



## Motorways of the Sea (MoS): contribution to the review of their priorities and implementation

The CPMR has been actively working on this policy since its launch, in conjunction with the European Commission and successive European coordinators. This has resulted in several contributions, based in particular on the results of a survey of its member regions.

In June 2016, the European Commission published a Detailed Implementation Plan for the MoS, the [DIP1](#)\*.

The document has been discussed at the meeting of the CPMR Transport Working Group and a seminar organised by the Islands Commission in October 2016, and at the CPMR General Assembly in November 2016.

The Commission will present an updated version of the DIP, the DIP2, in June 2017. This working paper has been drawn up with this in mind and as a contribution to the work planned by the Maltese EU Presidency during the first half of 2017. It contains:

- an evaluation of the DIP1,
- a proposal on changes to the way MoS are implemented during the period up to 2020 (the current programming period), with a view to restoring a geographical balance among the projects supported,
- a proposal for a review of the articles regarding MoS in the Regulation establishing the Connecting Europe Facility\*\* (CEF) for the next programming period, starting in 2021.

This work is part of the CPMR's campaign on accessibility. It provides arguments following the European Parliament's [Written Declaration](#) on the need for the TEN-T (of which the MoS are the maritime component) to support regional accessibility.

\* Available in English only.

\*\* The CEF finances the MoS

# 1 – The need to expand the DIP’s strategic and geographical dimensions and develop the concrete proposals

## 1.1 The DIP: both a compulsory exercise and an ambition

Extract from Article 21 of the TEN-T Regulation on MoS: *“Within two years after being designated (...), the European Coordinator for motorways of the sea shall present a detailed implementation plan for motorways of the sea (...).”*

The Executive Summary of the DIP1 can be found in [appendix](#) of this paper.

In his introduction to this 173-page document, the Coordinator Brian Simpson, sets out a vision: *“motorways of the sea have the ambition to re-balance the EU transport system.”* He concludes by saying that, *“Once consultation with the European Parliament and Member States has taken place, the Detailed Implementation Plan will constitute a clear and precise guidance for the future orientation of the MoS policy.”*

The DIP1 analysis and conclusions are organised into three pillars, which the coordinator deems to be priorities: environment, logistics and safety/traffic management and the human element.

This paper does not purport to provide a systematic analysis of the content of the DIP1. That would be a task beyond the CPMR’s field of expert capabilities. Specifically, it focuses on issues related to the CPMR’s transport priorities: improved accessibility, fair treatment for all territories, and the development of strategies for each sea basin. Indeed, Article 4 of the TEN-T Regulation states that MoS should contribute to these priorities.

## 1.2 DIP1, strategy and territories

### 1.2.1 – Are MoS just lines on the map, or are they actually smart support criteria for maritime transport?

The DIP1 constitutes an inventory of the challenges faced by the European maritime transport industry and a presentation of the instruments the EU is using to deal with them. However, the inclusion of the MoS within the TEN-T means they should be supported from a genuinely geostrategic point of view. While the term “Motorway of the Sea” may in itself be questionable, it is nevertheless true that they should contribute to a network.

Since their creation in 2001, the Commission has always had difficulty in mapping the MoS. The map below, taken from the DIP1, shows that the issue has still not been resolved 15 years later.

This is Europe’s maritime space!



No one knows what these blue lines correspond to, and the outermost regions and Arctic area are totally left out. Are maps showing the MoS necessary, or would it not be preferable to establish criteria specifying the conditions under which projects can comply with this European “label”?

### 1.2.2 – An overly-superficial approach to sea basins

A chapter entitled “Overview of the shipping operations” (pp. 19-29) merits particular attention from the CPMR member regions and geographical commissions. Using maps, it explains the links between the MoS and the 9 CEF corridors and analyses the various European sea basins from the point of view maritime transport development.

While it describes the characteristics of maritime transport, existing links and certain challenges, there are no operational conclusions regarding the issue of how MoS policy can help meet the challenges?

