



**European Committee  
of the Regions**

**COTER-VI/044**

**133rd plenary session, 6 and 7 February 2019**

## **OPINION**

### **Streamlining TEN-T implementation**

#### THE EUROPEAN COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONS

- underlines that the completion of the TEN-T core and comprehensive network is the key to ensuring territorial cohesion, making all regions more accessible and boosting the economic development of peripheral and cross-border regions;
- welcomes the proposal of the Commission, in the context of speeding up the implementation of the TEN-T network and achieving the Paris agreement objectives. It is also very important for harmonising procedure and technical standards and increasing interoperability;
- would like to stress the importance of streamlining procedures inter alia in border regions;
- suggests that instead of applying the proposed procedure to all TEN-T projects, the regulation should specify which projects fall under its application. Member States should, for example, be allowed to decide what projects fall under the regulation;
- recalls that administrative burden must not be simplified and reduced at the expense of subsidiarity and proportionality. Tailor-made approaches should be possible if a Member State already has streamlined procedures in place;
- welcomes the intention of the proposal to facilitate cross-border cooperation for the development of transport links, to remove missing links.

Rapporteur

Michiel Scheffer (NL/ALDE), Member of the Executive Council of the Province of Gelderland

Reference document

Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on streamlining measures for advancing the realisation of the trans-European transport network  
COM (2018) 277 - final

## Opinion of the European Committee of the Regions– Streamlining TEN-T implementation

### I. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AMENDMENTS

#### Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on streamlining measures for advancing the realisation of the trans-European transport network COM(2018) 277 final

#### Amendment 1

##### Recital (1)

<i>Text proposed by the European Commission</i>	<i>CoR amendment</i>
<p>Regulation (EU) No 1315/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council [1] sets out a common framework for the creation of state-of-the-art, interoperable networks for the development of the internal market. The trans-European transport networks (TEN-T) have a dual layer structure: the comprehensive network ensures connectivity of all regions of the Union whereas the core network consists of those elements of the network which are of the highest strategic importance for the <i>Union</i>. Regulation (EU) No 1315/2013 defines binding completion targets for implementation, with the core network to be completed by 2030 and the comprehensive network by 2050.</p>	<p>Regulation (EU) No 1315/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council [1] sets out a common framework for the creation of state-of-the-art, interoperable networks for the development of the internal market <b><i>and for the social, economic and territorial cohesion of the Union</i></b>. The trans-European transport networks (TEN-T) have a dual layer structure: the comprehensive network ensures connectivity of all regions of the Union, <b><i>as well as the necessary distribution channels to supply the basic network</i></b>, whereas the core network consists of those elements of the network which are <b><i>also</i></b> of the highest strategic importance for the <b><i>EU and should accordingly serve as cross-border and multimodal accelerators for a single European transport and mobility area</i></b>. Regulation (EU) No 1315/2013 defines binding completion targets for implementation, with the core network to be completed by 2030 and the comprehensive network by 2050. <b><i>Furthermore, Regulation (EU) No 1315/2013 focuses on cross-border connections that will improve interoperability between the different modes of transport and contribute to the multimodal integration of Union transport.</i></b></p>

<i>Reason</i>
<p>The TEN-T serves many purposes, among these social, economic and territorial cohesion. Cross-border cooperation needs to be as simple and easy as possible in order to improve low-emission, cross-border mobility; in line with paragraph 18 in the policy recommendations.</p>

## Amendment 2

### Recital (2)

<i>Text proposed by the European Commission</i>	<i>CoR amendment</i>
Notwithstanding the necessity and binding timelines, experience has shown that many investments aiming to complete the TEN-T are confronted with complex permit granting procedures, cross-border procurement procedures and other procedures. This situation jeopardises the on time implementation of projects and in many cases results in significant delays and increased costs. In order to address these issues and make synchronised TEN-T completion possible,, harmonised action is necessary at Union level.	Notwithstanding the necessity and binding timelines, experience has shown that many investments aiming to complete the TEN-T are confronted with complex permit granting procedures, cross-border procurement procedures and other procedures. <b><i>In addition, early public participation and consensus building are often neglected which results in the lack of support by citizens due to missing transparency.</i></b> This situation jeopardises the on time implementation of projects and in many cases results in significant delays and increased costs. In order to address these issues and make synchronised TEN-T completion possible, <b><i>simplified and timely</i></b> harmonised action is necessary at Union level.

