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## Key Findings

■ EU-27, Norway, Switzerland and UK spent $€ 1.5$ trillion between 1995 and 2018 to extend their road infrastructure. This equals $66 \%$ more of their budgets to extend roads than to extend railways (931 billion).
■ During the years 2018-2021, the gap decreased to some degree: The 30 European countries spent $34 \%$ more on extending roads than on extending railways. Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Italy, Luxembourg, and the United Kingdom invested more in rail than in road during these four years. All other countries still spent more on road than on rail.
■ The length of motorways in the 30 analysed European countries grew from $51,494 \mathrm{~km}$ to $82,493 \mathrm{~km}$ (by $60 \%$ ) between 1995 and 2020. Growth was highest in Ireland, Romania, and Poland. Growth was lowest in Lithuania, Latvia, and Belgium. In 15 out of 30 analysed countries, the motorway lengths more than doubled.

- The provision of additional road infrastructure creates an additional demand for individual motorised transport. Demand for rail transport grew as well and can be attributed to the extension of high-speed rail sections.
■ The research revealed that $13,717 \mathrm{~km}$ of regional passenger rail lines have been temporarily or permanently closed since 1995 . As a rough estimation, out of these lines $7,300 \mathrm{~km}$ could be re-opened relatively easily. The length of the overall railway network decreased by $6.5 \%$ in the period from 1995 to 2020.
- A total of at least 2,582 train stations have been (temporarily or permanently) closed.
■ Since 1995, twelve new airports for civil aviation have been opened, which now have a volume of at least 150,000 passengers per year. In addition, ten new runways have been inaugurated.


## 1 Aim of the study

The European continent is equipped with a dense network of inland transport infrastructure. The European Union (EU) has one of the densest transport networks in the world.

The highest motorway densities can be found in Northwest-Europe, around big cities and in the proximity of seaports. Most European capitals and large cities are surrounded by a ring of motorways. High motorway densities are also found around major seaports of northern Europe: the motorway densities of Bremen (205 km/1,000 $\mathrm{km}^{2}$ ) with the port of Bremerhaven, of Zuid-Holland with the port of Rotterdam (124 $\mathrm{km} / 1,000 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ ) and of Hamburg ( $107 \mathrm{~km} / 1,000 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ ) are among the highest of all European regions.

Railway density is highest in the regions of Germany, Czechia, Hungary, the Netherlands, Poland and Romania (Germany, Czechia and the Netherlands are also among the most densely populated countries). The density of railways is high in western and central parts of Europe and relatively lower in coastal areas. The highest network densities, which are above $300 \mathrm{~km} / 1,000 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$, can be found in three regions in Germany, one in Czechia and one in Hungary (see figure 1.1, Eurostat 2020 data).


Figure 1-1 Motorway and railway density in Europe 2020. Source: Eurostat 2022
Transport infrastructure has positive effects on economic growth and prosperity (e.g., Hong et al. 2011, Lenz et al. 2018). However, a further look into the details of the relation between productivity/economic growth and transport infrastructure investment also leads to controversial and inconclusive results (Deng 2013, Wadud \& Baierl 2017). More importantly, there are questions as to the marginal economic effects of further transport infrastructure expansion and to the meaningfulness of motorway and airport expansion in the face of the climate crisis (e.g., Metz 2008, Cervero 2009, Creutzig et al. 2018, Givoni \& Perl 2020, Lin et al. 2021).

In the same vein, scientists have highlighted for decades that more transport infrastructure will lead to more demand for transport (SRU 2005, Martens 2006).

Another angle to discuss necessities of transport infrastructure provision is the social dimension. The term "transport poverty" is relatively new to both academic and political debates, but it increasingly receives attention. It includes problems of affordability, mobility and accessibility (Simcock et al. 2021), for all of which appropriate transport infrastructure is a prerequisite. People may have no access to public transport and therefore rely on private cars (Mattioli et al. 2017).

In 2021, the EU endorsed a new Social Climate Fund, which shall "support European citizens most affected or at risk of energy or mobility poverty". The financial envelope for the implementation will be $€ 23.7$ billion for the period $2025-27 .{ }^{1}$ This is a support measure of the "Fit for 55 Package", which shall ensure a green transition and decarbonise transport.

Against this background, this report discusses the following three research questions:
1| Which are the transport infrastructure investment priorities in Europe?
The report investigates the investment priorities of EU-27, Norway, Switzerland and the United Kingdom as measured in annual public spending for road and rail infrastructure expansion.
$2 \mid$ How has transport infrastructure developed over the last decades and to what extent interrelates this supply of infrastructure with actual demand for the respective modes?

The report investigates the development of railways, motorways and airports in the mentioned 30 European countries. It provides a regression analysis of supply and demand for transport.
$3 \mid$ How has railway infrastructure developed in Europe over the recent decades?
The report will provide a detailed analysis of the railway sector's development in the 30 countries. The analysis is meant as a measuring stick about local communities' access to railway services.

Data and methodology
The research included two basic steps: a) data and information gathering, and b) their interpretation and documentation. The research area included EU-27, Norway, Switzerland and the United Kingdom ("core Europe"). We gathered data from 1995, because earlier years turned out to be sparsely documented. In order to answer the above research question 1 , information is about:

■ rail and road infrastructure investments for and expansion of existing new lines/roads, and

- an overview for planned investments in these sectors.

[^0]The International Transport Forum (ITF) provides information on investments into road and rail infrastructure (ITF-OECD 2023). This is an annual survey of ITF staff in collaboration with ITF member countries. The data includes national budgets.

For research question 2 we searched for the evolution of road and rail infrastructure [kilometres, km ] and for the development of demand for transport on this basic transport equipment [passenger kilometres, pkm].
The first step included going through data bases from Eurostat (2023a), ITF-OECD (2023), Worldbank (2023) and the European Commission's statistical pocketbook (EC 2022). In some cases, same indicators included different information. We proceeded as follows:
Step 1) Plausibility of all data was checked: Some single year numbers were outliers; some time series were outliers as compared to the other two time series of the same country. Finally, EC numbers were used for road and rail pkm; Eurostat data for motorway lengths and Worldbank data (via International Union of Railways) for railways lengths.

Step 2) In case of data gaps or remaining implausibility, national numbers were searched.

The investigation of abandoned railway lines and stations, i.e., research question 3 demanded to deviate from the path of official sources. Only in a few cases official data about closed railway lines was available online, and if so, it was available in different degrees of detail. We contacted national railway operators and other national (personal) contacts and could in some cases receive additional official material. In many cases we complemented our research by using unofficial sources such as Wikipedia, news articles or private sites about abandoned railways.
Therefore, our data comes with omissions, inaccurate information and estimates. In particular, we dealt with the following challenges:
■ We tried to find the potential of closed lines to be re-opened in the future. However, the transition from "ready to be re-opened" and "dismantled forever" is fluid and we could not exactly determine the state of the tracks. We interpreted our sources. Nevertheless, we made efforts to distinguish between the possibility to reuse a section/line and its impossibility. Ultimately, this is a matter of financial abilities/priorities and legal options.
■ The research focuses on passenger transport. Therefore, we did not account for lines that historically were exclusively used for freight transport. However, in many cases freight tracks may become useful for passenger traffic and vice versa.
■ If a line was converted into or replaced by railbound urban public transport, it was not counted. It is hard to find information for each and every case.

As the research includes data gaps and inaccurate estimations, we ensured to stay conservative with our numbers: We did not use data which we could not find. That is, there may be more closed railway lines and stations than are listed in this report.

## Definitions

The research focuses on middle and long distances and therefore not on local traffic. However, as we use ITF data to answer research question 1 about investment priorities, we partly include metros/tramways and urban roads, see below. Else, railways contain conventional rail and high-speed rail. Lines are counted in kilometres, irrespective of the number of their parallel tracks.

A motorway is a road with at least two lanes per direction with a barrier between the two directions (except in tunnels or special sections) and which is restricted for certain vehicles (such as bikes, tractors). Motorways comprise the highest categories of roads in the respective countries.

In the case of Austria, this includes not only motorways, but also "Schnellstraßen" (clearway). In the case of Latvia, we used the category "main roads" due to the lack of a dedicated motorway category.

The research also includes airport expansions to complement the perspectives about infrastructure extensions. Although not a focus, as we compare data about roads and rail, air transport is a third option of long-distance transport and oftentimes new roads and railways are built to develop them. Airport expansions are defined as new airport runways, which are finished or under construction. We also searched for new airports that do not replace older ones. For example, military fields which had not been used for civil aviation and were redesignated as international airports are included. Only those airports are included that had at least 150,000 passengers in 2019, according to the database of CAPA - Centre for Aviation. Some airports were inaugurated after 1995 but remain under this threshold.

Regarding the data on investments into rail and road, this report uses the ITF definitions (ITF-OECD 2023). The ITF collects data about all rail-borne infrastructure and all roads. This concept includes local infrastructure. However, country data varies. Some countries/sources do not include urban transport infrastructure investments. Chapter 7.1. specifies the investments which are included per country, as reported by the ITF.

Investment expenditure on both road and railways infrastructure include capital expenditure on new infrastructure or extension of existing roads/railways, including reconstruction, renewal (major substitution work) and upgrades (major modification work). Infrastructure includes land, permanent way constructions, buildings, bridges and tunnels, as well as immovable fixtures, fittings and installations connected with them, as opposed to road vehicles/rolling stock. Data should also include both government and private investment, unless specified otherwise.

## 2 Funding of transport infrastructure

Motorways and railways are usually built and extended based on national political long-term strategies and corresponding investment decisions such as the French National Transport Infrastructure Scheme or the German Federal Transport Infrastructure Plan. Investment priorities are usually set using some combination of transport project appraisal methods such as multi-criteria analysis (Bueno et al. 2015).

## Funding strategy of the European Union

The European Union's long-distance transport strategy is focused on the Trans-European Transport Network (TEN-T). TEN-T is a Europe-wide network of railway lines, roads, waterways, and airports. A main rationale to develop this network is to strengthen social, economic and territorial cohesion in the EU. ${ }^{2}$
During the period 2014-2019, one of main sources of EU funding for transport infrastructure, the Connecting Europe Facility (CEF Transport) has awarded $€ 23.3$ billion in grants to co-finance projects of common interest, i.e., for TEN-T (EC 2023). The vast majority ( $69 \%$ ) of the CEF transport budget is allocated to railways (see figure 2.1, rounded numbers).


Figure 2-1 Funding of the CEF by mode in the period 2014-2019.
Source: EC 2023
Therefore, it seems that the TEN-T investments follow the European Union's general policy objectives of a green and socially inclusive Europe. ${ }^{3}$ However, according to an analysis of several EU funds by Investigate Europe, rail has not been a priority in this timespan. The research found that almost $€ 19$ billion of the Cohesion Fund and European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) was spent on rail projects, of which $€ 12$

[^1]billion was for TEN-T in the period 2014-2020. The corresponding amount for road projects was $€ 33.7$ billion, of which $€ 19.5$ billion was for TEN-T. 4

## Investment priorities of the countries since 1995

On a general level, funding of roads is still a priority in Europe. Table 2.1 provides an overview of the national budget of road and rail infrastructure investments in the 30 countries under scrutiny (EU-27, Norway, Switzerland and United Kingdom). The first two columns on the left-hand side show the cumulative annual budget, which the countries spent between 1995 and 2018 for road and rail, respectively.
The third column divides the road budget (first column) by the rail budget (second column). If the ratio of these two figures is above one, then the spending priority was road extensions, if it is below one, then the priority was with rail networks.
The countries spent more than $€ 1.5$ trillion between 1995 and 2018 to extend their road infrastructure. ${ }^{5}$ It turns out that only three out of 30 countries prioritised rail over road in their budgets, namely Austria, Belgium and the UK.

As a common theme, the ratio of road to rail investments becomes higher as the countries' national income gets lower, but there are significant differences and exceptions. For instance, Romania's ratio is the highest (12.2), whereas the Bulgarian ratio (4.4) appears to be relatively moderate as compared to Romania. From this perspective, one can assume that infrastructure development may have different itineraries. The Bulgarian State railways closed 13 lines in the early 2000s. The closure of these loss-making lines was one of the most important measures stipulated in a national railway rehabilitation programme and also one of the demands of the Worldbank, which provided funds for the State railways' restructuring. However, during the 2010s, further closings were debated but ultimately not realised. Instead, Bulgaria upgraded some main connections.

A number of relatively rich states have a ratio close to one, namely Denmark, Italy, Luxembourg, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland.
The fourth column creates a ratio as in the third column, but for the four years from 2018 to 2021, which were the most recent reported in the database. ${ }^{6}$ A comparison of the fourth to the third column indicates if a shift of priorities may have started to take place in these years (i.e., more funding for railways than for roads).
This was the case in Denmark, France, Italy, and Luxembourg. In Denmark, the age of the rail network became problematic in the early 2000s. ${ }^{7}$ Since 2011, Denmark has considerably increased railway investments (ITF-OECD 2023). A similar story can be

[^2]told for Luxembourg: The Grand Duchy aims to lift the share of public transport to $25 \%$. Consistently, the country's railway investments have an upward tendency (ibid.).

Table 2-1 Comparison of road and rail infrastructure investments of European countries [ $€$ current prices]. Source: ITF-OECD 2023, own analysis.
Although there are clear definitions for all the terms used in the ITF survey, caution is required when comparing data between countries (see annex, chapter 7.1). ${ }^{12019 / 20}$ data missing for a number of countries (see annex, chapter 7.1).

|  | Cumulative road investments 1995-2018 [bn €] | Cumulative rail investments 1995-2018 [bn €] | Ratio road/rail 1995-2018 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Ratio road/rail } \\ 2018-2021 \\ \text { (those available } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Austria | 12.70 | 33.22 | 0.38 | 0.27 |
| Belgium | 7.49 | 23.26 | 0.32 | 0.84 |
| Bulgaria | 8.39 | 1.91 | 4.39 | 3.74 |
| Croatia | 12.00 | 1.75 | 6.87 | 3.27 |
| Czechia | 21.78 | 12.04 | 1.81 | 1.44 |
| Cyprus | not available | not applicable | not applicable | not applicable |
| Denmark | 19.22 | 17.05 | 1.13 | 0.80 |
| Estonia | 2.49 | 0.55 | 4.53 | 6.43 |
| Finland | 19.37 | 8.40 | 2.31 | 2.62 |
| France | 277.76 | 129.87 | 2.14 | 0.91 |
| Germany | 278.39 | 132.11 | 2.11 | 1.84 |
| Greece | 38.84 | 12.41 | 3.13 | 12.63 |
| Hungary | 16.93 | 7.71 | 2.20 | 2.56 |
| Ireland | 25.69 | 3.99 | 6.44 | 13.25 |
| Italy | 150.83 | 117.89 | 1.28 | 0.90 |
| Latvia | 2.84 | 1.15 | 2.48 | 4.70 |
| Lithuania | 5.25 | 1.82 | 2.88 | 3.63 |
| Luxembourg | 4.12 | 3.27 | 1.26 | 0.91 |
| Malta | 0.42 | not applicable | not applicable | not applicable |
| Netherlands | 46.85 | 22.11 | 2.12 | not available |
| Norway | 50.18 | 13.41 | 3.74 | 2.63 |
| Poland | 59.33 | 9.03 | 6.57 | 4.72 |
| Portugal | 23.41 | 7.65 | 3.06 | not available |
| Romania | 43.02 | 3.53 | 12.17 | 11.93 |
| Slovakia | 10.01 | 4.41 | 2.27 | 3.90 |
| Slovenia | 7.63 | 1.93 | 3.96 | 1.26 |
| Spain | 139.65 | 93.89 | 1.49 | 1.60 |
| Sweden | 36.64 | 28.72 | 1.28 | 1.45 |
| Switzerland | 74.40 | 59.09 | 1.26 | 1.24 |
| United Kingdom | 150.23 | 179.25 | 0.84 | 0.68 |
| Total | 1,545.86 | 931.41 | 1.66 | 1.34 |

Interestingly, Austria and the UK have shifted their spendings even more towards rail development. For the UK, this is remarkable, as the country was long well-known for the poor condition of its railway tracks, a consequence of their liberalisation process.

