



COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

Brussels, 2.10.2001
COM(2001) 544 final

2001/0229 (COD)

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**

(presented by the Commission)

EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM

1.	Introduction	3
1.1.	The role of the trans-European network and the guidelines	4
1.2.	Delays in completion	5
1.3.	The continued existence of bottlenecks	7
1.4.	The limits to the road network	7
1.5.	The need to revise the guidelines	7
2.	The scope of the revision	8
2.1.	Medium-term priorities to optimise network capacity	8
2.2.	The specific projects	11
2.2.1.	Progress made and where encouragement is needed	11
2.2.2.	Methods and criteria for selection of new projects	12
2.2.3.	New projects	13
2.2.4.	Modified existing projects	16
2.2.5.	Economic implications	17
2.3.	Technical changes to the outline plans	17
2.4.	Strategic environmental analysis: an instrument for developing the network	18
2.5.	Links to third countries	19
3.	Preparing for the next revision	20

1. INTRODUCTION

A unified European network is essential to guarantee genuine freedom of movement of goods and persons, to bring the outlying, island and land-locked areas closer to the central regions and to create a bridge towards the countries of Eastern Europe and the Mediterranean basin. If the infrastructure necessary is not completed and interlinked to enable trade to be conducted, the internal market and the territorial cohesion of the European Union will remain ideas that have failed to come to full fruition.

The trans-European networks have gradually arisen as one of the driving forces for the achievement of growth, competitiveness and employment. In 1990, the Council adopted an outline initial plan for high-speed railway lines put forward by the Commission. Through the inclusion in the Treaty of Maastricht of a Title on trans-European networks, the Community was given the powers and instruments for their development. Since then, the European Council, in particular the December 1994 Essen Council, and the European Parliament have given a number of decisive political incentives by adopting a list of fourteen priority projects. A number of financial instruments have been set up at Community level and by the European Investment Bank in order to conduct this policy, in particular a specific budget for the funding of the trans-European network.

Following a proposal by the Commission in 1994 laying down initial plans for a multimodal transport network, the European Parliament and the Council adopted Decision No 1692/96/EC on guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network (TEN-T) by 2010. This decision groups together, in a single reference framework, the priority projects initially adopted by the European Council and the outline plans for identifying other projects of common interest. Article 21 of the decision contains a revision clause under which the Commission is required to submit a report after five years indicating whether the guidelines should be adapted to take account of "economic development and technological developments in the field of transport, in particular in rail transport".

Since then, the Parliament and the Council on 22 May 2001 amended the outline plans to incorporate seaports and inland ports (Decision No 1346/2001/EC). For its part, the Commission has published a White Paper on the European transport policy for 2010.¹ The White Paper is the report referred to above. It states that, because of the delays in completing certain network projects, the saturation on numerous main routes, the gradual opening of the rail transport markets and foreseeable traffic growth, the revision already planned for the TEN-T guidelines must aim to reduce the bottlenecks in the planned or existing network without adding new infrastructure routes. The White Paper also makes clear that in 2004 the guidelines will need to be redefined to take account of enlargement and to provide a more accurate reflection of changes in traffic flows.

For its part, in order to promote sustainable transport, the European Council invited the Community institutions to adopt by 2003 revised guidelines for the trans-European transport network giving priority to infrastructure investment in particular

¹ COM (2001)370

for railways, inland waterways, short sea shipping, intermodal operations and effective interconnections.

This Communication therefore sets out the detailed changes which the Commission proposes to make to Decision No 1692/96/EC to update the guidelines. The amendments proposed are made in the light of the White Paper on the European transport policy and the Göteborg European Council, as well as a series of consultations with the Article 18 Committee and the parties concerned. These amendments are the first step in a process in which the next step will be to define, based upon a new proposal in 2004, new outline plans to cope with the evolution of the Union's policy priorities, including enlargement.

1.1. The role of the trans-European network and the guidelines

The original idea of the trans-European network goes back to the beginning of the 1990s. The high-speed rail and combined transport networks, for which most countries did not have national plans, were the subject of traffic studies carried out across the whole of Europe on the basis of the data available at the time, which served to lay the foundations for a network covering the entire continent. However, with regard to road and conventional rail infrastructure, the work of the experts has largely consisted in collating the existing national plans and filling in a number of missing links. The priority projects were adopted by Parliament and the Council on the basis of the work of the Heads of State and Government, which brought together the national priorities of Community interest, at the Essen European Council and subsequently the Dublin European Council.

Today, the network is made up of some 75 185 km of roads, 20 609 km of which are planned, 79 440 km of conventional and high-speed railway lines, 23 005 km of which are planned, 381 airports, 273 international seaports and 210 inland ports. In addition, the network includes traffic management, user information and navigation systems.² This infrastructure is used to move 40% of goods carried by road and more than half of rail freight traffic. The networks of airports and high-speed rail lines, the latter alone already representing 16% of total passenger rail traffic, account for an increasing share of total passenger traffic.

Since their task is to carry international traffic, the major network routes defined in the guidelines also serve as a reference in other Community legislation which has been introduced (directives on rail interoperability) or is being prepared (proposal for harmonisation of the bans on the movement of heavy goods vehicles in the trans-European network).

By defining priorities at the Community level, the guidelines for the development of the trans-European network make it possible to channel Community funding towards projects with a high Community added value. Payments from the Structural Funds, the Cohesion Fund, the budget heading for the trans-European networks and the European Investment Bank are therefore coordinated with each other, but also with payments from the Member States, the regions and the private sector.

² Taking account of the changes introduced by this proposal.

The major cross-border projects of the last decade, such as the Channel Tunnel, the high-speed line between Brussels and Paris and the bridge/tunnel between Sweden and Denmark, send out signals to the citizens of the European Union that European integration is progressing. The trans-European network is also a key instrument for economic, social and territorial cohesion.

The latest report on economic and social cohesion highlighted the progress made in recent years to provide regions whose development is lagging behind and cohesion countries with infrastructure almost on a par with that of other regions and countries, primarily with the aid of the structural financial instruments. While the trans-European network seems to be fulfilling its role in connecting outlying areas to the central areas in Spain, Portugal, Greece and Ireland, there is still work to be done to link the peripheral, mainly cohesion countries to the economic centre of the European Union. Travelling to other outlying and island areas, in particular the outermost areas and parts isolated from the outlying areas, depends on there being suitable ports and airports. However, it must also be borne in mind that the accessibility of these areas depends on many other factors as well, such as whether airlines and shipping or rail companies are prepared to offer accessible, high-quality services, though this goes beyond the framework of the infrastructure policy.

Furthermore, the European Spatial Development Perspective³ has shown that, in addition to the concern to provide infrastructure for regions whose economic development is lacking behind, it is now necessary to ensure a better distribution of transport flows throughout the Community area in order to ensure balanced development, to relieve the pressure on the central areas and to include the outlying areas in trade flows. The trans-European network policy's contribution to cohesion must therefore no longer simply be concerned with the need to connect the island, landlocked and outlying areas to the central areas of the Community but must also help to fulfil new requirements for the balanced development of the Community, such as the creation of new cross-border areas, by providing major infrastructure, in particular to overcome natural barriers and to restore the balance between the main shipping ports.