### *Reason*

Permit-granting procedures are not the only reason projects are delayed. The lack of early public participation and consensus building also delays them.

## Amendment 3

### Recital (3)

<i>Text proposed by the European Commission</i>	<i>CoR amendment</i>
In the legal frameworks of many Member States priority treatment is given to certain project categories based on their strategic importance for the <i>economy</i> . Priority treatment is characterised by shorter timelines, simultaneous procedures or limited timeframes for appeals while ensuring that the objectives of other horizontal policies are also reached. When such a framework exists within a national legal framework, it should automatically apply to Union projects recognised as projects of common interest under Regulation (EU) No 1315/2013.	In the legal frameworks of many Member States priority treatment is given to certain project categories based on their strategic importance for the <b><i>territorial, economic and social cohesion of the Union and measures to combat climate change</i></b> . Priority treatment is characterised by shorter timelines, simultaneous procedures or limited timeframes for appeals while ensuring that the objectives of other horizontal policies are also reached. When such a framework exists within a national legal framework, it should automatically apply to Union projects recognised as projects of common interest under Regulation (EU) No 1315/2013. <b><i>Where such a framework does not exist, competent authorities should give priority to the harmonisation of administrative procedures for the issuing of permits and project</i></b>

	<i>implementation or, where appropriate, take the necessary steps to facilitate the creation of a joint management entity.</i>
--	--

<b>Reason</b>
Combating climate change needs to be one of the fundamental targets of Union transport policy.

**Amendment 4**

Recital (4)

<b><i>Text proposed by the European Commission</i></b>	<b><i>CoR amendment</i></b>
In order to improve the effectiveness of the environmental assessments and streamline the decision-making process , where the obligation to carry out assessments related to environmental issues of core network projects arises simultaneously from Directive 2011/92/EU, as amended by Directive 2014/52/EU, and from other Union legislation such as Directive 92/43/EEC, Directive 2009/147/EC, Directive 2000/60/EC, Directive 2008/98/EC, Directive 2010/75/EU, Directive 2012/18/EU and Directive 2011/42/EC, Member States should ensure that a joint procedure fulfilling the requirements of these Directives is provided.	In order to improve the effectiveness of the environmental assessments and streamline the decision-making process , where the obligation to carry out assessments related to environmental issues of core network projects arises simultaneously from Directive 2011/92/EU, as amended by Directive 2014/52/EU, and from other Union legislation such as Directive 92/43/EEC, Directive 2009/147/EC, Directive 2000/60/EC, Directive 2008/98/EC, Directive 2010/75/EU, Directive 2012/18/EU and Directive 2011/42/EC, Member States should ensure that a joint procedure fulfilling the requirements of these Directives is provided <b><i>without necessarily having to lay down new procedures, if adequate ones already exist.</i></b>

<b>Reason</b>
Some Member States already have integrated procedures and it would be an additional administrative burden to introduce new procedures.

**Amendment 5**

Recital (8)

<b><i>Text proposed by the European Commission</i></b>	<b><i>CoR amendment</i></b>
Given the urgency to complete the TEN-T core network, the simplification of permit granting procedures should be accompanied by a time limit within which competent authorities responsible should make a comprehensive decision regarding the construction of the project. This time limit should stimulate a more efficient handling of procedures and should, under no circumstances, compromise the Union's high	Given the urgency to complete the TEN-T core network, the simplification of permit granting procedures should be accompanied by a time limit within which competent authorities responsible should make a comprehensive decision regarding the construction of the project. This time limit should stimulate a more efficient handling of procedures and should, under no circumstances, compromise the Union's high standards for

standards for environmental protection and public participation.	environmental protection and public participation. <i>That said, the time limit should only be set after an initial, early public consultation, including that with local and regional authorities, on the planned project.</i>
--	--

<b>Reason</b>
Self-explanatory. Permit-granting procedures are not the only reason projects are delayed. The lack of early public participation and consensus building also delays them.

