

# Procedure file

Basic information	
COD - Ordinary legislative procedure (ex-codecision procedure) Decision	1994/0098(COD) Procedure completed
Trans-European transport network: Community guidelines Amended by <a href="#">1997/0358(COD)</a> Amended by <a href="#">2001/0229(COD)</a> Repealed by <a href="#">2009/0110(COD)</a>	
Subject 3.20.11 Trans-European transport networks	

Key players			
European Parliament	Former committee responsible		
	<b>TRAN</b> Transport and Tourism		26/07/1994
		PSE <a href="#">PIECYK Willi</a>	
	<b>TRAN</b> Transport and Tourism		26/07/1994
		PSE <a href="#">PIECYK Willi</a>	
	Former committee for opinion		
	<b>BUDG</b> Budgets		07/09/1994
	ELDR <a href="#">PORTO Manuel</a>		
<b>ECON</b> Economic and Monetary Affairs, Industrial Policy		04/10/1994	
	PPE <a href="#">JARZEMBOWSKI Georg</a>		
<b>REGI</b> Regional Policy		13/09/1994	
	PPE <a href="#">LANGENHAGEN Brigitte</a>		
<b>ENVI</b> Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection		05/10/1994	
	ELDR <a href="#">DYBKJÆR Lone</a>		
Council of the European Union	Council configuration	Meeting	Date
	<a href="#">General Affairs</a>	<a href="#">1943</a>	16/07/1996
	<a href="#">Transport, Telecommunications and Energy</a>	<a href="#">1907</a>	11/03/1996
	<a href="#">General Affairs</a>	<a href="#">1902</a>	29/01/1996
	<a href="#">Transport, Telecommunications and Energy</a>	<a href="#">1870</a>	28/09/1995
	<a href="#">Transport, Telecommunications and Energy</a>	<a href="#">1834</a>	14/03/1995

Key events			
05/04/1994	Additional information		Summary
06/04/1994	Legislative proposal published	COM(1994)0106	Summary
21/07/1994	Committee referral announced in Parliament, 1st reading		
21/02/1995	Modified legislative proposal published	COM(1995)0048	Summary
14/03/1995	Debate in Council	<a href="#">1834</a>	Summary

19/04/1995	Vote in committee, 1st reading		Summary
18/04/1995	Committee report tabled for plenary, 1st reading	<a href="#">A4-0096/1995</a>	
17/05/1995	Debate in Parliament		Summary
18/05/1995	Decision by Parliament, 1st reading	T4-0239/1995	Summary
18/06/1995	Modified legislative proposal published	COM(1995)0298	Summary
27/09/1995	Council position published	<a href="#">09313/2/1995</a>	Summary
11/10/1995	Committee referral announced in Parliament, 2nd reading		
21/11/1995	Vote in committee, 2nd reading		Summary
20/11/1995	Committee recommendation tabled for plenary, 2nd reading	<a href="#">A4-0292/1995</a>	
12/12/1995	Debate in Parliament		Summary
13/12/1995	Decision by Parliament, 2nd reading	T4-0602/1995	Summary
29/01/1996	Parliament's amendments rejected by Council		Summary
11/03/1996	Debate in Council	<a href="#">1907</a>	Summary
29/05/1996	Formal meeting of Conciliation Committee		
17/06/1996	Final decision by Conciliation Committee		Summary
18/06/1996	Joint text approved by Conciliation Committee co-chairs	<a href="#">3613/1996</a>	
07/07/1996	Report tabled for plenary, 3rd reading	<a href="#">A4-0232/1996</a>	
16/07/1996	Debate in Parliament		Summary
16/07/1996	Decision by Council, 3rd reading		Summary
17/07/1996	Decision by Parliament, 3rd reading	T4-0395/1996	Summary
23/07/1996	Final act signed		
23/07/1996	End of procedure in Parliament		
09/09/1996	Final act published in Official Journal		

### Technical information

Procedure reference	1994/0098(COD)
Procedure type	COD - Ordinary legislative procedure (ex-codecision procedure)
Procedure subtype	Legislation
Legislative instrument	Decision
	Amended by <a href="#">1997/0358(COD)</a>
	Amended by <a href="#">2001/0229(COD)</a>
	Repealed by <a href="#">2009/0110(COD)</a>

Legal basis	EC before Amsterdam E 129D-p1
Stage reached in procedure	Procedure completed
Committee dossier	CODE/4/07528

