This document aims at extracting pertinent information on the Atlantic projects submitted to the 2014 CEF calls for proposals. It also gives a first analysis of what these results mean for the Atlantic Arc Commission.

Information on the adopted and rejected projects come from the online document published in July 2015 by the innovation and Network Executive Agency (INEA): Brochure Connecting Europe Facility (CEF) – Transport 2014 Calls for proposals.

Corridor Map with projects

CEF priorities (reminder)

In light of the main aims of the CEF, the funding allocated to projects is organised around three funding objectives:

- **Funding Objective 1** (FO1): Removing bottlenecks and bridging missing links, enhancing rail interoperability, and, in particular, improving cross-border sections;

- **Funding Objective 2** (FO2): Ensuring sustainable and efficient transport systems in the long run, with a view to preparing for expected future transport flows, as well as enabling all modes of transport to be decarbonised through transition to innovative low-carbon and energy-efficient transport technologies, while optimising safety;
- **Funding Objective 3** (FO3): Optimising the integration and interconnection of transport modes and enhancing the interoperability of transport services, while ensuring the accessibility of transport infrastructures.

### Multi-Annual and Annual Work Programmes

Between 80 and 85% of CEF funding during the 2014-2020 period will be allocated under the Multi-annual work programme (MAP). This addresses projects which are of a longer duration and of strategic importance, such as those along the nine Core Network Corridors (Rail, inland waterways, road and ports), on the Core Network itself and those addressing horizontal priorities which are pre-identified in Part I of Annex I of the CEF Regulation.

Approximately 15 to 20% of CEF funds during the 2014-2020 period will be allocated under the Annual work programme (AP). This addresses objectives which reflect transport infrastructure development, transport services and facilities as well as transport policy priorities of a shorter-term nature, which are reduced in scope or more diffuse in coverage (e.g. reduction of rail freight noise, support of freight transport services, specific actions in the fields of transport telematics and innovation).
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As one can see on the graph below, the Atlantic Corridor comes at the 7th place out of the 9th Corridor in terms of recommended CEF Funding per Core Network Corridors. It is quite difficult to suggest an explanation to this relatively small amount of funding dedicated to the Atlantic Corridor. It may be a more limited number of applications, less funding requested by applicants or a larger number of projects not recommended for funding. Only an in-depth analysis of each corridors could give us some keys.

Below is a graph presenting the number of projects and recommended CEF Funding granted for selected projects under Funding Objective 3, including the objective “Motorways of the Sea” which is relevant for the Atlantic Arc Commission members. Throughout Europe, 27 projects have been selected and recommended for funding under the priority “Motorways of the Sea” among which only 4 projects concern the Atlantic.
The map above indicates where these projects (FO 3) will be funded. One can notice that very few projects will be developed in the Atlantic Arc.
The map (below) identifies the location of the 27 projects recommended for funding under MO3 / Priority motorways of the Sea. Only 4 projects were selected in the Atlantic Area (cf. details below).
Projects recommended for Funding in the Atlantic Area

Regarding the Atlantic Corridor, 25 projects have been recommended for Funding, among which:

- **4 projects are EU projects: 16%**
  
  Funding objective 1: M: section Bergara-San Sebastián-Bayonne studies and works (ES-FR)
  
  Funding objective 1: S: study to contribute to the development of Rail Freight Corridor Atlantic. (DE, ES, FR, PT)
  
  Funding objective 2: S: Study to boost energy sustainable fuels for freight transport in European MotorWays: to identify, implement and validate new LNG/CNG refueling solutions along the Atlantic Corridor (ES-FR)
  
  Funding objective 3: W: deployment of ITS services on the Arc Atlantique corridor (BE, ES, FR, IE, NL, UK)

- **9 projects were submitted by a French structure: 36%**
  
  Regions of the Atlantic Arc Commission: Aquitaine (5) and Pays de la Loire (1)
  
  CPMR Region: Haute-Normandie (3)
  
  Funding objective 1: S: Studies for a connection between Port 2000 (Le Havre) with inland waterways
  
  Funding objective 1: S: Studies for the new high speed line between Bordeaux and Dax (to be linked to the Basque Y)
  
  Funding objective 1: M: Studies and work to upgrade the Serqueux-Gisors Line (Freight railways from Le Havre to Paris)
  
  Funding Objective 1: M: dredging programme in Port of Bordeaux for the new generation of container vessels & break bulk (increasing the draught to 11 m)
  
  Funding objective 1: W: redesign and upgrade the multi-purpose terminal in Nantes-Saint-Nazaire Port (lengthening the berg and increasing the draught to 14.5 m)
  