### Amendment 6

#### Recital (11)

<b>Text proposed by the European Commission</b>	<b>CoR amendment</b>
Public procurement in cross-border projects of common interest should be conducted in accordance with the Treaty and Directives 2014/25/EU and/or 2014/24/EU. In order to ensure the efficient completion of the cross-border <b>core</b> network projects of common interest, public procurement carried out by a joint entity should be subject to a single national legislation. By way of derogation from the Union public procurement legislation, the applicable national rules should in principle be those of the Member State where the joint entity has its registered office. It should remain possible to define the applicable legislation in an intergovernmental agreement.	Public procurement in cross-border projects of common interest should be conducted in accordance with the Treaty and Directives 2014/25/EU and/or 2014/24/EU. In order to ensure the efficient completion of the cross-border <b>TEN-T</b> network projects of common interest, public procurement carried out by a joint <b>management</b> entity should, <b>by joint agreement between the parties</b> , be subject to a single <b>EU or, where appropriate</b> , national legislation. By way of derogation from the Union public procurement legislation, the applicable national rules should in principle be those of the Member State where the joint entity has its registered office. It should remain possible to define the applicable legislation in an intergovernmental agreement.

<b>Reason</b>
It would facilitate cross-border cooperation, in line with paragraph 18 in the policy recommendations.

### Amendment 7

#### Article 1

<b>Text proposed by the European Commission</b>	<b>CoR amendment</b>
Subject matter and scope This Regulation sets out requirements applicable to the administrative procedures followed by the competent authorities of Member States in relation to the authorisation and implementation of all projects of common interest on the core network of the trans-European transport network.	Subject matter and scope This Regulation sets out requirements applicable to the administrative procedures followed by the competent authorities of Member States ( <b>national, regional or local authorities or other project promoters</b> ) in relation to the authorisation and implementation <b>of all infrastructure</b>

	<i>components and requirements</i> , of all projects of common interest on the core network of the trans-European transport network, <i>with priority status as identified in Article 3</i> .
--	---

<b>Reason</b>
Instead of applying the proposed procedure to all TEN-T projects, the regulation should specify which projects should fall under its application, in order to target the most important projects and speed up their implementation. Member States should decide what priority projects fall under the application of the regulation.

**Amendment 8**  
Article 2, point e)

<i>Text proposed by the European Commission</i>	<i>CoR amendment</i>
"Cross-border project of common interest" means a project of common interest according to Article 7 of Regulation (EU) No 1315/2013 covering a cross-border section <i>as defined in point (m) Article 3 of that Regulation</i> which is implemented by a joint entity.	"Cross-border project of common interest" means a project of common interest according to Article 7 of Regulation (EU) No 1315/2013 covering a cross-border section <i>within the framework of a cooperation agreement or any other type of agreement between Member States or between Member States and regional or local authorities or between regional or local authorities in different Member States or between Member States and third countries, for the planning and implementation of transport infrastructure</i> which is implemented by a joint entity.

<b>Reason</b>
It is important to value the potential of the local and regional authorities (LRAs) in cross-border projects.

**Amendment 9**  
Article 3

<i>Text proposed by the European Commission</i>	<i>CoR amendment</i>
‘Priority status’ of projects of common interest 1. <i>Each project of common interest on the TEN-T core network</i> shall be subject to an integrated permit granting procedure managed by a single competent authority designated by each Member State in accordance with Articles 5 and 6. 2. Where priority status exists under national law, projects of common interest shall be	‘Priority status’ of projects of common interest 1. <i>Member States shall identify priority components on the TEN-T. Projects of common interest that are located on priority section shall receive "priority status" and</i> shall be subject to an integrated permit granting procedure managed by a single competent authority designated by each Member State in accordance with Articles 5 and

<p>granted the status with the highest national significance possible, and be treated as such in permit granting procedures, where and in the manner such treatment is provided for in national legislation applicable to the corresponding types of transport infrastructure.</p> <p>3. To ensure efficient administrative procedures related to projects of common interest, project promoters and all authorities concerned shall ensure that the most rapid treatment legally possible is given to these projects, including as regards the resources allocated.</p>	<p>6.</p> <p>2. Where priority status exists under national law, projects of common interest shall be granted the status with the highest national significance possible, and be treated as such in permit granting procedures, where and in the manner such treatment is provided for in national legislation applicable to the corresponding types of transport infrastructure.</p> <p>3. To ensure efficient administrative procedures related to projects of common interest, project promoters and all authorities concerned shall ensure that the most rapid treatment legally possible is given to these projects, including as regards the resources allocated.</p>
--	---

<b>Reason</b>
See amendment 7.

