EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

RESEARCH AND DOCUMENTATION PAPERS

COMMUNITY POLICY ON TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURES

SERIES
REGIONAL POLICY AND TRANSPORT

16

EN - 3 - 1991

Published in the same series:

No 1: Résolution du Bundestag allemand relative à une politique européenne des transports

No 2: L'avenir d'Eurocontrol

No 3: ONU code de conduite pour les conférences maritimes

No 4: La nouvelle loi danoise sur la planification nationale et régionale

No 5: Quelques observations sur la théorie de la politique régionale et sur les tâches de la CE

No 6: Les effects de la crise sur la part respective des différents modes de transport

No 7: Adhésion de quatre pays méditerranéens et politique régionale

No 8: Entente entre certaines autorités maritimes sur le maintien des normes techniques à bord des navires de commerce

No 9: Problèmes de la circulation routière transfrontalière dans la région Aix-la-Chapelle-Hasselt-Liège-Maastricht

No 10: Convention pour la navigation du Rhin, signée à Mannheim

No 11: Le développement du déséquilibre régional dans la Communauté européenne 1970–1977

No 12: L'influence de la crise sur les emplois industriels dans les régions de la Communauté

No 13: Mémorandum d'entente sur le contrôle des navires par l'État du port

No 14: Transport as a bottleneck to economic growth in Ireland

No 15: The principle of 'Additionality' in regard to the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and its application in some Member States

Editing: Internal Market Division
European Parliament
L-2929 Luxembourg

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

RESEARCH AND DOCUMENTATION PAPERS

COMMUNITY POLICY ON TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURES

SERIES
REGIONAL POLICY AND TRANSPORT

16

EN - 3 - 1991

Cataloguing data can be found at the end of this publication

Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 1991

ISBN:92-823-0258-X

Catalogue number: AX-70-91-192-EN-C

Printed in Germany

Contents

1. Diagnosis

1.1. Pattern of investment in infrastructures and growth of traffic in recent years

During the last decade, Community goods traffic has grown by an average of 2.5% per year and passenger traffic by around 3.1% per year. This spectacular increase in the volume of transport has not been accompanied by an overall increase in investment in transport infrastructures.

According to studies produced by the ECMT (European Conference of Ministers for Transport), total investment by European countries fell from around 1.5% to 0.9% of the gross domestic product between 1975 and 1984. According to the same source, between 1975 and 1984 European investment in infrastructure fell, at constant currency values, by about 22%.

1.2. International traffic and deficiencies in infrastructures in relation to the objective of the large internal market

If we are properly to understand the problems faced by the Community in relation to transport infrastructures, we must take account not only of the present situation but also of forecasts associated with attainment of the internal market.

The abolition of all frontiers which impede the free movement of persons and goods will without doubt generate a substantial increase in transport movements. But if we do no more than extrapolate the growth of transport indices between 1975 and 1988 to the threshold of the year 2000, that is to say a growth in transport of 2.5% per year, the result will be that, at the turn of the century, the volume of transport will be 34% greater than the 1988 level and about double the 1975 level.

However, the most optimistic forecasts on economic growth in the Community, resulting from attainment of the internal market, give an annual growth rate considerably in excess of 2.5%. It thus seems unnecessary to go into greater detail to justify the conclusions put forward by all the specialized institutes, according to which the present imbalance between investment in transport infrastructures on the one hand, and, on the other, passenger and goods traffic will certainly jeopardize the proper functioning of the European economy and may frustrate full attainment of the objectives pursued at the Community level.

1.3. The Community after its successive enlargements

The abovementioned grounds for concern are exacerbated by the fact that the stated objective of attaining a large internal market, with the concomitant liberalization of movements of persons and goods, presupposes the existence of an adequate transport network covering the entire Community territory. That objective is more difficult to attain now that, after the successive enlargements of the EC beyond its original nucleus of central and north European countries, new problems specific to infrastructures have emerged and must be resolved. Thus, the natural obstacles which already made intra-Community traffic difficult (for example the Alpine Chain) are joined by others of no less importance. The reason for this is that the particularly insular and maritime nature of the Europe of the Twelve has been accentuated. Both the first enlargement incorporating the British Isles and Denmark and the enlargement incorporating Greece, Spain and Portugal brought to light a series of existing problems concerning links between the national networks of the new member countries and the networks of the countries of the Europe of the Six: the English Channel, the Irish Sea, the Great Belt crossing, the Pyrenees, the markedly insular character of Greece and its 'separation' from the remainder of the Community territory are good examples.

In addition, the transport infrastructure networks and international transport links of some of the new member countries were already subject to considerable deficiencies. And owing to the economic circumstances of some of those countries, they will not be able, in the short or medium term, to make up for their obvious lack of investments in order to eliminate or reduce the economic disadvantages resulting from their peripheral position remote from the great centres of industrial development in the middle of Europe. All these factors clearly show how important it is for the Community to take action to stimulate and promote action by the Member States in this area.

1.4. Developments in Eastern Europe

The above problems may be aggravated by a further difficulty, associated with the re-emergence of democ-

racy in the countries of Eastern Europe. In view of the links between the economies of those countries and those of the countries of the West it is foreseeable that there will be an annual increase in exports to those countries of about 4.7% and an annual increase in imports from the East of about 3.8% by the year 2000, which will lead to an increase in movements in both directions of more than 50% during the coming decade. This increase in trade will raise further problems concerning transport infrastructures along the East-West axes, so neglected for 40 years because of the political conditions prevailing over that period.

1.5. Estimates of traffic development for the various types of transport

Freight transport — 19 ECMT countries
Domestic + international *(billion tkm)*

	1970	1975	1980	1988	2000	2010	% of total by 2010	% increase
Train	274	244	269	257	251	247	14	–4
Road	439	543	687	830	1189	1442	79	74
Water	113	108	118	109	117	118	7	8
Total	826	895	1074	1196	1557	1807		51

(Percentage of total and growth relate to 1990.)
Source: ECMT.

2. The remedies

2.1. Action by the Community authorities

2.1.1. The European Parliament

The problem of financing infrastructures in which the Community has an interest and of eliminating the deficiencies of the European networks for the various types of transport has always been a preoccupation of the European Parliament. In the first comprehensive report approved by the European Parliament in 1961, the well-known Kaptein report, an entire chapter was devoted to the subject. A list was given of all the problems which, even then, required urgent attention, and specific measures were proposed for the financing of infrastructural works. In particular it was proposed that a European investment fund should be set up, using national and international public capital, private international capital and, possibly, capital provided by the European institutions. Since that time, the European Parliament has regularly reaffirmed that view. The specific means of implementation proposed have of course changed in step with internal developments within the European Community such as, for example, the decision to create the internal market, the endeavours to achieve tax harmonization and the proposal concerning the principle of territoriality.

2.1.2. The Commission and the Council of the European Communities

The Commission of the European Communities appears to have been aware of the need for action in this area since the beginning of the 1970s. The various Commission communications concerning action on transport infrastructure are well known. In 1976 and 1979, two comprehensive documents were presented on the subject. Following discussions with the Council of Ministers, the views put forward by the Commission in those communications merely led to the presentation of a 'restricted' programme on which the Parliament expressed its views. This led to the inclusion of ECU 2 million in the 1982 budget and ECU 15 million in the 1983 budget. At the request of the Council, on 10 June 1982 the 'restricted' programme was followed by an experimental programme presented in 1983 in which it was proposed, in particular, that ECU 300 million be made available on a three-year basis, at the rate of ECU 100 million for each annual budget. In any event, neither of those programmes secured the approval of the Council of Ministers. Nevertheless, the Commission, demonstrating great inventiveness and tenacity, presented successive programmes of action for transport infrastructures, but without any appreciable success.

In 1986 it put forward a proposal for a medium-term plan for transport infrastructures in which, taking an overall view, it described the principal deficiencies to which, in its opinion, the European transport network was subject, the ways in which the Community could take action to resolve them, the ways in which the Community could declare an interest so that Community action would be possible and it identified the needs for overall financial investments in infrastructures. In view of the Council's reluctance to adopt that legal basis, in 1988 the Commission submitted a proposal for a four-year plan extending to 1992, with a view to the attainment of the internal market, which included a list of the specific projects which it was considered should be financed by the Community. Again encountering resistence from the Council of Ministers, in 1989 the Commission reformulated its earlier proposal for the plan for the period up to 1992, making changes concerning the basis for Community financial action and concentrating the available resources on a small number of projects regarded as the most pressing. That proposal has recently been approved by the Council, resulting in the adoption of Regulation No 3359/90 of 20.11.1990.

Between 1986 and 1990, the Council limited its action to the adoption of purely *ad hoc* regulations which made it possible to use the budgetary appropriations for each year, by virtue of the manner in which the European Parliament exercised its powers on budgetary matters with respect to non-compulsory expenditure. The measures concerned were taken on a case-by-case basis, without any future or medium-term vision, an approach which the European Parliament always regarded as ineffective, in view of the problems to be resolved, and as politically reprehensible.