Lastly, the network will provide links to countries bordering the EU and in particular create a bridge to the candidate countries.

The trans-European network accounts for almost half of total goods and passenger traffic in the EU. Community action is making it possible to coordinate Community and national investment in projects which have added value at the European level. The network serves as a reference point for other Community legislation and is highly visible to EU citizens. It is a land-use planning instrument and enables links to countries bordering the EU to be improved.

1.2. Delays in completion

Sadly, work is not advancing as rapidly as expected when the idea of trans-European networks was launched. In the White Paper on growth, competitiveness and

³ European Spatial Development Perspective - Towards balanced and sustainable development of the territory of the European Union, agreed at the informal Council Meeting for Spatial Planning in Potsdam, 1999. Luxembourg.

employment, the Commission estimated the financial resources needed at the time at €400 billion, including €110 billion for the Essen priority projects alone. However, the Commission did make it quite clear that, in view of the low level of Community funding available, most of the funding for the projects would have to come from the Member States.

Today, the pace of investment seems to be too slow. In 1996-97, investment in the trans-European network projects was about €38 billion.⁴ If the rate of funding does not increase between now and 2010, there is a very serious likelihood that the network will not be fully completed, in particular the railway and inland waterway components.

In 1999, only 2 726 km of high-speed railway lines were operational. According to the most optimistic timetables for projects at the design or construction stage, about 8 400 km of high-speed railway lines will have come into service by 2010. It will therefore take about a further ten years to complete all the 12 600 km planned in the present guidelines. For the conventional railway network, most of the lines already exist. Investment is therefore generally aimed at improving quality and capacity, but it is much more difficult to get an overall view of the progress made. For inland waterways, the shortfall in funding is estimated at 40% and there are serious delays to some projects that are essential to improve links between the main river basins, such as making the Danube more navigable between Vilshofen and Straubing. This contrasts sharply with the road network, which is well on target for completion. Since 1996, 4 518 km⁵ of new and upgraded roads or motorways have been opened. The timetable for the work indicates that most of the road links planned will be completed by 2010.

The longest delays are generally on cross-border projects since the Member States have given priority funding to the national sections of the trans-European network in their investment decisions. These delays can mainly be attributed to the lack of an integrated approach to the planning, assessment and funding of cross-border infrastructures.

The scarcity of government funding has been accompanied by a general slowdown in infrastructure investment from 1.5% in the 1970s to about 1% of GDP in 1995. On top of this there has been the difficulty of deciding on the priorities for a very large number of projects. The Community's budgetary resources and legal means do not enable it to do anything on its own to speed up these cross-border projects since, under the Treaty, the national authorities are responsible for the implementation of a project on the territory of a Member State.

There are major delays in the completion of the network, in particular as regards cross-border projects. If transport infrastructure funding by Member States, the Community and other investors is not focused more specifically on the sections of the trans-European network, it is questionable whether the network can be completed according to the original timetable, i.e. by 2010.

⁴ This represents about one-quarter of total investment in overall transport infrastructure during this period (cf. COM(1998)176).

⁵ Not including Greece and Luxembourg.

1.3. The continued existence of bottlenecks

The White Paper on the European transport policy contains an analysis that highlights the economic changes which are creating additional imbalance in the transport system from one year to the next. During the last ten years, the excessive use made of roads for the transport of goods, the tremendous expansion in travel by air and the shortcomings in the rail freight system, in particular as regards infrastructure, have sharply increased congestion on the roads, on the railways and in the skies. There is a growing imbalance between transport modes, but also between various parts of the network since traffic growth is spread unevenly across the Community. In some transit areas, such as the mountain areas of the Pyrenees and the Eastern Alps, the annual growth in road traffic is over 10%.

Despite past efforts to develop trans-European infrastructure, bottlenecks continue to exist in Europe and have become a cause of major concern in some areas. According to information from the Member States, 7 500 km of roads (10% of the road network) and more than 16 000 km of railways (nearly 20% of the rail network) are regarded as bottlenecks or subject to technical restrictions (inadequate axle load-carrying capacity, no radio system, etc.). As for air transport, more than one flight in three is over 15 minutes late.

The areas most seriously affected are the international corridors in which North-South trans-European traffic is highly concentrated, natural barriers such as the Alps and the Pyrenees, the outskirts of major conurbations and trading centres in which long-distance, regional and local traffic meet and are concentrated and a certain number of EU borders, in particular those with the accession countries. The central areas are seriously affected, but so are certain outlying areas whose low-capacity infrastructure rapidly becomes saturated.

1.4. The limits to the road network

Opportunities for creating new capacity by building more roads are limited and offer only a temporary solution to the problem of network saturation. In the main European corridors, space is at a premium. In some areas, local residents are very concerned about pollution due to road traffic.

Against this background, efforts to modernise the Community road network, which started back in the 1990s, should focus on new priorities. These should be concentrated initially on **traffic management and user information systems** to optimise infrastructure capacity by better regulation of traffic flows throughout the day and throughout the network. On routes which are close to saturation, work is needed to improve **safety**, in particular in tunnels. In certain isolated or outlying areas, particularly on the Union's **borders** with the accession countries, some missing links still have to be filled in.

1.5. The need to revise the guidelines

The Commission's approach hitherto for dealing with increases in traffic has been to develop the multimodal dimension of the network in order to boost the overall capacity. This is how inland ports and seaports came to be incorporated into the network outline plans.

In view of the delays in completing the planned network, the Commission considers that a headlong rush to create new infrastructure routes cannot be the answer to the capacity requirements. The planned revision of the guidelines must instead confirm that it is necessary to complete what was decided in 1996 by focusing Community activities and projects on reducing the bottlenecks on major routes and on a small number of major projects.

2. THE SCOPE OF THE REVISION

The proposal to amend Decision No 1692/96/EC therefore chiefly concerns the Community's priorities for action and the list of specific projects. The changes to maps are technical only. The revision also provides an opportunity to update certain of the provisions, in to take more account of environmental concerns in future network extensions.

2.1. Medium-term priorities to optimise network capacity

The purpose of the changes is to refocus the priorities for Community action on measures which are most likely to provide a rapid but sustainable response to the problem of bottlenecks.

Article 5 proposes reducing the number of priorities for Community action but also adding four new ones: measures to achieve a rail freight network, encourage short sea and inland waterway shipping and promote integration between air and rail, and measures concerning intelligent transport systems.

Measures to create a rail network giving priority to freight

Although the physical characteristics of railways make them highly suitable as a mass transport system for freight, **little use is made of this asset**: the share of the market in rail freight in Europe has been falling for several decades and the volume of freight carried has been stagnating despite expansion in the market. One of the reasons for this is that European rail infrastructure is not adapted to high-intensity transportation of goods, and in particular is not suitable for combined use by both goods trains and passenger trains.