## Documentation gateway

Legislative proposal		<a href="#">COM(1994)0106</a> <a href="#">OJ C 220 08.08.1994, p. 0001</a>	07/04/1994	EC	Summary
Committee of the Regions: opinion		<a href="#">CDR0176/1994</a> <a href="#">OJ C 210 14.08.1995, p. 0034</a>	28/09/1994	CofR	Summary
Committee opinion	<b>BUDG</b>	PE210.248/DEF	21/11/1994	EP	
Economic and Social Committee: opinion, report		<a href="#">CES1305/1994</a> <a href="#">OJ C 397 31.12.1994, p. 0023</a>	23/11/1994	ESC	Summary
Committee opinion	<b>ECON</b>	PE210.361/DEF	24/11/1994	EP	
Committee opinion	<b>ENVI</b>	PE210.624/DEF	20/12/1994	EP	
Committee opinion	<b>REGI</b>	PE209.379/DEF	09/02/1995	EP	
Modified legislative proposal		<a href="#">COM(1995)0048</a> <a href="#">OJ C 097 20.04.1995, p. 0001</a>	22/02/1995	EC	Summary
Committee report tabled for plenary, 1st reading/single reading		<a href="#">A4-0096/1995</a> <a href="#">OJ C 151 19.06.1995, p. 0003</a>	19/04/1995	EP	
Committee draft report		PE211.161	05/05/1995	EP	
Text adopted by Parliament, 1st reading/single reading		T4-0239/1995 <a href="#">OJ C 151 19.06.1995, p. 0172-0234</a>	18/05/1995	EP	Summary
Modified legislative proposal		<a href="#">COM(1995)0298</a>	19/06/1995	EC	Summary
Council position		<a href="#">09313/2/1995</a> <a href="#">OJ C 331 08.12.1995, p. 0001</a>	28/09/1995	CSL	Summary
Commission communication on Council's position		<a href="#">SEC(1995)1429</a>	09/10/1995	EC	Summary
Committee draft report		PE214.457	19/10/1995	EP	
Committee recommendation tabled for plenary, 2nd reading		<a href="#">A4-0292/1995</a> <a href="#">OJ C 339 18.12.1995, p. 0005</a>	21/11/1995	EP	
Text adopted by Parliament, 2nd reading		T4-0602/1995 <a href="#">OJ C 017 22.01.1996, p. 0035-0058</a>	13/12/1995	EP	Summary
Commission opinion on Parliament's position at 2nd reading		<a href="#">COM(1996)0016</a>	24/01/1996	EC	Summary
Joint text approved by Conciliation Committee co-chairs		<a href="#">3613/1996</a>	19/06/1996	CSL/EP	
Report tabled for plenary by Parliament delegation to Conciliation Committee, 3rd reading		<a href="#">A4-0232/1996</a> <a href="#">OJ C 261 09.09.1996, p. 0005</a>	08/07/1996	EP	
Text adopted by Parliament, 3rd reading		T4-0395/1996 <a href="#">OJ C 261 09.09.1996, p. 0050-0058</a>	17/07/1996	EP	Summary
Committee opinion	<b>BUDG</b>	PE209.089/DEF	06/10/2000	EP	

Follow-up document		<a href="#">SEC(2004)0220</a>	19/02/2004	EC	
Follow-up document		<a href="#">COM(2007)0094</a>	13/03/2007	EC	Summary
Follow-up document		<a href="#">SEC(2007)0313</a>	13/03/2007	EC	
Follow-up document		<a href="#">COM(2009)0005</a>	20/01/2009	EC	Summary
Follow-up document		<a href="#">SEC(2009)0018</a>	20/01/2009	EC	Summary
Follow-up document		C(2009)05706	22/07/2009	EC	
Follow-up document		C(2010)3558	08/06/2010	EC	

#### Additional information

European Commission

[EUR-Lex](#)

#### Final act

[Decision 1996/1692](#)

[OJ L 228 09.09.1996, p. 0001](#) Summary

## Trans-European transport network: Community guidelines

---

\$summary.text

## Trans-European transport network: Community guidelines

---

This proposal for a decision aimed to adopt the guidelines to be implemented in the transport sector, in accordance with the provisions of Chapter XII of the Treaty on European Union, on trans-European networks. The trans-European transport network, as envisaged, had the following characteristics: - roads: 58 000 km to be built, modernised or realigned; - railways: 70 000 km of lines, including 23 000 km of high-speed lines and conventional lines modernised to take speeds of over 200 km/h; - inland waterways: 12 000 km of waterways; - combined transport: development of well-equipped intermodal corridors and platforms to ensure effective transshipment of goods between railways, roads, inland waterways and shipping routes; - airports: 250 of Community significance; - European radio navigation system, based on satellites: this would help the network to function correctly and safely. The investment needed to develop this network amounted to around ECU 400 billion over the next 15 years. Public funding would be supplemented by public/private partnerships, the arrangements for which were being examined within a working party chaired by Commissioner Christophersen. ?

