



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

SECRETARIAT-GENERAL

PV(2018) 2261 final

- *English language version of the French text which is authentic* -

Brussels, 18 July 2018

TEXTE EN

MINUTES

of the 2261st meeting of the Commission

held in Strasbourg

(Winston Churchill building)

on Tuesday 3 July 2018

(afternoon)

—

PV(2018) 2261 final

- *English language version of the French text which is authentic* -

EN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Attendance list	4-6
1. AGENDAS (OJ(2018) 2261/FINAL; SEC(2018) 2261/FINAL)	7
2. WEEKLY MEETING OF CHEFS DE CABINET (RCC(2018) 2261).....	7
3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE 2257 TH , 2258 TH , 2259 TH AND 2260 TH MEETINGS OF THE COMMISSION (6, 12, 20 AND 27 JUNE 2018) (PV(2018) 2257; PV(2018) 2257, 2 ND PART; PV(2018) 2258; PV(2018) 2258, 2 ND PART)	7
4. WRITTEN PROCEDURES, EMPOWERMENT AND DELEGATION OF POWERS.....	7
4.1. WRITTEN PROCEDURES APPROVED (SEC(2018) 333 ET SEQ.).....	7
4.2. EMPOWERMENT (SEC(2018) 334 ET SEQ.)	8
4.3. DELEGATION / SUBDELEGATION OF POWERS (SEC(2018) 335 ET SEQ.).....	8
4.4. SENSITIVE WRITTEN PROCEDURES SEC(2018) 336).....	8
5. INTERINSTITUTIONAL RELATIONS (RCC(2018) 114)	8
5.1. JOINT DECLARATION – MONITORING ITS IMPLEMENTATION	8
5.2. LEGISLATIVE MATTERS	12
5.3. RELATIONS WITH THE EUROPEAN COUNCIL AND THE COUNCIL	14
5.4. RELATIONS WITH PARLIAMENT	15
5.5. RELATIONS WITH NATIONAL PARLIAMENTS, THE OTHER INSTITUTIONS AND BODIES, THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMITTEE AND THE COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONS.....	15
5.6. OTHER BUSINESS.....	16

6. MAIN RESULTS OF THE EUROPEAN COUNCIL MEETING ON EUROPEAN UNION MIGRATION POLICY (BRUSSELS, 28 AND 29 JUNE) (SI(2018) 384; SI(2018) 388; SI(2018) 390)	17
7. INTERINSTITUTIONAL RELATIONS (CONTINUED) (RCC(2018) 114).....	19
7.1. <i>RELATIONS WITH PARLIAMENT</i>	19
7.2. <i>LEGISLATIVE MATTER</i>	21

Single sitting: Tuesday 3 July 2018 (afternoon)

The sitting opened at 14.08 with Mr JUNCKER, President, in the chair. Item 7 was chaired by Mr ANSIP.

Present:

Mr JUNCKER	President	Items 1 to 6
Mr ANSIP	Vice-President	
Mr ŠEFČOVIČ	Vice-President	
Mr DOMBROVSKIS	Vice-President	Items 1 to 7 (in part)
Mr OETTINGER	Member	
Mr HAHN	Member	Items 1 to 7 (in part)
Ms MALMSTRÖM	Member	
Mr MIMICA	Member	
Mr ARIAS CAÑETE	Member	
Mr VELLA	Member	
Mr AVRAMOPOULOS	Member	Items 1 to 6
Ms THYSSEN	Member	
Mr STYLIANIDES	Member	
Mr HOGAN	Member	
Ms BULC	Member	
Ms BIENKOWSKA	Member	
Ms JOUROVÁ	Member	
Mr NAVRACSICS	Member	
Ms CREȚU	Member	
Ms VESTAGER	Member	
Sir Julian KING	Member	
Ms GABRIEL	Member	

Absent:

Mr TIMMERMANS	First Vice-President
Ms MOGHERINI	High Representative / Vice-President
Mr KATAINEN	Vice-President
Mr ANDRIUKAITIS	Member
Mr MOSCOVICI	Member
Mr MOEDAS	Member

(3 July 2018)

The following sat in to represent absent Members of the Commission:

