



# A SUSTAINABLE FUTURE FOR TRANSPORT

November 20, 2009 • Brussels

## STAKEHOLDERS' CONFERENCE ON A SUSTAINABLE FUTURE FOR TRANSPORT

20 NOVEMBER 2009

### SUMMARY RECORD

#### INTRODUCTION

Following the public consultation on the Commission's Communication on the Future of Transport, a **second high level conference took place on the 20<sup>th</sup> of November 2009**. The aim of the conference was to collect stakeholders' views on concrete measures to consider in the preparation of the White Paper on Transport which will be published in 2010. It was attended by 539 delegates from whole Europe, including in particular representatives of the industry, public administration, and private citizens. The conference was opened by Antonio Tajani, Vice-President of the European Commission responsible for transport policy. Leif Zetterberg, Swedish State Secretary for Communications, explained the views of the EU Presidency. Matthias Ruete, Director General in charge of DG Energy and Transport, presented the results of the public consultation. 42 high level speakers discussed the different aspects of the future of transport in 6 thematic workshops. The video recording of the conference as well as the introductory speeches of VP Tajani and DG Ruete are available at the following link:

[http://ec.europa.eu/transport/strategies/events/2009\\_11\\_20\\_future\\_of\\_transport\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/transport/strategies/events/2009_11_20_future_of_transport_en.htm)

#### PANEL 1 – INTEGRATING THE TRANSPORT MODES: THE REVISION OF THE TEN-T

Chair: Prof. Carlo Secchi, TEN-T coordinator

Panellists:

- (1) Costantino Baldissara, President of ECG (The Association of European Vehicle Logistics) and Commercial & Logistics Director Grimaldi Group
- (2) Frans Schuitemaker, Managing Director NIJHOF-WASSINK
- (3) Patrick Verhoeven, Secretary General ESPO (European Sea Ports Organisation)
- (4) Johannes Ludewig, Executive Director CER (Community of European Railway and Infrastructure Companies)
- (5) Karin De Schepper, Secretary General INE (Inland Navigation Europe)
- (6) Annegret Reinhardt-Lehmann, Senior Vice President Fraport AG



# A SUSTAINABLE FUTURE FOR TRANSPORT

November 20, 2009 • Brussels

**Mr Secchi, Chairman** indicated that the review of the TEN-T policy is the focus of this workshop. Most appropriately the review of the TEN-T policy guidelines will coincide with the drafting of the new White Paper. Respondents to the Green Paper public consultation as well as the EU institutions and consultative bodies, in their conclusions and reports, strongly supported the Commission's proposal to develop a TEN-T core network in the form of a top network layer, over an underlying "comprehensive network". Such a core network shall build on the current priority projects, but move away from disconnected priorities towards a real network. The core network should also bring together all transport modes and apply intelligent transport systems.

**Mr Baldissara** explained that the transport system has to undergo a profound transformation. The White Paper gives an opportunity to modernise the transport system. Co-modality should stay at the centre of the next White Paper and the efficiency of each mode should be increased. Any attempt at modal shift without ensuring a sufficient performance will be detrimental to the economy.

Mr Baldissara is in favour of the harmonization of truck length at 20.75 m. If this was adopted, important reductions in transport vehicle kms and GHG could be achieved quite rapidly. The industry is going through tough times. Therefore it should be ensured that legislation does not add more burdens to firms. It should extend incentives to all modes of transport, as well as continue to support scrapping schemes".

All ships older than 30 years should be scrapped. Thanks to the replacement of old vessels the Union would be able to meet the 20% CO<sub>2</sub> reduction objective and the safety standards of maritime transport will be increased. Therefore the EC should encourage MS to apply scrapping schemes also to ships.

As Grimaldi moves cars by rail from Poland to UK they realize that German railways do not talk either to Poland's or to Belgium's railways. There is not a single European rail network; there is a problem of harmonisation and a problem of communication. When the train arrives in Antwerp, nobody knows that it is there and the gang is not called to unload the train. Therefore, there is not an efficient coordination between the different parties. IT standards should be harmonised as there is no communication; IT finance should be increased.

Once in the terminal transport companies need space. Ports also need space and connectivity as some ports do not have the right motorway connections. For example when 200 trucks are downloaded at Civitavecchia there are big queues at the access roads as there is no motorway.

Comparing investment requirements, to transport 4.500 cars, it takes about 400 rail wagons or an average ro-ro car carrying vessel. The investment required is roughly the same - about 50 million euros. Therefore, also for ro-ro ships, investments are very important and are needed.



# A SUSTAINABLE FUTURE FOR TRANSPORT

November 20, 2009 • Brussels

The EU has strong companies in the transport sector. There is a wide efficiency margin that is still to be exploited. There should be the same rules in all countries. If goods are sent by truck from Italy to Spain their transport is subject to different taxes than if they are going by ship.

**Mr Schuitemaker** called for an efficient and flexible system which is user friendly towards road freight transport and which promotes and encourages innovation. Regulation has to be based in less and more transparent rules. Euro 6 legislation should be stopped as it will increase the emissions of CO<sub>2</sub>.

PPP could be used to improve freight logistics. His company has invested in innovation which has reduced their emissions. It has a commitment to use ITS with which it will reduce empty mileage by 10% to 20%.

Mr Schuitemaker is in favour of a co-modality approach which is a domain where little has been achieved so far. Modal shift should be abandoned as an objective. There should be freedom of choice. All modes should pay full costs, but nothing more than that, for the use of infrastructure and the internalisation of external costs. All charges should be reinvested in transport. The internal market should be completed for all transport modes.

Concerning railways, an important problem is their lack of reliability. According to his experience only two trains out of 100 arrive on time. As they are rarely on time, their enterprise only uses trains when they run between the firm's own terminals, since for an external customer the delays would be unacceptable. Another problem is the imbalance in wagons in Europe which gives rise to empty returns.

Concerning standards it would be good to have a 44 tonnes maximum load for all countries. There are also differences between the railway couplings which are different between different countries. Couplings should be harmonized too as well as containers where there are differences between maritime and land containers. But harmonisation should be led by industry which should start talking about it.

**Mr Verhoeven** highlighted three priorities for the next White Paper:

- (1) Give ports a proper place within TENs. They are there on paper not in reality. Identify core network supported by comprehensive analysis.
- (2) Try to harmonise the objectives of sustainability and transport efficiency. Identify needs and act on them without wasting time on bureaucratic environmental assessments. Once a policy decision is taken it has to be carried out.
- (3) Foster co-modality by paying attention to all sectors. In maritime the "maritime space without barriers" is a good initiative. Ports' connections should be reinforced. The Ports Policy Communication is being implemented very slowly. There are also problems in implementing legislation for rail and for other modes.



# A SUSTAINABLE FUTURE FOR TRANSPORT

November 20, 2009 • Brussels

There is the question of how to identify what ports should be included in the core network. Now all ports are virtually in the TEN of ports. Planning has to be done having in mind the objectives of sustainability, but with flexibility. The first step is to find out how ports are used now, forecast future traffic and then deduct what should be in the core. The priority is to understand what the market wants.

