

Road transport: recording equipment, tachograph

1994/0187(SYN) - 12/07/1995

Mr KINNOCK stated that the Commission was prepared to take over 21 of the 34 amendments tabled. Amendments Nos 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6 improved the text. Amendments Nos 10, 12, 13, 15, 17, 19, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 29 and 30 were necessary to draw up Annex 1B. Amendments Nos 23 and 30 improved safety and Amendment No 32 supplemented the procedure for developing standards for alternative systems for the future. However, the following amendments were rejected: Amendment No 2 as the Commission was responsible for the coordination referred to in the text and for denouncing the absence of such; Amendment No 7 as it was redundant; Amendment No 8 as it was irrelevant; Amendment No 9 as road checks, instead of checks at an undertaking, were a valid implementing instrument in the countries, particularly in respect of international transport; Amendment No 11 as it was unreasonable to set a date for abolishing the current system when the alternative technology had not yet been fully developed. Amendments Nos 14 and 25 did not take account of the fact that the current type IIIa committee was adequate; Amendments Nos 16 and 27 imposed costs on businesses that were so high that they could compromise the chances of the entire legislation being applied; Amendments Nos 18 and 21 attributing a secondary role to the driver card were inconsistent with the aim of the new system. Finally, Amendments Nos 33 and 34 would unintentionally give the false impression that option 1A ignored electronic components whilst these were the basis of the technological development desired by the Commission. Mr Kinnock reiterated that the Commission and Parliament were determined to improve road safety, which required the use of the best technology available.