European Communities

388.9

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

Working Documents
1982-1983

REPORT

drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Transport

on the simplification of formalities at Community
airports

Rapporteur: Mr M. JUNOT

By letter of 5 February 1982 the Committee on Transport requested authorization to draw up a report on the simplification of formalities at Community airports.

By letter of 15 March 1982 the committee was authorized to submit a report on this matter.

On 30 April 1982 it appointed Mr Michel JUNOT rapporteur.

It considered the draft report at its meetings of 13 July, 19 October and 4 November 1982 and, at the last of these meetings, unanimously adopted the motion for a resolution as a whole.

The following took part in the vote: Mr Seefeld, chairman; Dame Shelagh Roberts and Mr Carossino, vice-chairmen; Mr Junot, rapporteur; Mr Albers, Mr Buttafuoco, Mr Cardia, Mr Gatto (deputizing for Mr Ripa di Meana), Mr Klinkenborg, Mr Modiano and Mr Moreland (deputizing for Lord Harmar-Nicholls).

The Committee on Transport hereby submits to the European Parliament
the following motion for a resolution, together with explanatory statement:

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

on the simplification of formalities at Community airports

The European Parliament,

- having regard to the motions for resolutions tabled by Mr MOORHOUSE and
  others pursuant to Rules 47 and 48 of the Rules of Procedure on the improvement
  of the formalities at Brussels International Airport[1],

- having regard to the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr BOYES pursuant to
  Rule 47 of the Rules of Procedure on the examination of photographic
  equipment at airports in Member States[2],

- having regard to the report of the Committee on Transport (Doc. 1-842/82),

A wishing to facilitate the development of air transport within the Community
   and to simplify travel for European citizens,

B concerned by the impediments to the free movement of persons within the
   Community,

1. Notes the serious inconvenience and delays suffered by intra-Community
   travellers at European airports;

2. Regrets that the Commission has not been able to obtain from the Council
   effective measures to remedy this situation;

3. Calls on the Member States, meeting within the Council:

   . to harmonize their positions in relation to Annex 9 to the Chicago
     Convention on ways of facilitating operations in the civil aviation sector,
   . to take practical steps to standardize their control procedures,
   . to bring out, with this in mind, the European passport as soon as possible,
   . to apply Article 48 of the Treaty of Rome establishing the principle of
     freedom of movement and, consequently, to abolish customs controls for
     intra-Community travel;

----

[1] Doc. 1-91/81 and Doc. 1-565/81
[2] Doc. 1-500/82

4. Proposes that constructive measures should be adopted to improve the conditions under which people travel within the Community:

   . by the airline companies, which should introduce simplified and standardized procedures both for the embarkation of passengers and for the checking in and returning of luggage and improve the flow of information to passengers awaiting embarkation;

   . by the administrative authorities, which should completely abolish control procedures for intra-Community travellers, introduce check-in points specifically for Community nationals on international flights and adapt their staffing arrangements to actual air traffic conditions,

   . by the airport authorities, which should improve their information policy - which is mainly based on visual display units - taking particular account of the linguistic diversity of Europe, and adopt a common set of clear symbols for the guidance of passengers;

5. Considers that, apart from their practical aspect, such measures will have a positive psychological impact by enhancing the feeling of belonging to a closely-knit Community;

6. Calls on the Commission to take account of the measures recommended and to incorporate them into the proposal for a directive which it is due to draw up on the easing of formalities and controls in the passenger transport sector;

7. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Commission and the Council.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

I. INTRODUCTION

1. It hardly needs to be recalled that the free movement of persons constitutes one of the fundamental principles of the European Community.

Theoretically, therefore, persons using Community airports for intra-Community flights should be able to pass through with the utmost ease and be treated in exactly the same way as they would be on domestic flights, in other words without customs and police formalities.

Experience has shown that this, unfortunately, is simply not the case and that there is very considerable room for improvement.

