



September 2018
AK Position Paper

Establishing the Connecting Europe Facility

COM (2018) 438

About us

The Austrian Federal Chamber of Labour is by law representing the interests of about 3.7 million employees and consumers in Austria. It acts for the interests of its members in fields of social-, educational-, economical-, and consumer issues both on the national and on the EU-level in Brussels. Furthermore the Austrian Federal Chamber of Labour is a part of the Austrian social partnership. The Austrian Federal Chamber of Labour is registered at the EU Transparency Register under the number 23869471911-54.

The AK EUROPA office in Brussels was established in 1991 to bring forward the interests of all its members directly vis-à-vis the European Institutions.

Organisation and Tasks of the Austrian Federal Chamber of Labour

The Austrian Federal Chamber of Labour is the umbrella organisation of the nine regional Chambers of Labour in Austria, which have together the statutory mandate to represent the interests of their members.

The Chambers of Labour provide their members a broad range of services, including for instance advice on matters of labour law, consumer rights, social insurance and educational matters.

More than three quarters of the 2 million member-consultations carried out each year concern labour-, social insurance- and insolvency law. Furthermore the Austrian Federal Chamber of Labour makes use of its vested right to state its opinion in the legislation process of the European Union and in Austria in order to shape the interests of the employees and consumers towards the legislator.

All Austrian employees are subject to compulsory membership. The member fee is determined by law and is amounting to 0.5% of the members' gross wages or salaries (up to the social security payroll tax cap maximum). 816.000 - amongst others unemployed, persons on maternity (paternity) leave, community and military service - of the 3.7 million members are exempt from subscription payment, but are entitled to all services provided by the Austrian Federal Chambers of Labour.

Renate Anderl
President

Christoph Klein
Director

Executive Summary

BAK welcomes the further expansion of the trans-European transport networks (TEN-T) and the availability of European co-financing. However, it disapproves of the use of funds from the Connecting Europe Facility (CEF) for military purposes. In order for Austria to be able to fully benefit from co-financing, it would have to deviate from its neutrality status. BAK appreciates the European Commission (EC)'s intention of making a contribution to attaining the climate objectives through the financing of transport infrastructure projects, but critically views the fact that this vision is not reflected in the relevant sections of the regulation. BAK therefore takes the view that the draft regulation needs to be amended as regards the evaluation of the investments.

General considerations

The proposal for a regulation has the aim of establishing the legal basis for the co-financing of European infrastructure under the CEF for the time period 2021 to 2027, thereby repealing Regulation 1316/2013¹ for the time period 2014 to 2020. The BAK opinion presented here refers exclusively to the provisions concerning transport (i.e. TEN-T; CEF also covers energy and digital infrastructure and Regulation 283/2014², which also is to be repealed, deals with telecommunications infrastructure). In the area of transport, CEF is intended to make a contribution towards the completion of both TEN-T layers. The aim is to complete the core network by 2030 and the comprehensive network by 2050, and to support the transition to smart, sustainable, inclusive, safe and secure mobility. Details of the TEN-T (including corridors, equipment) have been regulated in Regulation (EU) 1315/2013³.

The financing of transport infrastructure creates jobs through construction projects, on the one hand, and permanent employment through the operation and use of such infrastructure by various modes of transport, on the other hand. In 2015, for example, 11.2 million persons EU-wide were gainfully employed in the sectors of transport and warehousing, generating revenue of EUR 651 billion. BAK welcomes the further expansion of the TEN-T and the availability of European co-financing. However, high-quality jobs will only be created if the provision of the funds for the infrastructure expansion requires that certain standards be met. There-

fore, BAK considers it necessary for the CEF to be used to support TEN-T projects aimed at providing sufficient motorway rest areas with safe and guarded parking spaces for professional drivers. This infrastructure component is a prerequisite for general road safety and compliance with the statutory driving and resting periods of professional drivers. We are aware of the fact that the draft regulation at hand focuses on aspects of EU co-financing of infrastructure projects. Nevertheless, it is important to us to point out that merely expanding infrastructure will not be sufficient and that numerous framework conditions for the creation of high-quality jobs in the transport sector and for the implementation of a more sustainable transport system fall within the sphere of influence of the EC. Particularly in commercial road transport, efforts to stop wage and social dumping have, so far, failed. Moreover, the working conditions have become increasingly unacceptable, especially in circumstances where employees are separated from their families for several weeks on end. From the view of BAK, effective sanctions and controls are also urgently required.

