



EUROPEAN SEA PORTS ORGANISATION ASBL / VZW
ORGANISATION DES PORTS MARITIMES EUROPEENS ASBL / VZW

Trans-European Transport Networks (TEN-T)

*Proposals for a Regulation on Union guidelines for the development of the TEN-T
and a Regulation establishing the Connecting Europe Facility*

ESPO position including amendment proposals

12 March 2012 - FINAL

1. The European Sea Ports Organisation supports the Commission's proposal for new guidelines on the development of the Trans-European Transport Networks. ESPO especially welcomes the opportunity that the proposed guidelines offer to reinforce the multimodal gateway position of European seaports. Compared to the previous guidelines, seaports now have a prominent place in the TEN-T framework, both in the comprehensive and core networks.
2. ESPO recognises that the current economic crisis will make the realisation of TEN-T projects more challenging than ever. This means that a more profound analysis of the available financial instruments is necessary in order not to reduce ambitions. Transport is one of the few growth sectors in Europe and adequate infrastructure connections are vital for Europe's welfare. TEN-T policy should in this respect address growth in both Europe's external and internal trade.
3. ESPO shares the Commission's view that the core network should be developed as a European priority by 2030 and that the comprehensive network should be achieved by 2050. ESPO especially appreciates the requirement that seaports in both networks should have adequate and appropriate hinterland connections by then. Given the pan-European interest involved, ESPO believes that the Commission should be given the necessary tools to ensure that Member States meet the target deadlines.
4. ESPO recommends that, in the interest of transparency, the selection criteria and methodology used for the proposed core network of ports should be an integral part of the TEN-T guidelines. Also, the mechanism for updating the core network should be clarified.
5. ESPO principally supports the concept of having multi-modal corridors as a tool to implement the TEN-T core network. ESPO also welcomes the fact that these corridors should include seaports and their accesses. However, several questions arise about the design and timeframes of the ten corridors that are listed in the annex to the regulation

proposal that sets up the 'Connecting Europe Facility'. This list may therefore need to be reviewed. For that purpose, ESPO is collecting input from its members on the various sections of the corridors. In addition, the relation with the railway corridors set up under Regulation 913/2010 is not clear. ESPO does support the use of European coordinators, corridor platforms and corridor development plans to ensure timely and coordinated achievement of the corridors and strongly recommends that port authorities concerned are actively involved.

6. ESPO regrets that the Commission has not used the opportunity of the TEN-T review to propose measures that aim at achieving a better integration of transport and environmental policy objectives, by acknowledging that projects that will be given the 'common interest' status, fulfill 'Imperative Reasons of Overriding Public Interest' (IROPI or similar) criteria. Also, the TEN-T guidelines should include special and fast track procedures for projects of common interest in order to deal with environmental and other assessments in an efficient manner.
7. The comprehensive network of seaports should be as inclusive as possible. ESPO therefore repeats its earlier proposal to ensure that international ports included under the present TEN-T criteria remain full part of the comprehensive network. It would add to clarity if, in addition to the maps, a list of comprehensive network ports would be published as annexe to the guidelines.
8. The TEN-T guidelines remain rather vague on the position of Motorways of the Sea. ESPO believes these should be integrated as the maritime section of the core network through a specific corridor. Motorways of the Sea should no longer be seen as port-to-port connections, but as services connecting hinterlands. Specific attention should be paid to connections with ports in countries neighbouring the EU (i.e. those located in the Mediterranean, Black Sea and Baltic Sea). These ports should furthermore be included in the relevant maps and lists of ports. In addition, ESPO believes that European ports ensuring maritime links with third countries should be approached as border crossing points.
9. ESPO agrees that the integration of ports in the TEN-T should be accompanied by a review of the EU policy framework for ports. ESPO believes that well-balanced and proportional measures are needed that will help ports to further improve their performance. Above all, the review should not fail to provide a series of State aid guidelines, allowing public funding of general infrastructure available to all users, including maritime and land-side access to ports.
10. ESPO understands that the proposed EU funding under the Connecting Europe Facility (31.7 billion Euro for the period 2014-2020) will be almost entirely used for the funding of the core network. ESPO wonders first of all whether this sum is adequate, given that the overall completion of the TEN-T is estimated to require 500 billion by 2020, of which 250 billion would be needed to complete the missing links and remove bottlenecks of the core network. ESPO recognises the need to stimulate private sector participation in infrastructure funding. However, the importance of 'Public Private Partnerships' should not be overestimated for major infrastructure projects, since private investors are not always likely to take high risks. New financing instruments could also play a role in addressing the needs for investments in large EU infrastructure projects. In this context, the EU Project Bond Initiative is an option to be further assessed. In any case, ESPO believes that governments should continue to take their responsibilities in funding basic transport infrastructure. ESPO therefore supports the recommendation of the TEN-T

Expert Group on Funding Strategy and Financing Perspectives (July 2010) to investigate the opportunity of deconsolidating productive investments such as transport infrastructure from the government deficit with the objective to accelerating the recovery from the crisis. Some temporary amendments to the Stability and Growth Pact could be envisaged in this sense.

11. ESPO invites the Commission to clarify how projects both in the core and comprehensive network would benefit from EU support. The concrete procedures to apply for funding, both for core and comprehensive network projects, should be elaborated in more detail as well.
12. ESPO welcomes the fact that, under the Connecting Europe Facility, proposal grants for works related to rail and inland waterways can go up to 30 and 40% of the eligible cost for actions addressing bottlenecks and cross-border sections respectively. Given that seaports are one of the principal cornerstones of the new TEN-T framework, ESPO believes that inland transport connections to ports (including road, rail and inland waterways connections), the development of Motorways of the Sea, as well as the development of ports and multi-modal platforms should equally be entitled to receive grants up to 40% of the eligible costs. Road connections should indeed not be ignored, as they are essential for connectivity and proper investment in them will reduce bottlenecks and related emissions.
13. Projects with potential EU added value are now broadly identified as cross-border sections, missing links, multi-modal connecting points such as seaports and major bottlenecks. ESPO believes that for all pre-identified projects it should be quantifiably demonstrated and measurable why a cross-border section, missing link, multi-modal connecting point or bottleneck has EU added value. Any funding of a project through the TEN-T budget should be the result of a proven effect that the realisation of the proposed project leads to EU added value, in terms of transport efficiency, sustainability and/or territorial cohesion. ESPO therefore invites the Commission to develop within the TEN-T Guidelines a transparent methodology that would justify TEN-T funding. With such a methodology projects with EU added value can justifiably be labelled as ‘projects of common interest’.
14. ESPO has elaborated the principal elements of its position in a series of amendment proposals, both for the draft Regulation establishing TEN-T guidelines and the draft Regulation establishing the Connecting Europe Facility. These can be found in two annexes to this document. A preliminary overview of potential modifications and clarifications of the list of multi-modal corridors is included in a separate annexe. This list serves purely informative purposes and is not meant as a list of amendment proposals.

