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The Public Consultation in the area of Strategic Infrastructure

Link to the consultation: <https://ec.europa.eu/info/consultations/public-consultation-eu-funds-area-cohesion_en>

ECF calls on its partners to reply to the above public consultation (link) by Thursday the 8th of March to advocate for more budget for cycling in the most relevant EU programmes of the upcoming Multiannual Financial Framework 2021-2027, which is currently under negotiation.

The aim is to share the same message: Cycling must be linked to the EU priorities , included in the EU programmes and benefit from specific actions within the new generation of Fuding Instruments.

You are invited to use the text below when replying to the open ended questions in the consultation.

**Q4: Please specify how the current programmes/funds add value compared to what Member States could achieve at national, regional and/or local levels?**

CEF has the potential to mobilise additional national and regional funding along main transport corridors. The CEF Programme invests in projects with a strategic importance for Europe which might be different from national priorities. To solve transnational problems very often local bottlenecks on transport networks should be removed. Cycling/ Cycle Highways are a sustainable way to release capacity in these places on TEN-T corridors.

**Q5: Is there a need to modify or add to the objectives of the programmes/funds in this policy area?**

The current TEN-T Guidelines allow co-financing of cycling-related measures through CEF but the current wording does not support standalone cycling projects (they have to be part of a wider project) and there is no obligation to integrate cycling-related measures (so cycle routes crossing TEN-T corridors are sometimes cut by new motorways for example).

When looking at the programme/funds budget allocations, it becomes obvious that mobility and transport and especially cycling is underrepresented in the budget considerations of the EU.

ECF therefore demands:

1. Significantly increase the amount of financing for infrastructure projects in transport and mobility in general and drastically increase the percentage of bicycle funding.

2. Include cycling as a mode of transport in the CEF network, ask fro the inclusion of bicycle infrastructure in all relevant projects in the TEN-T network and make stand alone bicycle infrastructure projects (such as cycle highways and EuroVelo routes) eligible for individual funding.

**Q6 and 7: Please specify if you have identified another way to simplify and reduce burdens?**

• The average size of the projects is too large. There should be a possiblity to apply with smaller size stand alone cycling projects (for example to build cycle highways along existing TEN-T corridor highways releasing capacities)

• The guidelines and provided information about the calls for proposal are too complex. We propose to add simple (cycling related) examples explaining how CEF can be used to improve conditions for cycling.

• The communication about project opportunities and especially about cycling is poor.

• Externalities of costs are not taken into account. Cycling can contribute to the decarbonisation of the transport sector and delivers health benefits (because of the increased phsycal activity). This should be taken into account at the budget allocation and the co-financing rates.

**Q8: How could synergies among programmes/funds in this area be further strengthened to avoid possible overlaps/duplication? For example, would you consider grouping/merging some programmes?**

Indeed, we would only see advantages in strengthening synergies among programmes and grouping them in a systematic approach along a project idea, which can be supported in a sort of “cascade” system meaning a range of instruments which can support its continuity. The new EU Framework for Research and Innovation (H2020) should deliver innovative solution to be implemented along the TEN-T corridors, CEF should mostly focus on the implementation of these along the TEN-T corridors and EuroVelo routes. The ERDF Funds should focus on the implementation of connected (but not European level) (cycling) transport infrastucture investments.