In this connection, we would once again like to point out the general unequal treatment of the various modes of transport, which results in massive distortions of competition in the transport system and, in particular, places environmentally-friendly transport by rail at a disadvantage compared to road and air transport. The European Court of Auditors, in its most recent

report⁴, also comments on this circumstance: “Intermodal competition is fierce, and it affects the sustainability of high-speed lines: high-speed rail does not compete on an equal basis with other transport modes”. Eliminating discriminatory framework conditions therefore also has a leverage effect towards achieving a resource-efficient and climate-friendly transport system.

Besides the systematic wage dumping in road transport, differences in taxes and duties have to be mentioned first and foremost. Whereas in the railway sector, a rail infrastructure usage fee is charged on all routes, lorries only pay tolls on motorways, and air transport is exempt from fuel duties. Passing on the full infrastructure cost to the transport prices in road freight transport would boost rail freight transport. At the same time, it would strengthen primarily regional, small-scale economic structures, as was shown by an analysis of lorry tolls on all roads, conducted by BAK⁵. Contrary to all concerns raised by the industrial sector, the introduction of a country-wide lorry toll in Switzerland had an impact of 0.1% on consumer prices. Model calculations for Austria assume price increases of a maximum of 0.09% to 0.11%. Taking into consideration the cost-saving efficiency effects to be expected, the price increases would likely be even lower. Therefore, BAK vehemently calls upon the EC to take these circumstances into consideration in its legislative proposals and to advocate a homogeneous European transport policy as well as mandatory lorry tolls, at least on all TEN-T roads.

Regarding the capital endowment of the facility, the draft regulation seems to provide for a larger budget than in the previous period. Looking at the details, however, it becomes clear

that out of the approx. EUR 19 billion, which may also be used by the Member States that do not receive funds from the Cohesion Fund, one third has been reserved for adapting the TEN-T to the requirements of military mobility. It appears that, under the guise of TEN-T expansion, a substantial portion of the EU funds is in fact to be used for the creation of a military and defence union, even though this aspect is only briefly mentioned in the Explanatory Memorandum and in the Recitals in a single short paragraph each. BAK disapproves of the use of CEF funds for military purposes; moreover, in order for Austria to be able to fully benefit from these funds, it would have to deviate from its neutrality status.

BAK appreciates that the European Commission (EC) intends to make a contribution to attaining the climate objectives through the financing of transport infrastructure projects. The fact that this vision is not reflected in the relevant sections of the regulation is, however, critically viewed. In general, there still is not sufficient emphasis on monitoring the effects of EU funding within the framework of CEF. This was recently also criticised by the European Court of Auditors, and BAK takes the view that the draft regulation needs to be amended as regards the topic of evaluation. Europe’s cities, which are home to 70% of the EU population⁶, are confronted with major transport-policy challenges. Yet, whereas substantial funds are available for military interests, the topic of urban mobility appears to be unworthy of a separate mention, let alone co-financing, which from the point of BAK is a clear point of criticism. Against this backdrop, a potential debate on the expansion of the existing TEN-T core network by up to 15% must be rejected.

A major objective expressed in the draft regulation is to increasingly also plan and finance cross-sector projects. The background for this intention is that both energy supply (alternative drives) and digitalisation (interconnected, automated mobility) will be major fields of action involving transport policy challenges in the years and decades to come. For instance, incentives must be created for projects focussing on the joint planning and realisation of transport and energy aspects, or transport and digitalisation aspects. We take the view that this objective is reflected in the specific contents of the draft to a limited extent only.