## Trans-European transport network: Community guidelines

---

\$summary.text

## Trans-European transport network: Community guidelines

---

\$summary.text

## Trans-European transport network: Community guidelines

---

Following the recommendations of the Essen European Council and the demands of the European Parliament, the Commission has amended its proposal as follows: - Annex I to the initial proposal has been amended in order to take account of enlargement to Austria, Finland and Sweden; - an additional provision has been added to Article 10 on the railway network in order to take account of new high-speed technologies (e.g. subject to adequate conditions of interoperability of systems such as TRANSRAPID); - an Annex III containing a list of projects which should start up in the next five years has been inserted. The list of projects is indicative as regards investments in infrastructure over the first five of the next fifteen years when the trans-European transport network is established, as defined in the guidelines. The list includes: - the 14 projects which the Essen European Council defined as priority projects ready for implementation (Berlin-Munich-Verone TGV; Paris-Brussels-Cologne-Amsterdam-London TGV; TGV South; Paris-East-South Germany TGV; Betuwe line; Lyon-Torino-Milan-Venice-Trieste TGV; Patras-Thessalonica motorway; Lisbon-Valladolid motorway; Cork-Dublin-Belfast-Larne-Stranraer rail

link; Malpensa Airport; rail/road link between Denmark and Sweden; Nordic triangle; Ireland-United Kingdom -Benelux road link; west coast main line); - 21 other important projects which complement the above 14 projects with a view to structured development of the trans-European transport network; - 5 pilot projects which will allow logistics to be introduced into the transport network. ?

## Trans-European transport network: Community guidelines

---

Pending Parliament's opinion under the co-decision procedure, the Council held a policy debate on the proposal for a decision on the Community guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network. The proposal concerns all forms of transport infrastructure - land, sea and air - in a context of intermodal integration. The proposed guidelines are intended to replace the three modal Decisions adopted by the Council on 29 October 1993 (road, inland-waterway and combined-transport networks). They also include railways, ports and airports, and information and management systems for the whole network. After the debate, during which progress was made on some aspects of the proposed Decision, the Council instructed the Permanent Representatives Committee to expedite the discussions, in light of the opinion of the European Parliament, so that a common position could be established as soon as possible. Referring to the conclusions of the Essen European Council, and independently of the proposed Decision, the Council: - stressed the importance it attached to the coherent and rapid development of the trans-European transport network, and in particular the implementation of the 14 priority projects approved by the European Council; - drew attention to the importance of the systems of transport management, especially in the field of air transport.

## Trans-European transport network: Community guidelines

---

The Committee has adopted the report of Mr. Wilhelm PIECYK. There were more than 300 amendments tabled, not only on the proposal itself, but also on the annexes, where the networks of railways, roads, waterways, airports are defined in detail. The rapporteur stressed that absolute priority should be given to environment-friendly modes of transport and to creating ecologically acceptable transport networks. . But in the Commission proposal there is a considerable gap between ambition and reality. There are only 11 rail links, 57 for combined transport and 26 inland waterway links as against 126 road links. The Committee almost unanimously felt yesterday that this approach must be changed. Also the investments should be modified: rail 40%, road 25%, combined transport 15%, waterways/sea and airports/inland ports/telematics 20%. It was reconfirmed yesterday that the projects proposed by the Christophersen Group are totally unacceptable, because Parliament did not participate in and was not informed. The Committee agreed with the rapporteur that in the proposal the aspect of environmental protection requirements should take account of two points. Firstly, a separate article on environmental requirements is required and, secondly, the Annexes and in particular the list of priority projects, need complete restructuring. ?

## Trans-European transport network: Community guidelines

---

Noting that the proposal sought to establish a communications system that guaranteed 'sustainable mobility', the rapporteur highlighted the concept of ecologically acceptable transport and cited trains and the inland waterway network as examples. In light of this criterion the Commission proposal was not satisfactory as it provided for 126 road links but only 11 projects for rail, 57 for combined transport and 26 for inland waterway networks. Mr PIECYK therefore proposed that 40% of the investments should go to rail, 25% to roads, 15% to combined transport and 20% to inland waterways. The rapporteur also regretted that Parliament had not been involved in the drafting of the proposals by the Christophersen Group, which had been damaging because they raised false expectations among the public in the Member States. Parliament therefore asked that it be involved at the project development stage. The Commission responsible for transport, Mr KINNOCK, stated that the Commission could only take over around 100 of the 238 amendments tabled, and it had reservations about another 20 of them. He added that he had prepared a text summarising once again the Commission's position on this matter.