#### For example:

- The DIP1 notes that there are insufficient ferry links along the Atlantic coast. This is true, and it results in intense, polluting and dangerous road traffic along the Atlantic seaboard. It is necessary to find ways of bring about a huge modal shift, by putting trucks and containers on boats. How can this be done? The DIP1 provides no answers, aside from mentioning the work of DG Move and the ESSF<sup>1</sup> on schemes such as the European Ecobonus. But while this work is very welcome, it is of a general nature and does not address specific territorial issues. MoS policy should adapt them to the different sea basins.
- The DIP1 devotes just 2 lines to the Black Sea. It states that “Ports in the Black Sea are connected among each other through various ro-ro services”. Is such a remark sufficient when the lack of ferry connections are one of the main drawbacks of the Black Sea?<sup>2</sup> By way of comparison, in 2015 the Baltic had 46 international ferry services, whereas the Black Sea only had 9.

Comparative information on the development of ferry services in the Black Sea and the Baltic Sea		
	Baltic Sea	Black Sea
Total number of international ferry services (excluding coastal shipping)	46	9
<b>including:</b>		
-Rail ferry services :	4	5
-Passenger ferry services:	43	8
-cruise services:	30	0
Number of ports with regular international ferry connections	42	17

Aside from being subjects of study, sea basins need to become fields of public action to boost maritime transport. CEF land corridors have forums and coordinators, but who plays this role in each of the sea basins? Despite his expertise, significant efforts and the support of DG Move, is a single coordinator sufficient for this task?

<sup>1</sup> European Sustainable Shipping Forum, a DG Move advisory body on maritime transport maritime

<sup>2</sup> This was emphasised at a conference organised by DG Move in Sofia in March 2015 (See PowerPoint).

The DIP1 recognises that the geographical distribution of projects supported by MoS policy is unbalanced, with there being a larger concentration in the North Sea/Baltic area. It says this is explained by the implementation of the sulphur emission control area (SECA) in these two basins. With the introduction of the 0.5% sulphur limit for the entire EU from 2020, the Commission will have to step up its efforts in other sea basins.

### **1.2.3 – Deep sea/short sea shipping: the issue of maritime accessibility for intermediate hinterlands**

The DIP1 rightly notes that the increased size of transcontinental container ships is concentrating traffic on fewer and fewer European ports. River and rail transport should of course be encouraged to provide connections with these major ports, but some areas of hinterland currently connected by medium-sized ports will no longer have the maritime option open to them. If no alternative is offered, road transport will take a new share of the market by offering a flexible service from the major ports.

These trends are being accentuated on the one hand by DG Move's policy of focusing support on the 9 CEF priority corridors, and on the other hand the limited access of the comprehensive network of ports to the MoS scheme. Such concentration has furthermore been encouraged by the [2016 report by the Court of Auditors on EU policy on seaports](#).<sup>3</sup>

The DIP1 gives no consideration to this issue, which falls within the broader framework of the modal shift support and short sea shipping services. Since the end of the Marco Polo programme in 2013, DG Move has refused to envisage the possibility (aside from state aid) of providing **supply-driven support** for maritime services due to the risk of distorting competition. As there is no guarantee of progress on **demand-driven support** (the Ecobonus scheme), how might the EU support feeder and spoke-hub services from major ports?

The DIP1 offers no solutions. This problem is not specific to the MoS debate. It is more broadly due to the absence of any European policy on a modal shift towards environmentally-friendly modes of transport. This goes back to the 2011 Transport White Paper, and it is in clear contradiction with the EU's climate commitments.

### **1.2.4 – Islands and the outermost regions**

The outermost regions (ORs) and islands benefit very little from MoS policy. The CPMR and its Islands Commission<sup>4</sup> have pointed this out on several occasions. This was also highlighted in the forums organised by coordinator Brian Simpson and at the [ESSF](#) meetings. The Conference of Presidents of the ORs held in Madeira in September 2016 also pointed out the problem.

However, an objective quantitative and qualitative assessment of the results of the 2014 and 2015 CEF/MoS calls for proposals still needs to be done in order to confirm this observation. (*The CPMR is in contact with the European Parliament with a view to conducting this study*).

The DIP1 does not hide this issue. The contribution of the MoS to the accessibility of these regions is frequently mentioned as a necessity. It thus mentions the possibility of building liquefied natural gas fuelling stations in archipelagos such as the Azores and the Canary Islands. However, no operational details are provided on how to improve connections with their mainlands, neighbouring countries or other islands and archipelagos. How this can be done in a context where the Commission does not consider as eligible:

- projects that do not include at least one port from the core network?
- projects involving ports outside the EU, except under restrictive conditions?