Finally, the data analysis finds Germany as a long-term advocate of roads/motorways: The country is among those with the highest motorway density (see figure 1.1), it spends roughly double the amount of their budget on roads as compared to railways, and the recent years do not indicate significant change.

The following figure 2.2 serves as a visualised summary of table 2.1. The 28 countries with railways are divided into four categories of investment spendings in the period from 1995 to 2021. The first category includes countries that spent three times more for rail than for road. The second category comprises countries that spent more for rail. The third category includes those countries which spent more for road than for rail. It also includes a subcategory for countries which started shifting budget towards rail, as they spent more for rail than for road in the recent years 2018-2021. The fourth category includes countries which spent at least three times more budget for the extension of roads than for extending railways between 1995 and 2021.
It turns out that no country prioritised rail three times over road. The bulk of countries belongs to the third category, which represents countries that spent up to 2.9 times more for road than for rail.


Figure 2-2 Comparison and categorisation of road and rail investment spendings in 28 European countries 1995-2021. Source: own analysis based on ITF-OECD 2023, see table 2.1

The following table 2.2 (next page) uses a different perspective on investment priorities by depicting per capita spendings. The two columns on the left-hand side use the same raw data as table 2.1, which is investments into new infrastructure. The two columns on the right-hand side provide an insight on maintenance spendings.

First, richer countries tend to spend more money per capita than their poorer counterparts in absolute terms, both for existing and new infrastructure. Second, the countries usually spend more money for new investments than for maintenance. Third, the spread between road and rail per-capita investments is high, indicating different priorities all over Europe. This can only partly be explained with different income levels.
Data is not available for a number of countries. However, some interesting cases can be depicted:
■ Only Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Luxembourg and the United Kingdom spend more per capita on railways than on roads. France almost equally invests in rail and road.

■ Luxembourg and the United Kingdom spend more than the double on rail maintenance than on road maintenance. This may be due to a backlog, but could also point to a shift of priorities. The latter interpretation is more likely given the overall political commitments and recent investment priorities.
■ In the three years from 2018 to 2020, Bulgaria and Norway were spending much of their budget for road extensions. For Bulgaria, this appears to be catching up with investments as compared to Western Europe, i.e., favouring roads. In Norway, this can be attributed to the Sotrasambandet project (a new road in Norway's Vestland county), which started in 2018 and involves tunnels, bridges and viaducts.

Table 2-2 Rail infrastructure investments of European countries.
Source: ITF-OECD 2023, own analysis. 2018 data is used, because it is available for most countries

|  | Road: per capita new investments 2018 [ $€$ ] | Rail: per capita new investments 2018 [ $€$ ] | Road: per capita maintenance 2018 [ध] | Rail: per capita maintenance 2018 [€] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Austria | 52.4 | 190.3 | 82.1 | 63.3 |
| Belgium | 59.6 | 81.0 | 18.9 | 28.0 |
| Bulgaria | 125.6 | 13.7 | 36.5 | 5.1 |
| Croatia | 69.8 | 24.4 | 47.3 | 23.6 |
| Czechia | 98.3 | 69.7 | 82.0 | 63.1 |
| Cyprus | not available | not applicable | not available | not applicable |
| Denmark | 187.1 | 233.3 | 198.7 | not available |
| Estonia | 165.7 | 20.0 | 29.5 | not available |
| Finland | 276.7 | 89.0 | 98.4 | 40.1 |
| France | 147.2 | 153.1 | 35.3 | 51.4 |
| Germany | 190.7 | 91.5 | not available | not available |
| Greece | 201.1 | 14.1 | not available | not available |
| Hungary | 182.1 | 82.2 | 38.8 | 65.1 |
| Ireland | 142.4 | 9.0 | 18.1 | 44.1 |
| Italy | 108.5 | 47.3 | 121.7 | 69.3 |
| Latvia | 114.9 | 10.8 | 104.8 | 58.1 |
| Lithuania | 116.0 | 23.2 | 51.4 | 55.7 |
| Luxembourg | 310.2 | 434.1 | 110.1 | 260.4 |
| Malta | not available | not applicable | not available | not applicable |
| Netherlands | not available | not available | not available | not available |
| Norway | 764.5 | 247.9 | not available | 133.8 |
| Poland | 70.3 | 12.2 | 12.2 | 18.9 |
| Portugal | not available | 12.8 | not available | not available |
| Romania | 112.0 | 9.4 | not available | not available |
| Slovakia | 141.2 | 51.3 | 54.3 | 2.8 |
| Slovenia | 159.1 | 73.8 | 55.5 | 59.3 |
| Spain | 75.2 | 46.3 | not available | not available |
| Sweden | 245.4 | 140.0 | 101.5 | 70.1 |
| Switzerland | 448.3 | 361.5 | 304.6 | 64.1 |
| United Kingdom | 130.5 | 203.8 | 35.1 | 102.9 |
| Total | 145.2 | 100.6 | (not applied) | (not applied) |

## Priorities in the near future

After many decades of predominantly funding road transport, priorities seem to start shifting away from motorways. However, there is still leeway for investments into the road. For instance, Switzerland opened the Ceneri base tunnel in 2020, thereby accomplishing the first stage of the new rail link through the Alps. This new rail link was supposed to shift not only goods, but also passengers towards this mode (Ehrbar 2021). The promised capacities could be made available, but the Swiss government expects additional demand for freight transport - and plans to respond with additional capacities for both railways and motorways. ${ }^{8}$ There is debate about significant future increase from two to three lanes.

In the following, we provide an example for a country that still puts much emphasis on motorway extensions, namely Germany, and an example for a country that has completely shifted its focus towards sustainable modes, namely Wales. In both cases, we provide some background on the infrastructure plans for the upcoming years.

The German government decided in its coalition agreement to start a dialogue about priorities for the expansion of federal infrastructure. The public expected this to happen for projects which are planned by 2030 under the current Federal Transport Infrastructure Plan. The current plan still prioritises motorway expansion, which includes high risks of very high investment cost (Gehrs \& Donat 2023). However, the government aims at informing the preparation of the new infrastructure plan for the decade after 2030. A number of motorway extension projects of the current plan shall even be accelerated. ${ }^{9}$
In contrast to these practices, the National Transport Delivery Plan of the Welsh Government explicitly reduces and re-prioritises investment on new road schemes. Amongst others, it includes a vision to achieve "an accessible, sustainable and efficient transport system", and it introduces a sustainable transport hierarchy, which prioritises walking and cycling, followed by public transport. The list of programmes, projects and interventions consequently includes a long number of projects and initiatives for public transport, active travel, electric vehicle charging support of multiand intermodal travelling and behavioural change. Only some road schemes are under construction and will be completed (Welsh Government 2022).

[^3]
## 3 Comparison of transport supply and demand

Railway construction in Europe started in the $19^{\text {th }}$ century. In Western Europe, peak lengths were realised during the first half of the $20^{\text {th }}$ century. After World War II, plans to increase efficiency led to closures (e.g., "Beeching cuts" in Great Britain). In Central and Eastern Europe, such closures started after the fall of the Iron Curtain.

After World War II, road transport infrastructure was extended all over the continent. Motorisation and demand for individual motorised transport increased.

## Development of transport infrastructure in Europe

Figure 3.1 describes the development of motorway and railway network lengths since 1995 in kilometres; and the development of distances covered on roads and railways in billion passenger kilometres. Data for regional roads' lengths (federal, state and urban roads) is not available (solid black line). Therefore, we compare motorways (and not all roads higher than the local level) to railways.


Figure 3-1 Comparison of road and rail demand and supply in Europe 1995-2020.
Left axis: Demand for road and rail transport [bn pkm], dashed lines
Right axis: Lengths of motorways and railways, solid lines
Green: rail; black: road
Sources: Pkm road and rail, motorways km: European Commission (2022). Railways km: International Union of Railways and national/other statistics (see annex, chapter 7.3).

The two black lines in figure 3.1, which designate the development of road supply and demand, are trending upwards. That is, the length of motorways grows between 1995 and 2020. The distances covered grow as well, but there is a drop between 2019 and 2020 (COVID-19 pandemic). The country data that deliver these European-wide
results are provided in the annex (chapter 7.3). The overall development of motorways (from 1995 to 2020) in the European countries can be summarised as follows:

■ The length of motorways in the 30 analysed European countries grew from $51,494 \mathrm{~km}$ to $82,493 \mathrm{~km}$ (by $60 \%$ ).
■ Growth of the motorways' lengths was highest in Ireland ( $1,321 \%)^{10}$, Romania ( $714 \%$ ) and Poland ( $596 \%$ ).
■ It was lowest in Lithuania (2 \%), Latvia (3 \%) and Belgium (6 \%).
■ In 15 countries (one half), the motorway lengths more than doubled. These countries are Bulgaria, Croatia, Czechia, Estonia, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Portugal, Norway, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, and Spain.
The distances covered on roads in the 30 European countries can be summarised as follows:

■ Overall demand as expressed in road pkm increased by $29 \%$ between 1995 and 2019.

■ In every single of the 30 analysed countries, demand increased in this period.
■ In every single country, demand decreased between 2019 and 2020. This is a COVID-19 ramification; in 2020 the distances covered fell by $17 \%$ on average, as compared to 2019.
■ Only in six out of 30 countries, demand for road transport in 2020 was below 1995 levels, despite the massive restrictions during the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020. These countries are Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Netherlands, and the United Kingdom.

Unsurprisingly, as these European countries spent billions into the extension of roads (as investigated in chapter 2), motorway networks extended.
Historically, it could be proven, that the provision of road infrastructure to cater for expected growth leads to higher levels of service and consequently longer trip distances. As car owners travel longer distances under these new and more car-oriented circumstances, they are also expected to travel more in the future which leads to the provision of more infrastructure. These consequences are well-known as a circle of self-fulfilling prophecies (SRU 2005, Martens 2006, Rodrigue 2020). The recent decades in Europe confirm these findings, as illustrated in figure 3.1: If supply grows, so does demand.
Statistically, the relationship between the evolution of transport supply and demand is less obvious, yet it exists. Calculations based on the available data, which test the causal dependency of the evolution of motorway lengths (railway lengths) and the actual demand for passenger transport by car (by train) on national territory, point to a high to very high positive association for most European countries. That is, the statistical perspective supports the historic perspective in most countries. ${ }^{11}$

[^4]As a long-term investment, the creation of motorways implies lock-in effects with all its negative consequences. Science has pointed out for a long time now that "radical interventions will be necessary in order to escape carbon lock-in in the transport system" (Driscoll 2014, see also IPCC 2022). As long as planners treat different transport modes as fungible goods, then "it is likely that the existing path dependencies will reinforce and reproduce a high-carbon transport system" (ibid.).
In other words: Any scenario in which humankind achieves substantial greenhouse gas emission reductions includes a significant shift from road to rail (e.g., Barisa \& Rosa 2018, Lefèvre et al. 2020, Kany 2022).

Both the historic and statistical perspectives about transport supply of and demand for railways are less obvious: Whereas the overall network length in Europe has slightly but continuously decreased, the demand for transport by train has slightly but continuously increased (see figure 3.1). However. in a statistical analysis for each of the 30 countries, we found a moderate to high positive correlation between rail kilometres and demand for rail transport in most cases (see annex, chapter 7.2).

Chapter 4 will provide more detail to the development of rail infrastructure in European countries. In the following, we provide some more detail of development of demand for high-speed rail and travelling by air.

## The evolution of high-speed rail

In the recent decades, many European countries have developed high-speed rail (HSR) train sections (see figure 3.2). Spain and France currently have invested most, but the network is increasing all over Europe. Our research about newly opened railway lines confirms that HSR extension was a priority amongst newly built railways in Europe.

Evidence suggests that HSR has some positive results on tourism; and knowledgebased industries are more likely to cluster near stations (Chen \& Vickerman 2017). However, Vickerman (2018) argues that dramatically enhancing the accessibility between cities cannot help with convergence (similar economic structure) in Europe per se, but HSR can complement other cohesion policies relating to labour markets and skill development.

In terms of modal shifts, results are partly counterintuitive. For instance, in the case of Italy a reduction of air passengers was measured in the period of HSR openings between certain cities, suggesting an intended shift from airplanes to trains (Eurostat 2023b). However, an analysis of panel data from Italy could not find evidence of a modal shift from motorway to HSR services. The authors highlight that general conclusions for effects of HSR programmes cannot be drawn and suggest further research (Borsati \& Albalate 2020).

Figure 3.2 compares transport supply of and demand for high-speed rail. The pattern filled columns show the development of built HSR sections in $1,000 \mathrm{~km}$ in the

[^5]respective countries from 1995 to 2020. The green line represents the distances covered with HSR trains on these sections in billion passenger kilometres. The growth of supply and demand go hand in hand. Apparently, the major share of railway demand growth in Europe between 1995 and 2019 can be attributed to HSR (104 billion passenger kilometres out of 161 billion pkm, $64 \%$ ).


Abb. 3-2
Comparison of HSR lengths (pattern filled columns) and demand for HSR (green line, bn pkm) in Europe. Source: European Commission (2022). *2019 value to avoid COVID-19 bias

## Newly built airports

Roads and railways are landbound infrastructure and therefore travelling by car and train incur substantial investments and maintenance as compared to travelling by plane. However, airports do need significant infrastructure as well, both for the airplanes themselves and for approaching roads and rails.
According to the ITF database, European countries have spent $€ 5.4$ billion per year on average since 1995 for airport infrastructure investments (ITF-OECD 2023). ${ }^{12}$ Moreover, new railways have been built in the recent decades to connect airports with city centres, e.g., between Bucharest city centre and Bucharest airport.
Below is a list of new airports and airport runways which have been built since 1995. (order descending by number of passengers in 2019). ${ }^{13}$ Further capacity extensions were realised through new terminals and longer runways.

