Public Consultation on Regulation (EU) No 1315/2013 on Union guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Introduction

Context and purpose of the consultation

The EU holds responsibility on infrastructure policy - in the fields of transport, energy and telecommunications - since 1 November 1993. Accordingly, the Union shall contribute to the establishment and development of trans-European networks (TEN).

In the transport sector, Europe's TEN-T policy remains key in preventing obstacles to the free circulation of goods, services and citizens throughout the EU in a growing area without frontiers. It aims to boost economic, social and territorial cohesion between all Member States and their regions. More and more, it has become a transport infrastructure concept that extends to EU neighbours and is part of the cooperation with other areas of the world. Importantly, TEN-T policy is at the same time close to European citizens': enhancing accessibility of their home regions and providing connectivity with distant destinations.

Newer developments are going on in transport and other policy fields, which interact with TEN-T policy:

- Global transport flows are changing in volume and direction;
- Interconnection and interoperability between the modes of transport but also with energy and telecommunication networks, projects of common interest with other third countries as well as the UK's withdrawal from the EU will change the EU's "internal transport landscape"
- The transport system is undergoing a fundamental transformation – In the context of a long-term climate strategy the wider deployment of automation, digitalisation and clean vehicles is becoming a reality;
- Improving Military Mobility and dual-use (civilian and military) infrastructure across the Union making better use of our transport network, to ensure that military needs are accounted for when planning or updating certain infrastructure projects is also an important element.

Such developments will entail stronger association of infrastructure with issues such as infrastructure use, efficiency, enhancing mobility concepts or new social questions in transport. They will also call for stronger cooperation between Member States and a wide range of other actors – public and private ones. Not least, synergies between transport and the energy, digital and telecommunication sectors will increase.

Against this background, the Commission has decided to undertake a comprehensive evaluation of Regulation (EU) No 1315/2013 on Union guidelines for the development of the TEN-T.

This public consultation is designed to support the evaluation of the current Regulation by gathering the views of stakeholders. The Commission published on 13 September 2018 an Evaluation Roadmap.

The survey contains six sections:
A. General questions on Regulation 1315/2013
B. The form of the TEN-T network
C. The features of the TEN-T network
D. Infrastructure use on the TEN-T network
E. Implementation tools for the TEN-T network
F. Further information

In case of questions and remarks, please contact: MOVE-TEN-T-REVISION@ec.europa.eu

About you

*Language of my contribution
- ◎ Bulgarian
- ◎ Croatian
- ◎ Czech
- ◎ Danish
- ◎ Dutch
- ◉ English
- ◎ Estonian
- ◎ Finnish
- ◎ French
- ◎ Gaelic
- ◎ German
- ◎ Greek
- ◎ Hungarian
- ◎ Italian
- ◎ Latvian
- ◎ Lithuanian
- ◎ Maltese
- ◎ Polish
- ◎ Portuguese
- ◎ Romanian
- ◎ Slovak
- ◎ Slovenian
- ◎ Spanish
- ◎ Swedish

I am giving my contribution as

*
- ◯ Academic/research institution
- ◯ Business association
- ◯ Company/business organisation
- ◯ Consumer organisation
- ◯ EU citizen
- ◯ Environmental organisation
- ◯ Non-EU citizen
- ◯ Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
- ◯ Public authority
- ◯ Trade union
- ◉ Other

*First name

Philip

*Surname

SMART

*Email (this won't be published)

philip.smart@aberdeenshire.gov.uk

*Organisation name

255 character(s) maximum

CPMR North Sea Commission

*Organisation size
- ◉ Micro (1 to 9 employees)
- ◯ Small (10 to 49 employees)
- ◯ Medium (50 to 249 employees)
- ◯ Large (250 or more)

Transparency register number

255 character(s) maximum

Check if your organisation is on the **transparency register**. It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.

