

er Integrated Trans-European Transport Network at the Service of the Common

| Meta Informations | |
|-------------------|--------------------|
| Creation date | 28-04-2009 |
| Last update date | |
| User name | null |
| Case Number | 587758641021611809 |
| Invitation Ref. | |
| Status | N |

| Background of the respondent | |
|--|---|
| Country of residence | France |
| Region: Please write down the name of your region (using as base the NUTS 1 or NUTS 2 classification system as relevant, for details see http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2007:039:0001:0037:EN:PDF) | FR232 |
| TEN-T components/major infrastructure most involved with (you can choose more than one) | Road Maritime |
| Name: | IINSTITUT DU DROIT INTERNATIONAL DES TRANSPORTS |
| Name of your organisation | IINSTITUT DU DROIT INTERNATIONAL DES TRANSPORTS |
| Type of Organization | Private |
| Type of involvement in the TEN-T/major transport infrastructure matters | Consultancy / research |

| Green Paper Questionnaire | |
|--|---|
| Q01.- Should the Commission's assessment of TEN-T development to date cover any other factors? | La place française est peu représentée dans les instances européennes. Les opérateurs français se sont positionnés lors du développement des RTE ? Si oui comment ? Sur quels critères ? La répartition des RTE n'est pas homogène. Il manque une coordination nationale française, la question des critères de sélection des projets européens est posée ? La place portuaire et logistique normande (et son hinterland), même s'ils ont bénéficié de financements communautaires, ne sont pas suffisamment valorisés dans les RTE. Problème d'accessibilité et de positionnement des Petites Entreprises aux appels d'offres, par manque de moyens. |
| Q02.- Should the comprehensive network be maintained or abandoned, and what advantages and disadvantages would either approach involve? Could the respective disadvantages be overcome, and if so by what means? | YES - the comprehensive network should be maintained |
| Please justify your choice by answering the sub-questions of Q02 as comprehensive as possible | Le schéma global n'existe pas encore mais c'est le modèle vers lequel il faut tendre. |
| Please allocate the advantages as described above to the following categories: | Important for access function and territorial cohesion |
| Please allocate the disadvantages, as described above, to the following categories: | |
| Q03.- Would a priority network approach be better than the current priority projects' approach? What would be the advantages and disadvantages of either approach, and how should it be developed? | YES - The priority network approach would be better than a priority projects approach |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Please justify your choice by answering the sub-questions of Q03 as comprehensive as possible</p> | <p>La planification des projets prioritaires au niveau européen semblerait logique mais difficilement réalisable en raison des disparités d'application de la législation. La concurrence entre les infrastructures européennes pose également problème (exemple des Ports de Anvers, Dunkerque et Rotterdam). Les concertations entre hinterlands des ports européens est indispensable, leurs échanges et projets peuvent faire l'objet de projets transnationaux de coopération type INTERREG.</p> |
| <p>Please allocate the arguments described above to the following categories: - Advantages of priority network approach (compared to priority projects approach)</p> | |
| <p>Disadvantages of priority network approach (compared to priority projects approach)</p> | |
| <p>Elements that should be taken into account in the development of a priority network approach (planning method)</p> | |
| <p>Q04.- Would the flexible approach to identifying projects of common interest, as proposed with the "conceptual pillar", be appropriate for a policy that, traditionally, largely rests on Member States' individual infrastructure investment decisions? What further advantages and disadvantages could it have, and how could it best be reflected in planning at Community level?</p> | <p>No opinion</p> |
| <p>Q05.- How can future challenges in the sectors of waterborne and air transport (especially ports, inland waterways and airports) as well as of freight logistics be best taken into account within the overall concept of the future TEN-T development? Do different requirements for freight and passenger transport require different treatment in the TEN-T policy? What further aspects relating to different transport sectors / common transport policy issues should be given attention?</p> | <p>La conception européenne des infrastructures devrait être liée à la notion de flux existants (Europe de l'Est, Chine).</p> |
| <p>Q06.- How can Intelligent Transport Systems in all modes, as a part of the TEN-T, enhance the functioning of the transport system? How can investment in Galileo and EGNOS be translated into efficiency gains and optimum balancing of transport demand? How can ITS contribute to the development of a multi-modal TEN-T? How can existing opportunities within the framework of TEN-T funding be strengthened in order to best support the implementation of the ERTMS European deployment plan during the next period of the financial perspectives?</p> | <p>La Commission européenne a un rôle moteur dans le développement des nouvelles technologies, mais se pose toujours le problème d'accès aux financements des programmes européens (7ème PCRD) pour les laboratoires de taille moyenne et les petites entreprises. Plusieurs outils existent mais il est nécessaire de les relier entre eux par un système de gestion globale (transports matières dangereuses...). L'émergence de la thématique « Sécurité » entraîne également le développement de nouveaux outils (Opérateur Economique Agréé, traçabilité, gestion des risques...). La France est en pointe sur les hubs informatiques portuaires (système AP+).</p> |
| <p>Q07.- Do shifting borderlines between infrastructure and vehicles or between infrastructure provision and the way it is used call for the concept of an (infrastructure) project of common interest to be widened? If so, how should this concept be defined?</p> | <p>No opinion</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q08.- Would a core network (bringing together a priority network approach as referred to in Q3 and a conceptual pillar as referred to in Q4) be "feasible" at Community level, and what would be its advantages and disadvantages? What methods should be applied for its conception? | No opinion |
| Q09.01- How can the financial needs of TEN-T as a whole - in the short, medium and long term - be established? | Les établissements financiers français maîtrisent l'ingénierie financière nécessaire au développement des infrastructures. Mais le modèle économique n'est pas toujours viable et le problème de la rentabilité est posé : exemple le shortsea. |
| Q09.02.- What form of financing - public or private, Community or national - best suits what aspects of TEN-T development? | |
| Q10.01- What assistance can be given to Member States to help them fund and deliver projects under their responsibility? | |
| Q10.02.- Should private sector involvement in infrastructure delivery be further encouraged? If so, how? | |
| Q11.01- What are the strengths and weaknesses of existing Community financial instruments used for TEN-T? (TEN-T budget, Cohesion Fund, ERDF, EIB loans)? | |
| Q11.02.- Is there a need for new financial instruments (including "innovative" instruments)? | No opinion |
| Q12.01.- How could existing non-financial instruments be improved? | |
| Q12.02.- Which new non-financial instruments should be introduced, for what reason? | |
| Please classify your proposal above: | |
| Q13.- Which of the options for developing the TEN-T is the most suitable, and for what reason? | |
| Q14.- Would you like to make any further comment or proposal? | |