" from the first sentence.</p>	<p>The requirement applies to products that are made available on the market. Subsystems and safety components are made available on the market before they are installed in a cableway installation. The indication of the manufacturer's and for imported products also the importer's name and postal address on industrial products is a basic traceability requirement which is laid down in Decision 768/2008/EC (New Legislative Framework (NLF) Decision).</p>
<p>4.2.6 Article 2(2)(d) excludes cableway installations used in amusement parks exclusively for leisure purposes from the scope of the regulation. It is not clear what difference it makes in terms of safety conditions and basic requirements if the person travelling in a cableway installation is using it for leisure purposes or transport. The EESC thus recommends that only the reference to "on-site or mobile equipment for use in fairgrounds" be retained.</p>	<p>This exclusion is taken from the current Directive. It should be taken into account that the main criteria to determine the scope of a cableway installation is the traction by cable and the passenger transport function. Furthermore, the conformity assessment procedure required under the cableways legal framework is strict as it implies the transport function.</p>
<p>4.2.7 Recitals 57 and 58 in the preamble</p>	<p>Regarding the transitional provisions,</p>

<p>and Article 41 set out transitional provisions, but there is no general statement to the effect that the draft regulation does not apply to installations that are already in use. The wording "it is not necessary to require all existing cableway installations to be brought into conformity with the provisions applicable to new installations," which is included in the Directive on cableway installations (Recital 28), should be added to Article 9 as a new paragraph 3. In addition, provisions should be included in Article 9, following the current paragraph 3, to allow for the re-commissioning of cableway installations. Cableway installations may be re-commissioned under the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Safety components and subsystems that have undergone a conformity assessment and been placed on the market in accordance with Directive 2000/9/EC or the current Regulation must be used when recommissioning under the following conditions:</li> <li>- The installation to be transferred should be in a technical condition such that, following recommissioning, the level of safety ensured is broadly equivalent to that of new installations."</li> </ul>	<p>the principle of legal certainty is applicable to the existing installations. In addition, cableway installations are kept under national competence, and subject to specific national regimes, whereas safety components and subsystems, which are to be integrated into installations, are subject to the rules on the free movement of goods. In this sense, the proposal provides for transitional arrangements that allow the making available on the market and the putting into service of subsystems and safety components that have already been placed on the market in accordance with the Directive.</p> <p>On the re-commissioning/ relocation of installations, the issue is under assessment in the inter-institutional negotiation procedure.</p>
<p>5.2 The definition of "safety component" given in Article 3(4) should be amended by deleting the words "or a cableway installation", because infrastructure, whose procedures are decided by the Member States, cannot contain the "safety components" referred to by the regulation – such components are instead known as "safety-critical components".</p>	<p>The issue is under assessment in the inter-institutional negotiation procedure.</p>

<p>5.3 Under Article 11(9), further to a reasoned request from the Member States, manufacturers are to provide them with all the information and documentation relevant to a conformity assessment procedure. To rule out any possibility of components built according to the set of harmonised standards (and for which there is therefore a presumption of conformity) coming under the scope of this Article, the EESC recommends that paragraph 9 be clarified by inserting the following words at the beginning: "with regard to components not put into circulation according to the set of harmonised standards, manufacturers shall ...".</p>	<p>The manufacturer has to provide the competent national authority with all the information and documentation necessary to demonstrate the conformity of a product regardless of the application or not of the harmonised standards.</p>
<p>5.7 Recital 19 in the preamble does not correspond to any operative part of the text and should therefore be deleted.</p>	<p>The issue is under assessment in the inter-institutional negotiation procedure.</p>
<p>5.8 Recital 23 in the preamble is confusing because it places the free movement of goods and safety analysis in the same context, and should therefore be deleted.</p>	<p>Recital to be maintained because the safety analyses must also cover industrial products - subsystems and safety components which are subject to the principle of the free movement of goods - and their effect on the safety of the installation.</p>
<p>5.16 Article 10(1) stipulates that a cableway installation may only remain in operation if it complies with the conditions set out in the safety report. The operating and maintenance manual is an important document, not least for safe operation of an installation. The EESC therefore recommends that the text be amended by replacing "remains in operation" with "is operated", and the words "safety report" with "documentation specified in Article 9(2)".</p>	<p>The issue is under assessment in the inter-institutional negotiation procedure.</p>
<p>5.20 The provisions of Decision 768 on</p>	<p>Recital 38 refers that Regulation (EU)</p>

formal objections to a harmonised standard (Articles R9 and R19) should also be inserted into Article 17.	No 1025/2012 provides for a procedure for objections to harmonised standards where the standards (including the standards drawn up under the cableways EU legislation) do not entirely satisfy the requirements of the Regulation.
5.21 There is a risk of Article 18(4) also being applied to test trains. To avoid this, "with the exception of test trains" should be added.	The issue is under assessment in the inter-institutional negotiation procedure.
5.22 Article 19(2) could be interpreted to mean that the Declaration of Conformity (DoC) of safety components or subsystems already put into circulation also have to be updated. Consequently, the final part of the first sentence, "shall be continuously updated", should be replaced with "shall be updated when a subsystem or safety component is put into circulation".	The requirement to continuously update the DoC refers to products that are going to be made available on the market. It is the same provision for the internal market legislation aligned to NLF.
5.23 Under Article 21(2), subsystems are also to be given a CE marking. Given that there are no subsystems on the market that do not contain at least one safety component, and which therefore carry its CE marking, this requirement should be dropped. The EESC therefore recommends that the words "the subsystem or" be deleted.	The proposal aligns the conformity assessment procedures available for subsystems with those already used for safety components, based on the conformity assessment modules set in Decision No 768/2008/EC establishing a common framework for the marking of products (NLF Decision). Consequently, it also provides for the affixing of the CE marking to indicate compliance with its provisions, in line with the existing system for safety components.



N°17	<b>Completing EMU - The Proposals of the European Economic and Social Committee for the Next European Legislature (own-initiative opinion)</b> <b>EESC 7057/2013 fin – ECO/357</b> <b>500<sup>th</sup> Plenary Session – July 2014</b> <b>Rapporteur: Mr Joost VAN IERSEL (GRI-NL)</b> <b>Co-rapporteur: Mr Carmelo CEDRONE (GRII-IT)</b> <b>DG ECFIN – Commissioner REHN</b>	
	<b>Points of the EESC opinion considered essential</b>	<b>Commission position</b>
	<p>The EESC emphasizes that the pursuit of investment, growth and employment should be placed at the core of the current EU priorities. The EESC in this regard calls for launching a European plan for growth and employment and proposes a number of specific elements that should be included in such a plan.</p>	<p>The Commission considers that, indeed, moving the European economy from initial recovery to strong, sustainable and inclusive growth and job creation is the main challenge the EU is facing today. In this regard, and concerning the EESC call for launching a European plan for growth and employment, the Commission would like to point to the ongoing mid-term review of the Europe 2020 strategy, and encourages the EESC to provide input in the context of the ongoing public consultation. Furthermore, the Commission would like to point to the commitment set out by the next Commission President in his political guidelines to publish a jobs growth and investment package within the first three months of his mandate. The Commission has duly taken note of the specific instruments considered by the EESC to be desirable elements of such a package.</p>
	<p>The EESC highlights the need to move forward towards a deep and genuine Economic and Monetary Union (EMU) in an integrated manner, pursuing a step by step approach in the financial, economic, social and political sphere based on the “Four Presidents Reports” and the</p>	<p>The Commission fully shares this view on the need for an integrated step by step approach, which also underlies the Commission's Blueprint for a Deep and Genuine EMU published in November 2012. The Commission fully shares the importance of the social dimension of</p>

<p>Commission's Blueprint for a Deep and Genuine Economic and Monetary Union. In this regard, the EESC calls for a roadmap for the coming legislature, and considers the elaboration and implementation of a wide number of specific instruments of importance to ensure a stable and sustainable EMU for the future.</p>	<p>EMU. The specific instruments mentioned in the opinion are largely in line with those considered in this Blueprint, and the considerations related to these instruments as set out by the EESC have been duly taken note of. Furthermore, the Commission would like to point to the commitment set out by the next Commission President in his political guidelines to continue with the reform of EMU on the basis of the "Four Presidents Reports" and the Commission's Blueprint for a Deep and Genuine Economic and Monetary Union taking into account the social dimension, which includes action on a number of the specific issues raised in the EESC's opinion. This notably concerns the review of the "six-pack" and the "two-pack legislation"; proposals to encourage further structural reforms, if necessary through additional financial incentives and a targeted fiscal capacity at Euro zone level; and a proposal for a more efficient external representation of the EMU.</p>
<p>The EESC calls for a rebalancing of economic governance from budgetary and stability concerns towards growth and social measures.</p>	<p>The Commission would like to clarify the mutual interdependence of budgetary issues on the one hand and growth and social concerns on the other. The Commission has constantly highlighted the importance of pursuing the mutually reinforcing objectives of fiscal consolidation and growth, as evidenced in the priorities of the Annual Growth Survey. Fiscal consolidation has never been an end in itself, but rather a prerequisite for building solid foundations for growth and restoring confidence. Furthermore, the European Semester of policy coordination fully integrates economic</p>

	and budgetary surveillance under the European Semester, highlighting the importance of both sound public finances and unleashing the growth potential of the economies.
As part of moving towards a sustainable EMU, the EESC calls for the elaboration of microeconomic policies to boost growth. The EESC in this regard specifically mentions the completion of the Single Market, investment, industrial policy, energy policy, the labour market and labour mobility, favourable conditions for enterprises, services, research policies and corporate taxation as priority areas.	The Commission fully shares the importance of an ambitious EU agenda on microeconomic policies that can stimulate growth. The Commission concurs with the specific highlights mentioned in the opinion.
The EESC calls for increased simplification and communication on EMU as a joint effort by the Commission, European Parliament, Member States and civil society.	The Commission fully shares the importance of a broad debate and consensus building, as well as a clear communication and simplification strategy on EMU as a joint effort by the Commission, the European Parliament, Member States and civil society. In moving forward with deepening EMU, broad-based political and societal support is as vital as ever. The Commission would like to emphasize that EU social partners can play a very important role in that regard, in particular when considering potential future steps towards a deeper economic integration, and counts on the EESC's continued active involvement.

<b>N°18</b>	<b>Youth Employment Measures – Best Practices (exploratory opinion)</b> <b>EESC 474/2014 fin – SOC/503</b> <b>499<sup>th</sup> Plenary Session – June 2014</b> <b>Rapporteur: Ms Christa SCHWENG (GRI-AT)</b> <b>DG EMPL – Commissioner ANDOR</b>	
<b>Points of the EESC opinion considered essential</b>		<b>Commission position</b>
<p>The Commission welcomes the opinion of the EESC, which presents a collection of best practice in youth employment measures. While no specific request is addressed to the Commission, the latter would point out that the dissemination of best practice is among its activities in fighting against youth unemployment.</p>		

<p><b>N°19</b></p> <p><b>Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on a European network of Employment Services, workers' access to mobility services and the further integration of labour markets</b></p> <p><b>COM(2014) 6 final – EESC 518/2014 fin - SOC 500</b></p> <p><b>499<sup>th</sup> Plenary Session – June 2014</b></p> <p><b>Rapporteur: Ms Vladimíra DRBALOVÁ (GRI-CZ)</b></p> <p><b>Co-rapporteur: Mr Luis Miguel PARIZA CASTAÑOS (GR1I-ES)</b></p> <p><b>DG EMPL – Commissioner ANDOR</b></p>	
<p><b>Points of the EESC opinion considered essential</b></p>	<p><b>Commission position</b></p>
<p><b>1. Conclusions and recommendations</b></p> <p>1.2 The EESC recommends that the Commission defines fair mobility under Article 2 Definition in the light of new mobility patterns and the greater need for fair mobility. This definition has to be balanced. As a base the Commission could use the already existing wording of section 2 in the Regulation 492/2011, and at the same time express its intention to ensure full support for people who wish to exercise their right to work in other Member States based on their informed choice.</p>	<p>The concept of fair mobility is explained in the explanatory memorandum. The Union legislator may wish to introduce a clarification in the draft.</p>
<p>1.3. The EESC understands the Commission's intention to provide a nearly complete supply of vacancies on the EURES portal by extending the transparency principle to organisations other than the Public Employment Services (PES) through the voluntary participation of EURES partners in the EURES network on the basis of common minimum criteria. However, it sees risks if it is not ensured that private service providers have to meet the same quality standards as Public Employment Services. In any event, Member States may introduce criteria additional to those laid down in the Annex if deemed necessary, though these must on no account be discriminatory. Under no circumstances should participating private service</p>	<p>The Commission agrees with the EESC that the authorisation system to be established in the Regulation should ensure that all partners fulfil minimum quality criteria. It includes monitoring of the activities of partners and their compliance with relevant legislation.</p> <p>This should ensure a necessary level of quality of the services provided for the end user, regardless of the type of partner (public or private service provider).</p> <p>According to Article 18(5) of the proposal, support services to workers must be free of charge and support services to employers can be subject to a fee charged in accordance with national</p>

providers be allowed to charge for their services.	practices as foreseen in Article 18(6).
1.6. The EESC calls for coherence and synergies with EU policies to promote mobility, especially regarding the creation of a network of public employment services (PES) and measures to foster free movement of workers and of citizens and their families within the EU. When it comes to implementing the Youth Guarantee, the Committee supports extending the scope of the EURES network to those categories of citizens seeking apprenticeships, work-based traineeships or any other opportunities involving an employment contract, as long as this is in line with Articles 45 and 46 of the TFEU, to allow those workers to stay in a Member State for the purpose of employment in accordance with the provisions governing the employment of nationals of that State laid down by law, regulation or administrative action.	The Commission fully supports this conclusion.
1.8 The EESC calls on the Member States to make use of the Commission's technical support and to respect the deadlines for establishing an initial inventory of their national classification systems. This will make it possible to compare all classification data with the European classification for skills/competences, qualifications and occupations (ESCO).	The Commission fully supports this conclusion.
1.10 When it comes to the gathering of data and indicators, the EESC points out the need for sensitivity in how the regulation establishes the rights and obligations of Member States in relation to the transfer of information and statistics on, for example, mobile workers where no systems are	According to Article 29 of the proposal, Member States will produce and collect data according to common indicators. The actual methods for collection and production are for Member States to decide and no common requirements are set for the