Ms SUTTON	Deputy Chef de cabinet to Mr TIMMERMANS
Mr PETROCELLI	A member of Ms MOGHERINI's staff
Mr ARTJOKI	Chef de cabinet to Mr KATAINEN
Mr VALLETTA	A member of Mr ANDRIUKAITIS's staff
Mr DARMON	Mr MOSCOVICI's Office
Ms DEL BRENNA	Deputy Chef de cabinet to Mr MOEDAS

The following also sat in:

Ms MARTÍNEZ ALBEROLA	Chef de cabinet to the PRESIDENT	Items 1 to 6
Mr THOLONIAT	Adviser in the PRESIDENT's Office	Item 7
Mr ROMERO REQUENA	Director-General, Legal Service	
Mr PESONEN	Director-General, DG Communication	
Mr SCHINAS	Head of the Spokesperson's Service and Chief Spokesperson of the Commission	Items 1 to 7 (in part)
Mr SWIEBODA	European Political Strategy Centre	
Ms SILLAVEE	PRESIDENT's Office	
Ms CHAPUIS	A member of Mr ANSIP's staff	Item 5
Ms SCHMITT	Chef de cabinet to Mr AVRAMOPOULOS	Items 1 to 6
Ms NIKOLAY	Chef de cabinet to Ms JOUROVÁ	Items 6 and 7 (in part)
Ms VILA NUÑEZ	Secretariat-General	
Ms ANDREEVA	Commission Spokesperson's Service	Items 1 to 7 (in part)

Secretary: Mr SELMAYR, Secretary-General, assisted by Mr AYET PUIGARNAU,
Director in the Secretariat-General.

1. AGENDAS

(OJ(2018) 2261/FINAL; SEC(2018) 2261/FINAL)

The Commission took note of that day's agenda and of the tentative agendas for forthcoming meetings.

2. WEEKLY MEETING OF CHEFS DE CABINET

(RCC(2018) 2261)

The Commission considered the Secretary-General's report on the weekly meeting of Chefs de cabinet held on Monday 2 July 2018.

3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE 2257TH, 2258TH, 2259TH AND 2260TH MEETINGS OF THE COMMISSION (6, 12, 20 AND 27 JUNE 2018)

(PV(2018) 2257; PV(2018) 2257, 2ND PART; PV(2018) 2258; PV(2018) 2258, 2ND PART)

The Commission approved the minutes of its 2257th and 2258th meetings and decided to hold over approval of the minutes of its 2259th and 2260th meetings for a later meeting.

4. WRITTEN PROCEDURES, EMPOWERMENT AND DELEGATION OF POWERS

4.1. WRITTEN PROCEDURES APPROVED

(SEC(2018) 333 ET SEQ.)

The Commission took note of the Secretariat-General's memoranda recording decisions adopted between 25 and 29 June 2018.

4.2. EMPOWERMENT

(SEC(2018) 334 ET SEQ.)

The Commission took note of the Secretariat-General's memoranda recording decisions adopted between 25 and 29 June 2018.

4.3. DELEGATION / SUBDELEGATION OF POWERS

(SEC(2018) 335 ET SEQ.)

The Commission took note of the Secretariat-General's memoranda recording decisions adopted under the delegation and subdelegation procedure between 25 and 29 June 2018, as archived in Decide.

4.4. SENSITIVE WRITTEN PROCEDURES

SEC(2018) 336)

The Commission took note of the sensitive written procedures for which the time limit expired between 2 and 6 July 2018.

5. INTERINSTITUTIONAL RELATIONS

(RCC(2018) 114)

The Commission took note of the record of the meeting of the Interinstitutional Relations Group (IRG) held on Friday 29 June 2018 (RCC(2018) 114).

It paid particular attention to the following points.

5.1. JOINT DECLARATION – MONITORING ITS IMPLEMENTATION

i) Copyright in the Digital Single Market (Directive) – VOSS report – 2016/0280 (COD)

Mr ANSIP informed the College of the state of play in the legislative process concerning the proposal for a Directive on Copyright in the Digital Single

Market, which the Commission had presented on 14 September 2016. The main aim of the proposal in question was to modernise European copyright rules and adapt them to the digital environment in order to promote the emergence of a digital single market.