■ Amsterdam Schiphol, new runway 2003
■ Frankfurt, new runway 2011
■ Madrid Barajas Airport, new runway 1998 and further two runways 2006
■ Barcelona El Prat Josep Tarradellas, new runway 2002

- Rome Fiumicino, new runway 1999

■ Dublin, new runway 2022
■ Stockholm Arlanda, new runway 2003
■ Athens Eleftherios Venizelos, 2001

- Helsinki Vantaa, new runway 2002

■ Malaga, 2010
■ Warsaw Modlin, 2012
■ Memmingen Allgäu (Germany), 2004

- Doncaster Sheffield (United Kingdom), 2005

■ Karlsruhe/Baden-Baden (Germany), 1997
■ Weeze (Germany), 2003
■ Murcia Corvera (Spain), 2019
■ Cornwall Newquay (United Kingdom), 2008
■ Bydgoszcz (Poland), 2004

- Comiso (Italy), 2007
- Patrai Araxos (Greece), 2007

According to the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), the number of passengers carried in the European Union rose from 193.5 million in 1995 to 803.7 million in 2019 (via Worldbank 2023). Thus, aviation probably experienced the sharpest relative increase of passenger kilometres travelled of all modes in Europe. Aviation has also been one of the fastest growing sources of greenhouse gas emissions in the EU in this period.
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## 4 Development of railway networks

In this report it has already been noted that extension of transport infrastructure induces additional demand for transport, that extension of motorways leads to lock-in effects regarding carbon-intensive mobility, and that decarbonisation of transport has to rely on a shift to rail. European countries do acknowledge these facts in their decarbonisation strategies. ${ }^{14}$
However, in the past decades, many railway lines have been closed all over the continent. This section will provide the facts about the extent of closed lines in EU-27, United Kingdom, Switzerland and Norway since 1995. The intention is to provide a further perspective for eventual national discussions about the future priorities of transport infrastructure development.

These discussions should also take into account the social perspective of transport infrastructure, i.e., a dense rail network ensures mobility for various population groups.

## Transport poverty

Simcock et al. (2021) define transport poverty as the "inability to attain a socially and materially necessitated level of transport services." This definition is based on extensive literature research. More precisely, the authors elaborate on

■ the inability to meet essential travel costs (affordability),

- difficulties in moving around due to a systemic lack of sufficient transport (mobility), and
■ the difficulty reaching key activities, such as employment or education, at reasonable time, ease and cost (accessibility).

Why are railway networks relevant to reduce transport poverty?
When it comes to affordability and mobility, low-income households are less likely to own a car and therefore rely on public transport. This in turn causes accessibility problems in areas poorly served by public transport (Mattioli 2014). Older people experience decreased mobility, as active travel such as walking and cycling is a less feasible option. Moreover, many older people cease their licence in order to avoid unsafe driving. Therefore, they tend to rely on public transport (Lucas 2012).

There is a growing body of evidence that transport infrastructure in Europe has become car-centric to the extent that even in areas which are well served with public transport (cities), car dependence plays a role (see Mattioli 2021). In other words: If households do not have access to a car, then accessibility poverty may become relevant. E.g., households with children have to afford additional expenditure on transport services because of increased trip numbers for day care and other purposes. In such cases, public transport needs to have a high quality and be affordable to avoid forced car ownership (McLaren 2016).

[^7]In principle, accessibility shortfalls can be addressed through a variety of interventions at the demand side of mobility and transport, through smart land-use patterns and also by supplying public transport infrastructure. But it can be argued that public transport infrastructure is particularly relevant to reduce accessibility shortfalls. Many interventions are tailor-made for certain target groups such as commuters or business travellers, but they fail to serve multiple population groups, and they do not account for space and time as a whole (Martens 2017). Mees (2010) describes that access destinations increase exponentially with an increase in the number of connecting links of a network. The more nodes are connected, the more destinations can be reached by persons with access to the system. This network effect should always be accounted for to serve multiple population groups (Martens 2017).

## Overview of railway network development

The following sections describe the development of railway infrastructure in Europe during the recent decades. As described in the methodology, data collection started with the year 1995, because development in previous years turned out to be sparsely documented.

The research revealed an overall decrease (see figure 4.1). The sum of all networks in 28 European countries with railways amounted to $241,470 \mathrm{~km}$ in 1995 (see annex, chapter 7.3 for sources). Networks decreased until 2005, reaching a first low point at $227,365 \mathrm{~km}$. Since 2005, the sum of all national networks remained relatively stable, however reaching the low point in 2019 with an overall length of $225,661 \mathrm{~km}$ (see annex, chapter 7.3 for sources).


Figure 4-1 Development of the European railway network (EU-27, CH, NO, UK). Source: own compilation of sources, see chapters 7.3 and 7.4

Ten countries report a net increase of their railway networks' lengths since 1995, according to the last available official data (see annex, chapter 7.3). These are Belgium, Croatia, Estonia, Finland, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Slovenia, Spain and Switzerland. The bulk of the reduction took place in Germany (by $6,706 \mathrm{~km}$ ), Poland (by $4,660 \mathrm{~km}$ ) and France (by $4,125 \mathrm{~km}$ ). These three countries also still represent the longest total network lengths, followed by the UK and Spain.

It is important to note that these numbers represent the overall network development and do not distinguish between lines open for passenger and those open for freight transport only. For instance, the UK continually reduced routes open for freight traffic only. While the overall network size decreased, the size of routes open for passenger traffic could still be increased. ${ }^{15}$ In addition, quite some reduction can probably be attributed to streamlining the network without necessarily reducing connections and stations. As operators work on increasing allowed speeds on their network, the tracks' routing needs to be adjusted.
As described earlier, new lines can in many cases be attributed to HSR, whereas the closure of lines usually involved single-track, narrow gauge and/or branch lines. For instance, according to our research, Spain cut approximately 950 km of branch lines between 1995 and 2020. In the same time, it opened 2,900 km of additional HSR network.

## Temporal suspension of operation, closed and abandoned lines

The research revealed that at least $13,717 \mathrm{~km}$ of regional lines have been temporarily or permanently closed since 1995. Apparently, the exceptions are Luxemburg, Norway, Slovenia and the United Kingdom. In these countries no lines were closed.

Only in a few cases we could find official data about closed stations. In other cases, we could not find any source at all (see annex for details). Similarly, it is unclear to what extent stations have been opened. Only for the UK we have received a confirmed number of newly opened stations (116 new stations between 1997 and 2023).

As is depicted in table 4.1, a total of 2,582 stations have been (temporarily or permanently) closed during that time span. This number partly relies on estimates: In the cases of Bulgaria, Germany, Poland, Romania, and Spain no sources were found providing numbers. ${ }^{16}$
The table also depicts the potential to re-open lines which are currently closed. Here we can distinguish between lines/segments which are currently officially open, but no operation takes place and those lines/segments which are officially closed, but the tracks are in a legal and technical condition which allows a re-opening. In the latter case (re-opening of officially closed lines), it can still be argued that potential investments equal investments for new lines. However, this is out of the scope of this research. Instead, we relied on the sources describing the lines' conditions. In sum, a total of $7,263 \mathrm{~km}$ could be opened (in this incomplete estimate).

[^8]Tab. 4-1 Overview of closed regional railway lines in EU-27, CH, UK and NO since 1995. Sources: own research based on sources as documented in chapter 7.4.
*assumption: $\mathbf{1 0} \mathbf{~ k m}$ section = $\mathbf{1}$ station; **assumption: $\mathbf{5 0} \%$ of overall network decrease

|  | No. of lines | Length of lines <br> [km] | No. of closed stations | Potential length of re-usage [km] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Europe | >242 | 13,717 | 2,582 | 7,263 |
| Austria | 31 | 655 | 230 | 376 |
| Belgium | 17 | 188 | 62 | 47 |
| Bulgaria | 13 | 348 | 35* | 0 |
| Croatia | 5 | 118 | 28 | 118 |
| Czechia | 33 | 329 | 104 | 263 |
| Cyprus | no railways |  |  |  |
| Denmark | 1 | 23 | 1 | 0 |
| Estonia | 5 | 367 | 43 | 267 |
| Finland | 2 | 271 | 70 | 271 |
| France | 7 | 339 | 74 | 39 |
| Germany | unknown | 2,700 | 270* | 1,093 |
| Greece | 4 | 389 | 97 | 389 |
| Hungary | 28 | 919 | 259 | 919 |
| Ireland | 1 | 50 | 4 | 0 |
| Italy | 40 | 1,831 | 384 | 1,711 |
| Latvia | 6 | 499 | 81 | 269 |
| Lithuania | 5 | 298 | 14 | 158 |
| Luxembourg | 0 | 0 | 0 | not applicable |
| Malta | no railways |  |  |  |
| Netherlands | 3 | 34 | 17 | 25 |
| Norway | 0 | 0 | 9 | not applicable |
| Poland | unknown | 2,330** | 233* | unknown |
| Portugal | 8 | 460 | 101 | 379 |
| Romania | unknown | 300 | 30* | 100 |
| Slovakia | 2 | 37 | 222 | 0 |
| Slovenia | 0 | 0 | 0 | not applicable |
| Spain | 22 | 949 | 95* | 604 |
| Sweden | 4 | 234 | 35 | 197 |
| Switzerland | 5 | 38 | 13 | 38 |
| United Kingdom | 0 | 0 | 71 | not applicable |

Table 4.1 does not depict the length of opened lines. According to the research, lines and sections with a length of at least $13,902 \mathrm{~km}$ were opened in the 30 European countries in the same time span. ${ }^{17}$

The subsequent sections provide a more detailed picture of the development of regional passenger railways in selected countries, namely Austria, Czechia, Greece, Hungary, Latvia and Spain. ${ }^{18}$ The full list of abandoned railway lines and stations is added to the annex (chapter 7.4).
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## Austria

Austria is among the countries with the highest per capita budget for both new railway investments and railway maintenance (see table 2.2). The national rail company ÖBB claims Austrian trains to be among the most punctual in Europe. ${ }^{19}$ However, since 1995, 29 lines have been put out of service, totalling a length of 665 km (see annex, chapter 7.4). In this process, 230 stations have been closed. One example is the famous Ybbstalbahn.


Figure 4-2 Ybbstalbahn in Hollenstein - December 2006. Picture: Siegfried Nykodem
The Ybbstalbahn is a narrow-gauge railway in Lower Austria. ÖBB operations ended on December 11, 2010. The main route follows the valley of the Ybbs from Waidhofen to Lunz am See. From there, the railroad follows a mountain route to Kienberg-Gaming. There is also a branch line from Gstadt to Ybbsitz. The original route has a length of 50 km with 25 stations along the way, but tracks are partly dismantled. The Ybbstalbahn is famous, because it is used as a museum train on parts of the original route. Two local associations operate the so-called "Ötscherland-Express" on weekends between July and September, also undertaking track maintenance works.

## Czechia

In 1993, a programme to modernise four rail transit corridors was launched. This programme has not yet been completed, but most sections have already been upgraded to speeds of up to $160 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$.
In the early 2000s, some passenger services on lines with weak demand were discontinued. For example, the line between Kralovice and Mladotice stations was closed on January 1, 1997 due to the state of emergency of the tracks. The entire Rakovník Kralovice - Mladotice line lies near the border of the Central Bohemia and Pilsen regions, which complicates the resumption of traffic. Both regions consider this line as peripheral. Although a citizens' petition was filed, repairing the line would be very

[^10]expensive after many years of disrepair. In addition, the area is sparsely populated. This is also the reason why there are no longer regular passenger trains from the district town of Rakovník to the town of Kralovice. However, some seasonal tourist trains run on this section, so a re-opening is not completely out of the realm of possibilities.

The photo shows the Trojany stop between Kralovice and Mladotice stations. The picture was taken on April 12, 2007, i.e., 10 years after the line was closed. Today, nature has reclaimed the area - the building is completely overgrown with trees.


Figure 4-3 Abandoned railway station "Trojany" in Czechia, 12 April 2007. Picture: Marek Binko

## Greece

For many years, large parts of the Greek railway systems were not operational. Only in recent years, some unused sections in East Macedonia/Thraces were re-opened. On February 28, 2023, a head-on collision of two trains happened near Larissa in central Greece with dozens killed and injured. The crash put a spotlight on the poor condition of the railway infrastructure and chronically underfunded rails.
Once this accident happened, Hellenic Train, the Greek train operator, paused all operations, both for passenger and for freight transport. The operations are re-starting gradually. For some sections it may be decided to close them longer term or permanently. Hopes in Greece are that the incident will lead to a swift upgrade of the sector. The research in this report has taken into account active and inactive sections as depicted by a map from the Website Hellenic Railways Organisation in February 2023, i.e., before the train crash. ${ }^{20}$ In this map, the Peloponnese railway network remained largely unused, and some further sections.

There are also a number of ongoing projects to modernise the network, such as the high-speed rail between Tithorea and Domokos.
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## Hungary

Railway density is very high in Hungary. Since 2006, some upgrades of the network are in progress, co-funded by the EU. However, on 7 December 2006, as part of a broader economic restriction package, the Hungarian government announced its intention to stop operation on 14 regional lines with a total length of 474 km . With a change in the timetable on 13 December 2009, the national railway MÁV suspended passenger services on further 24 railway lines and sections with a total length of around 800 kilometres. However, in 2010, the then new government announced that they would undo a plethora of transportation decisions made by the former government. In this context, ten rural railway lines, which previously had been closed due to low revenues, were reopened.

The railway lines are not formally ceased and tracks not dismantled, but the service suspended indefinitely. However, the infrastructure is in bad condition, and scrap metal theft diminishes the probability of future reopenings.

## Latvia

Changes of the railway systems in all three Baltic states have the same goals. First, they need to be integrated with the network of European rails. All three states operate on $1,520 \mathrm{~mm}$ wide gauge, which was developed in Russian Empire times. Second, the network of train transport developed in the Soviet times included stops in small towns, located to functional infrastructure, valid to that specific period. When migration took place from the land to urbanised areas, many stations were abandoned. Large parts of the existing lines are now mainly used for cargo transportation.


Figure 4-4 Rail Baltica project. Source: RB Rail AS
The biggest network extension is "Rail Baltica", which is expected to provide a fast rail connection between the Baltic capitals every two hours, cutting the time en route by three. Up to four trains a day are supposed to run from Tallinn via Riga to Vilnius, with additional trains between Vilnius and Warsaw running ten times a day. Two night-trains are expected on the route Tallinn-Riga-Kaunas-Warsaw-Berlin and Vil-nius-Kaunas-Warsaw-Berlin. Travellers shall be able to reach Riga International

Airport from the Riga Central Station in around 10 minutes, and the minimum train frequency shall be 30 minutes.

## Spain

In the recent decades, Spain has invested heavily into motorways, high-speed rail and airports, and its transport infrastructure has therefore become a "paradigmatic case of oversupply and of mismatch with demand" (Albalate et al. 2015). The country ranks first in Europe in high motorway density as expressed in km per inhabitant, and sixth as expressed in km per $1,000 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ (Rodriguez-Pose et al. 2018 with data from 2011, see also figure 1.1). It has the longest network of HSR among European countries (see figure 3.2).

Moreover, many newly built airports in Spain are known as "cathedrals in the desert", because they account for less than 50,000 passengers per year (Rodriguez-Pose et al. 2018). Examples for such questionable investments are the airports of Castel-lón-Costa Azahar (inaugurated 2014), Lleida-Alguaire (inaugurated 2010), Ciudad Real (inaugurated 2008), and Huesca-Pirineos (inaugurated 2007).
Another example of inefficient investments in Spain is the airport "Base Aérea de San Javier", a military field which was used for civil aviation between 1995 and 2018. It received a passenger terminal with a capacity of 1.5 million passengers per year. With the opening of the new international airport Aeropuerto Internacional de la Región de Murcia, 30 km to the west, in January 2019, the airport was closed to civil aviation. Another airport nearby is the Aeropuerto de Alicante, which is located 80 km to the north.

