

## 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	585946942061912009
Invitation Ref.	
Status	N

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 <a href="http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2007:039:0001:0037:EN:PDF">http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2007:039:0001:0037:EN:PDF</a> )	ITE 32
TEN-T components/major infrastructure most involved with (you can choose more than one)	Road High-Speed Rail Maritime Conventional Rail Co-modal Air
Name:	Mario Valentino Romeri

Green Paper Questionnaire	
Q01.- Should the Commission's assessment of TEN-T development to date cover any other factors?	Yes. In the TEN-T Green Paper (COM 2009-44 final), the future possible use of hydrogen and fuel cells in road transport is completely forgotten. For example see: "In the longer term, hydrogen technologies could be very helpful for aviation and shipping" (COM 2009-44 final en p. 12).
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	- The EUR 400 billion invested so far in a network that was established by Decision of the EU Parliament and the Council in 1996, and amended in 2004, has helped to complete a large number of projects of common interest. There is however still a long way to go to implement the initial plans fully (because the intrinsic long-term nature of the projects involved and the considerable delays in the completion of many projects). The individual European citizen may not however always find it easy to see the results of the overall TEN-T policy or the European added value generated by the contributions from the Community (almost a third of the total). Objectives have been rather broad, which has made it impossible to meet them in full with the instruments available. In certain respects, they may also have lacked specificity, which has made it difficult to focus action and generate effective impacts and visible results.

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 Reference basis for structural policy objectives Broad reflection of national infrastructure planning
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	A priority network should ensure continuity of the current priority projects and build on them where justifiable. Climate change objectives should first and foremost guide any approach towards the development of a possible priority network.
Please allocate the arguments described above to the following categories:   - Advantages of priority network approach (compared to priority projects approach)	More rational planning approach at European level, including the possibility for coverage of network benefits 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 Enhanced possibilities for "environmental optimisation"
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)	Environmental protection / climate change Intelligent transport systems and new technologies (infrastructure and vehicles)
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	I think that a flexible approach could facilitate a new EC Clean Transport Policy focused on electric (plug-in) and hydrogen and fuel cell vehicles.
Please allocate the advantages, as described above, to the following categories:	Allows to promote measures that stimulate efficient infrastructure use along TEN-T axes through several Member States or at Europe-wide scale (e.g. measures that may involve infrastructure works of smaller scope and are not reflected in major projects' maps; may cover actions like Green corridors or rail freight corridors; ITS applications )
Please allocate the disadvantages, as described above, to the following categories:	
How could the "conceptual pillar" be best reflected in planning at Community level?	

<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>Q. What further aspects relating to different transport sectors / common transport policy issues should be given attention? A. As I've mentioned in Q4, in my opinion a new EC Clean Transport Policy focused on electric (plug-in) and hydrogen and fuel cell vehicles is necessary.</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>YES – the current concept of the infrastructure project of common interest should be widened.</p>
<p>Please justify your choice, and describe how such a widened concept should be defined.</p>	<p>In perspective of a new EC Clean Transport Policy focused on hydrogen and fuel cell vehicles it is necessary to think in an integrate approach between the vehicle system and the refueling system (hydrogen module in a multi-fuel refueling station or hydrogen refueling station). In a perspective of an integrate approach regarding hydrogen and fuel cell vehicles and hydrogen refueling system I observe that with a relatively small EC investment it should be possible to move the present situation beyond the classical "chicken and eggs paradox". In fact, based on the recent US credit provided by the "American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009" for the alternative fuel vehicle refueling property (sec. 1123: USD 200,000 in the case of any such property which relates to hydrogen), it is possible to determine the amount of EC fund necessary to build an integrated European hydrogen refueling station network. Based on the 95,700 km of the EU road links (of which 20,000 km that remain to be built or substantially upgraded, see COM 2009-44 final en p. 5) and the realization of one h</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>YES – a core network approach would be feasible.</p>
<p>Please justify your choice by answering the sub-questions of Q08 as comprehensive as possible</p>	<p>A new EC Clean Transport Policy focused on electric (plug-in) and hydrogen and fuel cell vehicles needs to a core network approach.</p>
<p>To which categories would you allocate the main advantages?</p>	<p>Strengthening the European planning approach Capturing benefits of a network Strengthening the network planning methodology</p>

To which categories would you allocate possible disadvantages?	
What basis could be used for its conception?	Best practice from national methods (please specify above)
Which are the three aspects that need to be given highest priority in the core network development method?	Common transport policy needs Technological challenges and opportunities of the future (transport and energy, infrastructure and vehicle) Economic sustainability
Q09.01- How can the financial needs of TEN-T as a whole - in the short, medium and long term - be established?	
Q09.02.- What form of financing - public or private, Community or national - best suits what aspects of TEN-T development?	
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)?	
Q11.02.- Is there a need for new financial instruments (including "innovative" instruments)?	
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?	
Q14.- Would you like to make any further comment or proposal?	