

ROADMAP			
TITLE OF THE INITIATIVE	Simplification of the EU passenger ship safety legislation		
LEAD DG – RESPONSIBLE UNIT – AP NUMBER	DG MOVE/D2	DATE OF ROADMAP	12/2015
LIKELY TYPE OF INITIATIVE	REFIT follow-up: Legislative review simplifying the EU passenger ship safety legislation		
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION	http://ec.europa.eu/transport/modes/maritime/safety/passenger_ships_en.htm		
This indicative roadmap is provided for information purposes only and can be subject to change. It does not prejudice the final decision of the Commission on whether this initiative will be pursued or on its final content and structure.			

A. Context, Subsidiarity Check and Objectives

Context

Passenger ships play an important role in the mobility of EU citizens - more than 400 million people pass every year through EU ports, with 120 million passengers transported between ports of the same Member State. The EU passenger ship safety legislation improves the safety of life on passenger ships sailing in EU waters, facilitates search and rescue operations and contributes to internal market in maritime transport. It ensures that the majority of passengers transported by domestic passenger ships travel on ships complying with common EU safety standards.

The EU legislation on passenger ship safety has been put in place over a period of 15 years mainly in response to accidents (the first legislation that is part of this simplification initiative was adopted in 1998). In 2009, the co-legislators adopted the third maritime package that aimed to improve the effectiveness of the existing measures on maritime safety; however, it did not include measures on passenger ship safety. The 2011 White Paper for the future of transport – "Roadmap to a Single European Transport Area – Towards a competitive and resource efficient transport system", recognised the need to modernise the current EU passenger ship safety legislative framework.

This has led the Commission to undertake a fitness check of the complex regulatory set up of the EU passenger ship safety. The four EU Directives that have been chosen for the fitness check and that are targeted in this review represent a set of key safety standards and requirements for passenger ships sailing in the EU waters, i.e. Directive 2009/45/EC, Directive 2003/25/EC, Directive 1999/35/EC and Directive 98/41/EC. The fitness check was announced in the Commission REFIT Communication of October 2013 and its results were reported to the European Parliament and the Council on 16 October 2015 (COM(2015)508).

Among other issues, the fitness check identified a potential to simplify, clarify and repeal a number of ambiguous, outdated or overlapping regulatory requirements. As an immediate follow-up, the Commission announced that it will consider adopting a simplified regulatory framework for EU passenger ship safety that will further enhance passenger safety and deliver its objectives in a simpler, clearer and more proportionate manner, with better respect for the subsidiarity principle.

In the spirit of the Commission's REFIT and Better Regulation agenda, and as a first follow-up step to the fitness check recommendations described below, this review is undertaken to bring about the identified simplification potential without changing the existing policy objectives and their key delivery mechanisms. In the second step, the Commission will follow-up with proposals on a number of other safety and internal market related issues singled out by the fitness check for further assessment.

Issue

Background

The safety of passenger ships in the EU is regulated at three levels: international, EU and national. The EU passenger ship safety legislation has been set in place to address potential safety risks caused by the fact that international standards do not apply to domestic voyages or that they are insufficient. It addresses the difficulties in search and rescue operations, aims at achieving a common safety level and ensures that the safety standards are well applied.

For ships engaged in international voyages (i.e. including between two EU Member States), international conventions and certain EU rules apply. The most safety-relevant applicable convention is the International

Convention for the Safety of Life At Sea (SOLAS). In addition, specific EU rules apply to ro-ro passenger ships (known as ro-pax ships), high speed craft (HSC) and registration of persons on board.

For ships engaged in domestic voyages (i.e. between ports of the same Member State), EU and national rules apply. The most extensive EU legislative instrument is Directive 2009/45/EC, regulating ships made of steel or equivalent material and high speed craft. Where applicable and feasible, it is based on internationally agreed standards. National administrations have established their own rules for non-steel ships that are currently not regulated at EU level.

In this framework, the four EU Directives that have been chosen for the fitness check and that are targeted in this review represent a set of key safety standards and requirements for passenger ships sailing in the EU waters, i.e. Directive 2009/45/EC, Directive 2003/25/EC, Directive 1999/35/EC and Directive 98/41/EC. Related legal texts are listed below where relevant.

Problems

The EU passenger ship safety legal framework has been evaluated as largely fit for purpose, having resulted in improved safety of life and contributed to developing the internal market.

