



Council of the European Union  
General Secretariat

Brussels, 02 December 2025

---

---

**Interinstitutional files:  
2023/0437 (COD)**

---

---

WK 15859/2025 ADD 3

LIMITE

TRANS  
CODEC

*This is a paper intended for a specific community of recipients. Handling and further distribution are under the sole responsibility of community members.*

## WORKING DOCUMENT

---

From: General Secretariat of the Council  
To: Working Party on Transport - Intermodal Questions and Networks

---

N° prev. doc.: WK 15256 2025 INIT  
N° Cion doc.: ST 16284 2023 INIT + ADD 1

---

Subject: Proposal for a Regulation amending Regulations (EC) No 261/2004, (EC) No 1107/2006, (EU) No 1177/20, (EU) No 181/2011 and (EU) 2021/782 as regards enforcement of passenger rights in the Union  
- Presidency non-paper  
- Comments from Finland

---

Delegates will find attached comments from Finland on the subject above.



## Written comments by Finland, Enforcement of passenger rights/Omnibus

### 1. Monitoring and oversight

#### 1.a Service Quality Standards

*Q1: Can delegations support the compromise proposed by the Presidency in Annex 1?*

It is acceptable for us. When it comes to standards regarding PRM rights – we would like to note that the Article 4(3) of Regulation 1107 discusses safety rules which the carrier must publish and apply to the carriage of disabled persons and persons with reduced mobility. Redundancies are to be avoided. Another thing to note is that the information PRM passengers need for their travels should be readily available for them and not only for NEBs when asked. In our opinion, most if not all of the information written in yellow and red in the Annex II should be available for passengers, not only for NEBs.

*Q2: Can delegations show any further flexibility towards extending and harmonizing the SQS across all modes?*

Increasing administrative burden, especially for smaller companies in bus and water transport, should be avoided, especially as those businesses mostly do not have this information readily available. There could be a little some flexibility when it comes to SQS's concerning PRM passengers, as noted above the information is essential to some passengers.

#### 1.b Risk-based approach

*Q3: Can delegations show any flexibility on reintroducing a reference to monitoring tasks or similar set-ups in the text?*

We might have some flexibility here but not very far reaching. We can support the risk-based approach in principle. Mentioning monitoring and even individual monitoring activities as long as they are not mandatory (and this is crucial), is not necessarily problematic for us, but new reporting obligations however are mostly not acceptable for us.

*Q4: Can delegations support the compromise proposed by the Presidency in Annex 1?*

While the Presidency's proposal is moving in the right direction, we have some reservations still. The wordings in paragraphs 1-2 are much better now, as the mention of "compliance assessment program" is omitted and specific monitoring activities are optional. We would rather see the Articles that are referenced here before stating our final view, especially concerning Article 16b as we have not seen any compromise text regarding that yet.

When it comes to paragraph 3, we are not able to support this. In our understanding risk-based monitoring, as other supervisory activities, are something that would be performed constantly in day-to-day activities. If paragraph 3 implies producing a report every two year in all modes, it is not possible for us to support that provision as that's way too burdensome for NEBs. We could possibly accept proposed paragraph 5, assumed that it does not lead into new reporting obligation for NEBs.

### 2. Ticket for the accompanying person

*Q5: What are delegations' flexibilities towards the EP's approach?*

We could have some flexibility here, but the issue might still require a further study.



### 3. Intermediation fees

*Q6: What are delegations' flexibilities towards the EP's approach?*

We would rather stick with the Council's approach. Using intermediary is a choice and if transparency towards the passenger is ensured that is sufficient in our opinion.

### 4. Individual complaint-handling

*Q7: The Presidency invites delegations to share written comments related to their national complaint-handling mechanisms.*

The Consumer Disputes Board (Kuluttajariitalautakunta, KRIL) operates in Finland as an out-of-court dispute resolution body in matters concerning passengers' rights, as well as in variety of other consumer matters. It handles disputes between passengers and transport service providers if the issue cannot be resolved directly with the company or through consumer advisory services. It's an independent, impartial body who makes its decisions autonomously and is designated as one of the ADR-entities under the ADR Directive. There is no fee nor monetary thresholds for filing a complaint. PRM passengers may however file a complaint to Finnish Transport and Communication Agency Traficom, which is an independent and autonomous public authority and operates in accordance with general law that concerns administration.

The decisions of the The Consumer Disputes Board in Finland are recommendations, as the procedure is supposed to be lighter than court. The decisions of Traficom regarding complaints from PRM passengers are similarly recommendations. The recommendations of both are generally complied well. However, if the trader does not comply with the recommendation, the passenger can always take the dispute to the court for a binding decision.