  Funding objective 1: W: Improvement of vessels access to the Port of Rouen (dredging works + enlargement of the Hautot-sur-seine turning basin)
  
  Funding objective 2: W: doubling the tracks between Saint Jean Station and Cenon and eliminating two level crossings between Cenon and Ambarès
  
  Annual Call: S: studies for installation of specific equipment (permanent counterflow facilities) for the section Gazinet-Dax
  
  Annual Call: W: Rail connection to the port of Bordeaux, maritime node of the Atlantic Corridor

- **7 projects were submitted by a Spanish structure: 28%**
  
  Regions from the Atlantic Arc Commission: Basque Country: 3 projects under Funding objective 1
  
  Region Centro, Portugal: 1 project
  
  Funding objective 1: W: Railway connection Aveiro – Salamanca – Medina del Campo: electrification of the line (Aveiro: Region Centro Portugal)
  
  Funding objective 1: W: supply, electrification and acoustic protection along the 32 km of the section Chamartin-Atocha-Torrejón (South of Madrid)
  
  Funding objective 1: W: Port of Bilbao: new quay 1358 m length and 21 m deep and additional 300 000m² port operation area for cargo
  
  Funding objective 1: W: work on the section Bilbao-Vitoria High Speed Railway line
  
  Funding Objective 1: W: missing link of 63.3km on the global project Vitoria-Bilbao-San Sebastián High Speed Railway Line
  
  Funding Objective 2: S: Multimodal Information Services and System in the Urban node of Madrid
  
  Funding objective 3: W: Multimodal logistics platform (132 ha) of Badajoz (Extremadura): study and work
- 4 projects were submitted by a Portuguese structure: 16%

2 studies and 2 mixed (works and studies) actions under objective 1 and 3: all concerns regions members of the Atlantic Arc Commission: Alentejo (1), Centro (1), Norte (1), Lisboa (1)

Funding Objective 1: M: Railway connection Sines/Elvas: design study and construction of a railway (missing link) for freight (Alentejo)

Funding Objective 1: S: Studies for the rail connection Aveiro (PT)-Vilar Formoso (ES) The action will define best approach (market driven or society concern) (Centro)

Funding objective 3: M: development of the multimodal logistics platform in port of Leixões (Norte)

Funding Objective 3: S: Studies to develop the port of Lisbon’s multimodal logistic platform

- 1 project was submitted by Germany: 4%

Funding Objective 1: M: upgrade line 23 Saarbrucken-Ludwigshafen: does not concerns the Atlantic Arc Commission members.

Regarding the Funding Priority 3 (including horizontal Priority “Motorways of the Sea”):

4 projects concerns directly or indirectly the Atlantic Arc:

4 projects represent 14.8% of the total number of selected project, among which 2 studies, 1 “works”, and one “mixed”.

1. Atlantis interoperable Services (ATLANTIS); Study for the launch of a new MoS service along the Atlantic Coast between Liverpool, Brest and Leixões (freight only). Applicant: Chambre de Commerce et d’Industrie de Brest (FR)


3. Installing gas and water cleaning system on 2 vessels liaising between Cork, Plymouth, Roscoff and Santander (identified as North Sea Mediterranean corridor) (works). Applicant: SAS Somabret (related to Brittany Ferries)


2 projects concerns the English Channel:

1. “Bridge”: infrastructure upgrade between Dover and Calais, an already existing MoS Route. Part of the North Sea Mediterranean Corridor (works). Applicant: Dover Harbour Board.

2. Study and deployment of integrated gas & water cleanings system and biofuel MGO blend for Atlantic Corridor Upgrade (classified as North Sea Mediterranean) (Mixed). Applicant: BAI Bretagne Angleterre Irlande

Comments:

Many projects recommended for funding are projects already in progress, thus qualified as mature by the EC/INEA.
“Atlantic” Projects not recommended for funding:

Below is a list of “Atlantic” projects that have been rejected at the end of the evaluation process. According to the evaluation remarks, some projects appear to be weak which is why they have not been selected. On the other hand, some projects receive very positive comments and yet are not recommended for funding for two main “official” reasons:

- **“Lack of EU added value”:** the EC/evaluation teams considered that cross border projects were the priority → This is a real problem for peripheral Regions that need a better liaison to the Corridor to access the EU Market.
- **“Budgetary constraints”:** the request funding was 2.7 times more than the available budget for this call. The EC had to make choices and decided to finance only project located on the Corridor. If we may be able to understand that for the first call of the new programming period, this should not remain the “rule” until 2020. Investments need to be balanced and not concentrated in the same Regions.

