

Dr. Christian Piehler  
Program Director Transport  
German Aerospace Center (DLR)  
Member of the Helmholtz Association  
Porz-Wahnheide  
Linder Hoehe  
D-51147 Koeln

Koeln, 28 April 2009

## **Statement of the DLR on the Green Paper TEN-T**

**Q1** Should the Commission's assessment of TEN-T development to date cover any other factors?

**A1** From a European point of view, the Commission's assessment seems appropriate. But it could be helpful to the further improvement of TEN-T policy to take more into account suitable answers to conflicts resulting from specific member states' interests and overall European aspects.

**Q2** What further arguments are there for or against maintaining the comprehensive network, and how could the respective disadvantages of each approach be overcome?

**A2** The comprehensive network layer of TEN-T should be maintained. From the perspective of effectiveness and efficiency of the transport system there seems to be no alternative. Nevertheless, much more efforts are needed to convince member states and stakeholders of their support to the overall approach.

**Q3** Would this kind of priority network approach be better than the current priority projects approach? If not, why not and what are the particular strengths of the latter? If so, what (further) benefits could it bring, and how should it be developed?

**A3** The concept of a 'priority network' appears clearly superior to the current priority projects and should therefore replace them. Priority networks additionally allow for a more systemic approach and accordingly a much better exploitation of the high potential of traffic nodes. Furthermore, full interoperability, target-agreed capacity standards, and increased climate adaptation capabilities underpin the superiority of the priority network approach.

**Q4** Would this kind of flexible approach to identifying projects of common interest 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?

**A4** The proposed flexible approach which integrates common planning and individual implementation definitely is desirable and maybe the only way to tackle the huge challenges of the complex transport system. Nevertheless, as already mentioned in answers 1 and 2, much more efforts are needed to convince member states and stakeholders of their support to an overall approach.

**Q5** How can the different aspects outlined above be best taken into account within the overall concept of future TEN-T development? What further aspects should be taken into consideration?

**A5** If the above mentioned approaches were used then the different aspects outlined would be an integral part of it. A further aspect to be considered could be railway stations. If they were recognized much more as inter-modal traffic nodes than now, they could much better contribute to the overall efficiency of the transport system. Like airports and ports, railway stations play a key role in inter- and co-modal transport, especially logistics. Beyond that, the improvement of inter- and co-modality in the transport system could be an important aspect to be taken into account.

**Q6** How can ITS, 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?

**A6** There is undoubtedly a tremendous potential for ITS and GNSS in the transport system. This includes, but is not limited to: improved safety and security; optimized traffic flows; capacity increases on railways, roads, airspace, and waterways; less fuel consumption and environmental impact; positioning, identification, monitoring, navigation, and surveillance of air, sea, and terrestrial vehicles; charging of infrastructure use; freight transport management; freight tracking in all transport modes etc. ITS is an essential part of any future-oriented approach. Consequently the further development and implementation of ITS and GNSS should have high priority. Concerning the implementation of ERTMS it seems of utmost importance to ensure cross-border interoperability of ETCS systems, sub-systems, and components through independent laboratories.

**Q7** 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?

**A7** ITS surely is the key factor for being able to shift the borderlines between infrastructure and vehicles. Therefore, coupled infrastructure-vehicle projects of common interest aiming for the improvement of ITS seem to be a suitable way to reach the challenging goals in this field. DLR is just building up such kind of an infrastructure (AIM – Application platform for Integrated Mobility). The whole city of Braunschweig (245,000 inhabitants) will be used as a test field for inner-, inter-, and co-modal ITS technologies and services for terrestrial vehicles. The site will be open to partners from all over Europe.

**Q8** Would this kind of core network be "feasible" at Community level, and what would be its advantages and disadvantages? What methods should be applied for its conception?

**A8** Such a core network approach in fact could contribute to find the best solution from a European perspective. Nevertheless, it would cause a huge financial and research effort and would also considerably affect member states' interests. Also at this point, much more efforts are needed to convince member states and stakeholders of their support to the overall approach.

**Q9** How can the financial needs of TEN-T as a whole – in the short, medium and long term – be established? What form of financing – public or private, Community or national – best suits what aspects of TEN-T development?

**A9** In order to take care for the success of the measures taken and member states' interests at the same time the only way seems to commonly agree on strategic goals and approaches and to realize implementation under individual responsibility in a coordinated manner.

**Q10** What assistance can be given to Member States to help them fund and deliver projects under their responsibility? Should private sector involvement in infrastructure delivery be further encouraged? If so, how?

**A10** Private sector investment may be a viable way limited to those cases with a real market. But in the Galileo case, for example, even this approach does not work: no market for satellite producers and operators, but a market for users, who do not invest in the infrastructure.

**Q11** What are the strengths and weaknesses of existing Community financial instruments, and are new ones needed (including "innovative" instruments)? How could the combined use of funds from various Community resources be streamlined to support TEN-T implementation?

**A11** Strength: fixed budget for 7 years; Weaknesses: no flexibility, only marginal coordination inside the EC between various funding lines; The use of commonly agreed strategic lines would also help for internal coordination within the EC.

**Q12** How could existing non-financial instruments be improved and what new ones might be introduced?

**A12** The new instrument of a TEN-T strategy board which includes all relevant stakeholders (EC involved DG's, member states, users, industry, research, ...) would allow for a commonly elaborated and agreed strategy.

**Q13** Which of these options is the most suitable, and for what reason?

**A13** Option 3 stands for a coordinated approach. But the above mentioned aspects of common definition and individual implementation should be considered.