<sup>3</sup> Available in all languages: <http://www.eca.europa.eu/en/Pages/DocItem.aspx?did=37734>

<sup>4</sup> Islands Commission Technical Paper ([MoS: Islands and Outermost Regions](#))

The only concrete suggestion made by the DIP1 on this issue makes an explicit (and welcome) reference to a suggestion made by the CPMR Islands Commission. The idea would be to adapt aid intensity to specific regional situations. MoS initiatives could, for example, be supported with a co-financing rate higher than the uniform rate of 30%.

The DIP2 must avoid making such general remarks on the criteria and merely making this “suggestion”.

### **1.2.5 – The DIP1 and external dimension of the MoS**

A chapter of the DIP1 is dedicated to the external dimension. It analyses a number of challenges and opportunities for the development of MoS in the sea basins shared by the EU with both close and distant neighbours. It states that the MoS should strengthen links with Asia, Africa and Latin America and make them “more efficient”. It highlights the role of peripheral and outermost regions in these strategies, and states that some of their ports could become regional hubs. It also takes into account the northern side of this external dimension.

This chapter of the DIP1 should be strengthened in the DIP2 by specifying the type of *à la carte* support that should be offered for each area.

### **1.2.6 – Peripheral projects not selected further to the 2014 and 2015 calls for projects**

The CPMR requests that the Commission and the Parliament provide a comprehensive geographical analysis of the projects selected and rejected since 2014. With the help of its geographical commissions, the CPMR has also taken undertaken a detailed analysis of rejected projects supported by its regions. A Working Paper from the CPMR Secretariat sets out a number of major examples of the difficulties encountered<sup>5</sup>.

## **2 – Proposal for changes to the implementation of MoS during the period up to 2021**

### **2.1 – Summary of adjustments that need to be made to the DIP2**

The TEN-T and CEF regulations governing the MoS will not be changed before 2021. Before then it will thus be necessary to improve the way they are implemented in order to achieve a new geographical balance of support over the entire programming period by correcting the deficiencies of the 2010-2016 period. The European Commission can using delegated acts to adjust the multi-annual CEF-MoS programme and the texts of forthcoming calls for projects (the last call for MoS projects for the period is likely to be launched in 2018.)

Logically, these adjustments will be based on the DIP2, expected for the summer of 2017.

#### **2.1.1 – Introduction of a Territorial Pillar: Pillar 4**

**Reminder of the legal basis, Article 4 of the TEN-T Regulation: the MoS must ensure**

- i) accessibility and connectivity of all regions of the Union, including remote, outermost, insular, peripheral and mountainous regions, as well as sparsely populated areas;*
- iv) a transport infrastructure that reflects the specific situations in different parts of the Union and provides for a balanced coverage of all European regions;*

<sup>5</sup> <http://cpmr.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/Projects-MoS.pdf>

Based on Article 4, Pillar 4 would permit the required improvements set out above. To avoid duplication, it would combine the territorial aspects included within the three pillars of the DIP1 and further develop them with additional findings/proposals. It could be organised as follows:

- MoS and geographical coverage: identification of the areas and types of projects to be given priority support from 2018, based on an evaluation of the projects financed since 2010,
- Priorities for each sea basin: common methodology; strategy and action plan for each maritime basin, including their non-EU parts,
- Strategy and action plan for the islands and outermost regions, including their non-EU parts,
- Strategy and action plan for the Arctic area, including its non-EU part.

A governance strand would be introduced to clarify how public authorities, professionals and stakeholders would be involved in regionalised strategies and action plans. At very least, a pilot project could be proposed for a given sea basin (to be determined).

### **2.1.2 – Introduction of “modal shift” pillar: Pillar 5**

Pillar 5 of the DIP 2 would establish arrangements for supporting the modal shift, in particular to promote the development of short sea shipping, on MoS themselves and to supplement them (feeder and spoke-hub services). Given that the EU’s work on this subject is still limited, this pillar can only be considered as a prospective development at this stage, and it would be further expanded upon by the following versions of the DIP.