The situation is all the more outrageous in that, while airlines offer a very fast means of transport between the various cities of the European Community, passengers very often spend more time at customs and policy check-in points than in the air.

If, in practice, road transport checks at intra-Community frontiers are becoming increasingly perfunctory - and in some cases have ceased to exist - the same cannot be said of the airports, at which checks continue to be carried out systematically.

2. For the European Parliament, the elimination of obstacles to the free flow of traffic at border crossings is a major, long-standing objective, and has been the subject of many report. Particular mention should be made of the report drawn up in 1979 by Mr Guillaume SCHTNS on behalf of the old Committee on Regional Policy, Regional Planning and Transport on 'the difficulties encountered at the Community's internal frontiers in the transport of passengers and goods by road'[1].

In a meticulous survey of the different obstacles encountered at internal border crossings, this report highlighted the very nature of the administrative, technical, economic, monetary and fiscal obstructions and recommended a whole range of practical measures which might serve to remedy the situation.

---

[1] Doc. 678/78

3. More recently, in a report drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs on the 1981 programme for the achievement of the customs union, Mr Karl von WOGAU pointed out that 'the problems attendant on the crossing of the Community's internal frontiers are related not only to the functioning of the customs union itself, but that a wide range of provisions in other areas ... create unnecessary formalities at border crossings'[1].

4. The efforts of the European Parliament will not have been completely in vain, since the Commission has just submitted a proposal for a Council directive on the 'facilitation of formalities and inspections in respect of the carriage of goods between Member States'[2], the objective of which is along the right lines, even though it is to be regretted that it does not also encompass the problem of passengers, bearing in mind the psychological impact of the measures envisaged.

5. It is noticeable that the elimination of obstacles in the passenger air transport sector has not been considered in any great depth, despite the fact that a relaxation of the attendant formalities figures among the nine priorities of the air transport programme adopted by the Council on 12 June 1978.

6. In this report, we shall first enumerate and then attempt to analyse the whole range of formalities and controls which are currently proving so disruptive to air transport.

We shall not, however, confine our attention to problems of an administrative nature: we shall also examine all the other factors which might improve the free movement of Community citizens and enable them to travel without let or hindrance.

It is essential above all to evolve procedures which could be accepted and implemented in the near future. It is also essential to ensure that all the measures advocated are fully acceptable at the international level and help to ease restrictions in the air transport sector without creating Community rules that discriminate against non-member countries.

----

[1] Doc. 1-241/81, p. 6

[2] COM(82) 189 final

II. THE SCALE OF THE PROBLEM

7. It is paradoxical that the most rapid means of transport is by far the most complicated for the passenger in terms of the formalities to be completed.

Indeed, the airline passenger is subjected to a whole range of difficulties and restrictions which simply do not apply to travel by train, boat or private car.

Quite apart from the distance factor which entails a long additional journey between airports and the cities they serve, the intra-Community traveller, after booking his seat and buying his ticket - which he is often required to do several days in advance - has to go through the following: check-in his luggage, have his ticket checked and stamped, wait fifteen to sixty minutes for embarkation, undergo police and customs formalities, have his hand-luggage checked by X-ray, perhaps undergo a body search, have his boarding card checked, fill in landing cards, submit to a further series of customs and police controls and await the arrival of his luggage.

It is obvious from this list that the crossing of frontiers is alone responsible for countless obstructions to the air traveller.

8. We are bound to point out that the whole gamut of customs and police formalities at times adds hours to the journey. One of the examples most frequently cited is that of Brussels International Airport, which indirectly gave rise to the motion for a resolution by Mr MOORHOUSE and others which led to the drafting of this report[1].

The Belgian press has often reported on the dilatoriness of officials at Brussels International Airport and it is not uncommon for frontier police controls at this airport to take half an hour, if not an hour, to complete.

Brussels International Airport is not, however, the only airport to come in for criticism. For example, in a recent written question to the Commission[2], Mr PEARCE asked 'why delays repeatedly occur at passport control at Charles de Gaulle Airport'.