<p>available for monitoring some indicators. The Committee proposes that the quantitative indicators be complemented by qualitative ones.</p>	<p>nature and frequency of the data.</p> <p>Data on customer satisfaction (Article 29.c) will contribute to qualitative assessment of the performance of the network.</p> <p>Moreover, for the implementation reports referred to in Article 30 of the proposal, the Commission will seek to complement the information obtained from the Member States for the common indicators with additional information on the performance of the network (notably information resulting from the use of the portal).</p>
<p><b>Specific comments</b></p> <p>4.2.3 Furthermore, recent experience shows that there is little awareness of the EURES network and its services in many countries, particularly among young people. And only one-third of employers had heard about EURES before getting in touch with the network. The Member States have to communicate and promote EURES services better to ensure that the decision of people to take a job in the other state is based on their being fully informed.</p>	<p>The Commission agrees with the importance of awareness of EURES among employers and jobseekers. This is reflected in Article 19 of the proposal.</p>
<p>4.2.7 The EESC recommends clarification of the relationship between the EURES network and SOLVIT, the EU's single market advice and information portal. This applies particularly to those provisions (Article 7(4)) on support from the National Coordination Office in the event of complaints about job vacancies and recruitment in the EURES network, as well as cooperation with public bodies such as labour inspectorates.</p>	<p>The Commission takes note of the EESC recommendation, which may be explored in the inter-institutional negotiation process.</p>
<p>4.4.2. Services for workers and employers</p>	<p>The Commission's proposal is to allow</p>

<p>should be free of charge.</p>	<p>organisations to charge fees for support services to employers, in order to make it easier for employment services other than public employment services to join the EURES network. The EESC opinion is considered to be an invitation to the Union legislator to assess this issue in the inter-institutional negotiation procedure.</p>
<p>4.4.5 With the expansion of EURES's competences, National Coordination Offices will perform a series of new roles and for this they should have sufficient personnel and funding, including good staff training schemes. The Commission should ensure they receive as much technical and advisory assistance as possible.</p>	<p>The Commission agrees that the National Coordination Offices need sufficient resources to carry out its tasks, which is a responsibility of the Member States in accordance with Article 7(6). In addition, the Commission supports the activities of the National Coordination Offices through its European Coordination Office, the meetings of the EURES Coordination Group etc.</p>
<p>4.4.6 It would be useful if National Coordination Offices drafted work programmes for organisations involved in the work of the EURES network in their country. These programmes would set out planned activities, the total staffing and funding allocated for implementing these and mechanisms for monitoring and evaluating planned action.</p>	<p>The Commission takes note of the support provided by the EESC for the principles reflected in article 28 of the Commission proposal.</p>
<p>4.7.2. The EESC stresses the fundamental role of the social partners at all levels as principal players in the labour market who are heavily involved in EURES work to match skills with vacancies. Their role</p>	<p>The Commission agrees with the view that social partners play a key role in supporting mobility. The Commission encourages social partners to become members of the network. As regards</p>



<p>should not be reduced to that of associate members<sup>1</sup>. National Coordination Offices, in particular, should step up their collaboration with social partners and professional organisations. The Committee proposes that the social partners at European level and at national level should participate appropriately in the activities of the European office and national coordination offices.</p>	<p>their participation in the National Coordination Offices, this is something that has to be decided by each Member State.</p>
<p>4.8.1. To make sure that there is enough information on which to measure the performance of the EURES network, common indicators should be introduced to guide organisations participating in the network in identifying their results. They should also help assess the progress made against the objectives set for the EURES network as a whole. It is also important to use qualitative indicators such as job quality, equal treatment and social security rights. There must be sensitivity in how the regulation lays down the rights and obligations of the Member States in relation to the transfer of information and statistics on, for example, mobile workers where no systems are available for monitoring some indicators.</p>	<p>The Commission agrees with the view that the common indicators should as far as possible cover both quantitative and qualitative data. The limitations of the existing data collection mechanisms in public employment services must however be recognised, as well as the fact that data collection is essentially focusing on rapidly changing operational processes which may not necessarily bring value in terms of policy insights. There is a balance to strike between the wish for comprehensive information on the state of play and results relating to the performance of EURES, on the one hand, and the resources the collection of such data will require.</p>

---

<sup>1</sup> Joint letter from BUSINESSEUROPE, CEEP, ETUC and UEAPME to Commissioner László Andor, 19 December 2012.

<p><b>N°20 EU Quality Framework for anticipation of change and restructuring COM(2013) 882 final - EESC 217/2014 fin – CCMI/124 500th Plenary Session – July 2014 Rapporteur: Mr Joost VAN IERSEL (GRI-NL) DG EMPL – Commissioner ANDOR</b></p>	
<b>Points of the EESC opinion considered essential</b>	<b>Commission position</b>
<p>1.9 The European Commission can support the development of a common spirit across the Union, by facilitating partnerships between the various stakeholders. It can help to put the right conditions in place by making proper use of European Funds in specific cases. The Commission should emphasise arrangements concerning social dialogue at national and sectoral level as part of the EU Agenda for restructuring and anticipation.</p> <p>3.14 The European Commission is taking the lead in the organisation of discussions at EU level and in disseminating practices. It can support the development of a common spirit across the Union. It can help to put conditions in place for making good use of European funds. It has also a role in promoting the Social Dialogue on anticipating and restructuring in particular at sectoral level.</p> <p>3.6 Sector Councils on Employment and Skills at EU level can equally be of great help. They can also function as platforms for meetings between directly involved stakeholders. The EESC foresees at least three tasks for these Councils: information on needs in terms of education, exchanges of forecasts on future trends/challenges, and information on reasons that have led to the need for restructuring. All this would be beneficial for a continuing exchange of</p>	<p>In several industrial sectors particularly affected by restructuring, such as the automotive, steel, defence, chemical, printing and textile sectors, intense cooperation has been developed in recent years at EU level between the Commission, national and regional authorities and the main industry and trade union representatives or within the European social dialogue context. This cooperation has resulted in specific guidance for the relevant actors on how to better anticipate and manage change and restructuring, notably in the steel and automotive sectors.</p> <p>In the EU Quality Framework for anticipation of Change and Restructuring (QFR), the Commission calls on the social partners to contribute to reinforcing this QFR and to ease the economic adaptation process by drawing up and negotiating at the relevant level – notably sectoral – frameworks of action on anticipation of change and restructuring and internal flexibility.</p> <p>As stated in the EU's Agenda for New Skills and Jobs, the Commission supports the setting up of European Sector Skills Councils designed to anticipate the need for skills in specific sectors more effectively and achieve a better match between skills and labour</p>

<p>views as well as profitable for convergence to the top. European agencies should also benefit from operational and pragmatic conclusions of these Councils.</p>	<p>market needs. The European skills councils will be set up where there is a demand for them from organisations representing both sides of industry.</p> <p>In their first few years, European sector skills councils benefit from grants from the EU budget (EaSI Programme). The most recent call for proposals, currently ongoing, in this field aims at encouraging new forms of collaboration between public and private actors on the labour market to address persistent skills shortages and mismatches (applications until September). Further ways of funding sectoral skills initiatives through sector skills alliances and knowledge alliances, are accessible through the Erasmus+ programme.</p> <p>Some councils have already been set up, e.g in the textile and retail &amp; wholesale sectors. Many other sectors have benefited from Commission funding for feasibility studies on setting up European skills councils.</p>
<p>1.10</p> <p>The EESC agrees with the introduction of the EU Quality Framework as proposed by the Commission on a voluntary basis. It would note, however, that in the future a legal basis for specific framework conditions concerning worker participation may be desirable, without interfering in national competences.</p>	<p>The Commission will monitor the way the QFR is applied in the EU and send monitoring reports to the European Parliament and the social partners. Based on these reports and an accompanying political assessment, the Commission will consider to revise the QFR by 2016 if need be. This revision will establish whether further action is necessary, including a legislative proposal.</p>
<p>2.21</p> <p>As the EESC has extensively argued before, the EU, including the EESC, can certainly be of help in these processes. It points to:</p>	<p>The QFR is organised as a set of fiches of good practices addressed to each of the main actors involved: companies,</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the support of European agencies like CEDEFOP, Eurofound and others in disseminating data and analyses;</li> <li>- the support of the Commission, DG Employment in particular, in discussing good practices across Europe in publications as well as in targeted Conferences, notably in the framework of social dialogues, and in disseminating its own analyses and proposals for practices, prepared by European academics and experts;</li> <li>- focused projects of European Funds: Cohesion and Regional Fund, ESF.</li> </ul> <p>2.24</p> <p>The EU Sector Councils on Employment and Skills, the European Restructuring Forum and observatories as well as Eurofound's studies may be very helpful in facilitating the sharing of good practices across Europe.</p> <p>3.11</p> <p>There are more examples. Some of these systems are out of date, others still work well, illustrating how state involvement and engagement of the social partners provide common instruments in response to current dynamics. Others, however, are discontinued since some time. The Commission should, by systematically disseminating good practices, encourage national social partners and authorities in all Member States to identify pragmatic and useful tools.</p>	<p>employees' representatives, employees themselves, social partners and national/regional authorities. A more comprehensive collection of the good practices in this field may be found on the 2009 Checklist for Restructuring Processes.</p> <p>All the good practices outlined in the QFR fiches constitute real experiences of companies, workers' representatives and other stakeholders. Regardless of their transferability to other contexts – they can act as a source of inspiration for all the others.</p> <p>Those good practices were frequently driven, or inspired, by regulation and other public support mechanisms. Eurofound's European Restructuring Monitor (ERM) database on restructuring related legislation provides comparative information on national regulation. The ERM's database on support instruments for restructuring provides information on about 400 measures in the Member States of the European Union and Norway.</p>
<p>3.8</p> <p>In restructuring the EU can promote satisfactory coordination between the stakeholders involved by fostering effective procedures and processes in companies and</p>	<p>The Commission calls, in the QFR, on Member States and regions to use EU funds, in line with State aid rules and in support of investments anticipating and</p>

<p>regions via financial support from EU funds, where applicable.</p>	<p>facilitating industrial change, developing human capital via skills enhancement and training, as well as mitigating the adverse social consequences of restructuring by supporting re-employment of workers who are made redundant (notably through the European Social Fund (ESF) and the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF)).</p> <p>The Commission will support programming work of the European Structural and Investment Funds (ESF, European regional development Fund, Cohesion Fund (ERDF), European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development, European Maritime and Fisheries Fund), which operate under a Common Strategic Framework, as well as of the EGF, including through peer learning, networking activities and technical assistance.</p> <p>The actions and instruments set out in the QFR might qualify for support from the EU Structural Funds (especially the ESF and the ERDF), as well as the EGF.</p>
<p>2.15 Collection of data regarding restructuring operations – including their economic and social impact – should be made easier, and should lead to analyses. Effective coordination between Agencies like Eurofound and CEDEFOP, the Commission, and interested parties must continuously be guaranteed.</p>	<p>The Commission will carry out monitoring of the way in which the QFR is applied throughout the EU, it will send the monitoring reports to the European Parliament and to the social partners and disseminate them widely.</p>

<p><b>N°21</b></p>	<p><b>Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions - a European Strategy for more Growth and Jobs in Coastal and Maritime Tourism</b>  <b>COM (2014) 86 final - EESC 2242/2014 fin – INT/740</b>  <b>500th Plenary Session - July 2013</b>  <b>Rapporteur: Mr Paulo BARROS VALE (GRI – PT)</b>  <b>DG MARE - Commissioner DAMANAKI</b></p>
<p><b>Points of the EESC opinion considered essential</b></p>	<p><b>Commission position</b></p>
<p>Overall assessment</p>	<p>The Commission welcomes the opinion of the EESC which in its view is an important orientation towards the implementation of the Strategy on Coastal and Maritime Tourism. Overall, the opinion is in line with the options and actions prescribed for the future in the Communication. To be noted that several points raised by the EESC are already being addressed by the Commission.</p>
<p>(1.3) Since coastal areas are of particular strategic environmental, economic and social importance, steps to tackle problems in these areas need to be part of an integrated sustainable development policy, where spatial planning, the balance between use of renewable energies and other coastal activities and urban planning rules take on particular importance. (3.1) In the development of coastal areas the interests of the various sectors involved should be taken into account, not forgetting environmental issues, with particular attention paid to spatial and maritime planning aspects. (4.8)...; therefore, in its initiatives, the Commission should pay particular attention to consequences for the tourism sector.</p>	<p>The Commission shares the view of the EESC. The aim of the recently adopted Maritime Spatial Planning Directive is to promote the coherent use of marine resources by activities taking place at sea.</p> <p>The Commission has also developed a European Tourism Indicators System (ETIS) for Sustainable Management at Destination Level, which is a comprehensive, simple to use, flexible system, suitable for all tourist destinations.</p> <p>A sustainable approach to the development of coastal and maritime tourism is reflected in the Strategy as a cross-cutting principle (part 3.3 of the Communication).</p>

<p>(1.4) The EESC reiterates the idea of setting up a European tourism agency, in which all the interested parties participate, such as tourism confederations, tourist regions, tourism authorities and trade unions in the sector.</p> <p>(1.5) It may now be time to look at creating a proper joint policy for tourism, which, while safeguarding national autonomy, takes an overall view of the sector, creating synergies and coordinating the policies of each Member State. Every year fragmented ideas emerge which go no further because of the lack of coordination and of a joint tourism strategy which can promote a European brand of conventional and non-conventional tourist destinations, historic heritage and gastronomy while, at the same time, dealing with any negative publicity that may from time to time occur.</p>	<p>The Commission was entrusted by the Treaty of Lisbon with the duty to support Member States in the promotion of a competitive tourism for Europe. The Strategy for Coastal Tourism, in the path of the 2010 Communication on Tourism, proposes several actions to foster the coordination between EU policies and to increase the participation of stakeholders. Coordination efforts in the field of coastal and maritime tourism are particularly visible in the framework of European sea-basins strategies, which are already presenting positive results. The idea of a European tourism agency presents limited added value at this point, as Member States remain fully responsible for the definition of their national tourism policies.</p>
<p>(1.6) The growth of mass tourism (...) must be exploited, creating or promoting transport networks that link areas served by airports with other, more remote areas, giving continuity to the region by including very remote areas in tourist circuits, (...) so that visits to urban and coastal destinations can be combined in the same trip. (...) The EESC stresses the urgent need for the legislation on granting visas to be revised.</p> <p>(1.14) The EESC would also ask that (...) a link be made between maritime and coastal tourism and river tourism.</p>	<p>The Commission will soon launch a study on coastal and maritime tourism to assess, among other thematic, innovative strategies for the diversification of the tourism offered in coastal areas, in particular in mass tourism destinations, while integrating coastal and inland attractors.</p> <p>On April 2014, the Commission adopted a comprehensive Visa Package proposal aiming at more flexible visa rules, including a new type of visa (Touring-visa), making the EU more accessible to non-EU tourists.</p>
<p>(1.8) There is an urgent need for proper management of tourist ports because of the lack of information on marinas and how ports are linked, which makes access difficult for yachts and cruise</p>	<p>As announced in Action 3 of the Communication, the Commission will soon launch a Pan-European Dialogue for the Cruise Sector, bringing together cruise companies, ports administrations and</p>

