



**EUROPEAN COMMISSION**

SECRETARIAT GENERAL

Directorate G

**Relations with the European Parliament, the European Ombudsman, the European Economic and Social Committee, the Committee of the Regions and the National Parliaments**

Brussels, 4 June 2009

**SP(2009)3060**

**Commission communication  
on the action taken on opinions and  
resolutions adopted by Parliament at the  
March I and II 2009 part-sessions**

**THE FIRST PART OF THIS COMMUNICATION INFORMS PARLIAMENT OF THE ACTION TAKEN BY THE COMMISSION IN RESPECT OF AMENDMENTS TO PROPOSED LEGISLATION ADOPTED BY PARLIAMENT DURING THE MARCH 2009 PART-SESSIONS.**

**IN THE SECOND PART THE COMMISSION LISTS A NUMBER OF NON-LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY PARLIAMENT DURING THE SAME PART-SESSIONS WITH EXPLANATIONS AS TO WHY IT WILL NOT BE RESPONDING FORMALLY.**

## CONTENTS

<b>PART ONE – LEGISLATIVE OPINIONS</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>CODECISION PROCEDURE – 1<sup>ST</sup> READING</b>	
Charging of heavy goods vehicles for the use of certain infrastructure Saïd EL KHADRAOUI – A6-0066/2009	<b>6</b>
Type-approval requirements for the general safety of motor vehicles Andreas SCHWAB – A6-0482/2008	<b>9</b>
Industrial emissions (integrated pollution prevention and control) (recast) Holger KRAHMER – A6-0046/2009	<b>10</b>
Substances that deplete the ozone layer (recast) Johannes BLOKLAND – A6-0045/2009	<b>16</b>
Cosmetic products (recast) Dagmar ROTH-BEHRENDT – A6-0484/2008	<b>17</b>
Placing of biocidal products on the market Daciana Octavia SÂRBU – A6-0076/2009	<b>18</b>
Community guarantee to the EIB Esko SEPPÄNEN – A6-0109/2009	<b>19</b>
Performance and sustainability of the European aviation system Marian-Jean MARINESCU – A6-0002/2009	<b>20</b>
Aerodromes, air traffic management and air navigation services Marian-Jean MARINESCU – A6-0515/2008	<b>21</b>
Novel Foods Kartika Tamara LIOTARD – A6-0512/2008	<b>22</b>
<b>CONSULTATION PROCEDURE REQUIRING A SINGLE READING</b>	
Multi-annual recovery plan for bluefin tuna in the Eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean C6-0081/2009	<b>26</b>

Statute for a European Private Company Klaus-Heiner LEHNE – A6-0044/2009	27
Food distribution to the most deprived persons in the Community (amendment of the Single CMO Regulation) Czeslaw Adam SIEKIERSKI – A6-0091/2009	29
Structure and rates of excise duty applied on manufactured tobacco Zsolt László BECSEY – A6-0121/2009	31
<b>PART TWO – NON-LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTIONS</b>	<b>33</b>

# **Part 1**

## **Legislative opinions**

**Commission communication**  
**on the action taken on opinions and resolutions adopted by**  
**Parliament at the March I and II 2009 part-sessions**

**CO-DECISION PROCEDURE - First reading**

**European Parliament legislative resolution on the proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Directive 1999/62/EC on the charging of heavy goods vehicles for the use of certain infrastructures**

1. **Rapporteur:** Saïd EL KHADRAOUI (PSE/BE)
2. **EP reference number:** A6-0066/2009 / P6-TA\_PROV(2009)0113
3. **Date of adoption of the resolution:** 11 March 2009
4. **Subject:** According to the proposal, Member States would be permitted to levy differentiated tolls on heavy goods vehicles in order to internalize the costs of local air pollution, noise and congestion. Tolls would vary according to the environmental performance of vehicles, the time period travelled, and the type of roads used. The precise amount would be determined by Member States using a common method for the calculation of costs and maximum values. The revenue from the proportion of tolls corresponding to the external costs would have to be earmarked to finance projects for sustainable mobility.
5. **Inter-institutional reference number:** 2008/0147(COD)
6. **Legal basis:** Article 71 EC Treaty
7. **Competent Parliamentary Committee:** Committee on Transport and Tourism (TRAN)
8. **Commission's position:** The Commission can accept certain amendments.

The Commission can accept the following amendments: AM 1, 2 (except last sentence which lacks clarity), 3, 7 (first and second parts), AM 8, AM 11 (except last sentence), AM 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20 to 24, 31, 36, 42, 44 to 47, 50, 55, 56 (if earmarking is not limited to road transport), 58, 69, 73.

The Commission can accept the following amendments subject to re-drafting:

AM 4 after linguistic redrafting and once the part related to maritime transport is brought in line with the Commission's policy line and the part related to rail infrastructure is completed with "inter alia", AM 5 and 6 after linguistic redrafting, AM 10 by focussing on the importance of converging calculation methods to allow transparency in charging schemes,

AM 17 if the date for the introduction of an interoperable tolling system is brought in line with the one in the ITS action plan, AM 19 once the promotion of sustainable mobility is added as one of the main uses of earmarking of revenues from external cost charges, AM 34 and 41 after clarification of the table referred to, AM 51: reject last part of amendment since no discount is possible for external cost charges, AM 53: needs to be redrafted so that full coherence with the provisions of Directive 2004/52/EC and the comitology decisions implementing this Directive is guaranteed. As it does not set out a legal rule, it also needs to be converted into a recital, AM 54: vehicle taxation is not related to the internalisation of external costs and therefore not the subject of the on-going revision of the Directive, AM 57: the minimum annual increase dedicated to TEN-T projects should preferably be specified, AM 61: unclear reference to external borders with third countries should be deleted, AM 63: last part needs redrafting so as not to prejudice the Commission's right of initiative. AM 76 needs to make clear that regulatory charges, which are an external cost charge without any maximal values fixed in the directive, are allowed in urban areas, but not on any roads outside urban areas.

The Commission can accept the following amendments in principle: AM 43: the Commission recognises the need for Member States to be able to vary tolls, as long as it does not lead to unjustified differentiation.

