

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

1999



2004

Session document

FINAL
A5-0110/2004

25 February 2004

*****I** **REPORT**

on the proposal for a European Parliament and Council Decision amending the amended proposal for a Decision of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Decision No 1692/96/EC on Community guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network (COM(2003) 564 – C5-0485/2003 – 2001/0229(COD))

(Renewed referral)

Committee on Regional Policy, Transport and Tourism

Rapporteur: Philip Charles Bradbourn

Symbols for procedures

- * Consultation procedure
majority of the votes cast
- **I Cooperation procedure (first reading)
majority of the votes cast
- **II Cooperation procedure (second reading)
*majority of the votes cast, to approve the common position
majority of Parliament's component Members, to reject or amend
the common position*
- *** Assent procedure
*majority of Parliament's component Members except in cases
covered by Articles 105, 107, 161 and 300 of the EC Treaty and
Article 7 of the EU Treaty*
- ***I Codecision procedure (first reading)
majority of the votes cast
- ***II Codecision procedure (second reading)
*majority of the votes cast, to approve the common position
majority of Parliament's component Members, to reject or amend
the common position*
- ***III Codecision procedure (third reading)
majority of the votes cast, to approve the joint text

(The type of procedure depends on the legal basis proposed by the Commission)

Amendments to a legislative text

In amendments by Parliament, amended text is highlighted in ***bold italics***. Highlighting in *normal italics* is an indication for the relevant departments showing parts of the legislative text for which a correction is proposed, to assist preparation of the final text (for instance, obvious errors or omissions in a given language version). These suggested corrections are subject to the agreement of the departments concerned.

CONTENTS

	Page
PROCEDURAL PAGE	4
DRAFT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION	6
EXPLANATORY STATEMENT	23

PROCEDURAL PAGE

At the sitting of 30 May 2002 Parliament adopted its position at first reading on the proposal for a European Parliament and Council Decision amending Council Decision No 1692/96/EC on Community guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network (COM(2001) 544 - 2001/0229(COD)).

By letter of 26 September 2002 the Commission submitted to Parliament, pursuant to Articles 251(2) and 156 of the EC Treaty, the amended proposal for a European Parliament and Council Decision amending Decision No 1692/96/EC on Community guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network (COM(2002) 542 – 2001/0229(COD)).

By letter of 2 October 2003 the Commission submitted to Parliament, pursuant to Articles 251(2) and 156 of the EC Treaty, the proposal for a European Parliament and Council Decision amending the amended proposal for a Decision of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Decision No 1692/96/EC on Community guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network (COM(2003) 564 – 2001/0229(COD)).

At the sittings of 9 October 2002 and 20 October 2003 the President of Parliament announced that he had referred the proposals to the Committee on Regional Policy, Transport and Tourism as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Budgets, to the Committee on Industry, External Trade, Research and Energy and to the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Policy for their opinions (C5-0447/2002 and C5-0485/2003).

At the request of the Committee on Regional Policy, Transport and Tourism, the President of Parliament informed the Commission by letter of 21 November 2003 that Parliament considers that the submission of the Commission's proposal on 2 October 2003 constitutes a renewed referral to Parliament in accordance with the dispositions of Article 71(1) second indent of Parliament's Rules of Procedure and that the responsible committee would review and amend the changes made to the initial proposal, in accordance with the procedure laid down for a first reading.

The Committee on Regional Policy, Transport and Tourism had appointed Philip Charles Bradbourn rapporteur at its meeting of 20 November 2001.

It considered the Commission proposal and draft report at its meetings of 21 January 2004 and 18 February 2004.

At the last meeting it adopted the draft legislative resolution by 44 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.

The following were present for the vote: Paolo Costa (chairman), Rijk van Dam (vice-chairman), Gilles Savary (vice-chairman), Philip Charles Bradbourn (rapporteur), Pedro Aparicio Sánchez (for Danielle Darras), Graham H. Booth (for Alain Esclopé), Luigi Cocilovo, Nirj Deva (for Rolf Berend), Jan Dhaene, Den Dover (for Felipe Camisón Asensio), Garrelt Duin, Giovanni Claudio Fava, Markus Ferber (for Christine de Veyrac), Francesco Fiori (for Margie Sudre pursuant to Rule 153(2)), Jacqueline Foster, Mathieu J.H. Grosch, Catherine Guy-Quint (for Bernard Poignant), Konstantinos Hatzidakis, Ewa Hedkvist Petersen, Liam Hyland (for Gerard Collins pursuant to Rule 153(2)), Juan de Dios Izquierdo Collado, Georg Jarzembowski, Elisabeth Jeggle (for Sérgio Marques), Dieter-Lebrecht Koch, Giorgio Lisi, Erik Meijer, Rosa Miguélez

Ramos, Bill Miller (for John Hume), Enrique Monsonís Domingo, Francesco Musotto, James Nicholson, Josu Ortuondo Larrea, Peter Pex, Wilhelm Ernst Piecyk, Samuli Pohjamo, Alonso José Puerta, Reinhard Rack, Ingo Schmitt, Elisabeth Schroedter (for Nelly Maes), Renate Sommer, Ulrich Stockmann, Hannes Swoboda (Brian Simpson), Joaquim Vairinhos, Ari Vatanen, Herman Vermeer, Dominique Vlasto (for Dana Rosemary Scallon), Mark Francis Watts and Brigitte Wenzel-Perillo (for Carlos Ripoll y Martínez de Bedoya).