3. The legal means at present available to respond to transport infrastructure requirements

3.1. Budgetary resources

3.1.1. Chapter 58, transport

In the first place, Chapter 58 of the Community budget, which is devoted to transport policy, provides for a number of budgetary appropriations for the financing of the various infrastructures. Those appropriations have been included in the budget by virtue of the budgetary competences of the EP in the area of non-compulsory expenditure. The Transport Committee and the European Parliament have always regarded them as insufficient to cover the needs of the Community in that area (comparative tables prepared by the Commission of the European Communities on the annual employment of those budget headings are included as an annex).

In the mean time, the Council of Ministers has adopted a regulation on implementation of a programme of action for transport infrastructures, with a view to the attainment of the integrated transport market in 1992 (Regulation No 3359/90, Official Journal L 326, 24.11.1990).

The Council has agreed to identify large-scale transport infrastructure projects which are regarded as enjoying priority with a view to the internal market, agreeing to release around ECU 240 million during the three budgetary years for which the regulation will remain in force. The practical importance of that regulation, which is of limited duration and involves a restricted financial effort, must, however, be seen in political terms. Success has finally been achieved in bringing the problem into the open within the Council and affirming the political principles which will have to be applied and developed in the future. Thus:

(a) It has been recognized that attainment of the integrated transport market calls for the implementation of a Community action programme designed to achieve harmonious development of transport infrastructures;

(b) It has been recognized that the creation of rapid and efficient links between the various regions of the Community is a fundamental condition for the strengthening of economic and social cohesion;

(c) It has been acknowledged that Community financial support may constitute an essential stimulus for the promotion and launching of projects of interest to the Community, also encouraging the involvement of private capital.

It seems to us, therefore, that the adoption of the abovementioned regulation represents a fairly positive step forward, which augurs well for the future. Above all, that step by the Council must be seen as indicative of its acceptance of the principle of Community competence regarding transport infrastructures, and the appropriate conclusions must be drawn.

Attention must also be drawn to the Council's acceptance of the principle that financial support from various sources should be brought together and that the preconditions must be defined for such infrastructure projects to be declared to be in the European interest, so that participation in them is made attractive to private capital.

3.1.2. The Infrastructure Committee

By decision of 20 February 1978 (Official Journal L 58, 25.2.1978, p. 16) the Council set up a Transport Infrastructure Committee comprising representatives of the Member States, under the chairmanship of a representative of the Commission. The functions of that Committee are:

(a) To undertake consultation and consider questions concerning European transport networks of Community interest;

(b) To express views on national projects notified by the Member States, which are of Community importance;

(c) To consider projects which might qualify for Community financial aid.

In discharging the first of those functions, the Committee produced a general definition of the European road, rail and waterway transport infrastructures, which was subsequently presented to the Council as an annex to the medium-term implementation plan for transport infrastructures — COM(86) 340 final of 27.6.1986. The definition of the networks will have to be updated regularly in line with developments in the various sectors.

As regards examination and evaluation of the national programmes for infrastructures, the Committee described, in its three-year report for 1984–87 — COM(88) 280 final — a large number of difficulties

encountered by it. In the first place, the Member States proved extremely reluctant to draw up medium- and long-term plans, and particularly to put forward any precise timetable for the work to be undertaken.

The Committee also found that, in view of the diversity and differences in presentation of the various plans, it was difficult to use them as a basis for a future Community infrastructure plan. Finally, the Committee concluded that straightforward co-ordination of the action envisaged in the various national plans was virtually impossible, since priorities and objectives vary from one Member State to another.

3.1.3. ERDF

The ERDF (European Regional Development Fund) may also theoretically be used — and has been used — to finance projects in the area of transport infrastructure. However, it must be remembered that the fundamental objectives to be pursued in using the fund are clearly laid down in the Regulation governing it. The fund is intended to be used to reduce differences in economic development between the various regions of the Community, with priority therefore being given above all to the more backward regions or those in economic decline. At present, only 55% of the territory of the Community may have projects financed by the ERDF. However, statistics show that transport infrastructures continue to be financed to a considerable extent from the ERDF in the countries or regions where it can be used. For example, in Greece 24% of ERDF investment is in transport infrastructure; in Portugal, 18%; in Spain, 46.9%; in Italy, 9.6%; in Ireland, 39.1%; in Northern Ireland, 40.8%; and in Corsica, 25%.

3.2. Non-budgetary resources

3.2.1. EIB loans

Loans from the European Investment Bank (EIB) constitute the main non-budgetary instrument for financing transport infrastructure in the Community. However, only 7% of the total loans granted by the EIB out of its own funds relate to infrastructure.

Three types of project may qualify for EIB support in the area of transport infrastructure:

(i) projects relating to transport networks within the EC;

(ii) projects relating to external links with those networks;

(iii) projects financed under financial cooperation agreements between the EC and non-member countries.

The criteria for the selection of projects are strictly banking criteria relating to the profitability of the projects in question, and additional criteria are interest to the Community and importance for transport. Loans are granted at the most favourable rates charged in the capital market, this being possible as a result of the fact that the EIB is a non-profit-making institution enjoying prestige in the international markets, and the amounts lent are limited to 50% of the total cost of the works, with repayment over a long period (12, 15 or sometimes 20 years), occasionally with reimbursement being deferred for between 2 and 5 years. A table showing EIB loans for transport infrastructure projects is attached as an annex.

3.2.2. ECSC loans

As one of the measures for encouraging consumption of iron and steel products produced in the EC, the Commission of the European Communities may also grant loans out of ECSC (European Coal and Steel Community) funds. This was done in particular for the construction of the new lines for the TGV Atlantique, for which the Commission granted a loan of FF 577 million, and similar measures are being considered for the TGV Norte lines in Spain and the steel components of the Rhine-Main-Danube Canal.

4. The new Community approach — The proposals now under discussion

4.1. The programme for great trans-European networks

Following the discussions on European infrastructure networks held at the European Council meeting in December 1989 and June 1990, the Commission of the European Communities recently submitted a communication to the Council entitled 'Towards trans-European networks for a Community action programme' — COM(90) 585 final.

That draft resolution provides for a commitment by the Council to implement adequate regulations for the creation of a set of networks essential to the functioning of the internal market. Those networks are not limited to transport infrastructure but extend to telecommunications, energy and vocational training.

The rules in question will be those comprised in the programme annexed to the draft resolution, submitted by the Commission, which contains three inseparable elements:

1. The implementation of priority projects chosen by reference to their contribution to the functioning of the internal market and the strengthening of economic and social cohesion;
2. A set of general measures intended to facilitate the creation, implementation and operation of the trans-European networks;
3. A set of financial measures to enable the necessary investments to be made.

4.2. The programme of action on infrastructure for the period after 1993

In the mean time the Commission, in presenting its programme for 1991 in the sphere of transport, gave notice of the submission of a new proposal for a Council regulation on a programme of action to be implemented after 1993, that is to say on completion of the three-year programme envisaged in Regulation No 3359/90.

It seems clear that the new proposal must be seen against the more general background of the draft resolution for large-scale trans-European networks and the programme of action referred to therein. The new regulation must lay down specific rules relating to transport, so as to deal once and for all with the problems of planning, execution and financing of Community action for transport infrastructures.

5. Analysis of the new Community proposals

5.1. Recognition of Community competence

We can do no less than congratulate ourselves on the new political dynamism of the Community, which seems to accept the importance of concerted action to create the large-scale infrastructure networks which are essential to the proper functioning of Europe as an economic and social area. There is particularly good reason for satisfaction in so far as the European Parliament has always called for the Community to play a decisive role in that area, where action by the Member States, guided by considerations of national interest, has prevented the emergence and operation of true European networks capable of providing a basis for transnational traffic. The first point to be borne in mind, therefore, is that we consider political recognition of Community competence for action in the sphere of transport infrastructure to be essential. Above all, such Community competence must be one of the new areas of competence to be included in the Treaties and, in that connection, the proposals presented by the Commission at the Intergovernmental Conference now in progress are praiseworthy.

5.2. Aspects of Community action on transport infrastructure

5.2.1. Enumeration and economic evaluation of requirements

We consider that the requirements in terms of infrastructure must be analysed as part of an entirely European comprehensive approach; and that political decisions at national or regional level do not, by virtue of the specificity inherent in them or the diversity of their priorities or objectives, make it possible to focus adequately on the problem of reconciling the additional requirements in terms of infrastructure with the planning and execution of the works relating to them. A solution to Europe's problems will not be found merely through coordinated juxtaposition of national networks (which, moreover, has already proved impossible — see paragraph 3.1.2.) — it will be achieved by the creation of a true European transport network.