In the very proximity of this military airport, two local train lines existed but were closed: The connection Torre Pacheco to Los Alcazares was closed in 1970, the connection Albatera to Torrevieja was closed in 1986, both are dismantled.
In conclusion, many regional train lines were closed during the recent decades, that is, in a period of large-scale investments into motorways, airports and HSR: According to private research of Pablo Marinas, since 1995 approximately 950 km of railway tracks were closed ${ }^{21}$ (see also annex, chapter 7.4).

## 5 Conclusions

This report analyses data from 30 countries (EU-27, Norway, Switzerland and the UK) in the period between 1995 and 2020. With respect to the three research questions from the introduction, we can summarise the following.
1| Which are the transport infrastructure investment priorities in Europe?
The priorities in the recent decades have been road over rail: Between 1995 and 2018, EU-27, Norway, Switzerland and the UK spent $66 \%$ more of their budgets to extend roads than to extend railways. While some parts of the EU funds focus on sustainable transport and mobility, the relevance of these funds is minor given the national priorities. However, data indicates that in the recent years 2018-2021, the gap decreased to some extent: The analysed countries spent $34 \%$ more on extending roads than on extending railways. Austria, Belgium and the United Kingdom invested more in rail than road since 1995. Denmark, France, Italy and Luxembourg started to invest more in rail than road in the period 2018-2021. All other countries still focus on the road.

At this point it has to be highlighted that this (potential) shift of priorities appears to be slow, given the saturation of transport infrastructure in many countries, the climate emergency, and financial disparities of the European countries' inhabitants. The three big and therefore important countries Germany, Poland and Spain have not yet turned the wheel.
$2 \mid$ How has transport infrastructure developed over the last decades and to what extent interrelates this supply of infrastructure (in length) with actual demand for the respective modes?

Between 1995 and 2020, the length of motorways in the 30 analysed European countries grew from $51,494 \mathrm{~km}$ to $82,493 \mathrm{~km}$, which equals a growth of $60 \%$. Half of the countries have at least doubled their motorways' lengths.

We counted a total length of closed regional rail sections of $13,717 \mathrm{~km}$ since 1995. In the same period, lines or sections of lines on which trains can go faster than 250 $\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{h}$ at some point during the journey (high-speed rail) have increased from 2,605 km to $11,639 \mathrm{~km}$.

In addition, eight airports have added at least one new runway and further twelve airports were converted from pure military to an international civil airport.
Road transport, high-speed rail and air transport have experienced high growth in terms of passenger kilometres travelled in the recent decades. There is a historical and statistical relationship between this transport demand and supply.
$3 \mid$ How has railway infrastructure developed in Europe over the recent decades?
Long-distance, high-speed railway has been extended in twelve European countries, whereas regional passenger trains have been thinned out. A total length of $13,717 \mathrm{~km}$ of train sections has been closed temporarily or permanently. The biggest absolute losses took place in Germany, Poland, and Italy, but also smaller countries such as Austria, the Baltic states and Portugal had substantial closings.

As a consequence of closed railway lines, the research estimates a total loss of 2,582 stations and stops in the 30 countries (of which 28 countries have railways). This number is likely higher, because of unknown cases of closed stations along open railway lines, especially in the three Baltic states and Poland.

In the three countries Greece, Hungary and Portugal, long sections of regional railways are temporarily not operated. The longer they remain unused, the more probable it is that they will not be re-opened. According to the research, 7,263 km of closed passenger lines could be re-opened relatively easily in Europe. On a positive note, it seems that the reduction of lines has halted, and some selected lines have re-started service.

## Policy recommendations

European nations have a commitment to reduce energy and transport poverty, and they are committed to the Paris Agreement. Therefore, from a social and environmental perspective, the funding priorities for transport infrastructure need to shift accordingly.

Many countries have realised the assets they have at their disposal for their population, namely local and regional railways. This year, Germany has introduced a ticket that allows unlimited travelling in local and regional trains nationwide at a monthly price of $€ 49 .{ }^{22}$ All the other countries in North-West Europe start shifting priorities and expand their train networks.
While these (investment) policies are laudable achievements, they should mainly be regarded as starting points for more investments into an infrastructure that already exists, i.e., infrastructure for regional trains. The $€ 49$ ticket in Germany had its origin in 2022, when it was sold for $€ 9$ in period of three months. 52 million tickets were sold, leading to capacity limits of the network and the rolling stock.

Spain, France, Germany, Italy, and other countries also invest into HSR which can be an alternative to private cars and airplanes on long distances. It only makes sense to increase accessibility by train for large parts of the population by re-investing into regional train networks and connecting these regional with long-distance trains.
More precisely, countries could do the following:

## 1) Cut budgets ring-fenced to extend motorways

Motorway extensions are a pure political decision. If budgets are allocated, they will be spent for the given purpose. Decision-making tools such as cost-benefit analysis or strategic environmental assessment are downstream stages that will not change a political decision that was made in the first place. Countries should consider moratoria to stop long-term carbon lock-in.
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## 2) Elaborate taxation schemes earmarked to re-open regional railway lines

Transport poverty is determined by insufficient levels of mobility, affordability and accessibility. Regional train networks provide mobility, can be kept affordable for everybody, and guarantee accessibility in those (remote) areas they serve. In this regard, society has to find ways to pay for their re-opening.
Some transport taxation schemes assume the principles of "users pay" or "polluters pay". In addition, society as a whole should fight transport poverty. Some scientists suggest that everyone is entitled to a minimum level of transportation service (van der Veen et al. 2020). If decision makers agree with this suggestion, then appropriate taxation should be developed to accommodate for the cost. That is, an additional principle could be that "society pays to fight transport poverty".

## 3) Complement these budget shifts with other policies which aim at modal shifts

Finally, such new budgetary priorities should be complemented with policies that internalise external costs of transport and phase out environmentally harmful subsidies, to make rail transport more affordable compared to road and aviation. This will lead to higher demand for rail, and more revenues that can be used for maintenance works and comfort improvement. This can in consequence again lead to more demand for railways and more revenues.
Other regulatory and informative policies are helpful and necessary as well. For instance, current planning cycles and public decision-making processes can significantly delay re-openings of regional trains.
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## 7 <br> Annex

### 7.1 Details on national data about funding of infrastructure

The ITF Transport Statistics database (https://doi.org/10.1787/trsprt-data-en) comprises statistics collected by the International Transport Forum on transport networks, equipment, freight and passenger transport, road safety and spending on infrastructure. Additionally, there are quarterly data covering road traffic, new vehicles, and fuel use. Most of the ITF data series start in 1995.

The dataset on transport infrastructure investment and maintenance spending is used in chapter 2 and comprises data collected on an annual basis from the International Transport Forum (ITF) member countries. Data are collected from Transport Ministries, statistical offices and other institutions designated as an official data source.

The original data is collected in national currency, current values. Data are converted and published in Euros, current prices. Data should include both government and private investment, unless otherwise specified in the country-level metadata (see below).

Investment expenditure on both road and railways infrastructure include capital expenditure on new infrastructure or extension of existing roads/railways, including reconstruction, renewal (major substitution work) and upgrades (major modification work). Infrastructure includes land, permanent way constructions, buildings, bridges and tunnels, as well as immovable fixtures, fittings and installations connected with them, as opposed to road vehicles/rolling stock.
Maintenance expenditure includes non-capital expenditure to maintain the condition and capacity of the existing road/railway infrastructure. For road, this includes surface maintenance, patching and running repairs (work relating to roughness of carriageway's wearing course, roadsides, etc.).



## Austria

Source: Ministry of Transport and Infrastructure.
Rail infrastructure expenses do not include investment in Brenner Basistunnel (BBT), which started in 2004. Road infrastructure expenses do not include investment in urban and provincial roads. Since 2002, road infrastructure expenses only include investment in motorways (in 2002 at the exception of motorways, the whole federal road network was assigned to the Austrian provinces).

## Belgium

Rail infrastructure expenses refer to investment carried out by Infrabel (the Belgian infrastructure manager), including the estimated investments through PPP-constructions. Rail infrastructure expenses also include investment in maritime ports. Between 2013 and 2014, the reorganisation of the Belgian railways has influenced the perimeter of Infrabel, changing the scope of the managed investments, that creates a break in the series.

## Bulgaria

Source: Rail: National Railway Infrastructure Company. Road: Road Infrastructure Agency.

In 2010, rail infrastructure expenses include 13 million BGN Levs for supervision and technical assistance for preparation of projects. Road infrastructure expenses do not include investment in urban roads nor municipal roads. Road infrastructure expenses do not include road projects realised under the Phare Programme.

## Croatia

Data do not include private investment. Road infrastructure expenses do not include investment in urban roads.

## Czech Republic

Road infrastructure expenses include investment in motorways and roads of class I, II and III. Road infrastructure expenses do not include investment in urban roads.

Denmark

## Source: Denmark Statistics

Rail infrastructure expenses include investment in the Great Belt Bridge, the Øresund Bridge and the metro of Copenhagen. Since 2011, the increase in rail infrastructure expenses is due to the extension of the metro of Copenhagen. Road infrastructure expenses include investment in urban roads.

## Estonia

Source: Rail: Estonian Railway Ltd., Ott Koppel and since 2021 Rail Baltic investments (State Budget Unit of Estonian Ministry of Economic Affairs and Communications). Roads: State Budget Unit of Estonian Ministry of Economic Affairs and Communications.

Road infrastructure expenses include investment in some urban roads. Since 2005, road infrastructure expenses increased due to the construction of state roads in
accordance with the TEN-T requirements. Until 2011, road infrastructure expenses include government investment in state roads and EU structural funds. Since 2012, data include government investment in state roads and local roads, as well as structural funds and local co-financing for local roads.

Finland

## Source: Finnish Road Administration.

Data refer to investment carried out by State and municipalities assuming that investment carried out by municipalities is made on roads. Data include investment in urban and suburban railways. Data include investment in urban roads, but not in private roads.

## France

Data include investment in the main rail network, the rail network in the Île de France region, RATP network, the Grand Paris project, urban and provincial public transport, subways and tramways. Data do not include investment in the French part of the Eurotunnel. Data include investment in the entire French road network, including urban roads.

## Germany

Source: German Institute for Economic Research and German Aerospace Center.
Data include investment in stations. Between 2005 and 2012, data refer only to investment in Deutsche Bahn AG. Data include investment in urban roads.

Greece

## Source: EL.STAT.

Data include investment in rolling stocks. Data include investment in urban roads.

## Hungary

Data refer only to investment carried out by the State. Data include investment in urban roads.

Ireland
Data include investment in computer equipment, plant and machinery, property, safety buildings, signal equipment, signalling renewals, structures and track in the financial year.

Italy
Since 2002, data do not include investment in urban roads.
Latvia
Data include investment in suburban railways. Until 2002, data include only investment in state roads. Since 2003, data include investment in state roads, local roads and urban streets.

Lithuania
Data include investment in state and local roads carried out by the State. Data do not include investment in urban roads.

Luxembourg
(no information on sources and data provided)
Malta
Source: National Statics Office with figures derived from the Ministry for Transport and Infrastructure, the Ministry for Local Councils and Transport Malta.

Data include investment in urban roads.
Netherlands
(no information on sources and data provided)

## Norway

Data include investment in urban roads.
Poland
Data include investment in urban roads, except from 1996 to 1999 when they include only investment in national roads.

## Portugal

Source: Until 2008, Estradas de Portugal (EP); in 2009 and 2010, Instituto de Infraestrutural Rodoviárias (inIR); in 2012 and 2013, Instituto de Mobilidade et dos Transportes.
Between 2000 and 2008, data refer to the value of the annual investment in longterm infrastructure under the management of REFER. Data do not include investment in municipal and urban roads. Data include ongoing investment. Since 2009, data include investment in the entire national road network (common roads and highways).

Romania
Source: National Institute for Statistics.
Data do not include investment in urban roads.

## Slovak Republic

Data include the total gross investment in intermodal infrastructure administrated by Railways of the Slovak Republic (ZSR). Since 2009, data do not include the total gross investment in intermodal infrastructure administrated by the private sector. Data include investment in state and regional road segments, which may lead through urban areas. Data do not include investment in local roads.

Slovenia
Data include investment in state roads (main and regional), but do not include investment in urban roads. Data include investment in research and development.
Spain
Since 2006, data include investment carried out by Sociedad Estatal de Infraestructuras del Transporte Terrestre.

## Sweden

Source: National Accounts.
Data include investment in trams and metro. Until 2003, data do not include reinvestment (e.g. major renovations and reconstructions). Data include investment in urban roads and only investment carried out by the public sector.

## Switzerland

Data include investment in urban roads.

## United Kingdom

Data refer to investment in Great Britain. Data include investment in all urban and suburban railways, underground, Metrolink and Tramlink. Data do not include investment in rolling stocks. Until 2006, data include investment in the UK part of Eurotunnel. Until 2014, data include the Government grant to Network Rail (manager of the railway track). Since 2015, data include investment carried out by Network Rail. Data include investment in urban roads carried out by local authorities. Data include investment in motorways carried out by the private sector (DBFO schemes). Data refer to fiscal years ending on 31 March.

### 7.2 Statistical relationship between transport supply and demand

Kendall's Tau rank correlation is a widely used non-parametric i.e., distribution independent correlation coefficient that is robust against the influence of outliers. The value range of Kendall's Tau spans from -1 to 1 . A correlation coefficient of 1 means that there is a perfect positive linear relationship between the tested variables. Correspondingly, -1 is a perfect negative linear relationship between the tested variables. If the correlation coefficient is 0 , no linear relationship between the variables exists. As a rule of thumb, correlation coefficients between 0.5-0.7 can be interpreted as moderate, positive correlations; 0.7-0.9 as high positive correlations and above 0.9 as very high correlations. The same interpretation applies for negative correlations.
Statistical significance is tested by calculation of the $p$ value. The smaller the $p$ value is, the more significant are the results, i.e., the probability that the results occurred randomly are minimal. The threshold value for significance is usually assumed to be a $p$ value of 0.05 .
On the following two pages, the association is tested between the variables:
■ billion passenger km travelled on national roads by car (on railways), and
■ the variables: km lengths of motorways (railways)
per country (EU-27, Norway, Switzerland, UK) between 1995 and 2020. Kendall's Tau rank correlation is applied. The null hypothesis is that there is no association between these two variables.

The table below shows for road transport that for most countries, the null hypothesis can be rejected, meaning that there is a high to very high positive correlation between road kilometres [km] and demand for road transport [pkm]. Additionally, moderate correlations are found for Czechia, Switzerland, Latvia, France, United Kingdom and Spain. Negligible correlations are found for Sweden, Ireland, Italy and the Netherlands. A moderate negative correlation is found in Lithuania.