### Amendment 10

Article 4 (1)

<b><i>Text proposed by the European Commission</i></b>	<b><i>CoR amendment</i></b>
In order to meet the time limits set out in Article 6 and reduce the administrative burden related to the completion of projects of common interest, all the administrative procedures resulting from the applicable law, both national and <i>of the</i> Union, shall be integrated and result in only one comprehensive decision.	In order to meet the time limits set out in Article 6 and reduce the administrative burden related to the completion of projects of common interest, all the administrative procedures resulting from the applicable law, <b><i>including the relevant environmental assessments as well as citizens information and participation campaigns</i></b> , both <b><i>at</i></b> national and Union <b><i>level</i></b> , shall be integrated and result in only one comprehensive decision.

<b>Reason</b>
Combating climate change needs to be one of the fundamental targets of Union transport policy.

### Amendment 11

Article 5 (1)

<b><i>Text proposed by the European Commission</i></b>	<b><i>CoR amendment</i></b>
By ... ( <i>OP please insert the date one year of the entry into force of this Regulation</i> ), each Member State shall designate <b><i>one</i></b> single competent authority which shall be responsible for facilitating <b><i>the</i></b> permit granting process including	By ... ( <i>OP please insert the date one year of the entry into force of this Regulation</i> ), each Member State shall designate single competent authority/ <b><i>authorities</i></b> which shall be responsible for facilitating <b><i>an integrated</i></b> permit granting



for making the comprehensive decision.	process including for making the comprehensive decision. <i>If a Member State has already designated a single competent authority/authorities, the Member State in question may confirm the designation of that/those single competent authority/authorities.</i>
--	---

<b>Reason</b>
Some Member States already have integrated procedures or designated competent authorities. It would therefore be an additional administrative burden for them to introduce new procedures or designate new competent authorities.

### Amendment 12

#### Article 5 (2)

<i>Text proposed by the European Commission</i>	<i>CoR amendment</i>
<p>The responsibility of the single competent authority referred to in paragraph 1 and/or the tasks related to <i>it may be delegated to, or carried out by, another</i> authority at the appropriate administrative level, per project of common interest or per particular category of projects of common interest, <b><i>under the following conditions:</i></b></p> <p>(a) only one authority is responsible per project of common interest;</p> <p>(b) the authority is the sole point of contact for the project promoter in the procedure leading to the comprehensive decision for a given project of common interest, and</p> <p>(c) the authority coordinates the submission of all relevant documents and information.</p> <p><b><i>The single competent authority may retain the responsibility to establish time limits, without prejudice to the time limits set in accordance with Article 6.</i></b></p>	<p><b><i>Member States may delegate</i></b> the responsibility of the single competent authority referred to in paragraph 1 and/or the tasks related to <b><i>it, to an existing or a newly established</i></b> authority at the appropriate administrative level <b><i>taking into consideration national, regional and local competences,</i></b> per project of common interest or per particular category of projects of common interest, <b><i>provided that:</i></b></p> <p>(a) only one authority is responsible per project of common interest;</p> <p>(b) the authority is the sole point of contact for the project promoter in the procedure leading to the comprehensive decision for a given project of common interest, and</p> <p>(c) the authority coordinates the submission of all relevant documents and information.</p>

<b>Reason</b>
<p>The regulation should not interfere with the constitutional set-up of the Member States, in particular because in some Member States, different levels of government carry out these tasks.</p> <p>The time limits should be set in close cooperation with the project promoter, to make it possible to have a tailor-made timeframe for projects. Allowing the early involvement of all stakeholders, with enough time allocated to consensus building amongst all stakeholders, will significantly improve project implementation.</p>

### Amendment 13

Article 5 (5)