## Trans-European transport network: Community guidelines

---

In adopting the report by Mr Wilhelm Ernst Piecyk, the European Parliament approved the Commission proposal. The EP's amendments introduced new provisions aimed, in particular, at calling for environmental impact studies (protection of nature and the countryside) during the implementation of projects of common interest. They also stressed the importance of safeguarding the improvement, coherence and interoperability of the trans-European transport network, the creation of sustainable jobs in proportion to the level of investment, the safety of sea transport, and the air traffic control system. Furthermore, the European Parliament added several projects to the 14 priority projects to supplement the maps of the various networks: - Road network: the EP added over 15 new projects concerning Belgium, Germany, Ireland, the Netherlands, Finland, France, Spain, and the United Kingdom in particular; - Rail network: in particular, the EP included the following in the network: the Antwerp-Ruhr rail link with links to Rotterdam and Zeebrugge; a series of projects in Germany and the United Kingdom; a Madrid-Valencia-Barcelona high-speed train link; two rail lines in Sicily; improvement of the Berlin-Moscow line; a Porto-Vigo high-speed link; a project for a piggyback link across the Central Pyrenees; the Dunkerque-Channel Tunnel link; - Inland waterways: the EP called for the map for Italy to include the network between Veneto and the Po plain, and added the Igoumenitsa-Patras-Cyprus-North Africa network; - Combined transport: the EP added projects relating to the United Kingdom, Italy, Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands and Finland; - Ports: the EP added projects concerning Denmark, Germany, the United Kingdom, the Canary Islands, the Azores and Madeira; - Airports: the EP called for the port of Antwerp to be classed as a seaport, for Stansted Airport to be included, and for Shannon Airport to be granted the status of a Community connecting point. ?

## Trans-European transport network: Community guidelines

---

The Commission's second amended proposal incorporated 67 of the European Parliament's amendments in full and 35 in part (the EP had adopted 159 amendments at first reading). The main amendments introduced by the Commission related to the following points: - the

trans-European networks should take account of the aim to protect nature and the countryside; - modes of transport which caused least harm to the environment should be promoted; - projects should be evaluated in light of the alternative options for the infrastructure concerned; - the investment planned for the trans-European networks should have an effect on employment; - coherence and compliance with Community legislation should be guaranteed; - the guidelines were designed to form a reference framework for the implementation of projects of common interest in accordance with their technical and financial viability. They related mainly to the public authorities but also covered the private sector; - the network should be put in place progressively at Community level between now and 2010; - the objectives of the network were clarified: the network should, by example, encourage the strengthening of economic and social cohesion, offer users good quality infrastructures, be interoperable within and between all modes of transport, and interlink the major conurbations and regions of the Community, without bottlenecks; - the components of the network (transport infrastructures, traffic management systems, and positioning and navigation systems) were defined and set out in detail. Issues relating to the interoperability of the network, including telematic services, were covered by separate legislation; - the broad lines of measures included a reference to the creation of interconnection centres located on the periphery of urban centres; - the priorities for action were restructured and supplemented: the first priority was optimisation of the capacity and efficiency of existing infrastructure before establishing a new infrastructure. The idea of the systematic incorporation of modes of transport was also evident in several areas. Finally, a priority was added concerning the completion of projects of particular economic interest, taking into account the impact on the environment and economic and social cohesion; - the concept of potential economic viability was assessed on the basis of the socio-economic costs and benefits; - a new Annex III including a non-exhaustive list of projects due to commence in the next five years was added to the decision; - a new article was specially devoted to environmental requirements. These aspects should be taken into consideration during all phases of the development of the network, planning, design and completion; - the title of the section concerning the inland waterways network was revised and supplemented: a new paragraph included inland ports in the text, following the example of seaports; - with regard to ports (characteristics of the network), the text emphasised the infrastructure aspect of seaports; it clarified the function of ports in coastal shipping, which had significant potential for the harmonious development of the trans-European network which respected the environment; - an article authorised the Commission to define - on request - a project as fulfilling the conditions for projects of common interest. This definition did not imply any right to Community support; - the committee set up for the network had a purely advisory role and had no implementing powers. One of its main tasks was to exchange information between the Commission and the Member States on the development of the network: - the guidelines would be revised every five years and initially on 1 July 1999. It was important to note that the maps had been amended in order to distinguish more clearly between "existing links" and links that were deficient or due to be improved. Similarly, Annex II had been amended to set out the criteria and technical specifications for projects of common interest, particularly as regards nodes and traffic management systems. Finally, the Commission rejected Parliament's amendments aimed at: - including among the broad lines of measures studies based on cost-benefit analyses for the regions concerned and the creation of lasting jobs; - doing away with the main characteristics of the proposed road network; - calling for projects to be assessed on the basis of their compatibility with non-Community networks; - ensuring that all financial support from the Community in the area of trans-European networks complied with environmental requirements; - integrating air links in the combined transport network and doing away with the inclusion of rolling stock in this network; - calling for an annual report on the effects in terms of job creation and income growth, broken down by region; - calling on the Commission to propose within two years minimum environmental standards for each mode of transport together with a Community pipeline network for the transport of products. ?