He explained that, after two years of intense discussion, the Council (at the level of its Committee of Permanent Representatives), and the European Parliament's Committee on Legal Affairs had adopted their positions with a view to launching the trilogue between the three institutions. He reported that Parliament had this week to adopt or reject the negotiating mandate proposed by its Committee on Legal Affairs. Should it be rejected, the matter would be put back on the agenda of the plenary session in September, when new amendments could be adopted; this would make it doubtful whether the negotiations could be completed before the end of the current parliamentary term.

The prospect of Parliament's negotiating mandate concerning the Copyright Directive being adopted in the plenary session had prompted demonstrations and campaigns against some of the provisions of the draft Directive, on the grounds that it would destroy the internet and restrict freedom of expression.

He explained that the controversy focused on two provisions of the draft text, namely Article 11 on the rights conferred on publishers, and Article 13, which laid down the rules applicable to the use of protected works or other subject matter on the platforms of online service providers storing and giving access to content uploaded by their users. He noted that the platforms retained the value of the cultural and creative works without redistributing it to the creators, resulting in a 'value gap'.

He explained that the Commission had not yet adopted a formal stance on the positions of the Council and Parliament's Committee on Legal Affairs, but would have to do so once the trilogues began.

As regards Article 11 of the draft Directive, Mr ANSIP explained that the Commission was proposing to give press publishers autonomous copyright, similar to that which applied to the creative industries, to enable the granting of an operating licence that allowed online service providers, such as social media and news aggregators, to use press publications and helped counter the illegal use of online newspapers.

He said that the controversy surrounding Article 11 particularly concerned the possible impact of the rights conferred on publishers on the way users accessed and shared online press articles, for example via hyperlinks. Some MEPs and stakeholders felt that the Commission's proposal would have the effect of prohibiting or taxing hyperlinks which allowed users to access press articles, but this was not the case because the proposal, while guaranteeing new protection of press publishers' copyright, did not alter the scope of what was already protected by copyright today.

As regards Article 13, Mr ANSIP stressed that the Commission's proposal would require the platforms of online service providers storing and giving access to content uploaded by their users to apply measures such as content recognition technologies, enabling rightholders to monetise their stored content or prohibit access to it without their authorisation. Where agreements were reached with rightholders, the proposed measures would allow them to obtain appropriate remuneration for the use of their content. Where no agreement had been reached, the rightholders would have to supply the service providers with the metadata needed in order to ensure that their content was not stored.

The main opponents of Article 13 described the Commission's proposal as a 'censorship machine' because it would require platforms systematically to monitor what users uploaded and to block content at the request of rightholders. Mr ANSIP pointed out that this was not the case, because content recognition technologies were already widely used by service providers' platforms for commercial reasons.

He noted that there had been quite a lot of public debate on this issue which had prompted demonstrations, particularly in Berlin and several Polish cities, suggesting a possible repeat of the situation provoked by the Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement (ACTA). He therefore counselled vigilance and felt that at this point the Commission should continue to defend its proposal, while at the same time making its case to the media and the public.

Ms GABRIEL for her part confirmed that the proposed Copyright Directive was the subject of intense pressure, particularly from the main service providers' platforms. She noted that, since the proposal's adoption in September 2016, the Commission had made no amendments to it and had avoided commenting publicly on the report by Parliament's Committee on Legal Affairs before it was adopted in plenary, even though its approach was compatible with the Commission's positions.

She reported that she had intensified her contacts with MEPs to explain and defend the validity of the Commission's proposal, and stressed the large-scale mobilisation of creative industries and creators who saw it as a way of increasing cultural diversity. She pointed out that Article 11 allowed press publishers to better monetise internet content and Article 13 ensured that no content could be disseminated without the rightholder's consent.

She felt that the campaigns against the proposed Directive were based on disinformation when they described content filtering as censorship or a curb on the freedom of expression. For this reason, she advocated continued efforts to show that this proposal sought to protect content creators and ensure they received fair remuneration.

In the course of the discussion that followed, the Commission focused mainly on the importance of protecting content production and the possibility of monetising it without placing any restriction on the freedom of expression.

