

# EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

1999



2004

---

*Session document*

FINAL  
**A5-0444/2002**

9 December 2002

## REPORT

on the Commission White Paper ‘European transport policy for 2010: time to decide’

(COM(2001) 370 – C5-0658/2001 – 2001/2281(COS))

Committee on Regional Policy, Transport and Tourism

Rapporteur: Juan de Dios Izquierdo Collado



## CONTENTS

	Page
PROCEDURAL PAGE .....	4
MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION.....	5
EXPLANATORY STATEMENT .....	17
OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON INDUSTRY, EXTERNAL TRADE, RESEARCH AND ENERGY .....	21
OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT, PUBLIC HEALTH AND CONSUMER POLICY .....	26

## PROCEDURAL PAGE

By letter of 14 September 2001 the Commission forwarded to Parliament its White Paper 'European transport policy for 2010: time to decide' (COM(2001) 370 – 2001/2281(COS)).

At the sitting of 13 December 2001 the President of Parliament announced that she had referred the White Paper to the Committee on Regional Policy, Transport and Tourism as the committee responsible and the Committee on Industry, External Trade, Research and Energy and the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Policy for their opinions (C5-0658/2001).

The Committee on Regional Policy, Transport and Tourism appointed Juan de Dios Izquierdo Collado rapporteur at its meeting of 20 November 2001.

It considered the Commission White Paper and the draft report at its meetings of 21 February, 18 June, 9 July and 27-28 November 2002.

At the last meeting it adopted the motion for a resolution by 25 votes to 9, with 12 abstentions.

The following were present for the vote: Luciano Caveri, chairman; Rijk van Dam, Gilles Savary and Helmuth Markov, vice-chairmen; Juan de Dios Izquierdo Collado, rapporteur; Sylviane H. Ainardi, Emmanouil Bakopoulos, Carlos Bautista Ojeda (for Camilo Nogueira Román), Philip Charles Bradbourn, Felipe Camisón Asensio, Jan Dhaene, Garrelt Duin, Giovanni Claudio Fava, Jacqueline Foster, Mathieu J.H. Grosch, Ewa Hedkvist Petersen, Roger Helmer (for Rolf Berend), Georg Jarzembowski, Karsten Knolle (for Luigi Cocilovo), Giorgio Lisi, Caroline Lucas (for Josu Ortuondo Larrea), Nelly Maes, Emmanouil Mastorakis, Erik Meijer, Rosa Miguélez Ramos, Francesco Musotto, James Nicholson, Karla M.H. Peijs, Wilhelm Ernst Piecyk, Giovanni Pittella (for John Hume), Bernard Poignant, Reinhard Rack, Carlos Ripoll y Martínez de Bedoya, Dana Rosemary Scallon, Agnes Schierhuber (for Christine de Veyrac), Brian Simpson, Renate Sommer, Dirk Sterckx, Ulrich Stockmann, Margie Sudre, Hannes Swoboda (for Danielle Darras), Roseline Vachetta (for Alonso José Puerta), Joaquim Vairinhos, Ari Vatanen, Herman Vermeer and Brigitte Wenzel-Perillo (for Ingo Schmitt).

The opinions of the Committee on Industry, External Trade, Research and Energy and the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Policy are attached; the Committee on Committee on Budgets and the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs decided on 22 January 2002 and 27 September 2001 respectively not to deliver opinions.

The report was tabled on 9 December 2002.

## MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

### **European Parliament resolution on the Commission White Paper ‘European transport policy for 2010: time to decide’ (COM(2001) 370 – C5-0658/2001 – 2001/2281(COS))**

*The European Parliament,*

- having regard to the Commission White Paper (COM(2001) 370 – C5-0658/2001),
  - having regard to Articles 70 to 80 and 154 to 156 of the Treaty,
  - having regard to Rule 47(1) of its Rules of Procedure,
  - having regard to the conclusions of the Göteborg European Council of 16 June 2001,
  - having regard to the report of the Committee on Regional Policy, Transport and Tourism and the opinions of the Committee on Industry, External Trade, Research and Energy and the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Policy (A5-0444/2000),
- A. whereas transport policy in Europe needs to embark on a new phase in the light of the strategic importance of transport, the events of 11 September, enlargement, the globalisation process and the major dysfunctions affecting European transport,
- B. whereas, under the treaties responsibility for European transport policy should be shared between the Union and the Member States,
- C. whereas the resolution adopted by the European Council in Göteborg should be implemented in conjunction with all Union and national policies,
- D. whereas profitability should not come before transport safety,
- E. whereas European added value should be seen as a means of promoting and encouraging adequate funding,
- F. whereas, in addition to the crucial role it plays as regards citizens’ rights and the internal market, European transport should make a positive contribution to the globalisation process,
- G. whereas passengers’ rights should be more widely recognised, better publicised and more effectively regulated,
- H. having regard to the substantial impact which transport has on European tourism,
1. Welcomes the timely submission of the White Paper, which will enable a strategic debate to be held on transport in the European Union after 11 September; believes that there are serious shortcomings in European transport policy, which is a vital strategic sector of general interest; demands that responsibility for transport policy should be shared in the future constitution;

2. Notes that a considerable proportion of the proposed actions have already begun; calls on the Commission to establish a clear timetable for the proposed policy measures;

### **European transport policy**

3. Agrees with the Commission regarding the serious nature of the problems affecting transport and supports the proposals by the Göteborg European Council calling for priority to be given to combating pollution and bringing about a significant decoupling of transport growth and GDP growth;
4. Stresses that the concept of sustainability must be the basis and yardstick for European transport policy, and that this requires an integrated transport policy which will ensure the mobility of people and goods in an efficient, socially sustainable and environmentally friendly transport system;
5. Wishes to see transport given the political and budgetary weight warranted by its strategic character and its role as a general interest service, through a European transport policy that influences all transport modes, infrastructures and systems, as well as social harmonisation; considers that transport policy should complement and enhance the policy of regional balance and the linking of outlying areas with the centre of the Union;
6. Calls for not only national but also regional and local authorities and relevant interest organisations, in particular the relevant workers' and employers' associations as well as transport-users, to be involved in the drawing up of transport policies;
7. Warns that transport problems will not be resolved, and optimal use of infrastructure will not be achieved, unless efforts are made to manage the sector as a whole, aiming at both passenger and freight transport, and not just urgent problems in specific sub-sectors; cooperation between all policies pursued by the Union, the States, the regions and local authorities is vital in order to solve existing problems and improve the transport of the future;
8. Agrees with the Commission's analysis regarding the uneven growth of individual modes of transport in the European Union; supports the Commission in its efforts to increase the proportion of transport accounted for by safer and more environmentally friendly modes in the European Union and thereby to halt and reverse the current trend; points out, however, that the Commission's objective of stabilising the balance between transport modes at 1998 levels by 2010 can at best be a minimum objective;
9. Considers that a shift of goods from road to other modes of transport should be stimulated by improving the service quality of these other modes, thereby optimising the whole transport system, and in no way by negatively affecting the competitiveness of road transport;
10. Calls on the Commission to take account of the fact that only for a very limited percentage of road transport an alternative can be found in other transport modes, and that pricing instruments eventually should be used to cover infrastructure costs and external costs and not to force modal shift;