## Trans-European transport network: Community guidelines

---

The Council's common position corresponded closely to the Commission's amended proposal. However, it included a number of changes, the key changes relating to the proposals to exclude from the decision the specific provisions concerning environmental protection requirements and the new Annex III listing the priority infrastructure projects which should commence within five years. Nor did it adopt certain EP amendments relating to the infrastructure projects to be included in the maps in Annex I of the draft decision. The Council also included new provisions aimed at: - supplementing the characteristics of the road network; - including in the high-speed rail network a category of specially built lines to respond to specific situations; - changing the descriptions of the three types of airports; - repealing Decision 78/174/EEC setting up a committee in the field of transport infrastructure; - removing from or adding to the lists certain links relating to road, rail, combined transport and inland waterway networks; - including capital costs for ice-breaking works during winter under port and port-related infrastructure projects involving access to ports from the sea or inland waterways; - amending the specifications of the projects relating to airports. The Council retained the European Parliament's amendment concerning, in particular: - the objectives and nature of the guidelines established by the decision; - the proposal to define the essential requirements relating to interoperability and telematics separately from this decision; - the establishment of the network in accordance with the outline plans indicated on the maps in Annex I and the specifications in Annex II and the proposal to include the strengthening of economic and social cohesion among the detailed objectives; - the definition of the network components as transport infrastructures and management systems; - the addition of three new broad lines of measures; - the addition of certain priorities for Community action; - cooperation with third countries on trans-European transport networks; - the criteria to be met so that a project may be considered of common interest; - the compatibility of projects of common interest with the rules of the Treaty as regards questions of competition; - the removal of articles referring to the specific conditions of each modal network; - with regard to the characteristics of the rail network, the reference to current or new technology to equip lines specially built for high speeds; - the inclusion of new provisions relating to traffic management for inland waterway networks and ports; - the reference to coastal shipping under seaports; - the positioning and navigation network; - the creation within the Commission of a "committee on the trans-European transport network" which did not come under the Council's decision on comitology; - the revision of the guidelines (Commission report to be submitted every five years from 1 July 1999). ?

## Trans-European transport network: Community guidelines

---

The Commission accepted the common position since a number of significant amendments tabled by the EP and taken over by the Commission in its amended proposal had been retained. However, the Commission maintained its proposal with regard to a number of amendments that had been put forward by the EP and the Commission yet excluded from the common position, particularly the issue of the environment and the priority projects. ?

## Trans-European transport network: Community guidelines

---

The Committee adopted the draft recommendation for second reading (rapporteur: Mr Wilhelm PIECYK (D, PES)) on the common position established by the Council with a view to the adoption of a European Parliament and Council decision on EU guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network). All amendments, tabled by the rapporteur, are intended to reinstate the position of Parliament in first reading. The result of the first reading remains the basis for the further procedure at second reading. Mr PIECYK told the Committee that he did not want to enter into discussion with the Council for the second reading, but that he would head straight for a conciliation procedure. In the Common Position, the Council incorporated very few of Parliament's proposals. In particular, it omitted entirely the environment article, the list of priority projects, coastal shipping and the pipeline network. Other fields -such as inland ports - were only inadequately taken into account. Rapporteur PIECYK saw most of his amendments carried. They concerned the sections and articles of the proposal (1-8, 9-11, 12-26, 27a, 28, 29a, 91 and 30-31), but also the Annex I on road networks in France-Spain (32), Ireland (33), the Netherlands (33-34 and 97), the UK (35-36, 99 and 103), Germany (92-93) Germany-the Netherlands (94), Greece (95-96), Belgium-France (104-105), Belgium-the Netherlands (106), Denmark (107), Spain (108), Finland (109) France (110), Italy (113-114), Portugal (118) and Sweden (119). Amendments carried on railway networks: Germany (38-42, 120-122), Germany-France (43), Germany-Austria (123), Germany-The Netherlands (123a), Spain-France (44), France-Spain (45), Ireland (46), UK (47-49, 130-132), Austria (124), Spain (125-127), Sweden (135-136) and Europe (51 and 53). Also adopted were amendment 134 by Mr. Teverson (ELD, UK) on railway networks in the UK and by Messrs. Parodi, Danesin, Vicecomte and Santini (It, UPE) on railway networks in Italy. Messrs. Burtone (It, EPP) and Kaklamanis (Gr, RDE) saw their amendments 142 and 144 on Annex I adopted. Also carried were the rapporteur's amendments on ports in the EU (55-65), on ferry links (66-67), on combined transport (rail) (68-78, 80-82, and 145-149). Mr Parodi c.s. also got the support of the Committee for their amendment 153. Amendments carried on combined transport (inland waterways) were 154-155 and 84 by the rapporteur and 158 by Mr Parodi c.s.. Finally, amendments were adopted on airports: Spain-Portugal (139), Denmark-Germany-Belgium-the Netherlands-Austria (160) and on the annexes II (85) and III (163 by the rapporteur and 169 by Messrs Baldarelli, Piecyk, Imbeni and Ghilardotti (PES)). Conclusions: with the backing of the Committee on Transport and Tourism, rapporteur PIECYK now is in favour of a conciliation procedure EP-Council.