## **2.2 – Use of revised guidelines for future calls for proposals**

The 2014, 2015 and 2016 CEF MoS calls for projects have set *general objectives* corresponding to the “logistics”, “environment” and “human element” pillars. The above-mentioned territorial cohesion and modal shift pillars should be added in future.

As for the *specific objectives*, these should be reviewed and priority given to peripheral, outermost and island regions, as well as to the sea basins which have been underfunded since 2010 (further to an objective assessment carried out beforehand).

An alternative approach the Commission could adopt would be to “ earmark” grants allocated to different types of maritime territories. Experience shows that when peripheral projects compete with “big” projects in calls for proposals, they are not given a favourable evaluation. They are often penalised by the inadequate criteria of “maturity” and “impact”.

## **2.3 – The need for a new interpretation of Article 21 to encourage connections between ports within the comprehensive network and third countries**

*“Motorways of the sea cover maritime links between seaports within the comprehensive network or between ports in the comprehensive network and ports in third countries, if such links are of strategic importance to the Union.”*

Since 2013, the Commission has restrictively implemented this provision of article 21 of the TEN-T regulation, considering that projects between ports in the comprehensive network or between an EU port and an external port are ineligible.

This “lock-out” is disadvantageous to the peripheries. It should be called into question and should no longer apply to future calls for projects.

### 3 - Proposal for a revision of the Connecting Europe Facility (CEF) for the next programming period, as from 2021

The [Regulation](#) of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 December 2013 establishing the CEF will be revised for the next programming period. The European Commission has begun work on this revision, and is expected to publish a proposal for the “CEF II” by 2018.

This Regulation is of the utmost importance because it sets the co-financing rates for the different types of projects eligible for the CEF and for the distribution of funds between different objectives.

At its Political Bureau **in Malta on 10 March 2017**, the CPMR will adopt a position on the content of the amendments that should be made to the current CEF Regulation.

With regard to MoS and support for ports, the following points will be addressed:

#### **Rate of financing for ports - Article 10.2 (b) (iii)**

The subsidy rate for works in ports is now the same across the board at 20%. By comparison, the rate is 40% for cross-border rail projects. Considering that ports are by nature cross-border infrastructure, support for them should be aligned with this 40% rate.

**This proposal will be debated within the CPMR. The CPMR could propose that the 40% ceiling apply only to “peripheral” ports, a criterion that would have to be defined precisely.**

#### **Motorways of the Sea (MoS) - Article 10.2 (c) (v)**

The Regulation stipulates a single rate of 30% for actions supporting development of MoS. The CPMR and the Islands Commission have adopted positions seeking to adjust this rate according to territorial criteria. The DIP1 on MoS indeed envisages the possibility of a preferential rate for “specific regional situations”. In this context, the CPMR could propose a higher rate of 50% for the outermost regions and islands and other specific territories to be defined.

## APPENDIX



## Executive Summary

### - Detailed Implementation Plan for Motorways (DIP) - Document of the European Commission

#### 1- Introduction

There is no doubt over the importance of shipping as the backbone supporting world trade. In Europe, the shipping sector holds 40% of global shipping and European ships trade on all oceans, serving many markets all over the world. In addition, shipping is a central part of the intra-European transport system with ports, ferries, barges and various other operators moving goods and people by sea. Sea transport leads to decongestion on land-based networks, eases pressure on logistics chains and provides clear environmental and climate benefits. With its geography, Europe also has the advantage that its seas span the Arctic winter areas as well as the warmer climate areas which leads to an unparalleled experience with shipping operations in different conditions. Continuing to build on Europe's maritime dimension will strengthen the EU's global competitiveness, increase the number of job opportunities and promote leadership and international excellence in maritime R&D.

The concept of The Motorways of the Sea (MoS) is legally and comprehensively described in Article 21 of the TEN-T Regulation 1315/2013, where it is stated that MoS, inter alia:

(1) ...shall contribute towards the achievement of a European maritime transport space without barriers. They shall consist of short-sea routes, ports, associated maritime infrastructure and equipment, and facilities as well as simplified administrative formalities enabling short-sea shipping or sea-river services to operate between at least two ports, including hinterland connections

[...]