A way to proceed is to ask the regions. There is a lot of information about the regions where there is intense port activity and good hinterland connections. There is no need to devote much time identifying criteria: instead of pinpointing ports, it is better to pinpoint port regions. Then good hinterland connections should be provided and legal aspects solved.

**Ms De Schepper** noted that, to enable green supply chains there are 3 fast and cheap measures which require political will rather than money. First, there are some remarkable intelligent transport systems like River Information Services, ITS, ERTMS or SESAR within modes, but these modal information systems do not talk to each other. A common platform would allow reducing costs and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions as well as allowing operators to know what is moving across modes. If companies share the information they can have bigger loads and use bigger vessels and vehicles. For cities, clean trucks and clean barges could be used for the last mile. Sharing more information will allow more efficient and cleaner delivery routings.

Secondly, optimising existing infrastructure and creating better connections to ports and to inland ports are required to bundle freight flows. Ms De Schepper suggests appointing co-modal coordinators instead of modal ones to create truly co-modal and green corridors. Thirdly, internalisation of external costs on the basis of a European, modally neutral calculation method should progress at the same time in all modes. It should not be limited to CO<sub>2</sub>; pollution, accidents, congestion and noise should be included. This will give the right incentive for all transport modes to become more sustainable.

Besides a financial problem, Ms De Schepper thinks there is also a mental problem. 40% of port of Rotterdam's freight is shipped out by waterway transport and there is still plenty of capacity. Inland terminals are needed to move more goods by water, but to include them in land planning often triggers the opposition of citizens who do not want them in their backyard because they may produce noise or pollution. Citizens should realise that as consumers they demand trade but wish less trucks and congestion. But also terminals should be developed in a sustainable way without being visually intrusive.

**Mr Ludewig** made the following considerations:

- In the TEN-T there is a big discrepancy between needs, plans and reality. Implementation of the 30 priority projects has been rather modest. From a macroeconomic point of view, investment and expenditure in infrastructure has fallen from 1.7% of GDP in the 1980's to 0.7% of GDP now, while there are growing congestion problems.

With 500 billion euros to finance from now to 2020 of which 250 billion euros for priority projects and a TEN-T budget of 8 billion euros for 2007-2013 there is a growing



# A SUSTAINABLE FUTURE FOR TRANSPORT

November 20, 2009 • Brussels

discrepancy between ambitions and means. There are a growing number of bottlenecks even at times of crisis with 20% less rail freight traffic.

The transformation of the transport system in response to climate change will mean that additional investment is necessary. However, the money that can be expected from the public budgets will not go up, but rather down as more money will be needed for social services. Thus there is a need to be realistic.

- It would be a big advantage if legal requirements were respected. Directive 2001/14 states that there should be a balance between the revenues and expenses of infrastructure managers. The EU should make sure that MS respect this.
- CER supports internalisation for all modes in a comparable way. In Switzerland tolls include all external costs and are used to finance transport. The Netherlands will now introduce a toll system.

There is a growing discrepancy west/east of Europe with a much lower level of investment in rail (approaching zero investment in fact). The few projects that have been decided do not go ahead. The HST expansion in the western European countries is linked to the abundant funding available. But the situation in the Central and eastern European countries is alarming. The priority of their governments is the road. Three times as much funds are going to the road as to the railways. In some countries like Romania no investments have taken place and the rail modal share has fallen from 50% to 20% of the market. Due to lack of investment quality gets worse and worse and demand falls.

Practically none of the objectives fixed in the 2001 White Paper for the railways will be achieved. This is in part due to the fact that the taxation and pricing systems are very different from one mode to another. We need to have a strategic view of what we do. In the transport sector CO<sub>2</sub> goes up. How do we respond to it? We have to invest into change, but where will the money come from? The sector will have to pay more and there will be more self-financing. As governments will not be able to provide the money, the money will have to come from internalisation, even if it is clear that with internalisation prices will go up.

**Ms Reinhardt-Lehmann** pointed at the following aspects:

- Give airports a proper space. Air transport has not even been included in the front slide of the conference!
- Harmonise objectives: decide what the role of hubs and secondary airports is. Decide on availability at night which is important for flights to other continents.
- Introduce the concept of “travel-port”. This is the case of Frankfurt airport which has different modal connections (train, HST, aviation...). To help the emergence of this concept it is necessary to support the harmonisation of rail and air transport e.g. by coordinating schedules and reservation systems and ITS. There are lots of initiatives going



# A SUSTAINABLE FUTURE FOR TRANSPORT

November 20, 2009 • Brussels

on in this sense (F,B,D). Passengers like intermodality as in the case of going by HST to catch an intercontinental flight.

The line Köln-Frankfurt is a good example of the way in which passenger rail can become a perfect feeder line for an airport. Passengers get boarding cards at Köln. Their luggage is taken from them at their arrival at the Frankfurt airport. One single reservation and one single ticket cover both the train and the plane trip. The possibilities of integration are many. The passenger can be given information on her final destination when she boards the train.

There is quite a potential for rail-air freight connections. A first link has been that between Leipzig and Frankfurt airport where freight is taken to the airport by train. However, there is a problem with the availability of slots in the tracks.

**The Chairman** concluded that financing is the crux of the matter, but instead of starting from how much money is available, the White Paper should put forward a well-defined policy with a set of objectives much more ambitious and shared by voters. Then resources will follow. As Vice-President Tajani underlined, the political aspect is important. Technical aspects matter a lot, but political aspects decide.

A comprehensive network is required but also to move freight in the best possible and smooth way. Not only are funds needed to invest in platforms, but also in rail and road connections to them. A regulatory effort should be made too. The revision of the TEN-T will reduce distances and open plenty of possibilities. But for this to become a reality we need resources.

## **PANEL 2 – THE ROLE OF TECHNOLOGY: NEW VEHICLES AND ALTERNATIVE FUELS**

Chair: Matthias Ruete – Director General, DG Energy and Transport, EU Commission

### Panellists:

- (1) Reinhard Lüken - Secretary General of CESA (Community of European Shipyards Associations)
- (2) François Lacôte - Senior Vice President, R&D and Engineering Platforms, ALSTOM
- (3) François Gayet - Secretary General of ASD (Aerospace and Defence Industries Association of Europe)
- (4) Olly Macé - Head of Technology, Strategy and Regulation, BP Biofuels
- (5) Hans ten Berge - Secretary General of EURELECTRIC
- (6) Jonas Ericsson - City of Stockholm

**Mr Ruete** opened the panel discussion reminding the steep challenge of decarbonising the transport sector and the need to explore how to achieve this objective.



