

Towards a Better Integrated Trans-European Transport Network at the Service of the Common Transport Policy

Meta Informations	
Creation date	30-04-2009
Last update date	
User name	null
Case Number	851239427341012009
Invitation Ref.	
Status	N

Background of the respondent	
Country of residence	Belgium
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)	Flanders
TEN-T components/major infrastructure most involved with (you can choose more than one)	Inland waterways Maritime
Name:	Lefevere Christian
Name of your organisation	European Maritime Pilots association
Type of involvement in the TEN-T/major transport infrastructure matters	NGO

Green Paper Questionnaire	
Q01.- Should the Commission's assessment of TEN-T development to date cover any other factors?	
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?	NO - The comprehensive network should be abandoned
Please justify your choice by answering the sub-questions of Q02 as comprehensive as possible	We see not much benefit in maintaining the comprehensive network approach. If preference is given to a priority network a transparent procedure should be used to avoid distortion of the market
Please allocate the disadvantages, as described above, to the following categories:	Community instruments are insufficient to allow full network implementation Community action lacks visibility
Please allocate the advantages, as described above, to the following categories:	Important for access function and territorial cohesion Large scope for identification of projects of common interest
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
Please justify your choice by answering the sub-questions of Q03 as comprehensive as possible	the priority network approach should be based on common agreements, clear goals and a transparent and objective planning methodology.
Please allocate the arguments described above to the following categories: - Advantages of priority network approach (compared to priority projects approach)	Better focussed projects of common interest Possibility for coverage of all modes

Disadvantages of priority network approach (compared to priority projects approach)	May become too large in scope to ensure sufficient Community funding; thus not much change compared to comprehensive network approach
Elements that should be taken into account in the development of a priority network approach (planning method)	Traffic flows Inter-modal connections Links to third countries
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?	YES - a flexible approach would be appropriate
Please justify your choice by answering the sub-questions of Q04 as comprehensive as possible	A too long decision making process should be avoided. React to economic changes and market developments, enlargement of the EU.
Please allocate the advantages, as described above, to the following categories:	Allows for flexibility where necessary to facilitate the development of commercially viable services
Please allocate the disadvantages, as described above, to the following categories:	
How could the "conceptual pillar" be best reflected in planning at Community level?	Through objectives and criteria set out in the TEN-T Guidelines
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?	for waterborne transport projects should be market driven and concentrate on missing links. Freight and passenger transport certainly requires different treatment. Growth of freight traffic more important than passenger traffic (except cruise vessels/tourism). Shortage of capacity.
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?	Maritime transport and pilot services use GPS already for a long time. Galileo will make transport and pilot services less dependent on one satellite system. However, any satellite system signal (also Galileo) can be easily jammed by terrorists. other positioning systems should remain in place. AIS and LRIT are only good for identification. Warning for too high expectations from technology announced.
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?	No opinion
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?	Higher contribution by all member states. Certainly not by introducing higher transport taxes which would give transportation in the EU a disadvantage over other world regions.
Q09.02.- What form of financing - public or private, Community or national - best suits what aspects of TEN-T development?	A combination of public and private financing offers better guarantees to market oriented investments. If there is a common EU interest in a project community financing is justified.
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)?	Budget too small.
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?	No opinion
Q14.- Would you like to make any further comment or proposal?	Too often National interests get priority over EU common interest