----

[1] Doc. 1-565/81

[2] Written Question No. 58/82

This situation is particularly bad within the European Community, since the maximum duration of flights is usually not more than two or three hours, yet all too often the total time spent at the airport and getting to the airport is considerably in excess of the actual flight time.

III. CAUSES

9. From being restricted in the early days to the privileged few, air travel has evolved as a means of transport for the masses. In 1981, the airlines transported as many as 728 million passengers.

The large international airports in Europe cater for vast numbers of travellers:

1981:

PARIS - Orly	17.2 million passengers
- Roissy - Charles de Gaulle	11.1 million passengers
LONDON - Heathrow	26.8 million passengers
FRANKFURT	17.7 million passengers
ROME	11.7 million passengers

It goes without saying that the arrival and departure of such a large number of travellers, all subject to the obligatory formalities imposed by the police, customs and the airline companies, create problems of all kinds.

10. One of the main reasons for the situation with which we are concerned is, then, that the airport authorities are not always able to cope properly with the flow of passengers. When, for example, several fully loaded jumbo jets land at international airports within the space of a few minutes, the administrative control services become very rapidly overloaded. If this situation is compounded by certain difficulties peculiar to the airport's internal organization, the resulting congestion causes interminable delays.

11. A second reason is that the police, immigration and customs services make no distinction between the passenger who has come from a neighbouring European capital and the passenger who has come from, say, Bangkok or Rio de Janeiro, and examine all identity documents in exactly the same way.

12. A third reason is the existence of a number of formalities such as the completion of embarkation and landing cards, which are as random as they are unnecessary.

Random, because they are not imposed by certain Community countries.

Unnecessary, because they are required only for certain modes of transport, particularly air transport.

13. While to demand immediately the complete abolition of all controls is out of the question - the fight against terrorism and hijacking clearly justifies certain kinds of checks - we can at least demand, for Europeans travelling within the Community, the wide-scale abolition of a whole series of obstructive formalities which do nothing to enhance the feeling of belonging to a Europe without frontiers.

14. The fact that there are too few personnel to cope with the flow of aircraft is a further shortcoming, and this is made worse by the failure to adapt the police presence at airports to the number of flights and passengers.

15. The poor quality of the information services (interpretation into an insufficient number of Community languages), imprecise or uncoordinated signposting and, above all, the unreliability of the information given to passengers, particularly about changes to scheduled times of arrival or departure - all these are further causes of numerous delays or a source of irritation to passengers. In general, travellers often have the disagreeable impression of being treated in an unacceptably offhand way by the airport services and, in particular, by the airline companies.

16. Then there are the problems caused by the poor design of certain airports, which compel passengers to cover extremely long distances on foot; this of course, we mention just for the record, since the solution to such problems depends not on the Community but on the airport authorities and entails alterations to the infrastructures which would take many years, if not decades to complete.

17. If we are to try to discover the underlying causes of the complex formalities and the obstacles to the efficient flow of passengers at airports, we must first of all realize that an airport is a complicated structure that operates through the interaction of different services.

For the sake of simplicity, we may consider the running of an airport to involve three types of authority:

- the airport authorities themselves, which provide an infrastructure, suitable equipment, runways, buildings, maintenance services, etc.;
- the airline companies, which use many of these facilities;
- the administrative authorities and the customs, immigration and health control services, etc., which are responsible for the overall policing and inspection procedures.

In many cases, airport authorities have a statutory obligation to fulfil a general coordination function, which is evidently extremely useful and should be made mandatory for all airport authorities.

18. These three 'levels' of authority perform tasks which, although in juxtaposition, are not necessarily convergent, since each authority tends to take account only of its own specific function.

Thus, the police and customs authorities tend to be unaware of the commercial interests involved in facilitating as far as possible the flow of traffic.

Consequently, it is not in the least surprising that they do not display excessive zeal or seek to adapt their methods to the circumstances.

