

**MINUTES OF THE 4TH STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING
PAN EUROPEAN TRANSPORT CORRIDOR X
GREVENA, GREECE
26-28 APRIL 2002**

List of participants
Agenda

Item 1 Welcoming address

1. Opening remarks by Mr. Patsiavos, who welcomed all the participants at the 4th Meeting of the Pan-European Transport Corridor X Steering Committee. He thanked the authorities of the city of Grevena for their hospitality and offered the floor to the General Secretary of the Greek Ministry of Transport, to the Prefect of Department of Grevena Prefecture and the Mayor of the city, who were hosting the meetings.
2. The Mayor of Grevena, Mr. Ziogas, expressed his pleasure for hosting the works of the 4th Meeting of the Steering Committee in Grevena, with its long history. He explained his hopes for the development of the region through the new road that is being built in the area and expressed his wish that this new road will also be one of friendship among the peoples of the Balkan.
3. The Prefect, Mr. Petsas, welcomed the participants and described the local interest in the works of the Committee. He stressed on the importance of the Trans-European Networks for Greece and the potential they open for the development of Southeastern Europe and the locality of Grevena, which becomes a center of development. He stressed how trans-European transport networks are also networks of communication and culture, something proven by the eight different nationalities present at the meeting, and concluded by wishing the Committee a fruitful discussion.
4. Mr. Constantinidis, the General Secretary of the Greek Ministry of Transport, welcomed the participants, stressed how a meeting at the isolated region of Grevena symbolized the need for integration with the rest of Greece – and Europe. He explained that in order to achieve the European Union's goal of making the 21st century one of competition, friendship and cooperation, careful steps are needed. He considered that the Steering Committee's steps were just as careful and solid steps towards that goal and closed his remarks by wishing all participants a fruitful meeting.

Item 2 Adoption of the agenda

5. Mr. Patsiavos took the floor and thanked the hosts again for their hospitality and warm comments and expressed his hope that the meeting would be successful for the development of the Pan European networks and Transport Corridor X in particular. He explained a bit about the daily schedule of activities and moved to the ask for the adoption of the agenda. He made a specific note for Item no10, entitled "other business", which includes a proposal of the Chairman of Transport Corridor VII for inter-modality of Branch B of Corridor X, which is parallel to the Danube and involves combined parts of the two Corridors. He also inquired if there were other issues that the participants would like to include in Item 10, and seeing none he

proceeded to Item 3 of the Agenda, which involved approvals of the minutes of the 3rd meeting of the Steering Committee, for which no comments had been received.

Item 3 Adoption of the minutes of 3rd Meeting

6. Mr. Princic, the Slovenian delegate, noted that he had sent some comments and Mr. Patsiavos clarified that they had already been included in the minutes of the 3rd meeting.

Item 4 UIC Railway group presentation

7. Proceeding with Item 4 on the Agenda, the presentation of the UIC Railway Group from Austria, Mr. Patsiavos expressed his regret that the Group was not represented at the meeting, since they were always part of the meetings of the Steering Committee and they had been invited this time as well. He noted that the development of Corridor X is taking place on both the road and rail level, and therefore coordination of actions between the two modes is a primary goal which the Steering Committee is planning to achieve.
8. Mr. Adelsberger took the floor and explained that this absence was probably a misunderstanding and that his colleague is very ardent on cooperation
9. Mr. Gheivelis on behalf of the European Commission DG TREN praised the positive climate of cooperation between the two modes of transportation within Corridor X, something which is not so fruitful for other Corridors. His understanding is that the rail development groups tend to work separately from those focusing on road, which is reasonable due to the particularities of their work, but he also emphasized the need for cooperation for better results.
10. Mr. Patsiavos noted the Steering Committee's intention to assist in the future to have an account of the Group's work and promote this cooperation for the progress of the whole project.
11. Mr. Adelsberger commented briefly about the environment-friendly character of the Austrian transport policy, which involves multi-modal transportation and inevitably favors the rail mode. He expressed his certainty that cooperation is the wish of both modes and regretted that his colleague, Mr. Floeck, was not present.
12. Mr. Patsiavos noted the Committee's understanding for the particularity of the rail mode's technical and operational details, which is something the Committee does not wish to interfere with, yet cooperation is sought on the level of rail transport policy. He then moved to give the floor to Mr. Taxiltaris, who elaborated on the works done during the last thirteen months.

Item 5 Presentation of the Works of the Technical Secretariat

13. Mr. Taxiltaris thanked all the participants for their cooperation since the last meeting (March 2001), the continuous communication and the exchange of information. He presented the work of the Technical Secretariat with regard to data collection, processing and dissemination and mentioned the fora and journals in which the work

of the Technical Secretariat was presented and publicized. His presentation included a series of activities, such as coordination of meetings between Yugoslav, FYROM and Greek construction companies, cooperation with SECI and the World Bank (TTFSE) for problems and malfunctions at border crossings, an investigation for Terms of References Studies, the examination of indicative public-private partnership schemes and research concerning financing potential from international financial institutions (IFIs).

Mr. Taxiltaris also discussed the G24 meeting in March 2001, at which the EU's representatives underlined the absence of private investors and banks from its works. UNECE offered to coordinate and facilitate the technical issues of monitoring the development of the Corridors, and Mr. Thielmann of EU DG TREN presented the strategic issues on development of the communications and energy networks in Southeast Europe and Western Balkans (Bosnia, Serbia & Montenegro, FYROM and Croatia). According to the EU strategy, priority will be given to the revitalization of the networks through rehabilitating, maintaining and upgrading of already existing infrastructures, while the contribution of the EU institutions for this restoration will be a function of the capacity of each country. Financial contributions will be made in order to connect the region's capitals according to EU standards, and non-financial assistance will be targeted to enforcing operative and administrative authorities to this end. It was also noted that intensive efforts should be made by individual countries or groups of countries to ensure PPPs. Even though that was the last G24 meeting, a coordination group for Pan-European Corridors and Areas was agreed to replace its activities, yet a feeling of dissatisfaction was felt by Steering Committees and Technical Secretariats, because the potential role of DG TREN for the continuation of Pan-European Networks was left partly unclear. In order for intentions to be clarified, Mr. Nowak (of Corridor IV Technical Secretariat) initiated a meeting for all Technical Secretariats in Berlin in December 2001, at which Mr. Hahn contributed the most with his experience for brainstorming. The technical Secretariats of Corridors I, II, III, VI, VII, IX and X were present in order to diagnose the present and near future situation of coordination of tasks and recognized two things: a) a shift of the EU mechanisms to support the enlargement, which causes policies by branch to suffer, and b) a shared interest between energy and transport, as energy policies are also a capital domain. ISPA financing is still available and directed towards the already defined networks. It was decided that a common letter would be sent to reactivate communication between Technical Secretariats, Steering Committees and DG TREN, and it was addressed to the Transport Ministers of the EU member countries which participate in the development of the transport Corridors (namely Austria, Finland, Germany and Greece), asking them to coordinate efforts for the revitalization of existing networks.