---

## Trans-European transport network: Community guidelines

The rapporteur, Mr PIECYK (PSE, D), considered that the Council's common position did not demonstrate a political will to transpose the Maastricht objectives. He emphasised that the trans-European transport networks contributed to the economic and social cohesion of the Union. Parliament's position at first reading had been to plan the transport network in such a way as to ensure that access to the network respected the environment. In his view, Parliament should retain in full the position it had adopted at first reading as the Council had not changed its position. The Commissioner, Mr KINNOCK, pointed out that the financial regulation adopted contained transitional provisions that allowed appropriations to be allocated until the end of the year. For the following year Parliament would have to adopt the broad lines under the codecision procedure, which would require a rapid agreement between Parliament and the Council in order to avoid any harmful repercussions. He stated that of the 140 amendments tabled he could adopt 47 in full or in part in addition to a further 13, the substance of which had been incorporated in the Commission's amended proposal of 19 June. Compared with Parliament's first reading, the Commission had changed its mind on 7 amendments, which were taken over. Of the amendments that were rejected, Mr Kinnock referred to Amendments Nos 32, 35, 42, 43 and 52, which added routes of local importance or duplicated those that were already included. He rejected Amendments Nos 60, 61, 67, 69, 71 and 72 on high-speed trains and Amendments Nos 114 and 118 on combined transport as these projects were either not economically viable or could be financed by the states or rail companies. The Commissioner did support the amendments tabled by Parliament at first reading on the environment. As regards Annex 3, the Commission agreed with Parliament that the projects the Council had unanimously excluded from the list in question should provide a basis for the objectives in the short and medium term. Finally, the Commissioner pointed out that although the broad lines related to the territory of a Member State, they required, in accordance with the Treaty, the authorisation of the state concerned.

---

## Trans-European transport network: Community guidelines

In adopting the report by M. PIECYK (PSE, D), the European Parliament approved the common position of the Council with a large number of amendments. The main amendments essentially cover the following aspects: - an environment-friendly networks policy under which appropriations are allocated as follows: 40% for rail infrastructure, 15% for combined transport, a maximum of 25% for roads and for the consolidation of inland waterway and sea transport; - the priority projects are indicated in the directive (presentation of the 'main priorities' including the Malpensa-Linate airport complex, plus the list of other Europe-wide projects or projects connecting to third countries); - the taking into account of environmental requirements during planning, building and further development of the network at Community and national level; - every five years, and for the first time before 1 July 1999, the Commission shall submit a report stating whether the guidelines should be brought into line with economic and transport developments and the conclusions of the strategic assessment of the environmental impact of the global network. ?

---

## Trans-European transport network: Community guidelines

The Commission adopted 39 of the 111 amendments adopted by the EP at second reading and rejected 72. It rejected, in particular, the amendments aimed at modifying the common position that had been accepted. The main amendments incorporated in the amended proposal related primarily to the following points: \* Recitals: - adding a specific reference to the environment; - promoting modes of transport that were least harmful to the environment; - including a reference to the need to assess the projects in light of the alternative options; - highlighting the effect of investment on job creation. \* Objectives: - clarifying that the network should help to achieve the Community's objectives, and adding a reference to competition; - replacing "quality infrastructures" with "high-quality infrastructures"; - adding a specific reference to damage to the environment; - ensuring that the network was interoperable both within and between modes of transport. \* Broad lines of measures: - stipulating that interconnection centres should be established close to urban centres; - including in the broad lines of measures any other actions which proved necessary. \* Priorities: - the priorities of the measures concerned the establishment (and development) of connections and the improvement of access to the network; - a new paragraph referring to projects of specific economic interest. \* Projects of common interest: - a new paragraph referring to the priority projects (listed in Annex III) which should commence within five years; - to ensure that the Member States implemented the network schemes and facilitated the completion of the projects. \* A new article concerning environmental requirements at Community and national level. \* Seaports and sea transport: - a new heading for Section 5 and a new wording of the article on

ports; - a new article concerning seaports and coastal shipping (description of short-distance coastal shipping). \* Inland waterways: - inclusion of a paragraph concerning the network for information exchange and the management of internal navigation. \* Annex I - Network schemes: - Road network: the Commission accepted the amendments aimed at adding five connections involving Germany, Ireland and the United Kingdom and doing away with four connections involving Greece, Finland, Portugal and Sweden; - Rail network: as regards conventional lines, five connections were added involving Germany, France and the United Kingdom; as regards specially upgraded high-speed lines, four connections were added involving Germany, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and Italy; - Inland waterway network: addition of one connection involving Italy; - Combined transport (rail corridors): addition of a connection involving Belgium, the Netherlands and Germany. ?

---

## Trans-European transport network: Community guidelines

The Council observed that it could not agree to the amendments made by the European Parliament to its common position of 28 September 1995 on Community guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network. It therefore decided that the Conciliation Committee should be convened in accordance with Article 189b(3) of the Treaty.?