The Community's first task will thus be to prepare and update comprehensive master plans for the various European infrastructure networks for the various types of transport. Indeed, it is necessary to optimize and substantively improve the technical and political aspects of the work already done within the infrastructure committee, so that the latter becomes a forum capable of properly representing the diverse interests involved and of providing the necessary technical input for the Community political decision-making process. In that respect, it would appear important to involve in this programming work not only the Member States but also the economic agents who use those infrastructures, and it would also be advisable to ensure political coordination with the work carried out by other institutions which traditionally operate in that area and whose terms of reference go beyond the area of the Community. We are thinking in particular of the ECMT (European Conference of Ministers for Transport) and the ECE (United Nations Economic Committee for Europe). Such coordination is particularly desirable when it is borne in mind that the prospects of economic and political integration with EFTA and Eastern Europe appear to be growing stronger from day to day.

The master plans must take account of the fundamental objectives of a Community policy in that sphere, namely:

(i) coping with the foreseeable increases in traffic movements of people and goods within the Community, by creating a uniform and balanced system of transport infrastructure networks, embracing all areas of the Community and eliminating bottlenecks;

(ii) guaranteeing high safety standards in all transport systems, laying down the rules to be observed in transport operations, and proposing specific programmes designed to enhance safety in general and to eliminate infrastructural deficiencies which undermine safety;

(iii) defining the objectives to be attained in matters of environmental protection and energy saving in relation to construction of the infrastructure;

(iv) guaranteeing the possibility of genuine and fair inter-modal competition, eliminating any distortion which may exist at present.

The content of the master plans for the infrastructure should not, however, be limited to definition of the main axes and requisite interconnections, but should clearly establish the most important projects to be undertaken and the timetable for them. That is a task for which cooperation among the Member States is essential, since the fact that certain links are defined as forming part of networks of Community interest

does not necessarily mean that the Community itself must bear the burdens arising from their creation, maintenance or management. However, the master plan must indicate which political and administrative authority or authorities are to be responsible for which construction or maintenance works and lay down the timetable for their execution, whilst at the same time Community action must be possible in order to accelerate their completion.

These planning instruments may possibly take the form of a long-term master plan, covering a period of 10 to 15 years, supplemented by action programmes covering a period of 3 to 5 years, setting out specific projects giving effect to the priorities which have been established.

A rather complicated outstanding problem is that of bringing into operation adequate machinery for co-ordination of action at the various political and administrative levels involved. Even if Community expenditure on transport infrastructure grows significantly (a development for which the EP has been calling, and which we consider feasible and very important — see below), it would be unrealistic to think that the Community, as such, could provide financing for everything which is to be done. It is essential to secure the participation of national or regional bodies, and at the same time it is necessary to make certain that the action taken by the public bodies involved has the desired synergetic effect, as a result of programming previously developed by the Community. Only in that way will it be possible to attract the participation of private capital in resolving the present infrastructural shortcomings.

The efforts of the abovementioned public bodies (national and Community bodies) could be combined to take effect in two separate phases: when the master plans are defined and when the action programmes are approved, laying down for a specified period the priority measures to be taken, the timetable for them, the responsibilities of each of the administrations and the degree of their financial involvement, and the action which might benefit from the participation of private capital.

5.2.2. Financing

This brings us to the central problem of the financing of the programmes established at Community level. It should be made clear at the outset that we are perfectly aware of the extent of the overall financial effort required fully to achieve the policy objectives for transport infrastructures.

According to estimates provided by the European Railways Community, the financial needs of a programme for the development of the railways of the Member States would be as follows, at 1989 prices:

1986–90 .... ECU 11000 million
1991–95 .... ECU 28000 million
1996–2000 .... ECU 39000 million
2001– .... ECU 17000 million

According to an estimate from the same organization, only the cost of constructing the high-speed European network would be ECU 150000 million to be spent over the next 20 years, 100 on infrastructure and 50 on rolling stock.

As regards road transport, according to the estimates produced by the IRF for its Aimse (Advanced integrated motorway system in Europe) programme, the financial input required between now and the year 2000 is between ECU 25 and 30000 million.

In overall terms, calculations prepared by the Round Table of Industrialists indicate investment needs, for land transport alone, of between ECU 32 and 40000 million per year.

Once again, this financial effort cannot come only, or indeed predominantly, from the Community, but must be a collective effort on the part of all the administrations involved and society in general. We consider, however, that the Community must secure the financial resources necessary to exercise all the competences — which we consider must be attributed to it — regarding programming, coordination, implementation and assistance for raising finance for the projects decided upon.

We must consider three separate options:

(a) The machinery already in existence (see part 3 above)

(b) Financial engineering machinery

(c) The creation of a specific Community fund for infrastructures.

(a) *The existing financing machinery*

Financing through the structural Funds already existing in the Community may seem rather attractive, particularly at a time when the political decision has been taken substantially to increase their volume within the Community budget. However, the fact is that the provision of such structural aid is conditional

upon the production of evidence justifying it from the economic, social or environmental point of view for certain regions with specific problems of backwardness or economic decline — in other words, on the basis of considerations of a regional nature. Above all, it is the impact of the projects concerned on a specific region which is analysed, without direct reference to their importance for the Community.

In particular, it must be remembered that the decision to increase allocations to the structural Funds was accompanied by another decision concerning the geographical concentration of funds in certain clearly defined zones (today, only 40% of the Community territory qualifies for financing from the ERDF). Thus, they are funds which are regional or sectoral in character and must be applied by reference to the advantages that they will bring for regional development. The very origin of the projects to be financed, and the viewpoint from which they are analysed, is clearly distinguished by their regional nature.

This does not mean that they cannot contribute to the financing of certain projects which are of interest to the Community in general and are regarded as enjoying priority, but that is not their principal function.

Non-budgetary resources, in particular EIB loans, are more general in character and are more likely to be able to be used by the Member States in connection with their development policies. However, those loans too, being granted by the Bank in accordance with its own economic criteria, are unlikely to be regarded as a suitable financial mechanism for implementation of overall political policy on transport infrastructures. As far as ECSC loans are concerned, it is clear that, since they are granted on a case-by-case basis for specific purposes, they are not very suitable to be used as a general basis for action of this kind.

We should nevertheless like to express our support for the provisional formula arrived at when Regulation No 3359/90 was adopted for the three-year plan to 1992. The Council's recognition of the need to coordinate the financial resources already available and its agreement that, within certain limits, they may be combined for projects of interest to the Community, is a positive development. However, the Council itself, in adopting that programme and the modest financial commitments associated with it, also conceded by implication that the Community needs to have at its disposal a specific and enduring financial instrument capable of enabling it to implement policies in this area.

(b) *Financial engineering machinery*

The various proposals concerning ways of attracting private investment in infrastructural projects by means of various kinds of financial engineering machinery are also interesting and deserve to be properly considered.

However, the results of various studies should be borne in mind, among them one sponsored by the Commission of the European Communities in 1988, which indicated that few transport infrastructure projects are liable to be carried out with 100% private financing. Private capital will only be attracted by a high rate of financial profitability, which is not always available.

The difficulties encountered in relation to the Channel Tunnel must raise doubts in our mind as to miraculous financial solutions. And, as was pointed out in one of those studies, the case of the Channel Tunnel is on the borderline of what should be regarded as acceptable to the private sector in terms of profitability. A mere declaration of public utility will not be enough to attract private capital, unless technical and economic studies (possibly financed from the Community budget) prove the financial profitability of the projects in question.

It should also be noted that private investment in infrastructures is more readily conceivable for certain types of transport than for others. For example, at the present time it appears easier to channel private investment towards railway infrastructures than to roads. A return on the capital investment can be assured in the case of railways where the operation of them has been entrusted to an undertaking by way of concession, but it would be difficult to ensure such a return in the case of roads or waterways, at least as long as the different approaches at European level concerning the allocation of infrastructural costs persist.

Finally, the question may be raised of the extent to which reliance only on financial engineering machinery for the attraction of private capital may adversely affect the objective pursued, which is, let it be repeated, that of achieving greater economic and social cohesion. It seems reasonable to suppose that there would be a concentration of economically and financially profitable projects in European regions already possessing a strong social and economic structure (which would ensure an adequate return on private capital) at the expense, for example, of the peripheral regions, which are less populated and are economically disadvantaged, and would generate less traffic.

That does not mean, however, that this new approach to Community action on infrastructures should be undervalued — but it should be combined with traditional budgetary resources of another type, so that the Community can play its role as a catalyst for infrastructural projects throughout the territory of the Community.

(c) *The creation of a specific fund for infrastructures*

The idea of setting up a European Fund for the financing of infrastructures was put forward long ago. For example, there was the proposal put forward by the EP in 1961 to create a 'European Investment Fund', and to that may be added a whole series of ideas put forward by other Community institutions or interested social and professional bodies. Very recently, the working group 'Transport 2000' drew attention to the urgent need to create a fund of that kind.

Having regard to the above statement concerning the need for Community action regarding the large-scale infrastructures necessary for the operation of an integrated and economically and socially cohesive single market, we must conclude that it is essential for the EC to equip itself with financial instruments suitable for the implementation of its policies.

Political decisions must be supported by financial instruments which are consonant with the ambitions pursued. This means, in particular, that the resources allocated to such purposes must be clearly defined and must be foreseeable so as to facilitate effective programming. In other words, *ad hoc* action on an annual basis must be brought to an end.