During the third week of April 2002 a hopeful meeting of the coordination group in Brussels was held, organized in DG TREN by Mr. Gheivelis, which turned out to be fruitful and solved all misunderstandings. Mr. Finat, Director, and Mr. Thielmann, Head of Unit, were chairing sequentially during this meeting, where interventions were made by ISPA and by DG for Taxation and Customs Union. Mr. Patsiavos will report the results later this morning.

14. Mr. Patsiavos took the floor and since there were no questions, he reported on the meeting with the European Investment Bank (EIB). This meeting was held in

Luxembourg on the 31st of May 2001, between the Chair and Technical Secretariat of Corridor X and the Director of European Investment Bank (EIB) responsible for Mediterranean – Balkans External Leading Operations, Mr. Antonello Pugliese, and all the Balkan experts of his staff.

The Greek Chairmanship presented the main bottlenecks of the Corridor concerning Yugoslavia and FYROM and discussed thoroughly with European Investment Bank all possibilities for the financing of these bottlenecks, which are:

1. The section Demir Kapija – Gevgelija
2. The section Lescovac – Kumanovo
3. Belgrade bypass

Especially for the section Demir Kapija – Gevgelija the request of FYROM for new construction of half motorway (2 lanes and shoulder), was supported, indicating that this solution would help to avoid the disturbance of the traffic, since the old part would remain functional, and finally, after the rehabilitation of the existing road in a second stage, a full motorway would have been created, thus establishing a Corridor with unified characteristics, ensuring road safety and increased level of service for the users.

The EIB insisted on the rehabilitation of the existing road section based on the low traffic flows that do not justify the construction of a new motorway. Moreover, it was stated that the policy of EIB is to avoid loans for new roads if the existing ones, with the necessary rehabilitation, are made sufficient to serve the existing demand.

The insistence of the Greek Chairmanship resulted in the acceptance of the EIB for the construction of a new half motorway from Gevgelija to 12 km north, based on the easy geology of this section and due to environmental reasons. However, EIB kept its position for the rehabilitation for the rest 32 km of the section Demir Kapija – Gevgelija.

As far as the financing of the other two sections in the Yugoslavian territory is concerned, EIB indicated that this issue could be examined after the normalization of relations of Yugoslavia with the International Financial Institutions.

Mr. Patsiavos also mentioned the Technical Meetings between construction companies. On the 5th of October 2001 and on 29th of March 2002 two Technical Meetings took place in Athens, the first between Yugoslavian and Greek construction companies and the second between construction companies from Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Greece.

Both meetings were organised by the Greek Chairmanship of Corridor X, aiming at presenting the work already done in the Steering Committee of Corridor X to construction companies of the countries concerned. The reason was first of all to give them the possibility to know each other and second to exploit all possibilities for the development of eventual co-operation between them for the construction of projects along the Corridor, investing private money with the method of concession.

Mr. Patsiavos considered that both meetings were successful in bringing together technical expertise from different countries, hoping that co-operation could be developed in the future between construction companies.

This initiative could be continued in the future with other countries also, if a certain interest is expressed in this respect.

Mr. Patsiavos also informed about the 4th Meeting of the Corridors and Areas Co-ordination Group. This meeting was held in Brussels on Friday the 19th of April 2002, after a period of more than one year. It was a meeting that gave the chance to all Corridors and Areas Chairs to express their readiness to proceed with the work already undertaken in this context, requesting at the same time from the Commission to take certain initiatives for the active support of the works of the Steering Committees in terms of providing financial aid to certain Corridors that are unable to find the resources needed for this task.

The main conclusions of the above meeting can be summarised as follows:

1. The Commission is preparing a Communication regarding the work already done in the framework of TINA, which is expected to be ready by the autumn of this year. At this point the Greek Chair of Corridor X made a concrete proposal, which can be materialised during the Greek Presidency in the European Union the first semester of 2003. This proposal comprises the elaboration of set of Guidelines for the TINA and Pan-European Corridors Network, similar to those in the Decision 1692 of 96 for the Trans-European Networks. The result of this work will be the adoption of a relevant Decision or Conclusions by the EU Transport Council in June 2003. This Decision or Conclusions, which will be also incorporated in the 2004 Revision of Trans-European Networks, will constitute the official approval by the Commission of the work done within TINA and Pan-European Corridors, a request which has been widely expressed in the above mentioned meeting of the Co-ordination Group.
2. The issue of border crossings was referred as the one of the most crucial parameters for the effective operation of all Pan-European Corridors and Areas. After a relevant proposal by the Greek Chair, it was decided that a Seminar will be organised for border crossings, with the participation of DG for Taxation and Customs Union, which is elaborating a relevant programme in this regard.
3. The Commission asked all Steering Committees to determine annual or multi-annual Work Programs, which should incorporate benchmarking indicators, so that an evaluation could be achieved.
4. The initiatives for the development of Corridors or Areas should remain to the countries and the Chairmanships. The role of the Commission will be only subsidiary.
5. Each Steering Committee of Corridors or Areas should convene at least once a year. The Corridors and Areas Co-ordination Group will hold annual meetings, in order to monitor the work of Steering Committees.

6. United Nations Economic Commission for Europe and ECMT will participate in the works of the Corridors and Areas Co-ordination Group.

7. The Commission accepted the offer of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe to provide technical assistance to those Steering Committees that have not established Technical Secretariats.

8. All Steering Committees should develop appropriate systems for data collection.

9. Projects for maintenance of existing infrastructure should be also elaborated and proposed by the Steering Committees.

Mr. Patsiavos offered the floor to the European Commission and UNECE representatives to elaborate on these issues from their perspective as well.

15. Taking the floor from Mr. Patsiavos, the EC representative, Mr. Gheivelis, made a few comments on these issues. He started by congratulating the Technical Secretariat of Corridor X for the high quality work it produces, which is an example for all other Corridors. He brought up the DG TREN strategy for development in Southeast Europe until 2010, which was an initiative that started in 2001, when a transport network was established on the basis of TINA methodology and an already existing network. Therefore, the Corridor is to become a main instrument for development, yet priority should be given to rehabilitation of the network first, as no funds are available for new construction.

