1. Introduction

A Seminar on “Transport Infrastructure Development for a Wider Europe” was jointly organised by the European Conference of Ministers of Transport (ECMT), the European Commission (EC), the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) and the European Investment Bank (EIB). It was held on 27 and 28 November 2003 in Paris. Among about 120 participants there were officials of Ministries of Transport of 29 countries and the EC, representatives of international organizations, international financial institutions and non-governmental organizations and experts.

The aim of this Seminar, which was designed for high-level policy makers, was to provide guidelines for a common approach to planning and financing transport infrastructure across the entire European continent.

Because of the enlargement of the European Union and the growing globalisation of trade, there is a need for renewed reflection on the framework and instruments used until now to develop transport infrastructure at the international level. The overall objective of the Seminar was to identify what might become of the major transport axes between the enlarged European Union and neighbouring countries as well as Asia, the Near East and the Mediterranean area.

The following main questions were asked:

- Are the existing concepts (TEN, Pan-European Corridors, TEM/TER, etc) still useful? Could they be improved or should we adopt a new approach superseding them? What will be the consequences of the accession process on corridors?

- What kind of transport infrastructure planning must be set up on a Pan-European basis?

- What criteria should be used for the definition of a basic network outside the enlarged European Union suited to the needs of European integration and the relevant obligations for the States concerned? How could a multimodal approach be adopted. What are the linkages of the basic network with local, regional and national components.

- Which coherent transport connections are needed between TEN and the transport networks of those European countries that will not become members of the European Union in the near future? Which relations with the Balkan region (the REBIS Transport project), the Mediterranean Transport Area (the Euromed Transport project), BEATA, Black Sea Petra are needed? What perspectives for Europe-Asia, Far-East transport links.

- How should transport policy priorities be reflected in pan-European infrastructure plans? How to increase the role of the more environmentally-friendly modes (rail, inland navigation, maritime transport) and, at the same time, improve the efficiency of the transport system of the countries? Impact of the “motorways of the sea” concept on the transport priorities.
• How to ensure an optimal combination between local, regional, national and international priorities? Is it better to go for adaptation (step by step approach, i.e. rehabilitation and upgrading) or for outright modernisation, i.e. new construction? How can maintenance be adequately ensured?

• How to finance infrastructure developments on a Pan-European basis; national budgets availability for Pan-European network and corridors; local and regional network funding concerns; international subsidies and EIB, EBRD and WB financing; development of private participation in transport infrastructure financing. Are there financial shortages? What are the potential solutions?

2. Organisation and Programme of the Seminar

The Seminar was organised under the supervision of the Steering Group which was set up to this effect and which had meetings on 18 November 2002, 17 January, 26 June and 22 October 2003. This Group, chaired by Slovenia, was composed of selected country delegates, representatives of the European Commission, UNECE, the EIB and the World Bank as well as invited experts.

There were three sessions, each of them animated by a panel of experts and decision makers. Keynote introductory papers were prepared for each session by the Chair persons. A number of written contributions were prepared as well (see list of documents). They were available on the ECMT Website pages beforehand.

Session 1 - "Planning Infrastructure Development". was co-chaired by Mr. E. Thielmann (EC) and Mr. J. Capel Ferrer UNECE). The session was devoted to the examination of topics such as the current situation (including traffic, operation, investment, lack of connections, administrative and managing issues, environmental constraints) of the pan-European Corridors and Transport Areas in relation with TEN, TINA, TEM/TER and of the links with other continents, the difficulties encountered for the development of pan-European transport infrastructure, the need for new planning concepts, the basic requirements for a more efficient transport infrastructure planning on a pan-European basis, etc.

In Session 2 - "Financing the infrastructure developments on a Pan-European basis", co-chaired by Mr. M. Turro (EIB) and Mr. B. Zivec (Slovenia), a review of the situation of funding transport infrastructure in the Corridors and of financing constraints was made, the different sources available (national budgets, international subsidies, private capital involvement, etc.) and the potential solutions were discussed.

Session 3 - Round Table “Towards a New Policy”, chaired by Mr. J. Short (Secretary General – ECMT), was intended to summarise outputs of the first two sessions and to draw up recommendations for action at Pan-European level.