The Commission cannot accept the following amendments: AM 9: the directive only aims to internalise three external costs and does not provide unit values for any others, AM 12: would produce legal uncertainty, AM 25: introduces an unclear definition of scope of application which would create legal uncertainty, AM 26: restricts MS flexibility in applying tolls and vignettes on different categories of vehicles, AM 28 and 29: go against gradual introduction of directive and could deter Member States from applying it, AM 32: the bulk of safety costs are already covered by the infrastructure cost charge, AM 35: there is no link between EURO emission standards and application of external cost charges for noise and congestion, AM 37: adding a "conurbation mark-up" might lead to double-charging, AM 38 and 39: might result in European priority projects being neglected in favour of less complex national projects, AM 40: combining the mark-up and an external cost charge would lead to double-charging, AM 48: the amendment would introduce a too narrow definition of the European interest and alter the compromise reached in 2006 to secure the commercial viability of certain very peculiar infrastructure, AM 49: The amendment would allow Member States to discriminate based on other characteristics of technical or administrative nature, AM 52: Member States wishing to apply external cost charges should be allowed to do so in the interim period whilst setting up an interoperable electronic tolling system, AM 59: would create further constraints for MS wishing to apply external cost charges, AM 60: not related to internalisation of external costs, AM 62: prejudices the right of initiative of the Commission, AM 64, 65 and 66: leave too much discretion to Member States, AM 67 and 68: vehicle class can be different from Euroclass. AM 71, 72 and 76 deleting the definition, maximal values and calculation method of congestion cost would create a great legal uncertainty as congestion costs remain chargeable costs.

**9. Outlook for amendment of the proposal:** In order to facilitate the on-going work in the Council, the Commission has informed the Council working group orally of its position on the EP amendments immediately after the adoption of the opinion of the EP in first reading.

**10. Outlook for the adoption of the proposal:** The Czech Presidency held a political debate during the Transport Council of 30 March 2009. Following this debate, the prospects

for a rapid adoption of a common position appear limited. No significant progress is expected in Council under the Swedish and Spanish presidencies.

The second reading will take place under the new Parliament; an adoption in second reading or in conciliation is currently envisaged for the Belgian, Hungarian or Polish presidency in 2010/2011.

**Commission communication  
on the action taken on opinions and resolutions adopted by  
Parliament at the March I and II 2009 part-sessions**

**CO-DECISION PROCEDURE - First reading**

**European Parliament legislative resolution on the proposal for a regulation of the  
European Parliament and of the Council concerning type-approval requirements for the  
general safety of motor vehicles**

- 1. Rapporteur:** Andreas SCHWAB (EPP-ED/DE)
- 2. EP reference number:** A6-0482/2008 / P6-TA\_PROV(2009)0092
- 3. Date of adoption of the resolution:** 10 March 2009
- 4. Subject:** Type-approval requirements for the general safety of motor vehicles
- 5. Inter-institutional reference number:** 2008/0100(COD)
- 6. Legal basis:** Article 251 and Article 95 of the Treaty
- 7. Competent Parliamentary Committee:** Committee on Internal Market and Consumer Protection (IMCO)
- 8. Commission's position:** The Commission can accept all the amendments adopted by Parliament.
- 9. Outlook for amendment of the proposal:** There is no need for a formal modified proposal, as there is already agreement between the European Parliament and the Council, endorsed by the Commission.
- 10. Outlook for the adoption of the proposal:** It is to be expected that the Council adopt the proposal in first reading without further delay.

**Commission communication  
on the action taken on opinions and resolutions adopted by  
Parliament at the March I and II 2009 part-sessions**

**CO-DECISION PROCEDURE – First reading**

**European Parliament legislative resolution on the proposal for a Directive of the  
European Parliament and of the Council on industrial emissions (integrated pollution  
prevention and control) (recast)**

- 1. Rapporteur:** Holger KRAHMER (ALDE/DE)
- 2. EP reference number:** A6-0046/2009 / P6-TA\_PROV(2009)0093
- 3. Date of adoption of the resolution:** 10 March 2009
- 4. Subject:** industrial emissions (integrated pollution prevention and control) (recast)
- 5. Inter-institutional reference number:** 2007/0286(COD)
- 6. Legal basis:** Article 175
- 7. Competent Parliamentary Committee:** Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety (ENVI)
- 8. Commission's position:** The Commission can accept certain amendments.

On 10 March 2009, the European Parliament adopted 86 amendments out of the 128 that were tabled.

Out of the 86 amendments, 47 are acceptable to the Commission fully, in principle or in part as they clarify and improve the Commission proposal. The Commission's detailed position with regard to the amendments of the European Parliament is as follows:

**Amendments accepted by the Commission:**

Amendment **42** clarifies the obligation of the operator upon definitive cessation of activities.

Amendments **49, 50 and 53** are in line with the Aarhus Convention.

Amendment **58** reinstates a sentence from the current Large Combustion Plants (LCP) Directive and clarifies the Commission proposal.

Amendment **68** provides a clearer definition of scope.

Amendments **72 and 74** provide derogation from the NO<sub>x</sub> emission limit values for so-called "peak" operating combustion plants using liquid fuels. It is acceptable under the proposed conditions given the rather limited impacts on the environment, and does not weaken the requirements of the current LCP Directive.

Amendments **73 and 75** ensure that gas turbines and gas engines are treated in a similar way. It is appropriate as both may be used for emergency purposes.

**Amendments accepted in part or in principle by the Commission:**

Amendment **1** is acceptable in principle since it is consistent with the approach of the Commission but the wording needs drafting improvement.

Amendment **5** is acceptable in part and in principle, as far as it is consistent with other pieces of legislation and ongoing discussions of legislative proposals. The reference to the review of the legislation is not acceptable.

The first part of amendment **6** is acceptable since it clarifies and improves the wording of the Commission Proposal. The second part is not acceptable. It is misleading as the proposal contains some compliance requirements.

Amendment **7** adding a reference to the Aarhus Convention is acceptable in principle but the drafting should be improved.

Amendment **8** is acceptable in principle but the wording is too restrictive.

Amendment **12** is acceptable in principle since it would be useful to clarify the meaning of "emission levels associated with the best available techniques". It should however be improved in particular to be consistent with the wording used in the Commission Proposal.

Amendments **13 and 48** are acceptable in principle as they would clarify the text but should be consistent with the existing provisions of the IPPC Directive.

The last part of amendment **14** is in line with the spirit of the Commission Proposal and thus is acceptable in principle. The first parts are not acceptable since they would create ambiguities.

Amendment **16** is acceptable in part and in principle. The wording should be consistent with the Recommendation 2001/331/EC providing for minimum criteria for environmental inspections in the Member States.

The first part of amendment **18** is in line with the intention of the Commission Proposal and is acceptable in principle subject to the improvement of its wording. The second part is redundant with the Commission proposal and is not acceptable.

The first part of amendment **19** is acceptable in principle and in part to the extent that it is in line with the intention of the Commission Proposal to allow for the possibility for Member States to provide for joint operators. The last part of the amendment is acceptable in principle with the exception of the reference to a 'single' person, as this may unnecessarily limit the application of this provision.

The first part of amendment **20** is consistent with the Commission proposal and is acceptable in principle, subject to improvement of the wording with regard to what constitutes 'relevant data' and to ensure that the timing for provision of data is not unduly prescriptive. The second part is not acceptable.