Concerning the disappointment of last year's meeting in Brussels for the supposed EC's discontinued role in the future development of Transport Corridors, he noted that everything had now been discussed on another basis and new operational procedures were discovered. The EC's intention is to continue with coordination as long as there are actions to coordinate, where MoUs exist and meetings take place. He emphasized the fact that initiatives must originate from the countries that have signed the Helsinki Agreements, and that the UNECE and the ECMT will participate and assist with coordination in the wider sense. He agreed that not all problems have been solved yet, but governments must be reminded of their obligations after Helsinki, to fill up remaining political vacuums and establish proper institutions. He urged all participants to remind their governments that certain institutional steps to support efforts need to be made at the Bucharest Meeting in May 2002.

He also noted that one of the main tasks for each Corridor is to produce a status report, so as to be able to observe developments on an annual basis. He added that the UNECE will propose a method of work that resembles a lot that of the Corridor X Technical Secretariat and concluded by saying that the EC now has a clear idea of problems and how to overcome them, so that coordination is more efficient.

16. Mr. Patsiavos thanked Mr. Gheivelis for his work during the Brussels Meeting, a week ago.
17. Mr. Adamantiadis from UNECE thanked the Steering Committee for the invitation and thanked the local authorities for the hospitality. He began to elaborate on issues

that had already been mentioned concerning the contribution of the UNECE in this effort, which are focused on two main areas. First, UNECE aims to assist the Steering Committees which are lagging behind, and the Steering Committee of Corridor X is not one of them but rather sets an example of best practice, and its experience should be shared. The second expected contribution involves cooperation with others in order to try and identify uniform activities that can be infused into methodologies of all Steering Committees, so that results are uniform. He noted how important it is to have an annual status report of all Corridors that is also comparable, something which was evident at last year's meeting as well – i.e. cross-Corridor cooperation. He summarized by saying that is important to promote cooperation, assure harmonized technical standards, coordinate horizontal and cross-Corridor actions and share experience. Draft action plans of tasks will be discussed with the EC and with Technical Secretariats of Corridors VII and X, and basic tasks have been targeted, including cross corridor standards and terminology, which means that the major part of the work has already been done, but it only needs to be put in a usable format.

A major goal should be firstly to agree on the technical standards and terminology and then to establish a compatible format for central and harmonized reporting system of on-going projects, achievements and the geographic information system (GIS). It is the UNECE's intention to link the Pan European Transport networks to the Eurasian Networks and to establish websites linking all Corridors. He mentioned that there is already a team. This core team – among other actions – will invite representatives from the Technical Secretariats of Corridors VII and X, whose experience could be used as models. He noted that all this draft work will be soon finalized and presented, and then all bodies that are able and willing to participate in its works will also be invited, so as to create a framework of existing Steering Committees and Technical Secretariats to help harmonize their works. Mr. Adamantiadis concluded by saying that all the experience that has been accumulated will become immediately obvious.

18. Mr. Patsiavos thanked Mr. Adamantiadis and the UNECE for the mood to cooperate with the transport Corridors accomplishing that Corridor X is willing to participate and offered the floor to Mrs. Alleweldt from the EU ECOSOC.
19. Mrs. Alleweldt from ECOSOC congratulated the Technical Secretariat for the excellent work that has been done and made a short proposal as a representative of other groups involved with the Corridors beyond its technical parts – labor, employers and other groups. As the ECOSOC focuses on the promotion of Corridor X as a mode of regional development, the ECOSOC would like to see the Corridor contribute to the economic and social development of the region and in that spirit, she extended the ECOSOC's cooperation in any way it would be deemed helpful.
20. Mrs. Palcic from Croatia thanked for the hospitality of the local authorities and noted that the Steering Committee of Corridor X probably has an above average performance because of an excellent Chair and an excellent Technical Secretariat. She mentioned that little can be done by countries which are simple members of the Steering Committees and that it is primarily the Chairs that are in a position to push forward. As far as Croatia is concerned, Mrs. Palcic reminded everybody that her country is a member of the Steering Committees of two Corridors – that of the most active, and that of the less active –. By bringing up the example of a EU strategy paper for western Balkans that is not available to them, she asked Mr. Gheivelis how

non-EU members of the Steering Committees can have access to information that only Chairs that go to EU countries have. Concerning this very paper, the Technical Secretariat will forward it to Mrs. Palcic.

21. Mr. Gheivelis replied that sometimes it is hard to establish continuation of communication between the EU and Steering Committees members, because representatives differ at each occasion. For instance, a Ministry of Foreign Affairs representative is sent at the meeting for the Corridors' strategic development and a representative from the Ministry of Transport at the presentation of the TIRS study – something which causes unstable communication. He suggested that countries should also introduce better administration and coordination within their missions to EU and through their Ministries of Transportation for improved communication.
22. Mr. Patsiavos intervened to say that the Chairmanship of the Steering Committee may distribute such information to the members.
23. Mr. Adelsberger took the floor to thank once again for the organization of the venue and noted how important it is to produce results as soon as possible, in order to avoid more and more meetings. He noted that Corridors IV, VII and X are a network of synergies in the same region and that they should not be in competition, but rather in cooperation. He stressed the importance of meeting certain common standards, but also minimum standards – the later being the part of the undertaking that involves a lot of cost.

No other comments were added and no other interventions were made.

Coffee Break

Item 6 Presentation of the status of the Corridor

24. Mr. Patsiavos introduced the presentation of the status of the Corridor by saying that a database was presented to the Steering Committee during the previous meeting, which has been updated and completed. He noted that the procedure is a dynamic one, which relies on the provision of data from all member countries, urging them to send in their comments.
25. Mr. Mintsis thanked the local authorities for their hospitality, all the members for their trust in the Technical Secretariat work and the Greek Ministry of Transport for creating a very positive working environment for the Technical Secretariat. Also, he noted the social side effect of the meeting for the local community, as it improves its mentality and urged all participants to review the minutes of the meeting and send back their feedback for further processing.

Based on his experience in the meetings concerning the Pan-European Networks, Mr. Mintsis insisted on the importance of having complete, accurate and reliable data for the development of the Corridor, because they allow the advocates for the development of the Corridor to support their case at these fora and Steering Committee meetings.

Mr. Minstis made his presentation about the status of the Corridor, which is derived from the members' feedback and the technical Secretariat's on-site visits. He described the situation and main results concerning the rail and road main axes and branches, in terms of maintenance, running times, operational condition, problematic areas and services. He commented on the higher expectations for the road mode in comparison with the rail mode and came to certain conclusions regarding the status of the rail and road parts of the Corridor at each country. His main points were that procedures at cross border points should be reduced and that more cooperation for transport and economic activities towards the common goal of regional development should be implemented. Mr. Mintsis also stressed the need to identify the sections which have real problems in order to set the Steering Committee priorities, as well as the importance of having feedback from the countries in order to define costs.