However, while the key objectives of the EU passenger ship safety legislation on passenger safety and internal market remain highly relevant, the fitness check identified a scope for further enhancing the level of safety as well as the efficiency and proportionality of some of the regulatory requirements. The potential to simplify, clarify and repeal a number of ambiguous, outdated or overlapping requirements has been identified in the areas that follow. Specific measures are described in further detail in section B below.

- 1. Complexity and administrative burden:** Mandatory surveys for the safe operation of regular ro-ro ferries have been found to significantly overlap with other types of surveys and inspections (namely flag State surveys and port State control inspections). Member States have implemented these requirements in a pragmatic way, which means that the current legal framework no longer reflects the state of affairs. The complexity of the EU passenger ship safety legislation is aggravated by an outdated format of the safety standards for domestic passenger ships that have become over time extremely difficult to compare against the existing international requirements.
- 2. Ambiguity and lack of transparency:** The fitness check revealed that a number of provisions, definitions and requirements are ambiguous to such extent that in certain cases they may hinder an effective implementation of the legislation. These relate in particular to the scope and application of the harmonised EU standards, such as the type of ships covered or regularity of inspections.
- 3. Disproportionate requirements:** Small ships are defined as less than 24m long. This definition is considered the most appropriate in defining commonly applicable technical safety standards. As small ships are more sensitive to local operational conditions, Member States should be in a better position to assess the concrete risks and to define the corresponding safety standards. Furthermore, unlike for bigger ships, small ships tend to be operated in the same Member State until the end of their operational life and their transfer between Member States is limited compared to big ships. The applicable EU standards for small steel ships (i.e. covering ca. 70 ships out of 1950 small ships) have been evaluated as disproportionate and do not provide sufficient EU added value to be retained.
- 4. Outdated support for search and rescue operations:** While experience has shown that an effective search and rescue operation requires immediate access to accurate data as regards the persons on board, this is not always the case. According to the current requirements, this information has to be stored in the company's system and be – at all times – readily available for transmission to the competent authority responsible for search and rescue. This requirement, dating to 1998, ignores the development of systems such as SafeSeaNet and the National Single Window (operated under Directives 2002/59/EC and 2010/65/EC) and necessitates that the national competent authority contacts the shipping company in the event of an emergency. Furthermore, the recorded data does not always include information on nationality (i.e. besides name, age and sex), making the assistance provided to victims and their relatives more difficult. Operators that already transmit such data to SafeSeaNet or the National Single Window are exposed to double reporting regime.

Who is affected

Given that the above mentioned issues render monitoring, implementation and enforcement of safety standards suboptimal and unnecessarily difficult, all stakeholders are affected. Public competent authorities find the application of some of the requirements challenging or unclear; economic actors such as shipyards and shipowners and operators face legal uncertainty and disproportionate requirements; and passengers do not reap the full benefits of the existing legal framework.

How is the problem likely to develop in the future

The issues described above are primarily linked to Better Regulation, i.e. ensuring that legislation in place is simple, clear and predictable and that it continues to add value as new solutions emerge. In case the identified

simplification potential is not reaped and the existing legal framework not updated, some of its provisions are likely to gradually cease being fit for purpose.

Such scenario would also fail to address stakeholder concerns that in the past four years repeatedly pointed to the inhomogeneous and varied implementation of the passenger ship safety legal framework, its complexity and the lack of clarity in a number of definitions and requirements, overlaps and outdated reporting requirements.

Subsidiarity check

The legal base of Directives targeted by this simplification is Article 100 TFEU (ex Article 80 TEC), providing for measures to improve transport safety and for specific provisions for sea transport.

As the fitness check demonstrated, in general the EU passenger ship safety legislation complies with the principle of subsidiarity. It has however proven that the existing safety standards for small steel ships below 24 m in length are disproportionate vis-à-vis the identified safety and internal market objectives. This simplification initiative is envisaged to remove this requirement as it does not provide sufficient EU added value to be retained.

Concerning the EU added value more generally, as regards domestic voyages, it is unlikely that international standards would be more effective or efficient than the current EU standards. International IMO standards do not apply. In the absence of EU standards, Member States would have either to develop their own legislation or to adopt international rules, which are however not fully adequate for domestic voyages and would need to be adapted accordingly. This would also necessitate regular updates to keep track of new developments in shipbuilding technology. In any case, neither a common safety level would be achieved, nor internal market (namely the free transfer of ships between EU Member States) facilitated. In addition, EU standards provide for access for persons with reduced mobility, an element which is recommended, but not mandatory in international standards.

