Contribution ID: 83822e4b-52bd-486b-b90c-17f544500ac2

Date: 14/02/2020 16:09:50

Evaluation of the Regulation N°1315/2013 on Union Guidelines for the development of the Trans-European Transport Network Global Survey

Introduction

The European Commission's Directorate-General for Mobility and Transport (DG MOVE) has contracted a team of independent evaluators[1] to undertake a comprehensive evaluation of Regulation (EU) No 1315 /2013 on Union guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport (TEN-T) network. The study will provide the Commission with an independent evidence-based evaluation of the implementation of the TEN-T Guidelines. Based on the results and conclusions of the evaluation, the Commission intends to take concrete steps related to a possible revision of the guidelines in the framework of the European Green Deal. The attached letter from DG MOVE gives more information about the official nature and importance of the assignment.

The evaluation comprises several types of research, including a desk-based review of existing literature (including related legislation and policy documentation) and data as well as targeted consultations to collect data from specific stakeholder groups at local, national and EU level.

This survey forms an important part of the assessment and asks questions about your awareness, perceptions and experiences of the TEN-T Guidelines, their implementation and outcomes to date, as well as your views on recommendations for future EU policy developments in this area. These data will feed into our responses to the evaluation questions and assessment of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence and EU added value of the guidelines. For these reasons, your help is vital to the evaluation and to DG MOVE.

On our side, we have tried to keep the questionnaire as short and easy to complete as possible, with mainly multiple-choice questions. There are also some open questions, where you are kindly invited to give more detailed explanations and suggestions on specific issues that are of particular interest / importance to you. Responses to the open questions can be provided in English or in other EU languages. At the end of the survey, you may also express your interest in being contacted for an interview.

This survey is designed to support the evaluation of the current TEN-T Regulation and contains six core sections:

Relevance of the Regulation Effectiveness of the Regulation Efficiency of the Regulation Coherence of the Regulation EU-Added value of the Regulation Additional feedback on the overall strengths and weaknesses of the Regulation

Note that all information provided will be kept confidential, reported in aggregated form and only used for the purposes of the evaluation.

Thank you very much for your valuable feedback and support. In case of any questions, please contact julia.halej@Coffey.com.

[1] The evaluation team is formed of a consortium of companies led by Coffey International Development Ltd, and comprised of Transport, Innovation and Systems (TIS), Optimity Advisors and FGM AMOR.

About You

I am gi	ving my contribution as (please tick as appropriate):
	Academic/research institution
	Business association
	Company/business organisation
	Consumer organisation
	EU citizen
	Non-EU citizen
	Environmental organisation
	Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
	National public authority in the EU
V	Regional public authority in the EU
	Local public authority in the EU
	Public authority in a third country (non-EU)
	Infrastructure manager
	Transport operator
	Trade union
	Other (please specify)
If you s	elected Other, please specify:
If you s	selected Other, please specify:
Scope	of work (please tick as many boxes as appropriate):
Scope	of work (please tick as many boxes as appropriate): International
Scope	of work (please tick as many boxes as appropriate): International National
Scope	of work (please tick as many boxes as appropriate): International National Regional
Scope	of work (please tick as many boxes as appropriate): International National
Scope	of work (please tick as many boxes as appropriate): International National Regional
Scope	of work (please tick as many boxes as appropriate): International National Regional Local transport sector/s do you work with regularly (please tick as many boxes as appropriate):
Scope Which	of work (please tick as many boxes as appropriate): International National Regional Local transport sector/s do you work with regularly (please tick as many boxes as appropriate):
Scope V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V	of work (please tick as many boxes as appropriate): International National Regional Local transport sector/s do you work with regularly (please tick as many boxes as appropriate): Air
Scope	of work (please tick as many boxes as appropriate): International National Regional Local transport sector/s do you work with regularly (please tick as many boxes as appropriate): Air Road
Scope	of work (please tick as many boxes as appropriate): International National Regional Local transport sector/s do you work with regularly (please tick as many boxes as appropriate): Air Road Rail
Scope	of work (please tick as many boxes as appropriate): International National Regional Local transport sector/s do you work with regularly (please tick as many boxes as appropriate): Air Road Rail Maritime
Scope Which	of work (please tick as many boxes as appropriate): International National Regional Local transport sector/s do you work with regularly (please tick as many boxes as appropriate): Air Road Rail Maritime Inland Waterways
Scope Which Organi	of work (please tick as many boxes as appropriate): International National Regional Local transport sector/s do you work with regularly (please tick as many boxes as appropriate): Air Road Rail Maritime Inland Waterways Multimodal transport
Scope Which Organi	of work (please tick as many boxes as appropriate): International National Regional Local transport sector/s do you work with regularly (please tick as many boxes as appropriate): Air Road Rail Maritime Inland Waterways Multimodal transport isation size:

0	Not applicable
Count	ry of origin:
0	Austria
0	Belgium
0	Bulgaria
0	Croatia
0	Cyprus
	Czech Republic
	Denmark
	Estonia
	Finland
0	France
	Germany
	Greece
	Hungary
	Iceland
	Ireland
	Italy
	Latvia
0	Liechtenstein
0	Lithuania
0	Luxembourg
0	Malta
0	Netherlands
0	Norway
0	Poland
0	Portugal
0	Romania
	Slovakia
	Slovenia
	Spain
	Sweden
	United Kingdom Other
	Other
If you	selected 'Other', please specify here:
R	égion Nouvelle-Aquitaine
A. R	elevance
In this	section we are requesting your feedback regarding the relevance of the TEN-T Regulation in terms

of objectives and priorities that reflect the current context.

Large (250 or more)

The TEN-T policy remains key in promoting the free circulation of goods, services and citizens throughout the EU. It is instrumental in boosting economic, social and territorial cohesion between all Member States and their regions, as well as beyond the EU. Global transport flows are changing in volume and direction, and the general transport system is undergoing a fundamental transformation through digitalisation, as well as clean, connected and automated mobility contributing to the decarbonization of the transport sector. Infrastructure use and efficiency, enhancing mobility concepts and new social aspects in transport will play a key role in this transition, calling for stronger cooperation between Member States and a wide range of other actors – both public and private ones.

To what extent do you agree that the TEN-T policy objectives address the current and foreseeable challenges listed below? Please tick as appropriate.

	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know
Growth in congestion	0	0	•	0	0
Changes in the national/regional political contexts	0	0	•	0	0
Growth in transport / mobility demand	0	•	0	0	0
Changes in mobility behavior and corresponding mobility solutions for passengers (mobility as a service etc.)	0	0	•	0	0
Changes in freight transport concepts and corresponding transport solutions	0	0	•	0	0
Challenges in ports' policy (clustering, transshipment volumes, innovation, functional developments)	0	0	•	0	0
Challenges in airports' policy (such as clustering, SESAR)	0	0	•	0	0
Challenges in railway hubs (such as intermodality, design)	0	0	•	0	0
Challenges in freight terminals (such as equipment, automation)	0	0	0	•	0
Challenges in cities (such as electrification, increasing demand for seamless mobility chains)	0	•	0	0	0
Increasing concerns about environmental / health effects	0	0	0	•	0
Fast technological progress (digitalisation, automation, new propulsion systems, new transport "modes" – e.g. drones etc.)	0	0	•	0	0
Social challenges (public health, ageing society)	0	0	0	•	0
Climate change	0	0	•	0	0

Scarcity of natural resources	0	0	•	0	0
Adaptation of the network to the needs of military mobility	0	0	0	0	•
Other current and foreseeable external challenges not listed above (please explain below)	•	0	0	0	•

Ple	ase explain o	otner current a	nd foreseeable	external challen	ges not listed a	bove nere:	

And to what extent do you agree that the TEN-T policy objectives address the current and foreseeable policy needs listed below? Please tick as appropriate.