11. Also highlights the need to help overcome existing bottlenecks and the resulting massive pressure on the environment and population in regions which are particularly blighted by traffic;
12. Calls for the disparities, which exist in terms of gaps and bottlenecks, both within the Community and in the candidate countries, in road, rail, shipping, inland waterway, inland and sea ports and airport infrastructures to be recognised and for investment to be provided to create a balanced sustainable infrastructure network;

### **Cohesion, the spatial dimension and enlargement**

13. Highlights the need for transport policy to contribute to economic and social cohesion and take into account the specific nature of most remote, outlying, island and mountain regions and regions with low population density, through measures to offset as far as possible their disadvantaged situation and to ensure territorial continuity; emphasises that the road network is of great importance, particularly in outlying and sparsely populated areas and stresses, therefore, that the particular needs of those areas must also be duly taken into account when drawing up the common transport policy;
14. Has not forgotten the undertaking given in the Treaty of Amsterdam regarding the outermost and island regions and the major impact which transport has on their development; calls for the growing liberalisation of the transport sector to be accompanied by guarantees, investment, mobility, subsidies, price support and maintenance of services for remote and island regions;
15. Urges the Commission to submit a communication on the transport situation in the applicant countries, the level of sustainability, the incorporation of the *acquis communautaire* and the effects this has had, including specific proposals to deal with them before 2004;
16. Supports the Commission's objective of maintaining the railways' share of goods traffic in the Central and Eastern European countries at a high level, and calls on the Commission to present a workable plan regarding this;
17. Reminds the Commission of the urgent need to introduce rules, controls and up-to-date penalties to prevent the use of transport by mafia groups organising illegal immigration;
18. Points out that a European regional planning policy is vital for restoring spatial balance, redesigning transport infrastructures and developing polycentrism with a regional focus based on the network of European cities;
19. Notes that an adequate European traffic and transport policy can only be achieved by means of an infrastructure policy combined with adequate cross-border regional planning;

## **Land transport**

20. Recognises the decisive role played by transport in increasing prosperity in Europe, although a balance has to be struck between the interests of mobility, on the one hand, and those of environmentally friendly transport arrangements which protect resources; also accepts that users' wishes should be paramount while applying a fair system of charging;
21. Stresses the importance of proper enforcement of EU law in the road transport sector in order to combat problems of social dumping; therefore calls on the Commission to develop common systems for the exchange of information and best practice between Member States in policing of the road transport sector;
22. Supports the use of all forms of public transport and improved mobility for pedestrians, including those facing barriers to access to transport, notably disabled persons and older/elderly persons, motorcyclists and cyclists, through institutional investment, subsidies and legislation reflecting this preference; emphasises the vitally important role played by local passenger services in terms of mobility and sustainable transport in towns and cities and regions, and stresses the major responsibility of local authorities in this connection;
23. Calls on the Commission to submit a report on best practices for an EU-wide uniform benchmarking system for urban transport, covering public passenger transport as well as motorised private transport, and to press ahead with the development and promotion of innovative approaches favouring alternatives to private transport for short journeys within towns and cities;
24. Welcomes the increased funding for Marco Polo, by comparison with its predecessor, PACT; notes, however, that substantially more funding will be needed to achieve Marco Polo's objective of shifting a volume of freight equivalent to the expected growth in international road freight traffic to other modes of transport;
25. Calls on the Commission to promote the development of innovative logistical concepts, intelligent transport systems, new technologies and innovations so as to allow optimum use of existing and new infrastructures and vehicle capacity and by this contributing to the goal of decoupling; calls for ambitious European research projects to enable the efforts to market electric vehicles and other cleaner forms of transport to bear fruit;
26. Calls the Commission to set an ambitious and scheduled programme for the promotion of zero emission vehicles in the European Union;
27. Calls for work on Galileo, the European satellite navigation system, to press ahead resolutely, in order to bring Galileo's added value for optimising the transport system to fruition as soon as possible;
28. Calls on the Commission to promote the dissemination of best practices in the area of transport reduction; changing a product, its design or the production process may reduce the need for transport, so less transport capacity is necessary;



29. Proposes that high-capacity north-south and east-west corridors be created to facilitate concentration of goods traffic by road and ensure operational links with the applicant countries;
30. Calls for liberalisation and opening of markets in the railway sector, technical and functional integration and the accelerated introduction of interoperability as preconditions for revitalising the railways, together with far-reaching measures to speed up the introduction of uniform safety standards for the railways and for the occupational and social conditions of railway workers throughout the Union;
31. Considers that, in the interests of safety, infrastructures should remain in the public sector, with maintenance charges being levied on users;
32. Welcomes the Commission's initiative in proposing a new directive on the harmonisation of minimum safety standards for road and rail tunnels; Considers that, in developing this proposal, serious consideration should be given to the recent report by the Organisation on Economic Cooperation and Development, which proposes the banding of tunnels according to their level of security for the transport of dangerous substances;
33. Calls on the Commission to conduct and publish as soon as possible a comprehensive assessment of the overall economic, social and environmental impact to date of market opening;

#### **Trans-European transport networks**

34. Supports, as amended by Parliament, the Commission's proposals for trans-European networks, which will help remove bottlenecks, but considers the timescales for some of the projects to be too long, and recommends an accelerated timetable for a multimodal plan, with a particular focus on rail transport, for transiting the Alps and Pyrenees; stresses the vital importance to the railway sector of links with roads, ports and airports;
35. Considers it urgent to carry out projects which, with due regard for the environment, bring crossings through the Pyrenees up to a level comparable with those through the Alps;
36. Calls, with a view to the forthcoming review of the guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network, for the accelerated, priority development and improvement of the high-capacity north-south and east-west rail corridors in accordance with the TEN and TINA plans, in order to support the revitalisation of the railways within the European Union and promote links with the applicant countries and the Europe-Mediterranean free trade area; points out that that the large number of different gauges currently used in the EU will be further increased by enlargement and therefore calls on the EU to promote and finance EU-wide harmonisation of gauges;
37. Proposes that rail lines designated for fast freight transport be created and efforts also to incorporate the extensive European network of abandoned rail lines, be made;
38. Welcomes the Commission's proposal to include European 'sea motorways' in the review of TENs due to be carried out in 2004; points out that a sound financial

framework needs to be developed in order to enable the construction or improvement of port infrastructure necessary in this connection to be carried out in all areas of the European Union;