Amendment **21** is acceptable in principle, subject to further specification of the wording.

The merging of Articles 14 and 29 proposed in amendments **27 and 55** is acceptable in principle as it would simplify and streamline the legal drafting.

On other aspects of amendment 27, paragraphs 1 and 2 are acceptable in principle to the extent that they reflect current practices. The requirement for the Commission to publish an evaluation report is not clear and is not acceptable as the work carried out under the exchange of information is already widely available and also covered by the implementation report of the Commission. Paragraph 1a is not acceptable since it only refers to the publication and not to the adoption of the BAT reference documents (BREFs). The proposal to revise BREFs every 8 years is acceptable in principle but wording of the amendment is too rigid and would not allow for sufficient flexibility. The translation by the Commission of the entire BREFs is not acceptable and would create additional administrative burdens. The executive summary of all BREFs are already translated into all official EU languages.

Amendments **34 and 35** are acceptable in principle but specific references to Articles 15, 16 and 22 are not appropriate.

Amendment **36** is acceptable in principle as it is in line with the spirit of Commission proposal but the wording should be improved.

The first part of amendment **37** cannot be accepted, since it only refers to the publication and not to the adoption of the BREFs by the Commission. The change of the place of the term "where necessary" can be accepted since it clarifies the text.

In amendment **40** only a reference to Directive 2006/118/EC is relevant and can be acceptable.

Amendment **43** is acceptable in principle as it clarifies the text. The accessibility of data is acceptable in principle and in part subject to the comments made in relation to amendment 20.

Amendment **44** is acceptable in principle and in part. Setting minimum frequencies for inspections is acceptable in principle. However, an annual site visit is more appropriate than the proposed 18 months. The proposed criteria for the appraisal of the environmental risks are acceptable in principle since they are generally in line with Recommendation 2001/331/EC. However, the reference should be made to EMAS only and the criteria need drafting improvements. Some elements of the amendment such as the reference to "sufficient number of skilled persons" are unclear and are therefore unacceptable.

In amendment **46**, the publication of information on the internet is acceptable in principle. However, the proposed delay for making the report of the site visits available is not acceptable.

Amendment **51** is consistent with the Commission proposal and is acceptable in principle.

Amendment **52** is acceptable in principle as it is in line with the Commission proposal but the wording should be improved.

Amendment **54** is acceptable in principle and in part. The accessibility of the data on the internet can be accepted since it is in line with the intention of the proposal. However, the requirement to provide data "without delay" is too prescriptive.

Amendment **56** is acceptable in principle as it does not alter the main elements of the proposal but the drafting should be improved.

Amendment **59** is acceptable in principle as it clarifies the text but the drafting needs to be improved.

Amendment **60** is acceptable in principle subject to further consideration of the exact form of the information to be made available by Member States to the public.

Amendment **61** is acceptable in part and in principle. It is acceptable in principle to update the minimum requirements laid down in the Annexes in order to take account of the developments in BAT and of the results of implementation. However, the proposed procedure is too systematic and rigid. The revision of these minimum requirements should take place only where necessary and justified.

Amendment **62** is acceptable in principle. The setting of minimum requirements can be a useful tool to achieve environmental objectives and to create a more level playing field. This is particularly the case where BAT is not properly implemented leading to significant negative environmental impacts. For this reason, the legislation already includes minimum standards for activities posing significant environmental impacts. However setting minimum standards for all activities is unnecessary and could result in negative environmental impacts if minimum standards become default standards. Therefore any provision for the extension of minimum requirements to other sectors should only be considered when proved necessary and justified. The proposed procedure is too rigid and systematic.

Amendments **64, 65, 66 and 69** are acceptable in principle, subject to an improved legal drafting, as they could improve clarity of the scope.

Amendment **71** is acceptable in part. Providing derogation from the SO<sub>2</sub> emission limit values for so-called "peak" operating combustion plants using liquid fuels is acceptable given the rather limited impacts on the environment. However, the deletion of the derogation for plants using solid fuels is unacceptable.

Amendment **79** is acceptable in part and in principle provided that the wording is aligned with the current requirements of the Waste Incineration Directive.

#### **Amendments not accepted by the Commission:**

Amendments **2, 3 and 4** are not consistent with the Commission proposal.

Amendment **9** is not acceptable as a recital on comitology is required.

Amendment **10** is redundant.

Amendment **11** is not acceptable since the extension of minimum requirements to new sectors should only be considered when proved necessary and justified in order to achieve a better implementation of BAT and to limit excessive deviations from BAT. The proposed procedure is also too rigid.

Amendments **15, 17 and 22** would not improve clarity and do not bring added value.

Amendments **23, 24, 25 and 26** are not consistent with the Commission Proposal, are redundant or would create legal confusion.

Amendment **28** is redundant and amendment **29** could cause confusion and would not be in line with the Commission Proposal.

Amendment **30** is not consistent with the Commission Proposal as it is for the competent authorities to determine the BAT (and not only the emission levels) for the installation.

Amendment **31** is not acceptable since it is not consistent with one of the core elements of the Commission Proposal regarding the setting of emission limit values in relation to the emission levels associated with the BAT. It would significantly weaken the approach of the proposal. The inclusion of a reference to monitoring and compliance does not add any clarity and confuses the setting of emission limit values with enforcement. Furthermore, the last part of the amendment is redundant.

Amendment **32** is unacceptable as the proposed changes are either inconsistent with the Commission Proposal or do not improve the legal clarity.

Amendment **33** would lead to a lower level of protection of soil and groundwater.

Amendment **38** is not consistent with the Commission proposal and would create confusion for the interpretation.

Amendments **39 and 41** have no added-value and would lead to difficulties in implementation.

The terms "random" and "qualified" in amendment **45** are unclear and would lead to difficulties in interpretation and implementation. The other parts are redundant and do not bring added-valued.

Amendment **47** is redundant.

Amendment **57** would limit the applicability of the provision and would create a legal loophole for extension of combustion plants by less than 20 MW.

Amendment **63** would extend the scope of the exclusion for plants with low operating hours and thereby lead to exclusion from the scope of an additional number of installations.

Amendment **67** adds only little clarity and may lead to the inadvertent exclusion of activities from the scope.

Amendment **70** would lead to additional costs to small and medium size enterprises whilst adding little environmental benefit.

Amendment **76** would extend the scope of monitoring to plants for which no emission limit values are set in the Commission Proposal.

Amendment **77** is not consistent with the Commission Proposal and would remove the necessary flexibility and clarity of the proposal.

Amendment **78** removes the possibilities to reduce administrative burden in cases where the monitoring does not bring additional environmental benefits.