	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know
Facilitating the development of public/private sector partnerships to complement national / public sector investment where appropriate	0	•	0	0	0
Identifying and quantifying major European transport flows	0	•	0	0	0
Identifying and removing bottlenecks and missing links for all modes	0	•	0	0	0
Ensuring high levels of safety, security and other quality parameters of TEN-T infrastructure	•	0	0	0	0
Promoting the closing of missing links at borders	0	0	0	0	0
Defining clear priorities for TEN-T development and boosting their implementation	•	0	0	0	0
Supporting TEN-T implementation through EU instruments (coordination, funding etc.)	0	0	0	0	•
Promoting the comprehensive network and complementarity to the core network	0	0	•	0	0
Considering infrastructure needs from the perspective of users (e.g. providers of logistics or mobility services)	0	0	•	0	0
Encouraging active participation of actors at all levels: European, national, local, regional as well as industrial	•	0	0	0	0
Cooperating with third countries (including neighbouring countries) to facilitate trade and mobility with other parts of the world	0	0	0	0	•

Enabling decarbonisation of the transport system (e. g. through modal shift to sustainable modes and/or new technologies)	©	•	•	©	0
Optimising travel quality for passenger transport (including travel times, comfort, etc.)	0	•	0	0	0
Optimising quality for freight transport (including shipping time, reliability, etc.)	0	0	•	0	0
Supporting enhanced transfer between TEN-T and local / regional transport	0	•	0	0	0
Promoting accessibility for all	0	0	•	0	0
Other current and foreseeable policy needs not listed above (please specify)	0	0	0	0	•

Plea	se specify other current and foreseeable policy needs not listed above here:	

B. Effectiveness

In this section we are requesting your feedback regarding the effectiveness of the TEN-T Regulation in achieving its objectives.

In your view, to what extent have the current provisions for the development of the nodes in the network (i.e. urban and transport nodes) achieved their objectives so far in the areas below?

Please take account of both the 'network structuring dimension' (e.g. volume criteria as a basis for network inclusion, clustering approaches, business development trends, network integration etc.) and the 'functional dimension (e.g. equipment, design, decarbonisation objectives, innovation etc.).

	to a great extent	to some extent	to a small extent	not at all	don't know
Passenger transport nodes	0	0	•	0	0
Freight transport nodes	0	0	•	0	0
Inland ports	0	0	0	0	•
Maritime ports	0	•	0	0	0
Airports	0	0	0	•	0
Logistic / rail road / combined transport terminals	0	0	0	•	0
Other hubs as appropriate, such as TEN-T railway stations	0	0	0	•	0

Urban nodes	0	0	•	0	0
Definition and identification of TEN-T urban nodes	0	0	•	0	0
Connections between network infrastructure and regional and local infrastructure in the TEN-T urban nodes	0	0	0	•	0
Promoting low-noise	0	0	0	0	•
Promoting low carbon delivery	0	0	•	0	0

If you wish to explain in more detail ways in which the TEN-T Regulation has been effective in achieving its objectives for the development of the nodes in the network, please do so below.

_		

In your view, to what extent has the TEN-T Regulation achieved its objectives so far in the following areas:

	to a great extent	to some extent	to a small extent	not at all	don't know
Boosting the creation of a single, Europe-wide infrastructure network as the basis for continuous, seamless and interoperable transport and mobility	0	•	0	0	0
Promoting harmonised standards and other common infrastructure qualities	•	0	0	0	0
Strengthening the social, economic and territorial cohesion of the Union, including peripheral and outermost regions	0	0	•	0	0
Enabling low carbon and clean transport	0	•	0	0	©
Stimulating innovative transport solutions and taking up new technological developments (alternative fuels, digitalisation, ITS)	0	•	0	0	0
Facilitating the free movement of people and goods within the EU	0	•	0	0	0
Increasing benefits for users of passenger transport	0	•	0	0	0
Increasing benefits for users of freight transport	0	0	•	0	0
Ensuring smooth connections between long distance as well as first and last mile legs	0	0	0	•	0
Cooperating with third countries and extending the TEN-T to neighbouring countries	0	0	0	0	•