### **Sea transport and inland waterways**

39. Stresses the need for the creation of intermodal transport structures and highlights the role of inland ports as tri-modal hubs for combined transport;
40. Calls, in the framework of a European maritime and ports policy, for coordinated measures in the areas of shipping, ports and intermodality policy in order to boost the role of ports as transport network hubs, promote the objective of intermodal transport and support ports as logistical centres with high added value; endorses the proposal by the Commission to simplify the regulatory framework for short sea shipping and inland waterway transport by encouraging the creation of one-stop offices by easing administrative and customs formalities and by linking up all of the players in the logistics chain;
41. Calls again on the Commission to ensure that aid and competition in relation to maritime ports and port undertakings are monitored effectively and in the same way for all ports and undertakings, as well as to draw up without delay draft Commission guidelines for monitoring of maritime port aid and competition, guidelines that are clear and limited to what is essential;
42. Endorses the proposal to boost short- and medium-distance cabotage, but calls on the Commission to identify obstacles to the development of this form of transport, at least in certain areas, and to propose Community initiatives to give a new and balanced impetus to cabotage;
43. Reaffirms its opinion of 14 November 2001 on the proposal for a European Parliament and Council directive on market access to port services; insists in particular on the creation of equal conditions of competition in and between ports;
44. Considers that switching freight transport from roads to short sea shipping and inland waterways can play an important part in the EU strategy for meeting climate protection obligations under the Kyoto Protocol; points out that, in the maritime transport sector, further improvements in emissions are technically entirely feasible, and are in fact essential with regard to reducing sulphur dioxide emissions; notes that in some port towns and cities acceptable levels of sulphur dioxide emanating from vessels lying at anchor have already been exceeded; considers that an initial step would be to give vessels incentives to use low sulphur fuels by grading port charges; calls on the Commission to put forward as soon as possible a relevant proposal with a view to implementing the internalisation of external costs in the maritime transport sector and, in this connection, also to support other innovative port projects for reducing emissions;
45. Understands that the sector needs a stable legal framework, ample time to become operational and competitive and priority coordination with international rules on equipment standards, minimum social conditions, cataloguing of flags and safety requirements, with strict controls to ensure they are observed;

46. Calls on the Commission and the Member States to press strongly within the framework of the International Maritime Organisation (IMO) for a thorough review of international rules on liability in maritime transport; considers that oil companies, classification societies, and above all shipowners and all other parties involved in the transport of oil or dangerous substances should equally be held fully accountable, as current limitations of liability inevitably reduce the sense of responsibility on the part of those concerned; points out that there is also an urgent need to tighten up the inadequate rules on liability for all other vessels; considers that effective monitoring instruments urgently need to be created at IMO level for the purpose of examining whether flag states are fulfilling their responsibilities;
47. Notes that although maritime transport is considered to be more environment-friendly than many other forms of transport it also requires considerable investment in more environment-friendly combustion and fuels;
48. Urges a continuing review of Port State Controls, especially in the context of reducing maritime environmental pollution and raising the quality and efficiency of maritime transport;
49. Considers that serious problems exist in the maritime transport sector as regards standards of training and social standards applying to crews of vessels sailing under so-called flags of convenience, and that this entails a serious safety risk which cannot be dealt with using the existing means of action available to the EU; welcomes, therefore, the proposal by the Commission to create tax incentives in order to halt the trend towards vessels sailing under a foreign flag and to encourage as many vessels as possible to sail again under the flag of an EU Member State;
50. Considers inland waterways to be a useful transport policy tool due to being an innovative, environmentally friendly and relatively cheap mode of transport, and believes that they should be modernised, upgraded and extended through adequate investment; therefore calls for harmonisation and interoperability of rules, a single, Community-wide identification number for inland waterway vessels; considers the creation of high-performance, geographically comprehensive information systems on inland waterways to be extremely important in this connection and calls on the Commission to submit a proposal as soon as possible for harmonised technical provisions towards the implementation of River Information Services (RIS);

### **Air transport**

51. Points out that air transport is one of the fastest growing modes of transport, and that the efficiency and environmental sustainability of air transport must be substantially improved, for that reason;
52. Also supports the single sky (including the creation of cross-border functional blocks of airspace), flexible civil and military use of airspace, the maintenance of optimum safety standards and the need to speak with a single voice in international bodies and the Galileo project; in this connection, calls for Community accession to Eurocontrol at the earliest opportunity; states that a lot of work needs to be done to reach the target date of 2004;

53. Believes that the Air Safety Agency's remit should also extend to airworthiness;
54. Welcomes the Commission's proposal to establish a Joint Transatlantic Aviation Agreement, as a basis for a future regulatory framework for global air transport services, replacing existing bilateral agreements; demands that the Council take a constructive approach in the development of this proposal;
55. Calls on the Commission to examine air transport delays more closely and identify the exact reasons for them; calls also for specific proposals to be put forward to reduce congestion on the ground, if necessary through guidelines to improve airport planning policy;
56. Stresses that by developing local airfields it will be possible to increase the variety of transport choices for remote and thinly populated areas and those involving long distances, and improve direct links between such areas; acknowledges that new capacity needs to be added both through increased airport capacity and more efficient air space use; calls for efforts to ensure that reliable, frequent and efficient transport links are developed between regional airports and surrounding cities;
57. Points out that airports, as a component of an optimised global system, act as intermodality hubs fulfilling a distributive function, so that in addition to competition between airports, collaboration is also necessary; therefore calls on the Commission to explore models of airport cooperation, such as can be seen in Sweden, and to present proposals to that effect;
58. Shares the Commission's view that the optimum allocation of time slots at airports requires a thorough overhaul, and furthermore considers that as an interim step the reform of Regulation (EEC) No 95/93 and the assessment of the regulation's effect on the aviation market should be carried out at an early date;
59. Calls on the Commission to work vigorously within the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO) for the introduction of an aviation fuel tax;
60. Points to the importance of passenger transport via cableway, including its value for tourism purposes;

## Transport safety in Europe

61. Considers that transport safety in Europe should be the top priority and calls on the Commission to submit concrete proposals to bring about the ambitious goals mentioned in the White Paper;
62. Endorses the target chosen by the European Commission to reduce road deaths by 50 % by the year 2010 (20 000 deaths) and notes that the targeted level of safety performance will require unprecedented levels of implementation of evidence-based measures at EU, national and local levels if it is to be achieved;
63. Believes that each Member State should set firm objectives and statistical targets, coordinated by the Union, for reducing accidents for the various modes of transport, with precise timescales and adequate funding proposals to enable the targets to be met;
64. Calls on the Commission to adopt as soon as possible the Third Road Safety Action Programme (2002-2010) in which it will clearly identify which EU measures will contribute to reducing road deaths and serious injuries; asks the Commission to come forward with a broad range of demonstrably effective measures with high safety potential which can be implemented in the short to medium term;
65. Encourages the Commission to come forward with proposals for discrete multi-annual road safety programmes to be funded within the transport safety budget line covering areas such as the collection, analysis and dissemination of road safety data; best practice guidelines; and support for demonstrably effective consumer information programmes;
66. Proposes that a European road safety agency be set up as a focus for implementing a global safety plan negotiated with national, regional and local authorities and with the participation of citizens' groups, and with the aim of providing policy support, speeding up developments in road safety and accommodating and providing access to road safety data and best practice information across the EU;
67. Expressly supports the Commission in its intention of pushing ahead with EU-wide harmonisation of controls and penalties in the road transport sector, so as to ensure closer cooperation between national administrative and police authorities within the European Union and in the candidate countries in pursuing road traffic offences;
68. Proposes an experimental ban on overtaking by heavy good vehicles on particularly busy stretches of the European motorway network;

69. Given the importance of the human factor as regards safety and achieving European transport objectives, calls for the status, training, qualification structure and working conditions of those working in the transport and safety sectors to be reviewed and improved and for a European social policy to be introduced for the transport sector; calls for the specific interests of the handicapped to be taken into account in the Union's planning, legislation and investment;
70. Notes that priority should be given to policy measures which can be monitored and upheld in practice; that being so, urges the Member States to make adequate investments in both the quality and the quantity of the various inspection services;
71. Supports the proposal for a directive guaranteeing the interoperability of means of payment on the trans-European road network;