Since 1993, ESPO represents the port authorities, port associations and port administrations of the seaports of the European Union and Norway. The mission of the organisation is to influence public policy in the EU to achieve a safe, efficient and environmentally sustainable European port sector operating as a key element of a transport industry where free and undistorted market conditions prevail as far as practical.

*For more information, contact Patrick Verhoeven, Secretary General, at:
Treurenberg 6 – B-1000 Brussel / Bruxelles
Tel : + 32 2 736.34.63 – Fax : + 32 2 736.63.25
E-mail : patrick.verhoeven@espo.be – Web: www.espo.be*

ANNEXE 1

ESPO AMENDMENT PROPOSALS FOR THE DRAFT REGULATION ESTABLISHING TEN-T GUIDELINES

Amendment 1 (Article 1):

Member States should bear the financial responsibility for the implementation of the TEN-T guidelines.

Article 1

<i>Commission proposal</i> Article 1 Subject Matter 1. The guidelines specify the requirements to be respected by the <i>entities responsible for the management of the infrastructure</i> of the trans-European network	<i>Commission proposal</i> Article 1 Subject Matter 2. The guidelines specify the requirements to be respected by the <i>Member States</i> for the implementation of the trans-European network
---	--

Justification:

ESPO believes that Member States should be financially responsible for the implementation of the TEN-T guidelines. The reference to “entities responsible” implies that other parties, such as port authorities or private operators, could be held financially liable for the implementation.

Amendment 2 (Article 3):

The TEN-T guidelines should make it explicitly clear how projects of common interest are quantified and identified.

Article 3

<i>Commission proposal</i> Article 3 Definitions (e) 'European added value' means, in relation to a project, the value resulting from Union intervention which is additional to the value that would <i>otherwise</i> have been created by Member State action alone;	<i>ESPO proposal</i> Article 3 Definitions (e) 'European added value' means, in relation to a project, the value resulting from Union intervention <i>with a demonstrated effect on EU transport efficiency, sustainability and/or territorial cohesion</i> , which is additional to the value that would otherwise have been created by Member State action alone.
--	---

Justification:

Projects with EU added value are now broadly identified as cross-border sections, missing links, multi-modal connecting points and major bottlenecks. This still leaves room for arguing that any town with a piece of rail, road or a canal could be a multi-modal connecting point for example. Any project

funding through the TEN-T budget should be the result of a proven effect that the realisation of the proposed project leads to EU added value. This means that EU added value should be measurable and quantifiable, in terms of transport efficiency, sustainability and/or territorial cohesion. A transparent methodology should be developed to indiscriminately justify TEN-T funding for infrastructure.

Amendment 3 (Article 7):

The TEN-T guidelines should make it explicitly clear how projects of common interest are quantified and identified.

Article 7

<p><i>Commission proposal</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Article 7</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Projects of common interest</p> <p>1. Projects of common interest shall contribute to the development of the trans-European transport network through the creation of new transport infrastructure, the maintenance, rehabilitation and upgrading of existing transport infrastructure and through measures promoting its resource-efficient use.</p> <p>2. A project of common interest shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) contribute to the objectives set out in Article 4; (b) comply with Chapter II and, if it concerns the core network, comply in addition with Chapter III; (c) have been subject to a socio-economic cost benefit analysis resulting in a positive net present value; (d) demonstrate clear European added value. 	<p><i>ESPO proposal</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Article 7</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Projects of common interest</p> <p>1. Projects of common interest shall contribute to the development of the trans-European transport network through the creation of new transport infrastructure, the maintenance, rehabilitation and upgrading of existing transport infrastructure and through measures promoting its resource-efficient use.</p> <p>2. A project of common interest shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) contribute to the objectives set out in Article 4; (b) comply with Chapter II and, if it concerns the core network, comply in addition with Chapter III; (c) have been subject to a socio-economic cost benefit analysis resulting in a positive net present value; (d) demonstrate clear have European added value, which is clearly demonstrated through a transparent methodology to be developed by the European Commission.
---	---

Justification:

The TEN-T Guidelines should be more explicit on how ‘European added value’ is actually demonstrated. The Commission should develop a transparent methodology which can quantifiably prove why a cross-border section, missing link, multi-modal connecting point or bottleneck qualifies as a ‘project of common interest’, in terms of transport efficiency, sustainability and/or territorial cohesion.

Amendment 4 (Article 8):

The development of Motorways of the Sea should be promoted in order to create a level playing field among all European territories.

Article 8

<i>Commission proposal</i> <i>Article 8</i> Cooperation with third countries	<i>ESPO proposal</i> <i>Article 8</i> Cooperation with third countries <i>[Article 8.1 – New] (e) facilitate maritime transport and Motorways of the Sea without providing financial support to third country ports</i>
---	---

Justification:

The facilitation and promotion of Motorways of the Sea should not lead to EU financial support for ports in third countries. This would deteriorate the already unlevel playing field between EU and neighbouring non-EU countries.

Amendment 5 (Article 23):

In the interest of clarity, TEN-T guidelines should include a list of ports that form part of the comprehensive network.

Article 23

<i>Commission proposal</i> <i>Article 23</i> Maps Maritime ports which form part of the comprehensive network are indicated on the maps in Annex I.	<i>ESPO proposal</i> <i>Article 23</i> Lists and Maps Maritime ports which form part of the comprehensive network <i>are listed in part 1 of Annex I and</i> are <i>also</i> indicated on the maps in Annex I.
---	--

Justification:

ESPO believes that indicating the nodes of the comprehensive network only by anchors in maps makes it unnecessarily difficult to identify them and brings confusion. It will add to clarity if, in addition to the maps, a list of comprehensive network ports is added to the Annex 1 of the TEN-T guidelines proposal.

Amendment 6 (Article 24):

The components of maritime transport infrastructure should be better specified.

Article 24

<p><i>Commission proposal</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Article 24</i> Infrastructure components</p> <p>1. Maritime transport infrastructure comprises in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) maritime space; (b) sea canals; (c) Maritime ports, including the infrastructure necessary for transport operations within the port area; (d) Navigational aids; (e) Port approaches; (f) Motorways of the sea; (g) associated equipment; (h) ITS. <p>....</p> <p>3. Equipment associated with maritime transport infrastructure shall include in particular equipment for ice breaking, hydrological surveys, and dredging and maintenance of the port and port approaches</p>	<p><i>ESPO proposal</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Article 24</i> Infrastructure components</p> <p>1. Maritime transport infrastructure comprises in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) maritime space <i>including the construction and maintenance of dikes, locks and docks as well as capital and maintenance dredging and icebreaking;</i> (b) sea canals; (c) Maritime ports, <i>including the creation, modernisation and capacity extension of the (road, rail, and IWW) infrastructure</i> necessary for transport operations within the port area ; (d) Navigational aids; (e) Port approaches; (f) Motorways of the sea; (g) associated equipment; (h) ITS. <p>.....</p> <p>3. Equipment associated with maritime transport infrastructure shall include in particular equipment for ice breaking, hydrological surveys, and dredging and maintenance of the port and port approaches</p>
---	--

Justification:

The infrastructure components for each transport mode are the basis of the TEN-T and as such should be clearly and unambiguously defined.

