

5TH STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING
PAN EUROPEAN TRANSPORT CORRIDOR X
BLED, SLOVENIA
18-19 JULY 2003

Draft minutes of the first day of works – 18 July 2003

Morning Session

Item 1: Welcoming address by the Slovenian Ministry of Transport

1. Mr. Zivec, State Secretary of the Slovenian Minister of Transport, welcomed all the participants at the 5th Meeting of the Pan-European Transport Corridor X Steering Committee wishing them a pleasant stay in the city of Bled. He also wished for successful work during the meeting and for concrete results.

Item 2: Opening address by the Chairman of the Committee

2. Mr. Patsiavos, the Chairman, welcomed all the participants, wishing a good stay and fruitful outcome. He also cordially thanked the Slovenian Ministry of Transport and Telecommunications for the warm hospitality and the excellent organization of the meeting and especially Mr. Zivec, Mr. Prinic and Ms. Zarc for their efforts.
3. Mr. Patsiavos mentioned the evolutions since the last meeting, mainly the enlargement of the European Union that changes the perspective of Pan-European Corridor X, the Greek presidency of the Council of the European Union during the first semester of 2003, the Symposium organized by the Greek presidency in Brussels on the 6th of May 2003 and the

annual meeting of the Corridors and Areas Co-ordination Group on the 4th of June 2003, where the importance of the experience of Pan-European Corridors, including Corridor X, was recognized and should be used as guideline for the definition of the concept of Trans-European Corridors.

4. Mr. Patsiavos also referred to the two High Level Meetings, organized by the Infrastructure Steering Group of the European Commission, in Luxemburg on the 6th of February 2003 and in London on the 26th and 27th of June 2003. Their main issue was the identification of a Core Transport Network in Western Balkans, comprising Pan-European Corridors V, VII, VIII and X (which are the backbone of the Core Network) and other essential network components, forming the so-called REBIS transport infrastructure network. Furthermore, he pointed that Greece intended to provide grants of 550moeuros through the Hellenic Plan for the Economic Reconstruction of the Balkans (HiPERB) to six Balkan countries within the next five years. Finally, he stressed out the work of the Technical Secretariat since the last meeting and concluded with the Programme of the meeting.

Item 3: Approval of the agenda

5. Mr. Patsiavos suggested making a small change to the draft Agenda and to discuss item 10 instead of item 5 and the rest of the items to be treated in the same order of the agenda. There were no objections on that amendment and the Agenda was considered as adopted.

Item 4: Adoption of the Minutes of the 4th meeting of the Steering Committee

6. The Chairman reminded that the Technical Secretariat had already sent the minutes of the last meeting in Grevena to all participants and incorporated their comments and remarks. Then he asked if there were any other remarks. There were no further remarks, so the

minutes were considered as adopted (see issue delivered to the participants by the Technical Secretariat).

Item 5: The Pan-European Transport Network and the new EU policy: Results of the Symposium of Brussels “Towards the integration of the Trans-European and Pan-European Transport Networks”, the 5th Meeting of the Pan-European Transport Corridors and Areas Coordinators Group and the ISG/ HLM – REBIS

7. Professor Taxiltaris took the floor and presented the key points of the Pan-European Symposium held in Brussels on 6th of May 2003 (see attachment).

8. Mrs. Alleweldt, on behalf of ECOSOC, asked if there was enough coordination between Corridors and Core Network (ISG) and if the representative in the Corridors’ Steering Committee Meetings and the High Level Meetings was the same person. She also stressed that the enlargement of European Union was a positive step in social and economic aspect, but a focus on strategic plans was needed. She also mentioned that during the Italian presidency, a meeting of the ECOSOC would take place and in 2004 more strategic work (papers) would be made by ECOSOC.

9. Mr. Preston, on behalf of the European Commission DG TREN, took the floor and thanked the Slovenian delegation for its hospitality and the Technical Secretariat for the presentation. He also suggested to the participants to read the Van Miert report that was published on 30th of June 2003, available at the Commission’s website¹, and the REBIS final report available at the website of the European Commission’s and World Bank’s Joint Office for the Economic Reconstruction and Development in South Eastern Europe².

¹ http://europa.eu.int/comm/ten/transport/revision/hlg_en.htm

² http://www.seerecon.org/infrastructure/sectors/transport/documents/REBIS/Rebis_FR_Final.pdf

He also stated that REBI Study couldn't modify the Core Network, which could only be modified by Commission's decision, including the Sava River (issue to be discussed in the High Level Meeting of the Infrastructure Steering Group in October in Paris).