As regards the problem of the source of such funds, we regard as very interesting — and support — the idea of the 'Transport 2000' Working Group whereby the financing of the Fund (EIF) should be linked to energy consumption. It will be recalled that the group proposes a specific figure of the order of ECU 0.01 per specific unit of energy consumed (petrol, gas, electricity).

We support that suggestion for the following reasons:

(i) It is a fair method of levying a charge on citizens, whereby each pays according to the use made by him of the infrastructures and, moreover, the system reflects their standard of living, it being well known that there is a direct link between standard of living and energy consumption;

(ii) A charge of that kind is ecologically positive;

(iii) It will be levied on all users of the various transport systems;

(iv) It highlights the specific advantages of certain means of transport with respect to energy savings and will tend to encourage more rational and effective use of infrastructures;

(v) It will facilitate the collection of sufficient funds to meet foreseeable needs in terms of infrastructure.

It is important to endeavour to clarify the manner in which the fund will operate and how it will be managed by the Community:

(i) The revenue collected must be used in accordance with the needs established by Community programmes (master plans and action programmes);

(ii) Each year the necessary funds would be made available to the Member States for implementation of the scheduled projects. If those projects are not executed in time by the States, the funds would be taken back by the Community and made available for the financing of projects in other States;

(iii) In order to guarantee a proper balance in the apportionment of available funds, it might be envisaged that a certain percentage of the funds from a particular country would be allocated to projects to be carried out in that country;

(iv) For each type of project it will be necessary to fix the percentage of Community financing allocated to it and, if appropriate, a maximum overall limit for EIF financing.

6. Community policy for the allocation of infrastructural costs

The fact that a set of financial measures is proposed in order to contribute to the execution of transport infrastructure works does not mean that we should overlook the considerable work remaining to be done in defining a uniform policy for allocating the infrastructural costs to users.

The lack of a Community policy in this area is one of the main problems raised by the attempt to create a single European transport market. Indeed, it has proved impossible to establish a harmonized policy throughout the Community in this area, in so far as national traditions differ to a considerable extent and there is great resistance to change.

This state of affairs presents great obstacles to the resolution of certain fundamental problems in the area of the common transport policy, namely:

(i) The creation of a common market for carriers, without distortions of competition arising from the differing levels of taxation levied in the various countries;

(ii) The guarantee of fair competition between different types of transport, taking account of the specific advantages of each type.

Costs could be charged directly to users for the use of certain sections of infrastructures or indirectly by means of taxes charged on vehicles or fuel but not relating to the specific use of certain sections of infrastructure.

Both systems of taxation have specific advantages, depending upon the objectives pursued. Among the possible reasons for introducing tolls on certain types of infrastructure are budgetary problems and the need to attract private capital for their construction, ensuring an adequate return on capital.

The concessionaire companies are thus assured of a return on the capital invested by them and the generation of funds for maintenance and/or expansion of the network, also making it possible to undertake works which are costly from the financial point of view.

In addition, from the user's standpoint, the system seems fairer since the infrastructure is paid for only by those who actually use it. This statement must be interpreted carefully since in most cases the charges decided upon do not reflect the costs actually incurred but are rather the result of social or economic policy considerations.

In any event, the principle of direct taxation is without doubt more likely to make consumers aware that they are paying for use of a specific infrastructure.

However, there are two fundamental objections to direct taxation of that type: where the principle pursued is that of making a charge for external costs such as those associated with pollution and noise, it must be concluded that tolls are a less satisfactory system than indirect taxation as far as reflecting such costs is concerned. Normally, such external costs are associated with the technical features of vehicles (noise, safety) or fuel consumption (pollution). Therefore, indirect taxation appears more appropriate than tolls to make the user aware of those external side effects of transport.

The second objection relates to another Community objective, namely that of ensuring that an adequate network extends throughout the Community. Direct taxation by tolls has the effect, to some extent, of shaping the provision of new infrastructures by reference to demand. Financial criteria will become more important than social criteria and territorial enhancement in decisions concerning new infrastructural works. Better machinery for Community policy decisions will be required, in order to prevent the emergence of uncoordinated development patterns or gaps in infrastructural networks or, what would be even worse, increased disadvantages for regions which generate low-density traffic.

As far as the various means of transport are concerned, differing progress has been achieved at Community level in endeavouring to resolve this problem.

6.1. Road transport

In most European countries roads are built by governments and financed out of budgetary resources. Infrastructures are regarded as a collective public asset and their maintenance and construction are provided for from general tax revenue, although taxes are levied on transport (fuels and vehicles). These indirect taxes on transport (fuel and vehicles) account for between 3 and 6% of total government receipts (about 1.2% to 2.4% of gross domestic product), and as a rule the income thus raised exceeds by 25% the total expenditure on road infrastructures, and the figure is tending to increase. It may thus be inferred that taxes levied on transport are determined not only by transport policy considerations but also, to an increasing extent, by consid-

erations of a fiscal and budgetary nature. Recent political developments in the Federal Republic of Germany clearly illustrate this.

However, a number of countries have introduced direct taxes on the use of motorways, as a means of developing their national network without provoking new budgetary difficulties. Tolls have also been introduced in some countries in an attempt to secure greater participation of the private sector in motorway construction.

At Community level, efforts have been made in recent years to eliminate distortion of competition between road hauliers, a matter which was becoming urgent in view of the prospect of total liberalization of road transport, including the right of cabotage.

As the Commission study concluded, such harmonization was necessary since indirect taxes on transport account for about 10 to 20% of the operating costs of a vehicle, and the variation between some countries was equivalent to the average profit margin.

Initially, the Community attempted to resolve the problem by tax harmonization measures. In view of the resistance encountered from the Member States, the Commission took a new approach with effect from 1986 based on the 'principle of territoriality'. According to that principle, taxes would not be paid in the State of registration of the vehicle but in the country where the vehicle is used.

For specific application of the principle, the Commission proposed that costs should be charged taking account of the various taxes levied on transport, namely taxes on fuels, traffic taxes and tolls.

The amount would be determined, according to the Commission, on a flat-rate basis by reference to a standard vehicle or average vehicle, representing an entire class of vehicles. Upon payment of the tax to the authorities in the country of registration, the carrier would receive a seal, in the form of a sticker to be affixed to the vehicle in question. In principle, the budgetary revenue thus obtained would be distributed by a clearing procedure amongst the Member States to take account of the fiscal burden actually borne by each of them in relation to road infrastructures.

The Commission of the European Communities expressed preference for this system, which could be applied simply and immediately, rather than other systems which, perhaps with the aid of new technology, would make it possible to determine how far each individual vehicle had travelled within the territory of each country.

The Commission's proposals have not given rise to any positive decision on the part of the Council of Ministers.

Recently, the Commission made an amendment to the proposal just described, providing for the progressive introduction of a system of taxes on the use of heavy vehicles. The proposed system is based on the determination of a minimum road use tax, varying according to the impact of the lorries concerned on the road network. To guarantee equality of treatment of carriers, and having regard to the particular features of the system in the various Member States, the tax could be adjusted according to the distances travelled on toll motorways.

6.2. Rail transport

In the countries of the EC the railway companies are State monopolies responsible at the same time both for the infrastructures and for the services provided. The price policies of such companies are profoundly influenced by considerations of a public nature, giving rise to a complicated system of State subsidies, for operation of the system and for the infrastructure, which are difficult to distinguish.

The subsidies granted to such undertakings, which represent the link between the consumer and the infrastructure, in order to maintain their ability to compete with other means of transport which are developing rapidly, have given rise to a standardization of costs for users (prices) which, as a rule, bears no relation to the infrastructural costs actually incurred.

In recent years, however, some European companies have been making efforts to apply commercial criteria in their operational strategies, dividing their areas of activity into segments, placing unprofitable parts of their networks under separate management and orientating government subsidies to those parts of the network, by reference to political and social criteria based on suitability and competition.

The flexibility for European railways sought by the new Commission proposals will certainly facilitate the task of clarifying the ways in which the costs of using railway infrastructures are covered.

In view of the complexity of the problem of allocating and fully covering the infrastructural costs of rail transport, the Commission proposal does not specifically deal with the problem. But it is foreseeable that, if the proposed changes are actually made, there will also be significant changes in the price structures of

the railway companies, with the abandonment of uniform prices and a more truthful economic approach to the manner in which costs are covered.

The proposed separation of responsibility for infrastructures from responsibility for the provision of services may give rise to transnational joint ventures (possibly in the private sector) which may even involve economic agents operating other types of transport. Any such partnership will have to be based on a proper and transparent allocation of costs and profits and as a rule will be based on total cover of the infrastructural costs.

The proposal for an integrated European network of high-speed trains is an example which should illustrate the way in which railway companies ought to develop, so that they can offer transnational high-speed services conforming to a commercial and management logic different from that applied in the remainder of the railway network. The same could be said of the existing integrated combined transport networks and undertakings involved in transport operations of that kind.