The Committee on Budgets, the Committee on Industry, External Trade, Research and Energy and the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Policy did not give an opinion.

The report was tabled on 25 February 2004.

DRAFT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION

**on the proposal for a European Parliament and Council Decision amending the amended proposal for a Decision of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Decision No 1692/96/EC on Community guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network
(COM(2003) 564 – C5-0485/2003 – 2001/0229(COD))**

(Codecision procedure: first reading - renewed referral)

The European Parliament,

- having regard to the proposal amending the amended Commission proposal to the European Parliament and the Council (COM(2003) 564)¹,
 - having regard to the Commission proposal to the European Parliament and the Council (COM(2001) 544)²,
 - having regard to the amended Commission proposal to the European Parliament and the Council (COM(2002) 542)³,
 - having regard to its position at first reading of 30 May 2002⁴,
 - having regard to Articles 251(2) and 156 of the EC Treaty, pursuant to which the Commission submitted the proposal to Parliament (C5-0485/2003),
 - having regard to Rules 67 and 71(1) of its Rules of Procedure,
 - having regard to the report of the Committee on Regional Policy, Transport and Tourism (A5-0110/2004),
1. Approves the Commission proposal as amended;
 2. Calls on the Commission to refer the matter to Parliament again if it intends to amend the proposal substantially or replace it with another text;
 3. Instructs its President to forward its position to the Council and Commission.

¹ Not yet published in OJ.

² OJ C 362 E, 18.12.2001, p. 205.

³ OJ C 20 E, 28.1.2003, p. 274.

⁴ OJ C 187 E, 7.8.2003, p. 22.

Amendment 1

RECITAL 2

(2) The forthcoming enlargement of the Union and the objective of shifting the balance between modes plus the fact that it could take over ten years to complete some of the priority projects call for re-examination of the list of projects in Annex III to Decision No 1692/96/EC.

(2) The forthcoming enlargement of the Union and the objective of shifting the balance between modes ***and achieving an infrastructure network capable of meeting growing needs***, plus the fact that it could take over ten years to complete some of the priority projects, call for re-examination of the list of projects in Annex III to Decision No 1692/96/EC.

Justification

The aim must be to create a trans-European network which can cope in future with the increasing flow of goods and traffic.

Amendment 2

RECITAL 5 A (new)

(5a) The Community should concentrate its own resources on reinforcing the basic infrastructure before moving on to the construction of major infrastructure projects with a high economic and environmental impact.

Amendment 3

RECITAL 6

(6) Mechanisms should be put in place to support the development of motorways of the sea between Member States in order to reduce road congestion and improve access to peripheral and island countries. Establishment of such mechanisms backed up, *inter alia*, by tendering procedures must in no way prejudice the Community rules on competition or on public procurement.

(6) Mechanisms should be put in place to support the development of motorways of the sea between Member States in order to reduce road congestion and improve access to peripheral and island countries. Establishment of such mechanisms backed up, *inter alia*, by tendering procedures ***must be transparent and geared to needs, and*** must in no way prejudice the Community rules on competition or on public

procurement.

Justification

It must be ensured that the procedures proposed are transparent and geared to actual demand.

Amendment 4
RECITAL 6 A (new)

(6a) For the funding of priority projects which reinforce territorial cohesion, provision should also be made for the use of the structural funds, the Cohesion Fund and the ISPA Fund.

Amendment 5
RECITAL 7

(7) Closer coordination between the States involved in projects on the same route is necessary to improve the return on investments and to make it easier to synchronise them and to put together the funding package.

(7) Closer coordination between the States involved in projects on the same route, ***based on the Member States' own responsibility***, is necessary to improve the return on investments and to make it easier to synchronise them and to put together the funding package.

Justification

This insertion is needed to highlight the subsidiarity principle at this point.

Amendment 6
RECITAL 7 B (new)

(7b) Support for the development of the motorways of the sea should be seen as complementary to the provision of Community aid as an incentive to the development of short sea shipping operations under the Marco Polo programme. However, the granting of Community financial assistance under the two instruments should not be cumulative.

Justification

The principle of complementarity needs to be defined here.

Amendment 7

ARTICLE 1, POINT 3

Article 12 a (Decision No 1692/96/EC)

1. The trans-European network of motorways of the sea shall aim to concentrate flows of freight on a few sea routes in order to establish new viable, regular and frequent maritime links for the transport of goods between Member States in order to reduce road congestion and improve access to peripheral and island States.