Amendment **80** would add a criterion which is not verifiable.

Amendment **93** (same as amendment **115**) is not acceptable as it is not consistent with the Commission Proposal. It would remove the distinction between different types of poultry reducing therefore the proposed scope and providing far less environmental protection from industrial scale farms.

Amendment **97** is not in line with the Commission Proposal. It would weaken the NOx emission limit values for certain large combustion plants. The proposed values are not based on BAT and would offer lower levels of environmental protection.

Amendment **114** is not acceptable since the proposed restriction would significantly weaken the level of environmental protection (increase emissions of ammonia and threaten the objectives of the Thematic Strategy on Air Pollution).

Amendment **117** is not acceptable since it would reduce the scope of the current IPPC Directive.

Amendment **129** is not consistent with the Commission Proposal. It would create unjustified and discriminatory derogation for certain types of plants in the determination of the scope of the legislation.

Amendment **133** is not acceptable. It would exclude a large number of large combustion plants from the requirements in relation to emission limit values for large combustion plants in the proposal. It would lead to a lower level of environmental protection. The scope of the legislation can not be set by the BAT reference documents.

**9. Outlook for amendment of the proposal:** The Commission services do not intend to present a written amended proposal as the amendments accepted or accepted in principle, or partially, are limited in number and content. However, the Commission will inform the Council of its position.

**10. Outlook for the adoption of a common position:** Political agreement leading to a common position is foreseen under the Czech Presidency at the Environment Council in June 2009.

**Commission communication  
on the action taken on opinions and resolutions adopted by  
Parliament at the March I and II 2009 part-sessions**

**CO-DECISION PROCEDURE – First reading**

**European Parliament legislative resolution on the proposal for a Regulation of the  
European Parliament and of the Council on substances that deplete the ozone layer  
(recast)**

- 1. Rapporteur:** Johannes BLOKLAND (IND/DEM/NL)
- 2. EP reference number:** A6-0045/2009 / P6-TA\_PROV(2009)0172
- 3. Date of adoption of the resolution:** 25 March 2009
- 4. Subject:** substances that deplete the ozone layer (recast)
- 5. Inter-institutional reference number:** 2008/0165(COD)
- 6. Legal basis:** Article 175(1)
- 7. Competent Parliamentary Committee:** Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety (ENVI)
- 8. Commission's position:** The Commission can accept all the amendments adopted by Parliament.
- 9. Outlook for amendment of the proposal:** There is no need for a formal modified proposal, as there is already agreement between the European Parliament and Council, endorsed by the Commission.
- 10. Outlook for the adoption of the proposal:** The Council is expected to adopt the proposal in first reading at a forthcoming meeting.

**Commission communication  
on the action taken on opinions and resolutions adopted by  
Parliament at the March I and II 2009 part-sessions**

**CO-DECISION PROCEDURE - First reading**

**European Parliament legislative resolution on the proposal for a regulation of the  
European Parliament and of the Council on cosmetic products (recast)**

- 1. Rapporteur:** Dagmar ROTH-BEHRENDT (PSE/DE)
- 2. EP reference number:** A6-0484/2008 / P6-TA\_PROV(2009)0158
- 3. Date of adoption of the resolution:** 24 March 2009
- 4. Subject:** Cosmetic Products Regulation (recast)
- 5. Inter-institutional reference number:** 2008/0035(COD)
- 6. Legal basis:** Article 251 (2) and Article 95 of the EC Treaty
- 7. Competent Parliamentary Committee:** Committee on the Environment Public Health and Food Safety (ENV)
- 8. Commission's position:** The Commission can accept all the amendments adopted by Parliament.
- 9. Outlook for amendment of the proposal:** There is no need for a formal modified proposal, as there is already agreement between the European Parliament and the Council, endorsed by the Commission.
- 10. Outlook for the adoption of the proposal:** It is to be expected that the Council adopt the proposal in first reading without further delay.

**Commission communication**  
**on the action taken on opinions and resolutions adopted by**  
**Parliament at the March I and II 2009 part-sessions**

**CO-DECISION PROCEDURE – First reading**

**European Parliament legislative resolution on the proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Directive 98/8/EC concerning the placing of biocidal products on the market as regards the extension of certain time periods**

- 1. Rapporteur:** Daciana Octavia SÂRBU(PSE/RO)
- 2. EP reference number:** A6-0076/2009 / P6-TA-PROV(2009)0159
- 3. Date of adoption of the resolution:** 24 March 2009
- 4. Subject:** the placing of biocidal products on the market as regards the extension of certain time periods
- 5. Inter-institutional reference number:** 2008/0188(COD)
- 6. Legal basis:** Article 95
- 7. Competent Parliamentary Committee:** Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety (ENVI)
- 8. Commission's position:** The Commission can accept all the amendments adopted by Parliament.
- 9. Outlook for amendment of the proposal:** There is no need for a formal modified proposal, as there is already agreement between the European Parliament and Council, endorsed by the Commission.
- 10. Outlook for the adoption of the proposal:** The Council is expected to adopt the proposal in first reading at a forthcoming meeting.

**Commission communication**  
**on the action taken on opinions and resolutions adopted by**  
**Parliament at the March I and II 2009 part-sessions**

**CODECISION PROCEDURE - First reading**

**European Parliament legislative resolution on the proposal for a decision of the European Parliament and of the Council granting a Community guarantee to the European Investment Bank against losses under loans and loan guarantees for projects outside the Community**

- 1. Rapporteur:** Esko SEPPÄNEN (GUE/NGL/FI)
- 2. EP reference number:** A6-0109/2009 / P6\_TA-PROV(2009)0168
- 3. Date of adoption of the resolution:** 25 March 2009
- 4. Subject:** Community guarantee to the European Investment Bank against losses under loans and loan guarantees for projects outside the Community
- 5. Inter-institutional reference number:** 2008/0268(COD)
- 6. Legal basis:** Articles 179 and 181a of the EC Treaty
- 7. Competent Parliamentary Committee:** Committee on Budgets (COBU)
- 8. Commission's position:** The Commission can accept all the amendments adopted by Parliament.
- 9. Outlook for amendment of the proposal:** There is no need for a formal modified proposal as there is already agreement between the European Parliament and Council, endorsed by the Commission.
- 10. Outlook for the adoption of the proposal:** The Council is expected to adopt the proposal in first reading on 13 June 2009.