In the USA, the railways lead the freight transport market with a 40% market share. North American rail companies are able to diversify their systems, in particular by transporting containers "double-stacked" on top of each other and by making up train sets which are sometimes more than 2 000 metres in length. There are almost no passenger trains which would be an impediment to freight train transit, so goods can be transported long distances at rates which are competitive with lorries. In the European Union, this type of railway operation is impossible because of the high number of very low bridges and tunnels, the shortness of loop lines, the maximum permissible draw-bar loads, gauge constraints⁶ and the extremely high density of passenger train traffic on the outskirts of conurbations.

While it is not possible to devise a complete rail network for freight only, **investments must be aimed at developing trans-European corridors for use by**

⁶ The electrification of lines limits height clearance to 4.5 metres.

freight trains on a priority basis. These should consist chiefly of existing lines on which priority is given to freight or even dedicated freight lines. Without increasing the actual speed of freight trains, the ability of these trains to cover long distances without having to stop to allow passenger trains to pass would increase commercial speeds, the punctuality of point-to-point routing and line capacity all at the same time. In areas with a high traffic density, the separation of freight trains from passenger trains must be the guiding principle for the re-development and re-structuring of the network and may require the construction of new infrastructure. In other areas, this separation is likely to involve making different use of land by finding alternative low-traffic routes or even reviving abandoned infrastructure. On some lines, separation will require improvements to allow a better mixed use of the infrastructure (passing areas, increase in capacity, in particular by means of signalling and control-command systems).

The present guidelines already define outline plans for a conventional rail network and combined transport. Trans-European corridors which give priority to freight should be developed on the basis of these two networks in order to gradually establish a network dedicated to freight.

Separation should also be able to benefit from the capacity freed up on conventional lines as a result of the gradual development of the European high-speed rail network. The continuation of programmes for high-speed rail is therefore not incompatible with the creation of a freight network: on the contrary, it is part of the same drive to increase the capacity of the rail network as a whole. As a general rule, the promoters of high-speed rail projects should make sure that they lead to the freeing-up of track previously used by passenger trains so it can be used more easily by goods trains. They should also try to achieve maximum complementarity with air transport.

Lastly, the **terminals** through which goods are routed to their final destinations are major bottlenecks. In terminals open to all operators, public incentive investment in marshalling yards and transshipment equipment may play an important part in increasing capacity. The intermodal terminals for combined transport are already part of the combined transport network. This is a very good thing since the transportation of containers and swap bodies is the market sector displaying the highest growth. This proposal brings other freight terminals into the rail network.

Apart from specifically referring in Article 5 to measures to promote the completion of a rail network which gives priority to freight, the Commission proposes to modify the definition of the rail network in Article 10 to emphasise the part it must play in the carriage of freight and to incorporate the freight terminals. Furthermore, 2460 km of existing or planned lines are being added to the outline plan for the rail network.

Measures to promote short sea shipping and the use of inland waterways

It is essential for the development of short sea shipping and the use of inland waterways to provide ports with high-capacity rail access since their success depends on the quality of service provided in the port's hinterland. Seaports and inland ports have now been incorporated into the outline plans for the trans-European network. Recognising the shared interest in these ports is certainly a step forward, but this is not enough to allow for genuine cooperation between rail operators and shipping or inland waterway operators. A large number of **rail links to ports** still need to be built or upgraded before the full benefit can really be drawn from the potential

offered by **short sea** shipping and the use of inland waterways. Rail links to inland ports will in particular enhance the complementary nature of rail and inland waterway transport rather than intensify competition between the two modes. The marked progress in the use of traffic management systems and electronics in data exchange should also make it easier to use these modes.

Measures to promote integration between rail and air

Rail connections (high-speed lines, conventional lines and urban services) to airports enable complementarity between rail and air to be developed. In particular, rail links between high-speed lines and the main international airports should enable the capacity of the airport and rail networks to be optimised. On many routes, high-speed trains are in fact a very attractive alternative to flying in terms of time, price and comfort, especially if the time it takes to get to airports from city centres is taken into account. Furthermore, integration between the high-speed rail network and airports could provide benefits for fast freight transport, in particular express courier services.

To bring about this complementarity, rail companies, airlines and airport managers should therefore be encouraged to cooperate on rail and air services. **Investments which help to combine the rail network, in particular high-speed trains, and air transport should therefore be encouraged.** In some cases, this could mean railway stations at airports, in others baggage check-in terminals in railway stations. Other infrastructure or equipment could be considered to encourage the combination of systems and services for passenger information, reservations, ticketing and baggage transport which make it easier for passengers to switch from one mode to the other.

Apart from specifically referring to rail access to airports to promote complementarity between rail and air in Article 5, the Commission proposes a new definition of the airport network in Article 13 aimed at bringing about greater linkage between the airport network and high-speed rail lines.

Measures for intelligent transport systems

Intelligent transport systems, i.e. traffic management, user information and satellite navigation and positioning systems, offer considerable potential for improving network capacity and safety. The present guidelines and the projects of common interest identified in the guidelines for trans-European telecommunications networks (Decision No 1336/97/EC) already include these systems in the network and some of them are at an advanced phase of deployment. However, information and communication technologies are developing so rapidly that their coordinated deployment at Community level must be guaranteed more effectively. If this is not done, there is the likelihood of a patchwork of fragmented regional and national services developing, which would harm the proper functioning of the internal market and the trans-European network.

Community action must therefore aim at achieving maximum technical **interoperability** between systems, in particular in the fields of traffic management and information services for roads, air traffic management, and railway traffic management. This will require the adoption of plans for the deployment of intelligent transport systems along the main routes and should take the form of selective Community action on projects which are most likely to meet the objectives of safety and capacity improvement, but which also take account of existing interoperability

standards. For large-scale project implementation, the Community must also plan to make a substantial commitment, be it to satellite radio navigation (Galileo) or to rail traffic management (ERTMS).

2.2. The specific projects

The guidelines decision identifies a very wide range of projects of common interest. From among these many projects, Annex III contains the list of "specific projects" to which the Essen and Dublin European Councils in 1994 and 1996 attached particular importance. These projects, which are at varying stages of development, were regarded as needing a bigger commitment on the part of the Community. At Essen, however, the Heads of State and Government recognised the need to update the list regularly, something that the Commission has never yet proposed. Of the 14 "specific" projects, three have now been completed and six others, in the construction phase, should be finished by 2005. The present proposal therefore introduces a number of changes to the list in Annex 3. This amendment is also for institutional reasons, and on grounds of budget management and sustainable development.

Failing any proposal to amend the Annex, there is likely to be a serious institutional imbalance to Parliament's disadvantage. Strictly speaking, the current Annex lists the projects adopted by the European Councils of Essen and Dublin in 1994 and 1996 respectively on the basis of the report by the group composed of the personnel representatives of the Heads of State and Government chaired by Mr Christophersen. Parliament always rightly considered that this Annex had eluded its power of co-decision and expressed the desire to have an opportunity to revise the list. Immediately after the Dublin European Council, the Transport Commissioner announced to Parliament his intention of making a corresponding proposal on the occasion of the next revision.

The political importance of the priority projects is such that they account for over half the budget earmarked for the trans-European network and a substantial part of the Cohesion Fund. Updating the list of priority projects will enable this contribution to focusing and simplifying the management of Community funding to continue.