(3) Projects of common interest [...] may also include activities that have wider benefits and are not linked to specific ports, such as services and actions to support the mobility of persons and goods, activities for improving environmental performance [...] and (4) Within two years after being designated in accordance with Article 45, the European Coordinator for motorways of the sea shall present a detailed implementation plan for the motorways of the sea based on experiences and developments relating to Union maritime transport as well as the forecast traffic on the motorways of the sea.

The delivery of the MoS Coordinator's Detailed Implementation Plan fulfills the obligation set out in the TEN-T Regulation and presents concrete recommendations for development priorities under the MoS programme.

The Detailed Implementation Plan (DIP) has been built around three thematic pillars that were identified by MoS Coordinator Brian Simpson in his 2015 Work Programme. **These are:**

- the Environment,
- the Integration of maritime transport in the global logistics chain,
- Safety, Traffic Management and the Human Element.

The DIP methodology is based on:

- 1) An analysis of MoS Data (overview of shipping operations, MoS qualitative assessment, MoS maps and traffic data), and
- 2) An analysis of MoS Content (the development of priorities based on identified gaps, Member State and industry needs according to the above three pillars).

The first element relies on a large-scale data collection on the status of the Motorways of the Sea today. The focus is on data that is available in a reliable and comparable format as only such data allows for meaningful conclusions to be drawn on the status quo of the MoS. The data collected concerns maritime links (e.g. characteristics of the ships used on regular services) and ports (cargo volumes by type, infrastructure, maritime and hinterland connections). Once the level of adequacy is determined by comparing the status quo with the established objective, the data analysis could support the identification of those areas that can serve as horizontal priorities for the Detailed Implementation Plan. It is the objective of the DIP to identify areas where there is still a large potential for improvement.

The second element, based on existing information generated over several years, led to a full array of development priorities, along the lines of the three pillars. The knowledge generated by the 80 existing MoS projects, representing no less than €2.5 billion of investments, combined with the institutional and professional stakeholders' know-how led to a clear vision of development priorities for MoS, which have received many additional, valuable contributions as well as validation from a large number of stakeholders (more than 300 stakeholders have been invited to contribute).

To gather stakeholders input for the DIP, three Fora were organized in Brussels along the following key priorities:

- Pillar 1: Environment (March 15, 2016)- <http://www.onthemosway.eu/the-first-mos-forum-on-environment-in-brussels-video-agenda/>,
- Pillar 2: Logistics Integration of Maritime Transport in the Global Logistics Chain (May 17, 2016) - <http://www.onthemosway.eu/the-second-mos-forum-on-logistic-agenda-and-presentations/>
- Pillar 3: Safety, Traffic Management, and the Human Element (May 18, 2016)- <http://www.onthemosway.eu/the-second-mos-forum-on-safety-and-human-element-agenda-and-presentations/>

The stakeholder consultation has thus reached far and wide to gather the thoughts and contributions of the industry's and Member States' best experts.

The DIP hereby presents all these data and content, and concludes with clear development priorities. Furthermore, the reader will find in the DIP a number of annexes, including the full set of MoS data and maps, a dedicated section on the three MoS Fora and projects cofinanced through MoS over the last five years.

This is Europe's maritime space!



More than 800 regular ro-ro and container services are the heartbeat of European maritime transport. They call in more than 400 different EU ports and connect them with hundreds of ports worldwide. They comprise a large variety of different links from short distance ro-ro ferries crossing straits to round-the-world container liner services between the Far East, Europe and the Americas. (The map illustrates the extent of Europe's maritime dimension. It shows all the major European sea routes and their connection with intercontinental trades, based on AIS data. (Source: ISL).

In 2014, ports in the EU-28 handled 3.8 billion tonnes of cargo. According to estimates, around three billion tonnes are hinterland traffic, i.e. traffic that needs pre-/post-carriage by truck, rail or barge. Hence, the connections of terminals and ports with the hinterland infrastructure are vital for the success of maritime transport. The 79 maritime ports situated on the core network corridors (CNCs) of the TEN-T accounted for two thirds of the total European port traffic, i.e. 2.5 billion tonnes in 2014. Here, the ports of the Hamburg-Le Havre range– are situated in an area where five CNCs intersect – account for 1.1 billion tonnes, alone.

