

## 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	801801517472312009
Invitation Ref.	
Status	N

Background of the respondent	
Country of residence	United Kingdom
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> )	Berkshire
TEN-T components/major infrastructure most involved with (you can choose more than one)	Air
Name:	John Turton

Green Paper Questionnaire	
Q01. - Should the Commission's assessment of TEN-T development to date cover any other factors?	no
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 priority network approach is most likely to yield the most environmentally effective solutions
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.) 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	A priority network approach is likely to yield the overall most effective environmental solutions
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 Possibility for coverage of all modes Possibility for coverage of nodes and inter-modal connections Enhanced possibilities for "environmental optimisation" Possibility of better reflection of major European traffic flows and Cohesion objectives

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)	Traffic flows Interoperability and infrastructure standards Social, economic and geographical cohesion Minimum capacity requirements Environmental protection / climate change Due coverage of all transport modes Implementation capacities Inter-modal connections Harmonized cost-benefit analysis Connections between long distance transport and local transport / urban nodes Links to third countries
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 benefits are likely to accrue from the most effective use of the overall funding available compared to a fragmented approach
Please allocate the advantages, as described above, to the following categories:	Allows to incorporate into TEN-T infrastructure-relevant aspects of a wide range of common transport policy measures on a "rolling basis" 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 ) Allows for flexibility where necessary to facilitate the development of commercially viable services
Please allocate the disadvantages, as described above, to the following categories:	
How could the "conceptual pillar" be best reflected in planning at Community level?	Through objectives and criteria set out in the TEN-T Guidelines
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?	Through comprehensive modelling of future capacity needs.

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?	Intelligent transport systems are unlikely to have a significant impact within the timescales identified due to technology limitations
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.
Please justify your choice, and describe how such a widened concept should be defined.	A core network is likely to provide the most effective overall solution
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?	YES - a core network approach would be feasible.
Please justify your choice by answering the sub-questions of Q08 as comprehensive as possible	A solution is feasible through adequate prioritised negotiation
To which categories would you allocate the main advantages?	Strengthening the European planning approach Capturing benefits of a network Strengthening the network planning methodology Combining the "traditional" infrastructure approach (essentially priority network) and a more flexible "conceptual" approach Integrating transport infrastructure and transport policy developments in the best possible way Establishing a strong basis for concentration of Community support (financial and non-financial)
To which categories would you allocate possible disadvantages?	
What basis could be used for its conception?	Best practice from national methods (please specify above) New research (please specify above) Expert groups
Which are the three aspects that need to be given highest priority in the core network development method?	Infrastructure needs in relation to the Lisbon strategy Climate change and other environmental objectives Technological challenges and opportunities of the future (transport and energy, infrastructure and vehicle)
Q09.01- How can the financial needs of TEN-T as a whole - in the short, medium and long term - be established?	Through centrally-managed infrastructure funding
Q09.02.- What form of financing - public or private, Community or national - best suits what aspects of TEN-T development?	Public funding through a managed international programme
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?	Yes, through innovative public/private financing schemes
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)?	YES
Please explain	It appears to me that there is a need for new thinking, outside of existing 'boxes', to take account of the need for a managed programme across international borders
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:	Corridor coordination Setting of investment targets
Q13.- Which of the options for developing the TEN-T is the most suitable, and for what reason?	Option A: Dual layer: comprehensive network and priority projects (current structure)
Please justify	A mixture of networks and projects need to receive adequate attention
Q14.- Would you like to make any further comment or proposal?	