Kendall's Tau rank correlation for road kilometres [km] and demand for road transport [pkm] 1995-2020.

| Country | tau |
| :--- | :--- |
| Austria | $0.78^{* * *}$ |
| Belgium | $0.74^{* * *}$ |
| Bulgaria | $0.93^{* * *}$ |
| Croatia | $0.79^{* * *}$ |
| Czechia | $0.64^{* * *}$ |
| Denmark | $0.85^{* * *}$ |
| Estonia | $0.91^{* * *}$ |
| Finland | $0.83^{* * *}$ |
| France | $0.55^{* * *}$ |
| Germany | $0.73^{* * *}$ |
| Greece | $0.87^{* * *}$ |
| Hungary | $0.84^{* * *}$ |
| Ireland | 0.26 |
| Italy | 0.15 |
| Latvia | $0.57^{* * *}$ |
| Lithuania | $-0.51^{* * *}$ |
| Luxembourg | $0.86^{* * *}$ |
| Netherlands | 0.10 |
| Norway | $0.92^{* * *}$ |
| Poland | $0.93^{* * *}$ |
| Portugal | $0.76^{* * *}$ |
| Romania | $0.92^{* * *}$ |
| Slovak Republic | $0.88^{* * *}$ |
| Slovenia | $0.72^{* * *}$ |
| Spain | $0.32^{* *}$ |
| Sweden | 0.27 |
| Switzerland | $0.62^{* * *}$ |
| United Kingdom | $0.54^{* * *}$ |
| Signicance | ${ }^{*}$ |

Significance levels: * $\mathrm{P} \leq 0.05$, ${ }^{* *} \mathrm{P} \leq 0.01,{ }^{* * *} \mathrm{P} \leq 0.001$

The table below shows for railways that for most countries, the null hypothesis can be rejected, meaning that there is a moderate to high positive correlation between rail kilometres [km] and demand for rail transport [pkm]. Negligible correlations are found for Slovakia, Croatia, Portugal, Sweden and France. Czechia, Denmark, Austria and the United Kingdom show moderate correlations, Germany displays a high negative correlation. Further research is necessary to understand the causes of these differences.

Kendall's Tau rank correlation for rail kilometres [km] and demand for rail transport [pkm] 1995-2020.

| Country | tau |
| :--- | :--- |
| Austria | $-0.56^{* * *}$ |
| Belgium | $0.74^{* * *}$ |
| Bulgaria | $0.71^{* * *}$ |
| Croatia | 0.19 |
| Czechia | $-0.50^{* * *}$ |
| Denmark | $-0.52^{* * *}$ |
| Estonia | $0.32^{*}$ |
| Finland | $0.54^{* * *}$ |
| France | -0.24 |
| Germany | $-0.82^{* * *}$ |
| Greece | $0.38^{* *}$ |
| Hungary | $0.34^{*}$ |
| Ireland | -0.27 |
| Italy | $0.38^{* *}$ |
| Latvia | $0.59^{* * *}$ |
| Lithuania | $0.56^{* * *}$ |
| Luxembourg | $0.35^{*}$ |
| Netherlands | $0.63^{* * *}$ |
| Norway | $0.59^{* * *}$ |
| Poland | $0.61^{* * *}$ |
| Portugal | 0.18 |
| Romania | $0.76^{* * *}$ |
| Slovak Republic | 0.25 |
| Slovenia | $0.57^{* * *}$ |
| Spain | $0.73^{* * *}$ |
| Sweden | -0.11 |
| Switzerland | $0.67^{* * *}$ |
| United Kingdom | $-0.56^{* * *}$ |
| Sirana | 850.05 |

Significance levels: *P $\leq 0.05$, ** $\mathrm{P} \leq 0.01$, ${ }^{* * *} \mathrm{P} \leq 0.001$

### 7.3 Data on transport supply and demand

## Road passenger kilometres



## Hithumbullumumbly

## Rail passenger kilometres



## Length of motorways [km]
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## Length of railway network [km]





























## Length of railway network [km]: statistics used

AUS, BEL, BGR, CZE, ESP, EST, FIN, FRA, GRC, HUN, LTU, LUX, LVA, NLD, NOR, PRT, ROU
Worldbank database: https://data.worldbank.org/indica-
tor/IS.RRS.TOTL.KM?end=2021\&start=2019
Denmark
Statistics Denmark: https://www.statbank.dk/BANE41
Croatia
Croatian Railway Network Operator: https://eng.hzinfra.hr/?page id=418
Germany
German Institute for Economic Research and German Aerospace Center:
https://bmdv.bund.de/SharedDocs/DE/Publikationen/G/verkehr-in-zahlen-2022-2023-xls.html

Ireland
EC Statistical pocketbook 2022: https://transport.ec.europa.eu/media-corner/publi-cations/statistical-pocketbook-2022 en
Italy
Italian railway infrastructure manager: https://www.rfi.it/it/rete/la-rete-oggi.html Poland

Statistics Poland: https://stat.gov.pl/en/topics/statistical-yearbooks/statistical-year-books/statistical-yearbook-of-the-republic-of-poland-2022,2,24.html
Slovakia
Slovakian Infrastructure Manager: https://www.zsr.sk/o-nas/vyrocne-spravy/
Slovenia
Republic of Slovenia Statistical Office: https://pxweb.stat.si/SiStat-Data/pxweb/en/Data/-/2221601S.px/

## Sweden

Transport Analysis Sweden: https://www.trafa.se/bantrafik/bantrafik/
Switzerland
Swiss Open Data Portal: https://opendata.swiss/de/dataset/streckennetz-nachverkehrstragern6
United Kingdom
Office of Rail and Road: https://dataportal.orr.gov.uk/statistics/infrastructure-and-emissions/rail-infrastructure-and-assets/

### 7.4 Abandoned railways

## Austria

## Train lines

| Line | Year of closure | Length of line [km] | No. of closed stations | Potential to re-use | if potential to re-use, then length [km] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total |  | 665.1 | 230 |  | 376.4 |
| Mürzzuschlag-Neuberg | 1996 | 12.1 | 1 | no, dismantled |  |
| Obersdorf - Groß Schweinbarth / Bad Pirawarth | 2019 | 35.0 | 12 | unclear |  |
| Emmersdorf-Sankt Nikola (Donauuferbahn) | 2009 | 26.0 | 8 | partly dismantled |  |
| Gleichenberger Bahn (Gleichenberg Feldbach) | 2020 | 21.0 | 10 | touristic use | 21.0 |
| Weissenbach-Hainfeld (Leobersdorferbahn) | 2004 | 24.0 | 5 | dismantled |  |
| Freiland-Türnitz | 2001 | 9.0 | 4 | dismantled |  |
| Freiland-Sankt Ägyd | 2010 | 17.0 | 8 | cargo | 17.0 |
| Scheibbs-Kienberg (Erlauftal) | 2010 | 11.0 | 5 | touristic use | 11.0 |
| Deutschkreutz-Horitschon | 2013 | 6.0 | 3 |  | 6.0 |
| Leoben-Vordernberg | 2001 | 18.0 | 10 | partly dismantled, partly cargo |  |
| Hieflau-Eisenerz | 1999 | 14.5 | 5 | cargo | 14.5 |
| Zeltweg-Wolfsberg (Lavanttalbahn) | 2010, 2017 | 50.0 | 11 | cargo | 50.0 |
| Görtschitztalbahn (HochosterwitzHüttenberg) | 1995 | 29.5 | 9 | partly cargo, partly dismantled |  |
| Rosentalbahn (Weizelsdorf-Rosenbach) | 2016 | 18.0 | 7 | cargo, museum railway | 18.0 |
| Lavamünd-Sankt Paul | 1997 | 10.0 | 2 | dismantled |  |
| Aschacher Bahn (Haiding-Aschach) | 2019 | 20.5 | 7 | cargo | 20.5 |
| Gailtalbahn (Hermagor-KötschachMauthen) | 2016 | 31.0 | 11 | cargo | 31.0 |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline[18] \\ \text { Jauntalbahn (Sankt Paul - Bleiburg) } \end{array}$ | 2022 | 19.0 | 4 | replaced by Koralmtunnel. NOTE: one new station insted of 4 will be built |  |
| [18] Retz-Drosendorf | 2001 | 40.0 | 11 | partly museum train, partly cargo, | 40.0 |
| Zwettl-Schwarzenau | 2010 | 21.5 | 7 | cargo | 21.5 |
| Drösing-Zistersdorf | 2011 | 11.4 | 3 | cargo | 11.4 |
| Pinkatalbahn (Friedberg-Oberwart) | 2011 | 25.5 | 7 | not used anymore | 25.5 |
| Thayatalbahn (Schwarzenau-Waidhofen/Thaya) | 2010 | 12.0 | 4 | some touristic use | 12.0 |
| Ybbstalbahn | 2010 | 50.0 | 25 | partly museum train, partly not usable |  |
| Waldviertelbahn Gmünd-Groß Gerungs | 1996 | 43.0 | 17 | museum train | 43.0 |
| Lambach-Haag | 2009 | 22.0 | 12 | dismantled |  |
| Leoben-St. Michael (alte Trasse) | 1998 | 7.0 | 1 | cargo to Göss, beyond disma | tled |
| Wittmannsdorf-Wöllersdorf | 1997 | 9.1 | 2 | cargo from Steinabrückl, res | dismantled |
| Krems-Emmersdorf | 2010 | 34.0 | 12 | touristic use | 34.0 |
| Krumpe Mank-Obergrafendorf | 2010 | 18.0 | 7 | partly touristic |  |

## Sources (all websites were accessed 28 February 2023)

1. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lokalbahn M\%C3\%BCrzzuschlag\%E2\%80\%93Neuberg
2. https://www.meinbezirk.at/gaenserndorf/c-lokales/regionalbahn-wird-durch-busersetzt a3285078
3. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Donauuferbahn (Wachau)\#Stilllegung des \%C3\%B6stlichen Abschnitts
4. https://steiermark.orf.at/stories/3072778/
5. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Leobersdorfer Bahn\#:~:text=Der\%20G\%C3\%BCter-verkehr\%20wurde\%20vor\%20allem,den\%20Gerichtsberg\%20g\%C3\%A4nzlich\%20eingestellt\%20wurde.
6. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bahnstrecke Freiland\%E2\%80\%93T\%C3\%BCrnitz\#:~:text=Am\%203.,Trasse\%20wurde\%20ein\%20Rad weg\%20angelegt.
7. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bahnstrecke Traisen\%E2\%80\%93Kernhof\#:~:text=Seit\%20dem\%201.,(RCA)\%20zur\%20Verf\%C3\%BCgung\%20stellen.
8. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bahnstrecke P\%C3\%B6chlarn\%E2\%80\%93KienbergGaming
9. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Burgenlandbahn (\%C3\%96ster-reich)\#:~:text=Seit\%20der\%20Terminier-
ung\%20der\%20Strecke,ein\%20Zug\%20nach\%20Bratislava\%2DPetr\%C5\%BEalka.
10. https://www.kleinezeitung.at/steiermark/leoben/4246082/Bahnlinie-soll-nun-verkauft-werden
11. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Erzbergbahn
12. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lavanttalbahn\#Zeltweg \%E2\%80\%93 Wolfsberg
13. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/G\�\�rtschitztalbahn
14. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rosentalbahn
15. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lavam\�\�nder Bahn\#:~:text=Die\%20La-vam\%C3\%BCnder\%20Bahn\%20(LBB)\%20verkehrte,die\%20Drautalbahn\%20Klagenfurt\%2DMaribor\%20anschloss.
16. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Aschacher Bahn
17. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gailtalbahn
18. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jauntalbahn
19. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bahnstrecke Schwarzenau\%E2\%80\%93MartinsbergGutenbrunn
20. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lokalbahn Dr\%C3\%B6sing\%E2\%80\%93Zistersdorf
21. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pinkatalbahn
22. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Thayatalbahn
23. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ybbstalbahn
24. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bahnstrecke Lambach\%E2\%80\%93Haag am Hausruck
25. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Waldviertler Schmalspurbahnen
26. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Galgenbergtunnel
27. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gutensteinerbahn
28. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Donauuferbahn (Wachau)\#Stilllegung des \%C3\%B6stlichen Abschnitts
29. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lokalbahn Ober-Grafendorf\%E2\%80\%93Gresten

## Belgium

## Train lines

| Line | Year of closure | Length of line [km] | No. of closed stations | Potential to re-use | if potential to re-use, then length [km] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total |  | 187.6 | 62 |  | 46.5 |
| Railway line 15: Eksel - Neerpelt | 1996 | 16.0 | 5 | yes | 16.0 |
| Railway line 21B: Waterschei - Eisden-Mijnen | 1996 | 5.8 | 2 | touristic use by 2023 | 5.8 |
| Railway line 22: Tienen - Grimde | 1999 | 32.1 | 9 | dismantled |  |
| Railway line 28A: Brussel-Thurn en Taxis | 2000 | 1.4 | 1 | dismantled |  |
| Railway line 31: Ans - Roucourt | $\begin{array}{r} 1996 \& \\ 2005 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 6.4 | 4 | dismantled |  |
| Railway line 45: Trois-Ponts and Weismes | 2007 | 22.1 | 5 | dismantled |  |
| Railway line 45A: Jünkerath - Büllingen | 1998 | 14.9 | 5 | dismantled |  |
| Railway line 48: Sourbrodt - Waimes | 2007 | 12.5 | 5 | touristic use | 12.5 |
| Railway line 55: Langerbrugge - Ertvelde | 2004 | 7.7 | 4 | possible | 7.7 |
| Railway line 63: Kortemark - Westrozebeke | 2003 | 10.2 | 3 | dismantled |  |
| Railway line 77: Moerbeke-Waas - Y Rostijne | 2008 | 4.8 | 1 | dismantled |  |
| Railway line 85: Ruien - Leupegem | 2000 | 11.5 | 4 | dismantled |  |
| Railway line 86: Frasnes lez Anvaing - Leuze | 2006 | 7.6 | 2 | dismantled |  |
| Railway line 109: Cuesmes - Harmignies | 2005 | 7.2 | 3 | dismantled |  |
| Railway line 138: Châtelet - Disteel | 2019 | 4.5 | 3 | possible | 4.5 |
| Railway line 141: Genepiën - Court-SaintÉtienne | 2004 | 19.8 | 5 | dismantled |  |
| Railway line 156: Boussu-en-Fagnes - Mariembourg | 1999 | 3.1 | 1 | dismantled |  |

## Source (website was accessed 28 February 2023)

https://nl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lijst van opgeheven spoorlijnen in Belgi\%C3\%AB

## Bulgaria

## Train lines

13 train lines were closed in the years 2001-2003: Pazardzhik - Varvara, Saedinenie Panagyurishte, Sarafovo - Pomorie, Gorna Oryahovitsa - Elena, Khan Krum - Preslav, Yunak - Staro Oryahovo, Kurtovo Konare - Peshtera, Oresh - Belene, Yambol-Elhovo. The total length of these lines is approximately 348 km . The number of closed stations is unknown.
Source (website was accessed 24 February 2023)
https://www.nzherald.co.nz/travel/struggle-to-save-bulgarias-narrow-gauge-rail-way-baltic-roller-coaster/TPBF2UW7HNBFKQCCDDBQADUFRQ/

## Croatia

## Train lines

$\left.\left.\begin{array}{|l|r|r|l|l|}\hline \text { Line } & \begin{array}{r}\text { Length of } \\ \text { line [km] }\end{array} & \begin{array}{r}\text { No. of closed } \\ \text { stations }\end{array} & \text { Potential to re-use }\end{array} \begin{array}{r}\text { if potential to re-use, } \\ \text { then length [km] }\end{array} \right\rvert\, \begin{array}{lrl|l|}\hline \text { Caglin - Nasice } & & 5 & \text { operation suspended }\end{array}\right]$

Source (website was accessed 24 February 2023)