2. The trans-European network of motorways of the sea shall consist of **facilities and** infrastructure concerning at least two ports in two different Member States. These **facilities and** infrastructure shall include the port facilities, electronic logistics management systems and administrative and customs procedures, as well as infrastructure for direct land and sea access, including winter access, to the ports used by the links referred to in paragraph 1.

3. The projects of common interest of the trans-European network of motorways of the sea shall be proposed by at least two Member States. ***The projects proposed shall combine the public and private sectors in accordance with procedures allowing, before aid is granted from the national budgets supplemented, if necessary, by aid from the Community, a tendering process in one of the following forms:***

1. The trans-European network of motorways of the sea shall aim to concentrate flows of freight on a few sea routes in order to establish new viable, regular and frequent maritime links for the transport of goods between Member States in order to reduce road congestion and improve access to peripheral and island **regions and** States.

2. The trans-European network of motorways of the sea shall consist of **general** infrastructure **measures** concerning at least two ports in two different Member States. These **general** infrastructure **measures** shall **also** include the port facilities, electronic logistics management systems and administrative and customs procedures, as well as infrastructure for direct land and sea access, including winter access, to the ports used by the links referred to in paragraph 1.

2a. Waterways or canals which link two European motorways of the sea and make a substantial contribution to shortening sea routes, increasing efficiency and saving shipping time shall form part of the trans-European network of motorways of the sea.

3. The projects of common interest of the trans-European network of motorways of the sea shall be proposed by at least two Member States **and shall be geared to actual needs.**

(a) a public call for proposals organised jointly by the Member States concerned, intended to establish new links from the category A port, as defined in Article 12(2), which they select in advance within each maritime region, as defined in project No 21 in Annex III;

(b) insofar as the location of the ports is comparable, a public call for proposals organised jointly by the Member States concerned and targeting consortia bringing together at least shipping companies and ports located in one of the maritime regions, as defined in project No 21 in Annex III.

4. The projects of common interest shall focus on *facilities and* infrastructure which make up the network of motorways of the sea and may include, if necessary, *start-up aid for shipping companies operating the links referred to in paragraph 1. Start-up aid shall be limited to two years and shall be granted only if there are financial obstacles to starting up a project. The aid may not exceed the minimum estimated amount required to start up the links concerned.*

5. The projects of common interest shall be

3a. The projects of common interest of the trans-European network of motorways of the sea may also include activities which have wider benefits and are not linked to certain ports, such as ice-breaking, dredging operations and information systems, including traffic management and electronic reporting systems.

4. The projects of common interest shall focus on *general* infrastructure *measures* which make up the network of motorways of the sea and may include, if necessary, *pump-priming funding in accordance with the criteria of the Marco Polo programme.*

4a. The Commission shall publish a clear framework for financial intervention, annexed to the Community guidelines, which shall state the type of expenditure eligible in terms of equipment, infrastructure and start-up aid, and the procedures for intervention by the various sources of Community funding, namely the TEN budget, the ERDF and the Cohesion Fund.

5. The projects of common interest shall be

submitted to the Commission for approval.

submitted to the Commission for approval.

Justification

[A general change is proposed, in this and other amendments, whereby the German term 'Hochgeschwindigkeitsseewege' is to be replaced by the term 'Meeresautobahnen'. This does not affect the English term 'motorways of the sea'.]

Under the principles governing the development and extension of trans-European transport networks, aid may be provided only for general infrastructure measures, and certainly not for company-related equipment and operating costs of port and shipping operators, let alone the purchase of ships. Any pump-priming funding which may be needed for a new transport link has to comply with the criteria and limits laid down in the Marco Polo programme, which has already been carefully considered and adopted. The ports which are to be used to a greater extent for the network of motorways of the sea must also satisfy clear minimum criteria. The Member States may not in any circumstances intervene in the existing competition between port and/or shipping operators.

The plan for European motorways of the sea concerns efficient, speedy and cost-effective maritime links. In certain circumstances waterways or canals can play a supporting role in this, if they connect two motorways of the sea, such as the North Sea/Baltic Sea Canal.

Other activities, such as ice-breaking and dredging, should be mentioned in this text.

Over and above the trans-European transport network budget, a number of other sources of Community funding may co-finance investment aid and start-up aid for motorways of the sea.

Other public funding (by the State or regional and local authorities) may also play a part. This framework needs to be clarified, in particular with regard to Community backing for public-sector aid, so that interested shipowners have all the information that they need for drawing up future investment plans.

Amendment 8

ARTICLE 1, POINT 4

Article 17 a, paragraph 1 (Decision No 1692/96/EC)

1. In order to facilitate the coordinated implementation of certain projects or sections of projects amongst the projects declared to be of European interest referred to in Article 19a, the Commission may designate, **after consulting** the Member States concerned, a person called the "European Coordinator". The Coordinator shall act in the name and on behalf of the Commission. The mission of the Coordinator shall normally cover a single

1. In order to facilitate the coordinated implementation of certain projects or sections of projects amongst the projects declared to be of European interest referred to in Article 19a, the Commission may designate, **at the request of** the Member States concerned **and after consulting the European Parliament**, a person called the "European Coordinator". The Coordinator shall act in the name and on behalf of the Commission. The mission of the

project but may, if necessary, be extended to other projects located on the same route.