Discussing the Transport Infrastructure Regional Study (TIRS), Mr. Mintsis explained that it would fill up a hole by becoming the basis for infrastructure improvements with respect to their strategic needs. The TIRS includes the following countries: Albania, Bosnia, Bulgaria, Croatia, F.R.Yugoslavia, FYROM, Romania. Some of them (Albania, Bosnia and especially Croatia, F.R.Yugoslavia, FYROM that are included in Corridor X) were not included in the TINA exercise and is built on the basis of individual national objectives. Countries wish to rehabilitate from war destruction and overcome the result of the lack of maintenance during the last decade, upgrade their network, and construct new networks in order to meet their long-term requirements, something that involves connecting capital cities, and meeting demographic and economic needs). Facilitation of international transits, especially at border crossings, is also desirable, as well introducing interoperability of the network. No physical bottlenecks can be identified, except from certain bridges in Serbia and Montenegro, and overall traffic congestion is not observed apart from certain points. The main conclusion is that Corridor X needs systematic upgrading and rehabilitation, with a focus on establishing two lanes in the South.

As for the European Union's and the European Investment Bank's interventions during the TIRS meetings, Mr. Mintsis mentioned that their policy is oriented towards maintenance and operation and therefore efforts need to be intensified, so as to create the necessary conditions for improved border crossings, both for passengers and for cargoes. The European Commission has prepared detailed Terms of Reference for a second phase of TIRS, which will include pre-feasibility studies and a documentation and information center. Both the EC and the EIB intent to direct the Steering Committees to consider the development of the transport networks on a sectional level, i.e. to contemplate the financial and economic capacities, problems at the borders, issues concerning the operable network and improving maintenance.

26. Mr. Patsiavos thanked Mr. Mintsis for his presentation and information, and further commented on the importance of the TIRS conclusions.
27. Mr. Gheivelis was offered the floor and he mentioned that the EC has established a strategic network for the Western Balkans, while TIRS refers to the whole region, which means that the two networks are not the same, as TIRS has more alignments. TIRS is a study that has been developed according to the needs and wishes of the counties, i.e. following a bottom-up model, while the EC study represents a top-down approach. As an indicator of this difference, Mr. Gheivelis mentioned that the budget

of TIRS II is four times that of TIRS I and the following aims have been identified: a) to observe any data changes so as to define whether strategy changes are needed, b) to make projects more attractive for investment through IFIs, c) to identify the specific sectors and projects which need to be studied further (e.g. reform of the rail sector), which is important in order to secure structural reforms that will be operational and allow for improved project management, in order to receive IFIs' funding, d) to establish a group of experts so as to monitor project implementation, act as an intermediary between IFIs and projects by improving cooperation, and creating a documentation center using a common language, and e) to promote the rehabilitation of infrastructure over the design of new projects. Mr. Gheivelis stressed the fact that large new projects are unlikely to be financed by the EU until 2010, such as the Adriatic line put forward by Croatia, the Skopje-Sofia railway etc. Each project has to be studied on its own merits and costs and overall, in order for a project to receive financing, it has to move in the current context of political environment support.

28. Mr. Dionelis took the floor and commented on the excellent work of the Technical Secretariat. He brought up the issue of data compatibility and collection, and he mentioned the question of benchmarking indicators. He noted that TIR studies are important and they should be presented, as they highlight issues, but they alone don't define policies; policies are decided upon by the Steering Committees on the basis of the TIR studies results. Mr. Dionelis then proceeded to pose two questions, one concerning the origin of traffic (local, international, regional) according to data analysis, and one regarding the advancement and competition between the rail and road modes of Corridor X.
29. As to the origin of traffic on Corridor X, Mr. Mintsis noted the regional character of traffic, which cannot be missed. However, as a result of recent political actions and as indicated by pre-1990 figures, the Corridor is by all means an international one. According to estimations of Greek cargo operators, the current Corridor X can resume its role as an international traffic link if waiting times at border crossings are reduced. Mr. Mintsis also commented on the competition between the two modes of the Corridor, noting that road transportation is more attractive than rail on the basis of physical data and has primarily shorter travel times in comparison with the rail mode. At the same time, the road axis is closer to completion than the rail one.
30. Mr. Taxiltaris added to these comments, by bringing up the differential composition of traffic flows according to geography: the southern part of the Corridor facilitates by approximately 90% regional and local transportation, the northern part (eg Austria and Slovenia) facilitates both regional and international traffic, while the middle part (Croatia and Serbia & Montenegro) basically supports local movements, with trends that indicate the reappearance of international flows. Mr. Taxiltaris emphasized that taking into account the situation before 1990, the international composition of traffic will be a reality when infrastructure improvements occur and when the political, economic and security environment permits its evolution.

As far as the competition between the road and rail modes is concerned, Mr. Taxiltaris mentioned that in reality the road mode is more attractive for users and that it is up to the national and international authorities to adopt the proper policies that could equilibrate and/or reverse this trend. Also, investments for the development of the rail infrastructure are heavier. In any case substantial improvements are still necessary for

both modes, and severe problems are faced at cross border points. The issue is that adopting the proper policies for the rehabilitation of the Corridor and providing the necessary funding is also a symbolic move on behalf of the IFIs that will prove the political will of the international community to complete the Corridor and contribute to the integration of the region with the rest of Europe.

31. Mr. Dionelis expressed his enthusiasm for this comment, as according to pre-1990 data, Corridor X facilitated the highest percentage of international traffic compared to all Corridors and it was also the only Corridor in which the rail mode could compete road transportation.
32. Mr. Konstantakos brought up the question of costs by making a comment on a table on costs included in Mr. Mintsis' presentation. He noticed that national representatives gave an average cost for their branches of the Corridor which differs by something like 25% from the estimation of costs per country for the rehabilitation of the Corridor. He stressed the need to have more accurate data and information concerning costs and wondered whether the suggested costs are a rough estimate or the result of meticulous studies.
33. Mr. Patsiavos answered by saying that this was the information provided by countries, but no justification had been asked. Of course some data are not compatible and this is an issue that the new work program will look into thoroughly. He also agreed that some cost reports were probably estimations and not accurate studies.
34. Mr. Adelsberger expressed his disappointment with the status of the Corridor, because the road mode is already in a better position than rail and it is further being improved faster. He also noted that when making plans, market conditions need to be taken into consideration, where strong rail unions exist, while road rehabilitation and construction works involve cheaper labor costs. At the same time, safety regulations need to be emphasized and special concern is to be given to truck drivers, who spend approximately 20 hours behind the wheel. With regard to the G-24 EU policy directive no.1692, Mr. Adelsberger expressed his strong disagreement to the fact that the participation in the Coordination Group of Corridors and Areas depends on whether a country, by chance, has the Chair in one of the Corridors and said that advantages and disadvantages need to be looked at.
35. Mr. Patsiavos said that in order for more work to be done more and accurate data is necessary, and urged all participants to provide this information by the end of May, to include it in the Database. He urged Mr. Adelsberger to provide this kind of missing data for Austria.
36. Mr. Adamantiadis from the UNECE congratulated the Secretariat for the presentation of the status of the Corridor and made an additional comment concerning borders, noting that it is an important issue. He firstly stated that delays at border crossings discourage investments in infrastructure, even if there is a very good road network and secondly that these delays have economic and social impacts, preventing the development of the countries themselves, because Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) is discouraged.