The situation for international voyages is different. Full reliance on the relevant international standards would be more effective and efficient, provided that they guarantee an adequate level of safety. However, this may not always be the case. Therefore, having for example more stringent damage stability requirements for ro-ro passenger ships sailing to or from ports of different EU Member States is considered the best solution to deliver the adequate safety level for this type of ship, prevalent in the EU. This element is envisaged to be re-assessed once the international damage stability standards for passenger ships will have been upgraded in a satisfactory manner for the EU. It is therefore not addressed in this review which focuses on simplifying existing regulatory provisions without changing their substance.

Finally, in the absence of an enforcement mechanism at international level, the existing EU inspection regimes applicable to both domestic and international passenger ships remain a pre-requisite for maintaining a high standard of safety of life for passenger ships and eliminating substandard shipping.

Main policy objectives

The main objective of the EU legislation on passenger ships is to improve the level of safety of life on passenger ships sailing in EU waters. A second objective is to remove potential barriers to the internal market, including the transfer of ships between Member States.

In line with the Commission's REFIT programme, this initiative is part thereof, the objectives of this revision is to simplify and streamline the existing EU passenger ship safety regulatory framework, in order to (i) maintain EU rules where necessary and proportionate; (ii) ensure their correct implementation; and (iii) eliminate potential overlap of obligations and inconsistencies between related pieces of legislation.

An overarching objective is to provide for a clear, simple and up-to-date legal framework that is easier to implement, monitor and enforce, increasing thus the overall safety level.

More specifically, this initiative aims at:

1. Reducing complexity and administrative burden, primarily stemming from overlapping inspection regimes and outdated format of the safety standards;
2. Reducing ambiguity of definitions and requirements, related in particular to the scope and application of the harmonised EU standards;
3. Removing disproportionate requirements, particularly for small passenger ships; and
4. Eliminating double reporting requirements and outdated provisions concerning registration of persons on board.

B. Option Mapping

Given the simplification nature of its initiative, no materially different policy options have been identified besides the baseline scenario described above, i.e. no EU action. The fitness check has identified the simplification potential in detail, leaving little or no discretion as to what and how should be simplified. It should be also noted that the fitness check identified a number of other, substantial issues going beyond simplification elements. These are not included in this simplification review and necessitate further assessment and consultation with experts.

To some extent, an alternative instrument of addressing the identified simplification potential could be a non-legislative action such as interpretative guidelines or recommendations. Such instrument would however address only some of the identified issues (e.g. ambiguous definitions) and would lead to a situation where the requirements clearly identified as disproportionate, overly burdensome or outdated start to be legally enforced. Some stakeholders even pointed out that soft law would add another layer of documentation into the already complex legislative framework. Having said that, the implementation plan is envisaged to facilitate implementing the simplified legal framework.

More concretely, the main simplification proposals addressing the identified specific policy objectives are described below. Their exact legal form (such as repeal, amendment, recast) will be subject to a legal analysis.

1. Reducing complexity and administrative burden:

- a. Remove overlaps between the specific surveys under Directive 1999/35/EC, the expanded Port State Control inspections and the annual flag State surveys:

Notwithstanding the specificities of Directive 1999/35/EC, the vast majority of Member States combine or replace some of the inspections required under the Directive with either flag State surveys or port State control inspections. This practice renders the implementation and enforcement of this Directive problematic, given the different scope of these inspections and regulatory overlaps. For example, the legal framework allows for a port State control inspection to be replaced by a Directive 1999/35/EC survey. However, given that the scope of 1999/35/EC survey does not include all elements covered by the port State control, this overlap in fact creates a regulatory gap.

Removing the overlaps and inconsistencies between these inspection regimes would not only close the identified regulatory gap but it would also further rationalise the inspection effort of national administration and maximise the time in which the ship is commercially exploited. The maximum combination potential has been estimated in the fitness check at EUR 1 million (i.e. reduction of 770 self-standing ro-pax inspections per year for the entire EU, if the same ships continued in service as today), part of which has been already realised in practice by combining the various kind of inspections. Besides these monetary estimates, there is a significant burden for all the stakeholders related to the complexity of the regime, overlapping requirements spread across different pieces of legislation, expressed in different terms etc. This makes the implementation, monitoring and enforcement unnecessarily burdensome for all the parties involved.

- b. Simplify the format Annex of Directive 2009/45/EC, increase its readability and facilitate its updates:

Annex I of the Directive contains the actual technical requirements (i.e. safety standards). Its format dates back to pre-SOLAS 2009. With the adoption of SOLAS 2009, the numbering and the format of the corresponding Regulations have significantly changed. As a result, the actual Annex is extremely difficult to read and to compare against the current SOLAS requirements. The envisaged tabular format will provide for a more readable document that is easier to update, monitor and enforce.