---

## Trans-European transport network: Community guidelines

The Council was in favour of initiating the conciliation procedure as quickly as possible and was anxious to reach an agreement with Parliament on Community guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network. The general disposition was that a compromise should be reached with Parliament on the arrangements required for environmental protection. The Council called on the Permanent Representatives Committee to continue its work and to focus especially on those questions that were still open.

---

## Trans-European transport network: Community guidelines

\$summary.text

---

## Trans-European transport network: Community guidelines

Mr PIECYK (PSE, D) emphasised the importance of trans-European networks both for economic and social cohesion and in the context of the White Paper on growth and employment. Underlining the close links between transport and the environment, the rapporteur highlighted the environmental benefits that could result from a greater investment in rail transport and the development of navigable waterways. Although he deplored the lack of cooperation shown by the Council under the codecision process, Mr Piecyk thought that it was better to be optimistic and to implement the trans-European transport network, while in future following the theories being advocated by Parliament. In criticising the joint project, Mr KAKLAMANIS (RDE, GR), Mrs ERIKSSON (GUE/NGL, S) and Mrs VAN DIJK (Greens, NL) declared that their groups were opposed to the compromise, for different reasons. Commissioner Kinnock said that the networks were important for employment, growth, competitiveness, and economic and social cohesion in the European Union. He also referred to Article 129d, which specified that agreement had to be obtained from a Member State before trans-European networks could be implemented in its territory. In referring to the most important results of the conciliation procedure the Commissioner mentioned the inclusion of environmental aspects and the Council's acceptance of 18 amendments to projects that had been adopted by Parliament at second reading. As regards ports, Mr Kinnock said that the Commission wanted to present a specific report aimed at identifying those that were eligible. Finally, the Commissioner pointed out that the conciliation process had resulted in a more realistic outcome on an economic and social level, while at the same time favouring the outlying regions and respecting environmental requirements.

---

## Trans-European transport network: Community guidelines

Following the agreement on the joint text that was reached by the Conciliation Committee on 17 June 1996, the Council approved the Decision on Community guidelines by written procedure on 15 July. Given that this was achieved through the codecision procedure and that Parliament, for its part, had also confirmed the joint text at its plenary sitting of 17 July 1996, the decision was definitively adopted.

---

## Trans-European transport network: Community guidelines

Parliament approved the joint text. ?

---

## Trans-European transport network: Community guidelines

OBJECTIVE :establishing guidelines covering the objectives, priorities and broad lines of measures envisaged in the sphere of trans-European networks. COMMUNITY MEASURE: Decision 1692/96/EC of the European Parliament and the Council on Community guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network. SUBSTANCE : the guidelines are to be considered as the reference framework for action by the Member States and, where appropriate, the Community, towards the implementation of projects of common interest aimed at ensuring the cohesion, interconnection and interoperability of the trans-European transport network as well as access thereto. The network will be gradually put into place up to the year 2010, across the Community, by integrating the land, sea and air transport infrastructure networks, in accordance with the schemes illustrated by the maps shown in Annex I to the Decision. The broad lines of measures envisaged by the EC

cover : - establishment and revision of network schemes; - identification of projects of common interest; - development of the existing network; - promotion of the interoperability of the network; - optimum combination of modes of transport (intermodality); - complementarity of financial interventions; - R&D measures; - cooperation and conclusion of appropriate agreements with third countries concerned by network development. Priority actions include : - the creation or development of the connections needed to eliminate bottlenecks, fill in missing sections and complete major routes; - creation or development of infrastructure improving access to the network, making it possible to link island, landlocked and peripheral regions with the central regions of the Community; - the combination and integration of the various modes of transport; - inclusion of the environmental dimension in the implementation and development of the network; - gradual implementation of the interoperability of network components; - optimization of the capacity and efficiency of existing infrastructure; - establishment or development of interconnection nodes and intermodal interchanges; - improved network safety and reliability; - development and implementation of systems for the management and control of network traffic and of the information needed by network users. When planning and developing the projects, Member States must take account of environmental protection requirements by carrying out environmental impact assessments on projects of common interest. The Commission will submit every five years, and for the first time before 1 July 1999, a report indicating to what extent the guidelines should be revised. DATE OF ENTRY INTO FORCE : 10 September 1996. ?

## Trans-European transport network: Community guidelines

---

This report from the Commission concerns the implementation of the Trans-European transport network guidelines (2002-2003). It provides an assessment of the development of the trans-European transport network (TEN-T) following the TEN-T guidelines set out in Decision 1692/96/EC.

The investment data contained in the report refer to the ?old? and ?new? Member States and to Bulgaria and Romania and a partial distinction is made between EU-15, EU-10 and EU-2 and EU-27 (all three groups of States).