As for the airline companies, they take the view that the administrative formalities are no concern of theirs and that, in any case, any improvement would entail extra financial charges.

The airport authorities as such, whatever their legal status in the different countries, do not all feel concerned about problems which they regard as not falling directly within their sphere of competence.

Without entertaining the hope of ever reaching an ideal situation, we can nonetheless endorse the following observation by URS MEIER, Swissair's Director-General for France: 'An airport is first and foremost a community of persons united by a common objective: to facilitate the travel of other persons' [1].

---

[1] Aéroports Magazine, No. 128, May 1982, p. 6

PE 80.180/fin

IV. CURRENT REGULATIONS AND PRACTICES

19. It would be wrong to assume, however, that nothing has been done to improve the situation at our airports, particularly at the international level.

The need to facilitate the operation of the international civil aviation sector was recognized at a very early date by the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO)and is the subject of much of the Convention on International Civil Aviation.

20. Article 22 of the 1944 Chicago Convention, on the simplification of procedures, specifies that 'each contracting State agrees to adopt all practicable measures . . . to prevent unnecessary delays to aircraft, crews, passengers and cargo, especially in the administration of the laws relating to immigration, quarantine, customs and clearance'.

Article 23, on customs and immigration procedures, specifies that 'each contracting State undertakes, so far as it may find practicable, to establish customs and immigration procedures affecting international air navigation in accordance with the practices which may be established or recommended from time to time, pursuant to this Convention'.

21. The matter of simplifying formalities is covered by Annex 9 to the Chicago Convention. Chapter 3 of this Annex is of most interest to us here since it relates to the arrival and departure of passengers and their luggage.

The general spirit of the chapter is reflected in paragraph 3.1, which provides that 'the procedures and regulations applied to persons who travel by air shall not be less favourable than those applicable to persons who use other means of transport'.

The chapter goes on to specify the conditions and formalities that are to apply to passengers on arrival and departure, the documents that are to be carried by passengers and crew members and, lastly, the procedures for protecting passengers and members of the crew and their baggage.

Paragraph 3.34 is particularly significant in that it provides that 'the responsible public authorities are empowered to detain passengers and crew members, but for no longer than is justified, for the purpose of verifying that they may be admitted into the territory of the State concerned'.

In practice, the situation is strikingly different. Indeed, it would seem as if those responsible are set on making an exception of air transport. On the roads, intra-Community frontier checks are becoming less and less common, as, for instance, in the Benelux countries or between Belgium and France. On the railways, the formalities are more or less perfunctory. In the case of air travel, however, the various checks continue to be systematically and rigorously applied.

22. There nevertheless exists a body of precise rules which ought to make it possible to reduce the formalities to a strict minimum, particularly within the European Community, bearing in mind the legislative provisions currently in force.

The very nature of the Chicago Convention allows the contracting States to notify differences between national regulations and practices and the international standards enshrined in the Annex and in any amendments thereto.

However, there are many differences of opinion between the Community Member States over the question of notifying infringements of the Annex 9 principles.

23. In addressing itself to the task of simplifying formalities at airports, ICAO went further than the provisions of this Annex, since in 1968 it recognized the need to find new ways of 'expediting the procedures for passenger clearance at government control points'.

An important measure was the development of a specimen uniform passport which allowed more rapid visual inspection than the conventional passport and could also be read electronically.

This machine-readable passport (MRP) was produced by a group of experts after a dozen or so years of work and coordination meetings.

It consists of two parts: an upper side intended for visual inspection, on which the necessary particulars as to identity and the holder's photograph are displayed, and a lower side for machine reading.

One of the advantages of this new travel document is that it could do away with the need for embarkation and landing cards.

Provided that it could be read instantly, such a passport would be an important time-saver for the control authorities, who at present have to check the many pages of the conventional passport.