- c. Streamline the reporting mechanism of exemptions / equivalencies under Directives 2009/45/EC and Directive 98/41/EC:

The two Directives define a sui generis notification procedure that is rather lengthy (Commission has 6 months to raise objections) and not necessarily always followed in practice. For example, although Member States are expected to notify draft measures, exemptions are often notified after they had been granted. In addition, there is no database where such measures (either in their draft or adopted form) would be recorded and made available to all Member States and operators for their consideration. During the consultation process, the proposal has been made to align the specific notification procedures with the Directive 98/34 notification procedure of technical regulations related to products and information society services. This is expected to streamline, facilitate and maximise the added value of existing reporting requirements.

- d. Eliminate the redundant concept of the host state provided for under Directive 1999/35/EC (while retaining the possibility for joint inspections) and replace the term "survey" by "inspection":

The concept of the 'host' state was introduced by this Directive to facilitate the cooperation with non-EU Member States prior to the 2004 EU enlargement. It allowed for the surveys to be carried out by multinational teams of the involved host States (i.e. EU as well as non-EU members). It is no longer relevant for the majority of routes and unnecessarily complicates the framework, although there is a clear value in carrying out joint in-service inspections. The Directive also refers to "surveys" rather than "inspections". The word survey is used in international Conventions to indicate the obligation of flag States to monitor the compliance of ships with the international standards and issue or renew, where relevant, certificates. However, the special inspection regime for ro-pax ferries and HSC on regular service cannot be considered a survey in that respect and is therefore envisaged to be aligned with the notion of inspections. These changes are not expected to have any material impacts besides alleviating some of the regulatory complexity and incoherence.

2. Reducing ambiguity of definitions and requirements:

- a. Clarify that for the purposes of Directive 2009/45/EC:

- i. Aluminium is a material equivalent to steel:

Directive 2009/45/EC applies to ships built from steel and material equivalent to steel. It defines equivalent material as any non-combustible material which, by itself or due to insulation provided, has structural and integrity properties equivalent to steel at the end of the applicable exposure to the standard fire test. Aluminium is the only material that is explicitly mentioned in the Directive as being equivalent to steel (i.e. not by itself but due to insulation provided). While the large majority of Member States considers ships made of aluminium equivalent to steel and consequently within the scope of Directive, other Member States do not apply the Directive in the same manner. Such difference in interpretation seems to be primarily related to the definition of spaces which should be additionally fire insulated.

This leads to an uneven situation where one part of the fleet is certified under the Directive while another part of the same fleet is not (albeit a bigger one). Around 30 aluminium built non-HSC passenger ships above 24 m in length have been certified according to the Directive, while another 129 have not. Therefore, clarifying that aluminium built ships with proper fire insulation fall under the scope of Directive 2009/45/EC and enforcing its provisions is indispensable to establish a common safety level and a level playing field.

However, even with clarifying the corresponding fire insulation requirements, this proposal may necessitate additional fire insulation investment and therefore additional cost for some of the shipyards and shipowners. This stems from the fact the safety standards currently applicable to the aluminium ships outside the scope of the Directive are less stringent. Therefore, sufficient transition period will be envisaged to smooth the adjustment to the maximum extent possible.

It should be also noted that excluding aluminium from the scope of Directive 2009/45/EC is not considered a credible alternative, as it would defeat the entire notion of material equivalence described above and the policy objective of achieving a common, high safety level for passengers sailing domestically in the EU Member States.

- ii. Offshore service vessels and traditional ships fall outside the scope of the Directive:

As regards offshore service vessels, some Member States consider offshore workers as passengers and apply the rules for passenger ships, while others define offshore workers as crew and apply the less demanding IMO Code for Special Purpose Ships. The Directive standards are developed for persons without training or mandatory medical fitness requirements and therefore not destined for ships carrying industrial personnel. To be also noted that the IMO is currently developing appropriate international standards for this type of ships.

In relation to traditional ships, a number of rig-sailing passenger ships had been certified according to the Directive without meeting the appropriate requirements (for example, the Directive lacks any requirements or criteria related to the stability of these ships when using wind and sails as the main propulsion power). Currently, the text in the Directive indicates that ships not propelled by mechanical means are excluded from the scope; however, these rig-sailing ships usually have an auxiliary diesel engine capable of propelling the ship if needed. Accordingly there is a need to clarify in the Directive that

the ships that are primarily propelled by sails are excluded from the scope.

