



Atlantic Arc Commission

Minutes of the Transport Working group meeting

Meeting on 9 February 2016 in Brussels, Cantabria Delegation in Brussels

Member Regions: Galicia, Cantabria, Gobierno Vasco, Aquitaine-Limousin-Poitou-Charentes, Bretagne, Wales.

Excused: Asturias, Pays de la Loire, Navarra

CPMR: Patrick Anvroin, Director in charge of Transport

Partners: Atlantic Transnational Network (RTA-ATN).

Guest organisations: Representative from the Innovation and Networks Executive Agency (INEA) - European Commission

I. Welcome address and introduction, Inma Valencia, Presidency of the Atlantic Arc Commission

Inma Valencia, from the Cantabria Government representing the Presidency of the Atlantic Arc Commission (AAC) and the Presidency of the Atlantic Arc Commission's Transport Working Group, recalled that Cantabria took over the Presidency of the Transport Working Group in March 2015. Since then, the Cantabria's Regional Minister for Industry, Francisco Martín, participated in several meetings (namely the Working Group meeting on cross-border dimension of the Atlantic Corridor Forum on 28 October and the working group meeting on ports and inland waterways of the Atlantic Core Network Corridor on 10 December) to defend the interest of the Atlantic Arc Commission.

II. Assessment of the results of the last CEF call, Pauline Caumont

Pauline Caumont, Executive Secretary of the Atlantic Arc Commission, presented the assessment of the results of the 2014 CEF call for proposals. This internal document (circulated to the members) was prepared in December 2015. The data were taken from the Innovation and Networks Executive Agency's (INEA) [Brochure Connecting Europe Facility \(CEF\) – Transport 2014 Calls for proposals](#)

Regarding the Atlantic Arc, this assessment shows that many relevant projects outside the corridor failed to receive funding either because of a lack of EU added value or because of budgetary constraints.

At the EU level, 40.52% of the eligible proposals were recommended for funding. In the Atlantic, this rate falls down to 31.6 %. In addition, this assessment points out the fact that the percentage of success of annual calls (where Regions outside the corridor can apply for funding) was extremely low (5,5%).

More information is available on [Pauline Caumont's PowerPoint presentation](#)

III. Information on corridors work plans, Juncker Plan, Motorways of the Sea Call, Stefano Campagnolo

Stefano Campagnolo, Project Manager at INEA, first reacted to **Pauline Caumont's** presentation and explained that the reason why the annual calls' success rate is lower than the core network calls is that the latter absorb most of the allocated budget. He presented INEA and gave general information about the CEF and Horizon 2020 programmes, which are managed by the Executive Agency. Currently, two programmes are ending their lifetime: Marco Polo and TEN-T (predecessor of the Connecting Europe Facility – CEF.). The allocation of the CEF funds are the core business of INEA. He gave some key features about the Atlantic Corridor and pointed out its main objectives and priorities (in particular the cross-border dimension of projects.). Two Forum meetings have been organised in 2015 and three are foreseen in 2016 so as to revise the work plan. The updated work plan will be presented in June 2016 for approval during the second half of 2016.

Key Performance Indicators (KPI) have been adopted to assess the degree of completion of the Corridors as well as individual projects.

Regarding the Juncker Plan, the EIB is setting up an advisory hub. One of its possibilities is to pool resources from different areas (energy, innovation, etc.). cf. slide 15.

Regarding the current calls for proposals (deadline 15/02/16), below is the budget breakdown per Funding Objectives and priorities:

Commission

CEF general envelope calls for proposals

Total budget: €1.09 bn

<i>Funding Objective</i>	<i>Priorities</i>
FO1: Removing bottlenecks and bridging missing links	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• ERTMS: €200 million
FO2: Ensuring sustainable and efficient transport systems in the long run	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• New Technologies and Innovation: €60 million• Safe and secure infrastructure: €15 million
FO3: Optimising the integration and interconnection of transport modes and enhancing the interoperability of transport services	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Single European Sky (SESAR) €515 million• River Information System (RIS) 10 million• Intelligent Transport Services for Roads (ITS) €70 million• Motorways of the Sea (MoS): €130 million• Nodes of the Core Network €50 million• Multimodal logistic platforms €40 million

Assessment of proposals will be finalised by June or July 2016. Next calls for proposals should be launched in November 2016.

