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Example: World container Flow 2005 (Million Full Load Containers)

Source: UNECE compilation based on ECSA
(European Communities Shipowners Association & Drewry Shipping Consultants Ltd)
Major container ports and ERIM Network
-European Rail Infrastructure Masterplan

ERIM network
- Covers 32 countries
- Includes 20% of their route-length (50 000 km)
- Carries > 50% of traffic

UNECE “TOP 20” container Ports
Transport nodes along the ERTMS corridors investigated by UIC (TEMA project)

153 nodes were selected
- 57 inland terminals
- 63 sea- and inland port terminals
- 33 border stations

Selection Criteria
- In connection with ERTMS corridors
- Market demand and capacity saturation being relevant issues
Capacity constraints along ERTMS corridors

CT terminals - unsatisfied demand in 2020
- 500,000 to 800,000
- 300,000 to 500,000
- not available
- 100,000 to 295,000
- less than 100,000

Sea ports - unsatisfied demand in 2020
- 900,000 to 1,790,000
- 410,000 to 900,000
- not available
- 210,000 to 390,000
- less than 210,000

Infrastructure occupation in ERTMS corridors in 2020
- 85% or more
- 70% to 84.9%
- less than 70%
Investment choices: To ensure the existing

Transport patterns are well established
- to / from certain ports
- to / from certain CT terminals
- Along certain corridors

Must ensure that such existing logistical links continue to function with adequate infrastructure.
Adoption of integrated and coherent planning at EU level could have an influence in shaping strategies to mitigate current strong tendencies for concentration of traffic around a few ports and logistical solutions.

- East / west containers from / to Russia and Asia.
- Greater use / development of some Atlantic, Baltic and Mediterranean ports.
- Creation of hubs / gateways to organise traffic flows.
- Increase standardisation / optimisation for dominant traffic.

Without some centralised action (at EU level) there is not sufficient critical mass around «alternative » ports / terminals to change logistical patterns or existing trends.
The amount of investment needed is substantial, but fundable in the right environment for investment.

- Concentrate investment on winning opportunities
- Define coherent and legally enforceable plan
- Invite private capital to invest in a such a plan, based on assured return (e.g. 5-6% p.a.), underwritten by European Institutions.
- Allow market forces to operate on the basis of optimising (rather than duplicating) infrastructure.
- Competition ‘for’ market in some cases rather than ‘in’ all markets.

Reliance solely on market forces will not assure rational development of infrastructure or low cost solutions.

Without such a plan, weak links will continue to appear due to lack of coordinated investments.
Summary – Investment in Seaports and related rail hinterland infrastructure

The critical issues and areas are largely known.
Data is available to help make wise choices.
Infrastructure is costly to provide and duplication or sub-optimal decisions need to be avoided.
Co-ordinated action will be necessary at EU level to agree the blueprint for international transport links.
Such action will be necessary to align interests of all actors towards common objectives and coherent investment.
Public and private investment will be attracted to a logical and unified plan, underpinned by EU and UN.
Challenge will be to reach consensus on plan.