### **Intermodal transport**

72. Considers that the Marco Polo programme submitted by the Commission is only a pilot project which should be expanded substantially, given the importance of intermodal infrastructures for achieving transfers from road transport to other modes and for achieving synergy through links between different transport modes;
73. Points out that logistical support is of vital importance for transport and that the role of transport centres and intermodal zones and platforms should be recognised and strengthened;
74. Points out that there are still many obstacles on the way to an intermodal global transport system, which are primarily attributable to infrastructure and transport funding, operations, and transport services and regulations; in order to improve and encourage intermodality, calls for harmonisation of the loading units used by the different modes of transport, standardisation of rules on liability, the development of common principles for charges and for setting charges, and the development and introduction of an intermodal information system for efficient management of intermodal transport and of network services;

### **Charging for transport use**

75. Supports levying the use of infrastructure and external costs related to this utilisation, to be introduced at the same time for all transport modes, based on objective and non-discriminatory criteria and taking into account the specifically sensitive routes through the Alps and the Pyrenees, the islands and the most remote regions;
76. Welcomes the announcement by the Commission that it will be presenting a proposal for a framework directive this year on the levying of infrastructure charges for all modes of transport, taking account of the external costs of use of each mode of transport; regards the fair allocation of external costs for each mode of transport as a key element of a sustainable transport policy both from the point of view of fair competition between the individual modes of transport and from the point of view of effective environmental protection; expressly welcomes, in this connection, the possibility proposed by the Commission of cross-subsidisation in favour of more environmentally-friendly modes of

transport, following the example of Switzerland; calls, however, on the Commission not to define the conditions for cross-financing too narrowly;

### **Funding**

77. Calls on the Commission and the Council, as part of the new sustainable mobility policy, to revive the idea of a European loan to speed up the completion of the trans-European networks, particularly the major Essen projects (as revised in the new decision laying down guidelines in this field), so as to overcome funding-related problems, given the constraints imposed by the Stability Pact on the Member States public budgets, and the inadequacy of public-private partnerships;
78. Calls on the Commission to give guidelines for the use of the surplus charging income that is left after deduction of infrastructure maintenance costs, which should be earmarked for investments in the same transport infrastructure that generated the income, and for reduction of the negative externalities that are caused by that mode of transport;
79. Proposes, in accordance with the priorities set out in the White Paper and taking into account the decisions of the Göteborg European Council, setting up within the Financial Perspective a new European transport fund as a financial instrument with a substantial budget allocation, which would be applied across all Member States and deal with all modes of transport; calls on the Commission to conduct a study into the development of new methods for funding major infrastructure projects of common European interest;
80. Notes that, in order to achieve an adequate transport policy, it is necessary to gain an insight into transport flows in order to ascertain what connections are important, so that government resources can be effectively channelled and investments made selectively;

### **Coordination with other Community policies**

81. Calls for all European (TENs, Structural Funds, Cohesion Fund, Interreg, Ispa, etc.) and national policies with an influence on European transport to be coordinated so as to overcome the current lack of coherence and attempt to achieve synergies between them with the aim of promoting the most environment-friendly modes of transport; calls for greater coordination between the management of the REGIO, TREN and Environment programmes in order to ensure sustainability and cohesion in the transport sector;
82. Calls for improvements in the way in which European environmental policy (e.g. the Birds Directive and the Habitat Directive) is coordinated with transport policy, and particularly for the implementation of sustainable transport projects; argues, therefore, for a strategic environmental impact assessment to be carried out on new transport infrastructure projects, weighing up the environmental, social, economic and social benefits of an infrastructure project against its drawbacks relating to the application of particular environmental directives;
83. Calls on the Commission to draw up new guidelines and programmes aimed at securing, for all transport modes, reduced fuel and energy consumption, less noise and lower emissions of harmful gases by fuels, and tax relief for cleaner, more sustainable fuels;

calls for special reports to be drawn up on the effects of transport pollution on public health; calls for firm targets in order to comply with the Kyoto Protocol;

84. Affirms that integrating environmental and sustainable development policy into the transport sector, in accordance with Article 6 of Treaty, must be a priority of European transport policy for 2010 and stresses that this policy must also be coordinated with the Community's integrated product policy;

#### **Research and development, new technologies**

85. Welcomes the creation of a prior sub-theme 'sustainable surface transport' in the sixth framework programme on research and development and hopes that technological and strategic innovation in the fields of integration of environmental criteria, safety, intermodality and interoperability will contribute towards a more efficient and sustainable common transport policy;
86. Draws attention to the need to fund the 'sustainable development – sustainable surface transport – sixth research and development framework programme' research projects and, in particular, research to develop cleaner transport technology;
87. Welcomes the proposals in the sixth research framework programme for research on reducing harmful emissions and noise pollution and on improving fuel efficiency in transport;
88. Points out that the development and improvement of routes and better links between infrastructures are vital, but that they must not mark the limits of transport policy; considers that increased traffic flows demand intelligent and innovative solutions, so that it is essential to foster and make targeted use of information, communication and satellite navigation technologies, in order to enhance the control of traffic flows and optimise them;
89. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council and Commission.



## EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

In September 2001 the Commission published its White Paper entitled 'European transport policy for 2010: time to decide'. Transport policy is one of the few policies established in the founding Treaties.

The White Paper on growth, competitiveness and employment defines European transport as a key strategic sector. It is of great importance to business and trade unions alike, affects the entire Community in qualitative terms and encompasses all spheres. In the economic sphere it plays a valuable role in competitiveness and business (10% of GDP); in the social sphere the 10 million jobs it provides makes it a prime source of employment; and in the political sphere it is a vital means of enabling citizens to exercise their rights as enshrined in the Treaties, making for mobility across Europe and paving the way for globalisation.

The 1992 White Paper on the future development of the common transport policy laid down the initial guidelines for that policy. While a good deal of progress was made with regard to liberalisation, competitiveness, lower prices and the introduction of new technologies, the battle for sustainable management of transport was lost. The fact that transport is now a contributory factor in environmental degradation and the increase in greenhouse gases and is beset by serious congestion and safety concerns such as to prevent it from serving its purpose properly, points to serious errors in EU and Member States' transport policies. There have been insufficient controls, measures, incentives, investment, penalties and guidelines in the remaining sectoral policies and the public has not been brought on board. European transport policy is failing to make the grade.

We must carry forward and act on the message that emerged from Göteborg on the need to break the link between economic growth and transport growth. This will require step-by-step policies; modal transfers alone cannot be relied on. Finding effective alternatives to predict and reduce the number of journeys will be difficult to achieve without using ICTs (information and communications technologies), provided that they are competitively priced, without logistics and without coordination with other policies.

We are presented with the choice between managing transport or simply dealing with the associated problems. Göteborg laid down requirements concerning transport management, analysis of the reasons for travel and the proactive search for alternatives in all policies with specific objectives in each case. Consequently such an approach should apply to land-use planning, education, economic, taxation, research, town planning, competition and other policies, as any solution will require them to undergo far-reaching change.