# A SUSTAINABLE FUTURE FOR TRANSPORT

November 20, 2009 • Brussels

**Mr ten Berge**, Secretary General of EURELECTRIC, recalled the declaration of the electricity generation sector to become carbon-neutral by 2050. Full political support is required to deliver on this objective. Carbon-neutral electricity will be produced using a higher share of renewables (40%), coal plants equipped with Carbon Capture and Storage and nuclear. Decarbonisation of electricity will certainly have a strong impact on decarbonisation of the transport sector. Electrified trains are already carbon-free in France. Electric cars will be able to contribute to decarbonisation since the efficiency of electric motors is much higher than that of internal combustion engines. For the wider use of electric cars, intelligent, sophisticated infrastructure is needed to be put in place, comprising of smart grids and charging stations at home and at parking places. EURELECTRIC is currently looking for pilot projects and seeks the cooperation of cities. Measures concerning parking areas, taxation of vehicles, and access to roads should facilitate decarbonisation.

**Mr Ericsson**, representative of the City of Stockholm, recalled that Stockholm had declared to be fossil-free by 2050 already in 2001. The City has made great progress in most areas, but transport seems to be 'tricky' when reducing emissions. Shift to more public transport (currently representing about 70% of trips), using electric cars and biofuels are regarded as the main means to achieve decarbonisation in Stockholm. Mr Ericsson cautioned that the introduction of electric cars would take time, given that a car normally lasts around 20 years. He emphasised the big potential of biofuels to increase their efficiency and sustainability; and reminded that all of today's cars running on biofuels were just a 'quick fix' of normal petrol and diesel cars. In particular Mr Ericsson noted that their pilot projects with hybrid and diesel vehicles showed a huge CO<sub>2</sub> reduction potential. He also stressed that the best way to promote biofuels was to have a market for them; and that the industry needed certainty that there was demand for these vehicles and fuels.

**Mr Gayet**, Secretary General of Aerospace and Defence Industries Association of Europe, stated the key priorities of the aviation industry:

- Aviation is a worldwide industry that needs global regulations. The sector aims to achieve carbon-neutral growth by 2020 and reduce the sector's emissions by 50% by 2050. The objective is also shared by airlines, airports and the air navigation service providers. A four pillar strategy has been developed to achieve these goals, which encompass breakthrough technologies, efficient operations, effective infrastructure and positive market-based measures. Global and fair treatment will need to be ensured: a reason why most of these issues were raised at the level of International Civil Aviation Organisation.
- Further funding is needed for research and innovation. Mr Gayet thanked the Commission for its support in this regard, and reminded of the 7-year, 1.6 billion € Clean Sky Technology Initiative.
- R&D should be promoted in alternative energy for air transport. Successful flights have already been undertaken on biofuels; and given the limited number of airports and aircrafts up to 30% of jet fuel could be provided by 2030 from sustainable and commercially viable sources.



# A SUSTAINABLE FUTURE FOR TRANSPORT

November 20, 2009 • Brussels

**Mr Lacôte** stated that rail was the most energy efficient transport mode which uses electricity to the largest extent. The latest generation of high speed trains, based on the energy mix in France, is capable of transporting passengers for 2g CO<sub>2</sub>, 50 times less than airplanes. Improvement in the carbon footprint of railways depends to a large extent on the decarbonisation of electricity production. Any development that encourages modal shift is an action that will decarbonise transportation. Increasing rail speed, while consuming the same or less energy, could encourage modal shift. Mr Lacôte also pointed to the 42000 deaths on Europe's roads as a huge external cost. The development of technical standards, and financial aid for ERTMS, represent the right direction, but the capacity of rail should be further increased. Studies should be launched on increasing axle load from 17 tonnes to 19-20 tonnes. In addition, further progress in the rail sector could be made by generalising electric braking via recovery, particularly when there are frequent stops.

**Mr Macé** stated that BP already made some technological choices regarding biofuels, and was investing on three fronts: (1) low-carbon Brazilian sugarcane ethanol, (2) second-generation, ligno-cellulosic ethanol, (3) better, higher efficiency molecules coming from biomass. These investments were selected based on performance in terms of carbon savings, fuel quality and long-term potential for commercial competitiveness. BP is convinced that transport, in particular road transport, has to play its part in decarbonising man-made emissions. Road transportation fuel should be decarbonised equitably with human activities, but 'without hype' on the basis of the optimised pathway. Being too prescriptive in terms of technologies should be avoided. Replying to a question from the floor on liquefied natural gas (LNG), he noted that LNG was not a new technological concept, and one of the reasons why it never quite got off the ground was LNG's fundamental deficiency, namely low energy density. For quick market penetration, fuels are needed which are compatible with existing infrastructure and that travel well.

**Mr Lüken** noted that ships should be in the focus of the debate on decarbonisation, as some of the best and worst examples for environmental performance can be found among ships. He pointed to the great energy efficiency of combustion engines on ships, which however, use low-quality, high sulphur content fuels. Shipping already has centuries of zero-emission transportation behind it. Mr Lüken is convinced that the 20% reduction target by 2020 for shipping can be achieved without too much difficulty technologically and commercially, if the right frame conditions are set. Even zero emissions by 2050 are probably easier to attain than in any of the other transport modes. He emphasised the need to look at key drivers of innovation, namely globalisation. Transportation on ship has been revolutionised by European technology through containerisation and the increase in the size of ships. He stated that technology was certainly a key factor in decarbonisation, but it was not enough. Some of the commercially viable of technologies are still not applied, because the markets are not picking them up. Therefore more demonstrators are needed, possibly with the help of public investment; pioneers should be encouraged by setting the right frame conditions; and prescriptive rules which actually block innovation should be avoided. Looking at the industrial policy element is very important to combine decarbonisation with business opportunities.



# A SUSTAINABLE FUTURE FOR TRANSPORT

November 20, 2009 • Brussels

**Dr Simon Godwin**, Director of European Council for Automotive Research, intervened from the audience and stated that road was going to remain the dominant transport mode in the future. Technology only works as part of an integrated approach, and has to be technically and commercially viable in order to make a substantial contribution. Nobody knows for sure what the right technology mix will be in 2020, let alone 2050. Technologies must be driven by the market, and the right conditions should be created for that, ideally through EU-wide harmonised carbon-based vehicle taxation. Economic, regulatory, social, and political barriers should be removed to nurture new technologies. The automotive industry and suppliers are making significant investment in technologies that can satisfy current customer demand, and also ensure the future of vehicles. Dr Godwin called for financial support from Member States and the European Union to leverage the industry's activities in developing technologies, and to enhance the value of pre-competitive research. He also stressed that there was still potential in the conventional combustion engine in terms of efficiency gains. Collaborative research and government co-operation are essential to reach the potential of electric vehicles, by overcoming the main barriers, i.e. customer acceptance and high battery costs. New fuels will need to be sustainable and affordable.

