

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

Meta Informations	
Creation date	14-04-2009
Last update date	
User name	null
Case Number	478357142111210409
Invitation Ref.	
Status	N

Background of the respondent	
Country of residence	Other State
Please, specify your country of residence	Switzerland
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)	Antwerp
TEN-T components/major infrastructure most involved with (you can choose more than one)	Road Air
Name:	Lex Schellings

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 opinion
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	Now there is no cross border coordination, e.g. "Betuwelijn, e.g. Autobahn crossing the border at Venlo, Autobahn crossing the border at Lille-Kortrijk, Orly-Ch.deGaulle connection, etcetera
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 Coherence between instruments (financial and other) necessary for full network implementation and planning objectives as challenge for future TEN-T policy Possibility of better reflection of major European traffic flows and Cohesion objectives
Disadvantages of priority network approach (compared to priority projects approach)	Difficult to combine with sovereign national responsibility for infrastructure development
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?	NO - the proposed flexible approach would be inappropriate for the TEN-T

<p>Please justify your choice by answering the sub-questions of Q04 as comprehensive as possible</p>	<p>We are europeans, do not give too much influence of the member states in this respect of common systems</p>
<p>Please allocate the disadvantages and possible advantages, as described above, to the following categories: - Disadvantages of a conceptual pillar</p>	
<p>Advantages of a conceptual pillar</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>groupage centers and their connections are very important</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>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>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>Q09.01- How can the financial needs of TEN-T as a whole - in the short, medium and long term - be established?</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>Q10.02.- Should private sector involvement in infrastructure delivery be further encouraged? If so, how?</p>	<p>No</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>YES</p>
<p>Please explain</p>	<p>Pay for use e.g. per KM/Weight</p>
<p>Q12.01.- How could existing non-financial instruments be improved?</p>	

Q12.02.- Which new non-financial instruments should be introduced, for what reason?	Per Project international dedicated cooperations of qualified companies
Please classify your proposal above:	Sharing of best practices
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?	