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Introduction

What is the TEN-E Regulation?

The European Green Deal confirms the EU’s ambition to be climate neutral by 2050 and outlines a wide range of measures in different policy areas which need to be revised or newly introduced in order to meet this objective. In the energy sector, one of the key aims is to ensure that our energy infrastructure is fit for the purpose of achieving climate neutrality. In this sense, the Green Deal highlights the importance of smart infrastructure in this transition and specifically identifies the need to review and update the EU regulatory framework for energy infrastructure, including the Regulation (EU) No 347/2013 on guidelines for trans-European energy infrastructure (the “TEN-E Regulation”), to ensure consistency with the 2050 climate neutrality objective. As part of the political agreement between the European Parliament and the Council on the Connecting Europe Facility for the period 2021-2027 – the part of the EU budget which funds cross-border infrastructure projects for energy, transport and digital services – it was already agreed that the Commission should evaluate the effectiveness and policy coherence of the TEN-E Regulation. This revision of the TEN-E Regulation will also address the new policy ambition of the European Green Deal inter alia by integrating a significant increase in renewable energy in the European energy system and by putting the energy efficiency first principle into practice. More information on the European Green Deal is available on the EC website.

The TEN-E Regulation lays down rules for the timely development and interoperability of cross-border energy infrastructure [TEN-E] networks in order to achieve the EU’s energy policy objectives. Its key objective is the timely implementation of the projects of common interest (known as “PCIs”) which interconnect the energy markets across Europe. Interconnected energy markets allow for better integration of renewable energy sources, better security of supply and higher competition within markets that keeps prices in check. The TEN-E Regulation sets out criteria for establishing the PCIs necessary to implement priority corridors and areas in the categories of electricity, gas, oil, smart grids and carbon
dioxide networks. More information on the TEN-E network is available on the Europa website.

What is this survey about?

This survey is one of the elements of the wider stakeholder consultation strategy to inform about the revision of the TEN-E Regulation. The aim of this targeted survey is to collect information and gather views with respect to the implementation and functioning of the TEN-E Regulation from people with professional experience of how the current regulation works in practice. It also addresses forward looking questions as the evaluation is carried out in parallel with the impact assessment. Further background can be found in the Commission’s inception impact assessment.

Who should answer?
Professionals working for organisations involved in the design, implementation or permitting processes of energy infrastructure projects (notably Project Promoters of PCIs, National Regulatory Authorities and National Competent Authorities) or organisations with a strong interest in energy infrastructure and the topic it relates to.
It will only take approximately 30-40 minutes to complete this survey. Please note the information on the use of your input and personal data on the next page.

Your experience with the provisions of the TEN-E regulation in practice are of great value to us, which is why we would like to encourage you to provide explanations and examples in the open text boxes below the questions.

How is the survey structured?
The survey is structured in five main sections on (i) Effectiveness, (ii) Efficiency, (iii) Relevance, (iv) Coherence and (v) Value added by the EU Regulation.
The section on effectiveness is further broken down to collect your input on
• the permit granting process,
• public consultations,
• the PCI selection process,
• governance and the roles of different actors,
• cross-border cost allocation,
• and investment incentives.

How will this survey make a difference?
The survey aims to gather evidence to assess how the current TEN-E Regulation has worked in practice – which aspects have worked well, and not so well, and why – identifying factors which have helped or hampered achieving the objectives foreseen, and provide useful input for the Commission in the preparation of its revision. Your feedback will therefore help influence the future development of the regulatory framework for projects of common interest in the field of energy infrastructure.
Thank you for taking the time to respond to this survey – we highly appreciate your feedback! Should you have any questions concerning this survey or the study, you can contact us at TEN-E@ramboll.com.

Section 1: Effectiveness of the Regulation
The TEN-E Regulation (hereafter: the Regulation) was designed to help overcome some of the key barriers to the development of European wide energy infrastructure. The key questions asked to assess the effectiveness of the Regulation therefore concern the extent to which it has achieved its objectives, and the factors that influenced this.