More information is available on [Stefano Campagnolo's PowerPoint Presentation](#)

Discussion:

During the discussion, **Mar Martín**, from the Region Cantabria, mentioned the initiative "[Seals of Excellence](#)": DG Regio will give priority to projects that could not get funding via EU programmes (In particular with H2020.). Other DGs are interested in this initiative. Stefano Campagnolo had no information so far but invited us to contact DG Move directly.

IV. Update on the CPMR General Secretariat mobilisation on Accessibility and Transport, Patrick Anvroin

Patrick Anvroin, CPMR Director in charge of Transport, presented the overall priorities of the CPMR in terms of Transport and accessibility.

The first activity is to promote the **principle of accessibility in the EU transport policy**. Article 4 of the TEN-T guidelines states that accessibility and connectivity of all the Regions of the Union is an objective

of the Trans-European Transport Network. However, this objective fails to be implemented. The concentration of funding on the 9 Corridors is totally inadequate with this territorial cohesion objective.

Concerning the **Freight Transport service**, article 32 of [TEN-T guidelines](#) guarantees to “improve links to the most vulnerable and isolated parts of the Union, in particular outermost, island, remote and mountain regions.” However, in the 2014 annual work programme, there is no mention of accessibility. For the CPMR, the Devil is not in the legal basis, it is in its implementation!

In addition, regarding **Motorways of the Sea**, DG Move explicitly declared ineligible Feasibility or Market Studies, which should be eligible according to the TEN-T guidelines. There is an important inconsistency between the guidelines and the call.

The CPMR has started to work in closer cooperation with the European Parliament, to exchange information, meet with political groups’ advisers to alert them on problems in the CEF implementation. The CPMR also intends to take part in the TEN-T Days next 20/22 June in Rotterdam (still awaiting for the answer).

As the CRPM did not receive any invitation to participate in **the Corridors’ Forum**, **Patrick Anvroin** called on Regions to send him information. Follow-up of the Corridors is well done at the Geographical Commission level. We know that additional projects dealing with innovation will be introduced in the work plans. These work plans will be presented in Rotterdam, then validated by Member States.

A CRPM Intercommission working group on Transport will be organised in March to meet Brian Simpson, coordinator of the Motorways of the Sea (MoS). His report is due in June (to be presented to the EP Tran Committee). However we don’t know how many MoS calls will be launched before 2020. This report might essentially be useful for the post-2020 EU policy.

The CPMR activities and priorities in terms of Transport are summed up in the note presented in the CPMR Political Bureau in Haarlem (19/02/16): Technical Paper from the CPMR General Secretariat: [Materialising support for sustainable and “territorially balanced” maritime transport](#)

More information is available on [Patrick Anvroin’s PowerPoint Presentation](#)

Discussion and Debate:

Pauline Caumont thanked **Patrick Anvroin** and noted that this information will be extremely useful for the Atlantic Arc Commission Final Declaration 2016. It will also be noted that 90% of funding go straight to the corridor, which jeopardises the objective of territorial cohesion.

Marie-Pierre Mesplède, from the Aquitaine-Limousin-Poitou-Charentes Region, asked for precision on the possibility to amend or not CEF legislation, in particular regarding its financial aspect (reintegrate money/change the cofinancing rate for MoS/amend annex 1 of CEF).

Patrick Anvroin specified that reshaping the Corridor is theoretically possible not before 2023. Regarding the amendment to the regulation, this question will be raised again to Henrik Hololei, Director-General for Mobility and Transport next 2 March 2016 as we did not get a clear answer so far.

V. Roundtable with Atlantic Arc Commission members and actions of this group for the future

- **Importance of MoS in Member Regions**

Last October, a survey on MoS was circulated among the members. Not all the Atlantic Arc Commission member Regions replied to this survey but the CPMR was able to extract main political messages from it (cf. [Technical Note](#) presented in Haarlem).

The Executive Secretary asked about the interest of the Regions in MoS. Contributions received originated from the four Portuguese Member Regions, Cantabria, Aquitaine, Poitou-Charentes, Pays de la Loire, Bretagne and Wales.