*Country of origin

Please add your country of origin, or that of your organisation.
- ◯ Afghanistan
- ◯ Djibouti
- ◯ Libya
- ◯ Saint Pierre and Miquelon

3

○ Åland Islands	○ Dominica	○ Liechtenstein	○ Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
○ Albania	○ Dominican Republic	○ Lithuania	○ Samoa
○ Algeria	○ Ecuador	○ Luxembourg	○ San Marino
○ American Samoa	○ Egypt	○ Macau	○ São Tomé and Príncipe
○ Andorra	○ El Salvador	○ Madagascar	○ Saudi Arabia
○ Angola	○ Equatorial Guinea	○ Malawi	○ Senegal
○ Anguilla	○ Eritrea	○ Malaysia	○ Serbia
○ Antarctica	○ Estonia	○ Maldives	○ Seychelles
○ Antigua and Barbuda	○ Ethiopia	○ Mali	○ Sierra Leone
○ Argentina	○ Falkland Islands	○ Malta	○ Singapore
○ Armenia	○ Faroe Islands	○ Marshall Islands	○ Sint Maarten
○ Aruba	○ Fiji	○ Martinique	○ Slovakia
○ Australia	○ Finland	○ Mauritania	○ Slovenia
○ Austria	○ North Macedonia	○ Mauritius	○ Solomon Islands
○ Azerbaijan	○ France	○ Mayotte	○ Somalia
○ Bahamas	○ French Guiana	○ Mexico	○ South Africa
○ Bahrain	○ French Polynesia	○ Micronesia	○ South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands
○ Bangladesh	○ French Southern and Antarctic Lands	○ Moldova	○ South Korea
○ Barbados	○ Gabon	○ Monaco	○ South Sudan
○ Belarus	○ Georgia	○ Mongolia	○ Spain
○ Belgium	○ Germany	○ Montenegro	○ Sri Lanka
○ Belize	○ Ghana	○ Montserrat	○ Sudan
○ Benin	○ Gibraltar	○ Morocco	○ Suriname
○ Bermuda	○ Greece	○ Mozambique	○ Svalbard and Jan Mayen
○ Bhutan	○ Greenland	○ Myanmar /Burma	○ Swaziland
○ Bolivia	○ Grenada	○ Namibia	● Sweden
○ Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba	○ Guadeloupe	○ Nauru	○ Switzerland
○ Bosnia and Herzegovina	○ Guam	○ Nepal	○ Syria
○ Botswana	○ Guatemala	○ Netherlands	○ Taiwan
○ Bouvet Island	○ Guernsey	○ New Caledonia	○ Tajikistan

- Brazil
- British Indian Ocean Territory
- British Virgin Islands
- Brunei
- Bulgaria
- Burkina Faso
- Burundi
- Cambodia
- Cameroon
- Canada
- Cape Verde
- Cayman Islands
- Central African Republic
- Chad
- Chile
- China
- Christmas Island
- Clipperton
- Cocos (Keeling) Islands
- Colombia
- Comoros
- Congo
- Cook Islands
- Costa Rica
- Côte d'Ivoire
- Croatia
- Cuba
- Curaçao
- Cyprus
- Guinea
- Guinea-Bissau
- Guyana
- Haiti
- Heard Island and McDonald Islands
- Honduras
- Hong Kong
- Hungary
- Iceland
- India
- Indonesia
- Iran
- Iraq
- Ireland
- Isle of Man
- Israel
- Italy
- Jamaica
- Japan
- Jersey
- Jordan
- Kazakhstan
- Kenya
- Kiribati
- Kosovo
- Kuwait
- Kyrgyzstan
- Laos
- Latvia
- New Zealand
- Nicaragua
- Niger
- Nigeria
- Niue
- Norfolk Island
- North Korea
- Northern Mariana Islands
- Norway
- Oman
- Pakistan
- Palau
- Palestine
- Panama
- Papua New Guinea
- Paraguay
- Peru
- Philippines
- Pitcairn Islands
- Poland
- Portugal
- Puerto Rico
- Qatar
- Réunion
- Romania
- Russia
- Rwanda
- Saint Barthélemy
- Saint Helena Ascension and Tristan da Cunha
- Tanzania
- Thailand
- The Gambia
- Timor-Leste
- Togo
- Tokelau
- Tonga
- Trinidad and Tobago
- Tunisia
- Turkey
- Turkmenistan
- Turks and Caicos Islands
- Tuvalu
- Uganda
- Ukraine
- United Arab Emirates
- United Kingdom
- United States
- United States Minor Outlying Islands
- Uruguay
- US Virgin Islands
- Uzbekistan
- Vanuatu
- Vatican City
- Venezuela
- Vietnam
- Wallis and Futuna
- Western Sahara
- Yemen