To what extent do you agree with the following statements regarding the TEN-E Regulation’s overall impact?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Completely agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Completely disagree</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Contributing to energy market integration throughout Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Achieving an adequate security of supply level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Contributing to competitiveness in the EU energy market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Achieving the 2020 climate and energy targets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain your answer:

BirdLife sees sustainability and achieving climate and energy targets as one dominant driver for establishing the TEN-E Regulation. Today, the impact on climate and energy targets is still insufficient. Between regulation and practice great contradictions remain. We see that a nature-compatible renewable energy integration has not been achieved up to date and Europe remains insufficiently connected caused by severe delays in the building of energy infrastructure in line with nature. The need to revise the current TEN-E Regulations framework are further sustained by new developments and objectives by the European Union, such as the Green New Deal, the Climate Neutrality Objective, the commitments made to the Paris Agreement and the new Biodiversity Strategy.

Which factors do you think have contributed to the achievement of the objectives? On the contrary, which factors have hindered the achievement of the objectives?

The European Union’s progress towards achieving the 2020 climate and energy target is not a result of the TEN-E Regulation. Achieving climate and energy targets rely on variable nature-sensitive electricity infrastructure projects. However, the current TEN-E legislation benefitted and financially sustained fossil fuel based gas projects that contradict the commitments made under the Paris Agreement and the path to Climate Neutrality by 2050.

To what extent do you agree with the following statements concerning the financing of energy infrastructure projects?
The Regulation helped to finance energy infrastructure projects by…

* Making financing instruments available to finance PCIs.  
Completely agree  Agree  Neither agree nor disagree  Disagree  Completely disagree  Do not know  
X

* Increasing financing capacities of TSOs (ability to raise debt at a reasonable cost, ability to attract new institutional investors).  
Completely agree  Agree  Neither agree nor disagree  Disagree  Completely disagree  Do not know  
X

* Providing targeted EU financing under the Connecting Europe Facility.  
Completely agree  Agree  Neither agree nor disagree  Disagree  Completely disagree  Do not know  
X

Other (please describe)  
Increasing financial sustainability  
Completely agree  Agree  Neither agree nor disagree  Disagree  Completely disagree  Do not know  
X

Please explain your answer:

The TEN-E Regulation provides good ground for financing energy infrastructure projects. For future financial investment, it needs to be proven that energy infrastructure projects are in line with the commitments made under the Paris Agreement and in line with biodiversity goals. Not eligible for financial support should be fossil fuel infrastructure (gas and oil) and fossil gas dependent technologies like blue and grey hydrogen. The regulation needs to be further aligned with the EU Taxonomy Regulation to ensure that environmental objectives are sufficiently considered.

Section 2: Permit granting processes

Over time and since 2013, do you agree that the TEN-E Regulation has had a positive impact on shortening the duration of the permit granting procedure for PCIs?

Completely agree  Agree  Neither agree nor disagree  Disagree  Completely disagree  Do not know  
X

Please explain your answer:
The Permit Granting Procedure takes an average of 3.1 - 3.8 years, according to ACER. More efficient, easier and faster procedures can be put into place through strengthened EU-wide and cross-member states strategic spatial planning processes. This includes taking an ecosystem based approach which involves analysing the sensitivity of species and habitats to different activities (including the cumulative impacts) which helps to form exclusion areas at a regional level. The ecosystem based approach should also be reflected in flexibility and nature based decisions on the transmission through overhead powerlines or ground cables, taking into consideration the main environmental sensitivity and topographical limitations of a project instead of political determination. Enhanced cross-border cooperation enable authorities to adequately take into account species and nature conservation and residents concerns. Furthermore it provides legal certainty, security for planning and makes the energy transition attractive for further investment. There is a risk that fast track permit granting procedures undermine EU-Nature Directives, SEA and IEA Directives. The revised TEN-E Regulation needs to strengthen the role of nature protection.

To what extent do you agree that the permit granting in ‘one-stop shops’ has...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Completely disagree</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Reduced complexity of the permit granting process?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Increased efficiency in time and costs of the permit granting process?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Increased transparency of the permit granting process?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Enhanced cooperation between Member States?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Would allow addressing challenges related to the permitting of infrastructure for offshore renewable energy projects?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please present your views with regards to possible changes which will help improve the process:

Today, administrative processes are managed by Member States and lead to different procedures and different efficiency rates. „One stop-shops“ have not necessarily led to more efficient procedures in the Member States that need sufficient capacity for the implementation of the one-stop shop, to involve environmental authorities from different member states and legal security on open questions in order to comply with requirements under the Nature Directives. Granting One-Stop shops“ needs to ensure a high level of environmental analysis and clear procedures for authorities.