The PRESIDENT wound up the discussion by saying that he understood the concerns of artists and content creators. He thought the Commission's proposal was fair and pointed out that it enjoyed the support of the arts world. He therefore felt it was important to do everything possible to ensure that the trilogue between the three institutions could start before the end of July and the proposal for a Directive could be adopted before the end of the present parliamentary term.

The Commission took note of this information.

5.2. LEGISLATIVE MATTERS

ii) Trilogue

(point 3.1 of the IRG record)

- Framework for screening of foreign direct investments into the European Union (Regulation) – PROUST report – 2017/0224 (COD)

The Commission approved the line set out in SI(2018) 378.

iii) European Parliament dossiers – July 2018 part-session

(point 3.2 of the IRG record)

Ordinary legislative procedure – First reading

- European Defence Industrial Development Programme aiming at supporting the competitiveness and innovative capacity of the EU defence industry (Regulation) – GROSSETÊTE report – 2017/0125 (COD)

The Commission took note of SP(2018) 406, further to note SI(2018) 310, which it had already approved on 6 June 2018.

- Establishment of a European Travel Information and Authorisation System (ETIAS) and amendment of Regulations (EU) 515/2014, (EU) 2016/399, (EU) 2016/1624 and (EU) 2017/2226 (Regulation) – GÁL report – 2016/0357A (COD) / Establishment of a European Travel

(3 July 2018)

Information and Authorisation System (ETIAS) and amendment of Regulation (EU) 2016/794 (Regulation) – GÁL report – 2016/0357B (COD)

The Commission approved the line set out in SP(2018) 421 and took note of the compromise text attached to that document, further to note SI(2018) 151/2, which it had already approved on 28 March 2018.

- European Agency for the operational management of large-scale IT systems in the area of freedom, security and justice, and amendment of Regulation (EC) 1987/2006 and Council Decision 2007/533/JHA and repeal of Regulation (EU) 1077/2011 (Regulation) – MACOVEI report – 2017/0145 (COD)

The Commission approved the line set out in SP(2018) 443 and took note of the compromise text attached to that document, further to note SI(2018) 262, which it had already approved on 23 May 2018.

- ‘Omnibus Proposal’ – Financial rules applicable to the general budget of the Union and amendment of Regulation (EC) 2012/2002, Regulations (EU) 1296/2013, (EU) 1301/2013, (EU) 1303/2013, (EU) 1304/2013, (EU) 1309/2013, (EU) 1316/2013, (EU) 223/2014 and (EU) 283/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council and Decision 541/2014/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council (Regulation) – GRÄSSLE / ASHWORTH report – 2016/0282A (COD)

The Commission took note of SP(2018) 422 and the compromise text annexed thereto.

- Amendment of Regulation (EU) 2017/825 to increase the financial envelope of the Structural Reform Support Programme and adapt its general objective (Regulation) – TOMAŠIĆ report – 2017/0334 (COD)

The Commission approved the line set out in SP(2018) 438.

Special legislative procedure

- Amendment of Directive 1999/62/EC on the charging of heavy goods vehicles for the use of certain infrastructures, as regards certain provisions on vehicle taxation (Council Directive) – CLUNE report – 2017/0115 (CNS)

The Commission took note of SP(2018) 424.

5.3. RELATIONS WITH THE EUROPEAN COUNCIL AND THE COUNCIL

iv) Programming of Council business

(SI(2018) 387)

The Commission took note of the information in SI(2018) 387 on the Council meetings between 5 and 18 July 2018.

v) Non-legislative dossiers

(point 4.1 of the IRG record)

- Follow-up of the Eastern Partnership Summit of November 2017 – ‘20 Deliverables for 2020’ – State of play June 2018

The Commission took note of document SI(2018) 376.

- Progress Report on the Implementation of the European Union's Comprehensive Approach to External Conflicts And Crises – Action Plan 2016-2017 – Joint Commission / European External Action Services Information Note

The Commission approved the line set out in SI(2018) 377.

- Authorisation, granted to the European Commission and the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, to open negotiations on a Comprehensive Agreement with the Republic of

Uzbekistan (Joint Recommendation for a Council Decision) –
JOIN(2018) 12

The Commission approved the line set out in SI(2018) 382.