## https://eng.hzinfra.hr/?page id=418

## Czechia

## Train lines

| zrušené (canceled) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| úsek | stanice a zastávky | datum zrušení | délka <br> [km] | poznámka |
| section | railway stations and stops | cancellation date | length [km] | note |
| Frýdlant v Čechách - Heřmanice | Frýdlant v Čechách zastávka <br> Kunratice u Frýdlantu Dětřichov u Frýdlantu Heřmanice zastávka Heřmanice | 1996 | 10 | provoz zastaven již 13.1.1976 operation stopped already on 13.1.1976 |
| Cheb - Slapany | Slapany | 2003 | 6 | provoz zastaven již 1969 operation stopped already in 1969 |
| odbočka Dolní Rybník - Otvice | Otvice | 01.06.00 | 1 |  |
| Nezamyslice - Morkovice | Těšice <br> Tištín <br> Kovalovice-Osíčany <br> Prasklice <br> Uhřice u Kroměříže <br> Morkovice | 11.12.05 | 12 |  |
| Chrast u Chrudimi město Chrást u Chrudimi | Chrast u Chrudimi město | 11.12.05 | 2 |  |
| Praha Masarykovo nádraží Hrabovka - Praha hlavní nádraží |  | 11.12.05 | 1 | nahrazeno novostavbou replaced by a new line, not counted |
| Březno u Chomutova Chomutov | výhybna Spořice | 01.04.07 | 5 | nahrazeno novostavbou replaced by a new line, not counted |
| výhybna Spořice - odbočka Dubina |  | 01.04.07 | 2 | nahrazeno novostavbou replaced by a new line, not counted |
| odbočka Rokytka - Praha hlavní nádraží | výhybna Vítkov | 01.09.08 | 4 | nahrazeno novostavbou replaced by a new line, not counted |


| Hostašovice - Nový Jičín horní nádraží | Mořkov <br> Hodslavice <br> Bludovice <br> Nový Jičín horní nádraží | 22.04.10 | 10 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Uhřice u Kyjova - Ždánice | Želetice Dražůvky Ždánice | 01.06.10 | 9 |  |
| Kyjov - Mutěnice | Svatobořice Dubňany | 31.01.12 | 16 |  |
| Chrást u Plzně - PlzeňDoubravka |  | 15.11.18 | 9 | nahrazeno novostavbou replaced by a new line, not counted |
| odbočka Záběhlice - Praha-Vršovice | Praha-Strašnice zastávka | 13.12.20 | 4 | nahrazeno novostavbou replaced by a new line, not counted |
| Sudomě̌̌ice u Tábora - Votice |  | 03.04.22 | 20 | nahrazeno novostavbou replaced by a new line, not counted |
| Soběslav - Doubí u Tábora | Roudná | 11.09.22 | 9 | nahrazeno novostavbou replaced by a new line, not counted |
|  | 23 | celkem total | 66 |  |
| bez provozu (without operation) |  |  |  |  |
| úsek | stanice a zastávky | datum zastavení provozu | délka [km] | poznámka |
| section | railway stations and stops | date of cessation of operations | length [km] | note |
| Kralovice - Mladotice | Trojany | 01.01.97 | 12 |  |
| Horní Slavkov-Kounice - Loket předměstí | Horní Slavkov Horní Slavkov zastávka Údolí | 31.05.97 | 8 |  |
| Hněvčeves - Smiřice | Hořiněves <br> Račice nad Trotinou Račice nad Trotinou nákladiště <br> Sendražice Smiřice zastávka | 12.12.04 | 11 |  |
| Broumov - Otovice zastávka | Otovice Otovice zastávka | 10.12.05 | 5 |  |
| Čejč - Uhřice u Kyjova | Terezín u Čejče Krumvír Klobouky u Brna Dambořice Uhřice u Kyjova | 31.03.07 | 16 |  |
| odbočka Bažantnice - odbočka Vrbka |  | 13.12.08 | 1 |  |
| Královec - Žacléř | Lampertice Žacléř | 08.03.09 | 5 |  |
| Hrušovany nad Jevišovkou-Šanov - Hevlín | Hrabětice Hevlín | 01.07.10 | 7 |  |


| odbočka Kamensko - Dolní Bousov | Ledkov <br> Libáň <br> Dětenice <br> Osenice <br> Rokytňany <br> Rabakov <br> Domousnice <br> Řitonice | 15.11.10 | 23 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Heřmanův Městec - Chrudim město | Klešice Rozhovice Bylany | 11.12.10 | 13 |  |
| Velká Kraš - Vidnava | Velká Kraš zastávka Vidnava | 11.12.10 | 4 |  |
| Droužkovice - odbočka Dubina |  | 08.12.12 | 6 |  |
| Chotimě̌̌ - Radejčín | Dobkovičky | 07.06.13 | 5 |  |
| Dobronín - Polná | Dobronín zastávka Polná | 14.12.13 | 6 |  |
| Tršnice - Františkovy Lázně |  | 13.12.14 | 4 |  |
| Varnsdorf pivovar Kocour státní hranice |  | 13.03.15 | 1 |  |
| Praha-Malešice - Praha-Žižkov | Praha-Žižkov | 31.12.15 | 4 |  |
| Ivančice - Oslavany | Oslavany | 01.05.16 | 4 |  |
| Velké Opatovice - Jevičko |  | 06.12.20 | 5 |  |
| Vraňany - Lužec nad Vltavou | Lužec nad Vltavou | 10.12.21 | 3 |  |
| Straškov - Zlonice | Loucká <br> Černuc <br> Kmetiněves <br> Tmáň <br> Zlonice zastávka | 11.12.21 | 18 |  |
| Bošice - Bečváry | Toušice Zásmuky | 12.12.21 | 11 |  |
| Krupá - Kolešovice | Lišany u Rakovníka Olešná u Rakovníka Chráštany zastávka Kněževes Přílepy Kolešovice | 27.08.22 | 12 |  |
| Jindřichův Hradec - Obrataň | Horní Skrýchov <br> Dolní Radouň <br> Lovětín <br> Lovětín obec <br> Nekrasín <br> Nová Včelnice <br> Žd'ár u Kamenice nad <br> Lipou <br> Rodinov <br> Kamenice nad Lipou <br> Včelnička <br> Bohdalín <br> Benešov nad Lipou <br> Chválkov <br> Dobešov <br> Černovice u Tábora <br> Křeč <br> Sudkův Důl <br> Obrataň zastávka | 02.10.22 | 46 |  |


| Jindřichův Hradec - Nová By- <br> střice | Jindřiš <br> Jindřiš zastávka <br> Blažejov <br> Malý Ratmírov <br> Střízvice <br> Kunžak-Lomy <br> Kaproun <br> Senotín <br> Hůrky <br> Albeř <br> Nová Bystřice | 02.10 .22 | 33 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $\mathbf{8 1}$ | celkem <br> total | $\mathbf{2 6 3}$ |  |

Sources (all websites were accessed 4 March 2023)

1. https://cs.wikipedia.org/wiki/\�\�elezni\�\�n\�\� tra\%C5\%A5 Bakov nad Jizerou \%E2\%80\%93 Kopidlno
2. https://cs.wikipedia.org/wiki/\�\�elezni\�\�n\�\� tra\%C5\%A5 Brunt\%C3\%A1l \%E2\% 80\%93 Mal\%C3\%A1 Mor\%C3\%A1vka
3. https://cs.wikipedia.org/wiki/\�\�elezni\�\�n\�\� tra\%C5\%A5 D\%C4\%9B\%C4\%8D\% C3\%ADn \%E2\%80\%93 Old\%C5\%99ichov u Duchcova
4. https://cs.wikipedia.org/wiki/\�\�elezni\�\�n\�\� tra\%C5\%A5 Fr\%C3\%BDdlant v \% C4\%8Cech\%C3\%A1ch \%E2\%80\%93 He\%C5\%99manice
5. https://cs.wikipe-
dia.org/wiki/\�\�elezni\�\�n\�\� tra\%C5\%A5 Hosta\%C5\%A10vice \%E2\%80\%93 Nov\%C3\%BD Ji\%C4\%8D\%C3\%ADn horn\%C3\%AD n\%C3\%A1dr a\%C5\%BE\%C3\%AD
6. https://cs.wikipedia.org/wiki/\�\�elezni\�\�n\�\� tra\%C5\%A5 Hroch\%C5\%AFv T\%C 3\%BDnec \%E2\%80\%93 Chrast u Chrudimi
7. https://cs.wikipe-
dia.org/wiki/\�\�elezni\�\�n\�\� tra\%C5\%A5 Hru\%C5\%A1ovany na d Jevi\%C5\%A1ovkou-\%C5\%Aoanov \%E2\%80\%93 Hevl\%C3\%ADn
8. https://cs.wikipedia.org/wiki/\�\�elezni\�\�n\�\� tra\%C5\%A5 Chrudim $\mathrm{m} \% \mathrm{C} 4 \%$ 9Bsto $\% \mathrm{E} 2 \% 80 \% 93 \mathrm{He} \% \mathrm{C} 5 \% 99 \mathrm{man} \% \mathrm{C} 5 \% \mathrm{AFv}$ M\%C4\%9Bstec
9. https://cs.wikipedia.org/wiki/\�\�elezni\�\�n\�\� tra\%C5\%A5 Kada\%C5\%88 \%E2\% 80\%93 Vil\%C3\%A9mov u Kadan\%C4\%9B \%E2\%80\%93 Ka\%C5\%A1tice / Kada\%C5\%88sk\%C3\%BD Rohozec \%E2\%80\%93 Doupov
10. https://cs.wikipedia.org/wiki/\�\�elezni\�\�n\�\� tra\%C5\%A5 Krup\%C3\%A1\%E2\%80 \%93Kole\%C5\%A1ovice
11. https://cs.wikipedia.org/wiki/\�\�elezni\�\�n\�\� tra\%C5\%A5 Kyjov\%E2\%80\%93Mut\%C4\%9Bnice
12. https://cs.wikipe-
dia.org/wiki/\�\�elezni\�\�n\�\� tra\%C5\%A5 Mezim\%C4\%9Bst\%C3 \%AD \%E2\%80\%93 Otovice zast\%C3\%A1vka \%E2\%80\%93 \%C5\%9Acinawka \%C5\%9Arednia
13. https://cs.wikipedia.org/wiki/\�\�elezni\�\�n\�\� tra\%C5\%A5 Nezamyslice\%E2\%80\%93Morkovice
14. https://cs.wikipedia.org/wiki/\�\�elezni\�\�n\�\� tra\%C5\%A5 Opava v\%C3\%BDcho d \%E2\%80\%93 Svobodn\%C3\%A9 He\%C5\%99manice \%E2\%80\%93 Horn\%C3\%AD Bene\%C5\%A1ov
15. https://cs.wikipedia.org/wiki/\�\�elezni\�\�n\�\� tra\%C5\%A5 Pe\%C4\%8Dky \%E2\% 80\%93 Bo\%C5\%A1ice \%E2\%80\%93 Be\%C4\%8Dv\%C3\%A1ry/Kou\%C5\%99im
16. https://cs.wikipedia.org/wiki/\�\�elezni\�\�n\�\� tra\%C5\%A5 Praha \%E2\%80\%93 \%C4\%8Cesk\%C3\%A9 Bud\%C4\%9Bjovice
17. https://cs.wikipedia.org/wiki/\�\�elezni\�\�n\�\� tra\%C5\%A5 Rakovn\%C3\%ADk\%E2\%80\%93Mladotice
18. https://cs.wikipedia.org/wiki/\�\�elezni\�\�n\�\� tra\%C5\%A5 Trutnov \%E2\%80\%93 Kr\%C3\%A1lovec \%E2\%80\%93 Lubawka/\%C5\%BDacl\%C3\%A9\% C5\%99
19. https://cs.wikipe-
dia.org/wiki/\�\�elezni\�\�n\�\� tra\%C5\%A5 Velk\%C3\%A1 Kra\%C5 \%A1 \%E2\%80\%93 Vidnava \%E2\%80\%93 Nysa
20. https://cs.wikipedia.org/wiki/\�\�elezni\�\�n\�\� tra\%C5\%A5 Vra\%C5\%88any \%E2 \%80\%93 Lu\%C5\%BEec nad Vltavou
21. https://www.atlasdrah.net/
22. https://www.railtrains.sk/modules/AMS/article.php?storyid=415
23. https://www.spravazeleznic.cz/documents/50004227/142933391/cj163019 Prohl\%C3\%A1\%C5\%A1en\%C3\%AD+2023 Ca R 6+zm\%C4\%9Bna web.pdf/1c9c67e7-cc7e-46de-bfdb-90ab96f2d3ce
24. https://www.zelpage.cz/trate/ceska-republika
25. https://zdopravy.cz/prehledne-ministerstvo-zverejnilo-kolik-stoji-nevyuzivane-trate120057/
26. Správa železnic, Nákresné jízdní řády Railway Administration: Train Graphs

Údaje o vlečkách viz (Informations about railway sidings see)
27. https://ducr.cz/images/drurad/dokumenty/metodicke pokyny/Seznam provozovanych vlecek 12 2022.pdf
28. https://ducr.cz/images/drurad/dokumenty/metodicke pokyny/Seznam zrusenych vlecek 12 2022.pdf

## Denmark

The "Gedserbanen" operated until 2010. It was a connection between Nykøbing F and Gedser and had a length of 22.9 km . Train stations en route had already been closed in the 1970s, so only Gedser station itself was closed after 1995.

We also found but did not take into account a section from Vojens to Haderslev By, which had a length of 12 km . Passenger service on this track terminated in 1977, freight traffic operated until 2001.