Tools to monitor and support implementation (such as Implementing and Delegated Acts, European Coordinators, TENtec, reporting)	0	•	0	0	©
Facilitating transport operations	0	0	0	•	0

In your view, to what extent do you agree that the implementation of TEN-T projects contributed to enhancing:

	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know
The overall European network	•	0	0	0	0
Railway infrastructure, including intelligent components	•	0	0	0	0
Inland waterway infrastructure, including intelligent components	0	0	0	0	•
Road infrastructure, including intelligent components	0	0	0	•	0
Ports infrastructure (maritime and inland), including intelligent components	©	•	0	0	0
Motorways of the sea	0	•	0	0	0
Airport infrastructure, including intelligent components	0	0	0	•	0
Multi-modal transport nodes such as rail stations, logistic platforms, including intelligent infrastructure	0	•	0	0	0
Other innovative components of the TEN-T not listed above (please specify)	0	0	0	0	•

Ple	Please specify other innovative components of the TEN-T not listed above here:					

Overall, to what extent do you agree that the TEN-T Regulation has promoted the delivery of the following?

	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know
Accessibility for all passengers, in particular elderly people, persons of reduced mobility and passengers with a disability	0	0	•	0	0
Increased benefits for users through infrastructure standards aiming to enhance transport safety and security	0	•	0	0	0

Increased benefits for users through other infrastructure standards enhancing quality and continuity of services	•	0	•	•	0
Improved transport connections and / or transport flows between the Member States in all transport modes and at a multi-modal level	0	•	0	0	0
Support to the decarbonisation of all transport modes	0	•	0	0	0

To what extent to do you agree that the completion targets set forth will be met if no changes to the provisions of the TEN-T Regulation are introduced?

	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know
Completion of the Core Network until 2030	0	0	•	0	0
Completion of the Comprehensive Network until 2050	0	0	•	0	0

C. Efficiency

In this section we are requesting your feedback regarding the efficiency of the TEN-T Regulation. We are focusing on its cost-effectiveness and its ability to integrate the TEN-T network.

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know
The costs of governance and advice mechanisms of the core network corridors are reasonable in relation to the benefits they bring	•	0	•	0	0
Studies, such as corridor studies, carried out by European coordinators and their consultant teams, are a cost-effective tool to implement the core network	•	0	•	0	0
The sharing of responsibility between the different actors, including national, regional and local authorities, managers and users of infrastructure as well as industry and civil society, is well-balanced	•	•	•	•	•
The administrative burden linked to updating and reporting provisions of the Regulation is proportionate to the benefits.	0	•	0	0	0

In your view, to what extent has the cooperation between core network and rail freight corridors addressed key efficiency measures in the following areas:

	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know
Removing bottlenecks and complete missing links	0	0	•	0	0
Reducing operational and administrative barriers	0	•	0	0	0
Optimising interconnection and interoperability of national networks within the European transport network	0	•	•	0	0
Facilitating the use of new and existing infrastructure	0	•	0	0	0
Supporting the application of innovative technologies	0	•	0	0	0
Competition between freight and urban transport in cities	0	0	0	0	•

D. Coherence

In this section we are requesting your feedback regarding coherence of the TEN-T Regulation with other EU instruments and actions and internally between its different provisions.