6.3. Air transport (airports)

Most Community airports belong to the public sector although they often operate under some kind of private management, as independent agencies of the public authority which owns them.

The scales of charges applied by airports differ to a considerable extent, according to criteria which are not always apparent. Normally, airports charge lower taxes for domestic than for international flights. Discounts are also frequently granted to attract new customers, or special tariffs for larger customers. The system of cross-subsidization is also applied to finance small airports under the same ownership as a large airport, which is overloaded with traffic and generates financial surpluses.

It should also be noticed that airport income from duty-free sales is also used to cover airport operating deficits, when they arise (the figure is 25% of airport income).

Recently, the Commission of the European Communities submitted a very important proposal concerning the procedure for consultation between airports and their users — COM(90) 100 final — on which the EP has already given its opinion — Doc. A3-308/90; the proposal was based on three fundamental objectives:

(i) To ensure regular consultation between airports and users before any changes are made to tariff structures;

(ii) The provision of sufficient, comprehensible information for users concerning the financial, technical and operational performance of airports, so as to ensure that the prices charged correspond to the level of services offered;

(iii) To lay down a number of general principles governing the prices charged by airports, in particular that there should be a proper relationship between the service provided and the price charged, discrimination should be prohibited and transparency should be assured.

Supplementing that proposal, the Commission submitted a further proposal — COM(90) 576 — with a view to resolving the problem of slot allocation, in particular at peak periods, and preventing discrimination against new carriers wishing to enter the market.

6.4. Waterway transport

As far as river transport is concerned, the Commission has put forward no proposals. Over a period of years it has carried out some work on the calculation of marginal costs and the impact which a policy of allocating those costs to the users would have on the river transport market and on its competitiveness with other means of transport, in particular railways.

In this context, traffic on the Rhine river system presents a particular problem since, according to certain views, the Seamen's Convention prevents the levying of charges for the use of that infrastructure. The result of the negotiations in that connection being undertaken between the European Commission and the Central Committee for Navigation on the Rhine will be of considerable importance.

6.5. Sea ports

Despite the importance of sea ports within the Community transport systems, the Community has not devoted due attention to them. After two studies undertaken by an inter-port group, working within the Commission, and in spite of the conclusions presented by it regarding the lack of transparency in the port accounting systems, no proposals on this matter have so far been put forward.

The EP has drawn attention to this problem on several occasions and has asked the Commission to propose measures providing for openness in financial relations between the port companies and their owners so as to ensure that distortions of competition between ports are eliminated and infrastructural costs are properly covered (Doc. 1–844/82 and Doc. A2–215/88).

Conclusions

The economic growth forecasts associated with the creation of the internal market and the related increase of transport of persons and goods by the year 2000 indicate that there will be an increase in land transport services of 34% over the 1988 level. At the start of the new millennium, transport in goods is likely to reach around 1800 billion tonne-kilometres (that is to say, double the 1970 level) and passenger traffic will rise to around 4800 billion passenger-kilometres (that is to say, 2.3 times the 1970 level).

In addition, the liberalization of air transport services in the European Community, the opening up of new routes, and increased tariff and capacity competition between companies will lead to a substantial increase in the volume of air traffic which, in turn, will aggravate the existing problems of air traffic congestion and saturation of a number of European airports. The problems experienced at present in this sector are merely conjunctural, being associated with the Gulf Crisis, and once the related political problems are solved the industry will return to its previous growth rates.

Furthermore, the European Community, as the largest economic exporting and importing bloc in the world, moves about 90% of its goods in foreign trade and 30% in intra-Community trade through the ports of the Community, which thus play an extremely important part in the Community transport system.

The opening up of new markets in the countries of Eastern Europe and the forecasts of increases in trade with those countries, as we move towards the year 2000, indicate that there will be a growth in Community exports of around 4.7% per year and a growth in Community imports from Eastern Europe of around 3.8% per year, which will bring about increases of more than 50% in East-West traffic during the coming 10 years.

All these factors make it clear that there must be an adequate transport infrastructure network covering the entire territory of the Community, sufficient to meet the needs of Community industry and citizens and to facilitate the development of trade and the free movement of persons, as well as the requirements of economic and social cohesion.

This need for the creation of infrastructures must be viewed against the background of trends in investment. During the decade 1974–84, the total investment by Western European countries in land transport infrastructures fell, in constant currency terms, by around 22%. And, as a percentage of the GDP, the level of investment fell from 1.5% in 1975 to 0.9% in 1984. It is therefore of fundamental importance to reverse this trend if the Community internal market is to be able to function normally. And it must be borne in mind that the budgetary limitations to which all administrations are subject make it advisable to have recourse to the financial markets and that, in order to do so, it is necessary to fulfil the requisite conditions to attract the private capital available for financing of infrastructural projects whose features might make them attractive to the private sector.

We consider that the present transport infrastructures, as conceived at national level, are such that no true European networks exist and that it is therefore necessary to resolve the problems of continuity and compatibility of such networks at Community level, so as to ensure that they are operational. The Community can and must play a central role in establishing comprehensive infrastructures for the Community as a whole and in studying, defining and raising finance for specific projects whose attainment may seem more difficult. Above all, the Community must clearly define the priorities regarding infrastructures and ensure coordinated execution of the projects selected by the various political authorities involved.

The principles for Community political action outlined above presuppose that the Community has financial instruments at its disposal which are consonant with its needs. This is not only a question of volume, but also, and in particular, a question of ensuring that they are such as to respond to the needs for coordinated programming and creation of large-scale European infrastructural networks, improvement of safety and enhancement of the environmental impact. For these purposes, it is clear that the Community financial aid mechanisms under the existing structural Funds cannot adequately reduce regional imbalances, and the subsidies granted under the budgetary headings so far allocated to transport are derisory and devoid of any medium- or long-term vision. It would appear that the decision to set up a European Infrastructure Fund (EIF) specifically for transport is inevitable.

It must be realized that a coherent policy for transport infrastructures cannot be dissociated from the central problem of defining a Community policy for the allocation of infrastructural costs to users; and that, above all, a Community financial policy for infrastructures must be directed towards financing of a kind which is directly linked to the use of infrastructures and reflects the payment of external transport costs, in particular environmental costs and those relating to the quality of life.

Annexes

Annex I: European Investment Bank financing of transport

Individual EIB loans in the Community communications sector

(million ECU)

Country	1989 EIB and NIC resources								
	Railways	Roads	Sea transport	Urban transport	Air transport	Intermodal Other infra-structures	Total transport	Tele-communi-cations	Total
Belgium									
Denmark	98.2	148.2			35.8		282.2	74.7	356.9
Germany		81.6		26.5	5.8		114.0		114.0
Greece	15.2	15.7			0.9		31.8		31.8
Spain		115.2		9.2	216.0		340.4	503.2	843.5
France	251.3	248.8		106.9			607.0	28.6	635.5
Ireland		13.7			44.1		57.7	45.1	102.8
Italy	91.6	205.7	118.8	26.6	27.0	6.7	476.3	407.5	883.7
Luxembourg									
Netherlands					172.5		172.5		172.5
Portugal	34.3	95.4			19.4	34.4	183.5	33.8	217.2
United Kingdom	115.3		36.7		153.6		305.7		305.7
Article 18								165.5	165.5
Total	605.9	924.3	155.5	169.2	675.0	41.1	2570.9	1258.2	3829.1
of which NIC									

Source: EIB.

(million ECU)

Objectives	1989 EIB and NIC resources								
	Railways	Roads	Sea transport	Urban transport	Air transport	Intermodal Other infra-structures	Total transport	Tele-communi-cations	Total
Regional development		484.3	26.3	26.6	25.2	34.4	596.7	434.7	1031.4
Regional development + Community infrastructures	329.3	333.3			80.8		743.4	651.5	1394.8
Community infrastructures	276.5	101.2	129.2	35.5	545.6	6.7	1094.8	165.5	1260.3
Total	605.9	918.8	155.5	62.1	651.6	41.1	2434.9	1251.7	3686.5
Other objectives		5.5		107.1	23.4		136.0	6.5	142.6
General total	605.9	924.3	155.5	169.2	675.0	41.1	2570.9	1258.2	3829.1
of which NIC									

Source: EIB.

Individual EIB loans in the Community communications sector

(million ECU)

Country	1982–1989 EIB and NIC resources								
	Railways	Roads	Sea transport	Urban transport	Air transport	Intermodal Other infra-structures	Total transport	Tele-communi-cations	Total
Belgium									
Denmark	184.8	363.4	14.1		134.0		696.3	80.4	776.7
Germany		120.5		31.4	5.8		157.7		157.7
Greece	53.4	311.3	9.3		21.4		395.4	331.7	727.0
Spain	165.4	303.9	17.0	31.0	216.0	14.5	747.8	803.2	1550.9
France	541.0	1449.4	27.7	106.9	30.5		2155.5	424.9	2580.4
Ireland		326.3		49.6	102.0		477.9	338.1	816.0
Italy	272.9	1469.1	299.5	120.2	496.4	58.9	2717.0	3039.4	5756.4
Luxembourg		16.4	1.6				18.0		18.0
Netherlands					257.5		257.5		257.5
Portugal	115.2	315.5			19.4	64.0	514.0	38.6	552.5
United Kingdom	331.1	312.2	96.1		642.3		1381.7	371.4	1753.1
Article 18								525.5	525.5
Total	1663.8	4987.9	465.4	339.1	1925.1	137.3	9518.6	5953.0	15471.6
of which NIC									630.2

Source: EIB.

