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CEF2 Negotiations
Where do we stand?
A look back at our work on Transport

Preparing Post 2020
- 2 Policy Papers in 2017
- Letter sent to Comm. Bulc in February 2018
- WG meeting on 6 June to discuss CEF2 Proposal

Supporting Maritime Transport
- Advocating for more support to ports in CEF
- Pushing for more dynamism in MoS
- Accelerating the development of a European Ecobonus

Air Connectivity
- Work launched in 2017
- Expert group created in 2018 with Sardegna, Stockholm, Cornwall and Vasterbotten
- Meetings with DG MOVE and DG COMP have been held
Key principles for strong EU budget supporting accessibility for regions

Connecting Europe Facility & Cohesion Fund
- Should support priority corridors, Motorways of the Seas & the TEN-T network

Level playing field
- Interventions from EU budget to transport infrastructure must be coordinated so similar projects benefit from same co-financing rate

Reduce transport sector’s impact on environment
- CEF budget for decarbonisation should be increased; Maritime transport should be improved by increasing subsidies for harbour work & introducing flexible rate for actions supporting MoS

European Regional Development Fund
- Should boost accessibility for regions by supporting financing of secondary & tertiary nodes, including ports, & their connections to TEN-T network

Connecting Europe Facility Post-2020 Budget Allocation
- Should be at least same level as 2014-2020, provided CEF governance is substantially reformed to better address territorial challenges & involve regional & local authorities

Review of priority corridor routes
- EU should review priority corridor routes to create better balance in coverage of EU territories
Review for the CEF: CPMR objectives

3 Key Principles identified in 2017

- Making territorial cohesion an objective of the Programme
- Improving the its governance
- Increasing CEF support to maritime transport
Making territorial cohesion an objective of the programme

Our proposal

• Introducing accessibility as an objective to CEF in accordance with TEN-T Regulation and as an award criteria
• Increase the cofunding rate for projects enhancing accessibility
• Increase the support to the Comprehensive Network by creating a minimum share of the budget

What does the CEF2 say?

• Although accessibility is quoted among accessibility criterion, it doesn’t refer to territorial accessibility
• A minimum share of 9% should be dedicated to Comprehensive Network (15% of the 60% dedicated to infrastructures)

Our reaction

• Better support for the Comprehensive is a great win although Military Mobility raises questions and concerns
• Some new alignments to the Corridors contribute to a better accessibility
• Efforts are still needed in our fight for accessibility
Improving the governance of the Programme

Our proposal
- Widening the scope of eligible entities to submit projects for funding (only Member States in CEF1)
- Involving Regional Authorities in Project selection
- Better coordinate the efforts from different funds

What does the CEF2 say?
- Not limited to Member States anymore. However, art 7 (Work Programmes) reintroduces it
- The Programme refers to the Committee procedure that hasn't been amended
- Efforts seem to be made with a clear "domination" of CEF over shared management ones

Our reaction
- The is a step in the right direction, but WP shouldn't take a step backward
- Regrettably, there is a clear tendency to promote direct management over shared management in the European Commission.
Improving CEF support to maritime transport

Our proposal

• Recognising the cross-border nature of ports, thus increasing the cofounding rate
• Developing a better support for MoS
• Encouraging modal shift to reach EU commitments in terms of Climate Change

What does the CEF2 say?

• Neither Maritime links nor ports are considered cross-border
• Nothing on potential tools to encourage modal shift

Our reaction

• This fight is linked to the accessibility one. We need to put lots of efforts in the coming days/months in this one too.
• We need to wait for Medatlantic Ecobonus project's result
What to think about the whole Proposal?

Some improvements to make:
- No mention of accessibility
- A better governance
- Maritime transport has to be further supported

Some question marks:
- Military mobility: the proposal remains rather vague and doesn't guarantee much visibility for Regions
- Budget: decreased a bit, hard to plan how it will evolve in codecision

Some wins for the CPMR:
- Higher cofunding rate for the comprehensive
- Several amendments have been taken into account in the annex
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