

Transeuropean Networks

The European Approach to Modern Infrastructure

A Presentation by

Peter Parlasca MRICS

European Commission
Directorate-General for Energy and Transport, Brussels

at the 8th European Real Estate Society (ERES) Conference Alicante 27 – 29 June 2001



Peter Parlasca MRICS

European Commission

Directorate-General for Energy and Transport

Transeuropean Network Project Management

Mail: Rue de la Loi 200 B-1049 Bruxelles

Office: Rue De Mot 24 B-1040 Bruxelles

Tel: +32-2-296.63.55

Fax: +32-2-295.65.04

E-mail: Peter.Parlasca@cec.eu.int



Content

- History of Transeuropean Network Policy
- Legal basis
- 14 Essen projects
- Guidelines for funding
- TEN budget line
- TEN and the private sector
- Challenges in the future



History of TEN Policy

- Nov 93 Treaty of Maastricht: TENs chapter (Art 129 b,c,d)
- Dec 94 Essen council: 14 Priority projects
- Sep 95 Regulation on TENs funding (N° 2236/95 EG incl.Transport, Energy, Telecoms
- Jul 96 TEN guidelines adopted with annex of 14 Essen projects
- Jul 99 Agenda 2000: 4,6 Billion €for TENs



Legal basis I

Treaty of Maastricht 1993

TENs chapter

Art 129 b,c,d



Legal Basis II

Regulation (EC) No 2236/95 of 18
 September 1995

amended by

- Regulation (EC) 1655/1999 of 19 July 1999 including maps for different modes
- Decision No 1692/96 /EC of 23 July 1996



Legal Basis III

 Decisions adressed to member states

• Contracts with organisations (e.g. port authorities, national road administration)



Financial Needs

• Transeuropean Network to finance over 12 years:

400-500 B €

• rail 50 %

• road 40 %

inland waterways, ports,intelligent transport10 %



Funding I

• Eligibility in the TEN guidelines 1996 maps for all modes

```
rail
road
airports
ports
inland waterways
combined transport
intelligent transport systems for all modes
```

project of common interest



Funding II

• Limits of Funding from the TEN budget

- 50% feasibility studies
- 10% projects i.e. works
- 20% Galileo (as from 2003)



Funding III

- Types of Funding
 - Direct grants
 - interest rebates
 - guarantees (never used)



Funding IV

• Infrastructure Funding in other EU programs

- ERDF funds

- Cohesion funds (ES,PO,GR,IR) INTERREG up to 85% in Objective I regions



Funding

by other European Institutions

- European Investment Bank (EIB), Luxembourg more than 10 Bill ECU/€loans since 1993
 - inside EU
 - outside EU: accession countries (TINA-network)
- European Investment Fund (EIF), Luxembourg (guarantees for TEN-related loans until end of 2000)
- European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), London



Essen - Projects

projects of common interest part I

• 3 completed ones

- IRL Rail Freight Line
- Malpensa Airport Milano
- Oeresund Fixed road/rail Link between Malmö and Copenhagen



Essen - projects

projects of common interest part II

- 6 for 2006
 - 5 High Speed Trains and 1 Motorway
 - PBKAL Paris-Bruxelles-Köln/Frankfurt-Amsterdam-London
 - TGV Sud
 - TGV Est Paris-Metz-Saarbrücken
 - Betuwe Rotterdam-Ruhr area
 - WCML West Coast Main Line UK
 - PATHE/Egnatia motorway in Greece



Essen - projects

projects of common interest part III

- 3 Clever Corridors
 - Nordic Triangle Multimodal corridor (SW/FI)
 - Portugal-Spain-Centre of Europe
 - Irland-UK-Benelux road link
- 2 Tunnels with Darkness
 - Berlin-*Brenner*-Verona
 - Lyon-Frens-Torino-Milano-Venezia-Trieste



TEN Transport budget line

- 1995-1999 1,8 Billion ECU
- 2000-2006 4,2 Billion €(Agenda 2000)
 - up to 75 % Multiannual Indicative Program (MIP)
 - at least 25 % annual programs



MIP 2001 - 2006

Multiannual Indicative Program

•	April 2001 draft proposal	2,8 Bill €
	 11 Essen Projects 	1,3
	 Railway bottlenecks 	0,4
	 Cross border projects 	0,3
	 Intelligent transport systems (ITS) 	0,3
	– GALILEO	0,55



TEN and the private sector

Examples

- Channel Tunnel (FR/UK)
- Oeresund Fixed Link (DK/SW)
- Tajo Bridge (PO) ERDF
- Warnow Crossing (DE)



TEN and the private sector

Lessons

- Traffic forecasting is always difficult
- Private management of construction helps to keep on budget
- revenues from the project cover only parts of construction and maintenance costs
- to combine new with existing infrastructure can provide additional funding



TEN and the private sector

Conclusions

- Public Private Partnership (PPP) structures need projects creating a large proportion of revenues from user charges
- public funds should be equivalent to added value for the public
- projects with mainly public benefits or with many risks in planning and legislation can be cheaper if paid for from the state budget



Futur PPP projects?

- Brenner (AU/IT)
- Lyon-Torino (FR/IT)
- Tarragona-Perpignan (ES/FR)
- Fehmarn Belt (DK/DE)



Challenges in the Future

- Traffic increase
 - congestion
 - environment
- Enlargement



Enlargement accession countries

• Network: TINA Report
Transport Infrastructure Needs Investment

• Funding: ISPA



Responses to Challenges

- White book on transport policy (in preparation)
 - revision of the guidelines
 - aims
 - maps (minor changes)
 - revision of the financial regulation
 - TEN risk capital scheme