

TEN-T information session for CNC, ERTMS & MoS stakeholders, 15 March 2022 (online)	
Question from the audience	Response by the Commission
<i>Railway transport</i>	
As you postulate the 160 km/h quality for the long-distance rail network: will this lead to a revision of the high-speed network since integration of this network into the rail network and CBA of projects is challenging?	The TEN-T proposal aims at the achievement by 2040 of a high-performance long-distance rail passenger network, in particular capital-to-capital, with significant improvements already by 2030. A significant part of this network will be high-speed, as shown on the TEN-T maps. The introduction of a minimum speed (160km/h) on the main passenger lines paves the way for such an ambition and for a better integration of the existing and future high-speed network with the long-distance conventional network.
<p>Could we have a clarification on the P400 technical requirements for Infrastructure Managers. The possibility to transport 4m height trucks depends also on the type of wagons. What is the translation of this new « P400 standard » in terms of infrastructure requirements?</p> <p>P400 (continuation of question): Thanks a lot for your answer. However the text in the regulation is « provides a standard of at least P400 in accordance with item 1.1.1.1.3.5 of Table 1 in the Annex to Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/77748, without any additional requirement for special permission to operate services. » Unless I misunderstood, this doesn't give any Infrastructure gauge requirements, neither the TEN-T regulation, nor the Table in the Annex of the 2019/7774</p>	<p>The aim is to make the transport of such semitrailers possible. The exact definition of the requirement is given in Article 15(e) of the proposal.</p> <p>The Annex refers to the UIC code which defines the P400 loading gauge on the basis of standard wagons. The Regulation indeed does not prescribe a structure gauge as such, in order to provide for more flexibility as regards implementation of the P400 standard.</p>
The action plan for boosting long distance and cross-border traffic, published with the TEN-T revision proposal, targets at least 15 pilot projects by 2030 to address the different barriers to developing this traffic. What concrete mechanisms (such as calls	The objective of the initiative will be to support the deployment of the selected pilot projects, notably by identifying and addressing bottlenecks. It is envisaged to launch a call for expression of interests, possibly in June. Details of the process are still under

for proposals and/or specific grants or funding) will the Commission use to bring these projects into being?	discussion.
Against the background of the Russian aggression in Ukraine and close to the eastern borders of the EU, has a gauge change to UIC standard (1435 mm) been considered in Baltic States, beyond the Rail Baltica project, both for strategic reasons and to strengthen EU integration?	Rail Baltica is key to improve the connectivity of the Baltic states with the rest of Europe and it is a major missing link of the North Sea – Baltic core network corridor. Once completed, Rail Baltica will connect Tallinn, Riga, and Vilnius to the to the European standard gauge rail system. In the long term, it could of course form the backbone for further 1435 extension in the Baltics and the Commission is aware of preliminary considerations in the region to enlarge the 1435 system. Until then completing Rail Baltica is the priority to ensure a close integration into the European railway system.
Have you discussed to include also a section with special focus on local-regional cross-border rail passenger transport?	This aspect has been included in the general provisions of the revised TEN-T Regulation as well as under the aspect of urban nodes.
<i>Inland waterway transport</i>	
Why not set also a max number of days on which the water levels may undercut the minima and adopt implementing acts in cooperation with the respective river commissions? As to IWT and Inland Ports (art 20 par.3): add a criterion which relates to a total annual volume of passenger traffic (f.e. > 500 K).	Indeed, it is foreseen that there will be implementing decisions that define the reference water levels as well as the number of days on which the two minimum requirements are respected. These will of course be developed in close cooperation with Member States and all other relevant stakeholders, in particular the respective river commissions. The same applies to the specific complementary requirements that will be defined in implementing decisions.
What goal does the Commission aim to achieve by proposing setting out additional requirements complementing minimum requirements (art.22(5))? And why do you consider implementing acts to be the right instrument?	The idea behind the mix of minimum requirements and additional requirements is to cater for tailor-made solutions per river-basin, with the overall aim to ensure a "good navigation status". Article 22 (5) provides examples of what kind of requirements could be covered by these specific additional requirements.
Under the draft revision, what are the consequences of an inland	We are not sure to fully understand your question. Do you refer to the fact that some ports, currently on the TEN-T, have been