This two justifications appears in read below. These unsuccessful projects are detailed in the EC Brochure from page 383 onwards.

1. Intermodal platform of the Port of Huelva: **EU added value not substantial.**
2. Logistic terminal in the hinterland of Bilbao port: budgetary constraints and low EU added value.
3. Iberian ScanBaltic Corridor: weakness of the application in terms of quality, structure of the proposal is not clear.
4. Extension of the tram line between Bordeaux center to Bordeaux Merignac Airport: not retained due to budgetary constraints and relatively low EU added value.
5. Upgrade Zaragoza-Canfranc-Pau / Huesca – Canfranc: relevance of the action is poor, maturity is weak, did not receive the necessary approvals, quality is weak and description is incomplete, unclear and incoherent. // Similar project for Huesca-Laza and similar rejection for similar reasons.
6. Rail connection to the port of Avilés: environmental impact is not quantified and socio economic effects are not enough substantiated. Quality is poor.
7. New port dock close to A Coruña: action not relevant, port not located on the inland waterways, quality of the proposal unsatisfactory.
8. Rail connection to the outer port of Ferrol (Galicia): good proposed action but not retained due to budgetary constraints.
9. High speed railway Castejon-Logrono (Navarra – La Rioja): action relevance is good but not retained due to budgetary constraints.
11. Works on the section Burgos (Castilla y León) – Vitoria (Basque Country) 2 projects: very relevant but not retained for funding due to budgetary constraints.
12. Study on efficiency management: not relevant to the TEN-T calls priorities, lack on information on the political commitment, impacts poorly described. The proposals lacks consistency, logic and completeness.
13. Highway access to the port of El Musel (Gijón): does not address the priority of the call. Poor quality of the action, lacks essential details.
14. Improve the access of Port of Santander: relevance to the call is weak, maturity weak, milestones and deliverables too broadly defined.
15. New configuration of the docks/ port of Santander: not in line with call priorities.
16. Improvement of the railway access to the Port of Santander: good action but not retained for funding due to budgetary constraints.
17. Extension of the berthing line, port of Vigo: relevance is weak, impact weak, EU leverage effect is not sufficient.

18. Study on road access to the port of Avilés (Asturias): only positive assessment but not recommended for funding.

19. Metro San Sebastián (Basque Country): not relevant to the Call priority, no EU added value, action is poor: information provided is limited, incomplete and inaccurate.

20. Railway service between Spain and Portugal (freight): very good relevance, very good maturity, good quality but categories of costs are not clearly explained and limited EU added value.

21. Rail access to the port of Bilbao: action’s relevance is poor, maturity is poor, impact is poor, quality of the action is poor.

22. Preparatory Study Pau-Canfranc: effects at regional level, no sufficient EU added value, description of the action not clear nor complete enough.

23. Single window in small ports (Port of Bordeaux): relevance is weak, EU added value is limited

24. Rail freight between Huelva (ES) and Setubal (PT): relevance and maturity good but limited EU added value.

25. Rail freight between Alfarelos (PT) and Pampelona: relevance and maturity are very good but limited EU added value.

26. High Speed Rail Line between Bretagne and Pays de la Loire: relevance is good but impact is weak, various sections of the application are lacking information or described in general terms only.

27. Centre Europe Atlantique Railway (freight line between the Atlantic and Central Europe) study: relevance is fair but maturity is low. Financial resources are not secured and planned activities only briefly described.

28. Poitier Limoges high Speed Line (Study): very good relevance, maturity and impact. Quality is very good, activities are coherent with objectives but not selected due to budgetary constraints.

29. Studies concerning the connection of Moncorvo Mining complex to the TEN-T (PT): relevance is weak (no EU added value) maturity is weak but action of good quality.

30. Missing link motorway between Vilar (PT) and Spanish border: relevance is fair (not mentioned in the PT-ES written agreement), maturity is good, impact is good and activities are realistic.

31. Logistics Single Window for comprehensive ports in PT (Study): limited relevance, concerns e-freight activities not the Port. Overall quality is weak.

32. Alfarelos multimodal logistics platform: relevance is weak, maturity is poor.

33. Expansion of MSC Terminal Entrocamento: action relevance is good, maturity is weak, impact is good, quality of the proposal is weak.