Coordinator shall normally cover a single project but may, if necessary, be extended to other projects located on the same route.

Justification

In accordance with the principle that the Member States have primary responsibility for trans-European networks (see the second subparagraph of Article 156 of the EC Treaty), the approval of the Member States concerned should be required for the designation of a 'European Coordinator'. The elected Members of the European Parliament should have the right to be consulted about the designation of a 'European Coordinator'.

Amendment 9

ARTICLE 1, POINT 4

Article 17a, paragraph 4, point (b) (Decision 1692/96/EC)

(b) draw up a report every year for the Commission regarding progress achieved in the implementation of the projects for which the Coordinator is responsible, new regulatory or other developments which could affect the characteristics of the projects and any difficulties and obstacles which may result in a significant delay in relation to the dates indicated in Annex III;

(b) draw up a report every year for the Commission **and the European Parliament** regarding progress achieved in the implementation of the projects for which the Coordinator is responsible, new regulatory or other developments which could affect the characteristics of the projects and any difficulties and obstacles which may result in a significant delay in relation to the dates indicated in Annex III;

Justification

It is important that the progress made by the Coordinator is relayed to the Elected Members of the European Parliament on an annual basis.

Amendment 10

ARTICLE 1, POINT 4

Article 17 a, paragraph 4, point (c) (Decision No 1692/96/EC)

(c) contribute to the dialogue with operators, transport users, regional and local authorities and representatives of civil society with a view to gaining fuller knowledge of demand for transport services, of the constraints and of the service parameters required to optimise the use of the infrastructure being financed.

(c) contribute, **in close cooperation with the authorities of the Member States concerned and without prejudice to the procedures applicable under national law**, to the dialogue with **regional and local authorities, in particular, and also with** operators, transport users, regional and local authorities and representatives of civil society with a view to gaining fuller knowledge of demand for transport services,

of the constraints and of the service parameters required to optimise the use of the infrastructure being financed.

Justification

The European Coordinator must not encroach upon responsibilities which relate strictly to the ownership of projects. Instead, he must play the part of facilitator in the case of projects involving several Member States, in close cooperation with them. In addition, his role entailing collaboration and dialogue has to fit into the context of existing legislation and procedures in the various States.

Regional and local authorities throughout Europe can make a particularly valuable contribution to the Coordinator's work, since they have on-the-spot expertise and experience in planning and implementing transport projects. The optimum, sustainable implementation of projects can be guaranteed only by involving those concerned on the ground - and not without them.

Amendment 11

ARTICLE 1, POINT 6

Article 19, paragraph 1, point (e) (Decision 1692/96/EC)

(e) contribute to the territorial cohesion of the Union by integrating the networks of the new Member States and improving connections with the peripheral regions;

(e) contribute to the territorial cohesion of the Union by integrating the networks of the new Member States and improving connections with the peripheral ***and island*** regions ***in particular by including regional airports and ancillary services***;

Justification

It is in Europe's interests that the projects of common interest of motorways of the sea are established quickly.

Amendment 12
ARTICLE 1, POINT 6
Article 19, paragraph 3 (Decision No 1692/96/EC)

3. **By 2010** the Commission shall *draft* a *progress* report and, if necessary, propose amendments to the list of priority projects identified in Annex III in line with paragraph 1 of this Article."

3. *Every three years with effect from the entry into force of this decision* the Commission shall *draw up* a report *on the progress of priority projects and the level of involvement of the various financial partners concerned*. If necessary, *it shall* propose amendments to the list of priority projects identified in Annex III in line with paragraph 1 of this Article *and shall submit that proposal to the Council and the European Parliament under the codecision procedure*."

Justification

It is important for the Council and the European Parliament to be kept regularly informed of the progress of priority projects, in particular with regard to the financial packages, and for them to be able to amend Annex III accordingly, under the codecision procedure.

Amendment 13
ARTICLE 1, POINT 7
Article 19 a, paragraph 1 (Decision No 1692/96/EC)

1. The priority projects identified in Annex III are declared to be of European interest.

1. The priority projects identified in Annex III are declared to be of European interest. *When programming its financial requirements the Commission shall give priority to the projects declared to be of European interest. In the areas where there has been under-investment in infrastructure, the Commission may also make a proposal to declare the rail infrastructure connecting to the priority projects set out in Annex III to be of European interest. This declaration is made solely in accordance with the procedure laid down in the Treaty and in the legal acts based thereon. Any arbitrary setting of priorities with regard to the priority projects listed in Annex III should be inadmissible.*

Justification

Bearing in mind the exiguity of the specific budget line devoted to developing the trans-European transport network (€ 600 million per annum), it is important for funding to be concentrated on the priority projects. In the areas where there has been under-investment in infrastructure, some rail sections require the quality standards of trans-European routes since they perform an essential drainage function towards the routes and thus form part of the priority projects. The determination of the priority projects in Annex III is governed solely by the codecision procedure between Parliament and the Council, in accordance with Article 156 of the EC Treaty. That decision may not be circumvented, either, by a 'Quick Start' programme unilaterally laid down by the Council. The timing of aid for the individual projects within Annex III therefore depends solely on the prescribed criteria, such as each project's state of readiness in planning, funding and construction terms.