<p>port not meeting the requirements for core/compr. network?</p> <p>To follow up my question regarding the requirements for the core network: Under the current TEN-T regulation, inland ports in the compr. network shall have an annual freight transshipment volume exceeding 500 000 tonnes. In the draft revision, this requirement is not explicitly listed for inland ports in the core network, only for the ones in compr. network. Does that mean that this requirement (500 000 tonnes) shall not, under the draft revision, apply to the inland ports in the core network?</p>	<p>excluded from the network? There is indeed a provision in the Regulation (as already in the 2013 one) that transport nodes can also be excluded if they do not reach any longer the statistical thresholds over a period of three years. In the new Regulation, we lowered this exclusion criteria: they are only excluded if they do no longer reach 85% of the present threshold.</p> <p>The statistical thresholds for the inclusion of the transport nodes are precisely defined in the TEN-T planning methodology, a staff working document that has been published alongside the TEN-T Regulation. The Regulation only indicates the thresholds for the comprehensive network as this is also the network that is jointly defined with Member States in view of Article 172 of the Treaty. The thresholds for the core network can be found in the planning methodology SWD. To be noted that inland ports mostly qualify to become part of the core network by other criteria than the transshipment volume (e.g. inland ports which are part of main node as listed in the Annex I of the methodology, inland ports connected to rail freight core network lines, etc.).</p>
<p>In the revision, inland ports remain on the Comprehensive Network. This could be problematic for the Dutch region Limburg, because the river Maas is on the Core Network, allowing large ships to pass. For these large ships to be able to use our inland ports, these ports should be upgraded in terms of capacity, sustainability and digitalisation. Moreover, the inland ports will play a key role in facilitating the growth of the Chemelot Circular Hub. It is unclear whether the Comprehensive Network status of the inland ports offers sufficient (financial) possibilities to make this upgrade possible.</p>	<p>TEN-T is not a funding instrument and the core and comprehensive is decided according to the methodology that underlies the network, not according to financing needs.</p>
<p><i>Maritime transport</i></p>	
<p>If a harbour in the core network merges legally (administratively) with another harbour in the comprehensive network, could the new legal entity considered as belonging as one unit to the core network (as a "cluster") or would they still be two different</p>	<p>It depends and needs are to be analysed on a case-by-case basis. An administrative link or a "holding" authority for two or more physically separated ports would not be sufficient. A sufficient network impact is necessary for a port to be organized</p>

harbours?	and included in this context.
Under the article 39 para 2 of the current TEN-T regulation, the infrastructure of the core network shall meet all the requirements set out for the comprehensive network. Does this principle still hold under the draft revision? The article 22 of the draft revision seems to take a different approach in setting out the requirements for the core network.	The structure of the new TEN-T Regulation is indeed slightly different. You will always find in the respective article per transport mode and network type indicated which requirements apply and by which date. In principle, the requirements of the comprehensive network always also apply to the extended and core network. This is slightly different for IWT where IWW are only on the core network (there are no comprehensive IWW).
Article 21 outlines facilities to improve environmental efficiency of ships, could you please clarify what is understood under these facilities outside of those mentioned in the article?	Examples are provided for in Article 21(1)(c).
If the maritime sections of the European Corridors have been defined to reinforce and synchronize the land and maritime connections of the corridors through their maritime nodes, it would be understandable that they should have a specific consideration within the EMS.	Indeed. The European Maritime Space addresses the last mile and hinterland connectivity in ports as one key area to be addressed to make the maritime sector more efficient and more competitive. The Detailed Implementation Plan (work plan) for the European Maritime Space also addresses this. For instance by suggesting specific investment needs as well as estimating what would be needed in view of the existing political objectives in the Green Deal and the Sustainable and Smart Mobility Strategy.
<i>Road transport</i>	
<p>Why no mention of the very important ITS and connectivity requirements essential for road safety on the network?</p> <p>Although not highlighted in the presentations, Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS) deployments coupled with increased connectivity (4G/5G) do have some of the highest potentials to increase road safety on the TEN-T in the timescales and on the</p>	<p>ITS is mentioned as a very important part of ensuring road safety in the proposal for a revised TEN-T Regulation. In addition, the revision of the TEN-T is very closely linked to the ongoing revision of the ITS Directive. The TEN-T network forms the basis for enabling the implementation the provisions of the ITS Directive.</p> <p>There is clear reference made to the ITS provisions in the TEN-T Regulation in order to ensure best coherence between the ITS Directive and our Regulation. However, the TEN-T only makes reference to the ITS Directive, whilst it is up to the ITS Directive</p>

