



EUROPEAN COMMISSION  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT BOARD

Brussels,  
D(2011)

## Opinion

**Title**                    **DG MOVE - Impact Assessment on: Revised Union Guidelines for the development of the Trans-European transport network**

**(Resubmitted draft: version of 16 June 2011)**

### **(A) Context**

This impact assessment accompanies a revision of the guidelines defining the Trans-European Transport Network (TEN-T) policy. The TEN-T policy review was opened by the Green Paper "Towards a better integrated trans-European transport network at the service of the common transport policy" published in February 2009. The revised guidelines will aim to define a long-term strategy for the TEN-T policy that would contribute to the transport sector meeting the goals of the White Paper on transport "Roadmap to a single European Transport Area – Towards a competitive and resource efficient transport system" adopted in March 2011.

### **(B) Overall assessment**

**While the report has been improved following the recommendations of the Board's first opinion, several aspects should be further addressed. Firstly, the report should further strengthen the assessment of impacts by better demonstrating that the expected modal shift from road transport to other transport modes will actually materialize. Secondly, it should improve the comparison of options by aligning the qualitative assessment of the effectiveness of options with the scores in the summary table. Finally, the stakeholders' views should be better reflected throughout the report.**

### **(C) Main recommendations for improvements**

**(1) Further strengthen the assessment of impacts.** While the revised report better reflects the results of the quantitative analysis, it should further improve the qualitative assessment of the impacts on transport activity and better demonstrate that the expected modal shift from road transport to rail or other modes of transport will actually occur, despite the modelling results not supporting this conclusion. The report should better

demonstrate that a shift from road to rail would result in less noise, and would not lead to rebound effects and renewed congestion problems. The report should also better explain the impacts of policy options on economic growth, consumer surplus, employment and the environment, for instance by more clearly separating the temporary effects of building and adapting (parts of) the transport networks from the permanent effects arising from increasing transport infrastructure capacity effects, and by more clearly separating the direct effects of this proposal from those related to other mitigating measures. The link with national transport plans should be included in the baseline description as suggested in the Board's first opinion.

**(2) Improve the comparison of options** by ensuring the coherence between the qualitative assessment of the effectiveness of the options and the scores assigned in summary table 14. This should be done as regards the contribution to enhanced cooperation between Member States, and as regards added value for the use of EU funds. The coherence between the scores in table 14 and those in the earlier pre-screening comparison table 5 should also be ensured. The report should update in sections 5 and 6 the open points related to the multiannual financial framework decision, as the decision has now been adopted.

**(3) Report the stakeholders' views.** As suggested in the Board's first opinion, the positions of different stakeholders' groups should be transparently reflected throughout the report.

**(D) Procedure and presentation**

Efforts should be made to bring the length of the report closer to the recommended 30 pages.

**(E) IAB scrutiny process**

Reference number	2011/MOVE/009
External expertise used	No
Date of Board Meeting	Written procedure The present opinion concerns a resubmitted draft IA report. The first opinion was issued on 23 May 2011.