

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2004



2009

Committee on Transport and Tourism

2004/2209(INI)

9.2.2005

OPINION

of the Committee on Transport and Tourism

for the Temporary Committee on Policy Challenges and Budgetary Means of
the Enlarged Union 2007-2013

on the policy challenges and budgetary means of the enlarged Union 2007-
2013
(2004/2209(INI))

Draftsperson: Etelka Barsi Pataky

PA_NonLeg

SUGGESTIONS

The Committee on Transport and Tourism calls on the Temporary Committee on Policy Challenges and Budgetary Means of the Enlarged Union 2007-2013, as the committee responsible, to incorporate the following suggestions in its motion for a resolution:

1. Takes it for granted that the Trans-European Network for Transport (TEN-T), the Galileo, the Marco Polo and the Transport Research and Development projects are central to:
 - the realisation of the objectives agreed in the context of the Lisbon agenda,
 - the completion and effective functioning of the single market in the enlarged European Union,
 - the enhancement of economic and social cohesion by providing a homogenous, integrated transportation network, particularly by integrating the new Member States' networks and improving connections with outlying and island regions,
 - the integration of environmental legislation and sustainable development into the transport sector in accordance with Article 6 of the Treaty,
 - the attainment of the Gothenburg objectives, especially for sustainable growth, environmental protection and decoupling the expectation of economic growth from growth in transport volumes,
 - increasing transport safety,
 - ensuring public transport services.
2. Notes in this context that European Union expenditure on these projects provides real added value since it acts as well as acting as a catalyst for Member State and private expenditure on certain transport infrastructure projects. Regards an early definition (possibly in 2005) and a long-term EU financial commitment as essential for calling on the Member States with regard to their co-financing commitment and on potential private financial partners to be involved in Public Private Partnerships (PPP) in order to facilitate the continuous implementation of TEN-T projects.
3. Draws attention in particular to the need to realise all 30 TEN-T priority projects which are indivisible parts of the same network. Reiterates the importance of an integrated transportation network in the reunified Europe. Emphasises that TEN-T investment is necessary to ensure that the full beneficial effects be gained from the most recent enlargement and that the EU is prepared for future enlargements. Requires action at EU level in order to ensure that the Commission does not grant any EU cofinancing until international treaties necessary for the definition and realisation of pertinent transborder sections are signed by the Member States involved in each transnational section of each TEN-T project.
4. Stresses that in the future it will be of prime importance to place more emphasis on monitoring and evaluating the success of EU transport policies in general and the new agencies in particular. Furthermore, calls for greater attention to be given to finding innovative ways to bring in private sector money.
5. Points out that two necessary conditions for the Galileo project have now been met: interoperability and a management structure that makes it possible to move on to the

project's deployment and exploitation phase; points out that the policy of installing the global infrastructure for radio navigation and satellite positioning in accordance with the plan must now be implemented;

6. Wishes the European Union to be aware of all the implications of the glaring shortfall in implementing the main high-priority TEN-T projects as defined in Decision No 1692/96/EC¹, last amended by Decision No 884/2004/EC²; recalls that the Commission takes the view that carrying out the main high-priority projects alone represents an investment of 220 billion euros between now and 2020, while construction of all the infrastructure provided for in these Decisions would represent an investment of 600 billion euros between now and 2020;
7. Notes that the Marco Polo I programme proved very successful; points out that providing additional resources for the Marco Polo II programme is the logical consequence of this;
8. Notes with concern that the total sum of EUR 20.35 billion allowed for TEN-T assumes an average EU contribution of only 14.5% per project. Further notes that the EU contribution to some of these projects' total costs may be as much as 15%, 30% or even 50% according to proposals from the Commission, but that to reach this level of financing further EU funds should be made available. Reiterates that since 80% of the major projects running up to 2020 relate to non-road modes, where long-term investment is needed, the participation of private capital is unlikely. Therefore calls for the amount proposed for TEN-T to be seen as a minimum which can only be subject to upward revision if and when a new Financial Perspective is agreed.
9. Points to the new needs in terms of priority investment in transport infrastructure which could arise between now and 2013 following the probable enlargement of the Union to include at least 3 more States (Bulgaria, Romania and Croatia); recalls also that the European Union has begun exploratory discussions with neighbouring States on the subject of transport infrastructure and has set up a working party on the subject, which has yet to announce its conclusions;
10. The TEN-T priority projects are of common interest, therefore the realisation of these projects cannot solely depend on the co-financing ability of the individual Member States. Further to the suggestions laid out in the Green Book on Public Private Partnerships, calls on the Commission to develop concrete proposals (e.g. revolving guarantee fund) on how co-financing by Member States and private actors can be enhanced to complement the low EU contribution. Insists on quick approval of the directive on charging heavy goods vehicles for the use of certain infrastructure (the 'Eurovignette' directive) in order to facilitate the involvement of private actors in the financing of TEN-T.
11. In line with the recommendation of the Van Miert group, calls for the creation of a High Level Group to monitor the realisation of TEN-T projects and to make revisions to the list of priority projects in view of the progress of these projects and the available financing; projects with cross-border sections should be given priority treatment in this process.

¹ Decision No 1692/96/EC of the European Parliament and the Council of 23 July 1996 on Community guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network (OJ L 228 of 9.9.1996, p. 1).

² Decision No 884/2004/EC of 29 April 2004 (OJ L 167 of 30.4.2004, p. 1).

Insists on the need to push forward all 30 projects and, with this in mind, calls on the Commission to appoint European coordinators to resolve possible bottlenecks.