<p>ships.</p> <p>(1.9) The exponential increase in cruise holidays has been creating new situations (...) it is essential to minimise the harmful impact that these peak flows of visitors can cause in the areas visited.</p> <p>(1.11) Europe must keep a careful eye on cruise companies' employment policies.</p>	<p>tourism.</p> <p>The Commission is updating its Maratlas online tool to include all links to existing European marinas and ports, including information on services provided.</p>
<p>(1.10) The proposed move to carry out a survey of training needs and set up a "blue jobs" section in the EURES Portal is an important one; however, it is also essential for the Commission to publicise this extensively and raise awareness in Member States about the need to take on board the survey's outcome in their domestic training policies.</p>	<p>The Commission supports the views expressed and it is considering the possibility of launching a specific communication campaign to publicise the results of the survey.</p>
<p>(1.13) The EESC is in favour of a study on the preferences of tourists who visit or intend to visit Europe, showing what they did or did not like, the reasons why they would return or which prevent them from doing so, and why they might prefer non-European destinations.</p>	<p>The Commission has been following closely the preferences of tourists visiting Europe. Studies already developed include a Study on the Competitiveness of the EU tourism industry and a Study on online consumer reviews in the hotel sector. The Virtual Tourism Observatory also collects data on tourists' preferences.</p>
<p>(3.2) The main problems encountered in tourism have persisted over the years (...). It is therefore vital to establish a European political framework for developing tourism, a genuine European tourism policy, which steers joint development strategies while respecting Member States' freedom to develop their own domestic policies.</p>	<p>The Tourism Communication from 2010 defined the political framework for European tourism. The present Communication elaborates on this policy framework for coastal and maritime tourism in particular. This particular policy is being developed under the Blue Growth strategy and is being spurred through joint development strategies at sea basin and macro-regional level.</p>
<p>(3.4) Support for nautical tourism should be made concrete and should be regulated, creating new infrastructures and modernising existing infrastructure. Pleasure boating is, from this point of</p>	<p>The Commission is preparing a study on coastal and maritime tourism to assess innovative strategies for the development of a more competitive nautical tourism in Europe, including innovative practices for</p>



view, an activity which should be given a boost, with the development of new products which combine the potential of sea and river activities.	marina development. Links to inland activities, including river activities, will be explored.
(4.1) Information about the tourism sector is quite fragmented (...). The EESC welcomes the intention to remedy this shortcoming but points out that, since the 2010 communication when this problem was identified, very little progress has been made on this front.	Since the adoption of the 2010 Communication on Tourism, the Commission has intensified its efforts to gather information on the tourism sector. Besides several studies, the cooperation with Eurostat has been reinforced, the Tourism Satellite Accounts are providing useful contributions to the assessment of tourism in Europe and the Virtual Tourism Observatory will be operational by the end of 2014.
(4.6) As regards the problem of Member States requiring different competences for professional yacht skippers, the EESC feels that the Commission is not ambitious enough in its proposals. Although there is no doubt that the Commission's powers are limited in the area of tourism, the same is not true when it comes to the free movement of people and the creation of the single market, which are also concerned by this issue.	As announced in Action 5 of the Strategy, the Commission will assess the need for EU action on qualification requirements for professional yacht skippers. This assessment, which will have as a starting point a Study on the Competitiveness of the Boating industry, to be launched in the coming months, will thoroughly evaluate the situation. No measures, including those pertaining to the single market, are excluded <i>a priori</i> .

<p><b>N°22</b></p> <p><b>Proposition de règlement du Parlement européen et du Conseil modifiant le règlement (UE) n° 1308/2013 et le règlement (UE) n° 1306/2013 en ce qui concerne le régime d'aide à la distribution de fruits et légumes, de bananes et de lait dans les établissements scolaires</b></p> <p><b>COM(2014) 32 final – CESE 1559/2014 fin – NAT/642</b></p> <p><b>500<sup>ème</sup> Session plénière - juillet 2014</b></p> <p><b>Rapporteur: M. Albert KIENLE (GRI-DE)</b></p> <p><b>DG AGRI – Commissaire CIOLOŞ</b></p>	
<p><b>Points de l'avis du CESE estimés essentiels</b></p>	<p><b>Position de la Commission</b></p>
<p>Point 3.10. Le CESE estime juste de promouvoir dans le cadre des programmes à destination des écoles la distribution de fruits et légumes, y compris de bananes, et de lait.</p> <p>Il serait selon lui discutable de limiter la distribution au lait de consommation. Mieux vaudrait continuer de proposer une large gamme de produits laitiers, en tenant compte des aspects nutritionnels et éducatifs.</p>	<p>Réserve dans l'attente des résultats des négociations avec les autres institutions.</p> <p>L'étude d'impact qui accompagne la proposition de la Commission explique le bien-fondé du choix des produits</p> <p>Cet aspect de la proposition continue à être discuté avec le Conseil (et dans le futur avec le Parlement) car étant un des points sensibles.</p> <p>Cependant, dans le cadre des mesures éducatives de soutien, les Etats membres ont la possibilité d'inclure un plus grand choix de produits (y compris d'autres produits laitiers).</p>

<p><b>N°23    New EU Forest Strategy</b>  <b>COM(2013) 659 final - EESC 7442/2013 fin - NAT/624</b>  <b>500<sup>th</sup> Plenary Session - July 2014</b>  <b>Rapporteur: Mr Seppo KALLIO (GRII-FI)</b>  <b>Corapporteur: Mr Brendan BURNS (GRI-UK)</b>  <b>DG AGRI – Commissioner CIOLOŞ</b></p>	
<b>Points of the EESC opinion considered essential</b>	<b>Commission position</b>
<p>1.1. The EESC welcomes the new EU Forest Strategy (EUFS) and urges both the Commission and the Member States to ensure that the strategy is effectively and efficiently implemented.</p> <p>1.3. The EESC believes that the strategic orientations provided for each priority should be used to ensure that the Strategy is implemented swiftly.</p>	<p>Further to the Council conclusions on the EU Forest Strategy, the Commission will develop by early 2015 a concrete proposal for a multiannual implementation plan, focusing on priorities. The plan will contribute to improving coordination and to monitoring the implementation.</p>
<p>1.4. The EESC calls for rural development programmes to include forestry-related measures, and for promoting these measures, in order to ensure a higher uptake of available funds</p>	<p>The Commission welcomes the support to forestry measures under rural development. Member States should take advantage of opportunities presented by the new Rural Development Regulation. The Commission intends to undertake an evaluation of these measures in the coming years to improve their contribution to rural development</p>
<p>1.6. The EESC believes that the discussion on Sustainable Forest Management Criteria, regardless of the end use of wood, should be based on the widely recognised and accepted criteria and indicators formulated during the Forest Europe process and should also take into account Member States' particular characteristics and existing systems and legislation on forests.</p>	<p>The Commission has established an ad-hoc Working Group under the Standing Forestry Committee composed of experts from Member States and stakeholders to undertake the work on sustainable forest management (SFM) criteria. The starting point for the work would be the analysis of existing criteria and indicators of SFM as provided for by work carried out under Forest Europe and other relevant policies, regulations and tools in place,</p>

	and the analysis of their application in the EU.
1.7. With regard to principles for prioritising the uses of wood, the Committee dismisses any legally-binding rules and supports an open market-based approach and the freedom of market participants.	<p>Policy interventions should create favourable framework for the cascade principle to be applied by the market and enable sustainable supply of biomass for different users of biomass. Cascading use of secondary wood raw materials is already strongly encouraged by the Waste Framework Directive.</p> <p>As announced in the Strategy, the effect of incentives for using forest biomass in creating market distortions will be assessed by the Commission.</p>
1.9. The EESC supports the use of forest management plans, but underlines that they should continue to be used on a voluntary basis and kept clearly separate from the Natura 2000 management plans to avoid unnecessary costs and red tape.	<p>The Commission would like to underline that the forest target under the Biodiversity Strategy further promotes forest management plans.</p> <p>The Commission considers that biodiversity considerations are an integral part of the sustainable management of forests. Forest owners should ensure the protection of forest biodiversity, in order for the EU to achieve its 2020 biodiversity targets. The Commission considers it helpful if the forest management plan at least contains a reference to a Natura 2000 management plan, if the given forest covers a Natura 2000 area.</p> <p>The Commission intends to further discuss this issue with Member States.</p>
1.11. The EESC supports the promotion of wood and other forest materials including cork as a domestic, sustainable, renewable, climate and environment-friendly raw material and is convinced that the forest sector must play a key role in the success of a future bio-economy.	Forest resources are finite and vulnerable. The Commission will explore and promote the use of wood and other forest materials, including cork, as a sustainable, renewable, climate and environment friendly raw material that can substitute more resource-intensive or environmentally

	<p>harmful alternatives, provided it is produced without damaging the forests and their ecosystem services. Resource efficiency and prudent use of scarce resources should be a priority.</p> <p>Measures to be put in place should not distort market competition.</p>
<p>1.12. The EESC underlines the importance of making best possible use of current and future funding opportunities to support research and innovation, and highlights the role of initiatives such as the European Innovation Partnership (EIP) or the Public Private Partnership (PPP) on bio-based industries</p>	<p>The Commission will assist Member States and stakeholders in transferring technological and scientific knowledge to forest practice and the market, in particular through Horizon 2020 as well as through the European Innovation Partnerships on Agricultural Productivity and Sustainability and on Raw Materials.</p> <p>In addition, regions could be encouraged to adopt a smart specialisation strategy in the area of bio-economy and in the forest-based sector.</p>
<p>2.1. European forest cover is on an upward trend, increasing by around 0.4% per year over recent decades, and the situation regarding growing stock is also positive, with only around 60-70% of the annual increment being felled. Around 60% of woodland is in private hands, while the remainder is publicly owned.</p>	<p>The Commission considers that the reference only to the 60% could be misleading.</p> <p>While currently in the EU, only 60-70 % of the annual increment is being cut, it is important to mention that according to Member States' projections under Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry (LULUCF), harvest rates are expected to increase substantially. Furthermore, much of the increment takes place in younger forest stands which are far from having reached their harvesting age.</p> <p>This assessment should be therefore complemented with an evaluation of what is the biomass that EU forests can sustainably provide.</p>
<p>5.3 Concerning the launching of a cumulative cost assessment of EU legislation affecting value chains in the forest-based industry and that all</p>	<p>As announced in the Strategy, the Commission will launch a cumulative cost assessment of EU legislation affecting Forest-based Industry value chains, in 2014. The results could</p>

<p>stakeholders in the forest value chain should be involved in the assessment, to ensure a comprehensive and complete picture of the sector and a coherent approach.</p>	<p>contribute to a wider analysis of impacts, including costs, benefits, and coherence, of policies and legislation. As part of the assessment, the relevant sectoral stakeholders would be involved in line with the objectives of this study.</p>
---	---

<p><b>N°24</b></p>	<p><b>Exploration of hydrocarbons with fracking</b>  <b>COM(2014) 23 final – EESC 1320/2014 fin – NAT/629</b>  <b>499<sup>th</sup> Plenary Session – June 2014</b>  <b>Rapporteur: Mr Josef ZBOŘIL (GRI-CZ)</b>  <b>Co-rapporteur: Mr Sorin IONIȚĂ (GRIII-RO)</b>  <b>DG ENV – Commissioner POTOČNIK.</b></p>
<p><b>Points of the EESC opinion considered essential</b></p>	<p><b>Commission position</b></p>
<p>2.1 The EU is undergoing massive transformations in the field of energy, determined by overlapping factors such as important technological breakthroughs (concerning both renewables and fossil fuels), major geopolitical shifts and ambitious policy targets which sometimes lead to complex actions, the effects of which are difficult to sort out. But while the sources of energy have certainly multiplied and diversified, the European economy and vulnerable consumers face an increasing risk of unreliable supply and high prices.</p>	<p>Measures in the energy policy area need to be put in the larger context of the EU's long-term objective to become a resource-efficient low-carbon economy. In the short-term, natural gas, including gas from shale formations, can play a role in the transformation of the energy sector, provided it substitutes for more carbon intense fossil fuels and does not replace renewable energy sources.</p> <p>Security of energy supply is an aspect that the Commission recently addressed in its Communication on a European Energy security strategy (COM(2014) 330). Beyond the diversification of energy supplies, further enhancing energy efficiency is a key tool to improve the EU security of supply and make energy cheaper. As pointed out in the Commission communication on energy efficiency (COM(2014) 520), for every additional 1% in energy savings, EU gas imports are expected to fall by 2.6%.</p>
<p>3.12 It is also recommended that Member States ensure that companies apply the best available techniques (BAT), where applicable, and good industry practices to prevent, manage and reduce the impacts and risks associated with exploration and production projects. In addition, the Commission is reviewing the existing</p>	<p>The Commission is reviewing the existing BAT reference document (BREF) on the management of extractive waste, which will encompass waste resulting from hydrocarbon operations. The first meeting of the Technical Working Group for this work took place on 19-22 May 2014.</p>

reference document (BREF) on extractive waste under the Mining Waste Directive. The Committee believes it would be published soon.	The Commission has also initiated steps to develop a BREF on hydrocarbon exploration and extraction. These two processes are expected to be completed within three years.
3.13 To facilitate the public's involvement, the Commission will establish a European Science and Technology Network on Unconventional Hydrocarbon Extraction, bringing together practitioners from industry, research, academia as well as actors of civil society. Further research in the field on understanding, preventing and mitigating the environmental impact and risks of shale gas exploration and exploitation is also announced in the 2014-2015 work programme of Horizon 2020.	<p>This Network has indeed been established and its launch event took place on 8 July 2014<sup>1</sup>.</p> <p>A call for proposal was launched under Horizon 2020<sup>2</sup> in the field of understanding, preventing and mitigating the environmental impact and risks of shale gas exploration and exploitation. Proposals received are currently being evaluated by the Commission.</p>
3.14 Member States are invited to apply the principles of the Recommendation within six months and, starting in 2015, inform the Commission yearly about the measures adopted. The Commission will monitor implementation with a public scoreboard comparing the situation in the different Member States and will review the effectiveness of this policy in 18 months.	Member States should inform the Commission about the measures they put in place in response to this Recommendation for the first time, by December 2014 and annually thereafter. National reports will be published as received by the Commission on its website. The Recommendation invites Member States to already publish information on completed wells, planned projects, permits granted, baseline studies and monitoring results by 8 August 2014.
4.2 Since not all the EU countries are endowed with this primary energy source, the subsidiarity principle must be followed. The EU "acquis" provides adequate means	The Commission will assess the implementation of the principles set in the Recommendation by Member States and review the effectiveness of

<sup>1</sup> <https://ec.europa.eu/jrc/en/event/conference/launch-event-european-science-and-technology-network-unconventional-hydrocarbon-extraction>.