**Commission communication**  
**on the action taken on opinions and resolutions adopted by**  
**Parliament at the March I and II 2009 part-sessions**

**CO-DECISION PROCEDURE - First reading**

**European Parliament legislative resolution on the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulations (EC) No 549/2004, (EC) No 550/2004, (EC) No 551/2004 and (EC) No 552/2004 in order to improve the performance and sustainability of the European aviation system**

- 1. Rapporteur:** Marian-Jean MARINESCU (EPP-ED/RO)
- 2. EP reference number:** A6-0002/2009 / P6-TA\_PROV(2009)0169
- 3. Date of adoption of the resolution:** 25 March 2009
- 4. Subject:** Single European Sky II
- 5. Inter-institutional reference number:** 2008/0127(COD)
- 6. Legal basis:** Article 80(2) of the EC Treaty
- 7. Competent Parliamentary Committee:** Committee on Transport and Tourism (TRAN)
- 8. Commission's position:** The Commission accepts all the amendments adopted by Parliament.
- 9. Outlook for amendment of the proposal:** There is no need for a formal modified proposal, as there is already agreement between the European Parliament and Council, endorsed by the Commission.
- 10. Outlook for the adoption of the proposal:** It is to be expected that the Council adopt the proposal in first reading without further delay.

**Commission communication**  
**on the action taken on opinions and resolutions adopted by**  
**Parliament at the March I and II 2009 part-sessions**

**CO-DECISION PROCEDURE - First reading**

**European Parliament legislative resolution on the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulation (EC) No 216/2008 in the field of aerodromes, air traffic management and air navigation services and repealing Council Directive 2006/23/EC**

1. **Rapporteur:** Marian-Jean MARINESCU (EPP-ED/RO)
2. **EP reference number:** A6-0515/2008 / P6-TA\_PROV(2009)0170
3. **Date of adoption of the resolution:** 25 March 2009
4. **Subject:** Extension competences for EASA
5. **Inter-institutional reference number:** 2008/0128(COD)
6. **Legal basis:** Article 80(2) of the EC Treaty
7. **Competent Parliamentary Committee:** Committee on Transport and Tourism (TRAN)
8. **Commission's position:** The Commission accepts all the amendments adopted by Parliament.
9. **Outlook for amendment of the proposal:** There is no need for a formal modified proposal, as there is already agreement between the European Parliament and Council, endorsed by the Commission.
10. **Outlook for the adoption of the proposal:** It is to be expected that the Council adopt the proposal in first reading without further delay.

**Commission communication  
on the action taken on opinions and resolutions adopted by  
Parliament at the March I and II 2009 part-sessions**

**CO-DECISION PROCEDURE - First Reading**

**European Parliament legislative resolution on the proposal for a regulation of the  
European Parliament and of the Council on Novel Foods and amending Regulation (EC)  
No XXX/XXXX (common procedure)**

- 1. Rapporteur:** Kartika Tamara LIOTARD (GUE/NGL/NL)
- 2. EP reference number:** A6-0512/2008 / P6-TA\_PROV(2009)0171
- 3. Date of adoption of the resolution:** 25 march 2009
- 4. Subject:** Novel foods (common procedure)
- 5. Inter-institutional reference number:** 2008/0002(COD)
- 6. Legal basis:** Article 95
- 7. Competent Parliamentary Committee:** Committee on the Environment, Public health and Food Safety (ENVI)
- 8. Commission's position:**

**The Commission accepts 19 amendments directly or in principle:** 3, 7, 8, 12, 15, 20, 35, 41, 42, 44, 45, 53, 63, 64, 65, 76, 87, 88, 89.

Most of these amendments clarify the proposal or add provisions which are in line with its objectives.

**The Commission accepts 14 amendments partially or subject to rewriting:** 1, 6, 10, 25, 30, 31, 40, 66, 67, 69, 77, 82, 85, 93.

These suggested amendments need to be checked for correct legal drafting and for consistency with existing legislation.

**The Commission rejects 57 amendments:**

2, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 37, 38, 43, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 61, 62, 68, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 78, 79, 80, 81, 83, 86, 90, 91, 92.

## **Clarification of Commission position on amendments approved by the European Parliament in Plenary:**

### **Scope (amendments 9, 16, 17, 31, 91)**

The Commission proposal aims at avoiding a double risk assessment and authorization procedure at EU level for food ingredients. Therefore when a specific EU legislation, which already entails an EFSA assessment, applies for some categories of food ingredients, these food ingredients are excluded from the scope of the novel food legislation.

As it is the case with the use of nanotechnologies, that principle also applies when a food additive, flavouring or enzyme is produced with a new process giving rise to significant change or from a new source previously not assessed. The substance need to be re-assessed and authorized under the relevant specific legislation.

Therefore, amendments **9, 16, 17** are rejected while amendment **31** is accepted subject to rewriting.

### **Cloning (amendments 5, 10, 12, 14, 51, 91, 92, 93)**

The Commission proposal keeps the "status quo" and ensures that all foods derived from cloned animals require a pre-marketing authorization before being put on the EU market.

Therefore, the Commission does not agree with amendments **5, 14, 31, 33, 51, 91, 92** which exclude foods from cloned animals and their offspring (first generation) from the scope of the novel food Regulation and request the Commission to present a proposal to ban the placing on the market of food products derived from such animals.

The legal implications of the exclusion of food from cloned animals and from their offspring from the scope of this proposal would be that if a Commission legislative proposal on cloning were not adopted and applicable before the entry into application of this regulation, the marketing of food from cloned animals would be completely unregulated in the EU.

Amendment **10** raises the issue of the compatibility of animal cloning with Council Directive 98/58/EC on the protection of animals kept for farming purposes. It is accepted subject to redrafting.

Amendment **12**, referring to the European Group of Ethics and the EFSA opinions on cloning, is accepted.

Amendment **93** introduces a requirement for the Commission to report to the Council and the EP, no later than one year after the entry into force of the Regulation, on all aspects of food produced from animals obtained by using a cloning technique and from their offspring, followed where appropriate by any legislative proposal. It is accepted subject to redrafting.

### **Nanotechnologies (amendments 6, 11, 13, 50, 90, 91, 92)**

The Commission agrees with the inclusion of the definition of "engineered nanomaterials" (amendment **92**) which could be modified afterwards through comitology with scrutiny. It also agrees with the inclusion of a provision which clarifies that all the "engineered nanomaterials" used in foods and food ingredients need a pre-marketing authorization.

The Commission does not agree with the assumption that the general methodology used for the risk assessment of foodstuffs would not apply for the risk assessment of nanomaterials in food (amendments **6, 11, 13, 50**). However, as underlined in the EFSA opinion on nanotechnologies, additional tests and control measures need still to be developed.

The Commission does not also agree with a systematic labelling (amendment **90**) of all foods produced with the aid of nanotechnology. As defined in the common authorization procedure, labelling must be decided on a case by case basis, following the scientific assessment and after consideration of other relevant factors.