We agree with the Commission's priorities of shifting the balance between modes of transport, moving towards fair charging arrangements and acting to combat bottlenecks and environmental degradation, as well as that of giving a pivotal role to citizens, users and passengers through safeguards in respect of safety, quality and participation. We support the measures proposed by the Commission, the commitments it makes and its assessments. That said, they would appear not to go far enough towards achieving the objectives and averting budgetary wrangling.

The White Paper was drawn up prior to the events of 11 September 2001 and thus does not allude to them. That said, those events have since failed to make an impact on political action by the European institutions. The Council has been hiding behind national interests and putting a brake on urgent procedures and decisions in the field of transport without adequate justification, dragging its feet, and being swayed by outside events.

Can the European Union achieve its aims and display its credibility through its proposals if its economic and budgetary resources are hopelessly inadequate for promoting the guidelines and ambitious proposals that the sector requires? The days of a European transport policy that did not need a budget are gone. The credibility of EU transport policy is at stake.

Improving the working conditions of professionals in the transport sector is vital if the sector is to make any overall progress, and yet a European social policy for transport as such cannot be said to exist.

The White Paper does not provide a just assessment of the full merits of road transport. Roads form the infrastructure that guarantees the internal market, competitiveness, mobility and the exercise of the fundamental rights of citizens. They are the user's and consignor's choice because of the quality, cost and services they offer and, if it is to be realistic and change the status quo, any reform of road transport must accept the user's wishes as paramount from the very outset. Otherwise, our proposals will be mere idealism.

An improved and expanded rail and shipping network working in conjunction with air and road transport is the starting point for achieving efficient combined transport and modal transfers.

Logistical support, practically ignored in the White Paper, is of vital importance to planning, maximum use of capacity and the establishment of combined transport and intermodal transfers.

The creation of infrastructure in non-congested areas that avoids the customary routes, especially where travel from south to north and east to west is concerned, would help avoid congestion and pollution on saturated trans-European networks.

We wish to state clearly the European Parliament's support for rail transport in the Union and call for top priority to be given to the requisite assistance and to urgent changes to the terms governing its expansion, nature and adjustment to market conditions. To that end we ask that, as an indispensable pre-requisite, European rail management be subject to responsible liberalisation that covers all areas.

A special mention should be made of the underground, regional and local railway systems that carry passengers. Given their contribution to reducing congestion in major cities and providing an environmentally sustainable means of mobility, they should benefit from maximum assistance.

Parliament agrees that short-sea shipping should be a priority, since its potential to contribute towards freight traffic would diversify the range of sea transport, which is currently dominated by the transportation of cargo oil and dangerous goods. The ports hold the key to

the success of this mode of transport and will be unable to play their role unless they have adequate facilities for intermodal transshipment which can facilitate port transit of freight and the relevant documentation as quickly as possible and at the lowest possible cost. Short-sea shipping cannot get properly under way without intermodality; at the same time, however, it should also be seen as more than an alternative to bottlenecks on the roads and allowed to develop its full potential as a means of exchange between coastal regions and regions with waterways.

The Union needs a ports and sea-transport policy – which it does not have at present – and specific policies to implement the objectives (such as sea motorways) that it has mapped out in only the vaguest and most general of terms.

The potential afforded in much of the Union in terms of inland waterways – the number of which is set to increase after enlargement – is underexploited and could constitute an additional important factor in the modal transfers that transport needs.

The events of 11 September mean that commercial aviation objectives need to be rethought and redefined. Winning back passengers and guaranteeing their safety are now priorities for air transport, which had greatly increased its share of passenger traffic in particular.

In Parliament's view the 'single sky' and the Galileo projects, both of which will make the greatest possible contribution towards improving air traffic management, must be made available to transport in Europe as a matter of urgency and it is not convinced by the arguments being used to delay their approval.

Furthermore, the Council is less than enthusiastic about the Commission's call for Europe to speak with a single voice in international bodies. Parliament supports the Commission's call. Given the real need for military air space, we think it would be perfectly feasible to engage in flexible use involving strictly reserved zones alongside zones shared by civil and military air traffic. The problem posed to European air transport by Gibraltar needs to be resolved once and for all.

European transport faces a challenge on three fronts, involving managing demand whilst ensuring that the requirements of safety, the environment, congestion-free mobility and competitiveness are all catered for.

Safety is the first sign of quality in transport. A lack of safety is not compatible with quality. No transport policy objective should be achieved at the expense of the safety of users or citizens who must live with modern transport.

Parliament proposes setting up a European Road Safety Agency – bewilderingly absent from the White Paper – which would set uniform criteria, establish targets and make a scientific assessment of accident rates. It would then make specific proposals for given countries, regions, geographical areas or sectors, aimed at reducing deaths and injuries.

We favour transport charging that takes account of the corresponding external effects and call for it to be introduced as a matter of urgency. Such charging should have a theoretical basis and draw on objective studies so as to eliminate any type of bias.

The European Union needs a European Transport Fund to ensure that its policies are financially viable and credible. The European added value we are calling for must be accompanied by the European added budgetary value that we can introduce. We must abandon the misconception that European transport policy does not require a budget. We are seeking to open a new chapter in which funding provided by the EU institutions is equal to the challenge of achieving a new, integrated transport system for Europe. To that end we are proposing the establishment of a European Transport Fund with a solid budgetary foundation which takes account of the need for cohesion and at the same time is applied throughout the Union, covers all modes of transport and tackles all transport problems.

Aside from the financing formulas, the huge budgetary input that transport requires in order to modernise will require coordination of all European policies (TENs, Structural Funds, Cohesion Fund, Interreg, Ispa, etc.) and of national and regional policies with a view to arriving at a critical mass that can kick-start the ambitious and costly projects and plans. The current situation where everyone operates in isolation must be redressed now, not tackled at a later stage.

Enlargement will put a great deal of pressure on the Member States and applicant countries alike, in the form of heightened demand for transport and the resultant increase in congestion, acceptance of the Community *acquis* and increased competition in some sectors. The Commission ought to draw up a document devoted specifically to the impact of enlargement, in which it should go further than stating its desire for the railways to maintain their share. Connecting up an EU of 27 Member States will require high-capacity corridors and multimodal connections for which there are as yet no plans. Furthermore, TINA (the Transport Infrastructure Needs Assessment) will have to be looked at again. The limited figure of 0.14% of GDP with which the Union intends to meet the budgetary needs arising from enlargement suggests that the extent of the challenge has not been fully understood.

Parliament has made clear its support for the Galileo project on a number of occasions. It is a crucial means of guaranteeing an independent, ambitious and advanced transport system. This project will need private-sector funding in order to develop and will play an important role in guaranteeing economic viability in the long term. However, we do not have to wait for these conditions to be in place before launching the project. Galileo sets the standard for European ambitions and must be implemented forthwith if Europe is to show that it can hold its own, achieve a high standard of technology, deliver services, contribute to globalisation and be an equal partner in any future trade disputes.

17 April 2002

## OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON INDUSTRY, EXTERNAL TRADE, RESEARCH AND ENERGY

for the Committee on Regional Policy, Transport and Tourism

on the White Paper - European transport policy for 2010: time to decide  
(COM(2001) 370 – C5-0658/2001 – 2001/2281(COS))

Draftsman: Massimo Carraro

### PROCEDURE

The Committee on Industry, External Trade, Research and Energy appointed Massimo Carraro draftsman at its meeting of 18 December 2001.