This scheme, publicized by ICAO in a document entitled 'A machine-readable passport' (Doc. 9303), is still at the experimental stage. It is being tried out in the United States, particularly at Washington Airport.

It is undoubtedly an important example of what can be achieved through international cooperation.

24. Mention must also be made of the efforts made by IATA, which is attempting to encourage the airline companies themselves to simplify their procedures and has been sharply critical of the administrative authorities for their reluctance to reduce all manner of petty obstructive formalities.

25. Within the European Community, if appreciable differences already exist between the national regulations, the way in which they are applied further accentuates the differences between countries, and, indeed, between individual airports.

This phenomenon is not, however, confined to the air transport sector. It is daily in evidence at the different frontier posts.

It is certainly one of the main reasons why we should press for the introduction of measures which would eventually reduce certain types of control to a strict minimum, if not eliminate them altogether.

V. POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS

(a) General principles

26. The aim must clearly be to standardize both the regulations governing airport formalities and controls and their implementation and, at a more general level, the criteria applicable to freedom of movement for travellers at Community airports, with a view to establishing common European airport procedures.

Nothing, of course, must be done which bypasses international cooperation procedures. The objective must be quite simply to obtain for European citizens

a better service which truly ensures the free movement of persons as envisaged by the Treaty.

Since the responsibility for solving most of the problems of simplification rests primarily with the national governments, it would seem that the Community's main role will be to help achieve this fully attainable objective.

27. Account must also be taken of the existence of the International Civil Airports Association (ICAA), which in 1980 set up a EUROPE sector comprising 130 airports.

Within a given geographical zone, airport commandants exchange points of view, compare experiences and study their specific problems. It is intended that the solutions to these problems should be very simple and rapidly applicable, if only for the sake of securing greater credibility.

The EUROPE regional sector of the ICAA also represents the views of the European airports before a variety of specialist bodies such as the European Civil Aviation Conference (ECAC), the European regional office of ICAO and the Association of European Airline Companies, as well as before the European Community itself.

(b) Practical measures

28. An analysis of the difficulties encountered by the passenger at European airports shows that it is wrong to think in terms of one or more overall solutions and that the correct approach is to tackle each authority operating within the airports on each and every procedure it applies.

THE AIRLINE COMPANIES

29. It is essential that the airline companies should simplify the formalities to be completed by passengers on intra-Community flights (and, of course, on domestic flights in each country). Why do airline tickets have to bear the name of the passenger and consist of several pages, which no-one ever reads anyway? Why draw up manifests for each flight, when it is possible to issue tickets as simple as those used by the railways?

30. Why subject passengers to quite complicated baggage check-in formalities, when aircraft could be equipped with luggage compartments in which the traveller himself could deposit his suitcases when boarding, as is the practice, for example, on the TEE rail service?

These arrangements - ordinary tickets and loading of luggage by passengers - already exist in the United States and even on some European services. They could be more widely adopted on most of the intra-Community medium-haul services, without interfering with the requirement that passengers should pass before the scanning machines necessary to combat terrorism.

THE POLICE AND CUSTOMS AUTHORITIES

31. There can be no doubt that it is these authorities which cause most of the bottlenecks and resulting delays at airports. The first requirement, therefore, is to abolish customs and police controls completely whenever possible and certainly, as we stated earlier, in the case of journeys from one point to another within the Community. Passengers should arrive at and depart from airports (or airport buildings) reserved for 'domestic' services.

32. This would still leave the problem of the international airports, which are frequently faced with complex situations arising from the disembarkation and embarkation (or transit) of passengers of all nationalities and from all parts of the globe, with all the consequences that that entails: passports with or without visas, the need to produce certificates of various kinds, health and safety inspections, etc.

These problems do not exactly fall within the terms of reference of this report, which is mainly concerned with those issues which affect the Community. It should, however, be noted that it would be desirable for the international airports to have passages and check-in desks set aside for the use of EEC nationals. Such an arrangement has already been introduced in the United Kingdom, which is a step in the right direction, even though a distinction is made between United Kingdom nationals and citizens of the other Community Member States.