<sup>2</sup> <http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/topics/1126-lce-16-2014.html#tab1>.



<p>of finding solutions to the cross-boundary effects of fracking, should they occur. The EESC believes that the current EU regulations are adequate, covering most aspects involved in fracking; there is no need to adopt a specific "shale gas directive" for the time being. Thorough implementation of existing legal obligations is a safe way of developing this new extractive technology.</p>	<p>the Recommendation by August 2015, based inter alia on the Member States' reports, which are due in December 2014. On the basis of this review, the Commission will decide whether it is necessary to put forward legislative proposals.</p>
<p>4.6 The EESC recognises that unconventional hydrocarbon extraction technology has made progress in recent years. The key environmental and safety concerns have been successfully addressed in a credible manner and the risks in crucial environmental areas reduced. Nevertheless, the danger of water contamination in particular needs to be closely monitored; special attention must be paid to water stress areas. The EESC advises that the Commission's documents be revised at the earliest opportunity so as to incorporate the following suggestions.</p>	<p>The Commission's review of the effectiveness of the Recommendation in August 2015 will take into account technological developments and additional information on environmental impacts and risks as well as unexpected challenges in the application of Union legislation. Monitoring of water quantity and quality is indeed a key aspect, as pointed out in the Recommendation.</p>
<p>4.7 When assessing extraction projects, the benefits accruing to local communities (infrastructure, jobs, taxes and royalties, etc.) should be set out in full. It is very important – and good practice – that the proceeds from royalties and excise taxes be shared with local budgets in a transparent and predictable manner, preferably using a formula available for public scrutiny, in order to compensate communities for any negative consequences caused by extraction and reduce their opposition to such projects. The EESC advises that this point be incorporated into the Commission's Recommendations.</p>	<p>The allocation of proceeds from royalties and excise taxes is a topic to be addressed at Member States' level, which is why this is not covered in the Commission Recommendation.</p>
<p>4.9 Geological and seismic risks must be carefully assessed in specific basins but the Communication should mention that the</p>	<p>The Commission Recommendation invites Member States to ensure that operators carry out a site-specific risk</p>

<p>fracturing process takes place in much deeper wells than conventional extraction, well below the aquifers in the case of shale gas. Knowledge should continue to be developed, nevertheless, regarding the medium and long-term risks arising from the sheer scale of the operations involved in the new technology.</p>	<p>assessment, based on sufficient data, so as to identify all potential exposure pathways, and assess inter alia the risk of induced seismicity and water contamination.</p> <p>It is indeed necessary to continue increasing our knowledge on hydrocarbon extraction technologies and practices in order to further reduce environmental impacts and risks, including in the medium to long term. The Commission has commissioned further studies in this field.</p>
<p>4.10 The Commission may also want to mention that the water consumption per well is fairly low, and a good portion of this water returns to the surface to be either re-used or properly processed. The chemicals used are subject to the REACH Regulation in the EU and gas leaks must be properly managed, as should flaring of the waste gas. In addition, land use in proportion to the power density of other gas fields is much less than that of PV/wind and biomass installations; currently, this phenomenon is seriously underestimated by proponents of all kinds of renewables, although it often plays a role when decisions are taken on the feasibility of primary energy sources.</p>	<p>Water consumption per shale gas well varies depending on geological specificities but typically amounts on average to about 15 000 m<sup>3</sup> per well. When assessed per unit of energy produced, this is 2 000 to 10 000 times more than conventional gas, according to the International Energy Agency.</p> <p>Between 25-90% of the initially injected fracturing fluids are expected to remain underground, depending on geological conditions.</p> <p>Chemicals which match registration thresholds and criteria set in the REACH Regulation need to comply with its provisions.</p> <p>The Recommendation invites Member States to ensure that operators capture gases for subsequent use, avoid venting and minimise flaring.</p> <p>Land use is to be taken into account as part of environmental impact assessments and screenings carried out under Directive 2014/52/EU (amending Directive 2011/92/EU on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment).</p>



<p><b>N°25      Wildlife Trafficking</b>  <b>COM(2014) 64 final - EESC 1723/2014 fin – NAT/643</b>  <b>499th Plenary Session - June 2014</b>  <b>Rapporteur: Mr POLICA (GRIT-IT)</b>  <b>DG ENV – Commissioner POTOČNIK</b></p>	
<b>Points of the EESC opinion considered essential</b>	<b>Commission position</b>
<p>1.1 The EESC recognises the recent upsurge in wildlife trafficking as a new threat to the European Union from the economic, environmental and social points of view, and in terms of protecting public health and native animal and plant species. The EESC therefore supports the initiative by Parliament and the Commission to draw up a holistic and coordinated strategy to tackle this crime more effectively.</p>	<p>The Commission thanks the EESC for its opinion.</p> <p>The Commission is currently considering the possible follow-up to the Communication on the EU Approach against Wildlife Trafficking and the related stakeholder consultation.</p>
<p>1.2 The EESC considers that the starting point for the strategy should be compliance with, and reinforcement and coordination of, existing international agreements (particularly CITES), laws, regulations, policies and enforcement instruments, in the form of closer integration of all the relevant sectors - environmental protection, customs controls, the courts, combating organised crime, etc. - and more effective cooperation between wildlife source, transit and demand countries.</p>	<p>In this context, due consideration will be given to the approaches, instruments and agreements suggested by the EESC. The follow-up to the Communication should aim amongst others to strengthen cooperation between countries and stakeholders involved in the fight against wildlife trafficking, to establish a stronger and more uniform enforcement, and to create greater awareness and involvement of businesses and consumers.</p>
<p>1.5 The Committee believes that third country populations involved in trafficking need to be offered new and better opportunities for sustainable development and employment.</p>	<p>The Commission highlights that its new Biodiversity for Life ('B4 Life') initiative is designed to help the poorest countries combat wildlife crime and develop green economies. It aims in particular to develop nature-based solutions towards a green economy. B4 Life should leverage funding and stimulate business models such as markets for green products and eco-</p>

	<p>tourism; promote public-private partnerships for the sustainable management of natural resources; help develop Payment for Ecosystem Services schemes for small farm holders: offering incentives to manage their land to increase the quality and quantity of key habitats; and ensure access to benefit sharing for indigenous people and local communities.</p>
<p>3.7.3 The Committee highlights the need to provide third country populations involved in illegal wildlife trafficking with new and greater opportunities for sustainable development and employment, which could in part be achieved by converting unlawful activities into lawful ones, such as responsible tourism.</p>	<p>The Commission also would like to reinforce the link between poverty alleviation and biodiversity conservation by its new Biodiversity for Life ('B4 Life') initiative, which is the new framework for biodiversity-related activities in third countries, based on three main domains (governance, food security and green economy) and includes a specific pillar on the Wildlife Crisis. The Commission is convinced that a solid management of protected areas can provide security and wealth to surrounding population and a good protection against wildlife trafficking.</p>
<p>3.9.2 The EESC calls for genuinely effective, proportionate and dissuasive sanctions to be introduced. EU legislation must ensure that wildlife trafficking is included by the Member States among the "serious crimes" punishable with maximum sanctions of at least four years' imprisonment.</p>	<p>The Commission also agrees with EESC that appropriate and dissuasive sanctions against offenders should be applied to ensure effective measures against trafficking.</p>

<p><b>N°26      A clean air programme for Europe</b>  <b>COM(2013) 917 final, COM(2013) 918 final, COM(2013) 919 final,</b>  <b>COM(2013) 920 final - EESC 637/2014 fin – NAT/634</b>  <b>500th Plenary Session - July 2014</b>  <b>Rapporteur: Mr PEZZINI (GRI-IT)</b>  <b>DG ENV – Commissioner POTOČNIK</b></p>	
<b>Points of the EESC opinion considered essential</b>	<b>Commission Position</b>
The EESC stresses the need to ensure a healthy environment and excellent air quality as basic components of living and working conditions in order to safeguard the well-being of Europeans, and regrets that such an important factor is no longer as high up on the agenda of EU and national political priorities as it needs to be.	The Commission notes with appreciation the Committee's recognition of the importance of air quality for the well-being of European citizens, and its call for a higher political profile for the issue.
The EESC calls on the new Parliament, the new Commission and the Council to ensure that the EU institutions make it a top priority to safeguard safe and clean air standards in the future, with the full involvement of the social partners and organised civil society.	For its part, the Commission confirms that clean air policy will remain a key priority and notes that the 7 <sup>th</sup> EU Environment Action Programme (7EAP), which was adopted by the Council and European Parliament last year, includes a specific goal on air quality as part of the key objective of safeguarding the Union's citizens from environment-related pressures and risks to health and well-being.
The EESC considers air pollution to be among the most serious human health and environmental hazards, with significant adverse effects in terms of respiratory disorders, premature death, eutrophication and the degradation of ecosystems. It welcomes the Commission's initiative to establish a new Clean Air Programme and to reduce loss of life expectancy from 8.5 months in 2005 to 4.1 months in 2030, thereby gaining 180 million life years and protecting biodiversity in another 200 000	The Commission welcomes the Committee's endorsement of the assessment and impact reduction aims of the Clean Air Programme, and of the main targets to be achieved by 2030. These are a necessary but interim step towards the 7EAP goal of ensuring air quality levels which cause no significant adverse impact on human health or the environment.

km <sup>2</sup> .	
1.3.1. The EESC is convinced that achieving the transition to a more sustainable European economy involves setting a 2030 target, with a more certain medium to long term perspective, which businesses and investors need.	
The EESC considers it advisable to step up the application of Euro 6 emissions caps, measured on the basis of "real driving emissions", and the arrangements for replacing two-stroke engines since it doubts that the application of these measures will be able to achieve the desired results by 2020.	The Commission has set out its schedule for implementation of real driving emissions controls on new (Euro 6) diesels, but the timetable requires the full commitment and co-operation of Member States to ensure that the desired results are delivered by 2020. The Commission welcomes the Committee's highlighting of this extremely important issue.
The EESC supports the Commission's final objective – set out in the Clean Air Programme and the 2020-2030 energy and climate framework – to establish the emissions threshold for 2030 at a 70% "gap closure" between the current legislation baseline and the maximum technically feasible emission reductions (MTFR).	The Commission welcomes the Committee's endorsement of the emission reduction requirements set out in the Clean Air Programme and implemented in the proposal for a revised National Emission Ceiling Directive.
In order to achieve this objective, which must be enforced and implemented by all the parties involved, the EESC believes that firm action is required, including:	The Commission's position on each recommendation is set out below:
- the introduction of emissions reduction requirements for methane in 2020 and for mercury in 2020, 2025 and 2030;	Reduction requirements have not been included for methane in 2020 as methane is covered for that year by the requirements of the Effort Sharing Decision 406/2009/EC. Mercury emissions are covered by already existing EU legislation and will be further addressed in the forthcoming package implementing the recently agreed Minamata Convention.
- more stringent emissions caps for	The Commission welcomes the Committee's endorsement of the need to

medium combustion plants;	act on medium combustion plants. These measures are provided in proposal COM(2013) 919.
- the refusal of optional derogations from the Industrial Emissions Directive (IED) in cases that entail concrete health hazards;	<p>Under the IED, no derogations to individual plants can be granted which would entail environmental or health hazards. The Directive has several safeguards in place to prevent this (e.g. Article 15(4) and Article 18).</p> <p>As regards the transitional national plans submitted by a number of Member States (IED Article 32), the Commission Decisions make clear that their implementation shall be without prejudice to the obligation to comply with all relevant legislation, including on air quality.</p>
- specific measures to reduce ammonia and methane in the agricultural sector;	These measures are provided in Annex III of COM(2013) 920. The character of the requirement outlined in the proposed Directive aims at allowing the use of the Rural Development Fund, which is key for an effective implementation.
- more decisive action on transport emissions, including "real-world" measurements and the application of related tests in 2014, upon the introduction of the Euro 6 standards;	The Commission's implementation timetable for Euro 6 Real Driving Emissions (RDE) foresees adoption of the test procedure in 2014 and application for measurement purposes immediately thereafter. Application for type approval would be in 2017. See also response to point 1.4 above.
- the decisive implementation of the International Maritime Organization's (IMO) NOx and SO2 standards for ships by 2016, as agreed in 2008, in all European maritime areas, as Emission Control Areas;	While the designation of Emission Control Areas is for the riparian states in the context of IMO, incentives towards the establishment of new Emissions Control Areas (ECAs) is provided in Article 5.1 of COM(2013) 920.
- action to adopt stringent standards for particulate matter (PM) for new household appliances;	This is being taken up in the ongoing Ecodesign discussions on solid fuel boilers and space heaters.
- the design and development of eco-	This is achieved by integrating air quality



friendly machinery and plants;	considerations into the relevant Ecodesign initiatives and in the proposal COM(2013) 919, and stimulated through the IED and the Best Available Techniques (BAT) reference documents developed in this context.
- the full application of product life cycle assessments (LCA);	These are considered in the relevant Ecodesign initiatives.
- medium to long-term predictability, as opposed to overlapping policy measures;	This is achieved by focusing the main additional effort on the year 2030.
- support for education and training for consumers, workers and young people on the preservation and development of a healthy working, recreational and residential environment;	The Commission aims to promote capacity-building measures inter alia through the new LIFE programme 2014-2020.
- the promotion of research and investment in terms of innovative market applications of BAT, sustainable growth and decent and lasting employment;	The Clean Air Programme includes specific provisions on the effective integration of air quality concerns in the implementation of Horizon 2020 (through the Clean Air Research and Innovation Programme). Innovative techniques will also get enhanced attention in the context of the information exchange process under the IED.
- the international dimension of action to achieve environmental sustainability;	The Clean Air Programme identifies measures to encourage ratification of the Gothenburg Protocol by countries of Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia (EECCA) and calls for further international cooperation also beyond the UN Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) area.
- the assurance of consistency between this new strategy and other EU policies and objectives.	Very careful attention was paid to ensuring consistency between the Clean Air Package, the Climate and Energy Package and other relevant policies.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EESC fully agrees that the amendments to the Protocol to the 1979 Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution to Abate Acidification, Eutrophication and</li> </ul>	The Commission welcomes the Committee's endorsement of COM(2013) 917.