Section 3: Public consultation
To what extent do you agree with the following statements about the role of at least one public consultation introduced for PCIs?
The additional public consultation introduced for PCIs has...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Completely disagree</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Increased/improved public participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Increased awareness of PCI projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Increased trust among participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Increased public acceptance of PCI projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Led to improvements in the design of the projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain your answers, possibly comparing to other non-PCI projects:

The consultation for PCI projects is neither early nor informed a required by Article 7 of the Aarhus Convention. It often comes too late and lacks content and detail regarding environmental and social impact and mitigation measures. This lack can result in strong local opposition or opposition by civil society. The revised TEN-E Regulation must ensure full transparency through enhanced and participatory stakeholder engagement and promote post-construction monitoring. Projects promoters must have an obligation to inform potentially affected citizens.

Furthermore it will be necessary to provide public involvement as a condition of permit granting.

* To what extent would you agree that the input from the public consultation introduced by the TEN-E Regulation is/was used to guide the further development of projects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completely agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completely disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain your answers, possibly comparing to other non-PCI projects:

It is overall unclear in how far the input from the public consultation, informal discussions and hearings is taken into account from the project promoters as there is no transparent and standardized follow-up process. Commitments made, for example, about which
routing options get chosen at the end of the type, about the type of pylon that is used, the commitment to attach bird protection markings, need to get binding in the planning, which means the respective project promoter needs to stick to it, otherwise the willingness to participate will decrease. Often solutions are found in the consultation right before the permitting process, which will then be skipped, which makes it necessary to raise the same objections again.

* To what extent do you agree that the requirement for at least one public consultation is enough for increasing transparency and participation in the design and planning of the projects?

- Completely agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Completely disagree
- Do not know

[ ] Disagree

Section 4: PCI selection process

To what extent do you agree with the following statements concerning the PCI selection process?

* PCIs selected are the most relevant projects to the fulfilment of the TEN-E objectives.  

[ ]

* Cost-benefit assessments for the selection of PCIs are using an appropriate methodology.

[ ]

Please explain your answers:

Preliminarily it needs to be noted, that the TEN-E objectives must incorporate change in legislation and strategy from the last 7 years. Therefore the objectives will change and need to be aligned with the more ambitious EU climate and biodiversity objectives and keeping global temperature rise at 1,5 degrees. PCIs selected are not the most relevant
projects to the fulfilment of the current TEN-E objectives. There is still a need for a substantial increase in nature-sensitive energy infrastructure which realisation should be accelerated. The average duration of the implementation of an electricity PCIs is approximately 10 years.

Cost-benefit methodologies for all PCIs and for the energy system wide cost-benefit analysis should include information on potential environmental impacts, including whether all or part of a project is likely to fall within a site protected for its nature value in Europe. Direct and indirect impacts across the life-cycle must be taken into account. The methodologies must also be based on scenarios and demand assumptions that are in line with Europe’s commitments of cutting carbon emissions.

To what extent do you agree that the role of the different actors listed below is adequate in the selection procedure?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The role is adequate</th>
<th>The role should be weakened</th>
<th>The role should be strengthened</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* European Network of Transmission Systems Operators for Electricity and Gas (ENTSO-E/ENTSO-G)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators (ACER)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* European Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Regional Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* National Regulatory Authorities (NRA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* National Competent Authorities (NCA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Transmission systems operators (TSO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Distribution system operators (DSO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Other stakeholders (NGOs, energy industry, telecom companies, trade associations, finance community, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain your answers and, if applicable, elaborate on how the role of actors should change.

The European Network of Transmission System Operators for Electricity and Gas have a strong role in the selection procedure of PCIs, as the appearance in the TYNDP determines whether or not a project will have the chance to get on the final PCI-list. The process therefore serves as a preselection process. However, the preselectors do have a strong conflict of interest and are not neutral, as they allow Transmission System Operators having too much a say in the electricity planning. This is reflected in the current TYNDP-scenario which is not able to meet the commitments to the Paris Agreement and
misses opportunities to take biodiversity goals sufficiently into account.

The role of DSOs should be strengthened in order to allow for demand-side and response and new flexibility options to facilitate the integration of nature-sensitive renewable energy infrastructure.

The role of ACER and as a steering and monitoring vehicle should be strengthened, as they rightly observe and report on the progress of PCIs, but have no steering role to implement their recommendations.

