



Innovation and Networks Executive Agency

**Connecting Europe Facility 2014-2020
2017 CEF Transport Blending call 1 - Internal Evaluation Committee**

E-INTERNAL EVALUATION FORM

Proposal Title: Upgrading and electrification from Wien Stadlau / Gänserndorf to the Slovakian Border near Marchegg (bottleneck removal)

Proposal Number: 2017-AT-TM-0001-W

Proposal Type: TRANSPORT

I. SHORT DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL

Provide a short description of the proposal including its main objectives and purpose with maximum 4000 characters

The Action is located on the Baltic-Adriatic Core Network Corridor and specifically on the section between Vienna and Bratislava. It consists of the construction, upgrade and electrification of the railway line sections between Gänserndorf - Marchegg and between Vienna Stadlau and the Slovakian border, hence removing an existing bottleneck. The maximum speed will be increased from 120 up to 200 km/h, saving 25 minutes on this section. The modal shift from road to rail and the electrification of the line will result in a decrease in CO2 emissions.

II. SELECTION CRITERIA

a. Does the applicant(s) comply with the selection criteria about financial capacity?

If the proposal fails to comply with the selection criteria, please explain below.

☒ Yes
☐ No

b. Does the applicant(s) comply with the selection criteria about operational capacity?

If the proposal fails to comply with the selection criteria, please explain below.

☒ Yes
☐ No

III. TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT

Section III shows the technical assessment by the external experts on this specific proposal, without comparing it with other proposals. Under section IV, experts propose a scoring for the award criteria, while it is the responsibility of the Commission to decide on the granting of financial aid after considering the totality of the proposals under the provisions defined in point 10 of the Call for Proposals. The final selection process is reflected under section V.

Did the proposal obtain at least 3 points for each of the criteria evaluated under technical evaluation phase?

☒ Yes
☐ No

Comments

The relevance of the Action is very good as it concerns a bottleneck on a cross-border section of the Baltic-Adriatic Core Network Corridor.

The maturity of the Action is good. In terms of Financial Readiness the Action is well prepared. However, only minor contracts have been awarded yet and only some building permits have been awarded so far.

The impact of the Action is very good because it will lead to significant reductions of travel times and positive effects on the environment due to modal shift. However, the economic and financial analysis is not sufficiently clear in the CBA.

The quality of the Action is good as activities are described in detail and are coherent with the project objectives.

However, the relevance of activity 3 under this Call is not explained and ERTMS and the detailed design studies are not budgeted separately.

If the Action is retained for funding it is recommended not to fund ECTS/ERTMS in sub-activity 2.2 and activity 3 as they are not relevant to the call.

Furthermore, it is recommended to verify the relevance of the studies in activities 1 and 2, as insufficient information is provided about them.

IV. PROPOSAL SCORING

Award criteria	Marks awarded
1. RELEVANCE	4.0
2. MATURITY	3.5
3. IMPACT	4.0
4. QUALITY	3.0

V. CONCLUSION

1. Is the proposal recommended for funding?

YES

2. Overall Comments

The Action's relevance is very good as it addresses a bottleneck on a Core Network Corridor. Its maturity is good and the Action is well prepared in terms of financial readiness with clear evidence to support financial close. The impact is very good: CEF funding will expedite the implementation of the Action. The impact of CEF funding in leveraging external sources of funding is limited. The Action's quality is good. It was decided to recommend the Action for funding in a reduced scope, some activities being of limited or no relevance to the Call priority. The co-funding rate is reduced from 30% to 20% due to budgetary constraints.

3. Actions with synergies:

Does the proposal demonstrate synergies with one or more of the other CEF sectors and has the top up rate been requested?

(see application form A3.2)

If YES, please explain

- ☐ Yes
☐ No
☒ N/A

4. Actions with entities from Neighbouring/third countries

4.1. Is the participation of the applicants that are a third country /neighbouring country or entities established in a third country /neighbouring country necessary to achieve the objectives of the project of common interest? (see application form B4)

- ☐ Yes
☐ No
☒ N/A

4.2. Is the participation of the applicants that are a neighbouring country or entities established in a neighbouring country indispensable to achieve the objectives of the project of common interest? (see application form B4)

If 'No', then the applicants concerned are not entitled to receive EU funding pursuant to Article 9(4) of the CEF Regulation. Please explain why their participation would not be considered indispensable.

- ☐ Yes
☐ No
☒ N/A

5. Further remarks:

5.1. Are any activities (or activity components) not recommended for funding?

Are there any costs that should be reduced/excluded, because they are: (a) not reasonable, (b) ineligible or relate to ineligible activities or (c) not to be supported by CEF Transport funding for other than these reasons?

If YES, please explain why and identify the corresponding cost that needs to be deducted from the estimated total cost from the Action, activity by activity.

- ☒ Yes
☐ No

- [REDACTED]

5.2. Breakdown of the proposal's eligible costs and the requested CEF Transport funding.

Activities	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Total eligible costs	Co-financing Rate (%)	CEF Transport Financing

5.3. Breakdown of the proposal's recommended CEF Transport funding.

Activities	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Total eligible costs	Requested Co-financing Rate (%)	Requested CEF Transport Financing

5.4. Are there environmental issues that need to be clarified?

If YES, please identify all these issues and explain how and when they should be addressed and taken into consideration in the text of the grant agreement.

☒ Yes
☐ No

Some information is missing:

Development consent in Niederoesterreich foreseen only for 1 Q 2018.

EIA has been undertaken, decision available, but information on consultation and non-technical summary is missing. SEA summary and decision are missing.

For the part of the project falling in Vienna, the regional government has granted permission based on the regional conservation law to catch, move or destroy different protected species.

For the part falling under the responsibility of the Government of Lower Austria, the approval of Nature conservation law and Road law is expected in the 1. term of 2018.

5.5. Are there other issues that require further attention?

If YES please identify and make recommendation on any other issue. The list is not exhaustive. (e.g. this may include the identification of other activities or events that may not form part of the proposed Action but they are critical for the start or for the smooth implementation of the Action and thus they have to be closely monitored or perhaps be mentioned as condition or pre-condition). Please identify and describe in this section all other important issues for which the proposal does not provide sufficient information, which need to be clarified and/or addressed before the Grant agreement is concluded.

☒ Yes
☐ No

It is recommended to verify the relevance of the studies in activities 1 and 2, as insufficient information is provided on them.

5.6. Grant disbursement condition

5.6.1. Cross border impact

Does the Project demonstrate a cross border impact?

☒ Yes
☐ No

5.6.2. Bottlenecks

Does the Project address a bottleneck?

☒ Yes
☐ No

5.6.3. Involvement of a Cohesion Member State

Does the Project involve the territory of at least one Cohesion Member State?

☐ Yes
☒ No