## **PANEL 3 – THE MAIN ACTORS OF TOMORROW'S TRANSPORT SYSTEM. TRANSPORT USERS: SAFETY, SECURITY AND PASSENGERS' RIGHTS**

Chair: Mathieu Grosch MEP, TRAN Committee, Rapporteur on “A sustainable future for transport”

### Panellists:

- (1) Michael O'Leary, CEO of Ryanair
- (2) Herman De Croo, President ETSC (European Transport Safety Council)
- (3) John Gilbert, President of EUROLINES
- (4) Caroline Ofoegbu, Deputy Director General of the FIA (Fédération Internationale de l'Automobile) European Bureau
- (5) Christopher Irwin, Vice-Chairman of the Board, EPF (European Passengers' Federation)
- (6) Rodolfo Cattani, Secretary Executive Committee EDF (European Disability Forum)

**Mr de Croo** presented a document published by the ETSC in 2009: “Road safety as a right and responsibility for all. A Blueprint for the EU's 4<sup>th</sup> Road Safety Action Programme 2010-2020”. Each year around 39,000 people are killed in the EU in road collisions. The current level of risk on the roads would not be tolerated in any other transport mode. If there were a crash of an air plane with 100 passengers being killed every day as it is on the roads we would not accept that. We need to fight the trivialisation of road deaths and collisions and be ambitious in reducing road accidents. ETSC proposes an EU shared target of 40% reduction



# A SUSTAINABLE FUTURE FOR TRANSPORT

November 20, 2009 • Brussels

in road deaths for the period 2011-2020. Each individual member states should aim at the same reduction of deaths and also serious injuries. The target should be accompanied with dedicated measures. A series of proposals have been presented by the ETSC. The cost of reducing the number of accidents is far lower than the actual cost of accidents.

**Ms Ofoegbu** pleaded for putting users at the heart of future mobility policies. Mobility is an important enabler of economic, social and environmental welfare. Future transport policies should be sound, reality tested and able to meet future challenges; ageing population, increasing demand for personal mobility, increasing environmental pressure on transport. Mobility must facilitate social and economic well-being of citizens but also take into account relevant limitations. Measures should be addressing real needs and offer effective solutions.

Better harmonised data and research are needed. Policies should be based on good data and also take account of external factors, e.g the current economic crisis. In the area of road safety we need to better understand the causes of accidents, and definitions should be harmonised in order to address problems in a consistent way across the EU. Travel and tourism are not well covered in terms of harmonised data although it is an important area. Good data is essential for developing sustainable strategies in the areas of traffic planning and land use.

Better and more efficient road safety policies are needed. 2001 targets of the EU seemed unrealistic at the time, but brought tremendous progress. We need commitments to safety targets from the 'top'. Safety should be a priority, as in France, where big improvements were achieved. FIA is calling for a global decade for road safety to alleviate numbers of injuries and accidents on the roads, and FIA is welcoming the increased importance given to passenger rights.

**Mr O'Leary:** Passenger rights are really about providing users with low cost air travel. The White Paper should have at its heart how do we make air transport cheaper and how do we continue the market opening revolution pioneered by the EU Commission. We need more competition and less regulation. Taxation of air travel should be limited as taxes are independent of income and as they are limiting freedom to travel. Carbon taxes have the same function. The issue of monopolies should also be addressed; airports, Eurocontrol and Air Traffic Control (ATC). ATCs are national monopolies that make flying costly. ATC should be opened-up to competition, and countries should be free to propose cross border services in the area of ATC. Single Sky initiative has not delivered much progress and will be costly for airlines.

Passenger rights legislation does not address the 99.95% of the Ryan Air passengers, who pay their own tickets – as opposed to business class passengers – and who will rarely suffer from more than an hour delay. Passenger rights are discriminatory as they are not linked to fare prices. Compensation of rail and ferries are limited to 25% of the ticket price whereas Ryan Air would face up to 200% of compensation. Provisions allowing airlines to recover compensation from other parties do not allow recovering the full amount.



# A SUSTAINABLE FUTURE FOR TRANSPORT

November 20, 2009 • Brussels

Fuel surcharges should also be addressed. Flag ship carriers are using these to increase prices where low cost carriers do not impose fuel surcharges. The White Paper should address the future of air transport, which is heading toward a consolidation leading to few main airlines. There is a need to ensure competition, and less regulation is needed.

**Mr Irwin** acknowledges that the EU has an open market for air transport and that Ryan Air has contributed to lowering prices, but this has not necessarily reduced cost to society. That is the key issue; how do we tackle the wider cost to society of transport? There is no technological fix to this issue; there is a need for transport users to change behaviour.

The 2001 White Paper put the users at the heart of transport policy, and this should be reinforced. We need a system of passenger rights that creates a level playing field across modes and which is understandable and understood by users. It is about social equity. The weakness of the current system is essentially the variance between modes and the implicit way the most vulnerable users, typically travelling by busses and coaches, are excluded from passenger rights.

IT can help to guide users to make decision and possibly to change behaviours. It is far too difficult to get information on travel. Users do not have the needed information to exercise their choices. There should be a navigation-like system for public transport that is friendly and intelligent, and that enables retailing of transport.

We need to understand what passengers want. Passenger satisfaction should be improved, and this should be done via passenger satisfaction surveys. We should think less theoretically and more about how we manage to improve satisfaction of users. This could be a real driver of change and a measure of how successful policies have been.

**Mr Cattani** reminds that disabled users have additional difficulties on top of the general issues encountered in exercising passenger rights. Users with disabilities have a variety of different needs.

Existing legislation should be enforced. Much legislation is already in place, but there are still serious problems of accessibility for disabled, also to information. Technological development (e.g. touch screens and ATMs) excludes rather than including disabled users. Staff is not trained on disability awareness and on how to handle disability devices. Commission should monitor existing legislation closer and launch infringement procedures when necessary.

A long-term strategy should be established to ensure that all passengers can use all modes of transport. A UN Convention on the rights of people with disabilities is to be ratified by the EU, and the EU shall, according to §9, ensure full accessibility of all users, which will require a revision and completion of existing measures.

Standards and harmonisation are needed to better integrate the transport sector and to enable seamless travel. There should be standards for accessibility to ensure full compatibility



# A SUSTAINABLE FUTURE FOR TRANSPORT

November 20, 2009 • Brussels

between all modes of transport. Such standards should be a complement to legislation. Safety and security should also be included in all legislation. This would enhance customer rights and ensure compliance with existing legislation.

**Mr Gilbert** considers that coaches should have a place in the future transport policy. Users, and mainly those with low incomes, should have the opportunity to choose also busses and coaches as part of the 'mix'.

Public coach terminals are essential, but not always provided by public authorities, and where terminals exist, private operators are often excluded. Terminals should be easy accessible. Funds should be provided to coach terminals in the context of TEN-T. Coach terminals should give access to persons with reduced mobility. However, this is often not the case at the moment. Public authorities, governments and the EU should provide the necessary funding for coach terminals to be properly equipped.

There should be a level playing field across modes in terms of passenger rights. However, the cost burden should not be passed on to operators. Coach operators are already heavily burdened by taxes. Passenger rights are important in achieving high standards and a good reputation of the sector.

Information systems should be integrated in a way that passengers travelling by several modes of transport have easy access to information. A collective effort between the modes is required to achieve this. Safety performance of busses and coaches is very high in Europe but improvements could still be done to improve safety.