It considered the draft opinion at its meetings of 18 March 2002, 26 March 2002 and 16 April 2002.

At the last meeting it adopted the following conclusions unanimously.

The following were present for the vote: Carlos Westendorp y Cabeza, chairman; ~~(e)/président(e)~~ f.f. Yves Piétrasanta, vice-chairman; ~~(e)~~; ~~... (vice-président(e))~~; Massimo Carraro, draftsman; Sir Robert Atkins, María del Pilar Ayuso González (for Godelieve Quisthoudt-Rowohl), Luis Berenguer Fuster, Gérard Caudron, Giles Bryan Chichester, Elisa Maria Damião (for Harlem Désir), Willy C.E.H. De Clercq, Carlo Fatuzzo (for Umberto Scapagnini), Concepció Ferrer, Francesco Fiori (for Guido Bodrato), Colette Flesch, Christos Folias (for Werner Langen), Glyn Ford (for Gary Titley), Per Gahrton (for Nuala Ahern), Neena Gill (for Reino Paasilinna), Norbert Glante, Roger Helmer (for Christian Foldberg Røvsing), Hans Karlsson, Bashir Khanbhai, Peter Liese (for Peter Michael Mombaur), Rolf Linkohr, Caroline Lucas, Eryl Margaret McNally, Erika Mann, Marjo Matikainen-Kallström, Patricia McKenna (for Claude Turmes pursuant to Rule 153(2)), Elizabeth Montfort, Angelika Niebler, Paolo Pastorelli, Samuli Pohjamo (for Nicholas Clegg), John Purvis, Daniela Raschhofer, Imelda Mary Read, Mechtild Rothe, Paul Rübig, Konrad K. Schwaiger, W.G. van Velzen, Dominique Vlasto, Myrsini Zorba and Olga Zrihen Zaari.

## SHORT JUSTIFICATION

It would be appropriate for this opinion to focus on those aspects of the White Paper which are related in some way to the responsibilities of the Committee on Industry, External Trade, Research and Energy, i.e. freight transport, which is of huge importance for European industry, the promotion of biofuels and the quest to improve transport in Europe. The draftsman welcomes the proposed measures concerning urban transport, passenger transport and the promotion of the use of biofuels.

However, the White Paper remains somewhat abstract as far as **rail freight transport** is concerned, and fails to set out *concrete* measures which might help to 'revitalise' this sector and restore the balance between transport modes.

As the Commission states, the share of the goods market carried by rail in Europe fell from 21.1% in 1970 to 8.4% in 1998, with 241 billion tonnes of goods per kilometre being transported in 1998 compared to 283 billion in 1970, even though the overall volume of goods transported rose spectacularly.

Unless action is taken, rail's share of the freight market, which fell from 11% in 1990 to 8% in 1998, can be expected to slip to 7% by 2010. Its share of passenger traffic stood at 6% in 1998 and is expected to hold steady until 2010.

Rail transport will be opened up to regulated competition as from March 2003 with the opening-up of international freight services on the 50 000-kilometre trans-European rail freight network. By 2008 the entire European international freight network will have been opened up completely<sup>1</sup>.

The following problems are hampering the development of rail transport: the lack of infrastructure suitable for modern transport, the lack of interoperability between networks and systems, the failure to internalise costs and the lack of intermodality. All of these factors are having a negative impact on the competitiveness of goods transport by rail as compared to transport by road.

The measures proposed by the Commission in this White Paper will be insufficient to revitalise rail freight transport. On the contrary, the liberalisation of the railway sector will have a favourable impact on road transport, unless it is backed up by other measures to guarantee that all external costs will be internalised<sup>2</sup>. 'The facts behind the costs to the user' are still far from clear in the European Union. Therefore, as the title of this White Paper indicates, it really is 'time to decide'.

Furthermore, the Commission says that in 2002 it intends to propose a framework directive to establish the principles of infrastructure charging and a pricing structure for all modes of

---

<sup>1</sup> See Directive 2001/12/EC on the development of the Community's railways, which entered into force on 15 March 2001.

<sup>2</sup> See the European Parliament resolution of 18 January 2001 (Costa report – A5-0345/2000). At present only Directive 1999/62/EC on the charging of heavy goods vehicles for the use of certain infrastructures is applicable.

transport. However, this will still have to be adopted by the Council and the European Parliament, when the timetable for the liberalisation of the railway sector has already been established.

This is why your draftsman is calling for ancillary measures, which have not been included in this White Paper, with a view to improving the competitiveness of rail freight transport. These measures, which should include measures to support investment (especially in order to strengthen the network), cannot be funded without government support. In its resolution of 18 January 2001 (report by Mr Costa), the European Parliament had already reiterated the need for such measures, ‘designed to encourage modernisation and greater interoperability of the networks concerned and to increase the quality of services’.

Further measures, such as the ‘ecopoint’<sup>1</sup> system, could also help to reduce the imbalance which still exists between the transport of goods by rail and transport of goods by road, but only if it were introduced in all Member States. Another solution might be to apply the Swiss system, which provides for part funding for the strengthening of the rail network by using revenue from the motorway tax.

As regards the promotion of substitute fuels, the directive proposed by the Commission<sup>2</sup> will seek to encourage the use of **biofuels**, the aim being to replace 20% of traditional fuels by substitute fuels by 2020 - a project which will have a considerable impact, especially on the future of urban traffic. This proposal is currently under consideration by the European Parliament (report by Mrs Ayuso).

Further **research** and development efforts will have to be made in order to improve the quality, ecological impact and intermodality of European transport. In the sixth framework programme for research EUR 600 million has been earmarked for sustainable surface transport.

## CONCLUSIONS

The Committee on Industry, External Trade, Research and Energy calls on the Committee on Regional Policy, Transport and Tourism, as the committee responsible, to incorporate the following points in its motion for a resolution:

1. Welcomes the Commission White Paper on European transport policy for 2010 as a basis for discussion, particularly as regards urban transport, passenger transport and encouraging the use of biofuels;
2. Stresses the importance of a modern, congestion-free, interconnected and efficient European transport and energy network, including pipelines, in order to achieve the Lisbon objective of making Europe the most dynamic and competitive economy in the world;

---

<sup>1</sup> See the Commission proposal concerning a regulation establishing an ecopoint system applicable to heavy goods vehicles travelling through Austria for the year 2004 (COM(2001) 807).

<sup>2</sup> COM(2001) 547.