Amendment 14

ARTICLE 1, POINT 7

Article 19 a, paragraph 5 a (new) (Decision No 1692/96/EC)

5a. The Commission may propose to the European Parliament and the Council of Ministers that some of the projects included in Annex III be pushed ahead as a priority, with the aim of pursuing objectives designed to stimulate growth and contribute to economic, social and territorial cohesion, and also to intermodality within the European Union. Those projects may then be given priority treatment under Community financial instruments.

Justification

This amendment seeks to provide a legal basis for the 'Quick Start' initiative, which forms part of the European growth initiative. In addition, the European Parliament will be kept regularly informed of its progress on the basis of the report which the Commission should draw up on the basis of Article 19(3), as amended.

Amendment 15

ARTICLE 1, POINT 7

Article 19a, paragraph 6 (Decision 1692/96/EC)

6. If there is or will be a significant delay in starting work on one of the projects

6. If there is or will be a significant delay in starting work on one of the projects

declared to be of European interest in relation to the deadline of 2010, the Commission shall ask the Member States concerned to give the reasons for the delay within three months. After receiving and examining the reply from the Member States concerned, the Commission may, in order to protect the financial interests of the Community and with due regard to the principle of proportionality, decide to withdraw the classification of the project as a project declared to be of European interest.

declared to be of European interest in relation to the deadline of 2010, the Commission shall ask the Member States concerned to give the reasons for the delay within three months. After receiving and examining the reply from the Member States concerned, the Commission may, ***having consulted the European Parliament and*** in order to protect the financial interests of the Community and with due regard to the principle of proportionality, decide to withdraw the classification of the project as a project declared to be of European interest.

Justification

The elected Members of the European Parliament should be consulted before a project is declared not to be of European interest.

Amendment 16
ARTICLE 1, POINT 7
Article 19a, paragraph 7 (Decision 1692/96/EC)

7. Five years after the completion of a project declared to be of European interest or one of the sections thereof, the Member States concerned shall out an assessment of its socio-economic impact and its impact on the environment, including its impact on trade between Member States, on territorial cohesion and on sustainable development. Member States shall inform the Commission of the results of this assessment.

7. Five years after the completion of a project declared to be of European interest or one of the sections thereof, the Member States concerned shall out an assessment of its socio-economic impact and its impact on the environment, including its impact on trade ***and the free movement of people and goods*** between Member States, on territorial cohesion and on sustainable development. Member States shall inform the Commission of the results of this assessment.

Amendment 17
ARTICLE 1, POINT 7
Article 19a, paragraph 10 (Decision 1692/96/EC)

10. The coordinated or *transnational* enquiry procedures referred to in *paragraph* 8 and 9 shall apply without prejudice to the obligations by the Community legislation on environmental protection, particularly on environmental impact assessment. The Member States concerned shall inform the Commission when such coordinated or *transnational* enquiry procedures are launched and of the results.

10. The coordinated or *trans-national* enquiry procedures referred to in *paragraphs* 8 and 9 shall apply without prejudice to the obligations by the Community legislation on environmental protection, particularly on environmental impact assessment. The Member States concerned shall inform the Commission **and the European Parliament** when such coordinated or *trans-national* enquiry procedures are launched and of the results.

Justification

It is important that the elected Members of the European Parliament should be informed when such procedures are launched and of the results.

Amendment 18
ARTICLE 1, POINT 7
Article 19 a, paragraph 10 a (new) (Decision No 1692/96/EC)

10a. If the evaluation and enquiry procedures referred to in paragraphs 8, 9 or 10 find that the project or projects in question are likely to have undesired social, economic or environmental impacts, Member States shall consult with the Commission with a view to mitigating such impacts, including the option of withdrawing the project or projects from the priority list.

Justification

Parliament's resolution (2003) 0598 on the outcome of the European Council meeting held in Brussels on 12-13 December states that 'priorities for development of the TENs must be strategically planned in accordance with the common interest, and that added value of individual projects must be ensured via comprehensive impact assessments'. If such impact assessments are to be meaningful, it is vital that the TENs guidelines contain a provision to ensure that all relevant alternatives are considered if projects are found to have undesired social, economic or environmental impacts.

Amendment 19
ARTICLE 1, POINT 8 (B)
Annex III, Extension of project No 6 (Decision No 1692/96/EC)

Extension of project No 6 along the railway axis Lyon-Trieste/Koper-Ljubljana-Budapest-Ukrainian border

- Venezia-Trieste/Koper-Divaca (2015);
- Ljubljana-Budapest (2015).