12. Recalls the importance of the Cohesion and Structural Funds to the realisation of TEN-T projects but also to other transport infrastructure projects in countries and regions where transport infrastructure is seriously underdeveloped. Stresses that funding from these instruments is limited since not all countries and regions are eligible and because of the 4% cap, and therefore calls for the exclusion of TEN-T funding for priority projects when calculating the 4% cap. Underlines the strategic importance of transport networks for the EU in its relations with candidate and pre-candidate countries in the development of the EU's neighbourhood policy. Notes that in this as in other areas the connection of transport networks underpins the development of trade and investment and thereby promotes sustainability and stability and also social, economic and geographical cohesion. Calls for adequate funding for the development of transport inter-connections and common infrastructure with these countries.
13. Stresses the importance of increasing the budget for the Marco Polo programme to reduce road congestion undermining the productivity of the EU economy. Notes that market-oriented programmes are important to encourage industry, including SMEs, to invest in multimodal freight logistics for the management of its supply chains. With reference to the objectives set out in the White Paper on Transport Policy 2010, recalls the urgent need to restore the balance between transport modes and/or avoid transportation in order to achieve a sustainable transport policy.
14. Reiterates the important role that the new transport agencies for aviation, maritime and rail modes play in the co-ordination of administration and the effective implementation of EU law and policies. Notes in particular their responsibilities for transport safety and their contribution to environmental protection. Therefore insists that adequate provision for their funding be provided for in the Financial Perspective under heading 5 in order that their respective responsibilities as recently established in law can be fully discharged.
15. Insist that adequate funding must be provided at the appropriate time for the Galileo project on account of its strategic importance, its cost-effectiveness and its high European added value, on account of the benefits which it brings to such important sectors of the economy as agriculture, fisheries, the environment, external relations and development, and on account of the fact that they are crucial to transport-policy objectives such as safety, interoperability and intermodality, the use of new technologies, improved logistics and the transition to more sustainable forms of transport.
16. Calls for the creation of a specific budget line with a sum of at least € 1 billion to finance the deployment and commercial operation phase of the Galileo programme, with the conditions to be set in the forthcoming Regulation of the European Parliament and the Council (COD/2004/0156).
17. Supports the considerable increase in funding for research and development and emphasises the importance of research on sustainable surface transport aimed at achieving greater sustainability and safety as well as better interoperability and intermodality in the

field of transport.

18. Recalls the importance of tourism to the European economy to the European natural and cultural heritage and to particular countries and regions where it is an economic and social mainstay. Draws attention to the significance which may be attached to the fact that tourism has been included in the text of the European Constitution in such a way as to create a legal basis for granting the EU powers which it may use in order to engage in supporting, coordinating or supplementary activities relating to tourism. Reiterates its concern that no budget line to assist in the development of tourism has been established to reflect this new challenge and insists that the Financial Perspective, in planning for the future, provide for adequate levels of EU support for tourism through the establishment of a dedicated budget line and for sustainable economic development and natural and cultural heritage protection through and for tourism, supported where appropriate by the Structural Funds and other funds. Considers that, along with Objective 1 regions, Objective 2 regions could also be eligible for these funds. Insists that projects to assist in the development of tourism be eligible for funding from the Growth Adjustment Fund, once it is created.
19. Insists that the new structure of the Financial Perspective with only five headings provides the necessary flexibility and gives enough room for manoeuvre for unforeseen events. Therefore raises concern about the Commission proposal for a new reallocation flexibility instrument and the creation of the Growth Adjustment Fund. Insists that, as TEN-T projects are long-term infrastructural investments where stability is crucial, if funds earmarked for transport projects are to be transferred to these instruments they be treated separately and be used only to fund transport projects, otherwise the realisation of projects that are necessary to make Europe more competitive would be threatened.
20. Considers that the decommitment of commitments under N+2 should be reviewed in the revision under the TENs financial instrument and that the possibility of introducing N+3 should be considered though this should be strictly limited to the cross-border elements of the TEN-T projects.

PROCEDURE

Title	The policy challenges and budgetary means of the enlarged Union 2007-2013
Procedure number	2004/2209(INI)
Committee responsible	FINP
Committee asked for its opinion Date announced in plenary	TRAN 15.9.2004
Enhanced cooperation	
Drafts(wo)man Date appointed	Etelka Barsi Pataky 18.10.2004
Discussed in committee	24.11.2004 1.2.2005
Date suggestions adopted	2.2.2005
Result of final vote	for: 32 against: 9 abstentions: 4
Members present for the final vote	Margrete Auken, Etelka Barsi Pataky, Philip Bradbourn, Sylwester Chruszcz, Paolo Costa, Michael Cramer, Arūnas Degutis, Armando Dionisi, Petr Duchoň, Saïd El Khadraoui, Robert Evans, Emanuel Jardim Fernandes, Luis de Grandes Pascual, Mathieu Grosch, Ewa Hedkvist Petersen, Jeanine Hennis-Plasschaert, Stanisław Jałowiecki, Georg Jarzembowski, Dieter-Lebrecht Koch, Jaromír Kohlíček, Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou, Jörg Leichtfried, Fernand Le Rachinel, Bogusław Liberadzki, Evelin Lichtenberger, Erik Meijer, Ashley Mote, Michael Henry Nattrass, Robert Navarro, Josu Ortuondo Larrea, Reinhard Rack, Luca Romagnoli, Gilles Savary, Ingo Schmitt, Renate Sommer, Dirk Sterckx, Ulrich Stockmann, Gary Titley, Georgios Toussas, Marta Vincenzi
Substitutes present for the final vote	Johannes Blokland, Zita Gurmai, Anne Elisabet Jensen, Francesco Musotto
Substitutes under Rule 178(2) present for the final vote	Garrelt Duin