The proposed list of specific projects is intended to take account of progress to date by removing from the list projects that have been completed, to re-affirm the importance for the Community of the Alpine projects which are experiencing difficulties, and to add six new projects and new sections to two existing projects. The Commission considers that implementation of these projects should have priority in the interests of an efficient, coherent trans-European network that makes a greater contribution to sustainable development. It believes that political and financial support from the Community in defining, launching or completing these projects may be decisive before the next revision due to be proposed in 2004 takes effect.

2.2.1. *Progress made and where encouragement is needed*

The three completed projects should be taken off the list, these being: Malpensa airport, the Öresund bridge/tunnel and the conventional rail link between Cork and Belfast. The two projects which involve the construction of long Alpine tunnels are experiencing difficulties due to technical and financial uncertainty and the timetable. Despite these difficulties, these two projects, the *Lyon-Turin tunnel and the*

Brenner tunnel, are essential for the development of intermodality in the Alps. These projects, which in the long term may help to reduce the risk of any further increase in road traffic (safety, environment), are especially important for the Community.

2.2.2. *Methods and criteria for selection of new projects*

The new "specific" projects proposed in this decision have been selected by the Commission on the basis of projects in progress or at the design stage which already appear in the outline plans of the guidelines adopted in 1996 and concerning which the Member States and the European Parliament have expressed particular interest.

Since these projects are already considered to be projects of common interest as defined in the guidelines decision, the Commission has been able to follow their development very closely, and has awarded financial support to most of them. This has made it possible to identify projects experiencing particular difficulties in making progress or uncertainties which could be resolved with support or a political debate at European level.

However, two projects constitute an exception as they do not yet appear as such as projects of common interest in the guidelines. They are the Galileo satellite radionavigation project and the project across the central Pyrenees. The Galileo project, which calls for intensive coordination at European level and clearly aims to make use of tremendous developments in information technologies, has been the subject of repeated requests by Council and Parliament. The project concerning the Pyrenees, is in response to a request formulated by Parliament in 1996 with a view to establishing new links in the Pyrenees.

On the basis of studies carried out by the Member States and by itself, and regular discussions with the Member States, in particular within the Article 18 Committee, the Commission has assessed how each request fulfils the following three conditions:

- 1) The project's feasibility given its degree of advancement:
 - The degree of commitment of the Member States concerned
 - The project's potential cost-effectiveness
- 2) The contribution to the objectives of the White Paper:
 - The contribution to reducing bottlenecks, including problems linked to the lack of interoperability.
 - The contribution to sustainable development and, as indicated by the Göteborg European Council, to modal rebalancing and to infrastructure investments for the railways and inland waterways.
 - Preparation for enlargement.
- 3) The Community dimension:

- The strategic value for the Community (scale of the project, crossing of natural barriers, technological autonomy of the Union)
- The accelerating role or facilitating role that the Community can play to resolve difficulties (financing, cross-border coordination).
- The degree of urgency of action at Community level (status of the works, urgent need for cross-border coordination, financial needs).

The projects that the Commission has considered are at very varying stages of advancement; some are in the construction phase, others at the technical design stage, while others are still the subject of environmental, economic or financial studies. A decisive factor in choosing projects has therefore been to identify the ones going through a critical phase in their lives and calling for special attention at Community level.

The Commission has also endeavoured to strike a balance in the choice of projects and their geographical scope, while taking account of their contribution to the various criteria. Consequently, each of the criteria does not apply homogeneously. The Commission has made its choice after examining how a project meets the criteria as a whole and not by applying each of the criteria to all the projects.

It should be stressed that the Commission has examined alternatives where it has been presented with projects which are the subject of studies or work in the Member States. In this examination, in accordance with Article 155 of the Treaty, the Commission has taken account of the projects' potential economic viability.

2.2.3. *New projects*

A high-capacity rail link through the Pyrenees: This project does not appear in the current guidelines. The Parliament voted for four amendments concerning crossings through the Pyrenees on the second reading of the guidelines decision approved in 1996. In accordance with its commitment, the Commission examined the merits of those amendments. It came out that if nothing is done to improve passage through the Pyrenees, major bottlenecks may develop in that region owing to the long-haul traffic using this route, half of which consists of trade in goods between the Iberian Peninsula and countries beyond the French borders. Studies by the Franco-Spanish centre which monitors trans-Pyrenean traffic have shown that more than 15 000 heavy goods vehicles cross the two ends of this mountain range every day and that this traffic is increasing all the time at a very high rate (+ 10% per year). As early as 1998, flows between the Iberian Peninsula and the rest of Europe amounted to 144 million tonnes a year (77 by road, 63 by sea and 4.4 by rail). The centre estimates that by 2010-2015 an additional 100 million tonnes will have to be distributed between the various modes. The improvement of existing lines and completion of the *TGV South* will enable capacity to be increased in the medium term, on top of which there is the potential of short sea shipping. The capacity of short sea shipping to provide a genuine solution depends, however, on whether operators can gain the confidence of shippers. In this connection, new rail capacity will have to be harnessed, in particular through the central Pyrenees. **The Commission therefore proposes including, in the current revision of the guidelines on the trans-European network, a high-capacity rail link through the**

Pyrenees as a "specific" project, the route being left to agreement between the countries concerned.

A project of this nature will take between 10 and 20 years to complete. In view of the pressure of traffic and the expectations of the local communities affected, **coordinated studies on this project should be launched as soon as possible**, which should help get it included in the list.

In this context, there is the question of upgrading the existing line between Pau and Saragossa via Canfranc in order to improve passage through the Pyrenees in the shorter term. Despite its low capacity as regards long-term foreseeable needs,⁷ the advantage of this line is to be able to use the present tunnel and to encourage shippers and hauliers to gear their logistics chain to this future high-capacity crossing. It has therefore been proposed to include this line in the outline plan for conventional rail in the present revised guidelines in view of the request which has come from the governments of the two countries concerned. Apart from ensuring that this project will cause the minimum environmental disturbance to the area of the Pyrenees concerned, the Commission will see to it that any financial aid it gives serves as an incentive to develop a high-capacity route that is part of a long-term programme, the economic viability of which is guaranteed and which is the subject of cross-border coordination.

Decisive selection criteria: This project, which is the subject of preliminary studies, was requested by Parliament in 1996. The two countries concerned have already agreed to advance the studies at the Franco-Spanish ministerial seminar on 12 July 2001 in Toulouse. This project should have major positive socio-economic effects. It will make it possible to remove many bottlenecks in the Pyrenees and rebalance the modal split in this sensitive region. Aid from the Community is particularly important initially in order to promote the launching of coordinated economic and environmental studies.

It will also be necessary to rethink the question of a future Pyrenean road link which, for reasons of environmental impact, cost and acceptance by local residents, should ensure that piggyback transport is adopted.

Global satellite radionavigation and positioning system (Galileo): This **global programme**, which has a great deal of potential for traffic management and information for users of the trans-European network as well as offering numerous applications in sectors other than transport, requires an intensive phase of development up to 2005 followed by a deployment phase with a view to operation from 2008. Community support to this project is decisive and must be reflected as soon as possible in the revised guidelines for the trans-European network.