The report concludes that the total investment in the TEN-T network in the EU-27 over the two year period 2002 ?2003 showed that the average annual investments on the TEN-T network compared with 2000 and 2001 increased.

However, as these investments are calculated in constant prices and after discussions with representatives of the Member States, it is clear that the estimated investment in the TEN-T network can be misleading. Italy, for example, spent more than 22 billion EUR on TEN-T due to a very intensive investment period in the years 2002 and 2003. The average annual investment in these two years was almost double compared with the six previous years; additionally this EUR 22 billion represents more than 25% of the total investments in the EU- 27. Taking this fact and when analysing the investments in more detail, it is apparent that the total investments per country in comparison with GDP development ? especially in the EU-15 - decreased; in Denmark for example only 0.09% of the GDP was spent for TEN-T, while in Slovenia about 1.46% of the GDP was committed for the development of the TEN-T network.

Concerning financing, it can be concluded that national public funding still contributed by far the largest part of the investments in the TEN-T network. In order to optimise the scarce Community funds and to facilitate the coordinated implementation of certain projects, in particular cross-border projects, the Commission designated, in agreement with the Member States concerned, and after having consulted the European Parliament "European Coordinators". The European Coordinator acts in the name of and on behalf of the Commission and should work to speed up the implementation of the projects of common interest.

The completion of the 30 priority projects for international traffic by 2020 in general, is on track. Thus the annual investment volume in the years 2002 and 2003 was about EUR 40 billion. The elimination of bottlenecks especially on cross-border sections is still lagging behind and needs to be improved.

## Trans-European transport network: Community guidelines

---

This Commission Staff Working Document accompanies the report from the Commission on the implementation of the Trans-European Transport Network Guidelines 2004-2005 pursuant to Article 18 of Decision 1692/96/EC.

Part 1 concerns the implementation in general. In particular, it considers the main developments on the TEN-T modal networks (i.e. road, rail, inland waterways, ports, airports and combined transport).

Part 2 looks at the horizontal issues of interoperability, research and development, and environmental protection.

In part 3 there is a general assessment of the development of the TEN-T during the period in question and a more detailed section on the TEN-T priority projects.

Part 4 on Community funding provides an overview of the financing of TEN-T with particular reference to financial support from the EU during the reference period.

## Trans-European transport network: Community guidelines

---

This report provides an assessment of the development of the trans-European transport network (TEN-T) following the TEN-T guidelines set out in Decision 1692/96/EC. These guidelines constitute a general reference framework for the implementation of the network and identify projects of common interest. The transport modes covered by the guidelines are: road, rail and inland waterway networks, motorways of the sea, seaports and inland waterway ports, airports and other interconnection points between modal networks, as well as traffic management and navigation systems.

This report covers a two-year period, from 2004 to the end of 2005. The investment data it contains refer to the EU-15, the EU-25 as of 1 May 2004 and the EU-27 as from 1 January 2007. The funds allocated to TEN-T implementation in 2004 and 2005 were analysed for this report, by project and by Member State , with a special focus on priority projects.

The total investment in the TEN-T network in the EU-27 over the two-year period 2004 ?2005 was approximately EUR 101.74 billion. A

general assessment of the sources of TEN-T investment during 2004-2005 shows that national public funding contributed about 76.9%, by far the largest part, and together with loans from EIB accounted for more than 91%. In terms of modes, investment in the 2004 - 2005 period focused on railways (57%), followed

by roads (27%), airports (9%), ports (5%) and inland waterways (2%).

The report concludes that the total investment in the TEN-T network in the EU-27 over the two-year period 2004-2005 shows an increase in average annual investment in the TEN-T network compared with the previous period 2000-2003, with average spending already reaching about EUR 51 billion, a figure significantly higher than in previous years.

Moreover, average total investment as a percentage of GDP in the EU-27 increased from 0.43% in 2002-03 to 0.47% in 2004-05. One of the reasons is certainly the increase in grants due to the fact that the 10 new Member States were eligible for this funding from 1 May 2004.

However, a more detailed analysis of the investment shows that in some countries, especially in the EU-15 (Denmark, France, Germany), the total investment as a percentage of GDP was well below the EU average.

Concerning financing, it can be concluded that national public funding still contributed by far the largest part of the investment in the TEN-T network. In order to concentrate the scarce Community funds and to facilitate the coordinated implementation of certain projects, in particular cross-border projects, the Commission has designated 'European Coordinators', in agreement with the Member States concerned and after having consulted the European Parliament. The European Coordinators act in the name of and on behalf of the Commission and should speed up the implementation of the projects of common interest.

The completion of the 30 priority projects for international traffic by 2020 is in general on track. With an annual investment volume of about EUR 50 billion, transport infrastructure can be improved significantly. Nevertheless, the elimination of cross-border bottlenecks in particular is still lagging behind and needs to be improved.