**Multi Annual Calls:** 20 projects rejected

- Funding Objective 1: 12 “Atlantic” projects not recommended for funding
- Funding objective 2: 4 “Atlantic” projects not recommended for funding
- Funding objective 3: 4 “Atlantic” projects not recommended for funding

**Annual Calls:**

- 34 “Atlantic” projects not recommended for funding

**Conclusion:** All priorities and calls combined, a total of **54 Atlantic** projects were not recommended for funding, when only **25 projects** were successful. This discrepancy is quite important (more that twice as many projects rejected than validated).
CPMR Survey on Motorways of the Sea:

The CPMR has supported the concept of the Motorways of the Sea (MoS) since its launch in 2001 followed by its inclusion in the TEN-T. Now, it is a key instrument in European maritime transport policy within the framework of the guidelines for the Trans-European Transport Network, revised in 2013, and the Connecting Europe Facility (CEF).

The European Commission is invited (Article 21 of the TEN-T guidelines) to “submit (before the summer 2016) a detailed implementation plan for the motorways of the sea based on experience and developments relating to the Union maritime transport as well as the forecast traffic on the motorways of the sea”.

In helping the Commission prepare this plan, the CPMR wishes it to include the provisions necessary to ensure that the MoS take into account the territorial specificities of Europe’s various peripheral Regions. The CPMR also wants the MoS to be an integral part of Action Plan of each of the CEF’s 9 priority corridors.

The Atlantic Arc Commission circulated this survey among its members. As of 9/12/15, so far only 5 answers were received, one of which accounts for 4 member Regions (in Portugal).

Below is the current list of Regions that have sent their contributions (at date of 9/12/15):

- **Portugal**: one answer valid for the 4 Member Regions: Alentejo, Lisboa Vale del Tejo, Centro y Norte
- **Spain**: still waiting for Galicia, Asturias, Cantabria and Basque Country
- **France**: Aquitaine, Poitou-Charentes, Pays de la Loire et Bretagne (still missing: Basse-Normandie)
- **UK**: comments received from Wales but not in the shape of the questionnaire.
- **Ireland**: no contribution received so far

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region 1</th>
<th>Region 2</th>
<th>Region 3</th>
<th>Region 4</th>
<th>Region 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 1, possible answers:**

1.1: In general, the MoS meet the need of maritime Regions and their implementation is satisfactory. (0 answers)

1.2: The MoS meet the needs of Maritime Regions but their definition and eligibility conditions should be reviewed (4 answers)

1.3: the MoS meet the needs of maritime Regions, their implementation is satisfactory but the budget allocated is not sufficient (0 answers)

1.4: The MoS do not meet the needs of maritime Regions and should be replaced or completed with a separate instrument dedicated to European maritime transport (1 answer)

**Question 2, possible answers:**

2.1: the level of funding for the MoS should be different, depending on location (2 answers)
2.2: Because of the specific nature of their shipping (imbalance and low volumes), **islands** should be granted a preferential rates (3 answers)

2.3: Because of their distance, **outermost Regions** should be granted preferential rate (3 answers)

2.4: A connection between two ports in the Global TEN-T network should become eligible (3 answers)

2.5: A connection between an EU port and a **third country** must become eligible (2 answers)

2.6: **EU start-up aids** (which were removed in 2013) must be reintroduced if they don’t create unfair competition and if they help to improve accessibility and territorial cohesion. (3 answers)

2.7: “other elements to maximize the system” For Pays de la Loire, the Commission should think about new support schemes: the vessel could be considered as an infrastructure and become eligible to a European financial help. In the case of the service being stopped, the shipowner could sell the boat hence reimbursing part of the EU

**Question 3, possible answers:**

3.1: In general, governance of implementation of the MoS is satisfactory (0 answers)

3.2: A consultation forum should be set up as it has been done for the corridors in the Connecting Europe Facility (2 answers)

3.3: Since the MoS are a transversal priority, they should always be included in the discussions and action plans for each corridor comprising a maritime dimension i.e. within corridor forum meetings (4 answers)

3.4: A state should not be allowed to block a response to a call for CEF proposals in which one of its entities is involved (3 answers)

**Question 4, possible answers:**

4.1: In addition to the CEF, The EC should prepare proposals based on taxation of road transport (polluter payers’ principle) to help financing sustainable transport, in particular MoS. (1 answer)

4.2: in addition to the CEF, the EC should prepare proposals based on financial incentives for hauliers which chose maritime transport (**European Ecobonus**). Article 32 of the TEN-T regulation is not sufficient. (4 answers)

4.3: The financial instruments designed for “the greening” of maritime transports should be made accessible to smaller projects. The Region should also be consulted on the subject, like States or Shipping companies. (3 answers)

**Conclusion:** Although it is difficult to draw tendencies so far, it remains clear for all answering regions that the current calls & priority on Motorways of the Sea do not meet the needs of maritime Regions and need to be somehow adapted. Atlantic Arc Commission Transport Working Group meetings planned in 2016 will help defining a common message and prepare proposals to the EC before June 2016.