Decisive selection criteria: The European Council, in particular in Stockholm and Lisbon, stressed the importance of the Galileo satellite navigation programme. The EU has already given a broad commitment to support this project both financially and in terms of technical coordination. The project meets the objectives of the White

⁷ The line will only be able to carry 2.8 million tonnes, which will be 1.5% of the traffic across the Pyrenees by 2010-2015, and is subject to major operating restrictions due to high gradients.

Paper as regards fully exploiting the potential of the new technologies. Its scale and unique strategic nature give it a very considerable Community dimension.

High-speed train/combined transport in Eastern Europe: For historical reasons, there has been little development of West-to-East links between EU Member States and the candidate countries. However, trade with these countries is already generating significant traffic flows. On the rail corridor along the Danube, more than 60% of traffic is already international. The forecasts point to sustained growth in traffic. It is therefore necessary to facilitate the development of a **new high-capacity West-to-East rail link** for freight and passengers. It is therefore proposed adding the East European high-speed train/combined transport project from Stuttgart-Munich to Salzburg/Linz–Vienna to the list of priority projects. This project involves 713 km of track to be upgraded or laid for high-speed trains and goods transport. Numerous sections contain conventional links and high-speed lines running in parallel. With enlargement, it could be extended to Budapest, and even to Bucharest and Istanbul, through projects of mutual interest in the third countries concerned. The project consists of sections which exist or are planned in the guidelines in force. Completion of this project combined with the current *TGV East* (Project No 4) will provide a trans-European rail corridor from Paris to Vienna. Although this link will not be ready in full until 2012, it should be feasible to complete a large stretch of it by 2006. This upgrading of the East-West route would be a positive signal for enlargement and encourage modal rebalancing that cannot be left until the 2004 revision.

Decisive selection criteria: This project, which is in the construction phase, is at a very advanced stage. Its socio-economic benefit on most sections has been established. By transferring part of the road traffic on a rapidly developing West-East corridor, it will contribute to the objectives of the White Paper and help prepare for enlargement. Aid from the Community is needed both in terms of financing and in terms of coordination.

Fehmarn Belt: The bridge/tunnel crossing **the natural barrier of the Fehmarn Belt between Germany and Denmark** is a key link which will complete the North-South route linking Central Europe to the Nordic countries and allow the development of mutual trade. This project, on the route which includes the recently finished Öresund fixed link, is intended to provide a crossing spanning the 19 km-wide Belt. Completion of the project, which is still at the preliminary study stage, should help in the development of the Baltic region. Acceptance of its priority nature in the current revision of the guidelines will permit coordination of the investment decisions being prepared in the countries concerned.

Decisive selection criteria: A technical-financial study, co-financed by the Community, is being carried out jointly by the Member States concerned into private sector interest in helping to finance it. The project which make it possible to decongest the North-South link between the Nordic countries and continental Europe. Its scale and transfrontier nature justify Community action.

Straubing-Vilshofen: This projects concerns improving the navigability of the Danube between Straubing and Vilshofen in Germany. This stretch of the river is too shallow and needs to be dredged over about 70km to allow ships continuous passage. The removal of this bottleneck on the Rhine-Main-Danube route between the North Sea and the Black Sea will enable a large volume of goods traffic to be transferred

from the roads to waterways on this increasingly congested corridor. The project will have to be designed and implemented in accordance with Community environmental legislation and will help to integrate the candidate countries in the European Union and to bring the countries of the Eastern Danube closer to the European Union. Its inclusion in Annex III is therefore necessary in the light of enlargement.

Decisive selection criteria: Studies of variants based on economic and environmental analyses have already been undertaken. It is the only "specific" inland waterway project. It is strategic in order to ease the burden of road traffic and create a favourable context for the development of inland waterway transport on this East-West route on which traffic is likely to increase very considerably as a result of enlargement. Given the possible environmental constraints, recognising this specific project could facilitate the correct application of Community environmental legislation.

Interoperability of the Iberian high-speed rail network: The difference in rail gauge between the Iberian Peninsula and the rest of the trans-European network is a major obstacle to the efficient operation of the entire Community rail transport system. On the basis of the Spanish and Portuguese plans for high-speed lines, which include the construction of new lines and upgrading of existing lines, adaptation of the rail gauge of the Iberian network to **European standards** by 2020 will improve links between Spain and Portugal and the rest of the trans-European network. The development of these networks of high-speed lines will make it possible to free up tracks for the transport of goods. Inclusion of this programme in Annex III will help channel investments, including those already planned by the countries concerned, towards technologies that ensure interoperability **and in the long term will avoid the extra costs to which lack of interoperability gives rise.**

Decisive selection criteria: The Member States concerned have already launched a lot of work and studies. In the long term, this project will avoid additional costs due to the lack of interoperability because of the different track gauges. This rail project will contribute to sustainable development and to the removal of bottlenecks affecting airspace and road traffic. Its strategic and transfrontier character justifies additional action by the Community aimed at deriving greater benefit from the Community financing already provided for.

2.2.4. *Modified existing projects*

It is proposed adding **the mixed freight/high-speed line between Montpellier and Nîmes** to the Mediterranean branch of Project No 3 (*TGV South* Madrid-Barcelona-Montpellier). Completion of this 50-km line will connect the *TGV South* to the Paris-Marseilles route (*TGV Méditerranée*) and facilitate freight flows. Including this section in Annex III will improve the general traffic prospects for Project No 3 and more particularly the profitability of the cross-border section between Perpignan and Figueras and so could facilitate private-sector participation in the financing arrangements.

Decisive selection criteria: This extension has been agreed by the countries concerned. It will improve the economics of Project No 3 and will remove the rail bottleneck between Montpellier and Nîmes, thus making it possible to ensure a continuous rail freeway from Seville to the North of Europe. Strengthening the

Community dimension of this section will send a positive signal to investors on other parts of the route, in particular the Perpignan-Barcelona transfrontier section.

Similarly, it is proposed extending Project No 1, which includes the Munich-Verona Brenner route, to add the **Verona-Naples** railway line and its **Bologna-Milan** branch, giving nearly 830 km of new high-speed lines. This extension will help to bind the project more closely to the major towns and industrial areas of the Italian Peninsula. The project corresponds to investment already in progress or planned by 2007.

Decisive selection criteria: Work is in progress on many sections. The project will make it possible to reduce the pressure of road and air traffic on this route and improve the economic prospects of the Brenner rail tunnel (Project No°1). Its scale and the role of financial partner played by the Community give it a special Community dimension.

2.2.5. *Economic implications*

The Commission has estimated that the new "specific" projects proposed in this decision represent a total investment by the national and regional public authorities, the Community and the private sector of some €66 billion. Some €30 billion of this concerns work already decided by the Member States up to 2012 and hence investment already planned.⁸ Moreover, the indicative multiannual programme of the TEN budget adopted by the Commission on 19 September 2001⁹ already provides for total aid of €822 million for the period 2001-2006.

In accordance with the provisions of the guidelines decision, the design and implementation of the projects will depend on the cost-benefit analyses and more detailed environmental impact studies to be carried out by the relevant national authorities. In particular, any Community funding will be linked to compliance with the particular procedures and assessments of each financial instrument.