Ground-Level Ozone need to be incorporated into EU legislation.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although the qualitative long-term objectives of the proposal for a new national emission reduction commitments (NERCs) directive are undisputed, the EESC regrets that the 2025 objectives are not binding since this would secure their full enforcement.</li> </ul>	While the 2025 objectives are an important check-point to ensure adequate progress towards the 2030 objectives, it is also important to avoid over-constraining the trajectory to 2030 which could lead to sub-optimal implementation.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The EESC emphasises the need for regional policies to include measures to maintain healthy air quality levels since it is convinced that due to the high level of accumulated pollution and regional meteorological conditions, air quality management will only work if it is supported by EU policies to reduce emissions.</li> </ul>	The Clean Air Programme makes clear that while full compliance with existing air quality standards will be aided by implementation of existing EU legislation, it will also require action at national, regional and local level. The Commission will encourage the use of existing Community funds to support such action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National governments and local authorities need to show unwavering commitment to planning concrete measures aimed at reducing harmful emissions by developing detailed regional Air Quality Action Plans (AQAPs) with a strong emphasis on the various manufacturing, farming, service and private sectors, and energy production and distribution. The Commission should send a clear message concerning their effective enforcement, with prompt and firm action against non-compliant Member States. The EESC acknowledges however that several Member States have already taken steps in the right direction.</li> </ul>	<p>The Commission welcomes the Committee's highlighting of the need for effective air quality management planning at national regional and local level. It is particularly important that air quality planning is linked effectively with plans to achieve the revised national emission reduction commitments, and Article 6(2) of COM(2013) 920 provides for this.</p> <p>It is for Member States to decide on a case by case basis (and national circumstances) on the appropriate geographical planning scale for addressing air quality.</p> <p>The Commission intends to continue its monitoring of the effective implementation of the policy, and take appropriate action, including infringement procedures, if the Member States deviate from the set obligations.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Initiatives must be held to involve professional organisations, organised civil society, NGOs, the third sector,</li> </ul>	The Commission agrees on the importance of continued stakeholder engagement in the implementation of the package, and the Clean Air Programme introduces the

<p>information centres, at all levels, and research centres, in order to achieve the objective of continuous air quality improvements, which is vital to public welfare and the ecosystem.</p>	<p>idea of a regularly occurring Clean Air Forum bringing together all stakeholders mentioned on a biennial basis.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Committee reiterates its firm belief in the need for Europe to return to a sustainable form of economic development that prioritises quality of life, jobs, public health and environmental protection, tying in closely with all other Europe 2020 policy priorities and fully incorporating a comprehensive transition strategy towards the planet's balance, based on qualitative economic growth, which contributes to eradicating poverty and social injustice and, at the same time, preserves natural resources for future generations.</li> </ul>	<p>The Commission welcomes the Committee's endorsement of the central objective of the 7EAP. The Clean Air Package will play its role in bringing about such sustainable development, including increased productivity, increased employment and reduced health care costs, as well as a platform for the European clean technology sector to tap into the markets of emerging economies, which are taking air pollution increasingly seriously.</p>

<p><b>N°27</b></p>	<p><b>Transatlantic trade relations and the EESC's views on an enhanced cooperation and eventual EU-US FTA (own-initiative opinion)</b>  <b>EESC 5469/2013 - REX/390</b>  <b>500<sup>th</sup> Plenary Session - July 2014</b>  <b>Rapporteur: Mr Jacek KRAWCZYK (GRI-PL)</b>  <b>Co-Rapporteur: Sandy BOYLE (GRII-UK)</b>  <b>DG TRADE – Commissioner DE GUCHT</b></p>
<p><b>Points of the EESC opinion considered essential</b></p>	<p><b>Commission position</b></p>
<p>This opinion expresses support for an ambitious Transatlantic Trade &amp; Investment Partnership, which the EESC believes could boost growth and job creation within the EU for the benefit of European citizens, and could also contribute to enhanced global rules and standards for the benefit of the multilateral trading system. The opinion covers a wide range of topics and supports the EU's objectives in general across all three pillars of the negotiations: market access for goods, services and public procurement, regulatory coherence, and rules.</p>	<p>The Commission appreciates the EESC's overall support for a comprehensive and ambitious Transatlantic Trade &amp; Investment Partnership. The Commission's approach continues to be based upon the negotiating directives from the Council of Ministers and the recommendations of the joint EU-US High Level Working Group. As the EESC recognises, only this high level of ambition is likely to deliver the desired benefits of TTIP, including in the areas highlighted by the EESC of tariff elimination, market access for public procurement, geographical indications, and regulatory coherence.</p> <p>Multilateral trade policy remains the Commission's priority and in this regard it is important that the TTIP negotiations are not seen as a diversion. However, from a practical perspective, it is evident that a deal between the world's two biggest trading partners could help to support the multilateral process, in particular by developing enhanced rules and standards for key areas of international trade.</p>
<p>The EESC stresses the need for TTIP to deliver results evenly across all communities</p>	<p>The negotiations have reached a sensitive juncture given the changing</p>

in Europe, including business, workers, consumers and citizens, and the importance of close involvement of the EESC in the negotiations to help achieve this. Transparency is a key ingredient of the process, and the EESC suggests ways to improve engagement with wider civil society to help ensure this.

political contexts on both sides of the Atlantic, with a new European Parliament and change of Commission on the EU side, and mid-term elections approaching on the US side. During this period, it is important that the negotiators can continue detailed work on the many technical aspects of TTIP, so as to prepare for political choices to be made on the direction and key issues of the talks in 2015. The Commission supports the EESC's view that the benefits of TTIP should be evenly spread across all communities in Europe, including business, workers, consumers and citizens.

In this context, the public debate about TTIP is to be welcomed. The Commission is listening closely to the range of views expressed by many different stakeholders, and has already taken on board a number of suggestions: for example by including a chapter on small business interests, pursuing provisions on animal welfare, and consulting the public on investor-state dispute settlement (ISDS). The Commission has also made unprecedented efforts to inform citizens and explain the objectives and state of play of the TTIP negotiations in detail, via a dedicated website, high-level participation in roundtables and other events, dedicated civil society dialogues and use of social media. The Commission recognises that these comprehensive negotiations touch on many aspects of EU policy and it is important to ensure that all voices are heard. To help do so, a TTIP Advisory Group has been set up comprising experts from key civil society sectors. The group meets regularly to advise the

	<p>EU Chief Negotiator on all aspects of the negotiations, and reports of these meetings are available online. Members of the Advisory Group and three representatives of the EESC have access to EU negotiating documents.</p> <p>The EESC's recommendations play an important role for the Commission in these negotiations. The Commission considers that the role of civil society and transparency are important in trade policy and doubly so in the case of TTIP. In this regard, the Commission welcomes further cooperation with the EESC to enhance its exchanges with civil society, and it takes on board the need to hold more regular exchanges with the rapporteurs and members of the EESC.</p>
<p>On investment protection and ISDS, the EESC intends to produce an own-initiative opinion following the Commission's recent consultation, and will facilitate a dialogue between key stakeholders on this topic.</p>	<p>With regards to investment protection and investor-state dispute settlement (ISDS), the Commission welcomes the intention of the EESC to play an important role in facilitating dialogue with stakeholders and to produce a specific own-initiative opinion on the subject. The approach proposed by the Commission aims to ensure that TTIP and future EU investment agreements reflect best practices on issues such as transparency, the rights of governments to regulate in the public interest, and the avoidance of frivolous claims. The Commission is currently reviewing responses to its public consultation which closed on 13 July. The EESC's comments regarding the definition of the terms "frivolous claims" and "public purpose" will be taken into account in the overall assessment. This is unlikely to be available until November 2014 at the earliest, owing to the high volume of</p>

	<p>responses.</p> <p>The Commission recognises the importance of accurate economic analysis of TTIP's potential, and the EESC's comments on this subject are valuable as the work on the Sustainability Impact Assessment (SIA) moves ahead. Communicating clearly and in a balanced manner on the variable impacts of TTIP continues to be a priority.</p>
<p>The EESC stresses the need for consumers to have confidence in regulatory standards, particularly in the area of food safety.</p>	<p>The Commission is pleased that the EESC appreciates the frequent public assurances that regulatory standards of protection (for consumers, the environment, workers and more) will not be lowered through TTIP. The Commission has also made clear that the EU's system of protection for personal data is not on the table in the negotiations.</p> <p>As frequently stated in public by the Commission, TTIP will make no changes to the EU's current food safety standards. TTIP will uphold the EU's precautionary principle as outlined in the treaties. But the potential benefits to consumers of TTIP go beyond the area of regulatory standards. They range from more choice of goods in the shops, to more competitive EU industries able to expand their operations and contribute to stronger economic growth, more jobs and greater purchasing power for EU citizens.</p>
<p>With regards to the regulatory pillar of the negotiations, the EESC appreciates the Commission's frequent public assurances that regulatory standards of protection (for consumers, the environment, workers and more) will not be lowered through TTIP.</p>	<p>The regulatory pillar of the negotiations is a significant opportunity. An innovative agreement to reduce unnecessary duplication of regulatory costs (for example in key sectors such as pharmaceuticals or automotive), and a</p>

<p>The opinion recommends that negotiators take the opportunity to improve regulatory coherence between the parties, focusing on best practices, and ensure that regulatory cooperation can continue in future.</p>	<p>commitment to work together in future on jointly agreed priorities, would deliver the bulk of TTIP's potential benefits for all European interests. The Commission looks forward to further cooperation with the EESC on how to achieve the full potential of this part of the negotiations.</p>
<p>The EESC also stresses the potential benefits of TTIP for small businesses.</p>	<p>Similarly, the potential benefits of TTIP for small businesses (SMEs) in the EU are very significant. As a sector representing 99% of European and American business, employing millions of people and producing a wide range of highly innovative and specialised goods and services, small businesses make up an important share of transatlantic trade. TTIP could help make this easier by reducing existing barriers (ranging from lower tariffs to less red tape at customs), and could encourage more small businesses to export and reap the gains of access to the whole transatlantic market. The EESC's views on the content of the SME chapter in TTIP will help to ensure that the best results for these crucial companies are achieved.</p>
<p>The opinion highlights the importance of a strong sustainable development chapter, tackling labour and environmental issues, based on international principles and rules. Civil society's role in monitoring EU and US commitments is essential, and the EESC looks forward to facilitating this through participation in a dedicated Domestic Advisory Group.</p>	<p>A strong trade and sustainable development chapter is a key plank of the TTIP negotiations. As in its previous agreements, the EU aims to include language to ensure (a) that both parties fully retain the right to regulate on matters of environmental and labour policy; (b) the upholding in domestic laws and practices of the values and principles of international instruments such as the core ILO standards and Multilateral Environmental Agreements; (c) a commitment not to allow trade interests to erode these standards; and (d) the promotion of trade and</p>



	<p>investment favouring sustainable development. The set-up of channels for involving civil society in the implementation of such provisions both at domestic level and jointly also is a key element of the EU approach. Regarding the enforcement of this chapter, the EU does not believe that the threat of trade sanctions is the most effective way of solving potential problems, and recalls that there is no evidence in this regard. Instead, the continuous involvement of civil society, through an approach based on dialogue and accountability in line with international labour and environmental instruments, delivering independent, expert recommendations for the parties to follow up, is a surer way to meet our labour and environmental goals.</p>
<p>The EESC emphasises the crucial importance of securing the EU's energy supply and access to raw materials. The opinion also underlines the need to promote energy efficiency and renewable sources of energy.</p>	<p>In the current global context, as the EESC recognises, the energy and raw materials chapter of TTIP is essential to promote the EU's objectives of open markets and improved energy security through diversification of supply. The Commission welcomes the EESC's view as regards energy efficiency and promotion of energy from renewable sources. The Commission is looking at innovative ways to further develop trade and investment in energy from renewable sources and associated green technology through TTIP, as well as how to promote energy efficiency.</p>
<p>The EESC highlights the importance of consistently informing other EU institutions throughout the TTIP negotiations, including the European Parliament and the EESC itself, and also other civil society stakeholders.</p>	<p>At an institutional level, democratic oversight is built into the system. In the same way as for other trade agreements, the Commission remains accountable to the Council and to the European Parliament throughout the negotiating process. The Council and the Parliament</p>

	<p>are fully informed at every step, in line with the treaty obligations that the EESC highlights. At the end of the negotiations, the Council and the Parliament will need to ratify the agreement before it can come into force.</p>
--	--

<p><b>N°28      State aid to airports and airlines</b>  <b>C(2014) 963 final – EESC 1544/2014 fin – CCMI/125</b>  <b>500<sup>th</sup> Plenary Session - July 2014</b>  <b>Rapporteur: Mr Jacek KRAWCZYK (GRI-PL)</b>  <b>Co-rapporteur: Mr Nico WENNMACHER (GRII-LU)</b>  <b>DG Competition – Vice President ALMUNIA</b></p>	
<b>Points of the EESC opinion considered essential</b>	<b>Commission position</b>
<p>The spending of taxpayers' money, including EU budgetary resources, must be well prepared on the basis of a feasibility study not distorted by purely local politics but validated by relevant economic and social demand.</p>	<p>The compatibility conditions set out in the new EU State aid Guidelines for Airports and Airlines (OJ C 113, 4.4.2014), which entered into force on the same day, require among other things that the investment aid creates and maintains only capacity that meets in the medium-term the demand of passengers, airlines and freight forwarders in the catchment area of the airport.</p> <p>In this regard, the medium-term prospects for use must be demonstrated on the basis of sound passenger and freight traffic forecasts incorporated in an ex ante business plan and must identify the likely effect of the investment on the use of existing infrastructure, such as another airport or other modes of transport, in particular high-speed train connections.</p>
<p>Allowing an extremely long transitional period for airports to achieve profitability is not providing sufficient incentive for meaningful change in this respect.</p>	<p>The new Aviation Guidelines authorise operating aid to regional airports for a transitional period of 10 years, in order to allow them to adjust to the new market situation and to avoid any disruptions in the air traffic and connectivity of the regions.</p> <p>Under the current market conditions the available data and industry consensus point to a link between an</p>

