



European Federation of Inland Ports

Position of the European Federation of Inland Ports (EFIP) on the Connecting Europe Facility (CEF) within the Legislative Procedure

05 September 2018

The European Commission has published on the 6th of June 2018 the Proposal [COM/2018/438 final - 2018/0228 \(COD\)](#) and the European Parliament's (EP) Committee of Transport and Tourism (TRAN) published its draft report of Rapporteurs Marian-Jean Marinescu, Henna Virkkunen, Pavel Telicka ([COM \(2018\)0438–C8-0255/2018–2018/0228\(COD\)](#)).

As the unique representative of inland ports in Europe since 1994, EFIP takes the opportunity to give a contribution from its network - *constituted of nearly 200 inland ports located in 17 Member States of the EU and Switzerland, Serbia and Ukraine*- on the proposal before the vote on October 25 2018.

EFIP welcomes in the proposal:

- **Flexible earmarking is essential for the completion and effectiveness of the European transport network.** Funds need to go where they are most needed and conform to European priorities. Limiting a large amount of funds to individual Member States does not achieve the highest level of EU added value, especially in countries with a mature transport network. Following that consideration, **EFIP supports the Commission's proposal to make 30% of the Cohesion Funds directly available to all Cohesion countries on a competitive basis.**
- **The dedicated budget allocation for the infrastructure pillar (60%) and horizontal pillar (40%) is an innovative proposal.** The horizontal pillar includes multimodal connectivity, decarbonisation and digitalisation. An emphasis on these priorities is essential in order to achieve the 2050 targets. Inland port investments are needed to establish and maintain a competitive, connected, multimodal, sustainable and safe transport network while basic infrastructure remains a prerequisite. **EFIP believes the 60/40 division should be maintained as a balance between both priorities, which reflects the estimated 13 billion euros of total budget needs for port-related projects between 2014 and 2030.**
- **The introduction of the pre-identified sections is a welcomed addition.** Previously, the "pre-identified projects" definition was too rigid and not fit for purpose. **EFIP supports the inclusion of the pre-identified sections as an opportunity to adapt more reactively to the transport and logistics networks' developments.**



European Federation of Inland Ports

EFIP would like to provide the following input:

- 1) **The European Commission correctly places an emphasis on cross-border links.** However, the absence of a definition of cross-border links is problematic for inland ports. Inland ports facilitate and stimulate cross-border waterborne transport but are rarely cross-border in the narrowest sense. **EFIP suggests the introduction of a specific cross-border definition and change to the co-funding requirements for cross-border actions.**
- 2) **Port infrastructure projects require long-term planning and preparation.** During the previous CEF period, the lack of clarity of the timeline of future calls was very problematic as projects were expected to reach the needed maturity on short notice and were unable to plan for the long-term. Projects need to be prepared effectively and thoroughly in order to be eligible for funding; **transparency of the expected objectives, foreseen budgets and timeline of future calls are essential to be able to present a mature project.**
- 3) **5G support is an essential prerequisite in order to achieve smart and autonomous inland waterways.** It is therefore surprising that under the definition of “5G corridors”, inland waterways are completely omitted. Without 5G, the inland waterways will be unable to fulfil the potential of the Digital Inland Waterway Area (DINA) and the expectations resulting from the Digital Europe programme for the period 2021-2027. **EFIP insists that inland waterways are included in the 5G corridors.**
- 4) **Inland waterway projects tend to face difficulties in attaining full funding due to their long return on investment horizon.** Limiting inland waterways to the 30 % co-financing threshold is contradicting the CEF’s aim of supporting projects that have difficulty reaching their financing goals. **EFIP suggests to include inland waterway-related infrastructure projects under the 50 % threshold.**
- 5) **EFIP supports the added emphasis on alternative fuels.** This is an important step to achieve the decarbonisation of the European transport sector. However, the focus here is only on alternative fuels **even though there are other infrastructure initiatives, such as sustainable shore-side infrastructure, that can contribute to the decarbonisation of transport.**
- 6) **EFIP welcomes the inclusion of military mobility into the CEF.** There is however still some ambiguity regarding the planning and the definition of dual-use. EFIP supports the proposals of the European Parliament, **namely amendment 27. Regarding the dual-use issue, EFIP believes that it should be defined without infringing on commercial needs.**

Please see our detailed legislative recommendations