Amendment 7 (Article 24, paragraph 2):

Level playing field in the selection of maritime ports of the comprehensive network.

Article 24, paragraph 2

<p><i>Commission proposal</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Article 24, paragraph 2</i></p> <p>2. Maritime ports shall be entry and exit points for the land infrastructure of the comprehensive network. They shall meet at least one of the following criteria:</p>	<p><i>ESPO proposal</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Article 24, paragraph 2</i></p> <p>2. Maritime ports shall be entry and exit points for the land infrastructure of the comprehensive network. They shall meet at least one of the following criteria:</p>
---	---

<p><i>(a) The total annual passenger traffic volume exceeds 0,1 % of the total annual passenger traffic volume of all maritime ports of the Union. The reference amount for this total volume is the latest available three-year average, based on the statistics published by Eurostat.</i></p> <p><i>(b) The total annual cargo volume – either for bulk or for non-bulk cargo handling – exceeds 0,1% of the corresponding total annual cargo volume handled in all maritime ports of the Union. The reference amount for this total volume is the latest available three-year average, based on the statistics published by Eurostat.</i></p> <p><i>(c) The maritime port is located on an island and provides the sole point of access to a NUTS 3 region in the comprehensive network.</i></p> <p><i>(d) The maritime port is located in an outermost region or a peripheral area, outside a radius of 200 km from the nearest other port in the comprehensive network.</i></p>	<p><i>(a) The total annual traffic volume is not less than 1,5 million tonnes of freight or 200 000 passengers. The reference amount for this total volume is the latest available three-year average, based on the statistics published by Eurostat.</i></p> <p><i>(b) The maritime port is located on an island and is the primary maritime point of access to a NUTS 3 region in the comprehensive network.</i></p> <p><i>(c) The maritime port is located in an outermost region or a peripheral area, outside a radius of 200 km from the nearest other port in the comprehensive network.</i></p>
---	---

Justification:

The maritime ports belonging to comprehensive network have been identified by Member States in accordance with the criteria set by article 24 of the proposed guidelines. However, negotiations between the Commission and the Member States have resulted in additional ports being included on the basis of their status as category A (international) ports in the presently applicable guidelines. Likewise, ports which did not meet the criteria (taking into account their traffics in years 2007, 2008, 2009) but for which there are evidences that traffic growth is taking place and will continue, have also been accepted. In the benefit of a level playing field across Europe, ESPO recommends that all category A ports under the presently applicable TEN-T guidelines form part of the comprehensive network.

Amendment 8 (Article 37):

Port Community Systems should explicitly qualify as maritime ITS.

Article 37

<i>Commission proposal</i>	<i>ESPO proposal</i>
<i>Article 37</i>	<i>Article 37</i>
<p>4. ITS associated with transport modes shall in particular include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - for maritime transport: VT MIS and e-maritime services 	<p>2. ITS associated with transport modes shall in particular include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - for maritime transport: VT MIS and e-maritime services, including Port Community Systems (PCS)

Justification:

Information Technology Systems should include Port Community Systems. The text proposed by the Commission is ambiguous in this respect and could lead to their exclusion.

Amendment 9 (Articles 26 and 47):

Obligations concerning port hinterland connections should respond to traffic requirements.

Articles 26 and 47

<p><i>Commission proposal</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Article 26</i> <i>Transport infrastructure requirements</i></p> <p>1. Within the sphere of their responsibility, Member States, port operators and infrastructure managers shall ensure that:</p> <p>(a) Maritime ports are connected with railway lines, roads and, where possible, inland waterways of the comprehensive network, except in Malta and Cyprus for as long as no railway system is established within their territory.</p> <p>(b) Any maritime port offers at least one terminal open to all operators in a non discriminatory way and apply transparent charges.</p> <p>(c) Sea canals, port fairways and estuaries connect two seas, or provide access from the sea to maritime ports and correspond at least to inland waterway class VI.</p> <p>...</p>	<p><i>ESPO proposal</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Article 26</i> <i>Transport infrastructure requirements</i></p> <p>1. Within the sphere of their responsibility, Member States, port operators and infrastructure managers shall ensure that:</p> <p>(a) Maritime ports are connected, <i>where appropriate</i>, with railway lines, roads and, where possible, inland waterways of the comprehensive network, except in Malta and Cyprus for as long as no railway system is established within their territory.</p> <p>(b) Any maritime port offers at least one terminal open to all operators in a non discriminatory way and apply transparent charges.</p> <p>(c) Sea canals, port fairways and estuaries connect two seas, or provide access from the sea to maritime ports and correspond at least to inland waterway class VI.</p> <p>...</p>
<p><i>Commission proposal</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Article 47</i> <i>Nodes of the core network</i></p> <p>2. Maritime ports indicated in Part 2 of Annex II shall be connected with <i>the railway</i> and road transport infrastructure of the trans-European transport network by 31 December 2030 at the latest, except in duly justified cases.</p>	<p><i>ESPO proposal</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Article 47</i> <i>Nodes of the core network</i></p> <p>2. Maritime ports indicated in Part 2 of Annex II shall be connected with road transport infrastructure and, <i>where appropriate, railway infrastructure</i> of the trans-European transport network by 31 December 2030 at the latest, except in duly justified cases.</p>

Justification:

ESPO very much appreciates the requirement that seaports in both core and comprehensive networks should have adequate hinterland connections. This obligation should however take account of the specific type of traffic and demand in each port. Whilst all ports need road connections, ESPO believes that, similar to inland waterway connections, rail connections should only be developed where they are appropriate. For example, in the case of ro-ro ports a railway connection with the hinterland may not always make sense.

Amendment 10 (Article 47):

The criteria for the selection of maritime ports of the core network should be made explicit.

Article 47

<i>Commission proposal</i>	<i>ESPO proposal</i>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Article 47</i> <i>Nodes of the core network</i></p> <p>1. The nodes of the core network are set out in Annex II and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- urban nodes, including their ports and airports;- <i>maritime ports;</i>- border crossing points to neighbouring countries.	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Article 47</i> <i>Nodes of the core network</i></p> <p>1. The nodes of the core network are set out in Annex II and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- urban nodes, including their ports and airports;- <i>maritime ports and port clusters if they meet one of the following criteria:</i><ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>a) Their annual volume meets the following threshold formula: (bulk tonnage port / 1 % of the total bulk tonnage of all EU seaports) + (non-bulk tonnage port / 1 % of the total non-bulk tonnage of all EU seaports) > 1</i> <i>The reference amount for the total volumes is the latest available three-year average, based on the statistics published by Eurostat. Bulk cargo is understood to comprise dry and liquid cargo, including oil.</i><i>b) In insular Member States or NUTS 1 regions with access to the sea, where no ports are classified according to 1 a), as a general rule, only one seaport along each continuous coastline is classified as primary node. A second port may be classified as primary node if the corresponding hinterland covers landlocked NUTS 1 regions and the cumulative transshipment volume exceeds the threshold set out in point 1 a). The size and the hinterland connectivity of the ports are taken into account when considering two ports along a continuous coastline or in an insular Member State for classification as primary nodes. Ports on islands which are not Member States on</i>

	<p><i>their own do not qualify as primary nodes since their hinterland connections, if in the TEN-T at all, typically belong to the comprehensive network.</i></p> <p><i>c) Seaports along core network links crossing the sea that are not primary nodes, but are bridgeheads of corresponding ferries, are included as secondary nodes.</i></p> <p>- border crossing points to neighbouring countries</p>
--	---

Justification:

The maritime ports of the core network have been identified by the Commission in accordance with the criteria set in the Commission staff working paper ‘The New Trans-European Transport Network Policy - Planning and implementation issues’ SEC(2011)101. The Commission also proposed to include ferry bridgeheads as secondary nodes. In the interest of transparency, it is recommended to make these selection criteria and the methodology used an integral part of the TEN-T guidelines.