Currently the TEN-E regulation sees no role for environmental authorities. These should be leveraged to have an obligatory role on the regional and community level. Furthermore National Regulatory Authorities and National Competent Authorities need to be strengthened by including environmental experts.

Also other stakeholder, such as civil society organisations should have a stronger role, as they rightly have been pointing out conflicts with the selection and implementation of PCIs. However, they can also have a destructive stakeholder when using conservation interests to implement personal interests.

Also the role of the European Parliament needs to be strengthened in the selection procedure.

To what extent do you agree with the following statements concerning the gas and electricity EU-wide Ten-Year Network Development Plans (TYNDPs)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Completely disagree</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* The current framework is fit for purpose.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* The electricity and gas market and network models are sufficiently interlinked (e.g. scenarios and cost-benefit assessment).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* The current framework does sufficiently match the need for system integration, i.e. the consideration of sectors other than gas and electricity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* The TYNDPs do reflect enough coordination with distribution level networks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* The relevant actors are involved in the TYNDP processes and their respective roles are adequate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
* The TYNDPs do reflect sufficiently energy efficiency aspects. X

Please explain your answers:

Current TYNDP scenarios and past TYNDs are not in line with the Paris Agreement and keeping the temperature at 1.5 degrees nor do they reflect diverse pathways. Electricity and gas markets and network models are not sufficiently interlinked, as they are not modelled together. Also coordination with the distribution level networks is missing. As a direct result of this missing coordination and interlinkage, the latest assumptions in the scenarios are too high for gas and biomass that impacts negatively ecosystems and energy efficiency is not taken into account sufficiently.

It needs to be ensured that the energy efficiency first principle in the scenario development are paramount to ensure only cost-effective choices are taken. Relevant actors for the TYNDP-process, such as civil society actors, should be not only consulted, but see their views actually reflected in diverse scenarios. The TYNDP process should be in line with the Paris Agreement, the Climate Neutrality Goal, take into account higher assumptions of a 2030-emission reduction target and integrate scenarios that are based on 100 per cent nature-compatible renewable energy.

BirdLife advocates for a strict climate and strategic environmental impact assessment at an early stage before granting PCI-status to projects with binding obligations for the further planning. For the Ten-Year Network Development Plan there is a legal obligation rooted in SEA Directive Article 2 & 3.

The European Commission and Members States need to ensure that cross-Member States and regional energy system planning will to be strengthened to assess necessary grid capacity in line with the carrying capacities of ecosystems and ecological limits.

To what extent do you agree with the following statements on the selection criteria for projects of common interest?

* The general selection criteria are appropriate. X
* The specific selection criteria for electricity transmission projects are appropriate. X
* The specific selection criteria for gas projects are appropriate. X
* The specific selection criteria for electricity smart grid projects are
appropriate.  
* The specific selection criteria for carbon dioxide transport projects are appropriate. X

If you disagree, please specify changes you consider necessary:

The sustainability criteria must be widened to take into account nature conservation, climate protection and social criteria and should be made obligatory in the TEN-E. A shift from the specific criteria to general criteria in Article 4 of the TEN-E will be necessary. The criteria need to furthermore take into account the mitigation of environmental impacts in order to limit wildlife mortality.

Fossil-fuel based gas projects should not be eligible for the TEN-E regulation in order not to create stranded assets.

To what extent do you agree that projects of mutual interest with third countries should be included in the revised TEN-E framework? 

* Projects of mutual interest, i.e. projects with third country that benefit only one Member State, should remain outside the TEN-E framework. X
* Projects of mutual interest should be included in the TEN-E framework… X
* …subject to specific eligibility and selection criteria, X
* …subject to a specific selection process X
* …subject to specific conditions for regulatory measures and access to financial assistance would apply. X

Please specify your answer:
Projects of mutual interest must fulfil the same criteria in relation to restoring, protecting and maintaining valuable habitats and the conservation of species. Criteria, selection and conditions must ensure climate protection fulfilling European climate and energy targets.

Section 5 Governance and the roles of different actors

To what extent do you agree with the following statements concerning the effectiveness of the PCI monitoring and implementation planning procedures?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Completely disagree</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

* Current reporting and monitoring procedures on the PCI progress [popup box: i.e. Activity Status Reports, ACER monitoring reports, Transparency Platform etc.] are sufficient to ensure transparency on PCI development.