37. Mr. Patsiavos thanked Mr. Adamantiadis for his input, and mentioned that border crossings is item 8 on the agenda of the meeting and will be discussed later in more detail.
38. Mr. Princic from Slovenia noted his country's will to contribute to the development of the Corridor, but also expressed his discomfort with certain actions that exclude Slovenia from participating fully in this effort. He brought up the example of TERFN established by the Directive 2001/12/EC, and pointed out that the main part of Corridor X on the section Jesenice (SLO) – Villach (A) is not included/defined as a connection to TERFN while the branch line connection from Maribor to Sentilj is. He said that during the discussions in Brussels it was concluded that this mistake can be solved, on bilateral basis with the Republic of Austria, by defining this line as a feeder line to TERFN. As a member of the Steering Committee on Corridor X he can not agree on such decisions that can lead to misunderstanding of the role of the main Corridor. He stressed how such issues may be costly in terms of cooperation.
39. Both Mr. Patsiavos and Mr. Adelsberger said that they had never heard of something like that before and Mr. Gheivelis inquired who took this decision, but Mr. Princic answered that Slovenia was not included in the discussion on this directive and that it was a decision announced to them as a pre-accession country.
40. Mr. Patsiavos promised that the Chair of the Steering Committee is going to investigate this.

Lunch break

41. Mr. Adelsberger started out with the presentation of the Austrian long term General Transport Plan, which takes into account the following problems: a) there are more cars than households, b) there has been a 40% increase in the number of private cars during last period c) there has been an increase in transport of goods by road, d) different regions are accessible by different means (eg through the Danube) and e) TENs leading to the East would have to prepare to deal with extra volume of traffic and transport demand after enlargement of the EU. The principles of the Austrian plan are that transport policy must be economic, environment friendly, social (with regard to safety), employ intelligent transport means (for instance telematics) and also support the overall employment policy. Therefore, infrastructure policy should be decided on the basis of traffic capacity demands, space (geography and environment), efficiency and financiability, while any Corridor knots system should facilitate combined transportation and intermodality. He also mentioned that two main Austrian motor routes join Corridor X. As far as the rail corridor is concerned, investment emphasis has been given to certain links that would also allow the shift of traffic from road to rail (eg Vienna-Graz, Vienna-Linz). With regard to the multiway network, efforts have been focused on covering missing links to neighboring countries (Czech Republic, Hungary), as well as on taking certain additional measures to increase their national transport capacity. Overall, the Austrian plan foresees about 17bn € to be spent between during this decade, 1/3 of which on road transportation and 2/3 on rail. He also noted that most of the work on the motorways is expected to finish by 2006, as most of the work has been done. He mentioned the creation of a new separate tube in the period 2004-2008 next to the tunnel from Salzburg to Villach, which is on the main road axis and that with regard to rail the creation of a second track is not progressing fast because demand is not large. He also noted that there are reactions on

behalf of citizens in the South, which insist in a very expensive tunnel solution (Gastein Valley) having tunnels and a short-term solution will be provided soon, and the long-run solution will come later in the form of tunnels. There are also two tracks foreseen and until the completion of the Maribor – Sentilj it will take approximately 10 more years.

42. Mr Patsiavos thanked Mr. Adelsberger for his presentation, asked him to provide the presentation in written form and gave the floor to Mrs. Zhekova - Ivanova.
43. Mrs. Zhekova- Ivanova from Bulgaria made a brief presentation about the rail projects which are taking place on Corridor X and mentioned that network near Sofia is electrified, but other parts not yet. The improvement of railway facilities is proceeding and priority is given to a first section of 57km. The short-term policy foresees improvement of the rail-line and facilities, while the long term goal is to have the railway speed reach 160km per hour. It is important to improve technical conditions by electrification of the lines and modernization at border crossings. She also promised that new data would become available within two or three weeks concerning next steps.
44. Mr. Patsiavos thanked her and kindly asked her to provide this information in writing.
45. Mrs. Palcic from Croatia congratulated the Technical Secretariat for the status report of the Corridor, noting that it is always very accurate. She stressed how everybody would like to have better transport infrastructure in Croatia, however funds are given to social welfare instead. The point is that the final improved structure of the Corridor will be achieved gradually, aiming to meet the requirements and to keep in balance with financial capacities. Infrastructure improvement works are still in progress and will continue according to possibilities and requirements. Achieving improvements is possible, eg signaling facilities on three railway stations and inter-station dependence on the section Vinkovci-Tovarnik (SS and TK system), and level-crossings security. The interventions on electric power supply facilities of electric traction will be completed and will result in train speed increase from 60 to 120km/h and bigger line capacity. Reconstruction for speeds up to 160km/h are in progress regarding that the braking distance will be increased to 1500m. Operation is in progress and the financial means are provided in the budget of the Republic of Croatia for the next two years.

As for the road part of the main axis, the Zagreb-Bregana section will be fully completed until June 2002, as remaining works on the frontal road crossing are planned for next month and the section will be introduced into the toll system as from July 1st 2002. The Velika Kopanica-Zupanja section of 25,95km is almost fully finished and will be introduced to full operation in June 2002. The remaining part from Zupanja to Lipovac (border crossing to Serbia and Montenegro) is 29,43 km and it remains the only part of the road Corridor of the main axis that it doesn't have a full motorway profile in the Republic of Croatia. For this section, expropriations and preparation activities are on going. Nevertheless for this section, construction is not expected to begin before 2004.