AK's position in detail

Budgeted funds, types of financing

The draft regulation provides for approx. EUR 30.6 billion for the co-financing of transport infrastructure, which is slightly over EUR 4.4 billion more than in the 2014-2020 time period. However, the proposal allocates a separate budget of EUR 6.5 billion to a new category eligible for funding, namely projects for the improvement of military mobility in Europe. That means that this area accounts for over one fifth of the CEF funds available for the transport sector, while at the same time the general budget for civil transport, excluding the funds from the Cohesion Fund, is being cut.

From the point of view of BAK, any use of the EU budget to finance military transport infrastructure must be strongly rejected. The EU budget, which is already small with a planned EU-GDP volume of 1.11%, must not be overstrained with additional expenses. Such military projects should be funded from the national defence budgets, which currently (2018)

include financial resources of EUR 227 billion⁷, i.e. around 41% more than the total EU budget.

What is striking regarding the programme's budget is that at EUR 11.3 the budgeted CEF funds from the Cohesion Fund remained more or less the same, while those from the general transport budget now come to EUR 12.8 billion, which is EUR 2.1 billion less than in the previous programme period. This affects all countries that are not eligible for payments from the Cohesion Fund. From an Austrian standpoint, this is a disadvantage. In light of the enormous challenges the transport and energy sectors are facing in order to reach the targets of the Paris Climate Agreement, a budget of just over EUR 30 billion is, from our point of view, far too small and should be increased significantly as compared to the current financing period. The increased flexibility in the financing of the infrastructure projects in the transport sector is seen positively. It is clearly advantageous if CEF projects

	2014-2020	2021-2027	Difference ⁸
Transport total	26.25	30.62	+ 4.36
General CEF funds	14.95	12.83	- 2.12
Cohesion Fund	11.31	11.29	- 0.02
Military mobility	0	6.50	+ 6.50
Energy	5.85	8.65	+ 2.80
Digital	1.14	3.00	+ 1.86
Total	33.24	42.27	+ 9.02

Table: Table: Comparison of CEF funds, in EUR billion, rounded

are eligible for funding under several EU programmes. The participation of private investors in such projects is, however, very sceptically viewed, as it may lead to the Community having to bear losses and to a privatisation of profits.

What is striking regarding the programme's budget is that at EUR 11.3 the budgeted CEF funds from the Cohesion Fund remained more or less the same, while those from the general transport budget now come to EUR 12.8 billion, which is EUR 2.1 billion less than in the previous programme period. This affects all countries that are not eligible for payments from the Cohesion Fund. From an Austrian standpoint, this is a disadvantage. In light of the enormous challenges the transport and energy sectors are facing in order to reach the targets of the Paris Climate Agreement, a budget of just over EUR 30 billion is, from our point of view, far too small and should be increased significantly as compared to the current financing period. The increased flexibility in the financing of the infrastructure projects in the transport sector is seen positively. It is clearly advantageous if CEF projects are eligible for funding under several EU programmes. The participation of private investors in such projects is, however, very sceptically viewed, as it may lead to the Community having to bear losses and to a privatisation of profits.

Military mobility

In the draft at hand, the EC provides that more than one fifth of the transport budget under CEF for the time period 2021 to 2027 should be used "to adapt the TEN-T networks to military mobility needs". However, unlike the funds available for the energy sector and for digital networks, which are indicated as maximum amounts, the budgeted

EUR 6.5 billion is a fixed amount. BAK regards Austria's neutrality as an inviolable principle enshrined in its constitution. We take the view that it is at least doubtful whether investments in military infrastructure are compatible with the country's neutrality.