3. Planning Infrastructure Development

Session 1 discussion was focused on issues concerning infrastructure planning between the enlarged European Union, the wider Europe and beyond. While the overall objective of the Seminar was to identify the major transport axes between the enlarged European Union and
neighbouring countries as well as Asia, the Near East and the Mediterranean area, contributions and discussion covered broader issues relating not only to transport infrastructure but also other matters such as operation.

Historically, in a divided Europe, the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) played a main role in promoting international cooperation in planning of transport infrastructure in the whole Europe. Four infrastructure agreements for roads (AGR), rail (AGC), inland water (AGN) and combined transport (AGCT) were the main instruments used by the UNECE. This was supplemented by two sub-regional cooperation projects TEM and TER aimed at the coordinated development of main road and rail networks in Central, Eastern and South-Eastern European countries. In addition, in the recent years, new initiatives were taken to respond to growing interest in the development of Euro-Asian links.

Planning transport infrastructure in the European Union is carried out using various instruments such as the guidelines for the trans-European transport network (TEN-T) which defined the list of priority projects. The concept of the Pan-European Transport Corridors and Areas agreed at Crete in 1994 and amended in Helsinki in 1997 were intended, first of all, to connect the EU with surrounding countries. For most of the Corridors and Areas a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) has been concluded amongst the participating countries and with the European Commission.

Outside the enlarged European Union the situation is more difficult. After enlargement only one-third of Pan-European Corridors will be outside the territory of the European Union. While there have been many attempts to coordinate transport development plans for the Wider Europe, for example through intergovernmental agreements, such as animated by the UNECE, cooperation between countries is much looser. Differentiation of regions as regards distribution of population and economic activities as well as level of economic development makes problems even more complex.

In the recent years a number of new initiatives have been taken by the European Commission, United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), International Finance Institutions (IFIs) and other bodies to meet new challenges caused by changing political, social and economic conditions in the Wider Europe and neighbouring regions of Asia and North Africa. All organizations listed above are making great efforts to develop a common methodology for transport infrastructure planning at the pan-European level.

Consequently, the Pan-European Transport Network has been defined to consist of the following five components:

- The Trans-European Transport Network on the territory of the European Union (TEN);
- The ten Pan-European Corridors situated in acceding countries, in the NIS and beyond;
- The TINA Network, which is composed of the ten Corridors and the additional network components within the candidate countries for accession,
- The Four Pan-European Transport Areas (PETrAs) covering maritime; and
The Euro-Asian links, Transport Corridor Europe Caucasus Asia (TRACECA).

In the Communications on the “Wider Europe – new neighbourhood “ and “on the development of a Euro-Mediterranean transport network”, the European Commission outlined a new framework for relations between the enlarged EU and the surrounding areas, including improvements in transport links. In addition, a core transport network for South East Europe has been defined. Difficulties with implementation of earlier plans, mostly due to funding problems, gave impetus to searches for innovative funding solutions.

Contributions to Session 1 and panel discussion brought about much interesting information, views and answers to the questions asked by the moderators. They concerned both general matters and region/country and mode specific themes. The main points raised in background documents, written contributions and in the course of discussion have been summarised below.

Transport has to be looked at as a system. While infrastructure constitutes a crucial element of the system, transport quality and efficiency depend also on other elements and factors such as rolling stock and other equipment, organization, legal framework etc. Also when dealing with infrastructure balance is needed between meeting the needs of international, national, regional and local transport. In addition, in allocating resources, maintenance of existing transport infrastructure cannot be forgotten. In most acceding and neighbouring countries between one third and one half of the main road network is in poor condition (C. Queiroz). The same is true for railways. And on the local roads the maintenance backlog is even more serious.

The improvement of transport capabilities cannot be undertaken through infrastructure improvements alone. Alleviation of institutional bottlenecks (e.g. facilitation of border crossings) and introducing advanced traffic management are no less important and very often even more efficient and effective.

With the above issues in mind, there was a general agreement that the concept of transport corridors, with a concentration of attention on selected axis, proved to be useful. However, it requires revision. Proposals went in two directions. Limiting the number of corridors would make the programme more affordable and enable more rapid implementation. On the other hand, if the “Wider Europe” is to be better served and connected to Asia, adding new corridors may be necessary. This was stressed, among other, in Prof. V.I. Arsenov’s (Russian Federation) contribution. Prospects of rapid growth in international trade between the Far East, particularly China, and Europe are behind UIC proposals concerning the development of selected Asia-Europe rail links (Sharmae, Wisniewski) and intermodal transport operation on a global scale.