For the sake of clarity and a level playing field, it is therefore envisaged to clarify that these ships fall outside the Directive's scope. The ships that have been (incorrectly) certified under the Directive will need to be re-certified – to minimise this impact, sufficient transition period will be envisaged to ensure that it takes place within the business as usual re-certification period.

- b. Clarify that the regularity of the two annual inspections of ro-pax vessels in Directive 1999/35/EC is meant to take place at regular, six monthly intervals:

Over the time that Directive 1999/35/EC has been in place, a key issue has emerged to undermine its effectiveness in ensuring a common safety level: Different interpretation of the time window between the bi-annual inspections. The intention when the Directive was drafted is that these two inspections would be carried out with a certain time span between them, 5-6 months. However, the text in the Directive does not specify the regularity of the inspections; it only indicates that two inspections per year must be carried out. Although most Member States indicated that they would not have problems carrying out the two surveys provided for in the Directive with an interval of 5-6 months, some limited savings may be foregone in those Member States that currently carry out these surveys consecutively.

- c. Clarify the definitions of passenger registration requirements in Directive 98/41/EC:

The implementation experience has revealed a number of unclear definitions, making some of the provisions difficult to monitor and enforce. Among these unclear definitions are the definition of (i) voyage of more than twenty miles from the point of departure (e.g. whether the distance restarts at each intermediate stop, it is measured as a sailed distance etc.), and (ii) duration for which the data should be kept by the company (i.e. for the duration of the voyage or, if longer, how much longer). These clarifications are expected to bring about legal clarity for the operators and to facilitate the monitoring and enforcement for public authorities.

- d. Simplify the sea areas definition in Directive 2009/45/EC:

- i. Removing the reference to "where the shipwreck persons can land",
- ii. Removing the notion of "place of refuge".

This proposal would not influence the drawing of new sea areas for Member States but would eliminate only redundant or overlapping criteria: i) The Directive does not include any criteria that would indicate which type of coast is appropriate for shipwrecked person to land or even whether a shipwrecked person is referred to a person in the water, on a survival craft or on a ship in distress. Indeed, according to the majority of Member States, this expression has no added value and should be deleted; and ii) Member States already have procedures in place to assess the appropriateness of a particular coastline as a place of refuge on a case by case basis. In such framework, the notion of place of refuge as a defining parameter of sea areas was found to be outdated and inadequate for its purpose.

3. Removing disproportionate requirements:

- a. Exclude passenger ships built of steel or equivalent material below 24 m in length from the scope of Directive 2009/45/EC:

The benefits of this measure primarily relate to a simpler, clearer and more proportionate EU regulatory framework. Given the limited number of small steel ships currently covered by the Directive (i.e. currently ca. 70 out of 1950 small ships), the impacts on public authorities and operators are expected to be marginal. Transition period would be envisaged for the ca. 70 small ships certified under Directive 2009/45/EC and for the newly built ones, national legislation would apply. To large extent, such national legislation already exists – not only for small ships currently outside the scope of Directive 2009/45/EC but also for those covered by it (to be noted that several key safety aspects for small ships have not been harmonised in the Directive). In addition, the Directive already gave Member States the flexibility to apply national rules when they find the harmonised standards for small ships impracticable and/or unreasonable.

- b. Eliminate the requirement for the formal approval of the passenger registration system currently provided for in Directive 98/41/EC:

The requirement to approve passenger registration systems has proven to generate significant workload

for some national administrations (e.g. 4250 working hours in Greece compared to 100 working hours in Italy). Such workload, and the corresponding costs, have been evaluated as clearly excessive, namely vis-à-vis its narrow scope, given its partial overlap with the ISM code and given the difficulty to verify the approval in the absence of any certificates. Most importantly, its added value was found to be limited in addition to other, more substantial requirements focusing on the proper functioning of such system.

4. Eliminating double reporting requirements and outdated provisions concerning registration of persons on board:

- a. Record the information on the persons on board in an existing electronic system that in the event of an emergency allows for an immediate transmission of data to the competent authority:

For those operators that are already transmitting such information (and more) to systems such as SafeSeaNet or the National Single Window (as required by Directive 2002/59/EC, Regulation 562/2006 and Regulation 725/2004), this proposal would eliminate a double reporting requirement. The information would be reported only once by the operators and it would be made available, in case of an emergency, to the appropriate competent authorities. Whether this will have neutral or positive impact on companies' processes will depend on a case-by-case basis, determined by their individual use of IT. In any case, it will remove the coexistence of similar reporting requirements spread across several pieces of legislation with different scope and coverage that reduces legal clarity and hinders an effective implementation and enforcement.