In Recital 14, the EC refers to the Joint Communication on the Action Plan on Military Mobility⁹, according to which "by mid-2018, the Council is invited to consider and validate the military requirements in relation to transport infrastructure and that, by 2019, the Commission services will identify the parts of the trans-European transport network suitable for military transport, including necessary upgrades of existing infrastructure". We would like to point out that a Commission Communication lacks legally binding character, so that for us it is questionable whether there is any democratic legitimisation for this approach. Furthermore, it must be questioned whether it meets the general budgetary requirement to use funds economically and efficiently, given that so far it has not even been clarified whether and to what extent adaptations will be necessary and which investments this will entail. Providing for a fixed budget of EUR 6.5 billion first and evaluating where funds might be needed at a later stage is, in our opinion, a highly dubious way to administer public funds. Peripherally, we would like to mention that in the same Communication the Member States are also invited to "consistently take military requirements into account when building transport infrastructure". The Communication also states that the approval procedures for military transports of dangerous goods should no longer be regulated at Member State level, but rather for Europe as a whole and should also be simplified. This harbours the risk of national interests being neglected.

Our criticism concerning expediency is also substantiated by the fact that the articles in which the objectives and measures are defined in detail fail to mention any details on military mobility. The articles in question are:

- Article 3 – Objectives: Here, only the general objective of adapting the TEN-T networks to military mobility needs is mentioned.
- Article 9 – Eligible actions: Here, under sub-para c, there is only general mention of actions, or specific activities within an action, supporting transport infrastructure on the TEN-T network in order to adapt it to military mobility requirements with the purpose of enabling a civilian-military dual-use of the infrastructure, but such actions are not specified and no reference to details is made.

In the Annex, the indicators include only a vague reference to the “number of transport infrastructure components adapted to meet military mobility requirements”. Moreover, it is unclear how the objective of improving military mobility should be weighted with respect to cross-sector transport policy objectives such as climate protection and guaranteeing affordable and seamless passenger and freight transport. All in all, we are opposed to using CEF funds for military mobility purposes. In our view, an honest and open approach would be to create a separate facility for military mobility, which could, and should, cater specifically to the special requirements of neutral countries.

Objectives

It is appreciated that 60% of the overall financial envelope are to be allocated to sustainable transport modes (Recital 4),

but this target is not mentioned in either Article 3 (Objectives) or Article 13 (Award criteria). On the contrary, Article 13(1) sub-para i) says that “consistency with Union and national energy and climate plans” must be taken into account when granting co-financing. We believe that this wording lacks ambition and that the efforts of CEF should rather support the attainment of the climate objectives. For this reason, we miss, particularly in the provisions on objectives (Article 3), any mention of the climate objectives, urbanisation, crisis resilience of infrastructure and a reference to the White Paper on Transport¹⁰ in which also additional targets for achieving a more sustainable transport system have been described, for instance shifting road freight to rail transport or reducing casualties and fatalities in transport. The details provided in Annex II are equally ineffective in this respect. It is stated that 40% of the funds are to be used for “actions relating to smart, sustainable, inclusive, safe and secure mobility” and 60% for “actions relating to efficient and interconnected networks”. That means that ecological criteria apparently do not play any role for the majority of the proposed budgeted funds in the transport sector.

BAK welcomes the EC’s commitment made in Article 3(2) sub-para a) item i, namely to contribute to the development of “efficient and interconnected networks and infrastructure” as well as “interoperable systems” (cf. Explanatory Memorandum p. 1, last paragraph, and Article 13 Award criteria). Interconnected networks are the only way to ensure the highest possible added value. In any case, EU funding for infrastructure equipped for different systems, such as broad gauge railways and narrow gauge railways, should be excluded unless there is a national (such as in Spain) or historic reason for their existence.

Using synergies, cross-sector financing

In its draft, the EC speaks of growing convergence of the transport, energy and digital sectors and states that these sectors should increasingly be dealt with jointly. Examples include energy supply in transport or connected and autonomous mobility. One of the objectives of the draft regulation is therefore to harness synergies and to provide financing models for cross-sectoral projects.