<p>routes concerned. What measures could be taken to accelerate deployment, especially taking into account the cross-sectoral dimension and the links with systems not on the TEN-T itself?</p>	<p>to regulate its deployment etc.</p>
<p>Beside (already known) specific standards for Military mobility and newly incorporated standards for railway transport are there any important new standards put in place for road construction/reconstruction? As understand, roads are in the new "green perspective" put aside, but there are still some missing links, last miles and cross-border connection to be completed.</p>	<p>It is not correct that roads are put aside in the proposed revised TEN-T regulation. Several roads are proposed to be added to the TEN-T network, precisely because of their relevance for military purposes. One of the objectives of the revision was to fill in the gap between the TEN-T network and the EU military network. Chapter III also includes very clear requirements which will ensure that (existing and new) roads meet high level standards.</p>
<p><i>Air transport</i></p>	
<p>How do you define long-distance rail transport? Why regional rail is not sufficient to fulfil rail access to airports?</p>	<p>There is no precise definition for long-distance rail transport. As explained the aim is especially to ensure competitive city to city connections and replace short-haul flights below 500km. In this respect it is not sufficient to ensure only regional connections from airports as the customer in this case would opt for a connecting flight to the final destination rather than to take a regional train to the city centre before taking a long-distance train to her/his final destination.</p>
<p>We welcome the target to connect airports to high speed rail but I have a question regarding this. When the airport and high speed rail is connected with tramline (approx 700 meter ride) does it fill the criteria of TEN-T regulation or not?</p> <p>Maybe I did not express myself very well. I did not consider a tramline as a long distance railway. What I meant was that our airport (in Estonia) is connected to long distance rail network with the tramline and it is also possible to walk there from the airport and the distance is approx 700 meters from airport to long distance railway stop. Does this fulfil the obligation set in the TEN-T regulation?</p>	<p>The requirement is that the airport is connected to the long-distance rail network, which can be reached from the airport in walking distance. A tramline as such does not fulfil the condition of "long-distance".</p> <p>We are aware that sometimes a case by case assessment is needed. We invite you to address your question bilaterally. Thanks for your understanding.</p>

<p>Does the encouragement of rail to replace short haul aviation adversely affect the development zero emission short haul aviation? Should the criteria be on routes without zero-emission flights?</p>	<p>For the moment there are only very few short-haul zero-emission flight connections. The emphasis of TEN-T is to offer an attractive alternative to short haul flights up to 500km. There is no distinction between routes with zero-emission flights and such with conventional fuels.</p>
<p><i>Multimodal transport</i></p>	
<p>Which criteria do you consider to classify a freight terminal being part in the core network or comprehensive one?</p>	<p>The statistical thresholds to become a RRT on the TEN-T are defined in the TEN-T planning methodology, a staff working document that has been published alongside the TEN-T proposal. However, this regards only RRT.</p>
<p>With respect to multimodality, it appears that the COM believes that more terminals for freight and passengers automatically will result in improved multimodality. What do you base this assumption on?</p>	<p>Our assessment has shown that multimodality is indeed often hampered by a lack of terminal capacity and number of terminals across the network. However we are well aware that this is only one part in making the system more attractive. What we propose is that MS conduct a market analysis and according to the result develop the terminal system on their territory. In addition with extending the requirements of the railway network (electrification, 740m etc.) to the last mile access lines to the terminals we aim to ensure that the terminals are better integrated in the whole system.</p>
<p>Every urban node has to have a multimodal freight terminal located within or in the vicinity of an urban node. Could you please explain what does the vicinity mean (in kilometres)?</p>	<p>It was on purpose that we did not provide any more precise definition (e.g. in km) of what "in the vicinity" means. The situation in the Member States / regions is so different that it would be impossible to put a real "km" figure on this obligation. However, it needs to be assured that there is sufficient terminal capacity really "serving" each node and thus be "functionally linked".</p>
<p><i>Urban nodes</i></p>	
<p>One question concerning urban node and freight terminals. Esp. in very large urban nodes more than one terminal is essential as</p>	<p>It is indeed very true that more than one terminal is needed for larger urban nodes. This is why we impose a minimum</p>