3. Points also to the need to develop air, sea, inland waterway, and road transport links, which are vitally important to the EU's outlying regions, and combine them in Europe-wide transport networks;
4. Welcomes the liberalisation and opening-up of the transport market, in particular the full opening to competition of the rail network by 2008 as being of major potential benefit to business and industry;
5. Regrets the lack of practical solutions concerning the transport of goods, particularly as regards 'revitalising the railways' and improving their competitiveness in relation to road transport;
6. Reiterates the need to adopt a range of regulatory and investment-friendly measures with a view to encouraging the modernisation and increased interoperability of the railway networks in order to improve the quality of rail freight services without, however, departing from the principles of market competition;
7. Stresses the importance of intermodality as a key factor in the efficiency and competitiveness of transport in general; points out that the competitiveness of rail transport should not be improved artificially at the expense of other modes of transport; maintains that the different modes of transport have their own significant role in the Union's freight and passenger transport as a whole and must therefore be developed in a balanced way;
8. Is convinced that the market share of rail freight transport will continue to decline unless the planned liberalisation for this sector is accompanied by decisive ancillary measures with a view to modernising the network and redressing the existing imbalance between the various modes of transport;
9. Maintains that the intermodal shift policy being advocated by the Commission will require large-scale infrastructure investment and current public budgets, whether at national or Community level, are manifestly insufficient to meet that need; calls on the Commission, therefore, to draw up specific proposals with a view to allocating a substantially larger share of the Union budget to transport under the 2006-2013 financial perspective and to propose that a major European loan be launched to finance the priority trans-European network projects;
10. Points out that the internalisation of all costs, which is essential in order to balance costs and charges, must be accomplished in the European Community without delay in cases where road transport is taxed under the various systems in such a way that it is still paying less than the full costs which it generates;
11. Calls on the Commission to propose the introduction of alternative systems with a view to actively promoting rail freight transport, such as the system used in Switzerland, which consists of providing part funding for the strengthening of the railway network by using revenue from the motorway tax;



12. Welcomes the continuing success of the passenger and cargo aviation sectors; notes the growth of low-cost airlines; anticipates the early implementation of the 'Single European Sky' to resolve air traffic congestion and urges a sympathetic and environmentally sustainable review of increases in airport capacity;
13. Calls, until such time as alternative arrangements have been put in place, for free movement of goods to be achieved, especially where Alpine and Pyrenean passes are concerned, by eliminating every bottleneck and, in addition, for correctives to be provided to avert distortions of competition;
14. Urges a continuing review of Port State Controls, especially in the context of reducing maritime environmental pollution and raising the quality and efficiency of maritime transport;
15. Points out that road freight is essential for rural enterprises (especially in the remoter regions) and therefore must not be penalised by swingeing taxes and regulations, especially as many road transport companies in these areas are locally owned SMEs which should be encouraged and not penalised;
16. Points out that EU businesses are put at a disadvantage by unacceptable and chronic delays in air travel and urges the Commission to expedite proposals for improving the efficient use of Europe's airspace;
17. Welcomes moves to develop short-sea shipping routes and suggests that, where necessary, limited state aids should be considered acceptable where a general commercial and Community benefit is evident;
18. Welcomes the proposals in the sixth research framework programme for research on reducing harmful emissions and noise pollution and on improving fuel efficiency in transport;
19. Urges Member States to encourage the use of cleaner fuels by fiscal incentives, in particular more energy-efficient and less polluting diesel and LPG in cars.

16 April 2002

## **OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT, PUBLIC HEALTH AND CONSUMER POLICY**

for the Committee on Regional Policy, Transport and Tourism

on the Commission White Paper: European transport policy for 2010: time to decide  
(COM(2001) 370 – C5-0658/2001 – 2001/2281 (COS))

Draftsman: Marie Anne Isler Béguin

### **PROCEDURE**

The Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Policy appointed Marie Anne Isler Béguin draftsman at its meeting of 4 December 2001.

The committee considered the draft opinion at its meetings of 19 February 2002 and 16 April 2002.

At the latter meeting it adopted the following conclusions unanimously.

The following were present for the vote: Caroline F. Jackson, chairman; Alexander de Roo and Anneli Hulthén, vice-chairmen; Marie Anne Isler Béguin, rapporteur; Per-Arne Arvidsson, María del Pilar Ayuso González, Emmanouil Bakopoulos (for Pernille Frahm), Jean-Louis Bernié, Hans Blokland, David Robert Bowe, Martin Callanan, Dorette Corbey, Anne Ferreira, Marialiese Flemming, Cristina García-Orcoyen Tormo, Laura González Álvarez, Robert Goodwill, Françoise Grossetête, Eija-Riitta Anneli Korhola, Hans Kronberger, Bernd Lange, Peter Liese, Giorgio Lisi (for John Bowis), Torben Lund, Jules Maaten, Minerva Melpomeni Malliori, Patricia McKenna, Jorge Moreira da Silva, Rosemarie Müller, Riitta Myller, Giuseppe Nisticò, Ria G.H.C. Oomen-Ruijten, Marit Paulsen, Encarnación Redondo Jiménez (for Raffaele Costa), Dagmar Roth-Behrendt, Guido Sacconi, Giacomo Santini (for Avril Doyle), Horst Schnellhardt, Inger Schörling, Catherine Stihler, Nicole Thomas-Mauro, Kathleen Van Brempt, Phillip Whitehead and Stavros Xarchakos (for Cristina Gutiérrez Cortines).

## SHORT JUSTIFICATION

The Commission's second White Paper on European transport policy, coming ten years after the first, takes on the heavy responsibility of shaping mobility networks, and the European citizen's place in them, for the enlarged Europe of 2010 by means of some 60 proposals. This is a major challenge in terms of both quantity and quality when the European Union is expanding throughout the continent and where transport use is increasing exponentially in many sectors and regions. *'So unless major new measures are taken by 2010 in the European Union so that the fifteen can use the advantages of each mode of transport more rationally, heavy goods vehicle traffic alone will increase by nearly 50% over its 1998 level'*<sup>1</sup>. This illustrates the crucial importance that the White Paper can and must have in reconciling economic considerations with preserving the quality of life and the environment.

The transport sector, which impacts upon and interrelates with different aspects of social and economic life in a global and restricting way, cannot be considered from only one perspective. Yet it is just such a monolithic approach that has hitherto been adopted in transport management, just as with the development of road and air routes, based on a unilaterally economic and capitalist approach. The latest White Paper on Transport confirms the failure of this way of thinking, its collateral damage at all levels and the dead ends that have now been reached.

In future it is essential, and indeed a precondition for any new transport policy, that the policy should be firmly rooted in society, taking account of the related requirements, concerns and impacts. In response to growing aspirations of citizens, who cannot be reduced to nothing more than numbers of users, recurring damage to the environment, and Article 6 of the Treaty, the framework of sustainable development must inform the guidelines and priorities for all new commitments or decisions in the transport sphere without exception. A sustainable development policy means that before embarking on any new transport infrastructure projects it is first necessary to look at the question of optimising all existing transport infrastructure. This must be the preferred approach, particularly in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, which have diversified and comprehensive transport networks even though they may not be based on the latest technology. It is therefore mandatory to carry out a detailed and thorough study before starting any new projects in order to identify and highlight the opportunities for intermodal connections between networks that already exist or are planned. Civil society, which is directly concerned and which represents the interests of transport users, is rightly entitled to participate and be consulted, through NGOs and specialist associations, in the discussions.

As part of this New Deal, the structure of public transport is not only of strategic importance but also exemplifies the role and impact of political and practical strategies for mobility in society. The saturation of urban transport, the resulting complaints such as stress, pulmonary disease as well as accidents and their associated financial and human costs are strong arguments in favour of redefining our approach on the basis of sustainable transport and a commitment to all intermodal schemes.

This deliberate advance discussion with the aim of containing and rationalising transport

---

<sup>1</sup> Commission White Paper on Transport Policy, p. 9.

infrastructure must be followed up by an ambitious policy of Community investment and research and development efforts aimed at keeping constantly in check the harmful effects and noise nuisance caused by the transport sector, based on the Kyoto Protocol commitments. Targeted tax legislation, excluding exemptions, would provide the funding required for such research, combined with the internalisation of external environmental and social costs, based on the 'polluter pays' principle.