Despite the importance of maritime transport in Europe, the TEN-T Core Network Corridors contain only very few maritime links. The corridors are conceived as land-based corridors that start or end in ports however given the mix of needs in European ports, it is inconceivable to develop a one-size-fits-all approach for the Detailed Implementation Plan.

## 2- The three pillars of MoS and Development Priorities

---

### 1. Environment (Pillar 1)

The environment is a key area of development for MoS. The introduction of stricter emissions standards in general, and of the Sulphur emission control areas (SECA) in particular, produced an immediate need for new ship technologies, operational processes, new infrastructure, and new tools for financing environmental upgrades in the period from 2010 onwards. However, there are many other drivers in addition.

The global climate agreement reached at the UN climate change conference COP 21 in Paris last December ("the Paris Agreement") is seen as an historic and landmark instrument in climate action. Though formally lacking wording on international maritime transport, many expected the maritime sector to play its part. Therefore, climate remains high on the MoS agenda. Various other processes are driving environmental standards, such as air quality, operational pollution, and accidental pollution, integrated use of marine resources, environmental compensation measures and financing mechanisms for green shipping.

In total, there have been 20 projects financed under the TEN-T that related to the environment in the period from 2010-2013. These have generated just over EUR 655 million of investments of which the EU has contributed EUR 174.9 million. In addition to these, the number of environment/sustainable shipping projects financed under CEF so far has been 21, adding an investment of EUR 468.5 million of which the EU total contribution has been EUR 173.2 million. These projects were mainly LNG or scrubber-related reflecting the ECA-compliance preparations in the Baltic and North Sea/English Channel areas, extending the project networks across Europe and the Mediterranean as knowledge and know-how grew. Other projects however, included areas such as alternative fuels (methanol), electric vessels, onshore power supply, waste water reception facilities, and SECA compliance monitoring.

The First MoS Forum, organised on 15th March, gathered the industry's best experts to share their experiences, either on MoS flagship environmental projects, or from their areas of operation in general. The recommendations given in the Detailed Implementation Plan reflect what the industry and Member States see as development priorities on Climate, Air emissions, Operational and Accidental Pollution, on the Integrated use of marine resources, Environmental compensation measures and Financing tools for green shipping. Below are some examples of environment related development priorities (the full list is available in the DIP):

- Continue the current evolution of hybrids and battery use
- Further the development of LNG and methanol use including lowering LNG storage and logistic costs.
- Continue to encourage the uptake of cold ironing technologies
- Support new financial instruments through risk reduction mechanisms
- Support further new alternative and innovative solutions.

## 2. Logistics and Integration of Maritime in the Global Logistics Chain (Pillar 2)

The quest for ever-increasing efficiency in shipping and port operations is driven by the need to improve competitiveness of EU industries. Transport is a derived demand and hence for the transport sector to serve trade, transport costs must be kept at a minimum. Maximising efficiency on sea side and in ports is important to reduce transport costs and contribute to the competitiveness of EU traded goods and of related EU industrial sectors.

MoS are the maritime dimension of the EU but it is also the means for connecting the ports and their hinterlands and as such, it is the only priority project covering the entire EU economic and transport space. Issues such as last-mile connections, connectivity of the regions with particular and special characteristics, including the nine outermost regions and islands, are important considerations in a very complex connectivity network.

Improving last-mile connections by rail and inland waterways is essential for MoS to become integrated in the door-to-door logistics chain. This involves not only constructing physical infrastructure to connect ports via rail and with barge terminals to their hinterlands but also improving info-structure (and the related ICT solutions/platforms) to connect the different modes of transport present at a port.

MoS is also the way to connect short-sea links and maritime transport services with the Core Network Corridors (CNCs) and MoS links are the junctions allowing the connection of different CNCs. This concept is clearly presented in a map in the Detailed Implementation Plan showing Europe's most favourable logistics locations, the European SSS routes and the 9 Core Network Corridors.

Lastly, efficient cargo clearance procedures are highly relevant for the competitiveness of short-sea services. In addition to contributing to a European space without borders, initiatives now also need to consider port security including cyber-security.

In total, there have been 21 projects financed under TEN-T that related to the integration of the maritime transport in the logistics chains in the period from 2008-2013. These have generated just over EUR 759.6 million of investments of which the EU has contributed EUR 167.3 million in the TEN-T. A total investment of EUR 163.7 million of which the EU total contribution has been EUR 55.7 million in the CEF.

