



South Transdanubian Region

South Transdanubian Regional Development Council and its Agency

Position paper

of the South Transdanubian Regional Development Council and its Agency

on the Green Book on TEN-T policy review

Preamble

The South Transdanubian Regional Development Council (Council) and the South Transdanubian Regional Development Agency (Agency) welcome and highly appreciate the debate initiated by the European Commission Directorate General for Energy and Transport so as to have a broad based overview of the Trans-European Transport (TEN-T) policy

The position paper to be introduced briefly summarizes the standpoint of the Council and the Agency related to the questions regarded as relevant ones (from the Council's and the Agency's point of view) of the Green Book targeting the review of the TEN-T policy.

As a last section of the position paper the Council and the Agency draws the attention of the European Commission Directorate General for Energy and Transport to one potential priority project which is in accordance with the main objectives of the TEN-T policy review, whilst also supports the better exploitation of the single European market and the accession intentions of the European Union (EU).

The questions of the Green Book and the answers given

Question N° 2: What further arguments are there for or against maintaining the comprehensive network, and how could the respective disadvantages of each approach be overcome?

The comprehensive network allows the more objective coverage of the European territory reflecting to the needs of the single European market. The comprehensive network is less influenced by the lobbies of professional policies than the network built up exclusively from priority projects, as this latter network could be regarded as a „wish-list”. The comprehensive network also provides for the fulfilment of the general principles of territorial cohesion and equal opportunities. Based on the arguments listed we propose the use of the comprehensive network approach in the future TEN-t policy.



H-7621 Pécs, Mária u. 3.

Tel.: 36 72 513 760 Fax: 36 72 513 768

Question N° 3: Would this kind of priority network approach be better than the current priority projects approach? If not, why not and what are the particular strengths of the latter? If so, what (further) benefits could it bring, and how should it be developed?

The building rocks of the priority network approach are the priority projects arranged into a continuous network in order to exploit the benefits offered by the network. Consequently the priority network approach is – by having the network benefits – better than the approach exclusively building on the priority projects without linkages providing the continuity. Though the priority network approach means a step ahead only in case the network does not build on priority projects. The priority projects reflect such transport development needs which concentrate the resources for development, hence in themselves contribute to the strengthening of the existing bottlenecks of the transport network and to the increase the burden put on the environment. In case of priority projects, connecting them into a continuous network does not automatically mean the full scale solution needed for permeability and intermodality of the network.

Question N° 5: How can the different aspects outlined above be best taken into account within the overall concept of future TEN-T development? What further aspects should be taken into consideration?

The different aspects introduced should be built into the principles of the general concept of the future TEN-T development. This provides for the more uniform and integrated network approach, allows the involvement of the intermodal connections into the network. As for further aspects to be considered we propose that the creation of the network approach should be more closely linked to the regional development policy, and to the social and sectoral aspects related to the existence of transport connections. Alike, the cross border developments connecting the member states should be more emphasized, with a special attention paid to the accession potential of the network (i.e. involving into the network the potential EU member states of the future).

Question N° 8: Would this kind of core network be "feasible" at Community level, and what would be its advantages and disadvantages? What methods should be applied for its conception?

Yes, the „core network” is feasible on community level, as it consist of a „geographical pillar” (which is the „priority network approach” with increased content) and a „conceptual pillar”. The role of the „conceptual pillar” lays in enabling the flexible composition of the future TEN-T network in terms of time (i.e. the value of the projects competing with each other inside the network modifies according to the social and entrepreneurial needs as the time passes by). The benefits and disadvantages of the „core network” are identical with the ones indicated on the last page of the Green Paper.

Priority project proposal of the Council and the Agency related to the TEN-T policy overview

For the better exploitation of the single European market, strengthening of the accession potential of the TEN-T network, and providing for support of the north-south axes we propose the following project of European relevance:

connecting the Ploče (Cro) and Budapest (Hu) section of the **V/c corridor** and the **Gdańsk** (Pl) and **Žilina** (Sk) section of the **VI. corridor with** the still missing link which provides the direct linkage of the north and south sections by establishing the **Žilina (Sk) and Budapest (Hu) section**.

The proposed connection supports the achievement of the objectives of the Single European Transport Development Strategy, the unification of the V/C and VI transport corridors and as a result the creation of the north-south Baltic-Adriatic axe connecting five (three EU and two non-EU) states.

Place and date: Pécs, 23rd April 2009.

FEIGLI Ferenc
president
South Transdanubian Regional
Development
Council

MÁRTON György
managing director
South Transdanubian Regional
Development
Agency

