

## OPINION Nr. 2/CI(MAR)-CORATL/AMT/2015

**Addressee:** ATLANTIC CORRIDOR EUROPEAN COORDINATOR

**Subject:** OPINION ON THE DOCUMENT “COMMON KPI FRAMEWORK FOR CNC” AND CONCEPT FOR A STANDARD PROJECT SHEET

### I. FRAMEWORK

The present Opinion states the position of the Portuguese Authority for Mobility and Transport (AMT) on the document “Common KPI framework for CNC”, dated on 30 September 2015, sent by the European Commission Consultant TIS-INECO-EGISFRANCE-MFIVE-PANTEIA-BG, as well as on the concept for a standard project sheet presented in the last Atlantic Corridor Forum meeting, held in 1<sup>st</sup> October, 2015, in the scope of the initial tasks regarding the studies for the first revision of the Atlantic Corridor Work Plan, to be concluded till summer of 2016.

### II. ANALYSIS

#### 1. Common KPI framework for CNC

1.1. The studies’ methodology for the first revision of the Atlantic Corridor Work Plan will start from the results of 2014 Atlantic Corridor Study and Atlantic Corridor Work Plan from the European Coordinator, with a first task on Key Performance Indicators (KPI’s) harmonized approach (KPI Framework), then will proceed to a review of the project list that will conduct to the mapping of the projects, feeding the update of the Atlantic Corridor Work Plan, namely wider elements for the work plan (identification of impacts, including externalities) and measures for the implementation of the corridor (plan for removal of barriers and analysis of nodes).

The KPI’s, which are developed to assess and monitor the evolution of the corridors and the effects of the individual projects or groups of projects, will be developed in a common framework for all 9 trans-European Transport Network (TEN-T) core corridors.

The KPI framework consists of two following parts:

- A generic part, which describes mainly the supply-side (infrastructure) and selected demand characteristics, that will be used in all nine corridors;
- A corridor specific part, regarding the specific characteristics of the corridor and its critical aspects.

The KPI's should be based on the existing EU strategic framework, quantifiable, available from public statistical sources, capable of being aggregated to corridor level and relevant for the assessment of a corridor's performance.

The KPI's purposed in the document are linked to the general objectives of TEN-T (cohesion, efficiency, sustainability and benefits to its users) and corridor objectives (compliance regarding technical requirements, optimal integration and improved interconnection, clean transport, multimodal connections and efficient use of infrastructure), divided by modes (railways, inland waterways, roads, seaports, inland ports, airports and rail-road terminals) and grouped in supply and demand sides.

As well, there are purposed indicators for socio-economic data (GDP, employment, population, extension of the networks, types of nodes, etc.), as corridor background information, and for corridor specific objectives like modal split at specific nodes, infrastructure utilization rate, transport times on specific origin/destinations, etc..

**1.2.** In general, the KPI's framework purposed is in our opinion adequate, although there are some specific issues that need further analysis, taking also in account that all corridor infrastructures belong to the core network and need to meet, either general TEN-T requirements, either specific core network requirements, namely:

- For inland waterways supply side:
  - ✓ The use of a general indicator for CEMT requirement and of the indicators for draught, height, length and width might be redundant, unless dully justified
  - ✓ The need of an indicator for share of double locks (or more) needs to be dully justified, since it isn't a requirement of TEN-T Regulation and the reference in COM(2013) 940 is vague and doesn't seem enough to justify this indicator
  - ✓ According TEN-T Regulation, inland waterways in the core network should also comply with availability of alternative clean fuels and a KPI for it should be included;
- In the scope of inland ports, a KPI should be included regarding the offer of at least one freight terminal open to all operators in a non-discriminatory way and shall apply transparent charges, as required by TEN-T Regulation;
- There are 4 infrastructure requirements stated in TEN-T Regulation for core seaports that should also be covered by KPI's, that are:
  - ✓ Ports serving freight traffic shall offer at least one terminal which is open to users in a non-discriminatory way and which applies transparent charges
  - ✓ Implementation VTMISS and SafeSeaNet as provided for in Directive 2002/59/EC

- ✓ Deployment of e Maritime services, including in particular Maritime Single Window services, as provided for in Directive 2010/65/EU
- ✓ Availability of alternative clean fuels;
- The indicators regarding to connections to rail in ports and airports could be complemented with connections to road and, in the case of ports, where possible, to inland waterways;
- In the corridor background information, since the corridors only involve infrastructures of the core network, indicators regarding to comprehensive seaports, inland ports and rail-road terminals seem not to be needed. As well, the reference to 2010 values for GDP seem to be outdated and an effort to use updated data should be done;
- Although as a first general screening for the framework of corridor specifics, indicators regarding modal split at specific nodes, infrastructure utilization rate and transport times on specific origin/destinations are consistent, these type of indicators need to be deeply worked in order to be dully defined with a really harmonised methodology for all sections. Some terms also need to be clarified, like “AADT”.