Concentration on corridors and selected projects was also supported by the representatives of the European transport industry (“Common Statement” of the EIA and other International Organizations). Improving connections between the enlarged EU and other countries was mentioned as one of priorities. A “coordinated approach” is necessary – projects should combine linear infrastructure with border crossings, terminals etc. Information on plans and projects for the development of Europe-Asia rail transport were also delivered by the representative of the Organization for the Collaboration of Railways – OSJD (T. Szozda). OSJD makes special efforts to increase the use of containers.
Some authors (for example C. Reynaud) underlined the complementarity of the network and corridor approaches. The concept of the Regional Core Network serving the Western Balkan Countries (G. Lazarevic) illustrated the validity of this observation. The case of Latvia (A. Zidkovs) is particularly interesting. Pan-European Corridor I (Via Baltica) crosses the country in N-S direction but volumes of international freight flows in the E-W direction (from the Baltic ports Ventspils and Riga to the Russian Federation) are much higher than along Via Baltica. This shows clearly that in some cases improvement of other components of the transport system may be not less important than those belonging to transport corridors. There is also the need to balance between improving “accessibility” to the more peripheral or landlocked regions and the “profitability” of projects (C. Reynaud).

Promotion of environmentally sound means of transport was not questioned. However, it has to be noted that attention was directed to railways and maritime transport (motorways of the sea, short sea shipping). Inland water navigation was discussed in one contribution (W. Rydzkowski, K. Wojewodzka-Krol) but this topic was not raised in the course of the discussion.

**Varying Conditions**

In a Wider Europe, differentiation of demographic, cultural and economic conditions is much greater than in the core of Europe. Consequently, there is no single recipe for how to improve the transport system. Some of concepts which are based on the experience of the most developed and densely populated regions of the European Union are not necessarily appropriate in other regions. For example, in the case of rail - separation of passenger and freight transport, suggested in Y. Laufer’s contribution (GETC), is not necessary in countries of Eastern Europe with excess capacity of existing well developed network rail infrastructure.

In general, in the development of transport infrastructure in a Wider Europe, two strategies are competing:

- construction of new, highest standard facilities (motorways, high speed railways etc.);
- step by step approach – adaptation, rehabilitation, upgrading.

Via Baltica was mentioned as an example of appropriate solution (M. Miettinen, B. Dennis). Because of lower traffic volumes it is not necessary to build a motorway; upgrading the existing roads/rails may be much more effective and efficient with quick results.

**Summary of the Session**

The chairman’s main conclusions were as follows:

- The concept of corridors is still valid but there is the need to revise the list;
- Corridors can be developed through building new infrastructure or upgrading/modernization of existing facilities;
- Harmonization, integration and cooperation are conditioning the progress in meeting objectives;
Intermodal and multimodal transport have to be promoted but success depends on making them competitive in terms of costs;

- Europe-Asia corridors/links have to be identified;

- A balance is needed between the developing international and national transport systems;

- Improvement of the freight rail network in the core of Europe is a high priority;

- Maritime transport deserves special attention.

4. Financing the Infrastructure Developments on a Pan-European basis

Session 2 was divided into two parts. In the first one, questions of financing infrastructure were looked at from “the point of view of countries”. The “point of view of international financial institutions” was presented in the second sub-session. A Keynote introductory paper was prepared by the representative of the European Investment Bank. Eight contributions of country and IFIs representatives were distributed in advance. The main points of discussion were as follows:

**Prioritisation of Transport Infrastructure Investment**

The first part of the discussion concentrated on the issue of allocation of public funds in acceding and neighbouring countries where various sectors (transport, education, health, etc) are competing for scarce resources. The proportion of GDP allocated to the transport sector (A. Kopp) varies between countries (0.5 – 2.0%) but differences cannot be explained by the category of the country. However, it has been found that trends differ. In the group of wealthier countries of the European Union, after increases in the beginning of the last decade (1990s) transport infrastructure investment decreased. The trend in the accession countries and their neighbours was different. After some decrease in transport infrastructure investment at the beginning of the transition period, slow, but steady growth was observed in recent years.

There is also a difference between the proportion of funds allocated to various transport means. In the last 12 years, in the European Union countries the share of investment in the road sector decreased from about 70 per cent to 60 per cent (A. Kopp). In contrast to that in the accession countries the growth from app. 50 to 60 per cent was noticed. But these numbers have to be treated with some care, because they differ according to the source of information.