⊙ Czechia	⊙ Lebanon	⊙ Saint Kitts and Nevis	⊙ Zambia
⊙ Democratic Republic of the Congo	⊙ Lesotho	⊙ Saint Lucia	⊙ Zimbabwe
⊙ Denmark	⊙ Liberia	⊙ Saint Martin	

* Publication privacy settings

The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

⊙ **Anonymous**
Only your type, country of origin and contribution will be published. All other personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number) will not be published.

◉ **Public**
Your personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number, country of origin) will be published with your contribution.

☑ I agree with the [personal data protection provisions](#)

A. General Questions on Regulation EU 1315/2013 on the TEN-T guidelines

Over the years, TEN-T policy has grown into a genuine "European project" that gives direction to public and private investments – to achieve long-term benefits for society, such as accessibility and connectivity of states and regions as well as to facilitate economic development and exchanges in the internal market. Within the framework of the European Union's transport policy, TEN-T provides the basis for efficient, safe and sustainable transport operations. It is, therefore, directly interrelated with a wide range of EU actions on sectoral transport policies and it is a vital enabler of strategic transport policy objectives overall.

The TEN-T Guidelines establish eligibility for EU funding, notably under the Connecting Europe Facility and the Cohesion Fund. Priorities for TEN-T development, arising from the TEN-T guidelines, have been taken up in the corresponding funding legislation and been reflected in budget allocation procedures. In this respect, both "traditional" infrastructure projects (cross-border projects, railway or inland waterway projects, transport terminals etc.) and infrastructure components ensuring quality, efficiency, safety and sustainability of transport operations (intelligent transport systems, charging/refuelling for alternative fuels etc.) have been subject to EU funding.

Regulation (EU) N° 1315/2013 pursues a range of specific objectives, which can be grouped, into four main themes that were also used to structure this questionnaire: form of the network, features of network infrastructure, infrastructure use and implementation of the network.

* 1. In your view, how important is it to have a transport infrastructure policy at EU level?
   ◉ Very important
   ⊙ Important
   ⊙ Somewhat important

◯ Not important

◯ No opinion

Could you please explain briefly your answer?

1000 character(s) maximum

> it is very important in order to harmonise infrastructure investments and standards across borders and to contribute to territorial cohesion in the EU & beyond. Territorial accessibility should also be a priority for the development of the core network.

* 2. In your opinion, what should be the main focus of a transport infrastructure policy at EU level? (You may choose up to 5 options)

at most 5 choice(s)

- ☑ Establishing physical cross border infrastructures (railways, roads, inland waterways etc.)
- ☐ Removing physical and other bottlenecks in the network as a whole
- ☑ Facilitating the coherent and continuous EU wide deployment of innovative transport solutions (alternative fuels, intelligent transport systems etc.)
- ☑ Ensuring connectivity and accessibility of all regions of the European Union
- ☑ Facilitating multimodal transport chains (connecting ports, airports, rail-road terminals etc.)
- ☐ Ensuring EU wide quality infrastructure standards
- ☐ Improving dual-use (civilian and military) infrastructure
- ☑ Enabling the decarbonisation of transport (e.g. by a shift towards more sustainable modes of transport and to cleaner fuels)
- ☐ Other

* 3. Where do you see the greatest need for improvement/development in transport infrastructure policy to cope with the needs of today and of the future? (Please choose your three most important issues)

between 3 and 3 choices

- ☐ Enabling new transport and mobility solutions
- ☑ Further improving continuity of the TEN-T network and enabling a better use of existing infrastructure
- ☑ Speeding up the completion of the trans-European transport network
- ☐ Eliminating missing links in physical infrastructure (road, rail, inland waterway transport)
- ☑ Enhancing multimodal connecting points (ports, airports, rail-road terminals, urban nodes)
- ☐ Further advancing EU wide infrastructure standards
- ☐ Further improving cross-border connectivity for the transport of passengers and goods
- ☐ Stronger coordination between infrastructure development and transport operations
- ☐ Other

* 4. What are the main benefits you would expect if infrastructure policy is made and guided at European level?