Extension of project No 6 along the railway axis Lyon-Trieste-**Divaca**/Koper-Ljubljana-**Maribor-Graz**-Budapest-Ukrainian border

- Venezia-**south Ronchi**-Trieste/Koper-Divaca-**Ljubljana** (2015);
- Ljubljana-**Maribor-Graz**-Budapest (2015).
- **railway axis Marseille-Torino, with the Montgenèvre Tunnel as a cross-border section (2015).**

Justification

It is in the European interest that the project should make the missing connections, particularly the trans-frontier connection between south Ronchi-Trieste and Divaca, guaranteeing a connection between Ljubljana-Budapest and Italy (and thus also with France, Spain and Portugal), therefore ensuring the project's continuity.

The list of priority projects, as modified, envisages the establishment of a western rail corridor and an eastern rail corridor, without any connection between them. High-speed East-West traffic flows are virtually impossible in the present plan, except if they are routed through Lyons or Paris.

The Alps represent a major natural obstacle to the development of several regions, including Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur. A Marseilles-Turin rail link (via the Durance Valley and the future Montgenèvre Tunnel) would make it possible, at reasonable cost, to create a cross-border section capable of completing the Lyons-Turin axis and ensure a genuine opening up of border regions and of the Rhône Valley.

Finally, the construction of the Montgenèvre Tunnel will make it possible to develop a new intermodal transport centre in Marseilles.

Amendment 20
ARTICLE 1, POINT 8 (B)
Annex III, Extension of project No 16 (Decision No 1692/96/EC)

Extension of project No 16 along the freight railway axis Sines-Madrid-Paris

- Railway line Sines-Badajoz (2010)

Extension of project No 16 along the freight railway axis Sines/**Algeciras**-Madrid-Paris

- Railway line Sines-Badajoz/**Algeciras Bobadilla** (2010);

– New high-capacity trans-Pyrenean central railway line (2015-2017)

Amendment 21

ARTICLE 1, POINT 8 (B)

Annex III, Extension of project No 18, first indent a (new) (Decision No 1692/96/EC)

- measures to improve navigability between Straubing and Vilshofen (2013);

Justification

Extending the Rhine-Main-Danube inland waterway axis only makes sense if the navigability of the section between Straubing and Vilshofen is safeguarded and developed.

Amendment 22

ARTICLE 1, POINT 8 (B)

Annex III, Project No 21 (Decision No 1692/96/EC)

- Motorway of the Baltic Sea (linking **the Baltic Sea Member States** with Member States in Central and Western Europe) (2010);

– Motorway of the **sea of western Europe (leading from the Iberian peninsula via the Atlantic Arc to the North Sea and the Irish Sea)** (2010);

- Motorway of the sea of south-east Europe (connecting the Adriatic Sea to the Ionian Sea and the Eastern Mediterranean to include Cyprus) (2010);

- Motorway of the sea of south-west Europe (western Mediterranean), connecting Spain, France, Italy and including Malta, and linking with the motorway of the sea of south-east Europe (2010);

- Motorway of the Baltic Sea (linking **Member States within the Baltic Sea area** with Member States in Central and Western Europe, **including the route through the North Sea/Baltic Sea Canal**) (2010);

- Motorway of the North Sea (2010);

- Motorway of the Atlantic (2010);

- Motorway of the sea of south-east Europe (connecting the Adriatic Sea to the Ionian Sea and the Eastern Mediterranean to include Cyprus) (2010);

- Motorway of the sea of south-west Europe (western Mediterranean), connecting Spain, France, Italy and including Malta, and linking with the motorway of the sea of south-east Europe (2010);

- The Commission shall, within one year, identify and publish a list of specific projects upon which work may commence during the current programming period, for each of the seas concerned.

Justification

[A general change is proposed, in this and other amendments, whereby the German term 'Hochgeschwindigkeitsseewege' is to be replaced by the term 'Meeresautobahnen'. This does not affect the English term 'motorways of the sea'.]

The development of the motorway of the Baltic Sea should encompass development both within the Baltic Sea area and in connection with North Sea ports. The latter links can be established both via the Skagerrak and the Kattegat and via the North Sea/Baltic Sea Canal.

The Atlantic region and the North Sea region exist as such in the shipping sector. They should therefore be identified separately in the Commission proposal, and not incorporated into a motorway of the sea of western Europe, which does not really have any meaning.

Amendment 23

ARTICLE 1, POINT 8 (B)

Annex III, Project No 25 (Decision No 1692/96/EC)

Project No 25: Motorway **axis** Gdansk-Brno/Bratislava-Wien

- Gdansk-Katowice motorway (2010)
- Katowice-Brno/Zilina **motorway (2010), cross-border section;**
- Brno-Wien (2009), cross-border section

Project No 25: Motorway **route** Gdansk-Brno/Bratislava-Wien

- Gdansk-Katowice motorway (2010)
- Katowice-Brno-**Wien-Bratislava/Zilina-Budapest-Ivandarda**
- Brno-Wien (2009), cross-border section

Justification

The continuation of the North-South corridor from Zilina towards Budapest and the Hungarian-Croatian border would provide a direct link of great European interest from the Baltic Sea to the Adriatic Sea. As the Croatian and Bosnian stages are under construction and do not need any Community funding the proposed extension does not involve substantial extra resources.