33. Except in the United Kigdom, then, all passengers are at present treated in an identical fashion at the check-in points. Nationals of the European Community should be dealt with at separate check-in points, not with a view to giving them preferential treatment, but for the more logical reason of sparing them the

- 17 -

formalities to which they should on no account be subjected.

Apart from the practical advantages, special passenger processing arrangements for EEC nationals would have the important psychological effect of making them feel that they belong to the same Community.

While it is perhaps true that it is not always easy to introduce such arrangements in certain airports, in most of them it could be done quite cheaply and should be made obligatory once the European passport is in use (see para. 35 below).

34. Finally, embarkation and landing cards should be abolished since, apart from being contrary to the fundamental principles of the European Community, they are more the product of excessive bureaucracy than of an efficient security system in the countries which use them.

35. We must now pass on to the question of a European passport. The resolution adopted by the representatives of the governments of the Community Member States, meeting within the Council on 23 June 1981; established a model uniform passport which the Member States will try to bring out not later than 1 January 1985.

This passport is in conformity with the draft recommendation made by ICAO. However, no decision was reached on the question of a machine-readable band and Member States may or may not incorporate it, as they think fit.

This method of encoding information has elicited numerous questions from Members of the European Parliament concerning the confidentiality of the particulars to be recorded[1].

---

[1] Written Question No. 2102/80 by Mr COUSTE
Written Question No. 232/81 by Mrs EWING
Written Question No. 794/81 by Mr MEGAHY
Written Question No. 1037/81 by Mr RADOUX
Written Question No. 1166/81 by Mr HÄNSCH
Written Question No. 534/82 by Mr PEARCE
Oral Question No. 66/81 by Mr CHAMBEIRON
Oral Question No. 417/81 by Mr SCHINZEL
Oral Question No. 698/81 by Mr HABSBURG

Without wishing to make a definitive judgement on this fundamental and complex problem which concerns the protection of the rights of the individual in the face of the growth of computer applications - which has, moreover, been the subject of a report by Mr SIEGLERSCHMIDT - it seems that the possibility of machine-reading the uniform passport would help speed up the formalities with which we are here concerned.

36. A further sensitive issue connected with the speeding up of control procedures concerns the numerical strength of police and customs officers, which in the case of a number of airports has been found to be inadequate. If, in accordance with our wishes, controls were abolished for all intra-Community flights, a large number of police and customs officials would be made available for work on the other services.

Admittedly, this may be seen as a problem specific to the internal organization of the services concerned, but we may reasonably suggest that there should be better coordination between the flight planners and the administrative authorities with a view to matching the number of inspection officials to the number of arriving passengers, thereby avoiding a situation where the number of officers on duty is the same at both peak and off-peak hours.

37. It has also been suggested that the checks might be carried out on board aircraft once they have landed or even during their descent.

While, in some cases, on-board checks might prove to be an efficient procedure, it should be borne in mind that some crew members might have to be officially designated to perform them, which would create confusion between two different types of function and would in any case probably be hard to arrange in the immediate future.

38. The simplification, if not the abolition, of security measures at airports is a far more delicate problem.

Unfortunately, security measures are essential at places like airports. Unless major technical improvements were made, their effectiveness would be impaired by any attempt at simplification.

We must conclude, therefore, that no substantial progress can be made in this area,

39. While on the subject of security measures, mention should be made of
the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr BOYES[1] on the examination of
photographic equipment at airports in the Member States,

In this resolution, Mr BOYES expresses concern about the damage that
might be done to photographic films by repeated exposure to X-rays and
proposes that only manual inspections should be allowed. The first point
we might make in this connection is that most of the scanning machines used
at European airports are so designed that photographic films cannot be harmed
by such radiation as is emitted. Secondly, it must be borne in mind that
such films are generally used fairly soon after their exposure to the machines
in question, which suggests that cumulative effects from multiple exposure to
X-rays must be a very rare occurrence.