In response to Mrs. Alleweldt's remark, Mr. Preston pointed out that the Van Miert report foresees to a minimalist structure for better coordination i.e. a light-coordinating agency.

10. Mr. Patsiavos answered to Mrs. Alleweldt that basically the same people participated in London's High Level Meeting and in the 5th meeting of Corridor X, meaning that there was coordination between Core Network and Corridor X, because what was a priority in Corridor X was a priority in Core Network as well.
11. Mrs. Alleweldt pointed out that even after the enlargement, the 1/3 of the Pan-European Corridors would stay outside of European Union and that those transport links are essential and should be constructed.
12. Mr. Schwetz expressed his concern about the future role of the Steering Committees of the Corridors and about Corridor VII, which includes countries in European Union and third countries as well. In addition he declared that he supported the idea of coordination between Corridors and Core Network.
13. The Chairman thanked for the comments and since there were no further remarks, the meeting proceeded with Agenda Item 6.

Item 6: Activity Report – The progress of works on the 3 years' Work Programme

14. Professor Taxiltaris took the floor and presented the annual Activity Report of the Greek Chair of the Steering Committee and of the Technical Secretariat (see issue delivered to the participants by the Technical Secretariat).

15. Mr. Patsiavos informed the representatives that the proceedings of the Symposium in Brussels would be sent to all delegations as soon as they will be finalised. There were no comments and the procedure went on with Agenda Item 7, at first with the presentation of the Status of Corridor X by the Technical Secretariat and then with the presentations of the recent developments by each country's delegation, in North to South order.

Item 7: State of Play of Corridor X – Presentation on the status of Pan European Corridor X and all activities related to the Corridor i.e. studies, financing etc.

16. Professor Taxiltaris had the floor and presented the State of Play of Corridor X (see issue delivered to the participants by the Technical Secretariat).

17. Mr. Klaric, on behalf of Croatian delegation, stressed that the road section Zupanja – Lipovac would be finished by 2005.

18. Mr. Patsiavos thanked Professor Taxiltaris and gave the floor to Mr. Adelsberger, head of the Austrian delegation.

19. Mr. Adelsberger thanked the Chairman. He stated that June 2002 was the date of beginning the modernisation programme of the Austrian government. He also emphasized on the situation of the coming enlargement and the adjustment among the countries and the Van

Miert report. He pointed that traffic forecast, based on a new database, was in early stage and the preliminary results had not many differences compared to previous ones.

About the Austrian part of Rail Corridor X, Mr. Adelsberger pointed that long part of the section Salzburg – Villach was single track and it would be doubled by 2006. Also a small section in the South was under construction and it would not be completed before 2010, but it did not affect the capacity due to its small length. Doubling of Villach – Rosenbach line would be ready by 2012. At branch A, doubling of Graz – Spielfeld line was on going and it would be finished by 2012. Finally a PPP study was completed and works were already going, to be completed by 2010.

Concerning the Austrian part of Rail Corridor X, he mentioned that at the time being the Batburg tunnel was one tube. The second tube would be constructed in the period 2005 – 2009. The motorway from Graz to Vienna would be completed. By 2006, Branch A would be completed and the tunnels would be finished by 2009. In addition, it would be investigated if the construction of a second tube at Karavanke tunnel is necessary.

20. Mr. Patsiavos asked Mr. Adelsberger about the cost and the answer was that it would be sent by e-mail.
21. Mr. Patsiavos asked all the delegations to submit their presentations with work programmes and financial plans, in order to be included to a report to the DG TREN by the 1st of September, and he gave the floor to Mr. Princic.
22. During his presentation, Mr. Princic stated that, rail Corridor X in Slovenia was not yet completely constructed. There were still two single track sections, Ljubljana – Jesenice and Maribor - Sentilj, which would be completed before 2015, but inspite of that there were no bottlenecks.

Mr. Princic stressed strongly that according to the Directive 2001/12/EC the main line of the corridor X had no connection to TERFN at section Jesenice – Villach.

He was persuaded that from the point of wider European importance of the corridor X the proposal for the correction of the Directive 2001/12/EC should be addressed to the EU from the Steering Committee.

23. Mr. Mozetic then took the floor and presented the Slovenian road Corridor X. He stated that at the section Karavanke – Obrezje (175 km) the AADT has increased by 6%, between the years 2001 and 2002 and also that 30,6 km of motorway was under construction and would be completed by the end of 2004, 31,8 km was ready to start and 31,9 km were in preparation phase and would be according to National Motorway Construction Programme finished by the end of 2008. Furthermore, he pointed that at Branch A the AADT has increased by 5%, between the years 2001 and 2002 and that section Pesnica-junction Zrkovska c. was under construction and would be constructed by the end of 2011 (see attachment). Other sections were planed to be finished by 2012.