	<p>airport's financial situation and its traffic levels, with financing needs normally being proportionately greater for smaller airports (up to 3 million passengers per annum). In the light of their contribution to economic development and territorial cohesion in the Union, managers of smaller regional airports should therefore be given time to adjust to the new market environment, for example, by gradually increasing airport charges to airlines, by introducing rationalisation measures, by differentiating their business models or by attracting new airlines and customers to fill their idle capacity. During the transitional period, operating aid will be gradually phased out.</p>
<p>The EESC is deeply disappointed that the study which would have presented the ongoing state of public aid and similar practices as regards implementation of the Aviation Guidelines - and which it requested in its previous opinion – was never conducted. Too much room was left for political “mist” on the subject and not enough hard data was provided to propose reliable solutions. The EESC resubmits its request, which it regards as still relevant and justified. This study should provide information on the amount and type of aid, its actual impact on the development and efficiency of the economy and its impact on employment from a quantitative and qualitative point of view.</p>	<p>Before the European Commission adopted the new EU State aid Guidelines for Airports and Airlines it conducted an impact assessment taking stock of two public consultations, publicly available information and studies as well as its decision making practice and the judgments of the European Courts in this area.</p> <p>The impact assessment accompanying the adoption of the new Guidelines is available at the following link: <a href="http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/impact/ia_carried_out/docs/ia_2014/swd_2014_0042_en.pdf">http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/impact/ia_carried_out/docs/ia_2014/swd_2014_0042_en.pdf</a> and <a href="http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/impact/ia_carried_out/docs/ia_2014/swd_2014_0043_en.pdf">http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/impact/ia_carried_out/docs/ia_2014/swd_2014_0043_en.pdf</a>.</p>
<p>One of the serious problems resulting from the implementation of previous Guidelines was insufficient enforcement. The EESC is concerned that the high number of "exceptions" in the current regulation – in</p>	<p>These new rules aim to ensure that airports located in regions with a genuine transport need get access to the public funding that they need while also maintaining a level playing field</p>

<p>addition to the extremely long transitional period – will enable weak enforcement to continue in the future, thus undermining the main purpose of this regulation: the creation of a level playing field.</p>	<p>for airports and airlines irrespective of their business models.</p> <p>In order to be able to take stock of the specific market failures and regional handicaps, certain exceptions – however within strict boundaries in order to exclude undue distortions of competition - were introduced in the new Guidelines. These exceptions concern for example remote regions, (such as outermost regions, regions Malta, Cyprus, Ceuta, Melilla), islands and sparsely populated areas.</p> <p>With regard to the enforcement of the rules, the new Guidelines contain strict conditions for monitoring and transparency of the aid granted to airports and airlines.</p>
<p>That is also why it will be extremely important to closely monitor implementation of the "new" current Aviation Guidelines. The European Commission should review the extent to which the targets have been achieved and report back no later than within 12 months.</p>	<p>The Commission agrees that a close monitoring of the implementation of the new rules is pertinent for a level playing field. This is why the new rules contain strict monitoring and transparency conditions. At the same time it is important to reduce the administrative burden for the public authorities and undertakings concerned.</p> <p>A review of the new Guidelines is foreseen six years after 4 April 2014. That evaluation will be based on factual information and the results of wide-ranging consultations conducted by the Commission on the basis of data provided by Member States and stakeholders. Moreover, the Commission will reassess the situation of airports with annual passenger traffic up to 700 000 in order to determine the need for continued specific compatibility rules on</p>

	<p>operating aid in favour of this category of airport in the light of the future prospects for full operating cost coverage, in particular with regard to the change of market conditions and profitability prospects.</p>
--	---

<p><b>N°29</b></p>	<p><b>An open and secure Europe: making it happen</b>  <b>COM(2014) 154 final – EESC 1800/2014 fin - SOC/505</b>  <b>500<sup>th</sup> Plenay Session – July 2014</b>  <b>Rapporteur: Mr José Isaías RODRÍGUEZ GARCÍA (GRI-ES)</b>  <b>DG HOME – Commissioner MALMSTRÖM</b></p>
<p><b>Points of the EESC opinion considered essential</b></p>	<p><b>Commission position</b></p>
<p>1.7 The EU must set up a common asylum system with harmonised legislation, based on the Treaty's provisions for a common policy in this area. The Dublin Convention should be replaced with a more solidarity-based system within the EU that also takes account of asylum seekers' wishes.</p>	<p>The Commission notes that the second generation legislation forming the Common European Asylum System was adopted in July 2013.</p> <p>The Dublin System will be evaluated in 2016, which could provide an opportunity to look at possibilities of re-adjusting the Dublin mechanism. This would include examining whether to take into account the wishes of asylum seekers as to which Member State should consider their application.</p>
<p>1.10 The EESC proposes that Europol become a European agency under a European political or judicial authority, with a remit that extends beyond its current coordinating role, and, as soon as possible, with its own operational capability for investigation across the EU in cooperation with Member States' police forces.</p>	<p>Current EU Treaty provisions do not allow extending the competences and tasks of Europol in order to make it work as a sort of federal police, as suggested by the EESC.</p> <p>1) For Europol to become a sort of "European FBI", the EU should have an exclusive competence on national security which is not the case. Article 4.2 of the Treaty on the European Union states that "The Union [...] shall respect [Member States'] essential State functions, including [...] maintaining law and order and safeguarding national security. In particular, national security remains the sole responsibility of each Member State".</p> <p>2) The mandate and competences of Europol are defined in Article 88 of the Treaty in the Functioning of the EU which</p>

	<p>clearly limits Europol's mission to "support and strengthen action by the Member States". Furthermore, paragraph 3 of Article 88 excludes the possibility for Europol to have an independent operational capability for investigation, by stating that: "[a]ny operational action by Europol must be carried out in liaison and in agreement with the authorities of the Member States or States whose territory is concerned. The application of coercive measures shall be the exclusive responsibility of the competent national authorities".</p>
<p>4.1.3 The EESC is concerned at the impact of this strategy on developing third countries which need to maintain trained and qualified human capital in order to rise out of their current impoverished condition. When framing policies to attract external talent to the EU, ways of drawing upon this human capital while introducing measures to compensate the countries of origin so their growth is not jeopardised must be a priority. It should not be forgotten that the long-term solution for people from under-developed countries to secure a better future is not to attract them into the EU so they can find work and better living conditions, but to work for their countries to achieve such a level of development that their people do not see emigration as their only chance for survival.</p>	<p>The Commission believes that Mobility Partnerships should play an important role in addressing labour and skills shortages in Europe while facilitating trade related mobility. To do so, visa liberalisation dialogues and facilitation of the issuance of short-term visas can be an important element contributing to spurring economic growth in the EU as well as promoting development in third countries by allowing migrants to work in the EU and then return to their country of origin, bringing with them learning experience, income earned and increased networking capabilities contributing towards the development of their own country. In addition, the EU migration and development agenda should maximise the development impacts of South-South migration while mainstreaming migration policy into national development and poverty reduction plans in the countries of origin. At the same time, the Commission supports strengthening Policy Coherence for Development, as well as promoting reintegration measures for returning migrants. Such cooperation to ensure a well-managed migration would produce significant benefits for development in countries of origin, which in the long term</p>



	would improve living conditions there, thus contributing to reducing future migration pressure
<p>4.1.8 Spain, Greece, Italy Cyprus and Malta are under strong pressure from irregular migration from that part of the world, across the Mediterranean and through the Balkans, leading to tragic events such as those that have occurred on the shores of Lampedusa and which must be prevented by all means. The Committee urges the Commission and the Council to ensure that the European Union becomes more involved in a problem which concerns the Union itself and consequently all the Member States, and not only those located on the external borders, with more solutions and fewer reproaches to individual Member States.</p>	<p>The Task Force Mediterranean (TFM) was created in the immediate aftermath of the Lampedusa tragedy in October 2013. As identified in the Communication on the TFM of 4 December 2014 (COM (2013) 869 final), the main mandate of the Task Force was to identify – based on the principles of prevention, protection and solidarity – priority actions for a more efficient short term use of European Policies and tools.</p> <p>38 specific actions were identified that need to be developed in mid- and long-term in the following areas (1) Actions in cooperation with third countries; (2) Regional Protection, resettlement and reinforced legal avenues of entry to Europe; (3) Fight against trafficking, smuggling and organised crime; (4) A border surveillance operation contributing to enhancing the maritime situational picture and saving migrants' lives in the Mediterranean; and (5) Assistance and solidarity with Member States dealing with high migratory pressure.</p> <p>The Commission is committed to ensure that the actions identified are implemented. It adopted a Staff Working Document on the Implementation of the Work of the Task Force of 22 May 2014 (SWD (2014) 173 final).</p>
<p>4.1.9 The EESC deems it essential that short-term measures be complemented by long-term measures aimed at addressing the root causes of involuntary migration (poverty, human rights violations, conflicts, lack of economic opportunities, poor working conditions, unemployment, etc.).</p>	<p>The Commission fully agrees with the need to address root causes of irregular and forced migration, including through appropriate EU development support. In this context, it is essential to intensify cooperation with countries of origin and transit, in particular to contribute to institutional and legislative reforms and</p>

	<p>capacity building in partner countries with regard to migration and border management as well as asylum and reception capacity. The Commission would like to refer, in particular, to its 2013 Communication on ‘Maximising the Development Impact of Migration’ (COM(2013)292) and the subsequent Council conclusions of 23 September 2013.</p>
<p>4.2.3 The EESC would reiterate the recommendations it made in its opinion on the proposal for an amendment to the regulation, and considers that Frontex should become a European border-guard service comprising a European body of border guards.</p>	<p>The Commission would like to recall that the activities of the Frontex Agency are confined to the provisions of its legal framework established by Regulation Nr. 2007/20004. At the time of the adoption in October 2011 of the most recent amendment of the Frontex Regulation, the Commission undertook to launch a study on the feasibility of a European System of border guards. The results of that study will become available in the third quarter of 2014. In the meantime the Frontex Regulation foresees in its Article 33 an independent evaluation which is currently ongoing. The Commission will analyse the outcome of both studies and launch the necessary policy debate on possible future revisions of the Frontex mandate probably during the year 2015. This will be done to respond to the European Council Conclusions of June 2014, i.e. to study in the context of the long-term development of Frontex the possibility of setting up a European system of border guards to enhance the control and surveillance capabilities at our external borders.</p>
<p>4.2.4 The EESC supports the implementation of the [<i>smart borders</i>] package, since it is convinced that the introduction of new technologies will facilitate modern management of the Union's borders. It therefore urges the European institutions to press ahead with the legal instruments to</p>	<p>The Commission welcomes that the EESC recognises the importance of the Smart Borders package and the added value it should bring in modernising management of EU borders while ensuring that fundamental rights, including the right to protection of personal data enshrined by</p>

<p>facilitate the rapid implementation of these technologies.</p>	<p>Article 8 of the Charter, are fully respected.</p> <p>In order to achieve both the timely implementation as well as an optimal solution of the proposed Entry Exit and Registered Traveller Programme, the Commission pursues on parallel tracks and in cooperation with the co-legislators, the negotiation of the policy/legal aspects of the package and the technical proof of concept for Smart Borders. The proof of concept consists of an ongoing Commission-led study and a subsequent pilot project to be executed by EU-LISA.</p>
<p>4.5.8 Street violence recognises no borders, and violent trouble-makers can often move from one country to another, exploiting events wherever they occur. The Committee therefore points to the need for closer cooperation between the various national police forces, in order to identify and take action against these violent gangs, who might subsequently join terrorist groups.</p>	<p>A study<sup>1</sup> showed that most Travelling Violent Offenders (TVO) incidents are linked not to terrorist groups but to football supporter hooliganism (about 75%). The existing network of National Football Information Points was perceived as a good example of information sharing in this area which could be extended to other sport events and thereby cover an even larger share of all incidents.</p> <p>However, the study also acknowledged that sound statistics based on a common definition of TVO are lacking. Member States should therefore be encouraged to collect statistics which allow for reliable threat assessments of the phenomenon. Another way forward would be for the Member States to make better use of existing possibilities of SIS II alerts.</p> <p>As regards terrorism prevention, the Commission notes that a dedicated Working Group for first-line police officers has been set up at the EU level – RAN-</p>

---

<sup>1</sup> Study on possible ways to improve the exchange of information on Travelling Violent Offenders including those attending sporting events or large public gatherings: [http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/e-library/documents/policies/police-cooperation/general/docs/study\\_on\\_improving\\_the\\_info\\_exchange\\_on\\_travelling\\_violent\\_offenders\\_march\\_2013\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/e-library/documents/policies/police-cooperation/general/docs/study_on_improving_the_info_exchange_on_travelling_violent_offenders_march_2013_en.pdf).

	<p>POL. As a part of the EU Radicalisation Awareness Network, the group's objective is to increase among police officers the awareness of the radicalisation process to terrorism and violent extremism. The group facilitates networking, exchanging experiences, promotes learning and cooperation through seminars, workshops and study visits.</p>
<p>4.5.9 The EESC would voice its support for the measures being taken to raise levels of security for the public and businesses in cyberspace. In the light of the foreseeable increase in internet crime, the measures being carried out by the European Union to combat cybercrime deserve the strongest possible support. Cooperation with non-EU countries must make it possible to adopt a global approach to crime with a global dimension which does not stop at any border. Prevention is again crucial in this area to avoid being overtaken by cybercriminals in the use of new technologies. The European Cybercrime Centre should receive more resources, including financial ones, even though it has only recently been set up.</p>	<p>The Commission welcomes the support by the EESC to measures aiming at further cross-border cooperation, including with non-EU countries, in countering cybercrime. One priority is the adoption of the Budapest Convention of the Council of Europe by third countries cooperation against cybercrime, to which the Commission is strongly committed to.</p> <p>The Commission also takes note of the call made by the EESC for increasing the European Cybercrime Centre resources within Europol. There was considerable progress in the Centre's first year of operation, with growing responsibility putting pressure on its limited resources.</p>

N°30	<b>An immigration policy and relations with third countries (exploratory opinion)</b> <b>EESC 873/2014 fin - REX/398</b> <b>500<sup>th</sup> Plenary Session - July 2014</b> <b>Rapporteur: Mr Panagiotis GKOFAS (GRIII-EL)</b> <b>Co-rapporteur: Mr Luis Miguel PARIZA CASTAÑOS (GRII-ES);</b> <b>DG HOME - Commissioner MALMSTRÖM</b>	
<b>Points of the EESC opinion considered essential</b>		<b>Commission position</b>
1.5/ 4.4.2 The EESC proposes that the role of Frontex should be developed (over the medium term) into a European border-guard service comprising a European body of border guards.		The Commission would like to recall that the activities of the Frontex Agency are confined to the provisions of its legal framework established by Regulation No 2007/20004. At the time of the adoption in October 2011 of the most recent amendment of the Frontex Regulation, the Commission undertook to launch a study on the feasibility of a European system of border guards. The results of that study will become available in the 3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter of 2014. In the meantime the Frontex Regulation foresees in its Article 33 an independent evaluation which is currently ongoing. The Commission will analyse the outcome of both studies and launch the necessary policy debate on possible future revisions of the Frontex mandate probably during 2015. This will be done to respond to the European Council Conclusions of June 2014 i.e. to study in the context of the long-term development of Frontex, the possibility of setting up a European system of border guards to enhance the control and surveillance capabilities at our external borders.
1.6/4.3 The EESC is of the opinion that the EU should put in place procedures for better sharing responsibilities between		The Commission has consistently advocated solidarity and an appropriate sharing of responsibilities among