### **Precautionary principle, protection of animal welfare and environment, ethical aspects (amendments 1, 3, 19, 20, 23, 28, 29, 30, 43, 46, 47, 48, 52, 74, 76)**

The Commission agrees with amendments **1, 3, 20, 30** and **76** which make a clear reference to the protection of animal welfare and the environment in the objectives of the legislation while amendments **19, 23, 28, 29, 43, 46, 47, 48, 52, 74** are rejected.

### **Animal testing (amendments 21, 79)**

It is not possible to ban animal testing for novel foods as innovative products often require toxicological studies. However, the repetition of these tests on vertebrates should be avoided as already laid down in the EU legislation on cosmetics. Amendments **21** and **79** which ban animal testing are rejected.

### **Traditional foods from third countries (amendments 28, 35, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68)**

The Commission agrees with amendment **35** which fix at 30 years (instead of one generation) the period of history of safe food use and with amendment **63** which takes into account the consumption in any third country (instead of only the country which submits an application). It also agrees with amendments **64, 65** and **67** subject to redrafting while amendments **28, 66** and **68** are rejected.

### **Implementing rules and report (amendments 8, 15, 68 and 69)**

Amendments **8, 15** and **69** which introduce a commitment for the Commission to adopt implementing rules for the application of the various definitions of novel foods and for facilitating applications by small and medium businesses are accepted while amendment **68** is rejected.

### **Data protection (amendments 25, 27, 54, 77, 78, 80)**

The Commission agrees with amendment **25** laying down that an applicant who receives data protection for an innovative product would have an exclusive right to put it on the market for a 5 year period. It also agrees with amendment **77** which provides for further eligibility criteria for the granting of data protection.

Other amendments (**27, 54, 78** and **80**) which refer to official controls or introduce a systematic synchronization between the data protection periods provided under the novel food and the claims legislations are rejected.

**9. Outlook for amendment of the proposal:** The Commission does not intend to prepare a revised proposal.

**10. Outlook for the adoption of a common position:** The Council is likely to adopt its common position in the second half of 2009.

**Commission communication  
on the action taken on opinions and resolutions adopted by  
Parliament at the March I and II 2009 part-sessions**

**CONSULTATION PROCEDURE REQUIRING A SINGLE READING**

**European Parliament legislative resolution on the proposal for a Council regulation  
concerning a multi-annual recovery plan for bluefin tuna in the Eastern Atlantic and  
Mediterranean**

1. **Rapporteur:** not nominated (urgency procedure)
2. **EP reference number:** C6-0081/2009 / P6-TA\_PROV(2009)0128
3. **Date of adoption of the resolution:** 12 March 2009
4. **Subject:** Multi-annual recovery plan for bluefin tuna
5. **Inter-institutional reference number:** 2009/0029(CNS)
6. **Legal basis:** Article 37 of the EC Treaty
7. **Commission's position:** The Commission accepts some of the amendments:

**Amendment 1:** rejected, notably as the appropriate legal text to deal with quotas is the annual TAC & quotas Regulation, not the present proposal

**Amendment 4:** accepted

**Amendment 5:** accepted

**Amendment 6:** rejected, as this would breach the obligations of the European Community under the ICCAT Recovery Plan

**Amendment 7:** accepted

**Amendment 8:** accepted

**Amendment 9:** accepted

**8. Outlook for amendment of the proposal:** All amendments accepted by the Commission have been incorporated in the final version to be adopted by the Council, with different wordings. All amendments rejected by the Commission have not been incorporated in the final version to be adopted by the Council.

**9. Outlook for the adoption of the proposal:** The Council adopted the proposal on 6 April 2009.

**Commission communication  
on the action taken on opinions and resolutions adopted by  
Parliament at the March I and II 2009 part-sessions**

**CONSULTATION PROCEDURE REQUIRING A SINGLE READING**

**European Parliament legislative resolution on the proposal for a Council regulation on  
the Statute for a European private company**

1. **Rapporteur:** Klaus-Heiner LEHNE (EPP-ED/DE)
2. **EP reference number:** A6-0044/2009 / P6\_TA\_PROV(2009)0094
3. **Date of adoption of the resolution:** 10 March 2009
4. **Subject:** the statute for a European private company

The objective of the proposal is to set up a European company form designed for SMEs in order to help them to do business in the Single Market. Accordingly, the European Private Company has to be easy to set up and flexible in its operation.

5. **Inter-institutional reference number:** 2008/0130(CNS)
6. **Legal basis:** Article 308
7. **Competent Parliamentary Committee:** Committee on Legal Affairs (JURI)
8. **Commission's position:** The Commission accepts certain amendments. However it cannot support the ones that would make the SPE disproportionately costly for business.

In general, in many cases the proposed solutions are significantly different from the Commission's proposal; however, the Commission acknowledges that some of them may pave the way to a compromise in the Council. In particular, the Commission supports provisions increasing the uniformity of the Statute (e.g. registration of the business object in amendment 22) or the legal certainty (e.g. share offers to employees in amendment 15). The potential impact of some other solutions, such as the ones on the cross-border requirement and minimum capital has been acknowledged. The Commission has doubts about the compromise on employees' participation rights (amendments 71-73).

Overall, the original objective of the proposal should be maintained. The SPE Statute should make it easier for European SMEs to conduct cross-border business. Therefore it has to be simple, flexible and uniform in each Member State. However, the Commission remains open

to discuss possible compromise solutions in the Council, along the lines expressed in the EP legislative resolution.

**9. Outlook for amendment of the proposal:** The Commission does not intend to present an amended proposal.

**10. Outlook for the adoption of the proposal:** The future Swedish Presidency has expressed intentions to achieve an overall agreement on the regulation.

**Commission communication  
on the action taken on opinions and resolutions adopted by  
Parliament at the March I and II 2009 part-sessions**

**CONSULTATION PROCEDURE REQUIRING A SINGLE READING**

**European Parliament legislative resolution on the proposal for a Council regulation amending Regulation (EC) No 1290/2005 on the financing of the common agricultural policy and Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007 establishing a common organisation of agricultural markets and on specific provisions for certain agricultural products (Single CMO Regulation) as regards food distribution to the most deprived persons in the Community**

1. **Rapporteur:** Czeslaw Adam SIEKIERSKI (EPP-ED/PL)
2. **EP reference number:** A6-0091/2009 / P6-TA\_PROV(2009)0188
3. **Date of adoption of the resolution:** 26 March 2009
4. **Subject:** Food distribution to the most deprived persons in the Community (amendment of the Single CMO Regulation)
5. **Inter-institutional reference number:** 2008/0183(CNS)
6. **Legal basis:** Article 37 of the Treaty establishing the European Community
7. **Competent Parliamentary Committee:** Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development (AGRI)
8. **Commission's position:** The Commission can accept part of the amendments.