24. Professor Taxiltaris had a question concerning the remaining of missing motorway sections up to 2008.

25. Mr. Mozetic answered that up to 2008, the motorway sections of the main axis would be completed. After that date missing motorway links would remain only on Branch A.

26. Professor Taxiltaris asked the Slovenian delegation to refer these links in the questionnaires.

27. Mr. Klaric had the floor for the presentation of the Croatian delegation. He commented that at the road section Macelj – Krapina, 19 km would be finished by 2006, from which 7km concern the Jankomir junction. He also stated that 150 moeuros would be spent for the rehabilitation of Zagreb – Slavonski Brod section and the completion of the motorway to Lipovac. Concerning the railways, he mentioned the examining of operating a joint station at Sid at the Croatian/ Serbian border (see attachment).

28. The Chairman asked if there were any questions. Since there were no questions, there was a coffee break.

COFFEE BREAK

29. Mr. Adelsberger took the floor and commented, about intermodality, that the Graz and the Maribor terminals are in use.

30. Mr. Miklavcic, President of Management Board of Slovenian Railways and Mr. Zerjav, Executive Director of Freight Transport of Slovenian Railways took the floor and presented their future plans about freight and passenger transport.

31. Mr. Klaric made a comment about the subsidy of state.

32. The Slovenian delegates answered that comparing to other European countries prices, in Slovenia there are lower prices for regional passengers and same prices for international passengers. The prices for the regional passenger transport as a public service are controlled by the state. The subvention given for it achieves 43% of the total revenues in passenger transport.

33. Mr. Klaric asked about the amount for infrastructure given by the state.
34. The amount for infrastructure maintenance and for traffic management system counted about 17billions Slovenian tolars (SIT) or 77moeuros, given by the state in 2002.
35. Professor Taxiltaris intervned by asking for indicative figures of actual rail modal split between freight and passengers.
36. The Slovenian delegates answered that the rail share was between 14 - 16% for freight and 13% for passenger transport.
37. Mr. Patsiavos gave the floor to the Serbian delegation.
38. Professor Mandic began with the presentation of the Serbian part of rail Corridor X, reported the on going projects financed by E.I.B.: the overhaul of the track on the section from Belgrade to the borders with F.Y.R.O.M., the reconstruction and electrification of Dimitrovgrad border station to the border with Bulgaria on Branch C and the rehabilitation of the Belgrade – Novi Sad. The section from Belgrade to the Croatian borders was financed by national budget.

It was also mentioned that, between 2004-2007, funds by HiPERB are foreseen for the road section Vladicin Han – Levosoje: 60moeuros for the years 2004 and 2005, 20moeuros for the year 2006 and 14moeuros for the year 2007.

39. Mr. Jovic took the floor and presented the Serbian part of road Corridor X. He mentioned that in 2003, 50moeuros would be given by EC and other 5moeuros by EBRD. In addition

he stated that there was an on going project for new lane construction on the section Novi Sad – Belgrade.

40. Mr. Schwetz made a point by speaking about examination of the possibilities establishing intermodality basically in Belgrade (depending on the construction of the bridge) and generally along Corridor X in cooperation with Corridor VII.

41. The meeting proceeded with Mrs. Kramer's presentation, head of the Hungarian delegation. She stated that there was not much progress on Corridor X – Branch B. There were high tolls foreseen on M5 motorway and so they elaborated new toll policy in accordance to the Western European practice. The construction of the M5 motorway would start in 2004 (the negotiation with the concession company was still in progress) and would be completed by 2006 to Szeged and from Szeged to Roszke after 2006.

About railways, there is potential improvement. Kelebia's railway station had already been completed in 2001, but the rehabilitation of the line was in early stage.

42. Mr. Stratiev from Bulgaria took the floor and emphasized the priority of the Italian presidency for Corridor VIII. He also mentioned the financing by the European Union with 4,2boUSD for the development of the transport sector in Bulgaria.

43. Then, Mr. Ivanov presented the Bulgarian part of rail Corridor X (see attachment). He stressed that there were two stages of construction works. On the first stage, the section Dragoman – Kalotina would be electrified by June 2005, funded by the state budget with 22moeuros. On the second stage, the line Dragoman – Sofia would be doubled. The feasibility study would begin in June 2005, funded by the state budget with 3moeuros and the construction works would begin in August 2008 until December 2010, funded with 55moeuros by European Union.