5.4. RELATIONS WITH PARLIAMENT

vi) Non-legislative dossiers

(point 5.1 of the IRG record)

- European Parliament's Special Committee on Financial Crimes, Tax Evasion and Tax Avoidance (TAX3) – Follow-up to the hearing of 28 June 2018 – Reply to the written questions

The Commission approved the line set out in SP(2018) 419.

- Special Committee on the EU authorisation procedure for pesticides (PEST) – Follow-up to the hearing of 7 June 2018 – Replies to the Written Questions for the Group of Chief Scientific Advisors

The Commission took note of SP(2018) 432.

5.5. RELATIONS WITH NATIONAL PARLIAMENTS, THE OTHER INSTITUTIONS AND BODIES, THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMITTEE AND THE COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONS

vii) Follow-up to opinions of the Committee of the Regions – Plenary session of October 2017

(point 6.4.1 of the IRG record)

The Commission approved document SR(2018) 17/2 on the action taken by the Commission on the opinions adopted by the Committee of the Regions at its October 2017 session, for transmission to that Committee.

viii) Follow-up to Committee of the Regions opinions – November and December 2017 plenary session

(point 6.4.2 of the IRG record)

The Commission approved document SR(2018) 18/2 on the action taken by the Commission on the opinions adopted by the Committee of the Regions at its session of November and December 2017, for transmission to that Committee.

ix) Participation by Members of Parliament in international conferences

(point 6.4.3 of the IRG record)

- Twenty-fourth session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (COP24) (Katowice, 3 to 14 December 2018)

The Commission agreed to the request to the PRESIDENT from Mr Karl-Heinz LAMBERTZ, the President of the Committee of the Regions, concerning the attendance of four Members of the Committee of the Regions at the above-mentioned meeting, from 3 to 14 December 2018, as observers in the EU delegation, with a reminder about the procedure to be followed as set out in SR(2018) 16.

5.6. OTHER BUSINESS

x) European Electronic Communications Code (Directive – recast) – DEL CASTILLO VERA report – 2016/0288 (COD) / Body of European Regulators for Electronic Communications (Regulation) – TOŠENOVSKÝ report – 2016/0286 (COD)

(point 7 of the IRG record)

The Commission approved the line set out in SI(2018) 389.

6. MAIN RESULTS OF THE EUROPEAN COUNCIL MEETING ON EUROPEAN UNION MIGRATION POLICY (BRUSSELS, 28 AND 29 JUNE) (SI(2018) 384; SI(2018) 388; SI(2018) 390)

The PRESIDENT invited the Members of the Commission to analyse the European Council's conclusions on migration policy following its meeting on 28 and 29 June.

Mr AVRAMOPOULOS noted that, in the course of their discussions and taking into account current political sensitivities, the Heads of State or Government had managed to work out an approach that made it possible to pursue the action already taken to achieve more effective control of migration flows. In its conclusions the European Council had, in particular, reiterated that a viable European migration policy necessarily required a comprehensive approach that combined effective control of external borders, stronger external action and internal aspects, in line with the Union's principles and values.

He also pointed out that, for the Austrian Government, which had begun its tenure of the six-month rotating Council Presidency on 1 July, the migration issue was a challenge which could be tackled effectively only by all the EU Member States working together.

The Commission had presented no less than seven legislative proposals. On five of these, Parliament and the Council had reached an agreement, which the Council still had to confirm and finalise. The seven proposals were aimed at (i) reforming the common European asylum system, including the Dublin system, in order to better allocate asylum applications among the Member States, while guaranteeing fair, effective and sustainable processing of these applications, (ii) strengthening the Eurodac Regulation in order to improve the efficiency of the European fingerprint database for asylum seekers, (iii) establishing a fully-fledged European asylum agency, in order to share the burden more fairly among the Member States, (iv) replacing the Directive on the asylum procedure with a regulation in order to achieve a fully harmonised EU procedure and reduce differences in recognition

rates between Member States, (v) in the same spirit, replacing the Directive on the qualification of asylum seekers with a directly applicable regulation, (vi) recasting the Directive on minimum standards for the reception of asylum seekers in order to guarantee that they benefited from harmonised and dignified reception standards and lastly, (vii) establishing a permanent EU resettlement framework.