**Removal of co-financing (amendments 10-16-17-18-19)**

The Commission wants to maintain the introduction of co-financing. According to the Commission it will indeed allow the scope of the scheme to increase significantly by ensuring that the total funds available for the measure better match with the needs. It will also encourage the Member States to take greater responsibilities for the programme's management.

**Community origin (amendment 8)**

The Commission disagrees with the obligation for the foodstuffs to be distributed to originate in the Community because such an obligation would be an expression of EU protectionism with negative spill-over to other policy areas or CAP instruments and it could possibly lead to

difficulties in the WTO. Besides it could also lead to additional administrative costs supported by the Member States and the charities to control the origin.

#### **Costs related to the distribution (amendment 14)**

Concerning the costs related to the distribution the Commission is positive about the idea of reimbursing storage costs but maximum financial ceilings which should apply equally to all participating Member States have to be fixed by the Commission.

#### **Legal basis (amendment 2)**

The Commission finally considers that Article 37 is the appropriate legal basis of the Programme.

**9. Outlook for amendment of the proposal:** The elements of the European Parliament for which the Commission has indicated a positive position (e.g. the storage costs) may be incorporated to the draft in the framework of the discussions within the Council.

**10. Outlook for the adoption of the proposal:** The discussions are now at the Council level. It is up to the Czech Presidency to decide how to pursue the discussions on that issue.

**Commission communication  
on the action taken on opinions and resolutions adopted by  
Parliament at the March I and II 2009 part-sessions**

**CONSULTATION PROCEDURE REQUIRING A SINGLE READING**

**European Parliament legislative resolution on the proposal for a Council directive  
amending Directives 92/79/EEC, 92/80/EEC and 95/59/EC on the structure and rates of  
excise duty applied on manufactured tobacco**

1. **Rapporteur:** Zsolt László BECSEY (EPP-ED/HU)
2. **EP reference number:** A6-0121/2009 / P6-TA\_PROV(2009)0160
3. **Date of adoption of the resolution:** 24 March 2009
4. **Subject:** structure and rates of excise duty applied on manufactured tobacco
5. **Inter-institutional reference number:** 2008/0150(CNS)
6. **Legal basis:** Article 93 of the EC Treaty
7. **Competent Parliamentary Committee:** Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs (ECON)
8. **Commission's position:** The Commission cannot accept any of the amendments adopted by Parliament.

A number of amendments proposed by Parliament aim at abolishing the proportional minimum requirement for all tobacco products. However, the Commission considers that this requirement remains an essential part of the *acquis* in the field of tobacco taxation and therefore should not be abolished. In the enlarged EU it is not only important that the gap between the highest and lowest taxing countries is reduced but also that on a regional level taxes are approximated. The proportional minimum requirement ensures this. The Commission therefore cannot accept **amendments 2, 3, 7, 8, 12, 13 and 14**, which are all directly or indirectly related to the proposed abolition of the proportional minimum requirement.

In addition, amendments 8 and 13 would also result in a decrease of the proposed minimum rates for cigarettes and fine cut. These lower levels of increases in minimum rates as proposed by Parliament would undermine the objectives of the proposal, namely to reduce cross border shopping and illicit trade in the internal market and to contribute to a high level of health protection. Besides, amendment 13 would also postpone the implementation of the proposed changes from 2010 to 2014, which the Commission considers unjustified. For these reasons also the amendments mentioned cannot be accepted by the Commission.

**Amendment 1** makes reference to a number of other measures of tobacco control such as smoking bans, ban on advertising or the launching of education campaigns. In the Commission's view, there is no link between the proposed increases in the minimum rates or changes in the tax structure and the measures cited above. They therefore should not be mentioned here. On the other hand, the reference to illicit trade is already part of recitals 6 and 7 of the Commission's proposal and should not be repeated here.

**Amendment 9** proposes to postpone the date when Member States have to determine the weighted average retail selling price for the previous year from 1 January to 1 March of each year and to base its calculation on volume placed on the market instead of releases for consumption. However, the releases for consumption are data which are readily available to the tax authorities unlike the volume placed on the market. Because the data on prices of cigarettes released for consumption is readily available the average weighted retail selling price can be determined at 1 January of each year.

**Amendment 10** cannot be accepted because the level of the increases in minimum rates as well as the implementation date as suggested in the amendment would undermine the objectives of the proposal, namely to reduce cross border shopping and illicit trade in the internal market and to contribute to a high level of health protection.

**Amendment 11** proposes that the Commission should publish the excise duty and VAT levied on a nominal packet of cigarettes of a value of EUR 0 pre-tax. However, the Commission services already publish every six months the rates of excise duties and VAT levied on cigarettes ("Excise duty tables"). There would thus be no added value in the additional reporting requirements as required by Parliament.

**Amendment 15** intends to give Member States the option to introduce appropriate threshold price measures provided they are in line with Community legislation. This amendment goes outside the scope of the proposal. Introducing minimum price measures would be a fundamental change as it undercuts the common taxation principles laid down in the present Community legislation, which the Commission intended not to abolish but to strengthen in its proposal. As far as the health arguments are concerned, Member States can tackle cheap cigarettes and contribute to health objectives by increasing the excise duties.

**Amendment 16** would reduce the flexibility for Member States to apply specific duties by lowering the maximum share of the total tax burden that the specific excise duty may account for. From an internal market, budgetary as well as a health point of view, specific duties have clear advantages and more flexibility should therefore be provided to those Member States that place greater reliance on specific excise duties.

**9. Outlook for amendment of the proposal:** The Commission does not intend to modify its proposal and will inform the Council orally about its position on the amendments.

**10. Outlook for the adoption of the proposal:** The date of final adoption in the Council cannot be determined yet.

## **Part 2**

# **Non-legislative resolutions**

**THE COMMISSION DOES NOT INTEND TO RESPOND FORMALLY TO THE  
FOLLOWING NON-LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE  
EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT DURING THE MARCH 2009 PART-SESSIONS**

- European Parliament resolution of 10 March 2009 on the Commission action plan towards an integrated internal control framework (2008/2150(INI)) (COM(08) 0110)

Report by Gabriele STAUNER (EP: A6-0022/09)

Minutes, part 2, 10 March 2009

Competent: Siim KALLAS

DG Budget

**Reason:** The Commission will not be responding formally as Commissioner Barrot has already replied in plenary to the requests contained in the resolution.

- European Parliament resolution of 10 March 2009 on the integrity of online gambling (2008/2215(INI))

Report by Christel SCHALDEMOSE (EP: A6-0064/09)

Minutes, part 2, 10 March 2009

Competent: Charlie McCREEVY

DG Internal Market and Services

**Reason:** The Commission will not be responding formally as Commissioner Barrot has already replied in plenary to the requests contained in the resolution.