* PCIs implementation plans and the regular updates ensure timely project implementation.

Please explain your answer:

For stakeholders it is difficult to get access to monitoring and planning procedures of PCIs. It must be enforced that environmental baseline and monitoring data and reports that are collected in connection with a project are freely publicly available immediately. Information on candidate PCIs should be comprehensive and include maps showing locations and routes. The lack of overall transparency must be tackled to ensure public acceptance and speed up permitting processes and the implementation of the PCIs.

Section 6: Cross-border cost allocation

* To what extent would you agree that CBCA decision processes and outcomes enable effective investment decisions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Completely disagree</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please explain your answer, possibly comparing with other means of taking CBCA decisions:
Section 7: Investment incentives

According to Article 13 of the TEN-E Regulation, incentives can be provided for PCIs which are exposed to higher risks than normally incurred by a similar infrastructure project, and for which a net positive impact is confirmed by the CBA.

* To what extent would you agree that investment incentives enable effective investments in PCIs?

- Completely agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- X Disagree
- Completely disagree
- Do not know

Please explain your answer:

Effective investment incentives cannot be given when the PCIs that are chosen in the first place do not reflect energy and climate targets and do not fulfil legal obligations under the Nature Directives, Marine Strategy Framework Directives and/or the EIA-/SEA Directives.

Section 8: Efficiency of the Regulation

The evaluation of the efficiency of the Regulation considers the extent to which the resources used to implement the Regulation and achieve its objectives are used as efficiently as possible (with lowest possible resources/costs). In the case of the TEN-E Regulation, this mainly relates to the costs and benefits for NRAs and project promoters with regards to the implementation of the Regulation.

* To what extent do you agree that the benefits of the provisions in the TEN-E Regulation outweigh the costs?

- Completely agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- X Disagree
- Completely disagree
- Do not know

Please explain your answer:

Environmental and climate costs of poor sited infrastructure projects based on renewable
energy and projects that deepen dependencies on fossil fuel energy carriers, pose less benefits but more overall societal costs. However, these costs of inaction are also not reflected in the CBA and must form part.

Can you identify any opportunities to simplify the legislation or reduce unnecessary costs without undermining the intended objectives of the Regulation?

Unnecessary costs through stranded assets, such as fossil fuels infrastructure can be avoided through excluding them from the TEN-E Regulation. Studies show that the existing gas infrastructure is enough to even supply for greater demand in the future. Also costs that occur through delayed projects that do not meet environmental standards and/or lead to social dissatisfaction can be avoided by taking environmental, nature and societal factors into account in each stage of the different planning stages, project preparation, implementation and decommissioning.

* To what extent do you agree that the current reporting and monitoring procedures on the PCI progress can be simplified and still fulfill their purpose?

- Completely agree
- Agree
- Neither
- Agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Completely disagree
- Do not know

Please explain your answer:

It is smart and cost-efficient to keep reporting and monitoring procedures simple, at the same time environmental baseline, data and reports that are collected throughout the project need to be sufficiently detailed and legal obligations resulting out of the Nature Directives, SEA- and IEA Directives cannot be compromised.
Section 9: Relevance of the Regulation

The evaluation of the relevance of the TEN-E Regulation assesses the extent to which the TEN-E Regulation and its objectives appropriately respond to the changes in energy infrastructure needs and in the policy context (such as the climate neutrality objective under the European Green Deal).

To what extent do you agree that the following issues are currently well addressed by the Regulation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Completely disagree</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Integration of renewable energy sources into the electricity network</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Integration of renewable energy sources into the gas network</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Support of electrification of transport through appropriate grid infrastructure</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Smart sector integration</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Energy transition for fossil fuel regions</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Climate change mitigation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Climate resilience of energy infrastructure</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Improving energy efficiency of the energy system</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you ticked ‘Completely disagree’ or ‘Disagree’: How do you think the Regulation should change to better address these issues?

The Revision of the TEN-E Regulation must be based on the energy efficiency first principle, strictly encourage smart sector integration and enable the energy transition to energy infrastructure that is based on 100 per cent nature-sensitive renewable energy. This can be reached by integrating climate protection and absolute emission reduction as well as nature protection as guiding principles and criteria of the Regulation. The Integration of Renewable Energy sources should be addressed by only making nature-compatible energy infrastructure based on renewable energy eligible for funding.