2.3. **Technical changes to the outline plans**

Apart from changes to the maps in connection with the new priority projects mentioned, changes to the outline plans have been deliberately kept within limits. There would be no point in changing the outline plans by adding new infrastructure routes only five years after the guidelines came into force given the service life of the infrastructure involved and the general delay already accumulated in implementing the network. After consulting the Article 18 Committee and considering the projects approved by the European Parliament on second reading in 1996 and not included in the outline plans, the maps have been updated to take account only of the following:

- Rail links which were included in the Trans-European Rail Freight Network defined by Directive 2001/12/EC, but did not yet appear in the conventional rail outline plan maps and whose inclusion has been requested by the Member States concerned.

⁸ According to the survey currently being carried out by the Commission for the preparation of the implementation report in accordance with Article 18 of the guidelines.

⁹ Decision C(2001) 2654 final of 19/09/2001

- Rail links to improve connections to short sea shipping or inland waterway ports identified by Decision 1346/2001/EC. Proposed after evaluation of the type and volume of traffic expected and the degree of advancement.
- The Elbe-Lübeck and Twente-Mittelland canals in the inland waterways network, in line with the statement by the Commission¹⁰ when Decision 1346/2001/EC, which integrated ports into the network, was adopted.
- Corrections to maps, including route corrections, the replacement of links by parallel routes, and planned routes erroneously indicated as existing.
- Technical updates, including completed projects, high-speed rail lines which become lines upgraded for high speeds, conventional lines, which become lines to be upgraded for high speeds, the official cancellation of projects (Rhine-Rhone Canal, magnetic levitation link between Berlin and Hamburg) and category changes for airports already considered to be airports of common interest.
- Certain links connecting with the networks of the candidate countries and located in these countries' border areas.

2.4. Strategic environmental analysis: an instrument for developing the network

The directives on environmental impact assessment and the protection of natural habitats ensure that projects of common interest will be developed in an environmentally sound manner. Upstream of the decision-making process, the implementation of Directive 2001/42/EC on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment¹¹ adopted by the European Parliament and the Council on 27 June is a new instrument which should be implemented in the context of the trans-European network. While the time-limit for incorporating the directive into national law is July 2004, the Commission does not wish to defer such environmental impact assessments. It would like use to be made of the transition period to prepare for the most effective possible application of them in the context of the trans-European networks.

In accordance with Article 8 of the present guidelines, the Commission has developed analytical methods for a strategic assessment of the environmental impact of the network and its corridors. The development of these methods in the 4th Framework Programme for Research and Development and in pilot studies on the corridors has made it possible to determine the conditions for using these methods. In particular, a strategic environmental assessment manual for transport infrastructures has been produced. Additional guides in support of the application of the abovementioned directive are being prepared by the Commission.

On the basis of this experience, the Commission will take account in any future proposed revision of the present decision strategic environmental assessments covering sensitive parts of the network in accordance with the abovementioned Directive 2001/42/EC on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and

¹⁰ Commission Statement annexed to Decision No 1346/2001/EC, published in OJ L 185 of 6 July 2001, pp.36.

¹¹ OJ L197, 21.07.2001, pp. 30 - 37.

programmes on the environment adopted by the European Parliament and the Council on 27 June. The Commission will start the preparatory work without delay. It will be assisted in its work by the Committee referred to in Article 18(2). The Member States will supply a certain amount of information required for this work. The analysis will cover the enlarged EU.

The Commission will in particular establish specifications to be met by the new projects/corridors to be proposed by the Member States for inclusion in the network in 2004 covering both new projects and improvements to existing links. These specifications will specify the criteria and type of information that the Commission intends to request from the Member States when they propose projects/corridors in 2004.

When preparing this proposal, the Commission considered to what extent the proposed changes were likely to have environmental repercussions. Most of the changes are chiefly concerned with deriving greater benefit sooner from existing or planned infrastructure involving more environmentally-friendly transport modes that can absorb some of the growth in road traffic. In accordance with the traffic and CO₂ estimates in the White Paper, the proposed changes are part of a broader approach designed to restore the balance between transport modes and reduce the pressure of road traffic. This in turn will mitigate environmental repercussions in general.

The environmental impact studies on the projects or programmes leading to these projects will enable the projects to be designed to take maximum account of their environment. The small number of changes that involve adding new links will specifically make certain strategic environmental impact assessments eligible for Community financial support under the trans-European network heading which would not otherwise qualify for Community support.

The proposed text for the new Article 8 is intended to encourage strategic environmental assessment of future extensions to the network.

2.5. Links to third countries

Following on from the pan-European transport conferences, in particular the Conferences in Crete in 1994 and Helsinki in 1997, the Commission and several of the Member States are supporting the development of 10 pan-European transport corridors and 4 pan-European transport regions. Memorandums of understanding have been signed at government level by the countries crossed and the Commission and should in future facilitate and promote cooperation on each of these corridors and regions.

As part of the enlargement process, the projects for these corridors in the candidate countries for accession are being supported financially by the Commission through the Instrument for Structural Policies for Pre-Accession and TINA.¹² However, the candidate countries' networks do not all have the necessary connections with the European Union's network as defined in the present outline plans of certain Member States. The present proposal includes the necessary links to overcome this.

¹² Transport Infrastructure Needs Assessment.

The Commission will also consider how best to take account of the pan-European dimension of the trans-European transport network during the preparation of future revisions of the guidelines.

The Commission proposes to amend the maps in Annex I in order to facilitate links to the accession countries. Five new links totalling 300km have been added to the outline plans.

3. PREPARING FOR THE NEXT REVISION

In the Commission's first proposal on Community guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network in 1994,¹³ the main objective was to initiate a process designed to provide the Community with tools to achieve a better understanding of the economic and social factors influencing transport demand and its effects, and to adapt its strategy for the trans-European transport network accordingly.

This process must continue. The attached proposal to update the guidelines is a new stage in this process, consisting in focussing efforts in the medium term on a sufficiently small number of priorities and major projects in order to release new capacity without fundamentally altering the outline plans.

However, the Commission believes the present outline plans may soon fail to reflect adequately the reality of European traffic flows and priority needs from a trans-European viewpoint. Enlargement is likely to exacerbate the discrepancies. It does of course take time to change infrastructure networks. The work involved in implementing a project takes several years, sometimes decades, for the technical studies, to secure funding, to obtain permits and to carry out the work itself.

In view of the inertia built into this process, a further step will therefore be to define new outline plans to cope with the evolution of the Union's policy priorities. These outline plans will consist of a small number of high-capacity routes and transport nodes specifically designed to distribute tomorrow's trans-European traffic flows more evenly throughout the territory of a most probably enlarged Union.

The Commission believes that only a network structured in this way will provide genuine added value compared with national networks. The traffic studies and work to define the characteristics of, and the criteria for, the components of this network should be carried out in partnership with the Member States through the Article 18 Committee and with all other parties concerned.

This future revision will make it possible to take account of or clarify any new priorities which may emerge from the national plans several Member States are in the process of drawing up. This will include the updating of the list of priority projects in Annex III, to both refine their content in the light of progress made (this may imply the redefinition of a project, or part of a project), and to reflect the evolution of the Union's policy, including those related to enlargement.