Mr AVRAMOPOULOS therefore considered that the Commission should continue its efforts to encourage the co-legislators to adopt these proposals before the end of the year, and called on the Members of the College to remain calm amid the debates on the inherently sensitive topic of European migration policy.

In the course of the discussion that followed, the Commission raised the following key points:

- the importance for the Commission of continuing to convey to the public and the media the main elements of EU migration policy that needed to be put in place as quickly as possible in order to control migration flows, while honouring the Union's legal obligations towards asylum seekers;
- the need to implement a migration policy for the long term, while responding to the short-term concerns expressed by certain Member States, by favouring a common approach based on responsibility and solidarity;
- the need to recall the values and principles of the Union that underpinned the proposed comprehensive approach to migration in order to respond to the simplistic and selfish arguments employed in public debates on migration;
- a call to ensure that the legislative work under way led to the swift adoption of the Commission's proposals, which would lay the basis for implementation of a comprehensive approach to meet the challenges of migration in the long term.

The PRESIDENT felt that it was very important for the Commission to maintain its course at a time when a good many of the legislative measures it had proposed were ready for adoption as a result of the agreement reached between the Member States.

In this context, he regretted the lack of European spirit in the solutions advocated by some leaders and warned of the dangers of a change in approach, as this would simply set the Union back several years, yet without resolving the migration issue. He confirmed the need to flesh out the idea of regional disembarkation platforms for persons rescued at sea, which was included in the European Council conclusions. Lastly, he stressed the need to implement a comprehensive, responsible and solidarity-based approach, which was the only way of providing a dignified and sustainable solution to the migration question.

Winding up the discussion, he said that he was determined to finish the work begun by the Commission on asylum by contributing to the rapid adoption of its proposals and countering the spiral of fear being kept up by certain political movements for electoral purposes. He urged the College to do likewise.

The Commission took note of this information and of the notes in SI(2018) 384, SI(2018) 388 and SI(2018) 390.

7. INTERINSTITUTIONAL RELATIONS (CONTINUED) **(RCC(2018) 114)**

7.1. RELATIONS WITH PARLIAMENT

i) Non-legislative dossier

(point 5.1 of the IRG record)

- Adequacy of the protection provided by the EU-US privacy shield –
Statement by the Commission

At the PRESIDENT's request, Ms JOUROVÁ reported to the College on the state of play concerning the EU-US Privacy Shield with a view to that week's debate and vote in the European Parliament.

Ms JOUROVÁ began by saying she intended to defend the shield, while expressing doubts as to the willingness of the US to respond to the Commission's concerns. The European Parliament's draft resolution called for the suspension of the privacy shield, an instrument which, she pointed out, allowed the free circulation of data between the EU and the US and facilitated trade, as testified by the thousands of businesses on both sides of the Atlantic that had signed up to it. She indicated that there were divisions between the national delegations of the European Parliament and asked the Members of the Commission to make efforts to encourage a responsible and balanced approach, avoiding overreactions which could damage EU businesses and citizens.

However, there had already been some improvements, such as the appointments in the Federal Trade Commission and the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, although a permanent solution had not yet been found with regard to the Ombudsperson. On this point, she said she had some difficulty in understanding the reasons for the delay in this appointment, more than two years after the change in the US administration. She stressed that the Ombudsperson played an important role in the design and operation of the shield, since he or she enabled redress to be obtained in cases of access to data for reasons of national security. This issue would be the subject of careful analysis in the context of the two ongoing legal cases, namely the referral by the Irish court and the action brought directly before the EU Court of Justice by a non-governmental organisation. Despite the fact that this was a crucial aspect, to date no complaint had been lodged on the grounds of national security. She confirmed that she would not hesitate to follow up on the commitments made, including the suspension of the privacy shield, should the second review, expected in October, not produce the expected results. However, she pointed out that without the privacy shield, commercial transfers would necessarily become more expensive, particularly for SMEs.

Lastly, Ms JOUROVÁ welcomed the fact that the European Parliament stressed the need for regular, dynamic monitoring of the compliance of the shield. She regularly informed the US Commerce Secretary and the US Secretary of State, as well as other partners, of the Commission's positions. She hoped that the PRESIDENT and Ms MOGHERINI would be able to do the same in their meetings with their counterparts in the USA.