1000 character(s) maximum

> Harmonisation of infrastructure planning (capacities & standards) with better interoperability across transport modes and borders, improved connections to third countries, strengthened territorial accessibility, modal shift of cargo and passengers from road to sea and rail, reduced congestion and emissions, fewer deaths and seriously injured from road transport, as well as better conditions for roll-out of green and intelligent transport solutions

B. Form of the TEN-T network

The TEN-T network consists of a dual-layer structure. The **comprehensive network** represents the basic layer of the TEN-T and includes components for all transport modes – rail, road, inland waterway, air and maritime as well as their connecting points and corresponding traffic information and management systems.

The **core network** is a subset of the comprehensive network representing the strategically most important nodes and links of the trans-European transport network. It is multi-modal – i.e. it includes all transport modes and their connections as well as relevant traffic management systems. It has been structured using the nodes of highest strategic importance in the EU (urban nodes, seaports, inland ports airports, rail-road terminals) and connecting them to each other, following the corresponding main traffic flows.

The **core network corridors** are an instrument to facilitate the coordinated implementation of the core network. They cover the most important long distance transport flows on the core network and are intended, to improve cross- border links within the Union. Core network corridors cross at least two borders and involve at least three transport modes.

In this section we would like to hear your opinion on the adequacy of the form of the core and comprehensive TEN-T network to ensure the achievement of the objectives set in the TEN-T guidelines. This concerns in particular:

- Ensuring connectivity and accessibility of all regions of the Union (including remote, outermost, insular, peripheral, mountainous and sparsely populated areas), with the core and comprehensive networks;
- Ensuring coherent and continuous transnational links, without gaps and bottlenecks, for rail, road and inland waterway transport;
- Supporting inner-European and global maritime and air transport through port and airport infrastructure;
- Enabling multimodal transport chains through seamless connections between modes;
- Enabling smooth connections between long-distance and urban/regional transport for passengers and freight, i.e. enhancing "first/last mile legs" from/to origin/final destination;
- Ensuring an optimal interconnection and integration of especially the core network – with a view to high levels of efficiency, sustainability and decarbonisation;
- Connecting the TEN-T with neighbouring countries and where appropriate ensure interconnection and interoperability with other third countries.

* 5. In your opinion, is the core network as designed currently (covering links and nodes), adequate to meet the needs of the transport sector and its users?

- ○ Yes
- ◉ No
- ○ No opinion

* 6. In your view, are the TEN-T corridors a suitable tool to complete the TEN-T core network by 2030?
- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ No opinion

7. In your view, is the comprehensive TEN-T network adequate in terms of its required characteristics? (You may choose as many options as you consider appropriate)

	Yes	No	No opinion
Safety/Security	○	◉	○
Availability/adequacy of alternative fuel infrastructures	○	◉	○
Availability/adequacy of multimodal infrastructures	○	◉	○
Equipment for automated transport	○	◉	○
Equipment for Intelligent Transport Systems and digital mobility solutions	○	◉	○
Other	○	○	○

* 7.1. Does the comprehensive TEN-T network ensure appropriate complementarity with the core network as well as sufficient accessibility to all EU regions?
- ○ Yes
- ◉ No
- ○ No opinion

If no, please specify

500 character(s) maximum

> We believe that more funding should be allocated to the comprehensive network in general, and particularly to projects facilitating direct access to the core network. The EC is also requested to consider whether it would feasible to introduce a criterion – whereby no location on the comprehensive network should be more than a defined travelling time (e.g. two hours) away from the nearest connection point at the core network.