## 2. Concept for a Standard Project Sheet

2.1. In the 5<sup>th</sup> Atlantic Corridor Form meeting, held last 1<sup>st</sup> of October, the following concept for a standard project sheet was purposed be the DGOMVE/EC consultant for comments of the Member States and stakeholders:

### Concept for a standard project fiche

No.	Project Name					
Project type	study		works			
TEN-Tac ID						
Project Promoter						
Location						
Foreseen Start - End Date						
Framework for Implementation	2020		2030		unforeseen or after 2030	
Cross - Border Section	yes		no			
Adherence to the other Corridor	no	NSB	OEM	R-D	Med	Se-Med
TEN-T Policy Priority	Last mile connections	Physical and technical bottleneck	Operational and administrative barrier	Urban nodes	Other critical issue	
Category of Project	Rail	Rail ERTMS	Inland Waterway	Road	Maritime	
	Multiways of the Sea	Airport	Multimodal	Innovation	Other	

6. Financing			
Possible funding sources	Approved Funds	Potential Funds	Total
State budget (direct)			
Other public sources			
Public Loans			
Possible CEF			
Possible CF			
Possible ERDF			
Infrastructure manager sources			
Private sources			
Private loans			
Other			
Total			

7. Remarks on project financing and innovative financial instruments									


  

8. Implementation pathway																	
Feasibility study	Feasibility, environmental impact assessment and localisation				Design, procurement and financing				Construction/acquisition, contract								
	Application for environment authorisation	Environmental Assessment	Environmental decision	Application for localisation	Detailed design	Application for construction	Construction	Environment	Application for land for projects	Financial close	Working drawings	Land acquisition	Appointment of main/ S&B	Construction works	Safety certificates	Permit for use	Operation & maintenance
Status / deadline																	
Comment																	

9. Final Assessment of Project: strategic merit, benefits, costs and maturity				

10. Localization on national / corridor map					
					

1. Project description and overall objective			

2. Project main parameters			
- permanent way			
- catenary, power supply			
- bridges / viaducts			
- railway traffic control			
- ERTMS/ETCS			
- level crossings			
- ratings and terminals			

3. Project KPI's			
Max Axle Load Compliance (>22.5 tons)	Train Length Compliance (>740m)	Electrification Compliance	Other
current situation			
target			

4. Project planning reference					
CEF pre-identified sections	CF Operational Programme	ERDF Operational Programme	National Plans	Regional Plans and other Local Plans	Infrastructure Manager Contract Plans

5. Project budget	
Total cost	Source of information

2.2. The definition of a standard project sheet for all TEN-T core corridors, aiming to concentrate the relevant information regarding the project data and its status, bridging with the corridor and TEN-T objectives, is beneficial for the assessment and monitor of the corridor projects and shall be supported.

A good assessment and monitoring process for projects shall have a quicken effect for investment. To achieve it, it's important a better clarification and rationalization of some data fields and, in this way, some adjustments should be taken in account, namely;

- The line regarding “TEN-T Policy Priority” should be in alignment with the priorities Article 10 of TEN-T Regulation (Regulation 1315/2013). If the objective is to qualify the type of critical issues, the title should be changed in conformity. In that case a main type of critical issue to be referenced is the missing links;
- In the “Project planning reference”, there should be also possible to reference “other”;
- In “Financing”, and since there is a column for “Potential Funds”, the reference to “Possible” in CEF, CF and ERDF is not necessary. The exact scope of “Potential Funds” should be clarified;
- The exact concept of the items for “Implementation pathway” should clearly identified and the tableau simplified, namely:
  - ✓ Feasibility studies might be broken down, when relevant, by technical, environmental and cost-benefit analysis
  - ✓ The environmental impact assessment could be reduced to submission to EIA and to environmental clearance
  - ✓ The application and decision regarding localization should be clarified. Maybe it regards to permitting for works and in this case only one field is needed
  - ✓ “Detail design” and “working drawings” fields might be redundant and only the first be needed
  - ✓ “Application for construction” and “construction+environment” fields in the design, procurement and financing could better be substituted by “tendering”
  - ✓ The “appointment of works / D&B” could better be substituted by “consignation” and moved to the “construction/acquisition, contract” area
  - ✓ The field “safety certificates” should also reference the environmental component;
- When an attribute type “other” is selected it should be shortly described.

### III. OPINION

As a cross component regarding to all matters in the scope of this Opinion of AMT, every action that boosts and speed up the investment, removing bottlenecks for the timely implementation of key sustainable projects for the conclusion of the TEN-T core network, enhancing the added value for the EU economy and assuring a sustainable mobility, in the framework of social and territory cohesion, as well as developing and consolidating the EU Transport Single Market, as a competitive market, shall be primly supported.

Under that overall scope, this Opinion on the document “Common KPI framework for CNC” and on the concept for a standard project sheet, as presented in the Atlantic Corridor Forum meeting held in 1<sup>st</sup> October, 2015, supported in the analysis of the previous chapter, points several recommendations in order for a better assessment and monitoring process of the corridors and associated projects that contribute to a quicken effect in investment.

Although the KPI framework and standard project sheet approach purposed are, in general terms, adequate, it’s important a better clarification and rationalization of some data fields and, in this way, some detail adjustments are useful.

Namely, there are specific issues that need further analysis, which are the remarks referenced in sections 1.2 and 2.2 of the previous chapter of this Opinion that should be taken in account.

Lisboa, 9<sup>th</sup> October, 2015

President of the Board

João Carvalho