<p>Member States, and for the provision of financial, operational and reception support, since some Member States are faced with specific problems due to their geographical location.</p>	<p>Member States in migration matters. This takes the form of EU level financial assistance via the ERF (European Refugee Fund), RF (Return Fund), EBF (External Borders Fund) and their successors AMIF (Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund) and ISF (Internal Security Fund), via the actions of the relevant EU agencies, in particular FRONTEX and EASO (European Asylum Support Office), and via other measures (for example ad-hoc relocation of asylum seekers from Malta).</p>
<p>1.7/3.3 The EESC considers that the EU should promote an international legislative framework for migration and mobility, which should include the main ILO conventions and the UN Convention on the Protection of the Rights of all Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families.</p>	<p>In recent years, the EU has actively engaged in discussions on international migration and development and global migration management. In this context, the EU has urged states to work together on a global agenda on international migration which should produce tangible, effective, inclusive and forward-looking results. The EU has also stressed the need to uphold and ensure the implementation of relevant international human rights instruments. The Commission would like to refer to its Communication on Maximising the Development Impact of Migration of 21 May 2013 (COM(2013) 292).</p>
<p>1.9 The EESC considers that immigration and asylum policy needs to be better coordinated with the external policy, and that the European External Action Service (EEAS) to a greater extent should cover immigration, border and asylum policies.</p>	<p>The Commission agrees that migration and asylum policy objectives should be embedded and fully integrated into the EU's overall external action and in EU dialogues with third countries and regions. In this context, the advantages offered by the EEAS' overview of EU's overall external relations should be exploited. The Commission would like to refer to its Report on the implementation of the Global</p>

	Approach to Migration and Mobility of 21 February 2014 (COM(2014) 96).
1.11/1.12/1.13 The EESC believes that Mobility Partnerships should be converted into binding international agreements, which should give greater priority to aspects relating to economic migration and mobility, such as the organisation of legal migration and visa policy, recognition of qualifications, social security rights, and migration and mobility's contribution to development.	<p>The Mobility Partnerships provide frameworks for enhanced and tailor-made dialogue and cooperation with third countries on a wide range of areas, including on enhancing and promoting mobility of people and better managed legal migration.</p> <p>More work can still be done to make sure that the Mobility Partnerships are implemented in a balanced manner, i.e. better reflecting all four thematic priorities of the Global Approach to Migration and Mobility.</p> <p>The non-binding nature of the Mobility Partnerships is an advantage, as it allows the EU and interested Member States to conclude agreements that are acceptable to all parties involved (also considering the split competences of the topics involved), but which are not necessarily negotiated in all its details.</p>
1.15/1.17 The EESC stresses that cooperation on preventing and fighting irregular migration with countries of origin and transit needs to be improved, that information campaigns should to be launched, and that criminal networks involved in trafficking in human beings or smuggling migrants should be effectively tackled. The EESC also advocates cooperation between Frontex and Europol to combat organised crime, particularly trafficking in human beings and smuggling of migrants.	<p>The Commission shares the EESC's view that cooperation with countries of origin and transit should be improved, including on preventing and fighting irregular migration as well as trafficking in human beings. Information campaigns will soon be launched in main countries of transit on the Eastern [Ethiopia] and Western African [Niger] migratory route in cooperation with UNHCR and IOM.</p> <p>The Commission is currently working on developing a comprehensive EU Action Plan on smuggling of migrants to better steer all instruments at our disposal, including operational ones through strengthened cooperation</p>

	between FRONTEX and Europol, to fight criminal human smuggling networks.
1.19/4.5.6 The EESC reiterates its opposition to holding asylum seekers and irregular immigrants in detention centres as a matter of course, as this must remain an extraordinary measure.	<p>The Commission shares the EESC's opinion. The recently recast Reception Conditions Directive includes very restrictive grounds for the detention of asylum seekers, as well as strict requirements regarding the conditions of detention. Likewise, the Return Directive allows the use of detention for the purposes of preparing for return only as a last resort and contains explicit rules and safeguards for detention of irregular staying third country nationals.</p> <p>The Commission refers to its Communication on EU Return Policy of 28 March 2014 (COM(2014) 199) which gives strong support to the promotion of alternatives to detention as well as to the development of a codified set of detailed immigration detention rules by the Council of Europe, aimed at promoting full compliance with international and European human rights standards.</p>
1.20 The EESC expresses concern over the rise in intolerance, racism and xenophobia towards immigrants across Europe, and is also alarmed because in some Member States the protection of people's fundamental rights is being eroded.	All forms and manifestations of racism and xenophobia are incompatible with the values upon which the EU is founded. The Commission is committed to ensure the full and correct implementation of the EU's equality framework and the acquis on migration, to fight against discrimination and to ensure that migrant's fundamental rights are granted. Member States are bound by the EU Directives, which lay down standards both on regular and irregular migration and which are all based on the respect for migrants' fundamental



	<p>rights and dignity. More particularly, the Commission presented a report in January 2014 on the implementation of Council Framework Decision 2008/913 on combating certain forms and expressions of racism and xenophobia by means of criminal law.</p> <p>Furthermore, active anti-racism policies and promotion of the positive aspects of a diverse society are important to favour migrants' integration, as confirmed in the Common Basic Principles for Immigrant Integration Policy in the EU. Council Conclusions were adopted in June 2014 to reaffirm the Common Basic Principles ten years after their adoption in 2004 and following discussion in the European Integration Forum, which is co-organised between the Commission and the EESC.</p>
<p>1.22/4.2.3 The EESC proposes that the Dublin Convention should be replaced with a more solidarity-based system that should also allow asylum seekers to submit their requests in any Member State. The EESC considers that, in relative terms, Member States such as Malta, Cyprus and Greece are facing the greatest pressure.</p>	<p>The new Dublin III Regulation, adopted in June 2013, contains sound procedures for the protection of asylum applicants and improves the system's efficiency, including a solidarity mechanism (article 33). It is, however, not a solidarity instrument, but a mechanism to establish the Member State responsible for the examination of the asylum application.</p> <p>The Commission recognises that there is an uneven distribution of responsibilities for asylum claims in the EU, with 70% of asylum seekers making applications in five Member States (Germany, France, Sweden, UK and Italy). In 2013, the Member States that received most asylum seekers per capita were: Sweden, Malta, Austria, Luxembourg and Hungary.</p>

	<p>The Dublin Regulation will be evaluated in 2016, which could provide an opportunity to look at possibilities of re-adjusting the Dublin system.</p>
<p>4.2.5/4.2.6/4.2.7 The EESC proposes to expand resettlement programmes as well as programmes on relocation within the EU of beneficiaries of protection and asylum seekers, as there is currently very little solidarity between Member States when it comes to these issues. The Commission should submit a legislative proposal for a permanent and effective intra-EU relocation mechanism, on the basis of an EU distribution key for the relocation of asylum seekers, as described in the European Parliament report on enhanced intra-EU solidarity in the field of asylum (2012/2032 INI).</p>	<p>The Commission has consistently urged Member States to pledge resettlement places for refugees in need of international protection. The ERF and its successor AMIF provide financial incentives for Member States for this purpose. Under the AMIF, Member States are now required to make pledges for resettlement for (initially) 2-year periods, starting in 2014-2015, as part of their national programmes. Member States are required to indicate whether or not they will resettle in that period, and if so, how many persons.</p> <p>In the absence of political will by Member States to develop a permanent intra-EU relocation mechanism, the Commission organises an annual relocation forum, to encourage Member States to engage in such relocation.</p>
<p>5.1.10 The EESC proposes that in humanitarian crises caused by massive population displacements in transit territories, the EU could finance the establishment of immigration and temporary residence centres. Cooperation with the UNHCR and the IOM in such centres would guarantee an appropriate protection for those who require it.</p>	<p>The Commission is already supporting long-term capacity building in countries of first asylum or of transit to better deal with refugees in line with international standards, and enable durable solutions, through Regional Protection Programmes (RPPs). Such RPPs have to date been deployed in the Middle East, Eastern Europe, the Great Lakes Region, the Horn of Africa and North Africa.</p> <p>Furthermore, as for humanitarian aid it should be noted that it is provided in accordance with the humanitarian principles and international</p>

	humanitarian law, solely on the basis of needs of affected populations.
5.1.14 The EESC considers that short-term measures must be complemented by long-term measures aimed at addressing the root causes of involuntary migration.	The Commission shares the view that it is necessary to address root causes of irregular and forced migration, including through appropriate EU development support. In this context, it is essential to support third countries with institutional and legislative reforms and capacity building.

N°31	<p><b>Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: Internet policy and governance – Europe's role in shaping the future of internet governance.</b></p> <p><b>COM(2014) 72 final; EESC 1699/2014 fin – TEN/549</b></p> <p><b>500<sup>th</sup> Plenary Session – July 2014</b></p> <p><b>Rapporteur: Mr Antonio LONGO</b></p> <p><b>DG CNECT – Vice President KROES</b></p>	
	<p><b>Points of the EESC opinion considered essential</b></p>	<p><b>Commission position</b></p>
<p>1.4 As regards the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers' (ICANN) current role coming to an end and the Assigned Numbers Authority's (IANA) functions, the Committee feels that the Commission should be resolute in raising the question of the role that the EU should play in the future transnational body.</p>		<p>In a multistakeholder forum that manages important aspects of a global resource, the EU will clearly play a role but it is not the time now to determine in advance the specifics of a role or position in an as yet undefined body.</p>
<p>4.4.1 The Committee notes that the Communication does not sufficiently elaborate on either the concept of governance to which the EU should contribute, or the tools that are intended to secure multi-stakeholder decision-making processes regarding the internet.</p>		<p>The Commission supports an open, free, multistakeholder concept of Internet governance. Thus, so long as the Compact principles are met this should achieve the right goals. The Global Internet Policy Observatory will also contribute to better information exchange and to help to bolster multistakeholder concept, support and contributions.</p>
<p>4.4.2 Alongside pointing to the positive experiences of individual EU and non-EU countries, the Commission puts forward only one initiative: development of the Global Internet Policy Observatory (GIPO) platform (a positive and important initiative), with the intention of proposing additional practical proposals following the outcome of an upcoming public consultation. However, specifically in view of this Communication, a broad</p>		<p>The positions adopted in the Communication build inter alia on the results of the public consultations launched in view of the adoption of the Communication.</p> <p>The Commission is firmly committed to continue its engagement in discussions with different stakeholders. Public consultations constitute an important tool in this respect. Different options may be considered for the identification</p>

consultation has already been carried out; this has not added greater substance to the proposals in the Communication and above all reveals that the various bodies and stakeholders have given this inadequate attention.	of the most effective mechanisms for consultations in the future.
4.4.2.1 The Commission needs to clarify the specific role and added value of the EU itself and what is being asked of the individual States, not least in light of the objectives of the digital agenda for Europe. It also needs to define exclusive and shared competences here, not least to prevent overlaps and possible conflicts.	The Commission is committed to take a leading role when engaging with international counterparts in discussions on Internet governance. The Commission actively helps to coordinate European Internet governance positions with the Member States to ensure that the EU has the maximum impact on shaping international consensus building on these issues.
4.4.3 (...). The Committee asks the Commission to introduce direct incentive measures for governments, the business world and NGOs working to uphold the rights of citizens, and in particular consumer associations, which are not mentioned in the Communication.	The Commission is fully committed to engage in discussions with all stakeholders involved in issues related to Internet governance. Consumer associations are included amongst the most important stakeholders even if not specifically identified separately.
4.5.1 Another important aspect concerns measures at international level that the EU as a whole should put in place, as regards the governance of all electronic communications and citizens' rights. The Communication does not specifically address how to disseminate these initiatives at international level.	Such work will be carried out in the framework of different actions proposed by the Communication. In general, the Communication supports a vision of Internet governance model which promotes multistakeholder discussions on methods for ensuring the safeguard of fundamental rights also at international level.
4.6.2 As regards ICANN and IANA, this technical body has finally announced the launch of a process of global, multi-stakeholder management of the technical functions assigned to it from September 2015, the date of expiry of its contract with the US Government for the management of country-code top-level domains. The	Structural oversight cannot be achieved by international intergovernmental bodies and insisting on specific governmental or organisational roles might jeopardise the delicate negotiations on composition of a truly multistakeholder-managed outcome. Any new solution should certainly not

<p>Committee calls on the Commission to pinpoint exactly what role the EU should play in this future transnational body and to request a technical and a political representative on the board of the new ICANN.</p>	<p>fall behind the present multistakeholder reality.</p> <p>A representative of the European Commission will represent the views of European members of the General Affairs Council (GAC) in the IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group.</p>
<p>4.6.3 The Commission's support for a stronger Internet Governance Forum (IGF) which will serve as a discussion forum for all stakeholders is also important. The Committee calls for the EU to take a leading role in the next IGF, held in September 2014 in Istanbul, with joint and firm action by the Commission, the Member States and civil society, reiterating the content of the Communication.</p>	<p>Representation of the European Commission during the 9<sup>th</sup> IGF meeting was ensured by Vice President Kroes and by the additional members of her Delegation. One of the main aims of the participation of the Commission in the IGF was the promotion of an Internet governance vision presented in the Communication.</p>
<p>4.7.1 At intra-Community level, it is important that the Commission underlines correctly in the Communication the need to engender confidence in the internet through legislation designed to boost its security, stability and reliability such as the reform of the data protection framework and the Directive on network and information security.</p>	<p>The Commission has proposed a reform of the EU data protection framework and is actively working with Council and Parliament on finalising it, has proposed the legal and operational groundwork for an effective fight against cybercrime and an ambitious approach to cyber-security via the EU Cybersecurity strategy.</p>
<p>4.9.2 The Committee notes that the Communication makes no reference whatsoever to net neutrality, despite it having been recognised as fundamental to the digital agenda.</p>	<p>The Communication does address the importance of open internet in chapter 2 (A Principles Based Approach) and refers to the proposal for a regulation on "Connected Continent", adopted by the Commission in September 2013, which contains rules on net neutrality aiming at safeguarding the openness of internet.</p>

<p><b>N°32 Cyberattacks in the EU (own-initiative opinion)</b>  <b>EESC 1488/2014 fin - TEN/550</b>  <b>500<sup>th</sup> Plenary Session – July 2014</b>  <b>Rapporteur: Mr Thomas MCDONOGH</b>  <b>DG CNECT– Vice President KROES</b></p>	
<b>Points of the EESC opinion considered essential</b>	<b>Commission position</b>
1.1 The Committee would like to see an EU-level authority for cybersecurity created, analogous to the central authority in the aviation industry, the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA), to provide the strength of leadership required at EU level to deal with [...] cybersecurity.	The Commission takes good note of the EESC's Opinion. It underlines, however, that a good balance should be found between the need for coordination at EU level and the autonomy of the Member States in respect of the subsidiarity principle.
<p>1.2 Informed and empowered citizens are critical of strong cybersecurity in Europe. [...] and</p> <p>1.5 The mandate of the European Network and Information Security Agency (ENISA) should be extended and funding provided to take more direct responsibility for cyber security education and awareness programmes, especially those targeted at citizens and small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs).</p>	Under its current mandate, that was extended and approved in 2013, ENISA carries out tasks related to awareness-raising and cooperation between different actors in the information security field, notably by developing public/ private partnerships or initiatives like the annual European Cyber Security Month, the "Network and Information Security Driving Licence" and the EU Cybersecurity championship. Corresponding activities are foreseen in ENISA Work Programmes 2014 and 2015 in a commensurate manner with their budget. It also builds on activities financed by the Member States (e.g. under the European Cyber Security Month). EC3 and ENISA have also agreed to cooperate more closely in order to maximize synergies.
1.3 Businesses should be required by law to have a proactive approach to protecting themselves [...]	The Commission welcomes this recommendation, which supports Article 14 of the Proposed Network and Information Security (NIS) Directive.