**VP Tajani:** Passenger rights and safety are priorities. 30% of all users have reduced mobility. Providing mobility to these users will ensure their freedom and at the same time business opportunities for operators.

## **PANEL 4 – INTEGRATING THE TRANSPORT MODES: THE PERSPECTIVE OF MAJOR USERS**

Chair: Roel Gans, Director for European affairs, Dutch Transport Ministry

Panellists:

- (1) Aake Niklasson, CEO of Volvo Logistic
- (2) Volker Kefer, Board Member Deutsche Bahn
- (3) Alfons Guinier, Secretary General, European Community Shipowner's Association (ECSA)
- (4) Theresia Hacksteiner, Secretary General EBU (European Barge Union)
- (5) Fabio Gamba, Deputy Secretary General AEA (The Association of European Airlines)



# A SUSTAINABLE FUTURE FOR TRANSPORT

November 20, 2009 • Brussels

(6) Jos Dings, Director, European Federation for Transport & Environment

**Mr Niklasson** called for a better integration both within and between modes. Europe should be like one country or one union, which it isn't today even within the same mode. Logistic, transport companies and buyers need to cooperate in order to enable integration of modes. Green corridors and ITS are important for the integration of modes and for the environment.

**Mr Kefer** started with a general remark on the integration of modes seen from DB's point of view. DB decided a couple of years ago that they would offer transport from A to B and not from station A to station B. DB believed it would have added value to its customers. That was the background for buying Schenker (road transport company) and it has been the background for establishing companies renting cars and company renting bicycles. The decisive point in integration is how to connect the different modes in an efficient manner.

DB would like to see three things in the coming White Paper:

- A policy objective of shifting the modal share to rail. For two reasons: environmental and congestion reason.
- Secondly, there should be investment in railway lines, but even more importantly in nodes and in intermodal hubs.
- Finally, there should be a fiscal harmonisation between modes.

There are also some things that DB would not like to see in the coming White Paper. Due to a number of initiatives taken during the last 6 to 7 years on the infrastructure and operational side, the market share of rail freight in Germany has risen from around 8% to around 20% in 2008. EU rules and regulations – as, for example, transnational infrastructure managers or European Regulatory Bodies – should not make the system less efficient.

**Mr Guinier** mentioned that shipping is already inter-modal with 12 mio. TEU movements every day. An important challenge for transport policy is to make existing nodal points more efficient. That goes for ports where the policy is already in place via the Communication on a European Ports Policy. The recommendation is: "Stop talking – do it!" An important aspect in this regard is to secure free access to all modes – especially rail.

Reducing the administrative burdens is another area where efficiency gains could be realised. As for ports, the policy is in place through the Communication on maritime policy. Member States are putting a foot on the brake on e-communications especially on e-customs. The recommendation in this area is also to focus on implementation.

A third important recommendation is to include the international aspect when designing European transport policy, especially when deciding on standards. The European transport policy framework should enable the competitiveness of the European transport industry and of the economy at large.



# A SUSTAINABLE FUTURE FOR TRANSPORT

November 20, 2009 • Brussels

The future transport policy should not strive for decoupling economic growth and transport and should not include a modal shift objective. Modal shift is not a purpose in itself. Modal shift should be the consequence of combining different transport modes according to their logistic efficiency and costs, including external costs.

**Ms Hacksteiner** indicated that creating a framework for a sustainable transport system implies that support is given to the transport modes which still have extra capacity and which do not have congestion problems. An additional argument for support to the Inland Waterways (IWW) sector is that it is the most energy efficient transport mode. Modal shift should be the result of economic choices and not something imposed on the transport sector.

The IWW sector, with many SMEs, is heavily hit by the economic crises. Many of the firms have liquidity problems. To be able to meet the challenges of the future, IWW needs support to maintain capacity in the present situation.

For the IWW sector establishing a level playing field within and between all transport modes is seen as very important in a sustainability perspective. The importance of an infrastructure with sufficient capacity and especially nodes was also underlined by this sector.

**Mr Gamba** underlined that the right to mobility should be central to transport policy. Instrumental to this goal is intra- and inter-modal level playing field. This means that there should be no disparities between operators within a mode and an equal treatment across modes.

Funding is a central theme when discussing the future of transport. It should not be air transport or any other mode footing the major part of the bill. It is important that sufficient funding is put in place in order to secure the right to mobility and a level playing field.

**Mr Dings** said that transport policy had to come to grips with two important challenges strictly outside the normal realm of transport policy: the climate change problem and the huge deficits on the public budgets in the wake of the economic crisis. The risk is that if these challenges are not fully integrated into transport policy, the initiative in transport policy will to a large extent be taken by finance ministers and ministers of the environment. According to Mr Dings, the full integration of these challenges basically means that the decarbonisation of transport has to take place without money from the public budget.

Up to now EU has justified added value of EU spending under the TEN-T policy on internal market grounds. In the future, this justification should shift towards climate change; it is a global problem and therefore member states cannot be expected to pick up the full tab. EU should pick up this role and invest in climate friendly infrastructure and take the lead as EU has done in other climate policy areas.

The internalisation of external costs is wise strategy for the transport sector in the light of the crisis. Very soon the public budget needs to be balanced and there would probably be more support of raising environmental taxes than raising the taxes on labour.



# A SUSTAINABLE FUTURE FOR TRANSPORT

November 20, 2009 • Brussels

Finally, Mr Dings mentioned two areas where rail investment policy needs adjustment. First, if high speed rail lines are to cut emissions, they should compete with, instead of complement, air transport. Secondly a lot of EU money is spent on expensive high speed rail lines in EU15 while similar investment in existing rail in the new Member States would yield much higher benefits. This balance should be re-examined.

## **PANEL 5 – THE ROLE OF TECHNOLOGY: ICT IN TRANSPORT AND OTHER DEVELOPMENTS**

Chair: Luc Werring (Senior Fellow at the Clingendael Institute and former Principal Advisor, DG TREN, European Commission)

### Panellists:

- (1) Yves Amsler, International Association of Public Transport (UITP)
- (2) Pascal Campagne, CEO of FDC
- (3) Manfred Seitz, CEO of VIA-DONAU
- (4) Michael Robson, Secretary General of European Rail Infrastructure Managers (EIM)
- (5) Hans Rode, Head of Development Department, Swedish Road Administration
- (6) Fernando Caldeira-Saraiva, Research Director, British Maritime Technology Ltd

**Mr Werring**, chairman, opened the workshop by underlining the challenges that transport sector is faced with (change, fossil fuels, congestion, competitiveness, and others). The discussion was launched by a general question to all panellist on what they would like to be included in the next White Paper 2010 on transport policy, in terms of role of “intelligent technology” and more specifically ICT in transport.

**Mr Amsler** argued that the next White Paper should target modal shift in urban areas to low carbon transportation like public transport, walking and cycling. This could be achieved by an “EU communication campaign” that focuses on switching from car to public transport. Achieving greater awareness of all citizens about the impact of their mobility choices is an essential element towards the new culture for urban mobility. The EU should strengthen its role as facilitator, but without imposing top-down solutions due to the large diversity of local situations. The EU should support the exchange of best practice examples taking into account the specific needs of large cities.