<p>the interfaces between TENT and regional (city) logistic located in the surrounding area. How to integrate these important hubs into the TENT, if there are still not mentioned? Via the SUMP process? In urban areas sometimes the extension of the terminals is difficult due to competition with settlement area to reach the goal of tonnes per year.</p>	<p>requirement / obligation of one. This is accompanied by a market and prospective analysis of the MS that has to analyse the needs on the territory, and on the basis of such analysis establish an action plan for the development of terminals. By this, the MS has the possibility to add terminals that result from this analysis, via delegated act, to the TEN-T network. It is thus a much more flexible approach, since the pre-defined list of RRT in the Annex of the Regulation can be complemented by new terminals to be added.</p>
<p>A mere focus on the number of inhabitants in the selection/definition of urban nodes falls short and does not consider the relevance of individual nodes. Can additional criteria (e.g. connection to long-distance traffic, importance for the region, etc.) be identified and taken into account in the selection process?</p>	<p>One of the most important guiding principle of our so called TEN-T planning methodology, which defines the criteria for the definition of the network and its nodes, was that there are very objective and transparent criteria. The number of inhabitants gives a very solid and objective basis, also in view of transport flows. Other criteria such as geographical criteria (coverage per NUTS 2 region) have also been added.</p> <p>As a result, we have increased the number of urban nodes from current 88 to 424, out of these additional urban nodes only few have not been on the TEN-T network, which allowed us to maintain a relative stability especially of the core TEN-T network, and which was our ultimate goal to ensure completion of the network by given deadlines.</p> <p>Urban nodes are defined alongside with transport nodes such as rail-road terminals, airports, waterborne ports, which constitute additional nodal infrastructure elements of the TEN-T infrastructure that take into account the relevance of the region's connectivity.</p>
<p>My question concerns the railway stations. what will change? Will they be better taken into account in the next financing program and TEN-T policy?</p>	<p>One major change is that the TEN-T standards, in particular for rail, will also apply to the so called last mile sections (rail access routes and last mile connections). This is important in order to boost full interoperability and seamless connections. In the same vein, we aim at a better integration of those transport nodes. The TEN-T Regulation does however not define eligibility in financing</p>