Amendment 11 (Annexe II) – TENTATIVE proposal:

List of nodes of the core network - List of maritime ports

<i>Commission proposal</i>	<i>ESPO tentative proposal</i>
<i>2. List of maritime ports</i>	<i>2. List of maritime ports</i>
FRANCE	FRANCE
Bordeaux	Bordeaux
<i>Calais, Dunkerque</i>	<i>Brest</i>
Le Havre	<i>Calais</i>
Marseille	<i>Dunkerque</i>
Nantes Saint-Nazaire	Le Havre
Rouen	<i>La Rochelle</i>
	Marseille
	Nantes Saint-Nazaire
	Rouen
IRELAND	IRELAND
Cork	Cork
Dublin	Dublin
<i>Limerick</i>	<i>Shannon Foynes</i>
	<i>Rosslare</i>
ITALY	ITALY
Ancona	Ancona
Bari	<i>Augusta</i>
Genova	Bari
Gioia Tauro	<i>Cagliari</i>
La Spezia	<i>Catania</i>
Livorno	Genova
Napoli	Gioia Tauro

Palermo Ravenna Taranto Trieste Venezia FINLAND Helsinki <i>Kotka, Hamina</i> <i>Turku</i> UNITED KINGDOM Belfast Bristol Cardiff, Newport Dover Felixstowe Forth (Edinburgh) Glasgow Grimsby, Immingham Liverpool London Southampton, Portsmouth Tees and Hartlepool	La Spezia Livorno Napoli Palermo Ravenna Taranto Trieste Venezia FINLAND Helsinki <i>HaminaKotka</i> <i>Turku, Naantali</i> UNITED KINGDOM Belfast Bristol Cardiff, Newport Dover Felixstowe Forth (Edinburgh) Glasgow Grimsby, Immingham Liverpool London <i>Milford Haven</i> Southampton, Portsmouth Tees and Hartlepool
--	--

Justification:

The maritime ports of the core network are listed in section 2 of Annexe II of the proposal. On 12 December 2011, the European Commission published a new version this annexe as a corrigendum to its proposal. ESPO has used this corrigendum as a basis for the above modifications and corrections to the list of maritime ports. *It should be noted that this is a tentative amendment proposal, based on the criteria outlined in amendment 10 and following data received from ESPO members.*

Amendment 11 (Annexe III):

Indicative maps of the TEN-T should include the relevant maritime ports in neighbouring countries in the Mediterranean, Black Sea and Baltic Sea.

Justification:

Annexe III should also consider the extension of the TEN-T networks towards neighbouring countries in the Mediterranean, Black Sea and Baltic Sea, and include maps with the relevant maritime ports.

Amendment 12 (Articles 5, 7, 42):

Transport and environmental policy objectives should be better integrated.

Articles 5,7,42

<p><i>Commission proposal</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Article 5</i> <i>Resource efficient network</i></p> <p>Member States and, as appropriate, regional and local authorities, infrastructure managers, transport operators and other public and private entities shall plan, develop and operate the trans-European transport network in a resource efficient way, through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(a) an optimisation of infrastructure integration and interconnection;(b) the broad deployment of new technologies and ITS;(c) improvement and maintenance of existing transport infrastructure;(d) the taking into account of possible synergies with other networks, in particular trans-European energy or telecommunication networks;(e) the assessment of strategic environmental impact, with the establishment of appropriate plans and programmes and of impacts on climate mitigation;(f) measures to plan and expand infrastructure capacity where necessary;(g) adequate consideration of the vulnerability of transport infrastructure with regard to a changing climate as well as natural and man-made disasters.	<p><i>ESPO proposal</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Article 5</i> <i>Resource efficient network</i></p> <p>Member States and, as appropriate, regional and local authorities, infrastructure managers, transport operators and other public and private entities shall plan, develop and operate the trans-European transport network in a resource efficient way, through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(a) an optimisation of infrastructure integration and interconnection;(b) the broad deployment of new technologies and ITS;(c) improvement and maintenance of existing transport infrastructure;(d) the taking into account of possible synergies with other networks, in particular trans-European energy or telecommunication networks;(e) the assessment of strategic environmental impact, with the establishment of appropriate plans and programmes and of impacts on climate mitigation; <i>ensuring special and fast track procedures for projects of common interest;</i>(f) measures to plan and expand infrastructure capacity where necessary;(g) adequate consideration of the vulnerability of transport infrastructure with regard to a changing climate as well as natural and man-made disasters.
<p><i>Commission proposal</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Article 7</i> <i>Projects of common interest</i></p> <p>1. Projects of common interest shall contribute to the development of the trans-European transport network through the creation of new transport infrastructure, the maintenance, rehabilitation and upgrading of existing transport infrastructure and through measures promoting its resource-efficient use.</p>	<p><i>ESPO proposal</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Article 7</i> <i>Projects of common interest</i></p> <p>1. Projects of common interest shall contribute to the development of the trans-European transport network through the creation of new transport infrastructure, the maintenance, rehabilitation and upgrading of existing transport infrastructure and through measures promoting its resource-efficient use.</p>