In your view, to what extent do you agree that the provisions in the TEN-T Regulation are coherent with ongoing and expected developments in the transport policy areas concerned which are directly connected with TEN-T policy:

	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know
Alternative fuels	•	0	0	0	0
New mobility schemes	0	0	0	0	•
New technologies	0	•	0	0	0
Digitalisation	0	•	0	0	0
Automation	0	0	0	0	•
Multi-modality / combined transport	0	0	•	0	0
Freight transport services	0	0	•	0	0
Passenger transport services	0	0	•	0	0
Accessibility for all, including high-quality mobility chains for passengers	0	0	•	0	0

In your view, to what extent do you agree that the TEN-T Regulation is coherent with other relevant EU policies in the following areas:

	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know
Environmental, climate and resource efficiency issues	0	•	0	0	0
Social/territorial dimension	0	0	•	0	0
Urban policy, City / urban development strategies	0	•	0	0	0
Trade and international competitiveness	0	0	•	0	0
Neighbourhood and cooperation with third countries	0	0	0	0	•
International agreements related with the transport sector within the EU	0	0	•	0	0
Research innovation in new technologies	0	•	0	0	0
Public health	0	0	0	0	•
Official statistical data per mode of transport	0	•	0	0	0
Internal market	0	•	0	0	0
Maritime affairs	0	•	0	0	0
Home affairs and security	0	0	0	0	•
TEN - Energy	0	0	•	0	0
TEN - Communication	0	0	0	0	•
Other EU relevant policies not listed above (please specify below)	0	0	0	0	•

Ple	Please specify other EU relevant policies not listed above here:					

To what extent do you agree that TEN-T is complementary to the following EU instruments?

		_		_	
	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know
Horizon 2020	0	•	0	0	0
European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF)	0	•	0	0	0
EU Research and Innovation programmes	0	•	0	0	0
Different instruments on urban development	0	0	•	0	0

Other EU instruments have the potential to contribute to TEN-T	0	•	0	0	0
Other EU instruments not listed above (please specify below)	0	0	•	0	0
ase specify other EU instruments not listed abov	e here:				

To what extent do you agree that TEN-T and the Connecting Europe Facility (CEF) are coherent?

	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know
CEF funding priorities are aligned with TEN-T priorities	0	•	0	0	0

To what extent do you agree with the following statements on the internal coherence of the TEN-T Regulation?

	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	don' t know
The different provisions of the TEN-T Regulation are coherent among themselves	0	•	©	0	0
The different provisions of the TEN-T Regulation are coherent across modes	0	•	0	0	0

If yo	ou consider there are internal incoherencies between the provisions of the TEN-T Regulation, please
exp	plain below.

EU-added Value

In this section we are requesting your feedback regarding the EU added-value of the TEN-T Regulation.

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	don' t know
The results of the TEN-T policy could have been achieved at the national level without the TEN-T Regulation.	0	0	•	•	0

The results of the TEN-T policy could have been achieved at the regional level without the TEN-T Regulation.	©	©	0	•	0
The TEN-T Regulation is essential to achieve the objectives of EU Transport policy	•	0	0	0	0
The broadened TEN-T community (a wide range of public and private stakeholders actively contributing to TEN-T besides Member States) adds value to the establishment and development of trans-European networks.	•	•	•	•	•
European regions and cities and their citizens benefit from enhanced connectivity and accessibility	0	•	0	0	0
The TEN-T Regulation gives clear direction to transport infrastructure investment	•	0	0	0	0
The TEN-T Regulation is beneficial for various industrial actors by setting a coherent framework for standards and other requirements	0	•	•	0	0
The discontinuation of the TEN-T Regulation would negatively impact the establishment and development of trans-European networks	•	0	0	0	0
The broad 'infrastructure' scope of the TEN-T Regulation is able to incorporate expected future societal and technological developments	0	•	0	0	0
The TEN-T Regulation stimulates innovation and technological progress	0	•	0	0	0

Please rate your agreement about the extent to which the EU-wide network approach contributes to socioeconomic benefits in the following areas:

	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	don' t know
Time and cost savings	0	•	0	0	©
Wider access to labour and other social opportunities	0	0	0	0	•
Access to goods and services by users and economic operators	0	•	0	0	0
Improved mobility and accessibility	0	•	0	0	©
Wider range of suppliers and market networks	0	0	0	0	•
Increased competitiveness and attraction of economic activities	0	•	0	0	0

F. Additional feedback

Please provide feedback on the overall strengths of the TEN-T Regulation, and its future evolution.