* 8. In your opinion is it sufficiently clear how capacity bottlenecks and constraints are identified from the perspective of a European transport network approach?
- ○ Yes
- ◉ No
- ○ No opinion

If no, please explain how it could be improved!

> The justifications for inclusion or exclusion of bottlenecks projects in national transport plans are not always sufficiently publicly explained.This is illustrated by a case from DK where the regional authority considered the single-track (14 km long) on the railroad just north of the German border as a bottleneck, while the ministry did not – apparently without any clear basis in the TEN-T regulation. Similar cases are assumed to exist also in other member states. The procedures for identifying bottlenecks and constraints in the network could therefore be improved by providing clearer information about the basis for a national authority veto in the public domain to allow a region or other stakeholders to dispute the decision.

C. The features of the TEN-T network

The TEN-T guidelines set certain standards and requirements for the infrastructure on the core and comprehensive network.

In this section, we would like to hear your opinion on the adequacy of the "features" set out in the TEN-T guidelines. This concerns in particular:

- Ensuring interoperability throughout the TEN-T, where appropriate through standardisation;
- Ensuring comprehensive coverage of 'telematics applications' (intelligent transport systems) and other innovative information/communication technologies for all modes and the interconnections between them to use infrastructure most efficiently and to enable high-quality user standards;
- Enabling low carbon and clean transport, as contribution to the EUs Greenhouse Gas emission' reduction objectives (e.g. through refuelling/recharging infrastructure for alternative fuels);
- Enabling the mitigation of noise emissions and other harmful impacts on citizens and the environment;
- Ensuring high levels of safety and security in transport as well as of infrastructure resilience (in view of climate change adaptation and natural and man-made disasters);
- Applying and stimulating innovative technologies and innovative operational concepts (support decarbonisation, enhance safety and security, improve operations and information provision on the network etc.) and thereby contributing to the 'innovation chain' by deploying Research & Innovation results and identifying R&I needs;
- Ensuring accessibility to TEN-T infrastructure for all user groups.

* 9. Are the standards and requirements for all modes of transport (on infrastructure, interoperability, safety etc.) as set out in chapter II of the Regulation complete?

- ◎ Yes, they are complete
- ◉ They are mostly satisfactory
- ◎ They are somewhat unsatisfactory and lack essential elements
- ◎ No, they are not satisfactory
- ◎ No opinion

Could you please explain your answer?

> Ideally there should also be some standards referring to the capacity/congestion. A connection meet technical standards, but still not have the necessary capacity for the actual traffic. We believe that slots at airports should also be considered as infrastructure along with the list of physical equipment in this context. We would also emphasise the importance of ensuring that all infrastructure streams designated on the core

network are also a part of the national infrastructure planning. Furthermore, our view is that there is far too much room to interpret the rules and requirements attached to TEN-T. For example, it is sufficient to show that it is theoretically possible to drive 740 meters long trains on the core network track by 2030, which in Sweden is only possible if you stop all other traffic. We therefore request clarifications on how rules and requirements are to be interpreted in evaluation, reporting and eligibility assessments - theoretically - or practically

*10. From your perspective, has the aim of fostering the uptake of alternative fuels and propulsion systems, set in the TEN-T Regulation, been achieved?
- ○ Yes
- ● No
- ○ No opinion

10.1. If no, what is still missing?
- ☑ Availability of infrastructure
- ☑ Interoperability of infrastructure standards
- ☐ There are not enough vehicles on the market that could make use of these systems
- ☑ Other

If other, please specify
1000 character(s) maximum

in the case of Hydrogen fuel, we miss more widespread standards related to the use of the fuel – including technical requirements for safety, transport and storage etc. Greater coordination between member states is also needed in this respect.