The main question asked with regard to the transport sector is whether “it is appropriate to give priority to basic networks and links with European Union central markets or should investment concentrate on simpler rehabilitation projects or more local investment or even on improving quality of service provided with existing assets?”

Varying views were expressed in the contributed papers and the discussion. While, generally, advantages of concentrating efforts on main corridors were stressed, there were also views that prioritisation should be based on present and future traffic volumes and that social and economic objectives (development of poor regions) may and should be taken into account.
Macroeconomic Constraints

It is common that in many countries the macroeconomic constraints (i.e. on public debt and budget deficits) constitute the main barriers to the required increase in national funds for the development of transport infrastructure and, in particular, on main corridors. In this connection, the question was asked whether dedicated funds could be an acceptable solution to raise financing for main transport infrastructure projects.

Several accession countries have tried or are considering earmarking part of road user revenues in order to guarantee a certain level of funding for roads maintenance, modernisation and development (C. Queiroz). Some of them established road funds. But “despite the legislation in favour of road financing, the difficult budget situation faced by most countries is resulting in a much lower proportion of funds than legally earmarked for roads actually going to the sector”. In most accession countries it is much less than 50 per cent;

The case of Lithuania is of a special interest, as it was one of the first countries which established an off-budget road fund, but it was later abolished. A similar decision was taken in the Russian Federation.

Sharing Experience

In the last decades, considerable experience was accumulated in the European Union countries which benefited from the Structural and Cohesion Funds and in acceding countries receiving European Union financial assistance (Phare, ISPA, Interreg, etc.). A question was asked whether this experience can be used to implement transport corridors development plans in a Wider Europe. In the course of the discussion the importance of human resources and organisation was stressed. In many countries human resources at all levels of the transport sector administration are not sufficient to efficiently manage programme and project preparation and implementation. Continuous education of personnel to prepare it to new tasks and increase effectiveness is an important task of central and local governments.

In addition, continuity of organisation is required. While, in the transition period, changes are needed, it is crucial that changes in sector reorganization are well prepared and accompanied by the development of human resources.

Implementation Capabilities

Development of corridors is a complex technical, administrative and financial task. Not all acceding and neighbouring countries have sufficient capabilities to meet this challenge and to make effective use of resources. EU- and IFIs-sponsored technical assistance is of great value.

But probably the need for the creation of special organization(s) to manage the development of corridors was the most important question asked at this stage of discussion. The Co-ordination Office for the Corridors IV, VII and X was mentioned as a good solution, particularly as regards co-operation between transport modes, especially railways and inland water transport. The exclusion of some countries (Serbia) was a subject of critical comments. Having in mind that the considerable part of the Pan-European Transport Network is located outside the enlarged European Union, the role of the EC was discussed as well.
In summary, it was stated by the Co-chairman (B. Zivec) that the past and present experience have shown that practices such as Memoranda of Understanding, Co-ordination Offices, Steering Groups etc. are useful but not always fully satisfactory.

**Possible Sources of Financing - Contribution of International Financiers and Donors – Private Finance Options**

With few exceptions, transport infrastructure in European countries is under-financed. It is usual that the lack of adequate funds makes implementation of ambitious development plans practically impossible. It happens even in many countries where users pay most or all infrastructure costs through specific taxes (such as fuel tax). Unfortunately, as it was stressed earlier, in most countries only a part of the revenues comes back to the transport sector. With economic problems and public budget constraints there is a little chance of a significant increase in the public funds allocated to transport infrastructure projects. In this situation innovative ways of financing are looked for. In depth reviews of options were presented in the WB and EIB papers (C. Queiroz, P. Boeuf).

Some successes of privately financed transport infrastructure programmed in wealthier countries turned the attention of some acceding countries and their neighbours in this direction. In several transitional economies, governments started financing transport projects by a combination of funds allocated out of the budget and by long-term borrowing. The first experiences are not encouraging (UNECE). For example, because of low willingness to pay “there are likely to be few financially viable motorway concessions in the region in the near future, unless there is substantial public sector financial support”. This view was shared by C. Queiroz (World Bank) - “attempts to mobilize private funds for the road sector have not been successful”. However, it was stressed that analysis of this issue on the global scale gives a more optimistic picture – unsuccessful/cancelled projects constituted only 6 per cent of all privately financed road projects.