	and funding programmes.
Please think about if it really makes sense to only focus on SUMP if talking about integration of TEN-T with urban node. It is important to consider the smooth functioning of all the infrastructure and operations, so a joint infrastructure plan TEN-T, national, regional and local networks and hubs is required. A SUMP is not "allowed" to tackle such a framework.	A SUMP should be an all-encompassing integrated freight and passenger mobility plan for the entire functional urban area. However, the SUMP is not the only requirement for urban nodes. Member States also have to give attention to the seamless interconnection between the infrastructure of the trans-European transport network and the infrastructure for regional and local transport
<i>European Transport Corridors</i>	
Joining CNC and RFC means also bringing certain rail specific procedures (like capacity allocation) to these joined corridors. These procedures are also relevant for boosting the international passenger rail. Not forgetting about importance of facilitating rail freight, what was original purpose of RFCs, we should not limit these corridor rail activities to freight only, but extend them also to international passenger rail traffic.	This is precisely the aim of the TEN-T proposal but it is only a first step. In a second step next year we will see the revision of the RFC regulation which among other things looks into the capacity allocation for all types of railway traffic.
What is the structure both administrative and financial that you foresee for the new Western Balkan Corridor. Do you foresee an integrated approach or it will be implemented through simple cooperation of existing structures and financial instruments? How the integration or not to EU of Western Balkan Countries can risk the implementation of this Corridor?	The Western Balkan Corridor will have a similar governance structure (a Coordinator and a rail freight governance, mainly made of an Executive Board and Management Board). The corridor will be a driver towards EU integration.
The proposal suggests merging of the Rhine-Alpine with the North Sea-Mediterranean to the new North Sea-Alpine corridor. On the one hand, the manageability may decrease and the complexity increase. On the other hand, the merging of the corridors with the rail freight corridors can lead to a more balanced capacity management. Will a merge of the corridors gain enough added value for all countries and corridor partners involved? What are the consequences of merging for the Rhine-Alpine corridor, for example with regard to the access to funding,	Indeed, the main intention behind the merger of the two Corridors is to improve management of the existing capacity of the railway transport, which is one of the key problems identified along the Rhine-Alpine Corridor. The merger is expected also to foster interoperability and resilience between the two corridors (which is needed as the recent heavy disruptions on the Rhine-Alpine CNC have shown). Both corridors to be merged have the same market and the same O/Ds.

<p>political perception and representing our interests on national or European level?</p>	
<p>If the merging to the new North Sea-Alpine corridor is discussed in particular under the aspects of resilience and redundancy, then:</p> <p>the so-called ""Simplon route from Dijon - Brig - Simplon tunnel - Domodossola"" should also be included in the core network. It enables a large-scale bypass of the Upper Rhine and the Basel node and would be a gain in terms of redundancy</p> <p>the Freiburg - Colmar railway line should be considered as a connection within the corridor."</p>	<p>The Commission defines together with the MS the TEN-T comprehensive network. Thus, all partners have to agree on the sections that shall form part of the network. If this is not the case then a certain section cannot be added.</p> <p>At the same time, it should be noted that Simplon railway line is currently part of the Rhine-Alpine Corridor's (RALP) core network between Brig and Domodossola and the connection to Dijon is ensured by the railway infrastructure of the North Sea - Mediterranean Corridor, which connects to the RALP Corridor at Mulhouse.</p>
<p>Thank you very much for setting up the Western Balkans Corridor. When will the coordinator be nominated and the Corridor Forum established?</p>	<p>When the Regulation will have been adopted.</p>
<p>Facing the evidence that the existing border crossing section of some international corridors does not have the capacity to absorb all the movement of goods generated or that will be generated by the connected facilities (ports, industrial and commercial areas, etc.) that are connected, is the Commission, aware of which projects drawn up or in the process of being drawn that are necessities to resolve the problem of the capacity to absorb traffic (bottlenecks) in those cases?</p>	<p>The aim of the TEN-T policy is to develop the necessary infrastructure to allow for seamless, safe and sustainable cross-border transport. In this context, the design itself of the TEN-T network is taking into account infrastructure (capacity) needs, with a particular attention to border crossings (EU added- value). The Corridor studies and Work Plans of the Coordinators are analysing more in-depth each corridor and their border crossing sections, identifying issues and assessing solutions.</p>
<p>As far as the naming is concerned, we (EGTC RALP members) find the renaming of the Rhine-Alpine in the new merged corridor North Sea-Alpine very difficult. The Rhine is the main artery here and determines the range of tasks of the corridor significantly. This should also be reflected in the name (just as many of our 26 member organisations identity with the Rhine). Thus, the name</p>	<p>We take note of your suggestions.</p>