In our opinion, however, relevant provisions of the regulation are not worded specifically enough. Article 10 (Synergies) states only that there should be specific award criteria, Article 13 (Award criteria) fails to mention any such special regulations, and Article 14 (Co-financing rates) merely speaks of ancillary elements of such projects which are eligible for funding provided that they are not financed from the individual sectoral budgets of the facility anyway. We take the view that, in order to better support cross-sectoral projects, studies on this topic should be suggested and a higher financing rate should be considered. On this point, we agree with Amendment 45 of the Report by the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy, Committee on Transport and Tourism of the EU Parliament¹¹. There, in Article 14(5) (maximum co-financing rates in the case of cross-sectoral measures) the following addition is suggested: "In addition, the co-financing rate applicable to these actions may be increased by 10%; the co-financing rate shall not be higher than 90% of the total eligible cost".

Evaluation

BAK finds fault with the fact that the current evaluation of the CEF focuses on administrative and financial control while other criteria, such as sustaina-

bility and environmental impact, are lacking. In its report on the mid-term evaluation of the CEF¹²; the EC itself concludes: "Moreover, the performance framework provided in the Regulation is lacking well defined or robust indicators". This point of critique regarding the lack of evaluation is also supported by the latest report of the European Court of Auditors¹³ which includes, for instance, the following: "The Court found that the EU's current long-term plan is not supported by credible analysis, is unlikely to be achieved, and lacks a solid EU-wide strategic approach. Although the length of the national high-speed rail networks is growing, the Commission's 2011 target of tripling the number of kilometres of high-speed rail lines by 2030 will not be reached."

Even though Recital 45 of the draft regulation at hand speaks of the implementation of adequate monitoring and reporting measures including indicators, Article 21 (Evaluation) fails to mention specific objectives and indicators. Paragraph 2 only specifies the time of the evaluation: "The interim evaluation of the Programme shall be performed once there is sufficient information available about the implementation of the Programme, but no later than four years after the start of the programme implementation". This means that the mid-term evaluation, which has been common standard so far, will be delayed by one year, i.e. until 2025, which brings it closer to the end of the programme duration. This harbours the risk that undesirable developments may be discovered and corrected only at a later stage. BAK believes it would make sense if the EC, at all events, submitted a progress report during the first half of the programme period and specified the indicators used for the evaluation to the Parliament and to the Council. We

believe that the indicators listed in the Annex (number of cross-border links, number of alternative fuel supply points built or upgraded with the support of CEF, number of CEF supported actions contributing to the safety of transport) are not sufficient. According to the Regulation on Union guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network¹⁴, by 31 December 2023, the Commission shall carry out a review of the implementation of the core network, evaluating changes in passenger and freight transport. The same regulation also provides for a socio-economic cost-benefit analysis of the TEN-T projects, taking into account all the relevant social, economic, climate-related and environmental benefits and costs. Against this backdrop, neither the postponement of the CEF evaluation, nor the lack of detail in defining the indicators make sense; rather, synergies should be utilised for reporting purposes.

Extension of the TEN-T network

In Recital 9, the EC mentions an alignment of the core network corridors in order to reflect, inter alia, the evolution of the network and states that the length of the core network corridors should not increase by more than 15%. Allow us to point out, in this connection, that in its mid-term evaluation¹⁵ the EC reckoned with an investment need for the TEN-T core network of EUR 750 billion by 2030 and assumed roughly three times as much for the comprehensive network and other transport investments such as urban transport. Given the current length of all core network corridors of approx. 15,000 kilometres, an extension by up to 15% would mean an extension of the corridors by more than 2,200 kilometres. Given the enormous sum total of necessary investments, we deem it important to clarify that any alignment of

the core network must not jeopardise its completion by 2030. We take the view that this 15% tolerance should be cancelled, also in view of the recommendation by the Court of Auditors to carry out realistic long-term planning and agree with the Member States the key strategic stretches to be implemented first.