A lighter regime is envisaged for those (in principle smaller) operators that do not yet use the systems mentioned above. These companies operate mainly on very short domestic voyages (i.e. recording information only on the number of persons on board) and may still keep paper-based record of the information on persons on board. It is envisaged that they would have a choice to decide how such information is best transmitted to neutralise any possible cost increase. This would allow the local search and rescue centre to easily retrieve the number of persons on board from a single point of storage, at any point of time, regardless of the availability of a contact person.

- b. Register the nationality of persons on board:

As the consultation process and accidents have also shown, it is of outmost importance to have available from the very early stage of a post-accident phase not only the number and the list of persons on board (this requirement applies to long voyages only, i.e. beyond 20 nautical miles) but also the passengers' nationality. Some operators already report such information, namely when using the international reporting forms such as FAL forms 5 and 6 as provided for in Directive 2010/65/EC. The passenger information like name, date of birth, etc. is currently recorded on a basis of self-declaration of passengers. As suggested by operators, the same procedure to register nationality is therefore envisaged to make sure that those operators currently not recording such information face none or marginal cost of such additional data entry.

Proportionality check

Besides clarifying a number of definitions, removing disproportionate requirements without compromising the high level of safety is one of the objectives of this simplification initiative. This proposal also aims at removing some outdated requirements, namely by mandating or encouraging the use of electronic means of reporting developed for such purpose in the meantime (i.e. SafeSeaNet, National Single Windows). This, together with flexibility for some operators, is considered as the only proportionate and coherent option addressing the latest technological and legal developments.

C. Data collection and Better Regulation instruments

Data collection

This initiative is an immediate follow-up of the fitness check and builds therefore primarily on the data collected during this process and reported in the Commission Staff Working Document 'Adjusting course: EU Passenger Ship Safety Legislation Fitness Check', adopted in 16 October 2015 (SWD(2015)197). This data will be updated, where relevant, on the basis of the input received from stakeholders during the forthcoming consultation.

In addition to the data and analysis carried out in the framework of the fitness check, the preparation of this simplification proposal will necessitate an input from technical and legal experts regarding the concrete formulation of technical definitions and a clear legal drafting. This expertise will be gathered internally, in cooperation with the European Maritime Safety Agency and the Passenger Ship Safety Expert Group.

Consultation approach
<p>To a large extent, the views of stakeholders are already well known and have been reported on in the fitness check (including consultations in the context of 2011, 2012 and 2014 support studies and the 2012 online public consultation). More recently, stakeholders had an opportunity to express their views in a recent open public consultation on the quality of EU shipping, namely as regards the adequacy of existing international and EU legislative framework on ship safety.</p> <p>In addition and to specifically support the preparation of this simplification initiative, a targeted consultation on the measures identified in section B above will be organised. It is envisaged to take place once the results of the fitness check are fully disseminated.</p> <p>A targeted consultation of national experts will take place in the framework of the Passenger Ship Safety Expert Group. In-depth interviews with public authorities, industry or passenger associations will be organised on specific issues if needed. In addition, a workshop will be organised. All the Member States as well as industry and passenger associations will be contacted and invited to participate therein.</p> <p>The results of the targeted consultation will be reported in the Commission Staff Working Document that is envisaged to accompany the simplification proposal.</p>
Will an Implementation plan be established?
Yes
Will an impact assessment be carried out for this initiative and/or possible follow-up initiatives?
<p>Given that this initiative is an immediate follow-up to the fitness check that identified the issues for simplification in detail and assessed the simplification potential, a fully-fledged impact assessment is not foreseen. As highlighted in section B above, the envisaged measures are either not expected to generate any significant impacts (i.e. beyond those that are non-measurable such as legal clarity, certainty or simplicity) or there are no materially different solutions available.</p> <p>However, the simplification proposal will be accompanied by a Commission Staff Working Document that will recall the recommendations of the fitness check and explain the rationale of the proposed solutions from the technical as well as legal perspective. It will also include a summary and a feedback on the stakeholder consultation carried out in support of this initiative. The proposal will be also accompanied by an implementation plan that will list the actions needed to implement the simplification measures and will identify the main technical, legal and time-related implementation challenges.</p>