During discussion on the perspective for wider use of public-private partnerships (PPP) there was a prevailing view that in most acceding and neighbouring countries conditions are not favourable for this form of financing of transport infrastructure projects. An unsatisfactory legal framework, a lack of experience and problems of risk management are reducing interest of the private sector for international projects.

The vital role of IFIs and international donors, especially the European Commission, was underlined. EIB and EBRD have been very active in financing TENs and pan-European corridors projects in acceding countries. In the past, the contribution of the EIB was often combined with financing provided by the World Bank and the EBRD, now it is only the EIB. Enlargement of the European Union will radically change the connectivity issue and increase the interest of all three IFIs in assisting neighbouring countries, in particular Russia and the Western NIS. This requires changes in the existing EIB mandates and “the clear definition of the major axes linking the extended European Union with the WNIS and beyond” (M. Turro).

With increasing international assistance, the absorption capacity of available funds in many countries is not sufficient. Capabilities of national administrations in the selection of projects and their implementation becomes one of the crucial problems. In this connection, complementary technical assistance by the European Commission and other international institutions is critical for
improving and developing transport infrastructure in a Wider Europe. This is specially important in case of sophisticated financing schemes, such as various forms of PPP (P. Boeuf).

In summarising the session, the co-chair, B. Zivec, underlined the following points:

- Improving and developing the organisational framework is one of the main conditions for successful implementation of pan-European transport infrastructure plans; present forms (MoU, Steering Committees, etc.) are useful but not sufficient;
- There are various possibilities for new ways of financing (by IFIs and through various forms of PPP); they have to further reviewed and selected.

5. Round Table “Towards a New Policy”

Round Table “Towards a New Policy” was intended to summarise outputs of the first two sessions and to draw up recommendations for action at pan-European level. It was opened with the presentation of the moderator, by Mr. J. Short (Secretary General – ECMT), who proposed to structure the discussion on the final recommendations of the Seminar along three main themes:

- transport policy framework;
- corridors: lessons and proposals;
- financing issues.

Outputs of the session are summarized in the following points.

Transport Policy Framework

1) The Transport sector should be developed with the use of market principles with proper attention given to high safety and environmental standards. Among the main challenges the following are probably the most demanding: (i) reforming railways, (ii) harmonization and interoperability, (iii) liberalisation of the whole sector.

2) Transport policies should be supportive to alternatives to road transport. This requires special incentives.

3) Investment and operations should be integrated.

4) Investment decisions should be based on economic analysis (CBA, MCA, ...)

Concept of Corridors: Lessons learnt in the last 10 years and recommended actions.

1) The corridor concept proved to be useful because it stimulated international co-operation and led to focussing of efforts. A framework for effective selection and implementation of projects had been created. But there were also weak points: selection of projects was based rather on political than economic criteria, progress was uneven, e.g., soft measures were not adequately applied and the accent was rather on interurban transport (while the most difficult transport problems are observed on urban sections of transport systems).
2) There are reasons to maintain the concept of corridors, but the programme has be revised in the following directions:

- Selection of corridors and prioritisation of projects should be based on transport demand forecasts;
- Existing 10 corridors have to be revised taking into account the needs of a Wider Europe and of the connections with Russian Federation, China, Central Asia, Middle East and Mediterranean;
- Integration of all programmes such as TENs, Pan-European corridors, TEM, TER etc. should be considered;
- More accent should be placed on maritime transport, especially on a “motorways of sea” concept;
- The development of linear transport infrastructure must be accompanied with the development of nodes.

3) An adequate structure for defining and managing corridors is needed. Setting up a special group under Aegis of the European Commission would be desirable. It should involve countries, IFIs and international organisations.

4) Economic and traffic data should be prepared for the whole area in consideration (including countries of Asia, Middle East and Africa). More research is needed to develop demand forecasting methods. Development of effective methods to assess priorities is needed as well.

**Financing**

1) Financing the development and maintenance of transport infrastructure represents a great challenge to the countries. Public funds are and will maintain to be a main source of funds. But there are various ways of collecting resources and increasing effectiveness and efficiency of their use. In particular, at the country level:

- National multi-year investment plans are needed;
- Various means of collecting funds should be looked at (fuel tax, tolling, road funds, vignettes, etc.)
- Portfolio of projects for external funders has to be prepared, taking into account requirements of a given funder;
- Possibilities of developing PPPs in implementing projects should be examined;
- Special attention has to be given to the development of human resources in the transport sector;
• In allocating of resources a proper balance has to be kept between new investment and maintenance and rehabilitation/upgrading of existing infrastructure; in many cases maintenance and rehabilitation is the most efficient ways of using scarce resources.