- Le règlement RTE-T a permis l'identification de liens manquants transfrrontaliers ;
- Le texte promeut également les sections transfrontalières qui ne sont pas jugées prioritaires par les Etats membres.

Please provide feedback on the overall weaknesses of the TEN-T Regulation, and its future evolution.

La Région Nouvelle-Aquitaine estime que le règlement RTE-T n'a pas suffisamment soutenu les démarches vertueuses des ports maritimes, notamment en faveur du report modal, et qu'une évolution des critères pour leur intégration dans le réseau devrait permettre une meilleure prise en compte de leur volontarisme.

Ainsi, d'importants critères d'éligibilité devraient être ajoutés pour les ports maritimes :

- proximité d'une frontière (moins de 50 km);
- bassin de population desservi (au moins 200 000 habitants);
- report modal: au moins 10% de pré- et post-acheminements ferroviaires.

Ainsi, le port de La Rochelle, qui combine l'atout d'être un port en eau profonde avec une stratégie de report modal offensive, devrait être transféré du réseau global au réseau central. Quant au port de Bayonne, frontalier et dont la part de report modal est significative, il fait partie du RTE-T.

En outre, d'autres infrastructures sont manquantes sur la carte des réseaux :

- La ligne ferroviaire La Rochelle-Poitiers devrait être intégrée au réseau central ;
- La ligne ferroviaire Nantes-Bordeaux devrait être inscrite dans le RTE-T;
- La Garonne devrait faire partie du RTE-T, pour favoriser les interconnexions fluvilaes et ferroviaire en lien avec le port de Bordeaux.

Enfin, certaines normes applicables aux modes de transport devraient être assouplies :

- 1) L'obligation d'électrification des lignes ferroviaires du réseau global à l'horizon 2050 contraint à faire l'impasse sur d'autres formes d'énergies comme l'hydrogène pour remplacer le diesel, ou encore à de l'électrification discontinue, ou à de l'énergie embarquée.
- 2) L'ERTMS est un système lourd et exigeant. Des solutions plus souples, plus agiles et plus sûres devraient être favorisées sur les petites lignes moins capacitaires, de façon à mieux gérer les circulations et la signalisation.

G. Additional follow-up as part of the evaluation

Would you agree to be contacted for a follow-up interview with members of the study team to allow us to gain further in-depth insights into the implementation of the TEN-T Regulation, progress achieved and success factors/challenges from the perspective of different stakeholders?

Yes
No

The evaluation also includes **thematic case studies on selected TEN-T policy areas**. Each case study will be tailored to address specific research questions and will complement the interviews and surveys carried out as part of the broader consultation.

Would you be interested in being further contacted to respond to a short online survey or to participate in an interview or discussion in the framework of the following case studies?

	Yes	No
Case study 1: The role of urban nodes in the TEN-T policy	0	0
Case study 2: Core network corridors as a tool to facilitate the coordinated implementation of the core network and to enable its sound functioning	•	0
Case study 3: Infrastructure standards for all modes	0	0
Case study 4: TEN-T as an enabler of a future-oriented mobility system	0	0
Case study 5: High-speed rail	0	0
Case study 6: Digitalisation	0	0
Case study 7: Innovation and new technologies: Infrastructure innovation, modernisation and asset management	0	0
Case study 8: Seamless and barrier-free mobility for the trans-European passenger	0	0
Case study 9: The external dimension of TEN-T	0	0

If you have expressed an interest in being further contacted for interviews or surveys, please provide us with your contact details below.

Your name:

Luc Federman, Directeur général adjoint du Pôle "transports infrastructures mobilités cadre de vie" ; Marion Chauveau, Chargée de mission transport à la Représentation de la Nouvelle-Aquitaine à Bruxelles

E-Mail:

luc.federman@nouvelle-aquitaine.fr; marion.chauveau@nouvelle-aquitaine.fr

Phone number:

+33 5 57 57 80 76 ; +32 2 318 10 44

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey!

Contact

julia.halej@coffey.com