Sources (both websites were accessed 8 June 2023)

1. https://da.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sydbanen
2. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bahnstrecke Vojens\%E2\%80\%93Haderslev

## Estonia

## Train lines

The Estonian railway operator AS Eesti Raudtee pointed out that in addition to the list of closed railways as shown below, small intermediate railway stations have been liquidated along operational lines. The number of stations remained undisclosed, but an example is Lehtse station. After its closing, the previous two station intervals Ae-gviidu-Lehtse and Lehtse-Tapa became one station interval Aegviidu-Tapa.

| Line | Year of closure | Length of line [km] | No. of closed stations | Potential to re-use | if potential to re-use, then length [km] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total |  | 366.9 | 43 |  | 266.5 |
| Riispere-Haapsalu | 2004 | 52.8 | 2 | partly dismantled | 31.0 |
| Pärnu-Mõisaküla | 1996 (passenger), 2001 (freight) | 48.6 | 4 | dismantled in 2008 |  |
| Valga-Koidula | 2001 | 96.5 | 8 | yes, cargo-uage | 96.5 |
| Tallinn-Pärnu | 2018 | 139.0 | 24 | Planned to be re-activated via Rail Baltica project | 139.0 |
| Narva-Musta | 2001 | 30.0 | 5 | dismantled |  |

Sources (all websites were accessed 8 March 2023)

1. https://et.wikipedia.org/wiki/Keila\�\�\�Haapsalu raudteel\%C3\%B5ik; https://web.archive.org/web/20090907001602/http://jaam.ee/index.php?lk=32\&show=51
2. https://et.wikipedia.org/wiki/P\�\�rnu\�\�\�M\�\�isak\�\�la raudteel \%C3\%B5ik
3. https://et.wikipedia.org/wiki/Valga\�\�\�Koidula raudteel\%C3\%B5ik
4. https://et.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tallinna\�\�\�P\�\�rnu rongiliin
5. https://et.wikipedia.org/wiki/Narva\�\�\�Musta rongiliin

Finland
Train lines

| Line | Year of <br> closure | Length of <br> line $[\mathbf{k m}]$ | No. of closed <br> stations | Potential to re-use | if potential to <br> re-use, then <br> length [km] |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| Total |  | $\mathbf{2 7 1 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 0}$ |  | $\mathbf{2 7 1 . 0}$ |
| Kontiomäki-Taivalkoski | 2004 | 157.0 | 48 | possible | 157.0 |
| Misi - Kelloselkä | 2012 | 114.0 | 22 | possible, passenger service <br> terminated in 1967 | 114.0 |

Sources (the two websites were accessed 5 May 2023)

1. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bahnstrecke Kontiom\%C3\%A4ki\%E2\%80\%93Taivalkoski
2. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bahnstrecke Laurila\%E2\%80\%93Kandalakscha

## France

## Train lines

According to French Wikipedia, closures of passenger train lines in France mainly took place before the 1990s. Between 1990 and 2009, 735 km of passenger train lines were closed, and 784 km were re-opened. It remains unclear, which lines where closed or re-opened and when these lines were closed or re-opened in that time span. The following table therefore only lists train lines which were closed since 2010 and not opened since, as declared at French Wikipedia (source no.1).
$\left.\begin{array}{|l|r|r|r|r|r|}\hline \text { Line } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Year of } \\ \text { closure }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Length of line } \\ \text { [km] }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { No. of closed } \\ \text { stations }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Potential to } \\ \text { re-use }\end{array} \\ \hline \text { Total } & & \mathbf{3 3 9 . 0} & 74 & & \\ \hline \text { re-use, then } \\ \text { length [km] }\end{array}\right]$

Sources (the website was accessed 5 March 2023)

1. https://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fermetures de lignes ferroviaires en France
2. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bahnstrecke Cravant-Ba-zarnes\%E2\%80\%93Dracy-Saint-Loup
3. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bahnstrecke Haguenau\%E2\%80\%93FalckHargarten
4. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bahnstrecke Saint-Hilaire-au-Temple\%E2\%80\%93Hagondange
5. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bahnstrecke Le Palais\%E2\%80\%93Eygu-rande-Merlines
6. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bahnstrecke Trilport\%E2\%80\%93Bazoches
7. https://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ligne d\%27Andelot-en-Montagne $\% \mathrm{C}_{3} \%$ Ao La Cluse\#De SaintClaude \%C3\%Ao La Cluse (et \%C3\%Ao Bourg-en-Bresse)
8. https://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ligne de La Madeleine \%C3\%Ao CominesFrance

## Germany

## Train lines

The federal railway authority provides official lists about railway lines, which were closed between 1994 and 2018 and publicly owned. These lines represent a length of $5,148 \mathrm{~km}$ (see source 1 below). This number includes both passenger and freight transport. According to research of the German stakeholder organisation "Allianz pro Schiene", since 1994 a total number of $3,600 \mathrm{~km}$ of railway lines for passenger transport has been cancelled, of which 900 km were re-activated later (see source 2 below). On balance, $2,700 \mathrm{~km}$ of passenger railways have been cancelled since 1994.

Allianz pro Schiene also presented an expertise about which lines could be re-activated relatively easy. According to this expertise, these lines amount to a total length of $4,573 \mathrm{~km}$ for all lines closed since 1945. Out of these proposals for re-activation, $1,093 \mathrm{~km}$ of lines for passenger transport have been cancelled since 1995 (see source 3 below). The majority of these lines is situated in the Eastern part of the country (former GDR).
Sources (the two websites were accessed 15 February 2023)

1. https://www.eba.bund.de/DE/Themen/Stilllegung/ListenStatistiken/listenstatistiken node.html
2. https://www.allianz-pro-schiene.de/themen/infrastruktur/reaktivierungbahnstrecken/
3. https://www.allianz-pro-schiene.de/wp-content/uploads/2022/o9/Reaktiv-ierung-von-Eisenbahnstrecken 20223 Auflage.pdf

## Greece

## Train lines

The "Hellenic Railways Organization" provides on its network a general and detailed railway network map. It distinguishes between active, inactive and touristic lines. Abandoned railway lines, if existing, remain undisclosed. According to the map, a network length of 389 km is temporarily not operated. There are 97 stations along these lines.

Source (the website was accessed 8 February 2023)
https://ose.gr/en/railway-network/network-map/

Hungary

## Train lines

All of the below listed train lines have a potential to be re-opened. Track works will be necessary.

| Line | Year of closure | Total length [km] | No. of closed stations |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total |  | 919.1 | 259 |
| Környe - Papa | 2007 | 86.0 | 18 |
| Zalabér-Batyk-Zalaszentgrót | 2007 | 6.0 | 2 |
| Hajmáskér - Lepsény | 2007 | 31.0 | 8 |
| Sellye-Villany | 2007 | 58.0 | 26 |
| Diósjenő - Romhány | 2007 | 17.0 | 5 |
| Kisterenye - Kál-Kápolna | 2007 | 55.0 | 12 |
| Mezőcsát - Hejőkeresztúr | 2007 | 17.0 | 7 |
| Kazincbarcika - Rudabánya | 2007 | 15.0 | 5 |
| Nagykálló - Nyíradony | 2007 | 23.0 | 5 |
| Murony - Bekés | 2007 | 7.3 | 2 |
| Kunszentmiklós-Tass - Dunapataj | 2007 | 49.0 | 9 |
| Kecskemét - Fülöpszállás | 2007 | 39.0 | 12 |
| Kiskőrös - Kalocsa | 2007 | 31.0 | 6 |
| Körmend - Zalalövő | 2009 | 23.0 | 3 |
| Somogyszob-Balatonszentgyörgy | 2009 | 59.3 | 8 |
| Pusztaszabolcs-Dunaújváros-Paks | 2009 | 40.0 | 5 |
| Pécs-Bátaszék | 2009 | 64.0 | 16 |
| Galgamácsa - Vácrátot | 2009 | 0.0 | 1 |
| S. Szilvásvárad - Putnok | 2009 | 35.0 | 7 |
| Sáránd - Létávértes | 2009 | 20.0 | 4 |
| Ohat-Pusztakócs - Tiszalök | 2009 | 65.0 | 12 |
| Nyíregyháza - Balsa-Tiszapart | 2009 \& 2018 | 39.5 | 21 |
| Herminatanya - Dombrád | 2009 | 15.0 | 9 |
| Kisskánás - Kondoros | 2009 | 6.0 | 1 |
| Körösnagyharsány - Vészt | 2009 | 32.0 | 11 |
| Szolnok-Hódmezővásárhely-Makó | 2009 | 34.0 | 23 |
| Kecskemét KK - Kiskőrös KK | 2009 | 52.0 | 21 |

Sources (the two websites were accessed 15 February 2023)

1. https://hu.wikipedia.org/wiki/2007-es magyarorsz\%C3\%A1gi vas\%C3\%BAtbez\%C3\%A1r\%C3\%A1sok
2. https://hu.wikipedia.org/wiki/2009-es magyarorsz\%C3\%A1gi vas\%C3\%BAtbez\%C3\%A1r\%C3\%A1sok

## Ireland

## Train lines

The train line from Waterford to Rosslare Strand was closed in 2010 along with four stations on route. Its total length was approximately 50 km .

Source (the website was accessed 8 February 2023)
https://www.steamtrainsireland.com/museum-tickets/learning/irish-railway-his-tory\#:~:text=Irish\ Rail\ (Iarnr\�\�d\ \�\�ireann)\%2C,Ireland\ Railways\ operates\ another\ 357km

## Italy

## Train lines

| Line | Year of closure | Length of line [km] | No. of closed stations | Potential to re-use | if potential to re-use, then length [km] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total |  | 1,831 | 384 |  | 1,711 |
| Alcamo Diramazione - Trapani | 2013 | 47.118 | 8 | yes, closed due to landslides | 47.118 |
| Alcantara - Randazzo | 1995 | 37.04 | 9 | yes, but poor condition | 37.04 |
| Ancona - Ancona Marittima | 2015 | 1.72 | 1 | possible, maintenance necessary | 1.72 |
| Aosta - Prè S. Didier | 2015 | 31.369 | 11 | yes, good condition | 31.369 |
| Asti - Castagnole delle Lanze | 2012 | 20.128 | 5 | yes, good condition | 20.128 |
| Bastia Mondovì - Mondovì Cuneo | 1986-2012 | 42 | 10 | yes, but poor condition | 42 |
| Bosco Redole - Benevento | 2013 | 66.324 | 14 | yes, but poor condition | 66.324 |
| Bra - Cavallermaggiore | 2020 | 12.896 | 1 | yes, good condition | 12.896 |
| Brindisi - Brindisi Marittima | 2006 | 1.666 | 1 | dismantled |  |
| Caltagirone - Gela | 2011 | 45.113 | 7 | good condition, but a viaduct crashed | 45.113 |
| Cancello - Torre Annunziata Centrale | 2005 | 30.928 | 8 | yes, but poor condition | 30.928 |
| Cantalupo - Nizza Monferrato Alba | 2012 | 59.636 | 13 | yes, good condition, some touristic use | 59.636 |
| Castellammare di Stabia - Gragnano | 2010 | 4.749 | 2 | yes, good condition | 4.749 |
| Ceva - Ormea | 2012 | 35.432 | 8 | yes, good condition, some touristic use | 35.432 |
| Chivasso - Asti | 2011 | 51.316 | 16 | yes, good condition | 51.316 |
| Codola - Sarno | 2012 | 7.8 | 2 | yes, but poor condition | 7.8 |
| Pergola - Fabriano | 2013 | 35 | 10 | yes, but poor condition | 35 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Gemona del Friuli - Pinzano - } \\ & \text { Maniago } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 2012 | 41.897 | 9 | yes, good condition, freight transport | 41.897 |
| Gioia Tauro - Cinquefrondi | 2011 | 31.737 | 13 | yes, good condition | 31.737 |
| Gioia Tauro - Palmi - Sinopoli S. <br> Procopio | 2011 | 26.283 | 5 | unclear |  |
| Mandas - Gairo - Arbatax | 1997 | 159.393 | 23 | possible, maintenance necessary | 159.393 |
| Marina di S. Vito - Crocetta - <br> Castel di Sangro | 2003-2006 | 102.6 | 32 | yes, but poor condition | 102.6 |
| Marzi - Soveria Mannelli | 2010-2012 | 31.5 | 8 | yes, closed due to landslides | 31.5 |


| Mortara - Casale Monferrato - <br> Asti | 2010 | 73.449 | 18 | possible, tunnel crashed | 73.449 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| Palazzolo sull'Oglio - Paratico <br> Sarnico | $1966-1999$ | 9.648 | 1 | yes, good condition, some <br> touristic use | 9.648 |
| Palmanova - S. Giorgio di No- <br> garo | 1997 | 11.389 | 1 | dismantled |  |
| Pedace - S. Giovanni in Fiore | $1997-2011$ | 67.1 | 25 | yes, good condition, some <br> touristic use | 67.1 |
| Pinerolo - Bricherasio - Torre <br> Pellice | 2012 | 16.449 | 5 | yes, good condition | 16.449 |
| Portomaggiore - Dogato | 2016 | 13.148 | 1 | yes, good condition | 13.148 |
| Rocchetta S. Antonio Lacedonia <br> - Avellino | 2010 | 118.72 | 31 | yes, good condition, some <br> touristic use | 118.72 |
| Romagnano Sesia - Grignasco - <br> Varallo Sesia | 2014 | 25.091 | 8 | yes, good condition, freight <br> transport | 25.091 |
| Rovato Borgo - Bornato Calino | 2018 | 5.75 | 3 | yes, good condition | 5.75 |
| S. Nicola di Melfi - Gioia del Colle | $2011-2016$ | 127.076 | 14 | yes, good condition, freight <br> transport | 127.076 |
| S. Stefano Magra - Sarzana | 1999 | 6.519 | 1 | possible, maintenance ne- <br> cessary | 6.519 |
| Santhià - Arona | 2012 | 65.009 | 9 | yes, good condition | 65.009 |
| Sassari - Luras - Palau Marina | $1997-2015$ | 150.2 | 27 | yes, good condition, some <br> touristic use | 150.2 |
| Sulmona - Castel di Sangro - <br> Carpinone | 2011 | 118.1 | 15 | yes, good condition, some <br> touristic use | 118.1 |
| Velletri - Terracina | 2012 | 80.8 | 5 | no, almost dismantled |  |
| Vercelli - Casale Popolo | 2013 | 19.224 | 4 | yes, good condition | 19.224 |

Source (the website was accessed 8 March 2023)
https://www.ferrovieabbandonate.it/

Lithuania

## Train lines

| Line | Year of <br> closure | Length of line <br> [km] | No. of closed <br> stations | Potential to <br> re-use | if potential to <br> re-use, then <br> length [km] |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Total |  | $\mathbf{2 9 8 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 4}$ |  |  |
| Panevėžys-Joniškis | $2000-2003$ | 90.0 | 4 | cargo |  |
| Panevěžys - Anykščiai - Rubikiai | 2001 | 68.4 | 4 | touristic use | 9.4 |
| Alytus-Varėna | 1997 | 1997 | 50.0 | 2 | dismantled |
| Alytus-Šeštokai | 2003 | 60.0 | 1 | limited use |  |
| Pabradė - Gelednė - state border | 30.0 | 3 | dismantled |  |  |

Sources (all websites were accessed 8 March 2023)

1. https://siaurukas.eu/istorija/
2. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Auk\�\�taitija narrow gauge railway
3. https://lt.wikipedia.org/wiki/U\�\�nemun\�\�s gele\%C5\%BEinkelis
4. https://lt.wikipe-
dia.org/wiki/Pabrad\�\�s\�\�\�Kruleu\�\�\�\�ynos gele\%C5\%BEinkelis

## Luxembourg

According to the research, no train lines were closed.