In the course of the brief discussion that followed, the Commission raised the following main points:

- the issue of financial supervision, which required the possibility of exchanging information with the authorities responsible; in this context, the need to reach a balanced solution that would make it possible to maintain the working arrangements already in place;
- the readiness of certain stakeholders to establish a link between the privacy shield and the recent scandal linked to the undertaking Cambridge Analytica, even though the shield had not been in place when Cambridge Analytica began to make fraudulent use of citizens' personal data;
- the importance of having an Ombudsperson in order to ensure better data protection for EU businesses and citizens.

The Commission took note of this information.

7.2. LEGISLATIVE MATTER

ii) European Parliament dossier – July 2018 part-session (point 3.2 of the IRG record)

Ordinary legislative procedure – First reading

- Mobility Package I – Amendment of Directive 2006/22/EC as regards enforcement requirements and laying down specific rules with respect to

Directive 96/71/EC and Directive 2014/67/EU for posting drivers in the road transport sector (Directive) – KYLLÖNEN report – 2017/0121 (COD) / Amendment of Regulation (EC) 561/2006 as regards minimum requirements on maximum daily and weekly driving times, minimum breaks and daily and weekly rest periods and Regulation (EU) 165/2014 as regards positioning by means of tachographs (Regulation) – VAN DE CAMP report – 2017/0122 (COD) / Amendment of Regulation (EC) 1071/2009 on access to the occupation of road transport operator and of Regulation (EC) 1072/2009 on access to the international road transport market with a view to adapting them to developments in the sector (Regulation) – ERTUG report – 2017/0123 (COD)

Mr ŠEFČOVIČ reported on the state of the ongoing negotiations on the first set of mobility proposals of the present Commission. The discussions had now reached a crucial stage, particularly as regards the proposals on access to the market and social rules in the road transport sector, including the application of the rules on the posting of workers.

Significant progress had been made at the technical level, and this would help to improve the certainty and effectiveness of the legal framework in this important sector of the economy. However, he regretted that significant divisions remained both in the European Parliament and the Council, particularly concerning cabotage, rest periods in the truck cabin, and the thresholds set for application of the rules on posting of workers in international transport.

He believed it would still be possible to adopt the three sets of mobility initiatives proposed by the Commission before the end of this legislative term, even if time was running short. This was why he considered that the Commission should inform the Austrian presidency of the Council of its support for the proposal made by several Member States to schedule an

additional Transport, Telecommunications and Energy Council at the start of the autumn in order to try and reach agreement on a common approach.

Mr ŠEFČOVIČ concluded his presentation by stressing the quality and balance of the Commission's set of proposals, which had broad support and provided a sound basis for future negotiations.

Ms BULC then pointed out the objectives of this set of important Commission proposals in the field of mobility, namely to better protect European citizens and put in place new solutions in order to improve management of infrastructure and ensure more effective controls, while making the sector more competitive.

She noted the divisions within the European Parliament and the use of certain aspects of this first raft of measures for political ends, which made the result of the vote on 4 July very uncertain. The possible scenarios as regards the result of this vote were (i) approval of a mandate to initiate interinstitutional negotiations, (ii) closing of the first reading, or (iii) rejection of the mandate, or (iv) referral of the dossier to the lead parliamentary committee.

She ended by stressing the importance of the package, which was one of the College's main proposals in the field of transport.

In the course of the brief discussion that followed, the Commission raised the following main points:

- the need to move forward and adopt the set of proposals before the end of this legislative term, for the benefit of EU citizens; in this context, the need to step up communication efforts so as to inform, in particular, the delegations in the European Parliament and support the Member States that were favourable to a positive conclusion of the negotiations;

- recognition that the rules on the posting of workers had already given rise to infringement cases, which showed the desirability of a *lex specialis* for the international road transport sector;
- the need to avoid any risk of market fragmentation that might exacerbate the feeling that citizens were treated differently in different Member States.

The Commission took note of this information and of document SP(2018) 423.

*

* *

The meeting closed at 15.14.