Thirdly, it would be hard to justify recommending only a manual inspection
of photographic equipment since, apart from being an inadequate way of guaran-
teeing security, it would be a long and delicate process when the equipment was
loaded.

Nevertheless, we think that it would be useful to harmonize security
procedures and equipment and to advocate the use, by the police authorities, of
scanners which would do the minimum amount of harm to photographic films or
other objects sensitive to X-rays.

40. In conclusion, one of the first positive steps might be to eliminate
the 'divergences' from the standards laid down in Annex 9 to the Chicago
Convention, while extensively liberalizing and integrating intra-Community
formalities and procedures.

THE AIRPORT AUTHORITIES

41. With a view to establishing common European airport procedures, a number
of measures could be adopted by the responsible authorities with the aim of
facilitating the movement of passengers of all nationalities, while paying
particular attention to the needs of Community citizens.

---

[1]Doc. 1-500/82

PE 80.180/fin

Although most international airports have an information policy, it is not necessarily satisfactory or effective.

42. A whole range of measures may be recommended for general adoption by all European airports:

    - Reception personnel should be able to communicate in as many Community languages as possible and not be restricted to their national tongue and to English.

    - Announcements at airports or on board aircraft, in particular those giving flight details, should be made at least in the language of the country of destination, where intra-Community travel is concerned, to take account of the needs of citizens returning to their home country. For instance, in the case of a flight from Frankfurt to Athens, the announcement should be made at least in German and in Greek.

    The systematic use of English, even on domestic services in France, to take another example, is an affront to the other nations.

    This may seem to be an insignificant detail, but it is irritating to a passenger when he cannot understand or only vaguely understands the announcements made and has to rely on other passengers for clarification.

    Another arrangement would be to employ the four most widely spoken languages (English, German, French and Italian).

    - Because of the size and the architectural complexity of modern airports, it is essential to post up ground plans to facilitate the movement of passengers and to locate the principal services (telephones, toilets, post office, assembly points, emergency medical centre, banks, shops etc.) within the main airport area.

    Here too we shall insist that the necessary information should be both straightforward and provided in as many Community languages as possible.

    - Signposting at airports is generally inadequate. A special effort could be made to develop and install pictograms which are clear, not too

stylized and clearly visible to passengers using the facilities of an airport for the first time. Such action as is taken in this area should not rest with the Community alone but be undertaken by, say, the EUROPE sector of ICAA.

43. Owing to their simplicity, all the measures we have recommended would entail only a moderate financial outlay, which should ensure that they are implemented reasonably quickly.

Their adoption would certainly be seen as a major improvement by intra-Community air passengers.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

44. It will be seen from the foregoing that the simplification of formalities at airports primarily depends on two categories of measure:

- first and foremost, the provisions of the Treaty of Rome concerning the free movement of persons within the Community must be applied. This should result in all intra-Community air transport services being assimilated to the domestic transport services of each country, the primary consequences of which would be the abolition of all customs and police formalities.

- more generally, it is necessary to persuade the airline companies and airport authorities to harmonize their signposting systems, to ensure that as many Community languages as possible are in future used as a matter of course, to reduce the distances travelled by passengers on foot, to improve the information services for passengers, who are too often left in ignorance of unforeseen events, delays, etc. In addition, steps should be taken to ensure the uniform application in all the Community countries of the ICAO recommendations aimed at facilitating airport operations.
Lastly, thought should be given to the possibility of organizing shuttle services of the kind operated in the United States and even in certain European countries. On these services, travellers are required neither to book their seats in advance nor to obtain tickets written out in their name. They arrive at fixed times (for example, on the hour or every half-hour) and immediately board an aircraft. They pay the fare on board. The aircraft leaves at a fixed time and, if it is full, a second aircraft is provided for the remaining passengers. In general, the shuttle system should be used as often as possible.