<p>2. A project of common interest shall:</p> <p>(a) contribute to the objectives set out in Article 4;</p> <p>(b) comply with Chapter II and, if it concerns the core network, comply in addition with Chapter III;</p> <p>(c) have been subject to a socio-economic cost benefit analysis resulting in a positive net present value;</p> <p>(d) demonstrate clear European added value.</p> <p>3. A project of common interest may encompass its entire cycle, including feasibility studies and permission procedures, implementation and evaluation.</p> <p>4. Member States and other project promoters shall take all necessary measures to ensure that the projects are carried out in compliance with relevant Union and national rules and procedures, in particular with Union legislation on the environment, climate protection, safety, security, competition, state aid, public procurement and public health.</p> <p>5. Projects of common interest are eligible for Union financial aid under the instruments available for the Trans-European transport network, in particular the Connecting Europe Facility established by Regulation (EU) No XXX/2012.</p>	<p>2. A project of common interest shall:</p> <p>(a) contribute to the objectives set out in Article 4;</p> <p>(b) comply with Chapter II and, if it concerns the core network, comply in addition with Chapter III;</p> <p>(c) have been subject to a socio-economic cost benefit analysis resulting in a positive net present value;</p> <p>(d) demonstrate clear European added value.</p> <p>3. A project of common interest may encompass its entire cycle, including feasibility studies and permission procedures, implementation and evaluation.</p> <p>4. Member States and other project promoters shall take all necessary measures to ensure that the projects are carried out in compliance with relevant Union and national rules and procedures, in particular with Union legislation on the environment, climate protection, safety, security, competition, state aid, public procurement and public health.</p> <p><i>4 bis. Projects of common interest are conclusive of ‘Imperative Reasons of Overriding Public Interest’ (IROPI or similar) criteria.</i></p> <p>5. Projects of common interest are eligible for Union financial aid under the instruments available for the Trans-European transport network, in particular the Connecting Europe Facility established by Regulation (EU) No XXX/2012.</p>
<p><i>Commission proposal</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Article 42</i> <i>Environmental protection</i></p> <p>Member States and other project promoters shall carry out environmental assessment of plans and projects in particular as provided in Council Directives 85/337/EEC of 27 June 1985 on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment and 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora⁵⁶, and Directives of the European Parliament and of the Council: 2000/60/EC of 23 October 2000 establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water policy⁵⁷, 2001/42/EC of 27 June 2001 on the assessment of</p>	<p><i>ESPO proposal</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Article 42</i> <i>Environmental protection</i></p> <p>1. Member States and other project promoters shall carry out environmental assessment of plans and projects in particular as provided in Council Directives 85/337/EEC of 27 June 1985 on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment and 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora⁵⁶, and Directives of the European Parliament and of the Council: 2000/60/EC of 23 October 2000 establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water policy⁵⁷, 2001/42/EC of 27 June 2001 on the assessment of the effects of</p>

<p>the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment⁵⁸, and 2009/147/EC of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds⁵⁹ in order to avoid or, when not possible, mitigate or compensate for negative impacts on the environment, such as landscape fragmentation, soil sealing, air and water pollution as well as noise, and to effectively protect biodiversity.</p>	<p>certain plans and programmes on the environment⁵⁸, and 2009/147/EC of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds⁵⁹ in order to avoid or, when not possible, mitigate or compensate for negative impacts on the environment, such as landscape fragmentation, soil sealing, air and water pollution as well as noise, and to effectively protect biodiversity.</p> <p><i>2. Member States and other project promoters shall ensure that such assessments are carried out efficiently, avoiding unnecessary delays.</i></p>
---	---

Justification:

ESPO believes that the proposed TEN-T guidelines should propose measures that aim at achieving a better integration of transport and environmental policy objectives, by acknowledging that projects that will be given the ‘common interest’ status, fulfil ‘Imperative Reasons of Overriding Public Interest’ (IROPI or similar) criteria. Also, the TEN-T guidelines should include special and fast track procedures for projects of common interest in order to deal with environmental and other assessments in an efficient manner.

Amendment 13 (Article 52):

Port authorities must take part in the core network corridor platforms.

Article 52

<p><i>Commission proposal</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Article 52</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Governance of core network corridors</p> <p>1. For each core network corridor, the Member States concerned shall establish a corridor platform responsible for defining the general objectives of the core network corridor and for preparing and supervising the measures referred to in Article 53(1).</p> <p>2. The corridor platform shall be composed of the representatives of the Member States concerned <i>and, as appropriate, other public and private entities. In any case, the relevant infrastructure managers as defined in Directive 2001/14/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 February 2001 on the allocation of railway infrastructure capacity and the levying of charges for the use of railway infrastructure shall participate in the corridor platform.</i></p> <p>3. The European Coordinator shall chair the corridor platform.</p>	<p><i>ESPO proposal</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Article 52</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Governance of core network corridors</p> <p>1. For each core network corridor, the Member States concerned shall establish a corridor platform responsible for defining the general objectives of the core network corridor and for preparing and supervising the measures referred to in Article 53(1).</p> <p>2. The corridor platform shall be composed of the representatives of the Member States, <i>the infrastructure managers of the transport modes and the port authorities of the sea and inland ports which are concerned by the corridor.</i></p> <p>3. The European Coordinator shall chair the corridor platform.</p>
--	---

<p>4. The corridor platform may be established as a permanent legal entity, such as a European Economic Interest Group.</p> <p>5. The establishment of corridor platforms is without prejudice to the principle that the beneficiary of Union financial support has the final responsibility for the implementation of the projects.</p>	<p>4. The corridor platform may be established as a permanent legal entity, such as a European Economic Interest Group.</p> <p>5. The establishment of corridor platforms is without prejudice to the principle that the beneficiary of Union financial support has the final responsibility for the implementation of the projects.</p>
--	--

Justification:

ESPO supports the corridors' concept as a tool to implement the TEN-T core network and welcomes the fact that these corridors should include seaports and their accesses. ESPO recommends that port authorities concerned take part and are actively involved in the core network corridors platforms to reflect the importance of seaports as key entry and exit points of the corridors. Article 52 of the Commission proposal mentions only rail infrastructure managers.

Amendment 14 (Article 52):

The core network corridor platform should ensure alignment with implementation of EU Rail freight corridors and ERTMS deployment.

Article 52

<p><i>Commission proposal</i></p> <p><i>Article 52</i></p> <p>Governance of core network corridors</p>	<p><i>ESPO proposal</i></p> <p><i>Article 52</i></p> <p>Governance of core network corridors</p>
<p>1. For each core network corridor, the Member States concerned shall establish a corridor platform responsible for defining the general objectives of the core network corridor and for preparing and supervising the measures referred to in Article 53(1).</p> <p>2. The corridor platform shall be composed of the representatives of the Member States concerned and, as appropriate, other public and private entities. In any case, the relevant infrastructure managers as defined in Directive 2001/14/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 February 2001 on the allocation of railway infrastructure capacity and the levying of charges for the use of railway infrastructure shall participate in the corridor platform.</p> <p>3. The European Coordinator shall chair the corridor platform.</p> <p>4. The corridor platform may be established as a permanent legal entity, such as a European Economic Interest Group.</p>	<p>1. For each core network corridor, the Member States concerned shall establish a corridor platform responsible for defining the general objectives of the core network corridor and for preparing and supervising the measures referred to in Article 53(1).</p> <p>2. The corridor platform shall be composed of the representatives of the Member States concerned and, as appropriate, other public and private entities. In any case, the relevant infrastructure managers as defined in Directive 2001/14/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 February 2001 on the allocation of railway infrastructure capacity and the levying of charges for the use of railway infrastructure shall participate in the corridor platform.</p> <p>3. The European Coordinator shall chair the corridor platform.</p> <p>4. The corridor platform may be established as a permanent legal entity, such as a European Economic Interest Group.</p>