<i>Text proposed by the European Commission</i>	<i>CoR amendment</i>
<p>If a project of common interest requires decisions to be taken in two or more Member States, the respective competent authorities shall take all the necessary steps for efficient and effective cooperation and coordination among themselves. Without prejudice to obligations arising under applicable Union and international law, Member States shall endeavour to provide for joint procedures, particularly with regard to the assessment of environmental impacts.</p>	<p>If a project of common interest requires decisions to be taken in two or more Member States, the respective competent authorities shall take all the necessary steps for efficient and effective cooperation and coordination among themselves. Without prejudice to obligations arising under applicable Union and international law, Member States shall endeavour to provide for joint procedures, particularly with regard to the assessment of environmental impacts. <b><i>Especially in cases where a joint entity is set up by the participating Member States or competent local and regional authorities, this entity shall benefit from joint procedures and coordination among the Member States and should only be in contact with one single competent permit granting authority.</i></b></p>

<i>Reason</i>

### Amendment 14

Article 6 (2)

<i>Text proposed by the European Commission</i>	<i>CoR amendment</i>
<p>Duration and implementation of the permit granting procedure</p> <p>1. The permit granting procedure shall consist of the pre-application phase and the phase of the assessment of the application and the decision-making by the single competent authority.</p> <p>2. The pre-application phase, covering the period from the start of the permit granting procedure to the submission of the complete application file to the single competent authority, shall in principle not exceed two years.</p> <p>3. In order to launch the permit granting procedure, the project promoter shall notify the single competent authority of the Member States concerned about the project in writing, and shall</p>	<p>Duration and implementation of the permit granting procedure</p> <p>1. The permit granting procedure shall consist of the pre-application phase and the phase of the assessment of the application and the decision-making by the single competent authority.</p> <p><b><i>The single competent authority involves, in accordance with the respective Member State's institutional and legal framework, local and regional authorities, whose territories are concerned by the projects, in a participatory procedure, aiming to the preliminary evaluation of the project and also before the final authorisation.</i></b></p> <p>2. The pre-application phase, covering the</p>

include a detailed description of the project. No later than two months following the receipt of the above notification, the single competent authority shall either acknowledge it or, if it considers that the project is not mature enough to enter the permit granting procedure, reject the notification in writing. If the single competent authority decides to reject the notification, it shall justify its decision. The date of signature of the acknowledgement of the notification by the competent authority shall serve as the start of the permit granting procedure. If two or more Member States are concerned, the date of the acceptance of the last notification by the competent authority concerned shall serve as the date of the start of the permit granting procedure.

4. Within three months of the start of the permit granting procedure, the single competent authority, in close cooperation with the project promoter and other authorities concerned and taking into account the information submitted by the project promoter on the basis of the notification referred to in paragraph 3, shall establish and communicate to the project promoter a detailed application outline, containing:

- (a) the material scope and level of detail of information to be submitted by the project promoter, as part of the application file for the comprehensive decision
- (b) a schedule for the permit granting process, identifying at least the following:
  - (i) the decisions and opinions to be obtained;
  - (ii) the authorities, ***stakeholders, and the public likely to be concerned;***
  - (iii) the individual stages of the procedure and their duration;
  - (iv) major milestones to be accomplished and their deadlines in view of the comprehensive decision to be taken;
  - (v) the resources planned by the authorities and possible additional resource needs.

period from the start of the permit granting procedure to the submission of the complete application file to the single competent authority, shall in principle not exceed two years. ***The single competent authority could give the project promoter more time in special circumstances, related to the size and the nature of the project, and/or to allow enough time to properly involve the public. Such public consultations and participation must have already been undertaken before the pre-application phase. The outcome of public participation, in the form of trade-offs that directly affect infrastructure implementation, and the planned further measures for consulting the public, shall determine the length of the pre-application phase.***

3. In order to launch the permit granting procedure, the project promoter shall notify the single competent authority of the Member States concerned about the project in writing, and shall include a detailed description of the project. No later than two months following the receipt of the above notification, the single competent authority shall either acknowledge it or, if it considers that the project is not mature enough to enter the permit granting procedure, reject the notification in writing. If the single competent authority decides to reject the notification, it shall justify its decision. The date of signature of the acknowledgement of the notification by the competent authority shall serve as the start of the permit granting procedure. If two or more Member States are concerned, the date of the acceptance of the last notification by the competent authority concerned shall serve as the date of the start of the permit granting procedure.