In the short run EU policies should aim at improving the urban space by taking into account existing road space and giving priority to public transport modes that are more efficient in terms of space consumption (traffic and parking). In the long run it should foster land use planning and the development of long-term sustainable transport plans that integrates the ‘polluters pay’ principle as pricing model.



# A SUSTAINABLE FUTURE FOR TRANSPORT

November 20, 2009 • Brussels

Investment schemes (especially from public side, e.g. EIB) should take into account the full benefits of public transport. The EU should also tackle regulatory measures that promote public transport or that prevent the use of public transport, e.g. in Belgium 50% of all cars is services cars. The EU should use more the results of EU research projects and develop research priorities. Technical harmonisation and standardisation should be promoted for public transport equipment. Overall, the use of innovative ICT in transport should target the mobility of persons not of vehicles. Most ITS are largely developed, e.g. contactless ticketing, however not yet used widely. EU policy should not simply extend solution of long-distance travel to urban situations. High-quality public transport has a vital role to play to give access to work, shops, services and leisure facilities in cities.

**Mr Campagne** indicated that to increase the efficiency of the overall transport sector information systems on board of vehicles (in all modes) and system to manage the infrastructure are essential. These information systems communicate between vehicles themselves and between vehicles and the infrastructure. The impact of those information systems translate into lower congestion which facilitates all sort of trips, lowers the amount of pollution and increases the energy efficiency. In addition, safety and security of the transport system is increased. Especially satellite navigation systems have a big positive impact on safety and eco-driving. However, there are some barriers which prevent the rapid uptake of these information systems. The EU policy should aim to support the investments which are very high in this area; tackle underlying market failures; promote R&D and put in place an adequate regulation.

**Mr Seitz** said that is now 'time to act' on basis of a concise strategy for sustainable transport in order to address the challenges lying ahead European policy makers. The EU does not use enough the inland waterways (currently no congestion on this mode). The EU should continue its inland waterway action plan by putting in place an implementing body. Furthermore, the EU should implement an inland waterway navigation system based on EU standards on the Danube (and other rivers), according to the experience of FP7 and TEN-T projects. As inland waterways can contribute substantially to CO<sub>2</sub> reductions it is very important to increase the cooperation between modes and make IWW more efficient. This can be achieved through an integrated approach, the use of biofuels and a change in behaviour. Further R&D efforts and pilots projects are needed and in general more coordination at EU level. The focus of policies should shift to CO<sub>2</sub> reduction, e.g. by a CO<sub>2</sub> free transport act.

**Mr Caldeira-Saraiva** considers that one of the main measures for EU policies is to reduce the administrative burden for all transport service providers. The 'e-freight' initiative should be revised to realise the aim of zero paper requirement when carrying goods and zero waiting time spent on any administrative procedure during border crossing. There is a clear need to have a standard framework for the exchange of transport documents. There is a need for single national administrative window for all administrative procedures irrespective of modes. There is a need to have simple and harmonised border procedures for border crossing. The EU needs to create simple and efficient procedures to establish corridors between Europe, USA and Russia.



# A SUSTAINABLE FUTURE FOR TRANSPORT

November 20, 2009 • Brussels

The Commission should also encourage Member States to disseminate and exchange information. In addition, the Commission should encourage Member States to integrate the national databases and exchange best practices. Given the current reluctance of Member States to set up one-stop shops and to integrate information system, e.g. in ports, the Commission should consider issuing a recommendation on these matters.

**Mr Rode** indicated that at a recent conference in Sweden he tried to show how the use of ITS in daily life (and in transport) could give benefits to individuals and society. However, this is not always straightforward. For railway and the maritime sector the result is clearly positive. However, from the passengers point of view there is not evidence of clear benefits.

Cooperation between modes and Member States is low. A lot of actors in the transport sector do not use the same information technologies, cannot easily exchange information and the user cannot make a choice of transport services on a well-informed basis.

Sweden set up an ITS action plan for all modes. This action plan sets up clear goals and by whom and when they should be achieved. In short time, Sweden will report on the implementation and the achievements of this action plan. The EU should also set up an ITS action plan covering all modes.

There are a lot of complaints about deployment. However, the EU should consider how the existing infrastructure (physical transport infrastructure and the telecommunication infrastructure) can be used to solve the problems of today. The EU should reflect how to use the existing transport capacity better. In addition, the EU should find out and have a discussion about who will benefit from the improved infrastructure: benefits to individuals and benefits to society. On this basis, society should find a business model for transport. The EU should develop policies reflecting on a 'user model' for transport. In each case, e.g. for passenger or goods, the problem at stake (regulatory issues, economic, funding, lack of cooperation) should be clearly identified and tackled.

**Mr Robson** argued that ICT should be considered as a tool to better use the transport infrastructure. If the EU (or any other organisation) develops new technologies it should focus on the customer (passenger customer, freight customer). Europe needs to look at the possibilities to use ICT to fight climate change, i.e. to use more rail. The EU could use ICT as a technology to make transport more efficient. However, the EU should avoid that ICT create barriers to market entry or make transport more expensive.

The focus of the next White Paper should be on co-modality and on more information for passengers. In addition, the White Paper should underline the benefits of competition. Rail is a mode in competition with buses, cars or air transport, but it can also be a complementary mode if you consider big airports. However, it is usually not easy to buy combined tickets although the technology is available. To achieve this, the EU should focus on standards for data exchange and data requirements (for data exchange between systems). It is not necessary to establish one system. In freight it is currently difficult to identify suppliers or transport providers; however the existing technologies can help to overcome this kind of problems.



# A SUSTAINABLE FUTURE FOR TRANSPORT

November 20, 2009 • Brussels

Currently, the technologies are available and Europe does not have to re-invent the wheel, but to use the already existing technologies.

The EU should set the framework to make the use of ICT possible; however it does not need to pass new laws and regulations. The key issue for more use of ICT is a cultural change to focus on the customer. The EU should underline the benefits we could get by the use of ICT and not to try to impose it through legislation. The White Paper should refer to the use of ICT to increase co-modality, paperless transfer of ticketing, facilitate the border crossing or (freight) railways. Paperless documentation should be the norm.

## Summary of discussion

The discussion with the audience underlined the need to have harmonised standards to make the transport system more efficient. Legally binding laws and top-down approaches are however not seen as the most appropriate measures. There is shared feeling that the technology in general and ‘information and communication technologies’ in particular is readily available to deal with the challenges of the transport sector. However, deployment of these technologies is lacking behind. Therefore, the political will has to be there to act at EU level.

What is most needed is policy measures that focus on the overall infrastructure (encompassing all modes), more R&D efforts on technological deployment, linking of transport-related databases, and standards.

Advices of the panel:

- Focus on mobility of people, not of vehicles;
- Focus on a user model (or a needs approach);
- Support for an ITS action plan;
- Focus more on integration of the networks;

Time to act: part of the solution will come through the market (setting right prices), part must come through laws, part will come by setting incentives (providing funding).