With the background gained through existing MoS projects, plus the Second MoS Forum and the Issue Paper, recommendations made for the development priorities on Logistics and Integration of Maritime in the Global Logistics Chain (Pillar 2) contain the following as examples (the full list is available in the DIP):

- Further develop flow management services to support onshore organisations and ships in optimising overall traffic flow
- Develop a unique single window for trade and transport comprising all modes
- Further harmonise relevant administrative procedures
- Encourage better connections between MoS and short-sea shipping with blue growth and maritime spatial planning
- Strengthen EU territorial cohesion by improving the connection of ports with hinterland, improve adequacy of ports infrastructure and link better peripheral and outermost regions to the rest of the EU and to the world.

## 3. Safety, Traffic Management and Human Element (Pillar 3)

The EU generally has an excellent record as regards maritime safety and traffic management. The IMO and EU legislation implemented in the last decade have ensured a high level of safety for freight, crew and passenger transport. Symptomatically, safety, traffic management and human element have not featured heavily on the MoS agenda to date. Indeed, one would find a comparatively higher number of projects related to the environment and logistics, than projects specifically related to safety, traffic management or human element.

Nevertheless, in total there have been 6 projects so far financed under TEN-T and CEF. The projects generated a total investment of over EUR 131.7 million, of which the EU has contributed over EUR 60.8 million. While the analysis covers the projects identified by INEA as belonging to Pillar 3, it is important to note that many other environmental and logistics projects that belong to Pillar 1 and 2 also included activities contributing to the enhancement of maritime safety and the further development of traffic management and the human element.

When it comes to the Human Element, two projects have been funded under TEN-T and CEF, for a total investment of more than EUR 8.1 million. The EU contributed approximately EUR 4 million in total. These projects aimed at developing adequate training schemes for smooth and efficient freight transport by sea, i.a. by establishing the content of a modular MSc/Post Graduate Diploma/Certificate/Continuing professional development (CPD) programme and by starting the accreditation process.

The Issue Paper developed for Pillar 3 and the third MoS forum highlighted current and future challenges. The use of new fuels and propulsion systems, the ever-increasing share of intermodal transport and logistics, the challenges brought on by the growth of digitalisation in the shipping sector, the decreasing numbers of maritime professionals in Europe, the increased need for training in new thematic areas are all issues that require adequate resources and training to handle the increasing volume of maritime transport in a safe, sustainable, and efficient manner.

Development priorities for Safety, Traffic Management and the Human Element (Pillar 3) contain the following as examples (the full list is available in the DIP):

- Safe handling and storage of alternative fuels
- R&D for simplification of ship designs and autonomous ship
- Migration: search and rescue, preparedness, management
- LNG safety guidelines, safe storage and handling of alternative fuels
- Further development of ICT, route planning
- Information sharing platforms to efficiently use and analyse big data in sea traffic management
- Support better training (for soft skills, digital skills, new technologies, LNG safety, security and cybersecurity)

Motorways of the Sea constitute a fundamental contribution to the TEN-T network bringing the right complementarity required to the development of core network corridors.

The Detailed Implementation Plan proposes the further development of MoS built around three priority pillars following numerous recommendations from institutional and industrial stakeholders.



**Contact person:** Patrick Anvroin, CRPM Director  
**Email:** [patrick.anvroin@crpm.org](mailto:patrick.anvroin@crpm.org)

**The Conference of Peripheral Maritime Regions brings together 160 Regions in 25 States from the European Union & beyond.**

Representing about 200 million people, the CPMR campaigns in favour of a more balanced development of the European territory.

It operates both as a think tank and as a lobby for Regions, focusing mainly on social, economic and territorial cohesion, maritime policies and blue growth, and accessibility

#### **CONTACT**

6, rue Saint-Martin, 35700 Rennes  
Tel: + 33 (0)2 99 35 40 50

Rond-Point Schuman 14, 1040 Brussels  
Tel: +32 (0)2 612 17 00

Email: [Secretariat@crpm.org](mailto:Secretariat@crpm.org); Website: [www.cpmr.org](http://www.cpmr.org)

**Ref.: CRPMNTP170002**