4. Within three months of the start of the permit granting procedure, the single competent authority, in close cooperation with the project promoter and other authorities concerned and taking into account the information submitted by the project promoter on the basis of the notification referred to in paragraph 3, shall establish and communicate to the project promoter a detailed application outline,

	<p>containing:</p> <p>(a) the material scope and level of detail of information to be submitted by the project promoter, as part of the application file for the comprehensive decision</p> <p>(b) a schedule for the permit granting process, identifying at least the following:</p> <p>(i) the decisions and opinions to be obtained, <i>including, in particular, in accordance with the respective Member State's institutional and legal framework, the opinions of the local and regional authorities;</i></p> <p>(ii) <i>measures already taken to involve stakeholders and get the public to participate in the process and how this will be continued throughout project implementation;</i></p> <p>(iii) the authorities, <i>including, in accordance with the respective Member State's institutional and legal framework, local and regional authorities which must be involved;</i></p> <p>(iv) the individual stages of the procedure and their duration;</p> <p>(v) major milestones to be accomplished and their deadlines in view of the comprehensive decision to be taken;</p> <p>(vi) the resources planned by the authorities and possible additional resource needs.</p>
--	---

<b><i>Reason</i></b>
<p>By adopting a tailor-made approach for each project and involving the public early on in the process, delays in granting permits can be significantly reduced, due to fewer legal appeals against the outcome of the planning procedure. The necessary timeframe for consensus building among the stakeholders concerned cannot therefore be determined in general. Rather, it must be determined depending on quantifiable factors linked to project implementation, and various trade-offs during consensus building with all stakeholders involved. Such a flexible, tailor-made approach could even speed up project implementation compared to what the case might be were a strict timeframe imposed.</p>

### **Amendment 15**

Article 7 (1)

<b><i>Text proposed by the European Commission</i></b>	<b><i>CoR amendment</i></b>
<p>For projects that involve two or more Member States, the competent authorities of the Member States concerned shall align their timetables and agree on a joint schedule.</p>	<p>For projects that involve two or more Member States, the competent authorities of the Member States concerned shall align their timetables and agree on a joint schedule. <b><i>If a joint entity set up</i></b></p>

	<p><i>by the participating Member States applies for a permit, it shall only have to contact one competent authority. The competent authority will then coordinate with the other authority/authorities involved to ensure fulfilment of all obligations under applicable law in all Member States concerned by the project, as stated in Article 5(5).</i></p>
--	---

<i>Reason</i>
<p>This is to facilitate the granting of cross-border permits by adopting a one-stop shop approach for joint entities.</p>

## II. POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

### THE EUROPEAN COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONS

#### *Key messages*

1. underlines that the completion of the TEN-T core and comprehensive network is the key to ensuring territorial cohesion, making all regions more accessible and boosting the economic development of peripheral and cross-border regions;
2. points out that transport infrastructure development is often a competence of regional authorities, who are in charge of spatial planning, delivering plan approval orders and granting permits in their territory;
3. recalls that the Connecting Europe Facility (CEF) and the TEN-T Regulation have set ambitious targets for infrastructure development in Europe. The TEN-T core network should be completed by 2030, but it will be difficult to meet the financial needs to reach these ambitious goals;
4. recognises that together with strengthening the project pipeline, broadening funding and financing (CEF), and creating an investment-friendly environment, streamlining forms an important pillar of EU TEN-T policy;
5. welcomes the proposal of the Commission, in the context of speeding up the implementation of the TEN-T network and achieving the Paris agreement objectives. It is also very important for harmonising procedure and technical standards and increasing interoperability;
6. recalls these three fundamental principles:
  - ensuring procedures across different territories are coordinated, both inside and between Member States;
  - ensuring that the different legal requirements such as directives on habitat, water and biodiversity, are in sync;
  - maintaining and improving public participation