IFIS and the European Commission have an important role to play in solving problems relating to financing of the development of transport infrastructure. In addition to grants and loans, they facilitate programme and project formulation and execution through:

• Streamlining procedures;
• Formulating rules on PPPs;
• Providing technical assistance and training for the public and private sector;
• Organizing sharing experiences.

6. Final Conclusions of the Seminar

The Seminar reached a number of conclusions on the strategy to be pursued in developing transport infrastructure within an enlarged Europe. The full text of these conclusions is in document [CEMT/CS(2004)1]. They can be summarised as follows:

1) There seemed to be broad consensus regarding the strategy to be followed when planning and financing transport infrastructure in the Wider Europe and beyond. Such a strategy would include the following elements:

a) An appropriate stable policy and regulatory framework has to be put in place, aiming at further liberalization of transport at international level, increased international harmonization, promotion of interoperability and intermodality, easier border crossing, increased rail competitiveness, prioritisation of transport infrastructure projects on the basis of sound economic analyses and further focus on maintenance and rehabilitation of existing infrastructures.

b) While not denying the long-term value of the network approach as pursued by the UNECE, the corridor approach appeared more appropriate in the short- and medium-term; this approach facilitates priority-setting and enables planning and financing efforts to be focussed.

c) The corridor approach should, therefore, be pursued as a central element of the strategy for the development of transport infrastructure in the Wider Europe and beyond. However, the existing corridor layout may have to be adapted after the European Union enlargement which will create a new situation with a large part of the existing corridors inside the European Union. This would mean that some existing corridors, or parts thereof, would disappear and others would need to be extended or newly created.

d) While the future new corridors will focus primarily on links between the European Union and its neighbouring countries, the Euro-Asian transport links should be taken into account, because of the foreseeable increase of trade with Asia, particularly with China.
e) Clear criteria have to be chosen in order to define future corridors (the criteria used by the Van Miert Group were specifically mentioned in this respect as a possible basis). For example, future corridors should be defined on the basis of real needs, accurate data and thorough analyses and projections rather than on political decisions. They should also be conceived in a multimodal perspective, including maritime routes (“motorways of the sea”), and with particular focus on intermodal connections. Interoperability, harmonized transport conditions and rules, including infrastructure charging, and easy border crossing should apply over the whole length of each corridor. Projects within each corridor should be identified and prioritized.

f) Implementation of corridor development programmes should be made more efficient. To this end, benchmarking should be used to monitor and measure progress. Corridor management should also be improved, for example through the appointment of a coordinator for each corridor and the establishment of a permanent secretariat. Moreover, all stakeholders in a corridor (IFI's, transport operators, customs authorities, etc.) should be involved in the work. Coordination between corridors should also be improved. In this respect, mention was made of the possible creation of an international agency for corridors.

g) Technical assistance, aimed at capacity building for infrastructure development, was considered crucial: national administration officials should be trained in project appraisal and continuity of trained staff should be ensured.

h) Adequate financing should be provided, first and foremost from the countries concerned, but also from international sources. Financing, particularly international financing, should be provided for economically viable projects, appraised and prioritised on the basis of appropriate methodologies. Coordination among the various sources of financing, including between the various IFI's was considered important. PPP was considered interesting, but, to be successful, countries should be able to ensure the appropriate framework and guarantee its continuity. Continuity was also deemed important with regard to the part of the national budget allocated to infrastructure financing. Finally, at least part of the financing should be generated by dedicated charges, tolls or other user charges, the harmonization of which was needed.

2) In order to implement the above-mentioned strategy, some steps would need to be taken, including the following:

a) Creation of a working in order to review existing corridors and formulating proposals for making changes to and supplementing existing corridors. The European Commission should take a lead in this process, in which all concerned parties should be involved.

b) Determination of the statistical data that will be necessary and establishment of the necessary databases covering the Wider Europe and neighbouring countries.

c) Launching of a process of identification of priority projects within the various corridors in the Wider Europe.

d) Evaluation of the resources that can be made available at national and international level.

e) Providing technical assistance to countries in need thereof for capacity building on policy formulation and, in particular, on transport infrastructure planning.
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