*11. In your view, has the aim of stimulating innovative technologies and operational concepts along the TEN-T been achieved?
- ○ Yes
- ● No
- ○ No opinion

*12. In your view, has the objective of mitigating noise emissions and other harmful impacts on citizens (accidents, pollution, congestion) on the TEN-T network been achieved?
- ○ Yes
- ● No
- ○ No opinion

*13. In your view, has the TEN-T regulation helped to promote modal shift (from road /air to rail and inland waterway transport)?
- ● Yes
- ○ No
- ○ No opinion

* 14. In your view, has the TEN-T regulation helped to promote a clean and low carbon transport system overall?

- ● Yes
- ○ No
- ○ No opinion

* 15. In your view, are urban nodes/cities sufficiently integrated in the TEN-T network (in terms of multi-modal connections, last mile passenger and freight connections, possibilities for seamless through-traffic etc.)?

- ○ Yes
- ● No
- ○ No opinion

If no, please specify

1000 character(s) maximum

> Not all cities outside of the core network corridors /core network are sufficiently integrated in the network. Building on the ideas of connecting the identified 88 urban nodes it would also be relevant to demonstrate improving the connectivity of EU citizens outside of areas covered by the core network lines that connect these nodes. This is especially needed for those cities and dispersed populations that are beyond the area covered by the current core network between the 88 nodes and that lie in the areas between the 88 nodes and the borders of the EU (including the maritime coastlines) and sometimes have a long or difficult route to access the network – we suggest grouping citizens who are in areas outside of the 88 urban nodes into blocks (of say 500,000 people or some other number to be tested) and then to demonstrate the connectivity of those blocks to the routes of the core network or the core network corridors.

D. Infrastructure Use

The TEN-T guidelines specifically aim to achieve a better and more efficient use of existing and new infrastructure while increasing the benefits for the users. This concerns in particular:

- Enabling attractive, sustainable and efficient transport and mobility services, in accordance with the needs and expectations of users in the passengers' and freight sectors;
- Strengthening the integration of TEN-T development and transport service-related policy action in fields such as rail freight corridors, promotion of sustainable and innovative freight transport/logistics chains as well as of seamless multi-modal chains for passengers, maritime and air transport;
- Enabling the increased use of 'sustainable transport modes'
- Enhancing the efficiency of infrastructure use/provision through pricing and other appropriate regulatory measures

* 16. In your view, has the aim of enabling attractive sustainable and efficient multimodal transport and mobility services in accordance to users' needs in the freight transport sector been achieved?

- ○ Yes
- ○ Yes, Mostly
- ○ Partly
- ○ No, not at all
- ● No opinion

Could you please explain briefly your answer?

1000 character(s) maximum

```



```

*17. In your view, has the aim of enabling attractive sustainable and efficient multimodal transport and mobility services in accordance to users' needs in the passenger transport sector been achieved?

- ○ Yes
- ○ Yes, Mostly
- ○ Partly
- ○ No, not at all
- ● No opinion

Could you please explain briefly your answer?

1000 character(s) maximum

```



```

*18. In your view, has the TEN-T regulation helped to increase the efficiency of infrastructure use and infrastructure provision in the EU?

- ○ Yes
- ○ Yes, Mostly
- ○ Partly
- ○ No, not at all
- ● No opinion

Could you please explain briefly your answer?

1000 character(s) maximum

```



```

E. Implementation tools

In order to support the implementation of TEN-T policy while involving a wide range of stakeholders and ensuring coherence with other EU instruments a number of implementation tools have been established in the TEN-T guidelines. In this section, we would like to hear your opinion on:

- The suitability of the core network corridors as an implementation instrument
- The coordination between TEN-T implementation and other EU instruments
- The usefulness of the European coordinators in supporting the implementation of the corridors

19. In your view, is there sufficient coherence between the TEN-T policy and other EU policies?

	Yes	No	No opinion
Structural and cohesion policy	○	◉	○
Sustainable urban mobility policy	○	◉	○
Environmental policy	○	◉	○
Economic/trade policy	◉	○	○
Social/employment policy	○	○	◉
Cooperation with third countries policy	○	◉	○