## Latvia

Train lines

| Line | Year of closure | Length of line [km] | No. of closed stations | Potential to reuse | if potential to re-use, then length [km] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total |  | 499 | 81 |  | 269 |
| Gulbene-Alūksne | 2000 | 20 | 10 | touristic use |  |
| Rēzekne-Daugavpils | 1999 | 84 | 22 | cargo, limited use | 84 |
| Jelgava-Reņge | 2010 | 85 | 5 | cargo | 85 |
| Ventspils-Tukums | 2010 | 100 | 15 | yes | 100 |
| Skulte-Ipik̦i | 2005 | 100 | 23 | dismantled |  |
| Liepāja-Ventspils | 1996 | 110 | 6 | dismantled |  |

Sources (all websites were accessed 8 March 2023)

1. https://lv.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dzelzce $\% \mathrm{C}_{4} \% \mathrm{BCa} 1 \% \mathrm{C}_{4} \% \mathrm{ABnija}$ Gulbene\%E2\%80\%94Al\%C5\%ABksne
2. https://lv.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dzelzce $\% \mathrm{C}_{4} \% \mathrm{BCa} 1 \% \mathrm{C} 4 \% \mathrm{AB}-$ nija R\%C4\%93zekne\%E2\%80\%94Daugavpils
3. https://lv.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dzelzce\�\�a 1\%C4\%ABnija R\%C4\%ABga\%E2\%80\%94Jelgava\%E2\%80\%94Ma\%C5\%BEei\%C4\%B7i
4. https://lv.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dzelzce $\% \mathrm{C}_{4} \% \mathrm{BCa} 1 \% \mathrm{C} 4 \% \mathrm{AB}-$ nija Ventspils\%E2\%80\%94Tukums II
5. https://lv.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dzelzce\�\�a 1\%C4\%ABnija R\%C4\%ABga\%E2\%80\%94R\%C5\%ABjiena (\%E2\%80\%94Ipi\%C4\%B7i)
6. http://www.railwaymuseum.lv/linijas.htm

Netherlands

## Train lines

| Line | Year of <br> closure | Length of <br> line[km] | No. of closed <br> stations | Potential <br> to re-use | if potential to re-use, <br> then length [km] |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total |  | $\mathbf{3 4 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 7}$ |  | $\mathbf{2 4 . 9}$ |
| Roermond - Herkenbosch | 1996 | 7.5 | $\mathbf{1}$ | possible | 7.5 |
| Leeuwarden - Stiens | 1997 | 9.3 | 5 | dismantled |  |
| Boxtel - Veghel | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | dismantled |  |

Source (the website was accessed 8 March 2023)
https://nl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lijst van opgeheven spoorlijnen in Nederland\#cite note-1

## Norway

According to the research, no train lines were closed, but nine stations along open lines (Askim Næringspark, Takvam, Såner, Sandermosen, Ladalen, Langli, Elnes, Bjørgeseter, Drømtorp).

## Poland

## Train lines

Polish national statistics provides information about length of the railway network; however, the number of closed passenger lines and stations is not tracked. According to secondary information, the main closings took place until 2005.

Between 1995 and 2021, 4,660 km of the network was reduced.
Sources (the two websites were accessed 15 February 2023)

1. https://stat.gov.pl/obszary-tematyczne/transport-i-lacznosc/transport/transport-wyniki-dzialalnosci-w-2021-roku, 9,21.html
2. https://geopolityka.net/analiza-geopolityczna-aktualnego-stanu-sieci-kolejowej-w-polsce/

## Portugal

## Train lines

A website of "Infraestruturas de Portugal", which is a Portuguese state-owned company entrusted with the management, maintenance and operation of the national rail and road network in Portugal, provides information about length of operational and non-operational train lines. According to this site, the overall network length is $3,622 \mathrm{~km}$, of which $70 \%$ are currently used. Up to $1,095 \mathrm{~km}$ of railway lines could be re-opened. The list below shows passenger train lines which have been closed since 1995.

| Line | Year of <br> closure | Length of <br> line [km] | No. of closed <br> stations | Potential <br> to re-use | if potential to re-use, <br> then length [km] |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| Total |  | $\mathbf{4 6 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 1}$ |  | $\mathbf{3 7 9 . 0}$ |
| Linha de Povoa | 1995 | 29.0 | 9 | no (Ecopista) |  |
| Linha do Alentejo | 2012 | 64.0 | 6 | yes |  |
| Linha de Evora | 2009 | 75.0 | 12 | yes | 64.0 |
| Ramal de Caceres | 2012 | 73.0 | 5 | yes | 75.0 |
| Ramal de Figueira da Foz | 2009 | 50.0 | 15 | yes | 73.0 |
| Linha do Tua | 2018 | 21.0 | 5 | yes |  |
| Linha do Tamega | 2009 | 52.0 | 19 | no (Ecopista) |  |
| Linha do Corgo | 2009 | 96.0 | 30 | yes |  |

Sources (all websites were accessed 8 February 2023)

1. https://www.infraestruturasdeportugal.pt/pt-pt/infraestruturas/rede-ferroviaria
2. https://www.pordata.pt/portugal/extensao+da+rede+ferroviaria+total++ex-plorada+e+desativada+++continente-3108
3. https://i.ibb.co/SJFo30z/L-neas-clausuradas-ES-PT-large.png
4. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Linha da P\%C3\%B3voa
5. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Linha do Alentejo
6. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Linha de \%C3\%89vora
7. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ramal de C\%C3\%A1ceres
8. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ramal da Figueira da Foz
9. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Linha do Tua
10. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Linha do T\%C3\%A2mega
11. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Linha do Corgo

## Romania

There is no online information available about closed railway lines. According to oral information from Stefan Roseanu, President of the Romanian Railway Reform Authority, railway closing since 1995 could be in the order of 300 km , of which 100 km are not yet dismantled and could theoretically be re-used.

## Slovakia

## Train lines

Two lines have been closed since 1995 (see table below). According to the network operator, 222 stations were closed in total, of which 212 could be re-opened.

| Line | Year of <br> closure | Length of <br> line [km] | No. of closed sta- <br> tions | Potential to re- <br> use | if potential to <br> re-use, then <br> length [km] |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| Total |  | $\mathbf{3 7 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{9}$ |  | 0 |
| Jazero - Stupava | 7.0 | 2 | dismantled (2012) | 0 |  |
| Rimavská Sobota-Poltár | 2008 | 30.0 | 7 | dismantled (2007) | 0 |

Sources (the two websites were accessed 8 March 2023)

1. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bahnstrecke Dev\%C3\%ADnske Jazero\%E2\%80\%93Stupava
2. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bahnstrecke Rimavsk\%C3\%A1 Sobota\%E2\%80\%93Polt\%C3\%A1r

## Slovenia

According to the research, no train lines were closed.

## Spain

## Train lines

The table below lists the train lines which have been closed since 1995. The number of stations which were closed along the lines could not be found and the lengths of lines had to be estimated; except for Villacanas - Quintanar de la Orden and Soria Castejon (see sources).

| Line | Year of closure | Length of line [km] | $\begin{array}{\|r\|} \hline \text { No. of } \\ \text { closed } \\ \text { stations } \end{array}$ | Potential to re-use | if potential to re-use, then length [km] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total |  | 948.7 |  |  | 603.6 |
| Coruna - Santiago | 2009 | 75 |  | dismantled |  |
| Chapela - Vigo | 2011 | 11 |  | dismantled |  |
| Oviedo - Fuso de la Reina | 1999 | 14 |  | dismantled |  |
| Salou - Vandellos | 2020 | 28 |  | possible | 28 |
| Tortosa - Freginals | 1997 | 24 |  | dismantled |  |
| La Robla - Matallana de Torio | open | 16 |  | no service | 16 |
| Ponferrada - Cubillos del Sil | 1996 | 13 |  | dismantled |  |
| Toral de los Vados - Villafranca del B. | open | 8 |  | no service | 8 |
| Agramon - Cieza | 2019 | 34 |  | possible | 34 |
| Ribarroja - Lliria | 1998 | 12 |  | dismantled |  |
| Villacanas - Quintanar de la Orden | 1995 | 25.1 | 4 | dismantled |  |
| Vicalvaro - Morata de Tajuna | 1997 | 30 |  | dismantled |  |
| Pinto - San Martin de la Vega | 2012 | 13 |  | possible | 13 |
| Leganes - Campamento | 2002 | 11 |  | dismantled |  |
| Soria - Castejon | 1996 | 103.6 | 12 | possible | 103.6 |
| Soto del Real - Burgos | 2011 | 246 |  | possible | 246 |
| Olmedo - Medina | 2017 | 22 |  | possible | 22 |
| Algodor - Toledo | 2003 | 15 |  | dismantled |  |
| Huelva - Tharsis - La Zarza | 1999 | 80 |  | dismantled |  |
| Cerro Muriano - Almorchon | open | 120 |  | possible | 120 |
| Jerez de la Frontera - Arcos de la Fron- tera | 1996 | 35 |  | dismantled |  |
| Dolar - Minas del Marquesado | 1996 | 13 |  | possible | 13 |

Sources (all websites were accessed 8 February 2023)

1. https://i.ibb.co/SJFo30z/L-neas-clausuradas-ES-PT-large.png
2. https://es.wikipedia.org/wiki/L\�\�nea Villaca\%C3\%B1as-Quintanar de la Orden
3. https://es.wikipedia.org/wiki/L\�\�nea Soria-Castej\%C3\%B3n

## Sweden

## Train lines

| Line | Year of <br> closure | Length of <br> line [km] | No. of closed <br> stations | Potential <br> to re-use | if potential to re-use, <br> then length [km] |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| Total |  | $\mathbf{2 3 4 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 5}$ |  | $\mathbf{1 9 7 . 0}$ |
| Repbäcken - Malung | 2011 | 123.0 | 17 | yes | 123.0 |
| Eksjö - Hultsfred |  | 62.0 | 11 | yes | 62.0 |
| Torup - Hyltebruk |  | 12.0 | 1 | yes | 12.0 |
| Vetlanda - Åseda | 2006 | 37.0 | 6 | dismantled (2015) |  |

Sources (all websites were accessed 14 February 2023)

1. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/V\�\�sterdalsbanan
2. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bahnstrecke N\%C3\%A4ssj\%C3\%B6\%E2\%80\%03Oskarshamn
3. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bahnstrecke Torup\%E2\%80\%93Hyltebruk
4. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bahn-
strecke N\%C3\%A4ssj\%C3\%B6\%E2\%80\%93Vet-
landa\%E2\%80\%93\%C3\%85seda\%E2\%80\%93Nybro

## Switzerland

## Train lines

| Line | Year of <br> closure | Length of <br> line [km] | No. of closed <br> stations | Potential <br> to re-use | if potential to re-use, <br> then length [km] |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| Total |  | $\mathbf{3 8 . 4}$ | 19.5 |  | $\mathbf{3 8 . 4}$ |
| Sumiswald-Grünen - <br> Huttwil | $2004-$ <br> 2009 | 1.6 | 7 | yes |  |
| Fleurier - St-Sulpice | 2001 | 1.2 | museum train | 19.5 |  |
| Sihlwald - Sihlbrugg | 2006 | 4.2 | 1 | museum train |  |
| Sumiswald-Grünen - <br> Wasen | 2004 | 5.2 | 4 | yes |  |
| Wettingen - Mellingen | 2004 | 7.9 | 0 | cargo | 4.2 |

Source (the website was accessed 5 March 2023)
https://eingestellte-bahnen.ch/

## United Kingdom

The Office of Rail and Road (ORR) publishes track and route length for Great Britain, which can be found in table 6320 on this page:
https://dataportal.orr.gov.uk/statistics/infrastructure-and-emissions/rail-infra-structure-and-assets/

Every year they publish details of open railway stations as of 31 March in Great Britain. This was used for tracking which stations have closed (table 1415):
https://dataportal.orr.gov.uk/statistics/usage/estimates-of-station-usage
The ORR also includes details of open and closed stations in the statistics release: https://dataportal.orr.gov.uk/statistics/infrastructure-and-emissions/rail-infra-structure-and-assets/

According to this data, 71 stations were closed 116 were opened in Great Britain since 1995. No lines were closed.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: 'Fit for 55': delivering the EU's 2030 Climate Target on the way to climate neutrality (COM(2021) 550 final).

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ The current TEN-T policy is based on Regulation (EU) No 1315/2013.
    ${ }^{3}$ For example, see the European Commission's current cohesion policy objectives: https://ec.europa.eu/regional policy/policy/how/priorities en.

[^2]:    ${ }^{4}$ https://www.investigate-europe.eu/en/2021/despite-public-support-for-rail-trains-remain-underfunded-in-europe/
    ${ }^{5}$ The ITF-OECD database (https://doi.org/10.1787/trsprt-data-en) also provides investment spendings for motorways only; however, data gaps are extensive. These values therefore cannot be used for an appropriate overview.
    ${ }^{6}$ In many cases, 2018 or 2019 was the last reported year. Netherlands reported investments only by 2011. Standard deviation of the countries' annual figures is high, but each ratio is representative of the most recent reported budget.
    ${ }^{7}$ https://nyheder.tv2.dk/2004-02-23-danske-tog-paa-gamle-skinner

[^3]:    ${ }^{8}$ https://www.admin.ch/gov/de/start/dokumentation/medienmitteilungen.msg-id-86919.html
    ${ }^{9}$ https://taz.de/Autobahnausbau-in-Deutschland//5928755/

[^4]:    ${ }^{10} \mathrm{~A}$ visualisation of this remarkable expansion can be found here: http://www.irishmotorwayinfo.com/inex/roads/misc/timeline maps/big/index.html
    ${ }^{11}$ We applied Kendall's Tau in order to understand the relationship between the evolution of road/rail infrastructure $[\mathrm{km}]$ and the development of demand for transport on the respective basic transport equipment [pkm]. Kendall's Tau rank correlation is a widely used non-parametric, i.e. distribution independent correlation coefficient that is robust against the influence of outliers.

[^5]:    The null hypothesis is that there is no association between these two variables, which can be rejected for most countries. The country-specific values can be found in the annex (chapter 7.2).

[^6]:    ${ }^{12}$ These numbers are the sum of all 30 European countries' annual investments as provided by the ITF database. The database does not include information from Cyprus, Malta and Netherlands; and has further gaps few and far between, so the actual number is higher.
    ${ }^{13}$ The list only includes airports with more than 150,000 passengers in 2019. Smaller airports may have been opened since 1995, as is the case in Spain (see chapter 4). There are also further projects for new airports and runways being planned.

[^7]:    ${ }^{14}$ Recent analysis of selected countries' National Determined Contributions (NDCs) ambitions under the Paris Agreement, and inherent implementation risks can be found here: https://www.ndc-aspects.eu/publications/deliverables

[^8]:    ${ }^{15}$ We could not find such distinction for many countries. All sources we used can be found in the annex.
    ${ }^{16}$ The estimates for these five countries are kept conservative by applying a ratio of one closed station per ten kilometres of closed segments. Station density used to be lower than one per ten kilometres at all of the closed lines for which numbers of closed stations are known.
    In addition, in many countries it was not possible to find numbers about closed stations at open lines. Therefore, the actual number of closed stations in the 30 European countries is probably higher than reported.

[^9]:    ${ }^{17}$ The difference between closed and opened lines does not match the official numbers about overall network lengths. Reasons may be tracks with freight transport only, routes adjustments, closed sidings, maintenance works etc.
    ${ }^{18}$ In each country, the research about abandoned railways since 1995 included intensive internet consultation. Only in few cases, official data was available. The list of sources can be found in the annex. T3/WI also let national contacts double check the information. However, omissions, mistakes, and inaccuracies may still have occurred.

[^10]:    ${ }^{19}$ https://www.oebb.at/de/rechtliches/puenktlichkeit

[^11]:    ${ }^{20}$ https://ose.gr/en/railway-network/network-map/

[^12]:    ${ }^{22}$ Austria and Hungary offer similar tickets, which are relatively affordable and can be used throughout the country, see: https://greenpeace.at/uploads/2023/05/report-climate-and-public-transport-tickets-in-europe.pdf

[^13]:    
    
    European Commission (2020) \& (2022). EU transport in figures -Statistical Pocketbook 2020 \& 2022
    Length of "main roads". According to the law "On Roads", main roads are the roads that connect the s
    Website Latvian State Roads Authority: https:///vceli.iv/celu-tikls/statistikas-dati/valsts-celu-tikla-dati/ Bundesamt für Statistik, Sektion Mobilität In case of data gaps, data was interpolated (shaded in green).

    Dataset
    Source
    Dataset Austria
    Source Austria
    Source Greece
    Dataset Latvia
    Source atativa
    Source Switzerlan
    Data Gaps