In this connection, we have to criticise Article 23 (Delegated acts) as well. In said provision, the EC is empowered to amend the priority corridors by means of a delegated act. Thus, the responsibility for infrastructure policy of individual Member States and the EU is placed in the hands of the EC. In light of the strong interrelations of infrastructure policy on the one hand and regional, environmental and social policies of the countries on the other hand, this will have far-reaching (regional) consequences. In BAK's view, this runs counter to the principle of subsidiarity, and therefore BAK rejects a transfer of powers; the potential effects appear to be too essential for them not to be subjected to direct democratic legitimisation.

Digitalisation, alternative fuels

In several passages of the draft regulation (for instance Recitals 6 and 12), automated and connected mobility is referred to as the new challenge to infrastructure and its financing. In its position paper, the Association of German Transport Companies (Verband Deutscher Verkehrsunternehmen) states: "The autonomous vehicle could be part of the public transport system – but it could also seriously threaten the existence of today's public and long-distance transport."¹⁶ We appreciate that the topics of automation and digitalisation are taken into account and would like to point out that the focus in this connection must be on public transport and its feeder roads.

From the point of view of BAK, the public sector, the transport associations and ecomobility providers have to advocate for the use of autonomous vehicles where this makes the most sense: as public transport feeder networks, primarily in rural areas, and as an alternative in urban transport which, in any case, should provide more space for walking and cycling and should focus primarily on ecomobility.

BAK demands that connected and automated vehicles contribute to an increase in transport sustainability, better road safety and the affordability of mobility. Automated vehicles also must lead to an improvement of working conditions of those employed in the transport sector. Which roads will be adapted and approved for automated vehicles must be decided in line with transport policy and social objectives. For these reasons, BAK requests that part of the financing of the adaptations of transport infrastructure that may become necessary be borne in part by the manufacturers and users of the automated vehicles, and rejects permanent subsidies financed by the general public.

Regarding platooning, we would like to point out that there are not only advantages to it, but also a series of open questions and issues, similar to the debate on the introduction of gigaliners (costly adaptations of infrastructure, road safety issues, etc.). Ignoring these aspects, all of which also involve high costs, would result in a competitive disadvantage for ecological modes of transport. Therefore, not only a comprehensive and in-depth technical assessment and a macro-economic cost benefit analysis will be required, but also a social policy debate on whether using this new technology is reasonable.

In Article 9, alternative fuels infrastructure is also on the list of eligible actions. In this connection we vehemently point out that new fuels in motorised private transport are unable to solve either the problem of high infrastructure needs or other issues such as noise and accidents, and that the consumers' demands for price transparency, user friendliness and open systems (universal charging stations) must be taken into account as well.

Urban mobility

Europe's metropolises are those regions which, as the source and destination of mobility, are confronted with huge challenges when it comes to managing transport volumes. In Austria, commutes account for 40% to 60% of transport across city borders, depending on the mode of transport used (public transport, passenger car). The percentage of workers with international commutes is very low. In addition, agglomerations show massive growth rates, which goes hand in hand with an increase in transport. This dynamic development of urban areas is a special challenge in terms of traffic management, all the more because today, during rush hours, trams and buses as well as regional commuter trains are already "full" and numerous roads and rail routes are congested. Transport is the main polluter in terms of both local air pollutants and noise, and certain limits, for instance for particulate matter (PM₁₀) or nitrogen dioxide, are already exceeded in many places today.

Supporting the agglomerations in the most important infrastructure projects, which also include regional transport connections, is therefore indispensable in order to prevent an urban collapse and thus the collapse of the entire trans-

