

## **Brief on TEN-T as a result of the NSC Transport Group September 2010**

### **Remaining Issues:**

Key remaining issues:

1. The Core network proposal quite clearly gives a bias towards the connectivity of those places fortunately on a line of route between nodes (some of which, eg: capital cities, somewhat irrelevant in terms of transport geography) and those outside the envelope of all these places.
2. The EC do not appear to be in favour of linking peripheral areas to third countries and this attitude is against the interest of states at the edges of the EU. "At the edges" can be both geographic (ie: only a few countries are geographically adjacent) and political (ie: adjacent countries are mostly outside the EU). These states also have reduced access to funding as they have less scope for finding the necessary transnational partnerships with other EU nation states.
3. The discussion could be easier if more is known about the intentions for the comprehensive networks ie: as a process being developed in parallel. The definition of the comprehensive network has not been made clear. It is also assumed to be based on nation states and there is therefore a need to consider the more minor transnational links especially those requiring maritime or Motorways of the sea links.
4. Funding assistance needs to be available to the various forms of non pure public sector owned infrastructure.
5. It should be recognised that creating corridors in the periphery will aid in load aggregation and therefore spread modal choice.
6. The fact that maritime links can be much cheaper to provide than land links.
7. There needs to be access from peripheral locations outside of the proposal for 12 main core port cluster areas (whichever they are) and their immediate hinterlands to intercontinental trade.

### **Transport Geography v The Core network**

We mainly consider that there is a need for a process to match transport geography to the proposed Core network – if there is a mismatch then it can result in expensive "white elephants" - and that the process should assess:

- A. Freight flows and passenger flows separately.
- B. The hinterlands and areas reliant on and connected to the nodes chosen so far.
- C. The places connected by virtue of them lying on a line of route between nodes.
- D. Those places that are not covered by B and C above and whether or not they are "important" in freight or passenger terms and if they are how they are linked to the core network.
- E. Links to major intercontinental ports.

### **Comment on CPMR Technical paper for discussion at CPMR AGM**

[http://www.cprm.org/pub/agenda/1509\\_en\\_2010\\_09\\_cprm\\_response\\_to\\_the\\_2nd\\_consultation\\_on\\_the\\_future\\_of\\_ten\\_t.pdf](http://www.cprm.org/pub/agenda/1509_en_2010_09_cprm_response_to_the_2nd_consultation_on_the_future_of_ten_t.pdf)

See over :

On issue A : “Greater mobility”: Mobility in the periphery needs also to be covered in a way that closes and does not increase the gap between the relative mobility in different parts of the EU.

On issue B: “Core / comprehensive” : Strongly agree with the following:  
“We stress that the core network should not help strengthen the geo-economic heart of Europe to the detriment of the peripheries.” and  
“ large swathes of the EU territory have been left out of these 30 projects “ (although we may be perceived as “close” to Glasgow !)  
The proposed core network is “ without any reference to territorial balance; “

On issue C : we support the idea that “The development of intermodal transport must be supported by effective infrastructures.”

On Issue D – this text arises from NSC and we support it.

On Consultation Questions attached to the paper:

1. Methodology : Accessibility : an additional issue is the relative accessibility of places inside and outside the core network, connection to Third countries and intercontinental trade.
2. Ten-T Implementation: The process of identifying core network nodes should be recognised as a political expediency and is not sophisticated. This could be very much more expensive and less relevant than a proper assessment of future transport needs.  
Any new taxation mentioned in the CPMR paper intended to penalise polluting modes must not make peripheral areas uneconomic.

What is clearly not considered so far :

- the actual flows of traffic which may not currently follow routes between capital cities etc.
- the potential flows of traffic arising from new developments (example Shtokman) and from the improved transport links
- industrial and raw material concentrations (esp in remoter areas of Scandinavia)
- the relative cost of implementing the various connections. It may be possible to include some core network ideas relatively cheaply by basing the connections using maritime links as part of the corridor.

Additional points raised:

The NSC submission to the NSC executive group does include some geographic specific information both from Gothenburg and from the Northern Maritime Corridor Route via Aberdeen in order to highlight the need for links to third countries Norway and Russia from the Northern EU.

Some past presentations have mentioned reserving transport corridor capacity for freight – we would suggest this is very difficult in liberalised transport systems.

Not all maritime transport is on RoRo ferries.

Philip Smart