PE 80.180/fin

45. It is essential to remove the mystique surrounding air transport, so that it becomes as simple and straightforward as, say, surface rail or underground transport services, especially on the domestic or intra-   .   Community medium-haul runs. There is no reason why it should be essential to obtain an air ticket bearing the name of the passenger, when on the railways the traveller simply buys a ticket at a ticket counter and immediately boards a train.

46. If a number of formalities are considered essential from the point of view of security and counter-terrorist measures, they can perfectly well be carried out when the passenger boards the aircraft. In addition, medium-haul aircraft should be modified to enable luggage which cannot be taken on board to be deposited in a special compartment at the entrance, a facility that exists on, for example, the TEE rail service and on air shuttle services.

47. Only on the basis of the measures described above, which can be applied without undue difficulty, will the landing and embarkation formalities applied to passengers at European airports be truly simplified and the Community air transport sector find that it is at last in step with the times.

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION - Doc. 1-91/81

tabled by Mr MOORHOUSE, Mr MORELAND, Mr De KEERSMAEKER,
Dame Shelagh ROBERTS, Mr SEEFELD, Mr JANSSEN VAN RAAY,
Mrs VON ALEMANN, Mr BUTTAFUOCO and Mr VOYADZIS

on behalf of the Committee on Transport

pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure

on the improvement of the formalities at Brussels
International Airport

The European Parliament,

- firmly believing that citizens of the Community moving across intra-
  Community frontiers should be subject to the minimum of formalities,

1. Expresses concern at the growing inconvenience and delay caused to
   passengers in recent months at Brussels International Airport;

2. Calls on the Belgian Government to take immediate action to improve the
   situation and so give visitors more of a welcome.

- 24 -

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION - Doc. 1-565/81

tabled by Mr MOORHOUSE, Mr SEEFELD, Dame Shelagh ROBERTS,
Mr CAROSSIONO, Mr ALBERS, Mrs von ALEMANN, Mr BUTTAFUOCO,
Mr COTTRELL, Mr DAVERN, Mr GABERT, Mr GENDEBIEN,
Lord HARMAR-NICHOLLS, Mr JANSSEN van RAAY, Mr JUNOT,
Mr KEY, Mr KLINKENBORG, Mr MORELAND, Mr PETRONIO,
Mr REMILLY, Mr TRAVAGLINI and Mr VERONESI

with request for topical and urgent debate
pursuant to Rule 48 of the Rules of Procedure

on the improvement of the formalities at Brussels
International Airport

The European Parliament,

- firmly believing that citizens of the Community moving across intra-
  Community frontiers should be subject to the minimum of formalities;

1. Expresses concern at the continuing serious inconvenience and delay
   caused to passengers at Brussels International Airport;

2. Regrets that the Belgian Government's recent undertaking to improve the
   situation has failed to show any results;

3. Therefore, calls on the Belgian Government as a matter of urgency to
   take effective action with a view to ensuring that passengers are not
   held up more than absolutely necessary;

4. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Belgian
   Government.

MOTION FOR A RESOLTUION - Doc. 1-500/82

tabled by Mr Roland BOYES

pursuant to Rule 47 of the Rules of Procedure

on examination of photographic equipment at airports
in Member States

The European Parliament,

A - aware that X-ray machines at airport security points can damage photo-
graphic films,

B - believing that there is a cumulative effect when films have multiple
exposures to X-rays,

C - in the knowledge that there is no consistency in the way airport
security officials in Member States approach the problems of photographers.
Some Member States insist on all photographic equipment being X-rayed,
others allow manual checks, others insist on the shutter being released
in the presence of a security official etc.,

D - aware that this inconsistency can lead to conflict between travellers and
security officials,

1. Calls upon the Commission to report on the varying methods used by airport
security personnel to check photographic equipment;

2. Calls on each Member State to allow travellers to have the right of a
manual inspection;

3. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Commission and
to the Head of each Member State.