¹³ COM(94)106.

To enable these new outline plans to be in force before the next financial perspective is adopted and to allow time for the necessary studies and consultations, the Commission has set itself the target of putting the corresponding proposal forward in 2004.

This decision does not prejudge the financial commitment of the Community.

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

(Text with EEA relevance)

THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND THE COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION;

Having regard to the Treaty establishing the European Community, and in particular the first paragraph of Article 156 thereof,

Having regard to the proposal from the Commission¹,

Having regard to the opinion of the Economic and Social Committee²,

Having regard to the opinion of the Committee of the Regions³,

Whereas

- (1) The growth in traffic, in particular due to the growing share of heavy goods vehicles, has resulted in increased congestion and bottlenecks on international transport corridors. In order to ensure the mobility of goods and passengers, it is therefore necessary to optimise the capacity of the trans-European transport network, as referred to in Decision No 1692/96/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 July 1996 on Community guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network⁴, as amended by Decision No 1346/2001/EC⁵.
- (2) Requirements for the protection of the environment must be integrated into the definition and implementation of policy in the field of the trans-European networks in accordance with Article 6 of the Treaty. This entails the promotion of modes that cause less damage to the environment, namely rail transport, short sea shipping and inland waterways shipping.
- (3) The Gothenburg European Council has invited the Community institutions to adopt by 2003 revised guidelines for the trans-European transport network, with a view to giving priority, where appropriate, to infrastructure investment for railways, inland waterways, short sea shipping, intermodal operations and effective interconnections.

¹ OJ C , , p. .

² OJ C , , p. .

³ OJ C , , p. .

⁴ OJ L 228, 9.9.1996, p. 1.

⁵ OJ L 185, 6.7.2001, p. 1.

- (4) The Commission White Paper on the European transport policy⁶ calls for an integrated approach combining *inter alia* measures to revitalise the rail sector, in particular for freight services, to promote short sea shipping, to encourage greater complementarity between high speed rail and air transport, to promote the development of interoperable intelligent transport systems to ensure increased network efficiency and safety.
- (5) The efficiency of the common transport policy depends *inter alia* on the coherence between the measures to revitalise the rail sector and to develop the rail infrastructure. Directive 2001/12/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 February 2001 amending Council Directive 91/440/EEC on the development of the Community's railways⁷ provides for a Trans-European Rail Freight Network open to international freight transport services after 2003. The lines of the Trans-European Rail Freight Network should be considered as part of the rail network defined by the guidelines set out in Decision No 1692/96/EC so that they can benefit from investments and attract traffic from the road.
- (6) The second Pan-European Transport Conference in Crete in 1994 and the third Pan-European Transport Conference in Helsinki in 1997 identified ten Pan-European transport corridors and four Pan-European areas as priorities for co-operation between the European Community and the third countries concerned.
- (7) Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Cyprus, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, and Turkey have concluded association and Europe agreements and applied for membership in the European Union. The transport administrations of 11 of those countries, with the support of the Commission, performed a transport infrastructure needs assessment.⁸
- (8) Specific projects n° 9, 10 and 11 of Annex III have been completed.
- (9) The interconnection of the High-speed train south to the rest of the network requires the extension of the project to Nîmes.
- (10) The Brenner axis needs better connections to Italian cities.
- (11) Galileo, a European project for satellite-based radio navigation for civilian purposes, offers a strong potential for the development of navigation, positioning and traffic management applications and services for all modes of transport, as well as for the development of value-added mobility services.
- (12) Immediate actions must be taken to develop a high capacity rail route to transfer road freight traffic to rail and to make transit across the Pyrenees easier in order to handle the sharp traffic increase in that area.
- (13) The growth of international traffic on the west-east route between Stuttgart and Vienna, in particular along the Danube corridor, requires efficient infrastructure.

⁶ COM(2001) 370

⁷ OJ L 075, 15.3.2001 pp. 1 - 25

⁸ PHARE contract 97/0150.00

- (14) The bottleneck between Straubing and Vilshofen on the River Danube seriously hinders traffic on the international inland waterway Rhine-Main-Danube from the North Sea to the Black Sea.
- (15) The lack of interoperability of the Iberian rail network is a major obstacle to achieve an efficient transeuropean rail network.
- (16) The completion of a fixed link between Germany and Denmark should make the Nordic area more accessible.
- (17) Decision No 1692/96/EC should therefore be amended accordingly.

HAVE ADOPTED THIS DECISION:

Article 1

Decision No 1692/96/EC is amended as follows:

(1) Article 5 is replaced by the following:

“Taking into account the objectives set out in Article 2 and the broad lines of measures set out in Article 4, the priorities shall be:

(a) establishment and development of the key links and interconnections needed to eliminate bottlenecks, fill in missing sections, notably their cross-border parts, and improve interoperability on major routes ;

(b) establishment and development of infrastructure making it possible to link island, landlocked, peripheral and outermost regions with the central regions of the Community;

(c) the necessary measures for the gradual achievement of an interoperable rail network giving priority to freight transport, including measures in intermodal terminals ;

(d) establishment of rail infrastructures to ensure connections to ports in order to foster short sea and inland shipping services ;

(e) measures to link rail and air transport, including rail access to airports and the infrastructure and facilities required for air and rail transport services;

(f) deployment of interoperable intelligent transport systems to optimise the capacity of existing infrastructure and improve safety;

(g) integration of safety and environmental concerns in the design and implementation of the trans-European transport network.”

(2) Article 8 is replaced by the following:

“1. When projects are developed and carried out, environmental protection must be taken into account by the Member States through execution of environmental impact assessments of project of common interest which are to be implemented pursuant to Council Directive 85/337/EEC of 27 June 1985 on the assessment of the effects of

certain public and private projects on the environment⁹ and by applying Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora¹⁰.

Where necessary, an environmental assessment of the plans and programmes leading to such projects, in particular those financed by the Community, is implemented by Member States, pursuant to Directive 2001/42/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 June 2001 on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment¹¹.

2. If new routes or other important nodal infrastructure developments are proposed for inclusion in this Decision, an environmental evaluation of the proposed changes, in line with the principles of the Strategic Environmental Assessment, shall be initiated by the Committee established under Article 18.2.”

(3) In Article 9, paragraph 3 is replaced by the following:

“3. The network shall include infrastructure for traffic management, user information, incident and emergency handling and electronic fee collection based on active co-operation between traffic management systems at European, national and regional level and service providers of travel and traffic information and value added services, ensuring the necessary complementarity with applications whose deployment is facilitated under the trans-European telecommunications networks program.”

(4) Article 10 is replaced by the following:

“1. The rail network shall comprise high-speed rail lines and conventional rail lines.

2. The high-speed rail lines shall comprise:

(a) specially built high-speed lines equipped for speeds generally equal to or greater than 250 km/h using current or new technology,

(b) specially upgraded high-speed lines equipped for speeds of the order of 200 km/h,

(c) specially upgraded high speed lines which have special features as a result of topographical, relief or town planning constraints, on which the speed must be adapted to each case or lines which provides access to airports of common interest.