We are therefore entering a crucial phase, given that the outcomes of the earlier traditional approach to transport policy are irrefutable. We no longer have the time for 30-year plans, as suggested in the White Paper, to undo the asphyxiating and noxious fumes of traffic congestion which is increasing to saturation point. The damage and nuisance caused at all levels - social, economic and environmental - are already too blatant and in some instances irreversible. Above all, the continuing attacks on the environment, in the name of the same inflexible road and air corridor approach, will ruin all the efforts and undermine all the commitments made at summits and in the Treaties. The New Deal, based on environmental considerations, and set out in the 31 paragraphs of the attached conclusions, does not merely present simple alternatives but provides a way out that will preserve the quality of life and the environment for tomorrow's society.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

The Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Policy calls on the Committee on Regional Policy, Transport and Tourism, as the committee responsible, to incorporate the following points in its motion for a resolution:

1. Welcomes the Commission's approach of combating the effects of an uncontrolled growth in traffic on the environment, the quality of life and mobility by a combination of strategic priorities;
2. Affirms the need to decouple transport growth from economic growth, as agreed by the European Council in Göteborg in 2001;
3. Affirms that integrating environmental and sustainable development policy into the transport sector, in accordance with Article 6 of Treaty, must be a priority of European transport policy for 2010 and stresses that this policy must also be coordinated with the Community's integrated product policy;
4. Emphasises that the road network is of great importance for passenger traffic, particularly in outlying and sparsely populated areas; stresses, therefore, that the particular needs of those areas must also be duly taken into account when drawing up the common transport policy;
5. Calls for the interests of consumers (passengers and firms using transport services) and those of citizens to be equitably defended with regard to high quality transport services, public health imperatives and environmental concerns;
6. Calls on the Commission to put users at the centre of transport policy; in compliance

with the principle of subsidiarity, calls on the public and local authorities to involve citizens in the options for sustainable development of transport and to take decisions that satisfy their aspirations and demands;

7. Supports the participation and regular consultation of NGOs concerned with the environment, public health and consumers' rights when defining European transport policy;
8. Advocates ongoing involvement of transport sector employees' representatives; in particular, the euro-works councils should be consulted, as redirecting transport policy has an impact on the number and quality of jobs;
9. Notes that the analysis made in the White Paper applies to 'congested Europe', whereas both the problems and the solutions are different in sparsely populated countries and that general charges for the whole of Europe do not therefore work;
10. Regards a high standard of training and safe and healthy working conditions in the transport sector as being of fundamental importance to the safety and comfort of passengers and others as well as to the efficient working of the system and regrets the fact that the White Paper does not adequately reflect this; calls on the Commission to consult regularly with trade unions with a view to improving working conditions in the sector, including training and remuneration;
11. Calls for the contribution of the transport sector to reducing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions to comply with the Kyoto Protocol commitments and draws attention to the potential synergies in DG TREN (Energy-Transport) and the close link between reducing petrol consumption and climate protection;
12. Highlights the need to examine to what extent mandatory standards to limit noise and greenhouse gas emissions can be introduced for all modes of transport; stresses that, in addition to the policies mentioned in the White Paper, there is a need to involve many other areas of EU policy, such as a properly functioning regional and urban policy, to reduce the adverse effects of traffic;
13. Notes that although maritime transport is considered to be more environment-friendly than many other forms of transport it also requires considerable investment in more environment-friendly combustion and fuels;
14. Points out that improving individual modes of transport is not sufficient to achieve sustainable development of mobility; it is equally important to develop alternatives that will be viable in the future;
15. Calls for greater development of integrated mobility systems which optimise the networking of individual modes of transport, exploit their respective strengths and reduce damage to the environment;
16. Points out that, unless appropriate measures are taken, commercial traffic on Europe's roads is likely to increase by 50% by 2010, with a consequent increase in international

commercial road traffic of around 12 billion tonnes/km a year; calls for measures to develop intermodal commercial transport by integrating different transport modes in a way that allows efficient and rational use of the transport system;

17. Considers that citizens include pedestrians, or even cyclists, and that it is necessary to facilitate their travel as part of sustainable intermodal arrangements particularly in the urban environment; notes that the White Paper takes far too little account of the pollution resulting from passenger transport; notes also that half of the pollution from traffic is produced in the urban environment;
18. Notes that the White Paper makes no reference to the importance of correct driving in reducing emissions;
19. Points out that motorised two-wheeled vehicles have a key role to play in urban areas and should therefore be included in an integrated mobility system;
20. Calls for greater attention and support to be given to environmentally-friendly modes of transport, such as rail or vehicles running on dedicated tracks, inland waterway, bicycles and so on in the common transport policy;
21. Hopes that the concept of 'sensitive regions' will be taken into account and applied at EU level;
22. Calls for the consistent but gradual internalisation of environmental costs in accordance with the 'polluter pays' principle and, to this end, calls for binding targets and timetables to be established in the form of a new directive, which the Commission is requested to bring forward as soon as possible; in the road transport sector, appropriate instruments are performance-based road use charges for heavy goods vehicles;
23. Calls for consistent and gradual measures to improve the internalisation of external costs, as a way of influencing users' choices with a view to shifting transport demand to increasingly sustainable transport modes;
24. Maintains that the decision to develop trans-European transport networks must be based on environmental and public health impact assessments, covering the entire routes, in accordance with the relevant directive;
25. Calls for the co-funding of transport infrastructure projects with EU funds, such as the Regional Funds, the Cohesion Fund, ISPA, TEN and EIB, to be subject to environmental criteria because the European Union has a duty to set an example by immediately applying the SEA directive to its programmes, in particular TINA;
26. Requests that, in the context of enlargement, both the Member States and the applicant countries should adopt the principle of a sustainable transport policy in particular by promoting environmentally-friendly public transport (road, rail and waterway) and travel by pedestrians and cyclists;
27. Draws attention to the need to fund the 'sustainable development - sustainable surface

transport – 6th RDPF’ research projects and, in particular, research to develop cleaner transport technology;

28. Considers the fact that some Member States already achieve a higher market share for rail than that envisaged as a target by the Commission shows that the Commission’s approach is insufficiently ambitious; calls upon the Commission to examine how high market shares are achieved in certain Member States, to what extent they are due to unchangeable factors related to geography and historical development and to what extent they are due to ‘best practices’ which could be emulated elsewhere;
29. Welcomes investment in intensively-used, long distance and high-speed routes, provided such development is conducted in an environmentally and socially sensitive manner and not at the expense or to the detriment of local services which perform an essential social function;
30. Calls for appropriate action to be taken as soon as possible unequivocally to safeguard local and regional authorities’ freedom to award contracts for public transport services; believes that the competitive position of private operators and their legal and commercial rights can be protected without undermining the ability of publicly-owned operators to provide comprehensive services based on social need and the right of ordinary citizens, including the disadvantaged, to affordable mobility;
31. Calls for the preparation of a programme, including mandatory targets and dates, for the environmentally and socially beneficial development of the transport networks of the candidate countries and their integration into the European Union’s transport infrastructure; asserts that the modernisation of the rail network should be the priority of this programme.