- European Parliament resolution of 11 March 2009 on possible solutions to the challenges in relation to oil supply (2008/2212(INI)) (COM(08) 0384)

Report by Herbert REUL (EP: A6-0035/09)

Minutes, part 2, 11 March 2009

Competent: José Manuel BARROSO

Secretariat General

**Reason:** The Commission will not be responding formally as Commissioner Barrot has already replied in plenary to the requests contained in the resolution.

- European Parliament resolution of 11 March 2009 on the input to the Spring 2009 European Council in relation to the Lisbon Strategy

(EP: B6-0109/09)

Minutes, part 2, 11 March 2009

Competent: José Manuel BARROSO

Secretariat General

**Reason:** The Commission will not be responding formally as President Barroso has already replied in plenary to the requests contained in the resolution.

- European Parliament resolution of 11 March 2009 on Cohesion Policy: Investing in the real economy (2009/2009(INI)) (COM(08) 0876)

Report by Evgeni KIRILOV (EP: A6-0075/09)

Minutes, part 2, 11 March 2009

Competent: Danuta HÜBNER  
DG Regional Policy

**Reason:** The Commission will not be responding formally as President Barroso and the Vice-President, Mr Verheugen, have already replied in plenary to the requests contained in the resolution.

- European Parliament resolution of 12 March 2009 on Guinea-Bissau

(EP: B6-0115/09)

Minutes, part 2, 12 March 2009

Competent: Louis MICHEL  
DG Development

**Reason:** The Commission will not be responding formally as Commissioner Ferrero-Waldner has already replied in plenary to the requests contained in the resolution.

- European Parliament resolution of 12 March 2009 on the Philippines

(EP: B6-0121/09)

Minutes, part 2, 12 March 2009

Competent: Benita FERRERO-WALDNER  
DG External Relations

**Reason:** The Commission will not be responding formally as Commissioner Ferrero-Waldner has already replied in plenary to the requests contained in the resolution.

- European Parliament resolution of 12 March 2009 on expulsions of NGOs from Darfur

(EP: B6-0127/2009)

Minutes, part 2, 12 March 2009

Competent: Louis MICHEL  
DG Development

**Reason:** The Commission will not be responding formally as Commissioner Ferrero-Waldner has already replied in plenary to the requests contained in the resolution.

- European Parliament recommendation of 24 March 2007 to the Council on the European Union's priorities for the 64th Session of the UN General Assembly (2009/2000(INI))

Report by Alexander LAMBSDORFF (EP: A6-0132/09)

Minutes, part 2, 24 March 2009

Competent: Benita FERRERO-WALDNER  
DG External Relations

**Reason:** The Commission will not be responding formally as the requests contained in the recommendation are addressed solely to the Council.

- European Parliament resolution of 24 March 2009 on best practices in the field of regional policy and obstacles to the use of the Structural Funds (2008/2061(INI))

Report by Constanze Angela KREHL (EP: A6-0095/09)

Minutes, part 2, 24 March 2009

Competent: Danuta HÜBNER  
DG Regional Policy

**Reason:** The Commission will not be responding formally, given that Commissioner Hübner has already replied in plenary to the requests contained in the Resolution.

- European Parliament resolution of 24 March 2009 on complementarities and coordination of cohesion policy with rural development measures (2008/2100(INI))

Report by Wojciech ROSZKOWSKI (EP: A6-0042/09)

Minutes, part 2, 24 March 2009

Competent: Danuta HÜBNER  
DG Regional Policy

**Reason:** The Commission will not be responding formally, given that Commissioner Hübner has already replied in plenary to the requests contained in the Resolution.

- European Parliament resolution of 24 March 2009 on the Green Paper on Territorial Cohesion and the state of the debate on the future reform of cohesion policy (2008/2174(INI)) (COM(08) 0616)

Report by Lambert van NISTELROOIJ (EP: A6-0083/09)

Minutes, part 2, 24 March 2009

Competent: Danuta HÜBNER  
DG Regional Policy

**Reason:** The Commission will not be responding formally, given that Commissioner Hübner has already replied in plenary to the requests contained in the Resolution.

- European Parliament resolution of 24 March 2009 on the urban dimension of cohesion policy in the new programming period (2008/2130(INI))

Report by Oldřich VLASÁK (EP: A6-0031/09)

Minutes, part 2, 24 March 2009

Competent: Danuta HÜBNER  
DG Regional Policy

**Reason:** The Commission will not be responding formally, given that Commissioner Hübner has already replied in plenary to the requests contained in the Resolution.

- European Parliament resolution of 24 March 2009 on the implementation of the Structural Funds Regulation 2007-2013: the results of the negotiations on the national cohesion strategies and the operational programmes (2008/2183(INI)) (COM(08) 0301)

Report by Miroslav MIKOLÁŠIK (EP: A6-0108/09)

Minutes, part 2, 24 March 2009

Competent: Danuta HÜBNER  
DG Regional Policy

**Reason:** The Commission will not be responding formally, given that Commissioner Hübner has already replied in plenary to the requests contained in the Resolution.

- European Parliament resolution of 25 March 2009 on the 2007 Annual Reports of the European Investment Bank and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (2008/2155(INI))

Report by Gay MITCHELL (EP: A6-0135/09)

Minutes, part 2, 25 March 2009

Competent: Joaquin ALMUNIA

DG Economic, Financial and Monetary Affairs

**Reason:** The Commission will not be responding formally, given that Commissioner Almunia has already replied in plenary to the requests contained in the Resolution.

- European Parliament resolution of 25 March 2009 on the future of the automotive industry (EP: B6-0152/2009)

Minutes, Part 2, 25 March 2009

Competent: Günter VERHEUGEN

DG Enterprise and Industry

**Reason:** The Commission will not be responding formally as Commissioner Verheugen has already replied in plenary to the requests contained in the resolution.

- European Parliament resolution of 26 March 2009 on the state of transatlantic relations in the aftermath of the US elections (2008/2199(INI))

Report by Francisco José MILLÁN MON (EP: A6-0114/09)

Minutes, part 2, 26 March 2009

Competent: Benita FERRERO-WALDNER

DG External Relations

**Reason:** The Commission will not be responding formally as Commissioner Ferrero-Waldner has already replied in plenary to the requests contained in the resolution.

- European Parliament resolution of 26 March 2009 on an EU strategy for better ship dismantling (COM(2008) 0767)

(EP: B6-0161/09)

Minutes, part 2, 26 March 2009

Competent: Stavros DIMAS

DG Environment

**Reason:** The Commission will not be responding formally as Commissioner Figel' has already replied in plenary to the requests contained in the resolution.

-----