46. Mrs. Zdraveva from the FYROM delegation was offered the floor, and she thanked the Technical Secretariat for all the hard work, but especially for organizing the

meetings between the Greek and FYROM construction companies, which is a part of her country's policy. She also noted that special emphasis is put on the establishment of public-private partnerships (PPPs). FYROM does not plan only on new motorways, but uses financing for rehabilitation and trying to secure financing through PPPs. Concerning the railway network, she described the FYROM government's plan to review the organization's model and restructure within the year, so that by the end of 2003 functions are divided, with maintenance in the hands of the government and operational functions to private investors. She raised an issue of re-establishing two border crossings between FYROM and Greece.

47. Mr. Patsiavos kindly observed that re-opening border stations is also a matter of the Ministry of Economics and of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and not only of the Ministry of Transport, and asked her to proceed with the presentation of the Corridor in FYROM.

48. The presentation described the various parts of the Pan European Transport Corridors that go through FYROM (VIII and X). Concerning the road corridor, the total length of the main route is 172,2km, 104,4km of which (60,1%) have been constructed, 15,4km (9%) are in the phase of construction and 52,5km (31%) remain to be constructed. As far as Branch D is concerned, with total length of 127km, 52 km (43%) have been constructed, and as no construction works are currently taking place, there are 73km remaining (57%) to be constructed. She showed a detailed map of the sections that have been finished, are under construction and remain to be constructed on both Corridors VIII and X, including those that are planned to be finished by August 2002. Mrs. Zdraveva paid particular emphasis on the Negotino-Demir Kapija part, which has been divided into three phases, and as for the border crossings, she noted that the efforts are on-going and there are plans to renew or open old border crossing points.

With regard to the basic characteristics of the rail corridor, she explained that the average speed limit is 120km/h, the total length of the rails way is 215km all electrified, and there are 29 stations. With regard to signaling, interlocking and telecommunications equipment, no major problems exist, and she also noted that the Skopje-Kumanovo section of the railway is common with Corridor VIII. A 34km part operates with speed less than 100km/h on the whole section of the Corridor (parts: Zgropolci – Gradsko, Kukurecani – Krivolak, and Dubrovo – Demir Kapija) and needs reconstruction for 130km/h. The 10km section between Smokvica and Gevgelija is in the final phase of its reconstruction (last time works were done on it was in 1996) and the budget is at 22.000.000,00 \$. With regard to Branch D of rail Corridor X (Veles-Priler-Bitola-Kremenica), the speed limit on several sections is 80km/h, on a total length of 145,3km. There are 12 stations, with signaling, interlocking and telecommunications equipment partly established. The Bitola-Kremenica part, which is 16km long, is not in use and needs rehabilitation.

49. Mr. Patsiavos thanked the FYROM delegation and asked them to provide the presentation in written form.

50. Mrs. Stefanidou from "Egnatia Odos SA" presented the part of the works on Corridor X that are taking place in Greece, starting with the main axis of the Corridor and the Niki-Kozani-Florina section, which is 93km and is the continuation of Corridor X in Greece. This is a 4-lane cross section with three subsections, the first of which is the 22,5km between Kozani and Ptolemaida, which is a 4-lane motorway 22m wide. The

second part is 50kms long (Ptolemaida – Florina) and it is under construction except 2,5km for which a new contract is expected (estimated at 22m). There is also a 14km part which is not so well developed, but designs will be finished by June and the tender for its completion will be announced in the second half of 2002.

51. Mr. Patsiavos asked the representative of the company to provide this data in written form, and the floor was given to Mr. Malakatas.
52. Mr. Malakatas congratulated the Chair of the Steering Committee and the Technical Secretariat for their work and mentioned that out of the 61km between Thessaloniki and FYROM the 16km are a motorway. Upgrading of the roads depends on the revival of Corridor X, and he expressed his hope that by reviving this procedure, tangible results could be achieved within 4 years. Motorways are being expanded in Greece and one of the processes leading to agreement is the Central Greece axis, which will link Corridor X with the southern parts of Greece (through Lamia). He noted that the tender is in the phase of qualification of tenderers, and it is expected to finish within two or three months, while he was expecting that by the end of 2002 the potential for PPPs will be examined, so that works can begin.
53. Mr. Princic from Slovenia presented the status of the Corridor in Slovenia, and elaborated on the investments for the rail and road parts of the corridor. As for the railway section, he discussed the measures adopted by the Slovenian government in order to achieve higher speed on the Ljubljana-Maribor line: 19 level crossings have been eliminated and a deviation between Litija and Kresnice has been created; the works of the Krizni vrh cut is in progress and expected to finish by June 2002, while the works of the Dolga Gora and Poljcane stations has already been completed; the works of the Pocehova tunnel are on-going, and a two-stage ISPA-funded project for the modernization of the Ljubljana-Zidani most-Maribor line has been announced. Telecommunication devices have already been modernized with the implementation of optical wires, digital mobile telecommunications systems, digital telecommunication systems at railway stations and uninterrupted power supply for telecommunication. Feasibility studies are planned to take place under the ISPA program on the implementation of a GSM-R system, of an ETCS/ERMTS system, of remote control of fixed installations for electric traction system, and a study for the preparation of an outline scheme for the border station of Dobova will take place under BIP (Balkans Investment Programme).

As far as the road part is concerned, Mr. Princic said that certain parts have been completed, others are under construction, and others are planned. The section of the motorway Karavanke tunnel (Austria)-Ljubljana two subsections: the subsection Naklo-Kranj (8,7km) was opened in 2000, and a viaduct over the Trziska Bistrica river at the Podtabor-Naklo is under construction. The entire subsection is envisaged to be opened till the end of 2003. Works are under progress for the section of Ljubljana – Obrezje (Croatia), where the subsection between Visnja Gora and Bic (11,2km) was opened in 2000, while construction for the subsection Krska vas – Obrezje (12,3km) started in 2001 and is envisaged to finish within 2004. The section of the motorway Sentilj (Austria) – Maribor-Ljubljana involves a lot of works as well: the part of the subsection Pesnica-Slivnica (high speed road within Maribor, 2,4km) was opened in 2001, and so has the subsection Sentjakob-Krtina (7,7km); subsections

Vransko-Trojane (8,6km) and Krtina-Lukovica (4,4km) are expected to be finished in 2002.

Item 7 Presentation of the GIS

54. Mr. Patsiavos thanked the participants for their presentations and asked them to send all this information by the end of May. The floor was given to Mr. Miltiadou to present the GIS and the website developed by the Technical Secretariat.
55. Mr. Miltiadou presented the GIS network, which allows the study of the Corridor by branch, section, country and axis, while it facilitates the integration of new flows data, especially as far as border crossings are concerned. When closing the GIS presentation, Mr. Miltiadou noted how the shortage and accuracy of data can affect the effectiveness of this system and asked all delegates to doublecheck their data, so that they are accurate and made available promptly to the Secretariat. He also presented the website of the Corridor X which has been created by the Technical Secretariat and was delivered to the meeting participants on a CDROM.
56. Mr. Patsiavos asked if there were any questions and informed the participants that they could run the CD that was given to them and visit the website for more information. He then proceeded to the next item on the agenda, which was the border crossings.