(million ECU)

Objectives	1982–1989 EIB and NIC resources								
	Railways	Roads	Sea transport	Urban transport	Air transport	Intermodal Other infra-structures	Total transport	Tele-communi-cations	Total
Regional development	428.6	2887.1	146.9	166.2	332.3	64.0	4025.1	4099.0	8124.1
Regional development + Community infrastructures	500.8	1227.2	38.8		178.1	14.5	1959.5	1203.3	3162.8
Community infrastructures	589.4	852.4	198.4	35.5	1344.8	58.9	3079.4	527.6	3607.0
Total	1518.9	4966.7	384.0	201.7	1855.3	137.3	9063.9	5830.0	14893.9
Other objectives	144.9	21.1	81.3	137.4	69.9		454.7	123.1	577.8
General total	1663.8	4987.9	465.4	339.1	1925.1	137.3	9518.6	5953.0	15471.6
of which NIC									630.2

Source: EIB.

Individual EIB loans in the Community communications sector

(million ECU)

Country	1985–1989 EIB and NIC resources								
	Railways	Roads	Sea transport	Urban transport	Air transport	Intermodal Other infra-structures	Total transport	Tele-communi-cations	Total
Belgium									
Denmark	129.2	235.6	4.0		127.2		496.0	74.7	570.6
Germany		120.5		31.4	5.8		157.7		157.7
Greece	53.4	162.0	9.3		14.6		239.3	98.8	338.1
Spain	165.4	303.9	17.0	31.0	216.0	14.5	747.8	803.2	1550.9
France	475.0	1219.9		106.9	8.6		1810.4	108.7	1919.2
Ireland		201.7			102.0		303.7	89.7	393.3
Italy	221.4	952.6	287.9	88.5	437.3	58.9	2046.6	2057.8	4104.3
Luxembourg			1.6				1.6		1.6
Netherlands					257.5		257.5		257.5
Portugal	115.2	315.5			19.4	64.0	514.0	38.6	552.5
United Kingdom	313.1	221.1	93.2		577.7		1205.2	295.5	1500.6
Article 18								525.5	525.5
Total	1472.7	3732.7	413.0	257.8	1766.0	137.3	7779.5	4092.3	11871.8
of which NIC									227.3

Source: EIB.

(million ECU)

Objectives	1985–1989 EIB and NIC resources								
	Railways	Roads	Sea transport	Urban transport	Air transport	Intermodal Other infra-structures	Total transport	Tele-communi-cations	Total
Regional development	351.5	2208.3	129.2	84.9	231.8	64.0	3069.7	2417.4	5487.1
Regional development + Community infrastructures	500.8	860.5	38.8		178.1	14.5	1592.8	1043.0	2635.8
Community infrastructures	589.4	642.7	198.4	35.5	1286.2	58.9	2811.1	525.5	3336.6
Total	1441.7	3711.5	366.4	120.4	1696.1	137.3	7473.6	3985.8	11459.4
Other objectives	31.0	21.1	46.6	137.4	69.9		306.0	106.5	412.4
General total	1472.7	3732.7	413.0	257.8	1766.0	137.3	7779.5	4092.3	11871.8
of which NIC									227.3

Source: EIB.

Annex II* — Transport infrastructure projects financed by the EC under budgetary heading 780 and subsequently 581 and 580

(ECU 1000)

No	Projects	Allocations authorized = financial support granted	Payments made							Payments yet to be made	
			1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989		
1	Marshalling yard and customs post Domodossola (I)	7000	2100				3150			1750 (3)	1982 budget DA: 10000 DP: p. m.
2	Evzoni—Volos motorway (Klidi—Axios) (GR)	2500		750	1125					625 (3)	
3	English Channel fixed link (bank study) (UK—F)	400	240	160						Completed	
	Total 1983	9900[1]	2340								
4	Mülhausen—North rail junction (F)	3000		900			1350		750[6]	Completed	1983 budget DA: 15000 DP: 13000
5	Wexford by-pass (IRL)	3000		900			1350			750 (3)	
6	Evzoni—Volos Motorway (Axios—Gallikos section) (GR)	4000		1200	1800					1000 (3)	
7	Luxembourg—Trier motorway (Potaschbierg to German frontier) (L)	5000		1500						3500 (2) (3)	
	Total 1984	15000[2]		5410							
8	Chiasso—Milan railway line (new route) (I)	8500			2550	3825				2125 (3)	1984 budget DA: 80000 DP: 32000
9	Access road to Mont Blanc (Le Fayet—Les Houches) (F)	3800			1140					2660 (2) (3)	
10	Evzoni—Athens—Kalamata motorway (Varibobi—Schimatari section) (GR)	12500			3750					8750 (2) (3)	
11	Larissa—Plati railway line (GR)	12500			3750					8750 (2) (3)	
12	Shankill—Bray by-pass (IRL)	2400			720					1680 (2) (3)	
13	Nuremberg marshalling yard (D)	4200			1260	1890	1050			Completed	
14	London ring-road (Leatherhead—Reigate and M4/M40 sections) (UK)	9700			2910	5240	1550			Completed	
15	Sidcup by-pass (UK)	9000			2700				6300[6]	Completed	1984 budget DA: 80000 DP: 32000

* Explanation of symbols and footnotes, see page 32.

(ECU 1000)

No	Projects	Allocations authorized = financial support granted	Payments made							Payments yet to be made	
			1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989		
16	Colchester port—Harwich railway (UK)	2500			750	1125			625[6]	Completed	
17	Extension of Lys internal waterway (F)	2600			780					1820 (2) (3)	
18	Extension of Lys internal waterway (B)	5500			1650					3850 (2) (3)	
19	Dordrecht rail bridge (NL)	1700			510					1190 (2) (3)	
	Frontier infrastructure projects at:										
20	Doirani (GR)	770			308					462 (2)	
21	Rocroi (F)	670			268					402 (2)	
22	Mont Saint-Martin — Athus (F)	70			28				42[6]	Completed	
23	Modane railway station(F)	820			328		492			Completed	
24	Dromad Carrickamon (IRL)	180			72					108 (2)	
25	Brenner, Dadobre (I)	182			73				109[6]	Completed	
26	Gasperich (L)	1470			588					882 (2)	
27	Goch—Gennep (NL)	30			12		18			Completed	
28	Venlo (NL)	20			8				12[6]		
29	Newry (UK)	230			92					138 (2)	
30	Enniskillen (UK)	460			184					276 (2)	
	Total 1985	79802[2]			27356						
31	Improvement of Brenner—Bozen railway line (I)	19000				7600				11400 (2) (3)	1985 budget DA: 90000 DP: 34000
32	Construction of Chavants tunnel for access to Mont Blanc tunnel (F)	4000				1600				2400 (2) (3)	
33	Aachen—Cologne motorway: increased capacity in Cologne area (D)	4000				1600		1200		1200 (3)	
34	A120 road to East Coast ports: construction of Braintree by-pass (UK)	3500				1400			1050	1050 (3)	
35	Toulouse—Barcelona road: improvement near Pensaguel—Le Vernet (F)	2000				800				1200 (2) (3)	
36	Bayonne—Hendaye railway: increased capacity and safety (F)	1500				600				900 (2) (3)	

(ECU 1000)

No	Projects	Allocations authorized = financial support granted	Payments made							Payments yet to be made
			1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	
	Between Netherlands and Belgium: work to complete Bergen op Zoom—Antwerp motorway									
37	Bergen op Zoom (NL)	4200				1680				2520 (2) (3)
38	Antwerp (B)	1800				720				1080 (2) (3)
39	Access to Channel ports and to planned Channel tunnel — completion of M20 motorway between Ashford and Maidstone (UK)	9000				3600				5400 (2) (3)
40	Transit road between Sjaeland & Sweden: electrification and improvement of Ringsted—Rundsted (DK)	7000				2800				4200 (2) (3)
	On the main road, Peloponnese to Yugoslav frontier (GR):									
41	(a) Inofita—Schimatari	4600				1840			1380[6]	1380 (3)
42	(b) Ritsona—Thivai	3100				1240			930[6]	930 (3)
43	(c) Solomos—Nemea	3500				1400	1050			1050 (3)
	On the main rail line, Athens-Saloniki — Yugoslav frontier (GR):									
44	(a) Sfinga—Aliartos	1550				620		465		465 (3)
45	(b)Tithoria—Domokos—Larissa	10350				4140		3105		3105 (3)
46	(c) Salonika—Idomeni	1400				560		420		420 (3)
47	On main North—South transit axis of Ireland: Dunleer by-pass (IRL)	4000				1600				2400 (2) (3)
	On the main transit axes of the Iberian peninsula:									
48	(a) Irun—Portugal N620 (E82) road: Tordesillas by-pass (E)	2500				1000				1500 (2) (3)
49	Oporto—Spanish frontier IP4 (E801) road: Paredes—Peñafiel (P)	1500				600				900 (2) (3)
50	Ostend port: works for construction of new ramp for vehicle embarkation (B)	1000				400				600 (2) (3)