<p>5. The establishment of corridor platforms is without prejudice to the principle that the beneficiary of Union financial support has the final responsibility for the implementation of the projects.</p>	<p>5. The establishment of corridor platforms is without prejudice to the principle that the beneficiary of Union financial support has the final responsibility for the implementation of the projects.</p> <p><i>6. For each core network corridor, the corridor platform should ensure alignment with concerned EU rail freight corridors under Regulation 913/2010 and with the European Deployment Plan for ERTMS provided by Commission Decision 2009/561/EC.</i></p>
--	--

Justification:

The development of EU Rail freight corridors as defined by Regulation 913/2010 and the European Deployment Plan for ERTMS provided by Commission Decision 2009/561/EC will coexist with the implementation of core network corridors. ESPO recommends that the corridor platform ensures alignment with concerned EU rail freight corridors under Regulation 913/2010 and with the European Deployment Plan for ERTMS provided by Commission Decision 2009/561/EC

Amendment 15 (Article 53):

TEN-T guidelines should ensure that the implementation of the core network corridors adapts to evolving traffic demand and market needs.

Article 53

<i>Commission proposal</i>	<i>ESPO proposal</i>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Article 53</i> Corridor development plan</p> <p>1. For each core network corridor, the Member States concerned, in cooperation with the corridor platform, shall jointly draw up and notify to the Commission a corridor development plan within six months after entry into force of this Regulation. This plan shall include in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) a description of the characteristics of the core network corridor, including bottlenecks; (b) the objectives for the core network corridor in particular in terms of performance expressed as the quality of the service, its capacity and its compliance with the requirements set out in Chapter II; (c) the programme of measures necessary for developing the core network corridor; (d) a multimodal transport market study. (e) an implementation plan including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – a deployment plan relating to interoperable traffic management systems on multi-modal freight corridors without prejudice to the applicable Union 	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Article 53</i> Corridor development plan</p> <p>1. For each core network corridor, the Member States concerned, in cooperation with the corridor platform, shall jointly draw up and notify to the Commission a corridor development plan within six months after entry into force of this Regulation. This plan shall include in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) a description of the characteristics of the core network corridor, including bottlenecks; (b) the objectives for the core network corridor in particular in terms of performance expressed as the quality of the service, its capacity and its compliance with the requirements set out in Chapter II; (c) the programme of measures necessary for developing the core network corridor; (d) a multimodal transport market study to <i>be regularly updated with observed and expected evolutions of the traffic volume of each mode of the core network corridors. The study should also take account of the passenger traffic that shares the same infrastructure. It</i>

<p>legislation; -.....</p> <p>(f) an implementation plan, to be updated regularly, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the list of projects for extension, renewal or redeployment of transport infrastructure referred to in article 2 (2) for each of the transport modes involved in the core network corridor. - 	<p><i>must assess the socio-economic costs and benefits of the creation of the corridors and their European added value. The study must also determine whether the components of the corridors could be enlarged. Based on the conclusions of the study, Member States concerned could propose modifications of the composition of the core network corridors accordingly.</i></p> <p>(e) an implementation plan including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a deployment plan relating to interoperable traffic management systems on multi-modal freight corridors without prejudice to the applicable Union legislation; -..... <p>(f) an implementation plan, to be updated regularly, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the list of projects for extension, renewal or redeployment of transport infrastructure referred to in article 2 (2) for each of the transport modes involved in the core network corridor. -
--	---

Justification:

Traffic flows and modal share within the TEN-T network are likely to evolve in the coming years. ESPO recommends that the multimodal transport market study is used to ensure that evolutions of traffic flows and of modal utilisation are monitored, allowing Member States to modify the composition of core network corridors.

ANNEXE 2

ESPO AMENDMENT PROPOSALS FOR THE DRAFT REGULATION ESTABLISHING THE CONNECTING EUROPE FACILITY

Amendment 1 (Article 10):

The maximum co-funding rate for inland transport connections to ports and Motorways of the Sea should be raised.

Article 10

<i>Commission proposal</i>	<i>ESPO proposal</i>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Article 10</i> Funding rates</p> <p>1.Except in cases referred to in Article XXX of Regulation (EU) No XXXX/2012 [New Financial Regulation], proposals shall be selected through calls for proposals based on the work programmes referred to in Article 17.</p> <p>2.In the field of transport:</p> <p>(a) with regard to grants for studies, the amount of Union financial aid shall not exceed 50% of the eligible costs;</p> <p>(b) with regard to grants for works:</p> <p>(i) rail and inland waterways: the amount of Union financial aid shall not exceed 20% of the eligible cost; the funding rate may be increased to 30% for actions addressing bottlenecks; the funding rate may be increased to 40% for actions concerning cross-border sections;</p> <p>(ii) inland transport connections to ports <i>and airports, actions to reduce rail freight noise by retrofitting of existing rolling stock</i>, as well as development of ports and multi-modal platforms: the amount of Union financial aid shall not exceed 20% of the eligible cost.</p> <p>(c) with regard to grants for traffic management systems and services:</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Article 10</i> Funding rates</p> <p>1.Except in cases referred to in Article XXX of Regulation (EU) No XXXX/2012 [New Financial Regulation], proposals shall be selected through calls for proposals based on the work programmes referred to in Article 17.</p> <p>2.In the field of transport:</p> <p>(a) with regard to grants for studies, the amount of Union financial aid shall not exceed 50% of the eligible costs;</p> <p>(b) with regard to grants for works:</p> <p>(i) rail and inland waterways: the amount of Union financial aid shall not exceed 20% of the eligible cost; the funding rate may be increased to 30% for actions addressing bottlenecks; the funding rate may be increased to 40% for actions concerning cross-border sections;</p> <p>(ii) inland transport connections to ports (<i>including road, rail and inland waterways connections</i>) and airports, actions to reduce rail freight noise by retrofitting of existing rolling stock, <i>the development of Motorways of the Sea</i>, as well as development of ports and multi-modal platforms: the amount of Union financial aid shall not exceed 40% of the eligible cost.</p> <p>(iii) <i>airports and actions to reduce rail freight noise by retrofitting of existing rolling stock: the amount of Union financial aid shall not exceed 20% of the eligible cost.</i></p> <p>(c) with regard to grants for traffic management systems and services:</p>

<p>(i) the European Rail Traffic Management System (ERTMS): the amount of Union financial aid shall not exceed 50% of the eligible cost;</p> <p>(ii) traffic management systems, freight transport services, secure parkings on the road core network, <i>as well as actions to support the development of Motorways of the Seas</i>: the amount of Union financial aid shall not exceed 20% of the eligible cost.</p>	<p>(i) the European Rail Traffic Management System (ERTMS): the amount of Union financial aid shall not exceed 50% of the eligible cost;</p> <p>(ii) traffic management systems, freight transport services, secure parkings on the road core network, <i>as well as actions to support the development of Motorways of the Seas</i>: the amount of Union financial aid shall not exceed 20% of the eligible cost.</p>
--	---

Justification:

ESPO welcomes the fact that, under the Connecting Europe Facility, proposal grants for works related to rail and inland waterways can go up to 30 and 40% of the eligible cost for actions addressing bottlenecks and cross-border sections respectively. Given that seaports are one of the principal cornerstones of the new TEN-T framework, ESPO believes that inland transport connections to ports (including road, rail and inland waterways connections), the development of Motorways of the Sea, as well as the development of ports and multi-modal platforms should equally be entitled to receive grants up to 40% of the eligible costs. Road connections should indeed not be ignored, as they are essential for connectivity and proper investment in them will reduce bottlenecks and related emissions.