This network shall be defined by the lines indicated in Annex I. Essential requirements and Technical Specification for Interoperability applicable to high speed rail lines in current technology are defined according to Council Directive N° 96/48/EC of 23 July 1996 on the interoperability of the trans-European high-speed rail system¹². Member States shall notify to the Commission prior to the opening of

⁹ OJ L175, 05/07/1985 pp. 40 -48

¹⁰ OJ L206, 22.07.1992, p. 7

¹¹ OJ L197, 21.07.2001 p. 30

¹² OJ L235, 17/09/1996 p. 6

any high speed line whether it is a specially built high-speed line or a specially upgraded high-speed line.

3. The conventional rail lines shall comprise high quality lines, including the rail segments of combined transport referred to in Article 14, access links to sea and inland ports of common interest and those freight terminals which are open to all operators. Essential requirements and Technical Specification for Interoperability applicable to the conventional rail lines are defined according to Directive 2001/16/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 March 2001 on the interoperability of the trans-European conventional rail system¹³.

4. The network shall:

- play an important role in long distance passenger traffic,
- permit interconnection with airports,
- permit access to regional and local rail networks,
- facilitate freight transport by identifying and developing trunk routes dedicated to freight or routes on which freight trains have a priority,
- play an important role in combined transport,
- permit interconnection with short sea shipping and inland waterways.

5. The network shall offer users a high level of quality and safety, owing to its continuity and to gradual implementation of its interoperability, brought about in particular by technical harmonisation and the ERTMS harmonised command and control system recommended for the European railway network. To this end, a deployment plan shall be established by the Commission.

6. The network shall include the infrastructures and the facilities allowing the integration of rail and air transport services.”

(5) In Article 11, the following paragraph 3b shall be inserted:

“3b. The inland ports of the network equipped with transshipment facilities for intermodal transport and with an annual freight traffic volume of at least 500 000 tonnes are shown in Annex I.”

(6) In Article 13, the following paragraph 3 is added:

“3. International and Community connecting points shall be gradually linked to the high-speed lines of the rail network, where appropriate. The network shall include the infrastructures and the facilities allowing the integration of air and rail transport services.”

(7) Article 18 is amended as follows :

(a) the title is replaced by

¹³ OJ L 110, 20/04/2001 pp. 1 - 27

“Committee for monitoring and the revision of the guidelines.”

(b) paragraph 1 is replaced by the following:

“1. Member States shall, before 2004, notify the Committee established under article 18.2, and the Commission, of the national plans and programmes, which they have drawn up, affecting the development of the trans-European transport network, including the nature, the timetable and the estimated financial plans of the projects of common interest identified by this Decision.

Member States shall also notify the Committee established under article 18.2 and the Commission, of any updates of those plans and programmes.

A Member State shall, before making any change affecting the network identified in the Annexes to this Decision give notice of that change to the Committee established under article 18.2, the Commission, and any Member States likely to be affected of its intention.”

(c) paragraph 3 is amended as follows :

“3. The Commission shall report regularly to the European Parliament, the Council, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on the implementation of the guidelines described in this Decision. The Committee referred to in paragraph 2 shall assist the Commission with drawing up the report. The report shall be accompanied where necessary by legislative proposals to revise the guidelines.

(8) Article 19 is replaced by the following :

"Article 19

Specific projects

Annexe III contains the projects of common interest, the implementation of which is considered a priority by the Community".

(9) Articles 20 and 21 are deleted.

(10) Annexes I and III to Decision 1629/96/EC are amended as set out in the Annex to this Decision.

Article 2

This Decision shall enter into force on the twentieth day following that of its publication in the *Official Journal of the European Communities*.

Article 3

This Decision is addressed to the Member States.

Done at Brussels,

For the European Parliament
The President

For the Council
The President

ANNEX

Annexes I and III to Decision No 1692/96/EC are amended as follows:

(1) In ANNEX I, the sections 2, 3, 4 and 6 are replaced as follows:

Section 2: **Road Network**

2.0. Europe	2.4. Greece	2.8. Italy.	2.12. Portugal
2.1. Belgium	2.5. Spain	2.9. Luxembourg	2.13. Finland
2.2. Denmark	2.6. France	2.10. Netherlands	2.14. Sweden
2.3. Germany	2.7. Ireland	2.11. Austria	2.15. United Kingdom

Section 3 : **Rail Network**

3.0. Europe	3.4. Greece	3.8. Italy.	3.12. Portugal
3.1. Belgium	3.5. Spain	3.9. Luxembourg	3.13. Finland
3.2. Denmark	3.6. France	3.10. Netherlands	3.14. Sweden
3.3. Germany	3.7. Ireland	3.11. Austria	3.15. United Kingdom

Section 4 : **Inland Waterways network and Inland Ports**

Section 6 : **Airports network**

6.0. Europe	6.4. France
6.1. Belgium/Denmark/Germany/ Luxembourg/Netherlands/Austria	6.5. Ireland/United Kingdom
6.2. Greece	6.6. Italy
6.3 Spain/Portugal	6.7. Finland/Sweden

(2) ANNEX III is replaced by:

LIST OF SPECIFIC PROJECTS

1. High-speed train/combined transport north-south:
Munich-Nuremberg-Erfurt-Halle/Leipzig-Berlin
Brenner axis: Napoli-Verona-Munich and Bologna-Milano
2. High-speed train PBCAL (Paris-Brussels-Cologne-Amsterdam-London):
Belgium: F/B border – Brussels – Liège – B/D border
Brussels – B/NL border
United Kingdom: London – Channel Tunnel Access
Netherlands: B/NL border – Rotterdam – Amsterdam
Germany: (Aachen) G27 Cologne – Rhine/Main
3. High-speed train south:
Madrid-Barcelona-Perpignan-Montpellier-Nîmes
Madrid-Vitoria-Dax
4. High-speed train east
Paris – Metz – Strasbourg – Appenweier – (Karlsruhe) with junctions to Metz - Saarbrücken – Mannheim
and Metz - Luxembourg
5. Conventional rail/combined transport : Betuwe line
Rotterdam – NL/D border – (Rhine/Ruhr)
6. High-speed train/combined transport, France-Italy
Lyon – Turin
Turin – Milan – Venice - Trieste
7. Greek motorways: Pathe: Rio Antirio, Patras – Athens – Thessaloniki – Promahon (Greek/Bulgarian
border) and Via Egnatia: Igoumenitsa – Thessaloniki – Alexandroupolis – Ormenio (Greek/Bulgarian
border) – Kipi (Greek/Turkish border)
8. Multimodal Link Portugal – Spain – Central Europe
12. Nordic Triangle (rail/road)
13. Ireland/United Kingdom/Benelux Road link
14. West Coast main line (rail)
15. Global navigation and positioning satellite system Galileo
16. High-capacity rail link across the Pyrenees
17. East European Combined Transport/High Speed Train :
Stuttgart-Munich-Salzburg/Linz-Vienna
18. Danube river improvement between Vilshofen and Straubing
19. High-speed rail interoperability on the Iberian peninsula
20. Fehmarn belt : fixed link between Germany and Denmark