## **PANEL 6 – THE MAIN ACTORS OF TOMORROW’S TRANSPORT SYSTEM: THE WORKERS**

Chair: Saïd El Khadraoui – MEP, TRAN Committee

Panellists:

- (1) Joël Le Coq - Member of the Executive Committee, ETF



# A SUSTAINABLE FUTURE FOR TRANSPORT

November 20, 2009 • Brussels

- (2) Patrick Philippe - Head of IRU Academy (International Road Union)
- (3) Marc Baumgartner - President and CEO of IFATCA (International Federation of Air Traffic Controllers' Associations)
- (4) Mauro Marino - President of Sindacato dei Marittimi
- (5) Fernando Menéndez Rexach - President of the Port Authority of Gijón
- (6) Roberto Parrillo - President of the Road Transport Section, ETF

**Mr El Khadraoui, chairman**, after introducing the panellists, reminded that the more than 8 million people which are employed in the transport services sector in the EU are a huge asset and that it is important to keep the know-how and the skills and to adapt them to changing environments. The sector is facing a shortage of skilled labour which needs to be addressed.

**Mr Le Coq**, stressed the importance of the social pillar of sustainability and wants it to be covered in the upcoming White Paper (WP) to the same degree as the economic and environmental pillars of sustainability. The market and competition alone are not sufficient for the achievement of sustainable transport. The social dimension must not be forgotten. A certain degree of re-regulation may be needed.

The various modes of transport should not be seen as competing with each other but rather as complementing each other. We need to look at the whole transport chain in a global view. More needs to be invested in transport infrastructure, in particular to improve the hinterland connections of some ports. TEN-T corridors need to contribute to economic and social cohesion. They should be accessible from all regions.

The current economic crisis poses a risk for financing. The costs of infrastructure investment should not be included in the 3% public deficit ceiling of the Maastricht Treaty because they are investments for the future.

The ETF is in favour of user pricing according to the polluter pays principle. If we charge more for transport, this must however not be done at the expense of social conditions for transport. The costs have to be spread. Customers should also pay their share of the costs.

ETF supports technological innovations, but there have to be EU-wide norms and standards. We also have to work on the organisation of transport and on transport planning, e.g. to improve load factors. But we should always look at the effects this has on the workers. Social and legislative flanking measures are needed to take the effects on workers into account. Training for workers has to be provided sufficiently in advance.

The ETF calls for the creation of a Social and Environmental Observatory which would observe the effects of various policies and highlight the need for corrections if necessary.



# A SUSTAINABLE FUTURE FOR TRANSPORT

November 20, 2009 • Brussels

Thus concerns about the application of the policies produced by the Commission could be better addressed.

Replying to a question from a representative of the International Road Transport Union (IRU) in the audience, Mr Le Coq confirmed his support for using revenues from Eurovignette and from road pricing in general to finance the creation of secure rest areas for lorry drivers. Secure rest areas help preventing the ever more frequent and violent attacks on lorry drivers. In any case, the increase in costs due to road pricing should not come at the detriment of working conditions. Its revenues should be used to improve them.

**Mr Philippe** asked for a stronger focus on training and the development of skills in the next White Paper. The world of transport has been revolutionised over the last 10 years. It keeps changing fast. Workers have to be equipped with the necessary knowledge and skills to enable them to understand the regulatory, technological and market-related changes. Training will help both in recruiting skilled people and in keeping them in their job.

Training is essential for improving road safety and to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. Eco-driving can save on average between 10 and 15%, even up to 25% of fuel consumption. Eco-driving skills and safe driving skills are needed not only for professional road users but for all road users. We believe that training is crucial for building a sustainable workforce.

How can this be addressed in the White Paper?

- The Commission should set out an EU strategy for capacity building of training institutes and assist them in their work. Training standards should be harmonised across the subjects that affect transport. The Commission should build a framework for that together with Member States and the industry.
- A common EU enforcement space should be built. Training needs to be measured and assessed in the same way across the EU. We need benchmarks.
- The implementation of the training directive for coach and truck drivers (Directive 2009/53/EC) is rather complex, not standardised and very bureaucratic (e.g. it creates more barriers on the cross-border employment of drivers instead of supporting it). We may solve this issue by developing a structure in a public private partnership between the Commission, the Member States and the industry. A first step would be to include private partners in the Committee of the experts from Member States working with the Directive.

In conclusion, the efficient implementation of existing social regulations with all relevant partners is more important than the adoption of new ones.

**Mr Baumgartner** asked for a commitment to aviation in the White Paper. Aviation is a major source of wealth, connects peripheral areas to the core, contributes significantly to GDP and creates a lot of jobs. Aviation has been a growth industry with doubling of traffic every ten to 15 years in an auto-financed way. Infrastructure has nearly always been paid by the users i.e.



# A SUSTAINABLE FUTURE FOR TRANSPORT

November 20, 2009 • Brussels

the airlines (quite in contrast to other transport modes). Committing to aviation helps tackling environmental issues in aviation and in influencing the outside world.

Passengers first and foremost care about safety. Price is also an important factor, but safety is crucial. Environmental concerns are another societal challenge. The White Paper should enable the aviation sector to continue its work in a sustainable way. The aviation sector needs to address the growth of its CO<sub>2</sub> emissions: if growth predictions come true, its share in global CO<sub>2</sub> emissions will go up from currently 2% to 8% in 2030/2035.

Another issue is the saturation of airports, especially in Europe: with airport expansions facing difficult urban land issues, there may be a need to distribute traffic between airports. Transport policy should tackle the issue of saturated airports and possibly create some buffers.

Air traffic controllers are part of the ground-based infrastructure. There should be a commitment in the White Paper to invest more in this infrastructure. This should not only be related to technology – in some areas, there is indeed a need for the modernisation of outdated information systems, which is however already partly being addressed by the Single European Sky initiative and by SESAR. It should also be related to air traffic management staff. There is currently a 10-15% staff shortage in air traffic controllers. 1,500 air traffic controllers are currently missing. Existing staff need to work overtime to be able to cope with the traffic, which is becoming unbearable in some countries and also a safety concern. The shortage of staff will not be solved with SESAR; the growth in traffic will eat up all savings which SESAR brings. The deployment of SESAR may be slowed down by a shortage of skilled ATM workers.

The White Paper should also enable us to learn from incidents and accidents. We need data from incidents because there are too few accidents.

Last but not least, we need to make the sector more sustainable from a social perspective. Many studies by ILO (International Labour Office) and ITF (International Transport Workers' Federation) show that working conditions have worsened since 9/11 and following market liberalisation. Working conditions in ground handling have deteriorated; we fear that ATM workers will be next in line. Workers need to be taken along the way to a more sustainable transport system.

**Mr Marino** said that many of the problems identified in the 2001 White Paper for the maritime sector still have to be solved.