(ECU 1000)

No	Projects	Allocations authorized = financial support granted	Payments made							Payments yet to be made	
			1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989		
51	Line from Brenner to FRG and to Italy through Austria: studies and preparatory works for improvement project (I)	500				200			150	150 (3)	
	Total 1986	90000[3]				44255					
52	Scandinavian link — contribution to development of various fixed links (study) (DK)	500					200	150			1986 budget DA: 65000 DP: 24000
53	Transcity: preparatory work for planned provision of new rail links between the Sarre, Luxembourg and France (study) (D, F, L)	100						40	60	Completed	and 1987 DA: 10000 DP: 23800
54	Planned demonstration for better use and safety of motorways (study): Rhine corridor	1200						480		720 (2) (3)	
55	Rail lines for high-speed trains — impact analysis (study)	500						200		300 (2) (3)	
56	Study of European combined transport network	500						200		300 (2) (3)	
	Road links for access to Channel Tunnel:										
57	(a) Ashford road (UK)	1500						600		900 (2) (3)	
58	(b) Folkestone—Canterbury road (UK)	1500					600			900 (2) (3)	
59	(c) A26 Calais (F)	1500						600		900 (2) (3)	
60	(d) A26 Calais—Marck (F)	1500						600		900 (2) (3)	
61	New rail tunnel on line from Brenner to Ceraino (I)	6000					2400			3600 (2) (3)	
62	Extension of rail link between NL and FRG between Dordrecht and Eindhoven (NL)	3000						1200		1800 (2) (3)	
63	Road link between UK and Ireland: Pen—y—Clip by-pass (UK)	2100					840			1260 (2) (3)	
64	Work on combined transport axes FRG/Spain/Kehl/Cerbère (F)	2100						840		1260 (2) (3)	

(ECU 1000)

No	Projects	Allocations authorized = financial support granted	Payments made							Payments yet to be made	
			1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989		
65	Transhipment centre for combined transport at Verona (traffic through Austria) (I)	2500					1000			1500 (2) (3)	
66	Electrification of Salonika—Yugoslav frontier rail link (GR)	2500						1000		1500 (2) (3)	
67	Modernization of Lisbon/Oporto/Spain (Beira Alta) rail line (P)	8000						3200		4800 (2) (3)	
68	Construction of a Madrid—Burgos—France motorway (E)	6000						2400		3600 (2) (3)	
69	Construction of a Lisbon/Madrid/Barcelona rail line (Coslada—Ricla) (E)	6000					2400			3600 (2) (3)	
70	Athens—Kalamata road axis: Artimisio—Tripolis road (GR)	3000						1200		1800 (2) (3)	
71	Ireland North—South road axis (Tallaght—Galway section of Dublin ring-road (IRL)	3000					1200			1800 (2) (3)	
	Total 1987	53000[4]					22475				
72	Preparatory studies and works (Scanlink) Adaptation of container dimensions to combined rail transport	500						200		300 (2) (3)	1988 budget DA: 60000 + 5000 Art. 581 DP: 60000
73	Turin—Modena section (I)	3000						1200		1800 (2) (3)	
74	Bologna—Bari section (I)	5000						2000		3000 (2) (3)	
75	UK—Benelux—Modane section (F)	3000						1200		1800 (2) (3)	
76	Application of new technologies to road traffic management: RDS—TMC data system in Rhône valley (F)	1500								1500 (1) (2) (3)	
	Improvement of links with Iberian peninsula:										
77	RN 20, Foix by-pass (F)	4000						1600		2400 (2) (3)	
78	RN20, Salverdun—St Jean de Verges (F)	3000						1200		1800 (2) (3)	
79	N1, Madrid—Burgos, Manoteras—Continents section (E)	2000						800		1200 (2) (3)	

(ECU 1000)

No	Projects	Allocations authorized = financial support granted	Payments made							Payments yet to be made	
			1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989		
80	Madrid—Zaragoza—Barcelona—French frontier rail line (E)	10000						4000		6000 (2) (3)	
81	Northern line: Lisbon—Oporto (P)	3000						1200		1800 (2) (3)	
	Extension of transit routes with link to Channel Tunnel										
82	E40, Veurne—French frontier (B)	3000						1200		1800 (2) (3)	
83	Paris—London rail line for high-speed trains, London—Folkestone section (UK)	10000						4000		6000 (2) (3)	
84	Dublin—Northern Cross route (IRL)	5000						2000		3000 (2) (3)	
85	Electrification of Ringsted—Odense line (DK)	2000						800		1200 (2) (3)	
86	Electrification	3000						1200		1800 (2) (3)	
87	Rail signalling system	500						200		300 (2) (3)	
88	Signalling on Salonika—Idomeni line (GR)	1500						600		900 (2) (3)	
89	Boxmeer—Venlo motorway (NL)	5000						2000		3000 (2) (3)	
	Total 1988	65000[5]						43300			
90	Combined transport axis: Turin—Bologna—Bari (I)	6000[7]							2400[6]	3600 (2) (3)	1989 budget DA: 60000 DP: 30000
91	M40, South-East intersection Madrid (E)	3000[7]							1200[6]	1800 (2) (3)	
92	Lisbon—Evora—Madrid rail line (P)	5000[7]							2000[6]	3000 (2) (3)	
93	A20/M20 Folkestone—Dover, Maidstone—Ashford sections (UK)	5000[7]							2000[6]	3000 (2) (3)	
94	RN28, Abbeville—Rouen section (F)	4000[7]							1600[6]	2400 (2) (3)	
95	Rail link for high-speed trains—Brussels—Aachen (D) (B)	15000[7] + 5000[8]							6000[6] +2000[9]	9000 (2) (3) +3000 (2) (3)	
96	Electrification of Ringsted—Odense line (DK)	5000[6]							2000[6]	3000 (2) (3)	

(ECU 1000)

No	Projects	Allocations authorized = financial support granted	Payments made							Payments yet to be made	
			1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989		
97	Evzoni—Athens motorway, Elefsina—Corinth Malakassa—Inofita sections (GR)	7000[7]							2800[6]	4200 (2) (3)	
98	Boxmeer—Venlo—FRG motorway (NL)	3000[7]							1200[6]	1800 (2) (3)	
99	Luxembourg East-ring-road	2500[7]							1000[6]	1500 (2) (3)	
100	Vérona—Bologna by-pass (I)	3000[7]							1200[6]	1800 (2) (3)	
	Total 1989	60000[5][7] + 5000[8]							26000[10]		

Source: DG VII, Commission of the European Communities.

(1): Payment of first portion yet to be made
(2): Payment of second portion yet to be made
(3): Payment of third portion yet to be made

DA: allocations for authorizations
DP: allocations for payments

[1] Legal basis: Council Regulation No 3600/82 of 30.12.1982, Official Journal L 376, 31.12.1982, p. 10.
[2] Legal basis: Council Regulation No 3620/84 of 19.12.1984, Official Journal L 333, 21.12.1984, p. 58.
[3] Legal basis: Council Regulation No 4059/86 of 22.12.1986, Official Journal L 378, 31.12.1986, p. 24.
[4] Legal basis: Council Regulation No 4070/87 of 22.12.1987, Official Journal L 380, 31.12.1987, p. 33.
[5] Legal basis: Council Regulation No 4048/88 of 19.12.1988, Official Journal L 356, 24.12.1988, p. 5.
[6] The payment will be made before 31.12.1989.
[7] Authorization for the allocations will be given before 31.12.1989.
[8] Authorization for the allocations will be given before 31.12.1989, in the event of authority being given for transfer to another chapter; otherwise, this project will be covered by the authorization for future allocations.
[9] The payment will only be made if an authorization for allocations in 1989 is possible (see footnote 8).
[10] Presumably, on 31.12.1989; on 1.8.1989 ECU 1260000 of this amount was in fact paid.

Annex III — List of certain European Parliament reports

Doc. A2–252/86 — Hoffman report on the Commission proposal [COM(86) 360 — Doc. C2–69/86] on the medium-term programme on transport infrastructures.

Doc. A2–241/87 — Anastassopoulos report on the Commission proposal [COM(87) 579 — Doc. C2–257/87] on an *ad hoc* regulation on transport infrastructures.

Doc. A2–187/88 — Hoffman report on the Commission proposal [COM(88) 340 — Doc. C2–109/88] on an action programme concerning transport infrastructures with a view to attainment of the 1992 internal market.

Doc. A2–47/89 — Topmann report on the Commission proposal [COM(87) 716 — Doc. C2–296/87] on the allocation of transport infrastructure costs to certain utility vehicles.