7. would like to stress the importance of streamlining procedures etc. in border regions. The simplification of administrative authorisations, permit-granting procedures and other regulatory procedures shall therefore aim to facilitate TEN-T completion;
8. stresses that if Member States already have streamlined procedures in place, they should have the possibility of choosing their own streamlined procedure;
9. suggests that instead of applying the proposed procedure to all TEN-T projects, the regulation should specify which projects fall under its application. Member States should, for example, be allowed to decide what projects fall under the regulation;
10. recognises that the timely completion of the TEN-T network is being undermined by delays caused by long permit-granting procedures. However, those permits are granted in the integrated framework of national administrations, respecting European and national legal frameworks in the areas of spatial planning, environmental protection and civil rights. It is difficult to implement this complex procedure using a one-size-fits-all approach. A tailor-made approach is more suitable.
11. recalls that simplifying and reducing administrative burden is one of the key objectives of the current Commission. The proposal reflects this to a certain extent. However, administrative burden must not be simplified and reduced at the expense of subsidiarity and proportionality. Tailor-made approaches should be possible if a Member State already has streamlined procedures in place;
12. recalls that to achieve the Paris agreement objectives, it is necessary to speed up rail infrastructure development, prioritise addressing bottlenecks, complete missing sections and provide support for cross-border infrastructure enabling green mobility, in line with the opinions "Missing transport links in border regions" and "Delivering low emission mobility and that the EU could further contribute towards the financial viability of green mobility by actively supporting an international ETS as well as an EU ETS with stable, high carbon prices that do not fluctuate purely do to speculation, in line with the CoR opinion "Cost-effective emissions reductions and low-carbon investments";
13. recalls the need to balance the general, but not explicitly expressed interests, of the users (citizens and economic operators) in the spirit of freedom of movement of people and goods, with the interests of those affected by infrastructure development;

#### *Cross-border aspects*

14. insists on the need to continue pursuing cross-border, transnational and interregional cooperation as part of the aim of strengthening territorial cohesion in line with Article 174 TFEU;
15. points out that some of the CoR's observations regarding the constraints imposed by different procedural or organisational approaches in cross-border projects (e.g. opinion "Missing

transport links in border regions") are still pertinent, and calls for the removal of these legal and administrative obstacles to cross-border transport infrastructure development (e.g. opinion "Boosting growth and cohesion in EU border regions");

16. welcomes the intention of the proposal to facilitate cross-border cooperation for the development of transport links, to remove missing links. Nevertheless, cross-border projects and purely national projects have different preconditions and a top-down approach might not be suitable for their specific features;
17. recalls that, while the TEN-T network is a planning tool for developing pan-European transport connections, the place-based approach must be maintained for individual TEN-T projects. Spatial planning, as well as public and stakeholder participation, need to take place at local and regional level;
18. urges the Commission to encourage measures that are aimed at facilitating cross-border project implementation and addressing bottlenecks in TEN-T projects by streamlining administrative procedures and requirements.

Brussels, 7 February 2019

The President  
of the European Committee of the Regions

Karl-Heinz Lambertz

The Secretary-General  
of the European Committee of the Regions

Jiří Buriánek

### III. PROCEDURE

<b>Title</b>	Streamlining TEN-T implementation
<b>Reference(s)</b>	Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on streamlining measures for advancing the realisation of the trans-European transport network COM(2018) 277 - final
<b>Legal basis</b>	Article 307 TFEU
<b>Procedural basis</b>	Rule 41 a) of the CoR Rules of Procedure
<b>Date of Council/EP referral/Date of Commission letter</b>	– letter from the Commission of 17 May 2018 – letter from the Council of 15 June 2018 – letter from the Parliament of 11 June 2018
<b>Date of Bureau</b>	14 September 2018
<b>Commission responsible</b>	Commission for Territorial Cohesion Policy and EU Budget (COTER)
<b>Rapporteur</b>	Michiel Scheffer (NL/ALDE), Member of the Executive Council of the Province of Gelderland
<b>Analysis</b>	3 October 2018
<b>Discussed in commission</b>	25 October 2018
<b>Date adopted by commission</b>	14 December 2018
<b>Result of the vote in commission (majority, unanimity)</b>	unanimity
<b>Date adopted in plenary</b>	7 February 2019
<b>Previous Committee opinions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• opinion CoR 4294/2016 <i>Missing transport links in border regions</i></li> <li>• opinion CoR 6119/2017 <i>Boosting growth and cohesion in EU border regions</i></li> <li>• opinion CoR 3598/2018 <i>Connecting Europe Facility</i></li> <li>• opinion CoR 1531/2017 <i>The Future of Connecting Europe Facility (CEF) Transport</i></li> <li>• opinion CoR 4842/2017 <i>Final conclusions and recommendations of the High Level Group on Simplification post-2020</i></li> </ul>
<b>Date of subsidiarity monitoring consultation</b>	N/A