44. In addition, Mrs. Zhekova presented the road part. The information was submitted to the Technical Secretariat and the road (hard copy) and rail questionnaires as well.
45. The meeting proceeded by giving the floor to Mr. Zelenkov from F.Y.R.O.M. (see attachment). He pointed that the rehabilitation of Medzitlija and Bogorodica cross border stations had already started. He also informed that 3,9km of the section Negotina – Demir Kapija were under construction and would be completed in September and that other 6,2km would be completed the year after (2004). Also the section Tabanovce – Kumanovo was about to be constructed. Furthermore, he stressed on the possible Greek help through the HiPERB for the future construction of the sections Demir Kapija – Smokvica and Medzitlija – Bitola.
46. No other comments were added and no other interventions were made, so there was break for lunch.

LUNCH BREAK

Afternoon Session

47. The afternoon session began with Mr. Thomopoulos' presentation, on behalf of the Greek Ministry of Mercantile Marine, about the role of Thessaloniki port as the edge of the Corridor X and about the development perspectives and cooperation initiatives (see attachment).
48. The Chairman gave the floor to Mr. Kosteas, Commercial Director of Greek Railways. He stated that 80km of the main axis, of the section Thessaloniki – Idomeni, would be

rehabilitated within the following six months, costing 2 moeuros and train's speed would be 160km/ h. Also, the entire Greek rail part of Branch D would be reconstructed for 160km/h and 20t/axis. He also mentioned that there were projects by ERGOSE for amelioration of the line up to Idomeni, such as new alignment.

49. Mrs. Pavli took the floor and she stated, about the Greek road part, that Egnatia and P.A.TH.E. roads would be finished by 2007.

50. The Chairman reminded all the participating delegations to submit their presentations to the Technical Secretariat, in order to report to the European Union by the 1st of September 2003 and to incorporate them in the minutes as well.

51. Mrs. Alleweldt commented the conclusions of the ETF Zagreb meeting of January 2003. The cooperation of Trade Unions of the countries of Corridor X, which was needed in order to create stable conditions and economic development in the region, started slowly at the cross borders. She also informed the participants about a future conference of ECOSOC in November 2003.

52. Mr. Stratiev made a comment about the role of Trade Unions.

53. Mrs. Alleweldt answered that for an efficient transportation system everyone has to be on board, in order to avoid obstacles.

54. Mr. Adelsberger agreed with Mrs. Alleweldt's position by saying that the cooperation of ECOSOC with involved bodies exists in the case of Corridor IV.

55. There were no further comments and the meeting proceeded with Agenda Item 8.

Item 8: Results of the passenger and freight flows forecasting study

56. The floor was given to Mr. Miltiadou for the presentation of the special study elaborated by the Technical Secretariat on traffic flows forecasting on Corridor X (see issue delivered to the participants by the Technical Secretariat).
57. Mrs. Kramer commented that the base year's traffic on the Hungarian section was underestimated.
58. Mrs. Palcic said that official elements from CENSUS of UNECE should have been taken into account as a basis for the forecasting study. She also promised to send updated data depending on flow measures and submitted to the Technical Secretariat two maps presenting the volumes of traffic in Croatia for the year 2002.
59. Mr. Meelich added that the UNECE database of traffic volumes is available. He also made a comment that the traffic forecast for the section Maribor – Gruskovje is overestimated.
60. Mr. Adelsberger pointed that Maribor – Gruskovje section is 14km and that Maribor's area contained many villages resulting much local traffic. He added that in order to approach the international traffic volumes it is important to check the situation at the cross borders and subtract the local traffic.
61. Mr. Miltiadou added that there are two subsections. The first one is Maribor – Ptuj (Hadjina) and the second one is Ptuj – Gruskovje. Those results referred to the first part.

62. Mrs. Alleweldt asked for tables with past years' real figures for comparison, but Mr. Miltiadou answered that there was only one table of the base year figures and not for year series.

63. The Chairman noted that Hungary and Croatia should send new data for the finalisation of the forecasting study and the meeting proceeded with Agenda Item 9.

Item 9: Results of the questionnaire and on-site visits based survey at the cross border stations along Corridor X

64. Ms. Tsoukala took the floor and presented the results of the questionnaires and on-site visits based survey at the cross border stations along Corridor X (see issue delivered to the participants by the Technical Secretariat).

65. Mr. Kosteas indicated that at Idomeni border station there were problems such as change of locomotive, inexistence of phytosanitary control, necessity for the passengers to get off the trains during passport control. He mentioned the UN/ECE Resolution about passport control, since 1999, wondering for the actions in order to follow it.

66. Mr. Miltiadou agreed with Mr. Kosteas' pointed issues, and said that the reason that those are not included in the presentation is the comparative low need for improvement than needed at other border stations.