Item 8 Border Crossings

57. Mr. Patsiavos introduced the issue border crossings by mentioning a presentation made at the 3rd Steering Committee meeting in 2001, which triggered more interest on this problem and consequently the Chair of the Steering Committee proposes to organize a meeting with DG for Taxation and Customs Union. He also proposed to create a working group of members so as to improve cross-border issues. This would involve not only transport authorities, but also customs authorities.
58. Mr. Patris from the Greek Ministry of Transport and Telecommunications noted that problems arising at border crossings are a result of the combined deficiencies in legislation, infrastructure and taxation/customs. He suggested that there are two steps to counter this problem: 1) improve infrastructure, 2) harmonize legislation, introduce new procedures and simplify documents. He finally proposed to the Steering Committee to co-ordinate on-site visits at cross border points so as to collect data on procedures in close cooperation with the countries, that are hopefully going to be compatible with each other.
59. Mr. Patsiavos wondered if it would be possible to involve customs officials and organize such a meeting in Athens.
60. Mr. Princic mentioned that such a group already exists and has been established for railway companies on Corridor X, with a task on how to facilitate border crossings. Mr. Patsiavos enquired if customs authorities are involved, and Mr. Princic clarified that all relevant authorities are involved: customs, police, sanitary, veterinary and phyto-sanitary controls. Also, he said that border facilitation agreements have been signed between Slovenia and Hungary and Austria.

61. Mr. Adelsberger was quick to add that the rail section also has similar problems at border crossings, both on Corridor X and on VII. He said that these two Corridors involve the same countries and that there should be coordination amongst them on these issues.
62. Mrs. Vitou said that the UIC has established a Task Force East-West, which deals with border crossings not only on Corridor X, but over the whole Balkan region. She said that this Task Force is active only on the rail section, and particularly on freight trains. She said that as Corridor X crosses many countries, there are many border points and therefore more problems. Another one of the principal concerns of the Task Force is to examine individual problems of all points and compare differences in all procedures. Emphasis is put on discussing these differences with competitive authorities of rail and road transportation.
63. Mr. Patsiavos mentioned that all these initiatives and activities are taking place on the rail level, however problems are more severe in the road part. Of course cooperation with other Corridors is a desired and necessary condition, yet our proposal is on an administrative level and it is important to examine the legislation that is creating problems among Corridor X countries and bring about customs cooperation. UNECE has offered to help, and so has the DG for Taxation and Customs Union.
64. Mr. Lupescu brought in his experience to the discussion saying that efforts to achieve these goals on the rail mode have taken place at various levels. On the level of Ministers of Transport and railway companies, there has been a meeting with customs officers and it is expected that border police authorities will participate at the next meeting. UIC Action Border Crossing has conducted eight studies that include exact proposals and solutions. He stressed the difference between passenger traffic, which takes more time to check, while it is easier for freight traffic. Mr. Lupescu said that it has been about a year since this program has been initiated and that a questionnaire has been distributed, so as to identify results. He shared his thought that it is more effective to start such interventions following a top-down approach, i.e. by asking the government to examine the relevant legal framework (e.g. passports, visas, simplify procedures, disseminate data, take measures to facilitate international freight traffic), rather than adopting a bottom-up method, which doesn't enforce rules, cannot change regulation and does not know how or why to process data. He concluded by stating that it is not merely a matter of customs regulations, but one of government legislation.
65. Mr. Adamantiadis stated that UNECE has been dealing with such questions, but other organizations probably have more expertise. However, he invited the Steering Committee and all members to come in touch with UNECE and obtain all relevant agreements and work that has been concluded, so as to better comprehend the ways in which the organization can contribute to this task. He suggested that this way huge experience can be drawn for Corridor X and the efficiency of actions can be maximized. He expressed the strong willingness of himself and of his colleagues to be of assistance in this effort.
66. Mr. Patsiavos thanked Mr. Adamantiadis for his supportive attitude and said that several conventions have been made to set the legal framework for the development

of the Pan-European Networks, and it would be absolutely essential to include them in the works of the Corridor concerning border crossings. He promised closer work with the UNECE, and noted that more cooperation with experts in the field is needed in order to present some work and positive results concerning the issue.

67. Mr. Taxiltaris made a point by saying that the proposal of Mr. Patris involves the technical aspects of observation and study of malfunctions at borders, something which can be integrated at the planned on-site visits. He agreed that it is very positive that such “workshops” for railways already exist and praised these initiatives as they are absolutely compatible with the goals of Corridor X. However, the issue concerning border crossings is also a legal one, as Mr. Lupescu underlined, and the difficulty is to evaluate the legal and administrative particularities at border crossings. Therefore, cooperation with customs authorities has to be secured. Mr. Taxiltaris also mentioned a Greek report concerning compatibility of procedures for the same border crossing process between EU-members, non-EU countries, and pre-accession countries, and said that this is probably a question that needs to be clarified – something that may be an issue at a next meeting. He cautioned everybody, however, on the fact that the whole undertaking might end up being a unilateral approach if not all Corridor X customs authorities are invited, and noted how up to now the Corridor X Steering Committee have been isolated from customs authorities.
68. Mr. Lupescu said that in view of EU accession, the implementation of the Schengen Accords whenever this is possible is a positive step to this direction.
69. Mrs. Palcic from Croatia said that there was consensus about the importance of the problems, especially for the road mode, as work has been done in other fora with regard to rail. She urged the participants to take action and oblige themselves to use their resources (whatever that is – TTFSE, EC, UNECE, etc) and not to duplicate work that has been done by other groups. She proposed an agreement on something preliminary, something like a meeting in October, and examine then whatever reservations may arise from other authorities like customs, because border crossings are indeed a huge issue, but also an organizational one.
70. Mr. Patsiavos thanked Mrs. Palcic for her proposal and Mr. Dionelis asked for a clarification on whether Mrs. Palcic’s suggestion refers to a meeting or to a seminar.
71. Mr. Mintsis made a brief intervention about border crossings and mentioned that as it was raised at the Brussels meeting, the most important thing about borders is not only speedy passage, but safety. He then announced that the Technical Secretariat is planning to undertake a survey at border crossing points along Corridor X and organize a program of visits, so as to identify the customs problems and he asked for support from the delegates on the technical part concerning the function of the border procedures.
72. To answer the question of Mr. Dionelis, Mr. Patsiavos said that there are three stages for the border crossing actions: the first stage is the on-site visits to monitor and measure, so as to produce reports, the second involves the proposal for a special committee with customs authorities (with the cooperation with UNECE and EC Taxation) and a seminar would be the last stage.

