

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

Background of the respondent	
Country of residence	Italy
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)	Emila Romagna
TEN-T components/major infrastructure most involved with (you can choose more than one)	Conventional Rail Air
Name:	Anthony F. Camilleri

Green Paper Questionnaire	
Q01.- Should the Commission's assessment of TEN-T development to date cover any other factors?	It should include an assessment of barriers (especially political rather than technical) put in place by member states.
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	Only a comprehensive network can guarantee full ease of intermodal transport between member states.
Please allocate the advantages as described above to the following categories:	Important for access function and territorial cohesion Basis for a broad range of transport policy objectives (Help: rail interoperability, road safety etc.)
Please allocate the disadvantages, as described above, to the following categories:	Truly European planning is hardly possible
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?	No opinion
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 opinion
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?	Passenger transport needs to be given special attention, especially since it is often harder to make economically viable. the concept of cross-border public service obligation routes needs to be introduced.

<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>No opinion</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>Q09.02. - What form of financing - public or private, Community or national - best suits what aspects of TEN-T development?</p>	<p>The infrastructure/network itself should be primarily publicly funded. Veichles running on the network, and maintenance should be financed by privat operators. Community funding should be used to assist funding wherever the economic rationale for investement on a solely national level is insufficient.</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>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>No opinion</p>
<p>Q14. - Would you like to make any further comment or proposal?</p>	<p>As a trans-national commuter, my main priorities are that frequent cross border links by land (preferably rail), should be available between all adjacent EU member states. In a number of states this is far from the case (e.g. Italy-Slovenia border - linked by only one train per day). Thus, more effort needs to be addressed to creating the political will for these links in addition to providing the funding.</p>