1.4 Every Member State should have an organisation whose job it is to inform, educate and support the SME sector on issues regarding cybersecurity [...]	The Commission shares these concerns and works with ENISA on developing awareness materials, also for SMEs.
1.6 Businesses and organisations need to heighten the awareness of responsibility for cybersecurity at Board-level. The potential corporate liabilities resulting from inadequate cyber security policy and actions should be explicitly communicated to the directors of all organisations.	This recommendation effectively supports the EU Cybersecurity Strategy, in which industry is invited to promote cybersecurity awareness at all levels [...] and should reflect on ways to make CEOs and Boards more accountable for ensuring cybersecurity.
1.7 [...] All Internet Service Providers (ISPs) in the EU should have special responsibility for protecting their customers from cyberattacks. This responsibility should be defined and enshrined in legislation at EU level.	Article 13a&b of the Framework Directive (2009/140/EC) for electronic communications networks and services require ISPs to adopt security measures and report security breaches to national authorities.
1.8 To ensure that the great potential for economic growth from the dynamic expansion of cloud computing is quickly realised, special security requirements and obligations should also be imposed at EU level on the providers of cloud services.	Cloud computing is listed in Annex II of the proposed NIS Directive as one of the sectors targeted by the risk management and incident reporting obligations. The EU Cybersecurity strategy applies across the ICT domain, including cloud computing.
1.9 The Committee considers that voluntary measures are not enough, and so there need to be strong regulatory obligations [...]. Legislation is also needed to make notification of significant cybersecurity incidents mandatory for all businesses and organisations [...]	The Commission fully agrees that voluntary measures have not delivered and that a regulatory framework is needed. A balance should, however, exist between mandatory regulatory requirements and existing voluntary initiatives that have been successful.
1.10 The Committee strongly recommends that the EU takes a design-led approach to tackling the menace of cyberattacks, by ensuring that all the technology and services used in Europe to provide Internet connectivity and online services are designed to provide the highest possible levels of security from cyberattacks. Design considerations should especially focus on the man-machine interface.	Under the Horizon 2020 Framework Programme for Research and Innovation, the Commission is targeting funds to the NIS area. In particular, the area of security-by-design was present in the first call for proposals in the LEIT domain (Call ICT-2013-32). Other areas of interest in H2020 include: security research related to emerging ICT technologies; provision of solutions for end-to-end secure ICT systems,



	<p>services and applications; incentives for the implementation and adoption of existing solutions; and interoperability among network and information systems. Industry and SMEs are welcomed to submit proposals.</p>
<p>1.11 The EESC wants to see substantial cybersecurity standards developed and disseminated for all ICT networking technology and services by European Standardisation Organisations. [...] should include a compulsory code of practice to ensure that all ICT equipment and Internet services sold to European citizens conform to the highest standards.</p>	<p>This recommendation supports Article 16 of the Proposed NIS Directive that states that the Member States shall encourage the use of standards and/or specifications relevant to networks and information security. Moreover, the Commission and ENISA are currently considering the usage of certification schemes for cybersecurity.</p>
<p>1.12 The EU must act without delay to ensure that every Member State has a fully functioning Computer Emergency Response Team (CERT) in place [...]</p>	<p>The Commission welcomes this recommendation, which fully supports the provisions laid out in the Proposed NIS Directive.</p>
<p>1.13 The Committee demands that the European Cyber Crime Centre (EC3) at Europol receives the additional funding it requires to fight cybercrime [...].</p>	<p>Effective cooperation in the fight against cybercrime would require reinforcing EC3's resources. The Commission has made tremendous efforts to take this pressing need into consideration while applying austerity measures and staff cuts agreed by the EU Institutions with regard to all EU bodies. The Commission's budgetary proposal for 2015 provides for an increase of the EU contribution for Europol by EUR 10.7 million in 2015 to further develop the IT tools necessary to carry out its extended mandate, including for cybercrime related ICT tools. The Commission has also proposed to provide for an additional two temporary agents' posts above the level foreseen in the 2013 Communication on programming human and financial resources of decentralised agencies 2014-2020 (COM(2013)519). Only Europol and one other agency were in such a privileged position. Ultimately, it is up to the Budgetary</p>

	Authority to decide on the level of the EU contribution and the establishment plan (statutory posts of the agency) to cover the EC3 needs.
1.14 To sum up, the EESC considers that EU cyber security policy needs to deliver in particular on the following points: strong EU leadership; cyber security policies that enhance security while preserving privacy and other fundamental rights; awareness-raising among citizens and encouraging proactive protection approaches; comprehensive Member State governance; informed and responsible business action; deep partnership between governments, the private sector and citizens; adequate investment levels; good technical standards and sufficient R&D&I investments; international engagement. To this end, the Committee reiterates its recommendations concerning cyber security policy as voiced out in many previous opinions and calls on the Commission to follow up on the actions demanded therein.	The Commission takes note of the EESC recommendations. The Commission believes that a balanced approach should exist between regulation and soft measures, such as public-private partnerships. A notable step in this direction was the setting up of the Network and Information Security (NIS) Public-Private Platform in 2013. The Commission is also careful to avoid unnecessary regulatory burdens and costs. The Commission and ENISA are working together towards the implementation of many of these recommendations and requests, using available instruments and activities like Horizon 2020, the electronic identification and trust services (eIDAS) regulation, the NIS driving license, the European Cyber Security Month, and many others.

<p><b>N°33    The digital society: access, education, training, employment, tools for equality (own-initiative opinion)</b>  <b>EESC 773/2014 fin – TEN/548</b>  <b>500<sup>th</sup> Plenary Session – July 2014</b>  <b>Rapporteur: Isabel CAÑO AGUILAR (GRII-ES)</b>  <b>DG CONNECT – Vice-President KROES</b></p>	
<b>Points of the EESC opinion considered essential</b>	<b>Commission position</b>
<p>1.5    The EU and national authorities should act jointly to ensure that IT programmes and equipment are available at more affordable prices and respect multilingualism.</p>	<p>The EU cannot directly interfere in the market for pricing of IT programmes and equipment. However, through its innovation procurement instruments (PCP and PPI) it aims to strengthen the position of public procurers as first buyers in the market to stimulate markets relevant for public policies and achieve lower purchasing prices. Language technologies promoting multilingual access are a key part of the EU R&amp;I programme H2020.</p>
<p>3.2.2 All those responsible for the education system must cultivate an atmosphere in schools that is conducive to innovation, quality and cooperation in educational practice; all students must be stimulated during the educational process, with dissemination of good practice, civic participation and experiences at school, together with a culture of evaluation.</p>	<p>The EU promotes this culture of innovation through specific R&amp;I programmes, active since 20 years, aiming to stimulate new learning and innovative practices through ICTs at schools. Recent FP7 projects like iTEC and We.learn.it are good examples on how to scale innovation and engage into new ways of learning at schools.</p>
<p>3.5.3 Although greater female participation in the ICT sector could increase the euro area's GDP by EUR 9 billion, there are a number of reasons (for example, cultural stereotypes and traditions) for their insufficient participation in this sector, which is a problem not just in Europe but also in the wider world</p>	<p>The Commission has instigated a number of positive developments in women and ICT policy in recent years, especially awareness-raising about lack of women in digital jobs, and is supportive of further actions in this field.</p>

<p>3.5.4 point 2</p> <p>-considering the adoption of plans and robust measures, with funding, that address the issue of gender equality.</p>	<p>The Commission encourages, in particular, specific contexts that women web entrepreneurs or women in scientific careers may be facing.</p>
<p>3.5.4 point 7</p> <p>-teaching children to use computers and introducing them to programming at an early age (from primary school), as this would help girls to become more involved with ICTs.</p>	<p>The Commission encourages efforts to expose children early to coding, for example via the EU code week (<a href="http://codeweek.eu/">http://codeweek.eu/</a>) or similar initiatives. One of the objectives of this action is to get girls more interested in digital careers at an early age and, consequently, pursuing Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) education.</p>

<p><b>N°34      Enhancing the transparency and inclusiveness of the EU accession process (own-initiative opinion)</b>  <b>EESC 1609/2014 fin – REX/401</b>  <b>500th Plenary Session – July 2014</b>  <b>Rapporteur: Ms Marina ŠKRABALO (GRIII-HR)</b>  <b>DG ELARG – Commissioner FÜLE</b></p>	
<b>Points of the EESC opinion considered essential</b>	<b>Commission position</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1.3 The EESC recommends that the European Commission: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- substantially increases its financial support for building institutional capacities and developing citizen engagement in the accession process, as well as for strengthening the professionalism and independence of the media.</li> <li>- encourages both stronger civil and social dialogue in enlargement countries and links this more closely to the accession process.</li> <li>- increases its communication efforts to explain the benefits and challenges of enlargement policy to EU citizens, in cooperation with civil society organisations.</li> <li>- discloses all key documents for accession negotiations i.e. screening reports, translations of the EU <i>acquis</i> and opening and closing benchmarks and that these documents be published on the websites of the EU Delegations.</li> <li>- applies the DG Enlargement Guidelines for EU Support to Civil Society in Enlargement Countries 2014-2020 equally in all enlargement countries and revises these guidelines in order to address in more detail the specific challenges faced by the social partners in the context of social</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The European Commission takes note of the EESC recommendation. For the period up to 2020 the European Commission will ensure that due attention is given to building institutional capacities, developing citizen engagement and strengthening media independence and professionalism.</p> <p>In its EU Enlargement Strategy 2013-2014 the European Commission has indicated that it will increase focus on civil society, including capacity building and encouraging the creation of an enabling environment for its development and greater involvement of stakeholders in reforms.</p> <p>In its Enlargement Strategy 2013 -2014, the European Commission underlines the importance of EU citizens' support for enlargement policy. It is essential for Member States, together with the EU Institutions, to lead an informed debate on the political, economic and social impact of the enlargement policy. They have a key role in providing citizens with the facts on enlargement policy and, in so doing, to inform them</p>

<p>dialogue.</p> <p>- aims to fully implement the DG Enlargement Guidelines for EU Support to Media Freedom and Media Integrity in Enlargement Countries, 2014-2020.</p>	<p>of the benefits.</p> <p>The European Commission attaches great importance to the transparency of the accession negotiations, including the publication of key documents. Negotiating Frameworks as well as screening reports are systematically made public on the website of the Directorate-General for Enlargement. This also applies to the guidance communicated to candidate countries as a basis for the action plans for the chapters on the Judiciary and fundamental rights [chapter 23] as well as on Justice, Freedom and Security [chapter 24].</p> <p>As accession negotiations take place in an intergovernmental conference (IGC) context, publication of related documents cannot be decided by the Commission.</p> <p>The European Commission will apply the guidelines taking account of the challenges faced by social partners.</p> <p>The guidelines will serve as a basis for supporting media freedom at regional and individual country levels. Their implementation is a priority for the European Commission.</p>
--	---

N°35	<b>Post-2015 Hyogo Framework for Action : Managing risks to achieve resilience</b> <b>COM(2014) 216 final – EESC 2826/2014 fin – REX/407</b> <b>500<sup>th</sup> Plenary Session - July 2014</b> <b>Rapporteur: Mr Giuseppe Antonio Maria IULIANO (GRIT-IT)</b> <b>DG ECHO - Commissioner GEORGIEVA</b>	
<b>Points of the EESC opinion considered essential</b>		<b>Commission position</b>
(4.2) Experience shows that initiatives that are local or take a local approach are more likely and better able to reach vulnerable communities. The EESC advocates the promotion of local risk management approaches that involve local civil society organisations and regularly excluded communities. This implies a shift towards local risk management systems that make it possible to establish the necessary institutional mechanisms. National and internationally supported initiatives should prioritise the funding of local risk management activities.	<p>The resilience strategy (COM (2012)586 final) and its action plan are advocating for a strengthening of stakeholders' capacities at local level and the setting up of strong local structures to mitigate risks and to ensure the effectiveness of prevention and preparedness efforts as well as initial response operations.</p> <p>The Decision 1313/1013/EU on the Union civil protection Mechanism recognises the need for involvement of regional and local authorities in the activities carried out, in accordance with Member States national structures.</p>	
(5.2) The EESC welcomes the peer review mechanisms set up by some Member States and believes that they should be replicated across the board as a way forward. The EESC believes that the EU needs to be more ambitious in the medium to long term when it comes to improving data collection from Member States in order to ensure that the data is comparable and accessible, not only to NGOs, but also to civil society, the media, academics, the scientific community and other interested groups.	<p>The Decision 1313/2013/ EU on the Union civil protection Mechanism is promoting the participation of Member States to peer reviews, on a voluntary basis on assessment of risk management capability. The Commission is also invited to support the creation of voluntary peer review assessment programmes for the Member States' preparedness strategies.</p> <p>The Commission is currently up-scaling the peer review process and has published a call for tender to support six countries to be reviewed in 2014 and 2016 (four participating states and two European enlargement and</p>	

	<p>neighbourhood countries).</p> <p>The European Commission is working on data availability, accessibility, sharing and comparability, in particular towards establishing European standards and protocols for recording disaster losses, involving Member States and international partners.</p>
--	---