Amendment 2 (Annexe):

Motorways of the Sea must be established as an additional corridor.

<p><i>Commission proposal</i></p>	<p><i>ESPO proposal</i></p> <p><i>[New] Corridor 11: Motorways of the Sea</i></p> <p><i>The Motorways of the Sea corridor shall include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>maritime links and their hinterland interconnections between two or more core network ports;</i> - <i>maritime links and their hinterland interconnections between two or more ports included in the core and comprehensive network;</i> - <i>maritime links and their hinterland interconnections between one or more core and comprehensive network ports and selected ports in third countries (countries along the coastline of the Baltic, Mediterranean and Black Sea included).</i>
-----------------------------------	---

Justification:

To give continuation to the current TEN-T priority project no.21, an additional corridor ‘Motorways of the Sea’ is needed. Priority project 21 was focused on the EU’s goal of achieving a clean, safe and

efficient transport system by transforming shipping into a genuine alternative to congested land transport. The concept aims at introducing new intermodal maritime-based logistics chains to achieve door-to-door integrated transport chains. It will also help implement the policy initiatives on the European Maritime Space without Barriers, the maritime transport strategy for 2018 and will positively contribute to greenhouse gas (CO₂) reductions which is of paramount importance in the context of climate change. Motorways of the Sea tap on the huge potential of maritime transport as the backbone of international trade. In Europe, this capacity has not yet been fully exploited. Motorways of the Sea, which should be based upon successful shipping routes, are designed to shift cargo traffic from heavily congested land networks to where there is more available spare capacity – the environmentally friendly waterways. This will be achieved through the establishment of more efficient and frequent, high-quality maritime-based logistics services between Member States.

ANNEXE 3

PRELIMINARY COMPILATION OF SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS OF THE MULTIMODAL CORRIDORS LAID DOWN IN THE ANNEXE TO THE DRAFT REGULATION ESTABLISHING THE CONNECTING EUROPE FACILITY

DISCLAIMER

This list is a preliminary compilation of modifications and clarifications suggested by a number of ESPO members. It serves merely informative purposes and should not be read as a list of amendments proposals. ESPO does not take any responsibility for the accuracy or adequacy of the suggested changes and valuable modifications and clarifications of other sections of the corridors may still be missing from this list.

As outlined in its main position, ESPO believes that for all pre-identified projects it should be quantifiably demonstrated and measurable why a cross-border section, missing link, multi-modal connecting point or bottleneck has EU added value. Any funding of a project through the TEN-T budget should be the result of a proven effect that the realisation of the proposed project leads to EU added value, in terms of transport efficiency, sustainability and/or territorial cohesion. ESPO therefore invites the Commission to develop within the TEN-T Guidelines a transparent methodology that would justify TEN-T funding. With such a methodology projects with EU added value can justifiably be labelled as 'projects of common interest'.

Corridor 1: Baltic- Adriatic corridor

Pre-identified sections	Mode	Description / dates
Wien – Graz: a) Klagenfurt – Udine - Venezia – Ravenna b) <i>Maribor – Ljubljana - Koper</i>	Rail	Upgrading and works ongoing; (further) development of multimodal platforms
Trieste, Venice, Ravenna, <i>Koper</i>	Ports	Port interconnections, (further) development of multimodal platforms
<i>Ravenna-Ancona – Bari -Taranto</i>	<i>Rail</i>	<i>upgrading</i>
<i>Ancona – Bari -Taranto</i>	<i>Ports, MoS</i>	<i>Port interconnections, (further) development of multimodal platforms, traffic management systems to be deployed</i>

Corridor 2: Warszawa – Berlin – Amsterdam Corridor

Pre-identified sections	Mode	Description / dates
Amsterdam locks	<i>Ports, Maritime, IWW</i>	Studies ongoing, <i>works start before 2015</i>

Corridor 3: Mediterranean Corridor

Algeciras – Madrid – Tarragona
 Sevilla – Valencia – Tarragona
 Tarragona – Barcelona – Perpignan – **Marseille** - Lyon – Torino – Milano – Venezia – Ljubljana – Budapest –
 UA Border

Pre-identified sections	Mode	Description / dates
Algeciras - Madrid	Rail	Studies ongoing, works to be launched before 2015, to be completed 2020. <i>Electrification of the line Algeciras-Bobadilla (176 km) and duplication of the track in the subsection Algeciras-San Pablo (46 km)</i>
Barcelona	Port	interconnections rail with port (<i>Construction of the new accesses</i>) and airport
Barcelona - Perpignan	Rail	cross-border section, works ongoing, new line completed by 2015, Upgrading existing line: <i>Introduction of UIC on the Iberian existing line. Adaptation of the line to 750m-trains. Development of intermodal platforms and connection with the rail network on UIC+Iberian gauge</i>
<i>Madrid-Zaragoza-Barcelona</i>	<i>Rail</i>	<i>Upgrading of existing lines: Introduction of UIC on the Iberian existing line. Adaptation of the line and sidetracks to 750m-trains. Development of intermodal platforms and connection with the rail network on UIC+ Iberian gauge</i>
<i>Lyon-Avignon-Marseille (via Miramas and Fos)</i>	<i>Rail</i>	<i>Upgrading (ERTMS)</i>
<i>Venezia, Trieste</i>	<i>Ports</i>	<i>Port interconnections, (further) development of multimodal platforms</i>

Corridor 5: Helsinki – Valletta

Pre-identified sections	Mode	Description / dates
Turku, <i>Naantali</i> - Stockholm	Ports, MoS	port hinterland connections, icebreaking capacity
<i>Dortmund –Frankfurt-Mannheim/Hannover-Frankfurt – Mannheim to Basel</i>	<i>Rail</i>	<i>works</i>
Napoli – Bari - <i>Taranto</i>	Rail	studies and works
<i>Napoli – Bari - Taranto</i>	<i>Ports, MoS</i>	<i>Port hinterland connections, further development of multimodal platforms, traffic management systems to be deployed</i>
<i>Napoli-Gioia Tauro-Messina-Palermo</i>	<i>Ports, MoS</i>	<i>Port hinterland connections, further development of multimodal platforms, traffic management systems to be deployed</i>
<i>Catania - Valletta</i>	<i>Ports, Mos</i>	<i>Port hinterland connections, further development of multimodal platforms, traffic management systems to be deployed</i>
Palermo - Valletta	Ports, MoS	port hinterland connections, <i>traffic management systems to be deployed</i>