Note: the original order of names contradicts both the Van Miert map No 18 and the second sub-project - Katowice-Brno/Zilina motorway.

Amendment 24

ARTICLE 1, POINT 8 (B)

Annex III, Project No 29 (Decision No 1692/96/EC)

Project No 29: Railway axis on the Ionian/Adriatic intermodal corridor:

- Kozani-Kalambaka-Igoumenitsa (2012)
- Ioannina-Antirrio-Rio-Kalamata (2014)

Project No 29: Railway axis on the Ionian/Adriatic/**Black Sea** intermodal corridor (**'Corridor VIII'**):

- Kozani-Kalambaka-Igoumenitsa (2012)
- Ioannina-Antirrio-Rio-Kalamata (2014)
- **Bari-Durazzo-Sofia-Varna/Burgas (Black Sea) (2020)**

Justification

From the viewpoint of the integration of the Balkan countries into the EU, the integration of the TENs into the Balkans is fundamental. Since not all those countries involved are currently applicants for accession, and therefore are unable to benefit from the Structural Funds to support such a project, access to EIB facilities or the funds which the EU has earmarked and is committing to this area ought to be facilitated for this purpose.

Amendment 25

ARTICLE 1, POINT 8 (B)

Annex III, project No 29 a (new) (Decision No 1692/96/EC)

Project No 29a Seine-Schelde river navigation project

- **navigability improvements Deulemont-Gent (2012)**
- **Compiègne-Cambrai canal (2012)**

Justification

This project is intended to bring about substantial improvements in the links between the three major inland waterway networks in France, Belgium and the Netherlands.

Since the Council has decided to include this project in the list of priority projects in Annex III, and since it must be in a state of readiness in both countries in planning, funding and construction terms, Parliament must also consider this project, especially since the aim is to complete the review of the trans-European networks at a single reading.

A good Seine-Schelde link has the potential to reduce road freight by a quarter and will contribute to alleviating the congested road links between Benelux and the Paris region. The European Parliament has always been an advocate of inland navigation. The development of this missing link would represent a major step forward in promoting inland navigation.

Amendment 26
ARTICLE 1, POINT 8 (B)
Annex III, Project No 29b (new) (Decision No 1692/96/EC)

Project No 29b: Railway axis Praha-Linz-Ljubljana

- railway line Praha-České Budějovice (2010)-Linz (2016);

- railway line Linz-Graz-Ljubljana-Zagreb (2016).

- railway axis Wien-Graz-Ljubljana/Villach-Koper-Trieste

- railway line Wien-Graz-Ljubljana/Villach-Koper-Trieste (2018).

Justification

The objective of the trans-European networks is a substantial improvement in social and economic cohesion within the European Union, in particular in respect of those countries which will become full members of the Union on 1 May 2004. The cross-border rail projects Prague-Linz (2010) and Maribor-Graz (2015) have already been included in List 3 of the High-Level Group chaired by Mr Karel van Miert. An extension towards Zagreb already points to a future extension of the European Union to encompass countries in South-East Europe. In view of the Commission's opinion on Croatia's application for membership, which is expected at the end of March, links between Croatia and the European Union are also needed.

The route indicated here, from Vienna via Graz towards Venice/Trieste/Koper (via Villach) and Graz-Ljubljana is a central part of the axis Warsaw-Prague/Brno-Vienna-Adriatic. It is therefore of Europe-wide importance, not least in the light of future enlargements of the European Union to encompass countries in South-East Europe, which need appropriate links to EU territory for their socio-economic development.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

➤ PROCEDURE

The legislative procedure concerning the update and implementation of the Community guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network has been an ongoing exercise since October 2001. Although Parliament was able to adopt its position at first reading as early as May 2002, the necessity to ensure that the right decisions were taken concerning:

- the identification of strategic corridors and projects and
- the establishment of a legal and administrative framework to facilitate the development of trans-frontier projects¹,

has required an in-depth pan-European study to be undertaken at the highest level. The High Level Group, chaired by Mr Karel Van Miert, reported to the Commission on 30 June 2003. The current Commission proposal amending the amended proposal submitted in September 2002², is the Commission's response to that report.

The economic importance of the huge investments required for the construction of the trans-European networks did not escape the attention of the European Council in October 2003. In view of the recent lacklustre performance of the European economy, the Council called on Member States to maintain sound macroeconomic policies, accelerate structural reforms and promote investment in networks and knowledge. In response the Commission prepared the European Initiative for Growth, and in particular a list of 'ready to start' projects concerning segments of the 29 priority transport projects so far identified.