<p>has an important meaning beyond the corridor itself - the awareness of the initiative depends significantly on it. Can we propose to keep the Rhine in its name, i.e. North Sea-Rhine-Alpine corridor or NSRA?</p>	
<p><i>TEN-T governance</i></p>	
<p>Concerning the large number of implementing acts in this draft regulation: aren't you afraid to create a huge bureaucratic hurdle which causes large negotiations as well? For example, IWT alone is already concerned by implementing acts per river basin, for derogations GNS, for supplementary requirements, for force majeure, for the working program of the corridors...</p>	<p>Implementing decisions are an important tool to assure legal certainty; and the dialogue with concerned stakeholders in reaching those implementing decisions are equally important as to assure that we jointly reach our goal.</p>
<p>Synergies and complementarity between TEN-E and TEN-T should be increased. Can pipelines be included in the proposal as a sustainable transport mode in addition to the recognition of ports as energy and industry hubs?</p>	<p>Indeed, we aim at increased synergies and complementarity between TEN-E and TEN-T. This has also been more firmly enshrined in the revised TEN-T regulation, making at various instances reference to an improved energy efficiency or energy security. When it comes to pipelines as such, we recognise their importance, but they are in our view more an energy infrastructure than transport, and thus belong primarily to the TEN-E.</p> <p>However, the Commission supports the synergies between transport, energy, and digital sectors through the CEF Instrument. In practical terms, it will be applied either as 'synergetic elements' (each sector can accept as eligible cost ancillary elements pertaining to another sector) or through joint work programmes, jointly financed from each sector involved with the possibility to apply the highest co-funding rate of the sectors concerned and 10% top-up.</p>
<p><i>Other</i></p>	
<p>Last days events forces to think about it. Alternative fuels are fine, however in case of military crisis shall they ensure stable railway operations? Electrification is also vulnerable... Any</p>	<p>Resilience has become a very important element of the new TEN-T Regulation. Specific provisions have been included for various aspects of resilience in the new Regulation, e.g. in view</p>

<p>exceptions for any plans for military resilience?</p>	<p>of climate change, but also in view of intentional disruptions (e.g. terrorist attacks, cyber attacks) up to provisions for third country investments on critical infrastructure. Similarly, the use of diversionary / secondary lines when main lines are disrupted is facilitated for. As regards military mobility, we also made sure that there is greater coherence of the TEN-T network with the military network.</p>
<p>I suppose military transport is assessed these days. Who is in charge of this task and is it expected that it will lead to extending the network especially regarding east-west connections?</p>	<p>The Action Plan on Military Mobility of 2018 addresses issues related to military transport. The Action Plan is being implemented by the Commission, High Representative and the European Defence Agency in close cooperation with the Member States. Please refer to the 3 progress reports on the implementation of the Action Plan presented in 2019, 2020 and 2021. The military transport network is identified in the Military Requirements for Military Mobility within and beyond the EU. An update to the Military Requirements can be expected to reflect the eventual changes in the TEN-T.</p>
<p>Are you planning to conduct further bilateral consultations with the member states e.g. to discuss certain national elements of the TEN-T network (e.g. status of urban nodes, inland ports etc.) this year?</p>	<p>We are now negotiating the proposal with the Council and the Parliament. Thus all exchanges will take place in the context of the inter-institutional negotiations.</p>
<p>How to address technical issues regarding specific TEN-T connections? For example a road connection on the map has been recently diverted but the proposed map still shows the previous route.</p>	<p>Please address your national Ministry for such requests. It is up to the MS to bring such issues up to Council/Commission.</p>
<p>What are the criteria for deciding which neighbouring countries should be on the maps?</p>	<p>The territories covered by the TEN-T indicative maps are included in Annex IV of the TEN-T proposal. The only missing region relates to the Mediterranean countries, for which maps have been prepared but the process of adoption is still pending. The Commission does not intend to extend the TEN-T indicative network further, as it is considered that all neighbouring countries of the EU are covered (or planned to be covered – Mediterranean</p>

	countries).
Will the co-financing of projects (formerly known as Actions) be concretely and financially linked to their achieved implementing results ? Reference is made here to a similar approach in DG CLIMA IF CCS (Carbon Capture and Storage), where 60% of final grant is dependent on - in this case - verified emission reductions ?	The question is not clear. All criteria for funding projects are included in the relevant funding regulation.
For what concerns maintenance, will there be EU funding and grants dedicated to it?	The TEN-T Regulation defines policy priorities and related requirements for our network. It does however not predict eligibility. Eligibility criteria are defined in corresponding funding and financing regulations, e.g. CEF, Structural Funds, RRF.