More cost-efficient than integrating renewable energy sources into the gas network is the implementation of measures for increasing energy efficiency and decreasing end energy use. The integration of renewable energy sources into the gas network can fill in a niche for hard to decarbonise industrial sectors, such as aviation, heavy transport and the steel industry. However only so-called renewable gases which throughout its lifecycle account
for nature conservation and absolute emission and resource use reduction should be eligible for funding through the European Union. Gases that are based on fossil fuels should not be promoted.

**To what extent would you agree that the TEN-E Regulation has been relevant in supporting the development of the following infrastructure categories?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure Category</th>
<th>Completely agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Completely disagree</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* High-voltage overhead transmission lines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Electricity storage facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Safety and efficiency installations for electricity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Smart grids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Transmission pipelines for natural gas and biogas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Underground gas storage facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* reception, storage and regasification or decompression of liquefied natural gas (LNG) or compressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* natural gas (CNG)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Safety and efficiency installations for gas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Pipelines for crude oil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Oil pumping and storage facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Safety and efficiency installations for oil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Dedicated carbon dioxide pipelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Facilities for liquefaction of carbon dioxide and buffer storage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Safety and efficiency installations for carbon dioxide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Which of the challenges would you say are most important to address in the field of energy infrastructure today, compared to the situation in 2013? Please select up to 3 most important challenges.

at most 3 choice(s)
Which of the challenges would you say are least important to address in the field of energy infrastructure today, compared to the situation in 2013? Please select up to 3 least important challenges.

at most 3 choice(s)

- Public opposition to projects
- Environmental due diligence in the preparation, permitting and implementation of project
- Market fragmentation / market integration
- Security of supply
- Competitiveness of the EU energy market
- Permit-granting procedures
- Greenhouse gas emission reductions / climate neutrality
- Energy system integration
- Energy infrastructure investments
- Energy efficiency first principle
- Commercial viability of projects
- Energy financing capacity of TSOs
- Cross-border/regional cooperation
- Regulatory cross-border challenges
- Digitalisation
- Energy financing capacity of TSOs
- Other (please specify)
- Energy efficiency first principle
Which features do you consider the most important for a project of common interest (PCI) as part of trans-European energy network?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Important to a large extent</th>
<th>Important to a small extent</th>
<th>Not important</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Integration of renewable energy sources into the grid</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Contribution to greenhouse gas emissions reduction / fully consistent with climate neutrality 2050</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Security of supply</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Market integration (e.g. to reduce infrastructural deficits and increase system flexibility)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Increase competition on the market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Environmental due diligence in the preparation, permitting and implementation of project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Generation of direct benefits to the local communities</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which of the following infrastructure categories do you consider relevant for the regulatory framework on trans-European energy networks?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure Category</th>
<th>Relevant</th>
<th>Relevant to a large extent</th>
<th>Relevant to a small extent</th>
<th>Not relevant</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electricity infrastructure (transmission lines and storage)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grids for offshore renewable energy</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart electricity grids</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart gas grids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural gas infrastructure (pipelines and storage)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) terminals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated hydrogen (H2) networks</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure for the integration of renewable and carbon</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
neutral gases
Power-to-gas installations
CO2 networks (for transporting CO2)
Geological storage of CO2

The TEN-E Regulation presents nine Priority corridors: North Seas offshore grid (NSOG), North-south electricity interconnections in western Europe (NSI West Electricity), North-south electricity interconnections in central eastern and south eastern Europe (NSI East Electricity), Baltic Energy Market Interconnection Plan in electricity (BEMIP Electricity), North-south gas interconnections in Western Europe (NSI West Gas), North-south gas interconnections in central eastern and south eastern Europe (NSI East Gas), Southern Gas Corridor (SGC), Baltic Energy Market Interconnection Plan in gas (BEMIP Gas), Oil supply connections in central eastern Europe (OSC).

The TEN-E Regulation also presents three Priority thematic areas: Smart grids deployment, Electricity highways, and Cross-border carbon dioxide network.