Although, as far as transport is concerned, the 'Quick Start programme' is inextricably related to the list of priority projects for the development of the TEN-Ts³, the report on the Growth Initiative is addressed solely for the attention of the Council. A number of members of the Committee on Regional policy and Transport have expressed serious reservations as to the legality of the procedure adopted, for at first sight, it appears to pre-empt the possibility of Parliament expressing its opinion. In the Commission's view, the Quick Start list is not a short list of projects potentially benefiting from preferential treatment, but a list of component projects chosen from within the TEN-Ts' 29 corridors which are mature and on which work is ready to start.

➤ THE COMMISSION PROPOSAL

The present Commission proposal concerns two major aspects. First, the Annex proposes the addition to the list of priority projects already adopted by Parliament at its first reading in May 2002 of nine new strategic corridors, identified by the High Level Group, as well as the extension of eight existing projects. These new projects and the proposed extensions are required to adapt the TEN-Ts to the needs of an enlarged Europe. The methodology used by the High Level Group to identify the required projects and the degree of Member State participation in

¹ Trans-frontier projects have suffered in the past from the problems inherent in procedures dealing with differing national regulations and procedures.

² COM(2002)542.

³ Trans-European Transport Networks.

that procedure, which guarantees their commitment to completion, meets with the approval of your rapporteur, who recommends that the list be accepted without change.

Secondly, the Commission's amendments are aimed at supplying the legal provisions necessary to allow the development of 'motorways of the sea' as well as the rationalisation and simplification of procedures undertaken in the context of cross-border projects. These highly laudable aims also meet with your rapporteur's general approval and therefore he has proposed only small, but nonetheless significant, amendments.

The European Parliament rightly attaches great importance to the TEN-T strategy for it is one of the principal keys to the correct functioning of the internal market. To be competitive in the 21st century, Europe must enjoy a coherent and efficient transport infrastructure adapted to the needs of a Union growing in both size and importance.

With the aim of rationalising procedures and accelerating project implementation, the proposal introduces or develops a number of new ideas. Trans-national projects are to be declared of European interest. In its Introduction and Summary, the Commission points out that experience has shown that the priority projects face a series of problems stemming from lack of funding or organisation of the coordination required between Member States because of their trans-national dimension or the separate project authorisation procedures. Declaring projects to be of European interest will have the effect of giving priority to these projects within the funding rules of the various financial instruments used¹.

With the same aim in view the Commission proposes that certain projects of European interest be given the assistance of a European Coordinator whose tasks are enumerated in Article 17a of the proposal. Whilst the creation of the post of European Coordinator is undoubtedly conducive to speeding up procedures and the realisation of economies of scale, your rapporteur is of the opinion that Parliament, as well as the Member States, should be consulted prior to nomination. The progress reports the Coordinator is required to prepare for the Commission² should also be addressed to Parliament in order to allow it to monitor progress properly.

Furthermore, efforts should be made to ensure that there is no duplication of tasks between the Coordinator and the Commission. Amendments have duly been introduced to address these problems.

In a number of cases the Commission's text fails to recognise the important monitoring and controlling role Parliament must rightfully play in the creation of the trans-European transport network. Thus in Article 19(a) the executive act of withdrawing the classification of a project of European interest from a project requires, in your rapporteur's view, prior consultation of Parliament. Again, in the same article, the communication from Member States concerning the launching of coordinated or trans-national procedures and of the results obtained, should be addressed not only to the Commission but also to Parliament, in accordance with the provisions of the interinstitutional agreement on comitology and in particular, Parliament's right of scrutiny.

¹ Cohesion Fund and ISPA.

² Article 17a para 4 point b).

Your rapporteur was pleased to note that the revised list of priority projects includes the development of 'motorways of the sea'. This development is a clear necessity if Europe is successfully to achieve a realistic modal shift in its transport strategy and avoid the gridlock, which looms on the horizon. However, in your rapporteur's view, Project 21 is too imprecise in its current definition. Consequently, the Commission will be asked to publish, within one year, a list of specific projects, within the outlined corridors, which are susceptible to implementation within the current or forthcoming programming periods.

Article 3(2) of the Commission's revised proposal purports to list the components of the trans-European networks, including airports. In the view of your rapporteur, already expressed during the initial first reading, particular reference should be made to regional airports, which play an increasingly important role in trans-European transport.

Again, in Article 19(a) of the amended text, reference is made to the assessment the Member States concerned are required to make of the impact of the realisation of projects declared to be of European interest on socio-economic factors, the environment and trade. These reports, it is contended, should also take account of the project's impact on the free movement of people and goods.

The construction of large infrastructure projects will always have an impact on the environment. The development of sustainable transport should not however be perceived as discriminatory by favouring one or other mode of transport to the detriment of another. Your rapporteur considers that the specific aims outlined in Article 19(1)(f) of the Commission's text can be achieved by replacing the text of the Commission by a more comprehensive statement.

➤ **CONCLUSION**

Subject to the amendments and reservations mentioned above, your rapporteur recommends that the Commission proposal be adopted with all due speed.