

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	452242135101812009
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)	BE1
TEN-T components/major infrastructure most involved with (you can choose more than one)	Road Intelligent Transport Systems
Name:	The European Union Road Federation (ERF) - The Brussel Programme Center of the International Road Federation (IRF BPC)
Name of your organisation	The European Union Road Federation (ERF) - The Brussel Programme Center of the International Road Federation (IRF BPC)
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?	Improve the integration of the peripheral regions in the TEN-T network. Development of accessibility indicators and conduct "before and after" assessment. A better support of the public-private partnership in TEN-T construction and management. Implementing sustainability assessment of TEN-t projects (covering social, economic and environmental issues).
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	The comprehensive network should be maintained in order to improve the accessibility achieved during the last years and it should be extended to the "new" Member States (cohesion).
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
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

Please justify your choice by answering the sub-questions of Q03 as comprehensive as possible	This will allow to have an integral approach of the TEN-T network projects.
Please allocate the arguments described above to the following categories: - Advantages of priority network approach (compared to priority projects approach)	
Disadvantages of priority network approach (compared to priority projects approach)	
Elements that should be taken into account in the development of a priority network approach (planning method)	
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	The service providers' point of view should be taken into account. The Member States and the European Institutions should value other visions which usually are not considered by the private sector.
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:	Entails uncertainties regarding the specific definition of projects of common interest (consequently uncertainties in terms of cost, needs and possibilities for Community support)
How could the "conceptual pillar" be best reflected in planning at Community level?	
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?	Distinguishing infrastructure for goods and passengers would provide most efficient transport and, consequently, would be very positive for the European economic development. Congested areas should be particularly addressed.
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?	In the field of road sector, real and potential improvements of ITS are enormous. There are several research programmes in the FP6 and FP7 which deeply analyse them. Regarding Galileo, we suggest to consider research projects, such as "GIROADS" and "GINA" where possible applications and advantages of Galileo in the road sector are covered, including pilot tests.
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?	YES - the current concept of the infrastructure project of common interest should be widened.

<p>Please justify your choice, and describe how such a widened concept should be defined.</p>	<p>It would be better to have some flexibility in the definition of the infrastructure projects in order to have the possibility to include new developments in the future.</p>
<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?</p>	<p>No opinion</p>
<p>Q09.01- How can the financial needs of TEN-T as a whole - in the short, medium and long term - be established?</p>	<p>It is early to identify the financial needs of TEN-T at this stage, as there are several key factors to be identified before (e.g. the issues covered in this questionnaire). Taking into account the considerable delays in the development of the TEN-T, the lack of sufficient European investment and the different point of views of single Member States, it is of paramount importance to consider the public-private partnership.</p>
<p>Q09.02. - What form of financing - public or private, Community or national - best suits what aspects of TEN-T development?</p>	
<p>Q10.01- What assistance can be given to Member States to help them fund and deliver projects under their responsibility?</p>	<p>Facilitating the access to information about possibilities of public-private partnership and best practices. Making projects more attractive to the private sector, mitigating the risks and providing them with coverage or including PPP in low risk projects. Providing incentives to private participation at national and local level.</p>
<p>Q10.02. - Should private sector involvement in infrastructure delivery be further encouraged? If so, how?</p>	
<p>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)?</p>	
<p>Q11.02.- Is there a need for new financial instruments (including "innovative" instruments)?</p>	
<p>Q12.01.- How could existing non-financial instruments be improved?</p>	
<p>Q12.02.- Which new non-financial instruments should be introduced, for what reason?</p>	
<p>Please classify your proposal above:</p>	
<p>Q13.- Which of the options for developing the TEN-T is the most suitable, and for what reason?</p>	
<p>Q14.- Would you like to make any further comment or proposal?</p>	