For more information, see: https://ec.europa.eu/energy/topics/infrastructure/trans-european-networks-energy_en?redir=1

To what extent do you agree with the following statements concerning priority corridors and thematic areas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Completely agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Completely disagree</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Priority Corridors reflect the current infrastructure needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Priority Corridors are fit for purpose for future challenges to the energy infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Priority Thematic Areas reflect the current infrastructure needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Priority Thematic Areas are fit for purpose for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
future challenges
to the energy infrastructure

Please explain your answer:

In general Priority Corridor and Thematic Areas help to identify the most important projects per region. However they should take into account ecological corridors which fragmentation should be avoided. Biodiversity-friendly land-use planning requires information about connectivity for ensuring sustainable populations and maximizing restoration benefits. Crucial issues are how priority corridors and thematic areas incorporate and identify ecological corridors and how ecological connectivity can be assured. BirdLife Europe recommends looking into interdependencies and impacts outside nature protection areas having impacts also in nature protection areas and look at ecosystems as a whole.

Section 10: Coherence of the Regulation

Coherence is about the extent to which the objectives and the implementation of the activities related to the Regulation are non-contradictory (internal coherence), and do not contradict other activities with similar objectives (external coherence). Questions relate to whether there are any internal inconsistencies in the Regulation itself, as well as the degree to which it is coherent with other (EU) initiatives with similar objectives and its situation in the wider EU energy policy field.

Can you identify any overlaps, inconsistencies within the TEN-E Regulation (including in its measures and objectives)?

X Yes, there are overlaps, inconsistencies or incoherencies
   No, the Regulation is coherent overall
   Do not know

Please state your opinion on the following statements regarding the consistency between the TEN-E Regulation and other policies/initiatives at EU, international, and national level:
Inconsistencies, or conflicts with the Regulation  |  Consistent with the regulation  |  Do not know

* The Clean Energy Package / the Energy Union  |  X  |
* The European Green Deal / Long Term Strategy for Decarbonisation  |  X  |
* Trans-European transport networks (TEN-T)  |  X  |
* EU environmental acquis (habitats, water, etc.)  |  X  |
* EU Digital Strategy  |  X  |
* EU Industrial Strategy  |  X  |
* Paris Agreement  |  X  |
* UN Sustainable Development Goals  |  X  |
* Commission communication on a stronger and renewed strategic partnership with the EU’s outermost regions (COM(2017)623 final)  |  X  |
* EU neighborhood policy  |  X  |

**Section 11: EU added value of the Regulation**

EU added value concerns the extent to which changes can reasonably be argued to be a result of the EU intervention, over and above what could reasonably have been expected from national actions. Thus, it considers whether and to the extent to which it is justified in terms of the results it brought about compared to what could have been achieved by Member States themselves; and the extent to which the issues addressed by the TEN-E Regulation still require EU intervention (or, in other words, what the consequence of stopping the EU intervention would be).

* What do you think has been the EU added value of the TEN-E Regulation, compared to what could have been achieved if legislation on energy infrastructure networks only existed at national or regional level?

  * Regional cooperation  
    * Cooperation gains  
      * Improved regulatory certainty  
      * Increased transparency  
      * Increased acceptance of energy infrastructure projects  
      * Enhanced compliance with environmental requirements  
      * Greater speed and/or effectiveness of delivery
BirdLife recognizes the importance of the TEN-E Regulation and its importance to finance and implement large energy transmission infrastructure based on renewable energy and enhancing cross border cooperation.

Would the same results have been achieved legislating at national and/or regional level?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Completely disagree</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* The TEN-E Regulation has achieved more results than what could have been achieved legislating at national and/or regional level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* The issues addressed by the TEN-E Regulation continue to require action at EU level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain your answer:

National and regional level legislation does cover cross-border cooperation in Europe only to a certain extend and do not necessarily financially assist projects that have cross-border relevance.

Section 12: Final questions
Would you be willing to take part in a follow-up interview to provide further feedback for the evaluation?

Yes
No

Do you have any comments, remarks or information regarding this survey that you would like to share?

The survey covered all important aspects that BirdLife wished to comment on.

Please share any relevant documents and data that would be useful for the purposes of our evaluation.

We kindly ask if you could please reflect all inputs, including those that are in your position papers, in the responses to the survey questions.

The maximum file size is 1 MB

Thank you very much for taking the time to answer this survey. Once you click “submit” below, your answers will be saved and sent. You will still be able to make changes if you reopen the survey link invitation sent to your email address.
Your answers will be treated fully confidentially and not be shared with anyone else.
If you have any questions about this survey, please contact TEN-E@ramboll.com.