Marie-Pierre Mesplède mentioned that it was necessary to better know the position of the Port of La Rochelle before taking a stance on the issue. **Luis Elizondo**, from Euskadi, stated that MoS was important in the Region. **Mar Martín Raba**, from Cantabria, mentioned that they are working on that at the moment. **Nia Lewis**, from **Wales**, stated that the Regions is interested in principle and will check the contribution (sent as a written declaration and not as a reply to the questionnaire). **Vanessa Lobo**, from **Galicia**, will insist in giving an official answer to the questionnaire.

According to the discussion, there is still an interest in working on the MoS for the Atlantic Arc Commission member Regions. **Patrick Anvroin** presented some points on which to work:

- The level of funding for the MoS should be different depending on the location (higher if further from the center);
- Because of the specific nature of their traffic (imbalance and low volume) islands should be granted a preferential rate (relevant for the Island Commission but less for the Atlantic Arc Commission);
- A connection between two ports in the comprehensive TEN-T networks should become eligible under the MoS (so far, at least one port needs to be located on the core network);
- A connection between an EU port and a 3rd country port must become eligible;
- EU aids for start-ups (which were removed in 2013) must be reintroduced if they do not create unfair competition and if they help to improve accessibility and territorial cohesion.

These elements will fuel the debate and give density to the AAC Final Declaration 2016.

- **Renewal of maps of EU corridors**

Pauline Caumont set up the scene reminding that the EC does not want to change the maps of the TEN-T network before 2023. Still, some Regions are unhappy with the current design and the Atlantic Arc Commission needs to voice the concern of all its members. In addition, there is no “Atlantic Corridor” as such, as Atlantic Regions are split into two corridors: “North Sea Mediterranean” for Ireland and the UK; “Atlantic” for France, Spain and Portugal. A corridor better corresponding to the interests of the member Regions could be designed as a proposal in view of a future change. She opened the floor for debate.

Mar Martín Raba reacted positively to the idea, asking participants how this could be done.

Marie-Pierre Mesplède mentioned that the President Alain Rousset, together with the President of Basque Country, Iñigo Urkullu, met with Commissioner Bulc (in charge of Transport). The Commissioner made clear that no further subsidies should be expected. She also insisted that regional projects should be financed through ERDF (even if this is not possible for more developed Regions). The Commission wants the projects to be financed by the private sector (EIB, etc.). Even if the Atlantic Arc Commission works on maps, the Commission may not take it into account. Instead of redesigning the maps, we could work on amending the CEF Annex where priority projects are listed.

Nia Lewis, backed the proposal to work on the maps. Answering to Inma Valencia’s question, she insisted on the necessity to accompany the maps with a strong argumentation. Being on the map is an obligation to get co-financing. In the case of Wales, it was on the corridor and then disappeared. We need to come to the Commission with our views.

Patrick Anvroin added that Britany is also part of the “grey zone” forgotten by the Corridor.

Mar Martín Raba added that we could provide statistical data to prove that our amendments to the maps are justified from a European point of view.

In conclusion, members agreed to work on a clear argumentation which will come with an alternate map based on those prepared in 2012. Taking into account the Aquitaine-Limousin-Poitou-Charentes’ point of view, the message needs to be inclusive for all the Regions (not the one on the corridor vs. the one outside the corridor).

- **Political messages to include in the 2016 Final Declaration**

Pauline Caumont made suggestions in her PPT (cf. slide 13). The outcomes of this meeting will be used to prepare the Final Declaration to be voted during next General Assembly (2-3 June 2016 in Navarra)

Marie-Pierre Mesplède suggested to add a message on Marco Polo.

Patrick Anvrouin suggested to ask to be associated to the ongoing study on [Med-Atlantic ecobonus](#) (ES-FR-IT).

A technical group (which consists of the Regions that are members of the Political Bureau) will meet in April/May in Brussels to agree upon the messages to include in the Final Declaration (priority projects + ratio 90/10). A draft will be circulated ahead of this meeting.

VI. AOB

Participants asked to meet again before the General Assembly. Another Transport working group could be organised in parallel to the next CPMR Inter-Com working group (March, date to be fixed) or in April, in parallel to the meeting with technicians of the Regions that are members of the Political Bureau.