67. Croatian delegation informed that there were projects for change of locomotive.

68. Mrs. Alleweldt asked for the specification on passenger and freight stations.

69. Mr. Miltiadou answered by saying that this separation existed in the report but not in the presentation.

70. Mr. Zelenkov corrected that there was no PHARE Programme in Gevgelija.

71. Mr. Meelich commented that the cross border groups worked together to the signaling of railways.

72. Professor Taxiltaris took the floor and stated that the results of the survey were in details in the report and not in the presentations.

73. The Chairman proceeded to the next presentation by saying that those would be discussed in Item 12 Other business.

Item 10: A good example of using the Network: Measures for the development of the railway freight transport in South East European Region and its links to European Networks (Danu Transport GmbH).

74. Mr. Skobierski, on behalf of PROODOS, took the floor for the presentation about the Block Train Systems.

75. Mr. Kosteas highlighted the importance of PROODOS and stressed that the annual transportation of 2 btns will be possible by 2008.

76. Mr. Klaric made an intervention by asking the waiting time of a block train at the cross borders.

77. Mr. Skobierski responded that the waiting time was not always the same, so there was no answer to that question.

78. Mr. Kosteas referred to the trilateral agreement between Greece, F.Y.R.O.M. and Serbia for the facilitation of train circulation. Slovenia and Croatia were in discussion to be included in that agreement. He also spoke about the theme of block trains for containers. He finally emphasized that the cross border procedures were the main problem.

Item 11: Coordination of further activities.

79. Professor Taxiltaris took the floor and stated that the Technical Secretariat would continue to update the Corridor's database. He spoke about the contacts between Corridor X and DG TREN, IFI's and other Donors as well as the HiPERB.

80. Professor Taxiltaris proposed the organization of a particular meeting involving border-crossing and custom officers from participant countries in Corridor X, which should be organized in coordination with EC DG for Taxation and the Customs Union and TREN, with the objective to examine the interventions and measures for the rationalization/harmonization of the border crossing procedures along Corridor X. The participation of representatives of other Corridors is welcome and the contribution of TTFSE is strongly desired. For the organization and the adequate preparation of the meeting (elaboration of the topics to be discussed during the meeting, designation of speakers in collaboration with DG for Taxation and the Customs Union) a working group should be created associating the Technical Secretariat and representatives from each country.

81. Mr. Meelich informed the participants that a meeting about cross border procedures etc. was organized by UN/ECE in Bratislava.

82. Mr. Adelsberger emphasized the need for joint action among Corridors X, VII and IV.
83. Professor Mandic stated that there were different cross border procedures according to the legal status (E.U. members, N.A.T.O. members e.t.c.).
84. Mr. Schwetz added that a good proposal would be the invitation of police and custom authorities.
85. Mr. Kosteas stated that attention should be paid on the level of participants and that other organizations, such as UIC, TER/UN-ECE and EUROPOL should participate, to have the opportunity of concrete results.
86. Mrs. Zhekova supported that proposition.
87. Mr. Klaric proposed that only the Ministers of Transport or other persons under the responsibility of Ministries of Transport should be invited.
88. Mr. Zivec supported Mr. Klaric' s proposition adding that the necessary data should be collected from the respective bodies.
89. Mr. Skobierski proposed that PROODOS should be invited as operators in those meetings.
90. The delegations agreed on the invitation of all the Ministries of Transport of Corridor X countries, of DG of Taxation and UIC (as operators) and of the Chairs of Corridors IV, V and VII in order to present the work of their Technical Secretariats.

91. Mr. Patsiavos referred to the meeting of Customs in Thessaloniki and to the following 6th meeting of the Steering Committee of Corridor X.
92. After the proposition of Croatian and Serbian delegations for the following meeting, it was unanimously decided that it would take place in Dubrovnik, Croatia in February or March 2004.
93. Mr. Patsiavos summarized the tasks that have been discussed in the meeting:
- By the end of August 2003 all delegations should provide the latest information concerning the status of the Corridor.
 - By the end of September 2003 each country should inform the Technical Secretariat about the representative to the Working Group for Customs.
 - During the 3rd week of January 2004 organisation of the meeting of the Working Group for Customs Representatives.
 - During the 1st week of March 2004 organisation of the 6th meeting of the Steering Committee of Corridor X in Croatia.
94. Mr. Patsiavos asked all the delegations to give their information and presentations to the Technical Secretariat, in written form.

Item 12: Other business

95. Since there was no other business, Mr. Patsiavos thanked all delegations and proceeded with information about the next day's schedule.

96. Mr. Zivec closed the meeting thanking all the participants congratulating them for the concrete results.