Corridor 6: Genoa – Rotterdam

Pre-identified sections	Mode	Description / dates
<i>Genova</i>	<i>Port</i>	<i>Port hinterland connections, further development of multimodal platforms</i>
<i>Genova-Savona-Ventimiglia</i>	<i>Rail</i>	<i>Upgrading</i>
<i>Savona</i>	<i>Port/Mos</i>	<i>Port hinterland connections; traffic management systems to be deployed</i>
<i>Genova-La Spezia- Marina di Carrara- Livorno-Piombino-Civitavecchia - Napoli</i>	<i>Rail</i>	<i>Upgrading</i>
<i>Genova-La Spezia- Marina di Carrara- Livorno-Piombino-Civitavecchia -Napoli</i>	<i>Ports, MOS</i>	<i>Port hinterland connections, traffic management systems to be deployed</i>
<i>La Spezia-Parma-Verona-Brennero</i>	<i>Rail</i>	<i>upgrading</i>
<i>Zeebrugge</i>	<i>Port - Maritime</i>	<i>Locks: studies (currently ongoing) Works starting before 2016 Port: Hinterland connections (studies and works). E.g. road connection AX, inland waterway connection.</i>
<i>Dunkerque</i>	<i>Port, Rail</i>	<i>New cross-border rail link (studies and work)</i>
<i>Rotterdam</i>	<i>Port, Rail</i>	<i>Upgrade of port rail connection to Betuwe line (Caland bridge), studies and works</i>
<i>Antwerpen – Montzen - Aachen-Keulen/Mönchengladbach</i>	<i>Rail</i>	<i>Upgrading. Traffic management to be deployed.</i>

Corridor 7: Lisboa - Strasbourg

Sines / Lisboa – Madrid – Valladolid
Lisboa – Aveiro – Oporto
Aveiro – Valladolid – Vitoria – Bordeaux – Paris – Mannheim/Strasbourg
Le Havre – Rouen – Paris – Mannheim / Strasbourg

Pre-identified sections	Mode	Description / dates
<i>High speed rail Madrid-Gijon</i>	<i>Rail</i>	<i>Studies and works ongoing</i>
<i>Gijon/Nantes St. Nazaire</i>	<i>Ports, Mos</i>	<i>Ongoing and upgrading</i>
<i>Nantes St. Nazaire / Paris</i>	<i>Rail</i>	<i>Ongoing and upgrading</i>
<i>Brest/Paris</i>	<i>Ports ,Rail</i>	<i>Ongoing and upgrading</i>
<i>La Rochelle – La Pallice</i>	<i>Rail</i>	<i>upgrading</i>
<i>La Rochelle</i>	<i>Port</i>	<i>Port capacities extension (Anse St Marc and Chef de Baie)</i>
<i>Le Havre-Rouen -Paris</i>	<i>Rail , IWW</i>	<i>Studies and upgrading</i>
<i>Le Havre-Rouen -Paris</i>	<i>Ports</i>	<i>Hinterland connections, Port interconnections, development of multimodal platforms and terminals, road and rail accessibility</i>
<i>Gijon- Le Havre-Rouen</i>	<i>Ports, MoS</i>	<i>Studies hinterland connections</i>
<i>Rouen</i>	<i>Port</i>	<i>River Seine deepening (access channel to Rouen) : works ongoing</i>
<i>Le Havre – Rouen – Amiens – Reims – Metz</i>	<i>Rail</i>	<i>Studies and upgrading</i>
<i>Le Havre-Rouen –Chartres - Orléans – Lyon</i>	<i>Rail</i>	<i>Studies upgrading</i>

Corridor 8: Dublin – London – Paris – Brussel

Belfast-Dublin-Holyhead-Birmingham
 Glasgow/Edinburgh-Birmingham
 Birmingham-London-Lille-Brussel/Bruxelles
 Dublin/Cork/Southampton-Le Havre- **Rouen** - Paris
 London-Dover-Calais- **Dunkerque** -Paris

Pre-identified sections	Mode	Description / dates
Dublin, Cork, Southampton, <i>Le Havre</i>	Ports	hinterland connections
<i>Dunkerque</i>	<i>Port,</i>	<i>Port hinterland connections (studies and works)</i>
<i>Dunkerque -Calais</i>	<i>Rail</i>	<i>Upgrading (studies and works)</i>
<i>Le Havre – Paris</i>	<i>IWW</i>	<i>upgrading</i>
<i>Le Havre – Paris</i>	<i>Rail</i>	<i>Studies</i>

Corridor 9: Amsterdam – Basel/Lyon – Marseille

Pre-identified sections	Mode	Description / dates
<i>Volkerak Lock and Kreekrak Lock Prinses Beatrix Lock</i>	<i>IWW</i>	<i>All bridges in the Scheldt-Rhine connection have to meet the requirement of the 9.1 meter Rhine shipping height for four-layer container shipping.</i>
<i>Krammer Lock en Lock Hansweert</i>	<i>IWW</i>	<i>Route to connect to the Seine-Scheldt corridor and is also the alternative route for Rotterdam-Antwerp.</i>
<i>Prinses Beatrix Lock</i>	<i>IWW</i>	<i>Bottlenecks in corridor 9 for inland shipping (container and bulk) on the Amsterdam-Rhine Canal.</i>
Terneuzen	Maritime	<i>Locks: studies (currently ongoing); works starting before 2015</i>
Antwerp	Maritime, port	<i>Locks: works ongoing, overall completion by 2016 Port: hinterland connections (studies and works) E.g. Masterplan Antwerp.</i>
<i>Dunkerque</i>	<i>Port, Rail</i>	<i>New multimodal Terminals, cross-border rail link (all studies and works)</i>
Canal Seine - Escaut	IWW	<i>Canal Seine-Escaut: design completed, competitive dialogue launched, overall completion by 2018 Works along corridor to be completed in Belgium by 2016.</i>
Waterways upgrade in Belgium	IWW	<i>Wallonie: Studies, upgrading Flanders: new locks on the Upper- Scheldt; upgrade of the canal Roeselare-Leie; upgrade of the canal Bossuit-Kortrijk; upgrade of the Upper- Seascheldt; upgrade of the Seacanal Antwerp-Brussels and the canal Brussel-Charleroi</i>
Lyon	Rail	Eastern, <i>northern and southern</i> bypasses: studies and works
<i>Lyon-Avignon- Marseille-Fos port</i>	<i>Rail</i>	<i>Upgrading</i>
<i>Marseille</i>	<i>Ports</i>	<i>Hinterland connections and multimodal terminals</i>

Other Sections on the Core Network

Graz – Maribor – Pragersko	Cross-Border	Rail	studies <i>and</i> works
<i>Ljubljana – Jesenice – Villach – Salzburg.</i>	Cross-Border	Rail	<i>studies and works</i>
<i>Lusignan – Saint-Maixent-l’Ecole</i>	<i>Bottleneck</i>	<i>Rail</i>	<i>upgrading</i>