port system. However, the draft provides for funding options for agglomerations to a limited extent only. Just a few countries (Bulgaria, Estonia, Greece, Croatia, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Czech Republic, Hungary and Cyprus) are allowed to use amounts from the Cohesion Fund to finance urban transport. All other countries, which might also include those which have to deal with the largest traffic volumes and which form the most important economic centres in Europe, do not have this possibility of using Cohesion Fund grants (cf 1.4.4. “Compatibility and possible synergy with other appropriate instruments” of the Financial Statement). They only have access to TEN-T funds to complete the EU comprehensive network (cf Annex I Regulation (EU) No. 1315/2013). This includes, for instance, the bridging of missing links in high speed lines. Urban nodes may be financed that way, but important connections to the surroundings of the cities, which also reduce the burden on the core network, are eligible for TEN-T funds to a limited extent only. The focus on high speed transport alone is also criticized by the EU Court of Auditors¹⁷. In its report, the Court states that the cost per minute of saved travel time on high speed lines goes up to EUR 369 million and that billions could be saved by adequately taking this into account, namely by upgrading the existing conventional rail lines. However, the EC draft regulation fails to provide any concrete solutions for the special problem of agglomerations. The wording in Article 9(2) sub-para a) item ii is definitely too vague. The only way to realise the desirable EU climate policy objectives (cf Recital 4) is through cities.

Only in agglomerations can the economic principle of the EU to maximise the value-added of investments (cf Recital

16) be complied with. This holds true for reaching a maximum number of beneficiaries as well as for positive impacts on the climate, health and economy. Therefore, neglecting the agglomerations is also irresponsible from an economic point of view.

Footnotes

¹ Regulation (EU) No 1316/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 December 2013 establishing the Connecting Europe Facility, amending Regulation (EU) No 913/2010 and repealing Regulations (EC) No 680/2007 and (EC) No 67/2010

² Regulation (EU) No 283/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 March 2014 on guidelines for trans-European networks in the area of telecommunications infrastructure and repealing Decision No 1336/97/EC

³ Regulation (EU) No 1315/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 December 2013 on Union guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network and repealing Decision No 661/2010/EU

⁴ Special Report No 19/2018: "A European high-speed rail network: not a reality but an ineffective patchwork" <https://www.eca.europa.eu/en/Pages/DocItem.aspx?did=46398>

⁵ Flächendeckende Lkw-Maut und Nahversorgung - Auswirkungen einer flächendeckenden Lkw-Maut auf Lebensmittelpreise und den ländlichen Raum, Vienna 2015 https://wien.arbeiterkammer.at/service/studien/VerkehrundInfrastruktur/Flaechendeckende_Lkw-Maut_und_Nahversorgung.html (only available in German)

⁶ COM (2013) 913 final: Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: Together towards competitive and resource-efficient urban mobility

⁷ European Commission: EU Budget for the future - The European Defence Fund https://ec.europa.eu/commission/sites/beta-political/files/budget-may2018-eu-defence-fund_en.pdf

⁸ Deviations are due to rounding errors.

⁹ JOIN (2018) 5 final: Joint Communication to the European Parliament and the Council on the Action Plan on Military Mobility

¹⁰ COM (2011) 144: White Paper - Roadmap to a Single European Transport Area – Towards a competitive and resource efficient transport system

¹¹ 2018/0228(COD): Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the Connecting Europe Facility and repealing Regulations (EU) No 1316/2013 and (EU) No 283/2014, Committee on Industry, Research and Energy, Committee on Transport and Tourism

¹² COM (2018) 66 final/2: Report from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on the mid-term evaluation of the Connecting Europe Facility (CEF)

¹³ Special Report No 19/2018

¹⁴ Regulation (EU) No 1315/2013

¹⁵ COM (2018) 66 final/2

¹⁶ <https://www.vdv.de/position-autonome-fahrzeuge.pdf>
(only available in German)

¹⁷ Special Report No. 19/2018

Should you have any further questions
please do not hesitate to contact

Thomas Hader

T: +43 (0) 1 501 651 2668
thomas.hader@akwien.at

and

Peter Hilpold

(in our Brussels Office)
T +32 (0) 2 230 62 54
peter.hilpold@akeuropa.eu

Bundesarbeitskammer Österreich

Prinz-Eugen-Straße 20-22
1040 Vienna, Austria
T +43 (0) 1 501 65-0

AK EUROPA

Permanent Representation of Austria to the EU
Avenue de Cortenbergh 30
1040 Brussels, Belgium
T +32 (0) 2 230 62 54
F +32 (0) 2 230 29 73