73. Mr. Minstis also stressed the importance of acquiring strong government support for carrying out the on-site visits, and reminded the participants that the Secretariat's last attempt stumbled on "investigation" from local authorities. Going in depth is necessary, and for that the Secretariat will need to observe procedures officially and formally, which is the reason why Mr. Mintsis asked for some sort of permissive arrangement to record the border crossings' physical situation and procedures.
74. Mr. Patsiavos said that the visit program will be planned in advance in coordination with the participants, and that there will be consultations with customs authorities, expressing his hope that he would be able to provide more details about that by the end of the next month.

He then asked Mr. Princic to confirm again about the document that allowed for the rail border crossings cooperation between Slovenia, Austria and Hungary, and Mr. Princic indeed confirm its existence, as it has been published in the government's gazette. He offered to send it to the Secretariat, but said that the text is in German.

Item 9 Presentation of the Work Programmme

75. Mr. Patsiavos then gave the floor to Mr. Taxiltaris, who proceeded with the presentation of the Work Programme of the Technical Secretariat. He mentioned certain significant issues and also discussed the importance and methodology for flows forecasting, asking all participants to send their feedback and comments on the Work Programme by the end of May 2002.

The New Work Programme, presented by Mr. Taxiltaris, is the continuation of the previous one and consists of eight (8) items:

1. The maintenance and continuous update of the archive of studies and the definition of needs for new studies.
2. The contribution to the development of favorable conditions – from technical point of view – for the involvement of IFIs in the development of Corridor X.
3. The improvement, updating and management of the already established Information System.
4. The optimization of procedures at border-crossings and custom controls, and the facilitation of improved access conditions to Corridor X.
5. The continuous and systematic monitoring of any procedure concerning the development of Corridor X.
6. The development of cooperation between the countries of the Corridor and other Pan-European Corridors.
7. The dissemination of information concerning the Corridor and the work done by the Steering Committee and the Technical Secretariat.
8. The secretarial support to the Steering Committee.

Some crucial issues were then discussed:

1. The need for up to date information concerning the development of the Corridor (infrastructure, operational aspects, studies, etc.) for the Database and G.I.S. update.

2. The priority for financing, which should be given to rehabilitation and maintenance projects.
3. The encouragement of the understanding and cooperation between neighboring countries – partners in Corridor X establishing bilateral cooperation, in combination with a new series of expertise and on-site visits, for the registration, under real conditions, of the border crossing procedures and the respective delays, during the period September – December 2002.
4. The need for demand parameters registration (passenger and freight traffic flows) along the Corridor X (both rail and road sectors) and mid-term flows forecasting.
5. The necessity for reliable data.

Concerning the flows forecasting along the Corridor, Mr. Taxiltaris presented the plan, which consists of six (6) actions:

1. The evaluation of similar studies and the exploitation of the international experience.
2. The collection of all necessary material – data for the forecasting process (trip durations, delays at cross-borders and other demand parameters). The data collection process will include questionnaire surveys, interviews and communication with national and international Organizations.
3. The construction of a Database for the reference year.
4. The definition of the constraints and scenarios.
5. The freight and passenger flows forecasting.
6. The determination of priorities and the documentation of actions for the development of the Corridor.

76. Mr. Mintsis added that the importance of the traffic flows forecast has to do with the fact that any organization or private investors needs to have it in order to proceed with any project. Validity of data is a major question, but once this reliable data is collected and verified it is to everybody's gain, as more investments will be attracted and maybe parts of the investments can be carried out by the participating governments as well.
77. Mr. Adelsberger said that the plan is ambitious and comprehensive, but thought that it should also include measures that would allow immediate improvements on the Corridor, especially in terms of rail, to convince sponsors that their funds are well and effectively used.
78. Mr. Patsiavos said that this is also a concern of the Steering Committee, which is why special emphasis is put on border crossings, where most delays occur. He invited Mr. Adelsberger to contribute with any ideas that would help towards this direction, and said felt that little progress can be done without solving the issue of border crossing.
79. Mr. Mintsis stressed the need to speed up governments' activities and show them that the Corridor is a key factor for the development of the whole region, by improving the Corridor's financial organization, and mentioned how the Steering Committee serves as a tool for speeding up the cooperation on functional processes by transferring information for instance. He closed by saying that when people started talking about Corridor X three years ago, the general feeling was that it could only be successful if

large-scale projects were undertaken, but it is now evident that it can also be done with small and solid steps, and for that reaching out to the governments is necessary.

80. Having said that, Mr. Patsiavos summarized briefly the procedural issues and asked the delegates to send their comments and ideas on the status of the Corridor, on the meeting with customs authorities in Autumn and on the traffic flows study by the end of May. He also urged participants to start gathering all necessary data so that they are prepared for the on-site visits, which will take place between September and December of 2002, and as for the date and place of the next meeting, he suggested that it might be good if meetings were held at other countries of Corridor X as well, in view of the EU enlargement. He offered the Greek government's support to any such proposal and asked delegates to come up with any suggestions by the end of May.
81. Mr. Princic from Slovenia said that the next meeting could be held in Slovenia, yet he was not authorized to make such a proposal and that if official contact was to take place among Ministries then maybe it could work out.
82. Mr. Patsiavos said that the meeting would have to be fixed for the beginning of July 2003, as Greece would be too caught up with the EU presidency, something which was a concern to Mr. Adelsberger, who said that rather than wait for 15 months until the next meeting, it might be good to have it in December of 2002, so that the Greek presidency would not be an obstacle. Mr. Patsiavos noted however that having the meeting so early would not allow the Chair and the Secretariat to process all the data gathered from the on-site visits and the customs meeting in the fall, so as to present its work promptly to the participants. Having said all that, Mr. Patsiavos opened the Agenda item no 10.

Item 10 Other business

83. As was stated in the beginning of the meeting, an issue that arose was the intermodality of the Corridor and potential cooperation with Corridor VII, something that was introduced by Mr. Dionelis.
Mr. Dionelis took the floor to say that this was an idea derived from the White Paper of EU, as there are certain rail sections running parallel to the Danube.
84. Mr. Patsiavos said that there will be a contact between Chairmen of Corridors VII and X, in order to clarify the way of co-operation and after that written information will be sent to the countries.