Doc. A3–140/90 — Romera i Alcazar report on the amended Commission proposal [COM(89) 238 — Doc. C3–117/90] on an action programme concerning transport infrastructures with a view to attainment of the 1992 internal market.

European Communities — European Parliament

Community policy on transport infrastructures

Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities

1991 — 33 pp. – 21 × 29.7 cm

ISBN: 92-823-0258-X

Catalogue number: AX-70-91-192-EN-C

Price (excluding VAT) in Luxembourg: ECU 5

Venta y suscripciones • Salg og abonnement • Verkauf und Abonnement • Πωλήσεις και συνδρομές
Sales and subscriptions • Vente et abonnements • Vendita e abbonamenti
Verkoop en abonnementen • Venda e assinaturas

BELGIQUE / BELGIË

Moniteur belge / Belgisch Staatsblad
Rue de Louvain 42 / Leuvenseweg 42
1000 Bruxelles / 1000 Brussel
Tél. (02) 512 00 26
Fax 511 01 84
CCP / Postrekening 000-2005502-27

Autres distributeurs /
Overige verkooppunten

Librairie européenne/ Europese Boekhandel
Avenue Albert Jonnart 50 /
Albert Jonnartlaan 50
1200 Bruxelles / 1200 Brussel
Tél. (02) 734 02 81
Fax 735 08 60

Jean De Lannoy
Avenue du Roi 202 /Koningslaan 202
1060 Bruxelles / 1060 Brussel
Tél. (02) 538 51 69
Télex 63220 UNBOOK B
Fax (02) 538 08 41

CREDOC
Rue de la Montagne 34 / Bergstraat 34
Bte 11 / Bus 11
1000 Bruxelles / 1000 Brussel

DANMARK

J. H. Schultz Information A/S
EF-Publikationer
Ottiliavej 18
2500 Valby
Tlf. 36 44 22 66
Fax 36 44 01 41
Girokonto 6 00 08 86

BR DEUTSCHLAND

Bundesanzeiger Verlag
Breite Straße
Postfach 10 80 06
5000 Köln 1
Tel. (02 21) 20 29-0
Telex ANZEIGER BONN 8 882 595
Fax 20 29 278

GREECE

G.C. Eleftheroudakis SA
International Bookstore
Nikis Street 4
10563 Athens
Tel. (01) 322 63 23
Telex 219410 ELEF
Fax 323 98 21

ESPAÑA

Boletín Oficial del Estado
Trafalgar, 27
28010 Madrid
Tel. (91) 44 82 135

Mundi-Prensa Libros, S.A.
Castelló, 37
28001 Madrid
Tel. (91) 431 33 99 (Libros)
431 32 22 (Suscripciones)
435 36 37 (Dirección)
Télex 49370-MPLI-E
Fax (91) 575 39 98

Sucursal:

Librería Internacional AEDOS
Consejo de Ciento, 391
08009 Barcelona
Tel. (93) 301 86 15
Fax (93) 317 01 41

Llibreria de la Generalitat de Catalunya
Rambla dels Estudis, 118 (Palau Moja)
08002 Barcelona
Tel. (93) 302 68 35
302 64 62
Fax (93) 302 12 99

FRANCE

Journal officiel
Service des publications des Communautés européennes
26, rue Desaix
75727 Paris Cedex 15
Tél. (1) 40 58 75 00
Fax (1) 40 58 75 74

IRELAND

Government Publications Sales Office
Sun Alliance House
Molesworth Street
Dublin 2
Tel. (1) 71 03 09

or by post

Government Stationery Office
EEC Section
6th floor
Bishop Street
Dublin 8
Tel. (1) 78 16 66
Fax (1) 78 06 45

ITALIA

Licosa Spa
Via Benedetto Fortini, 120/10
Casella postale 552
50125 Firenze
Tel. (055) 64 54 15
Fax 64 12 57
Telex 570466 LICOSA I
CCP 343 509

Subagenti:

Libreria scientifica
Lucio de Biasio - AEIOU
Via Meravigli, 16
20123 Milano
Tel. (02) 80 76 79

Herder Editrice e Libreria
Piazza Montecitorio, 117-120
00186 Roma
Tel. (06) 679 46 28/679 53 04

Libreria giuridica
Via XII Ottobre, 172/R
16121 Genova
Tel. (010) 59 56 93

GRAND-DUCHÉ DE LUXEMBOURG

Messageries Paul Kraus
11, rue Christophe Plantin
2339 Luxembourg
Tél. 499 88 88
Télex 2515
Fax 499 88 84 44
CCP 49242-63

NEDERLAND

SDU Overheidsinformatie
Externe Fondsen
Postbus 20014
2500 EA 's-Gravenhage
Tel. (070) 37 89 911
Fax (070) 34 75 778

PORTUGAL

Imprensa Nacional
Casa da Moeda, EP
Rua D. Francisco Manuel de Melo, 5
1092 Lisboa Codex
Tel. (01) 69 34 14

Distribuidora de Livros Bertrand, Ld.ª
Grupo Bertrand, SA
Rua das Terras dos Vales, 4-A
Apartado 37
2700 Amadora Codex
Tel. (01) 49 59 050
Telex 15798 BERDIS
Fax 49 60 255

UNITED KINGDOM

HMSO Books (PC 16)
HMSO Publications Centre
51 Nine Elms Lane
London SW8 5DR
Tel. (071) 873 2000
Fax GP3 873 8463
Telex 29 71 138

ÖSTERREICH

Manz'sche Verlags- und Universitätsbuchhandlung
Kohlmarkt 16
1014 Wien
Tel. (0222) 531 61-0
Telex 11 25 00 BOX A
Fax (0222) 531 61-81

SUOMI

Akateeminen Kirjakauppa
Keskuskatu 1
PO Box 128
00101 Helsinki
Tel. (0) 121 41
Fax (0) 121 44 41

NORGE

Narvesen information center
Bertrand Narvesens vei 2
PO Box 6125 Etterstad
0602 Oslo 6
Tel. (2) 57 33 00
Telex 79668 NIC N
Fax (2) 68 19 01

SVERIGE

BTJ
Box 200
22100 Lund
Tel. (046) 18 00 00
Fax (046) 18 01 25

SCHWEIZ / SUISSE / SVIZZERA

OSEC
Stampfenbachstraße 85
8035 Zürich
Tel. (01) 365 54 49
Fax (01) 365 54 11

CESKOSLOVENSKO

NIS
Havelkova 22
13000 Praha 3
Tel. (02) 235 84 46
Fax 42-2-264775

MAGYARORSZÁG

Agroinform
Budapest I. Kir.
Attila út 93
1012 Budapest
Tel. (1) 56 82 11
Telex (22) 4717 AGINF H-61

POLAND

Business Foundation
ul. Krucza 38/42
00-512 Warszawa
Tel. (22) 21 99 93, 628-28-82
International Fax&Phone
(0-39) 12-00-77

YUGOSLAVIA

Privredni Vjesnik
Bulevar Lenjina 171/XIV
11070 Beograd
Tel. (11) 123 23 40

CYPRUS

Cyprus Chamber of Commerce and Industry
Chamber Building
38 Grivas Dhigenis Ave
3 Deligiorgis Street
PO Box 1455
Nicosia
Tel. (2) 449500/462312
Fax (2) 458630

TÜRKIYE

Pres Gazete Kitap Dergi Pazarlama Dağitim Ticaret ve sanayi AŞ
Narlibahçe Sokak N. 15
Istanbul-Cağaloğlu
Tel. (1) 520 92 96 - 528 55 66
Fax 520 64 57
Telex 23822 DSVO-TR

AUTRES PAYS
OTHER COUNTRIES
ANDERE LÄNDER

Office des publications officielles des Communautés européennes
2, rue Mercier
2985 Luxembourg
Tél. 49 92 81
Télex PUBOF LU 1324 b
Fax 48 85 73
CC bancaire BIL 8-109/6003/700

CANADA

Renouf Publishing Co. Ltd
Mail orders — Head Office:
1294 Algoma Road
Ottawa, Ontario K1B 3W8
Tel. (613) 741 43 33
Fax (613) 741 54 39
Telex 0534783

Ottawa Store:
61 Sparks Street
Tel. (613) 238 89 85

Toronto Store:
211 Yonge Street
Tel. (416) 363 31 71

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

UNIPUB
4611-F Assembly Drive
Lanham, MD 20706-4391
Tel. Toll Free (800) 274 4888
Fax (301) 459 0056

AUSTRALIA

Hunter Publications
58A Gipps Street
Collingwood
Victoria 3066

JAPAN

Kinokuniya Company Ltd
17-7 Shinjuku 3-Chome
Shinjuku-ku
Tokyo 160-91
Tel. (03) 3439-0121

Journal Department
PO Box 55 Chitose
Tokyo 156
Tel. (03) 3439-0124

Price (excluding VAT) in Luxembourg: ECU 5

ISBN 92-823-0258-X

OFFICE FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS
OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

L-2985 Luxembourg