

Preparation for the TEN-T working session in Göteborg,  
Wed 30.09.2009, 09:00 – 12:00

This short and informal discussion paper is firmly based on two official position papers which were discussed and approved in the CPMR-BSC Transport Working Group, and which have been brought to the knowledge of the CPMR-BSC Executive Committee:

- TEN-T: A policy review. Final standpoint on the Green Paper of 04.02.2009 (dated 29.04.2009)
- Future European Transport Policy. Mandate for the chair of Transport Working Group, final version (dated 14.07.2008)

---

Two questions have been raised by the CPMR General Secretariat in preparation of the TEN-T meeting in Gothenburg:

Q1 – Which are the priority themes and concepts for your Geographical Commission in the review of the TEN-T guidelines?

Q2 – Which are the geographical priorities for your Commission: axes, corridors, Motorways of the Sea...? (*to be elaborated below*)

---

*Q1 – Which are the priority themes and concepts for your Geographical Commission in the review of the TEN-T guidelines?*

**A) Key messages** (“priority concepts”) from the final standpoint on the TEN-T Green Paper:

- (1) CPMR-BSC shares the observation that a fundamental review of TEN-T policy is needed. This also includes a review of current priority projects.
- (2) CPMR-BSC shares the concept that future TEN-T policy has to integrate infrastructure, service and innovation aspects, and that it should be better aligned with the non-infrastructure elements of European Transport Policy.
- (3) CPMR-BSC underlines that future TEN-T policy has to reflect the fundamental political and socio-economic changes of EU, of its neighbours and worldwide after 1989 which have opened threefold challenges in the field of transport:
  - (a) Eastern Germany, Sweden, Finland, Poland, the three Baltic States and several other states in Central and Eastern Europe have become EU members.
  - (b) The eastern EU neighbours Russia, Ukraine and Belarus have undergone a transition to market-oriented economies, and their integration with EU economy is growing.
  - (c) The Baltic Sea Region could become a major gateway for global trade flows between Asia and Europe via the Transsiberian Railway and other east-west oriented corridors.
- (4) CPMR-BSC favours the proposed mix of “comprehensive network”, coherent “priority network” and “conceptual pillar”. However, it proposes a clearer setup as regards the

geographical scope, the implementation of policy objectives, the selection of projects and the role of innovation.

- (5) CPMR-BSC proposes that user-oriented pilot projects on the comprehensive network which integrate infrastructure, service and innovative elements should be more strongly supported. One of these concepts is the international “green freight transport corridor”.
- (6) CPMR-BSC underlines the key importance of shortsea shipping and of adequate hinterland connections to the ports. Both have to be further developed under a clear users’ perspective: Taking a ferry must be as easy as taking a bridge. This also implies that high-volume ferry / RoRo connections will be integral part of the TEN-T comprehensive and priority networks.
- (7) CPMR-BSC strongly suggests the selection of projects in the “conceptual pillar” not to be based on a pure cost-benefit analysis alone, which would result in projects only on high-volume links with a high return on investment. Instead, core objectives of European Policy should be reflected in the assessment, which will essentially be a multi-criteria analysis aiming at “European Added Value”.
- (8) CPMR-BSC recognizes the need for road user charges on heavily loaded elements of the TEN-T where appropriate, at the same time urging for public support of rail service and infrastructure, e.g. through long-term service contracts. EU’s role should be threefold:
  - a) Design the legal framework for infrastructure, service and innovation;
  - b) Support projects for international and cross-border transport (= internal market), support projects in peripheral regions (= cohesion objectives + raw materials policy);
  - c) Support pilot solutions on the comprehensive network, implement standardized innovative solutions on the core network.

These eight key messages are explained and commented at length in section II of our final standpoint. From today’s perspective, not much has to be added to this.

## **B) Motivation** for CPMR-BSC (“priority themes”) from “Mandate for the chair” paper:

The mission of CPMR-BSC is to highlight issues which are of special concern in the Baltic Sea Region, as compared to other European regions. For future transport policies, these are e.g.

- low population density and long distances, leading to low efficiency of mass transport, low transport volumes in individual transport and a special role of air transport;
- large quantities of raw materials of high importance to EU (e.g. mining, forestry, oil) especially in the north and in Russia, leading to large freight flows;
- harsh climatic conditions especially in the north, leading to high investment and maintenance costs (e.g. frost damage, icebreaking);
- high importance of shortsea shipping for the majority of international transport links, especially when it comes to freight transport, together with an extraordinarily dense and frequent ferry / RoRo network in parts of the region;
- the current and future modal split in freight transport, where environmental arguments speak for rail and sea transport which has however several obstacles to face;
- congestion in some major ports (e.g. Hamburg, St. Petersburg) and routes;
- not yet satisfactory interoperability and considerable “administrative bottlenecks” especially at the EU/RU borders.

**C) New issues** which have not been mentioned so far in the previous papers:

\* EU-COM has decided 22.07.09 on the "European Deployment Plan" for ERTMS ([http://ec.europa.eu/transport/rail/interoperability/ertms/ertms\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/transport/rail/interoperability/ertms/ertms_en.htm)). This can be seen as a first glance at the future TEN-T core network, if this map is combined with the priority projects' map.  
=> No BSC-TWG standpoint so far.

\* In the Baltic Sea Region Programme, five major transport projects have been approved in June 2009. At least three of them (EWTC II, SCANDRIA, TransBaltic) have declared openly their ambition to discuss TEN-T policy, and all three are working with the "green corridor" concept.  
=> BSC-TWG standpoint: Support the three or more projects, act as facilitator and neutral platform for discussion.

\* The EU Baltic Sea Strategy may be the first step towards a macro-regional governance approach. In the long run, this could mean a stronger role for "regions", "stakeholders" and EU Commission, and a weaker role for national governments.  
=> No formal BSC-TWG standpoint so far. However, sympathy and interest for EU Baltic Sea Strategy was expressed in our meeting 02.04.09 in Brussels.

---

**Q2 - Which are the geographical priorities for your Commission: axes, corridors, Motorways of the Sea...?**

*At this stage, it is not a matter of defining "priority projects" as in the list of 30 TEN-T projects, but rather relates to drafting geographical orientations (example: multimodal corridor linking one sea to another...) During its forthcoming meetings, the working group can look into concrete projects in greater detail.*

The geographical priorities can be summarized as follows:

- (1) Transport infrastructure is only one element of transport policy. Service aspects have to be integrated into future corridors + axes. This is especially true for "green freight transport corridors" and for those corridors which contain a sea passage, a thing quite common for the Baltic Sea Region.  
=> cf. key messages #2 + #5 and explanations.
- (2) All current priority projects should be reviewed, based on a transparent methodology. Due to the changed EU geography after 1989 and to new relations to Russia and Asia, the focus of attention has to shift eastwards when compared with the previous lists of projects.  
=> cf. key messages #1 + #3 and explanations.
- (3) User-friendly RoRo / ferry connections will have to be integrated into future corridors + axes. This is of special importance for the Baltic Sea Region.  
=> cf. key message #6 and explanations.
- (4) The method to define the "core network" and to select investment projects should not be based on transport volumes and a pure cost-benefit approach alone.  
=> cf. key messages #4 + #7 + #8 abc and explanations.

Since it was explicitly not welcome to define "priority projects", no concrete corridor or project is mentioned here.