One of them is tackling the shortage of seafarers on-board. A number of initiatives that have been taken to solve this problem have not yielded any result. The situation has actually got worse; young people are not interested in such work. The hardships of a seafarer's life, such as long stays away from home, the risky nature of the business and the lack of social life do not encourage young people to take up a job as seafarer. As it is impossible to do the physically challenging work on board until retirement, more mobility is necessary to be able



# A SUSTAINABLE FUTURE FOR TRANSPORT

November 20, 2009 • Brussels

to leave the ships and work in an office at a certain age / stage of the career. This would also provide young seafarers with a long-term perspective.

A European Maritime Academy would be good for training, in connection to on-board activities and to retrain people for office jobs. Professional certificates for on-board staff should be recognised for future career on land. Such a European Academy would be a centre of excellence which would help standardising European training rules. Currently, there are significant differences between Member States. A European Academy may also be a way to attract more young people to the sector.

Another (old) issue that (still) needs to be tackled are the provisions indicating how many people need to be on-board a ship for safety reasons. With no more than 20-25, the average number of people on board is too low. They have to make sure that the ship runs 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. Shifts become tough as people don't get enough rest and suffer from fatigue and stress. Most of the accidents at sea happen due to human errors, precisely because people were very tired or under stress. If there are only 20 people on board, they sometimes have to stay on board even when the ship is in a port; this excludes any social life. Ships used to stay in a port for a week, now they stay just 8 to 12 hours. The White Paper should foresee an increase in the number of people on-board.

One very topical factor that threatens life on-board is the fact that piracy and terrorism have increased in recent years. The White Paper should address this. Europe should be more present both at political level (e.g. more aid for Somalia) and at military level (organise safe routes where ships can go in convoys). Having security staff on board is costly and may increase violence, if pirates know that there are security people with weapons on board. Although costs for these convoys are high, they could be a relatively cost-efficient way of ensuring safety.

**Mr Menéndez Rexach** highlighted three priorities:

- There should be a better co-ordination between European transport policy and other policies affecting ports. There is a great variety of ports in Europe and ports are affected by a number of legislative areas (environment, coastal protection, water, maritime planning laws etc.). Ports should be well represented in the White Paper, especially when talking about the TEN-T. Priority should be given to modal infrastructure including ports. Ports and maritime transport constitute green corridors par excellence.
- There is a need for clarification of the role of port workers in intermodal transport chains. A Port Directive has been announced, but nothing has been done yet. There is a need to define the situation at EU level in order to have a harmonised playing field for all. More stress should be placed on port managers. A number of basic activities are carried out directly by the port authority. The private sector can flourish on the basis of clearly defined rules which should guarantee the social conditions of workers.



# A SUSTAINABLE FUTURE FOR TRANSPORT

November 20, 2009 • Brussels

- Funds need to be made available more quickly. It currently takes too long until decisions on granting funds are taken. State aid procedures should be clarified and accelerated. Often ports don't know when they will get funds, when decisions are being taken and how long the funded works may be carried out. It is therefore necessary to cut the time required to make decisions, especially in times of economic crisis. Sometimes it is already too late when the funds are made available.

Upon request by the Chair, Mr Menéndez Rexach informed the audience of the ESPO Award on Societal Integration of Ports which the Port of Gijón had recently won. The award had been given to the Port of Gijón for its efforts to restructure the port area where there used to be a number of abandoned industrial areas and where a new “city in the port” with space for both services and leisure activities has been created. Among others, they built an expo area and created a new beachfront. There are now many cultural events and other activities in the area. Altogether, the project consisted of 76 different actions which were carried out over the last 25 years, during which there always was a very close co-operation between the port and local and regional authorities.

The award has been given to the Port of Gijón mainly because of the positive impact this project has had on the port and on the city. The port area has tremendously gained in popularity. The local population has learned how the port works and what added value and employment it creates. People start to appreciate the role of the port in the city and are proud to work for the port. The port could thus reconnect with the city: it is again a full part of the life of the city.

**Mr Parillo** appreciated that a number of important points are mentioned in the Communication on a sustainable future for transport (COM (2009) 279), namely that transport workers will be at the centre of policymaking, that road safety remains a leading concern and that it is important to protect and develop the human capital. He also agreed with the view that there can be no economic efficiency in any sector unless prices reflect all costs.

His intervention then focussed on three main objectives: improved road safety, fair competition and sustainable development.

As regards road safety, the rise in the number of light duty vehicles (LDVs) poses a problem. LDVs have become very powerful and are increasingly used. Their drivers, however, are not subject to any regulation. The lack of legislation on training in driving these vehicles could have an impact on road safety. The use of tachographs in LDVs should be contemplated. The Working Time Directive and the Regulation on driving time and rest periods should apply to all professional drivers, regardless of the max. weight of their vehicle. This is not just a question of road safety, but also of fair competition.

The liberalisation of the road transport market was feasible in a Community of 15 relatively homogeneous Member States in terms of social conditions. It is however an entirely different story in an EU with 27 Member States with huge differences in salary levels (e.g. a comparison shows that if the salaries of French and Belgian drivers were at 100, their



# A SUSTAINABLE FUTURE FOR TRANSPORT

November 20, 2009 • Brussels

Hungarian colleagues would be at 38, the Romanians even below that). In such a context, the full liberalisation of road haulage leads to social dumping. Fair competition is not possible. Urgent action is above all needed in the area of cross trade, i.e. when a lorry from country A carries goods from country B to country C.

Better training and improved working conditions are also necessary to make jobs in the transport sector more attractive to young people and thus fight the increasing shortage of qualified staff which a number of European countries are bound to face. Many drivers are older than 50 and there will not be enough young people to replace them once they retire.

The Working Time Directive should cover all professional drivers, regardless of their status (self-employed or not). Self-employed drivers should however be treated in a slightly different way from employed drivers. A pragmatic solution would be to only consider the time related to transport such as loading and unloading as working time in the case of self-employed drivers. All other tasks such as meeting customers, accounting and administration should not be considered as working time.

When it comes to the enforcement of working time rules in the case of self-employed drivers, ETF suggests an innovative approach: Self-employed drivers should be required to follow the rules of the Working Time Directive, but their customers (often large companies providing most of the contracts) should also bear some responsibility. The shared responsibility of customers should be made clear. This would help the self-employed drivers and address the issue of unfair competition.

What about self-employed people who are treated as employees (the “false self-employed”)? Each Member State sets its own rules. One country cannot act on a self-employed person from another country that is actually a false self-employed. Including the self-employed in the Working Time Directive will not solve this issue. A Regulation may be needed because it is more effective in ensuring fair competition. A Directive, that first needs to be transposed in all the Member States, would have the opposite effect of what we want: some countries would be creating these false self-employed people and sending them everywhere without any possibility of enforcement or sanctions. We need not only a clear definition of what “self-employed” means, but a global framework that also includes enforcement and sanctions to ensure a more balanced market.

As long as we allow certain drivers to work 86 hours a week, every week of every month of the year, while complying with existing legislation, we are still far from achieving sustainable transport.