*20. In your view, is there sufficient coherence between the TEN-T policy and other current and upcoming transport policies objectives/trends (alternative fuels, new mobility patterns, sustainable urban mobility, automation etc.)?
- ○ Yes
- ◉ No
- ○ No opinion

*21. Are you familiar with the European coordinators?
- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

21.1. If yes, do you perceive the European coordinators useful to facilitate and accelerate the implementation of the TEN-T core network?
- ◉ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ No opinion

*22. In your opinion, how realistic are the dates for completion of the core network in 2030 and the comprehensive network in 2050?
- ○ Very realistic
- ○ Moderatly realistic
- ◉ Less realistic
- ○ Not at all realistic
- ○ No opinion

23. Have you already used the European Commission's TEN-Tec system?

   ◉ Yes
   ◎ No

23.1. If yes, how would you rate the usefulness of the European Commission's TEN-Tec system, which provides statistical information and maps on the status of the TEN-T network?
   ◎ Very useful
   ◉ Useful
   ◎ Somewhat useful
   ◎ Not useful
   ◎ No opinion

F. Further information

24. If you wish to add further information or comments - within the scope of this questionnaire - please feel free to do so here.
3000 character(s) maximum

> Q6:
> The TEN-T corridors are primarily regarded as a suitable tool to complete themselves, but they have had limited effects on the rest of the Core Network. We would still consider it reasonable to prioritise the completion of the corridors which can be seen as the most important part of the Core Network.
> Q 13:
> Investments in ports, multimodal terminals and rail have helped to promote modal shift, but not enough has been done to promote a shift towards maritime transport. To begin with, ports should be considered as cross border infrastructure and the definition of cross border links should include maritime sections. We also believe that MoS must be better integrated in the network, and in order to strengthen the visibility and political support to MoS, the EC is invited to include MoS in the TEN-T maps.
> Q14:
> Although the regulation has helped to promote a clean and low carbon transport system, the performance and progress is not satisfactory.
> Q19:
> The regulation should as a general rule facilitate for greater integration of 3rd countries into the network - recognising all of the transport corridors within the EU member state area that contribute to trading and mobility with 3rd countries.
> In context of Brexit, the NSC re-iterates its support to the proposal from the EC to connect Ireland (Dublin /Cork) to the ports of Zeebrugge/Antwerpen/Rotterdam and the core network.
> Q 20:
> The NSC believes that the TEN-T policy should contribute to harmonise technological specifications and increase the density of charging and refuelling stations for alternative fuels – in particular for hydrogen fuel. The future network should be able to accommodate automated/autonomous transport solutions according to a coherent regulatory framework.
> Q 22:
> It seems more and more unrealistic that the Core Network and its corridors will be fully implemented by 2030. there have been delays and several bottlenecks remain. The Regulation should ensure a more efficient implementation of the corridors. Different options could be considered, such as strengthening the role of the Corridors' forums.
> The member states involved should also take steps to further streamline administrative procedures, such as procurement and permitting procedures in cross border infrastructure projects. There is furthermore a need to raise awareness and increase the capacity of authorities and transport stakeholders to apply innovative

financial instruments, e.g. blending schemes, for funding of transport infrastructure.

Other issues

The criterion to establish the relevance of ports or airports cannot be limited to its passenger or transshipment statistics alone, but should also take into account their strategic and territorial importance + projections for future economic opportunities. We would also like to highlight that the importance of ports that are mainly fishing ports, and their need for accessibility via hinterland roads and railways, is currently not recognised under the TEN-T.

25. Please feel free to upload a concise document, such as additional evidence supporting your responses or a position paper. The maximum file size is 1MB. Please note that the uploaded document will be published alongside your response to the questionnaire which is the essential input to this public consultation. The document serves as additional background reading to better understand your position.

The maximum file size is 1 MB

Only files of the type pdf,txt,doc,docx,odt,rtf are allowed

c6d9cd6c-bc16-4a92-a09d-febe46db8923/Supporting_document_to_NSC_response_to_TEN-T_consultation_ver_2.pdf

Contact

MOVE-TEN-T-REVISION@ec.europa.eu