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	788795111432312009
Invitation Ref.	
Status	N

Background of the respondent	
Country of residence	Belgium
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)	Bruxelles capitale
TEN-T components/major infrastructure most involved with (you can choose more than one)	Intelligent Transport Systems
Name:	POLIS
Name of your organisation	POLIS
Type of involvement in the TEN-T/major transport infrastructure matters	NGO Other

Green Paper Questionnaire	
Q01.- Should the Commission's assessment of TEN-T development to date cover any other factors?	The two key messages coming out of this completed questionnaire are the need to reinforce the interface between the TEN-T and urban/local transport networks (referred to as a 'nodes' in the green paper) and the strengthening of the multi-modal dimension in TEN-T. It is considered that the Commission's assessment fails to acknowledge the shortcomings of TEN-T policy since the green paper only fleetingly touches upon these two items; yet they are vital to the improved functioning of the TEN-T network and to tackle climate change. They would also allow to better take into consideration the demands for territorial cohesion. Giving due attention to the interface would help improve journey efficiency (a lorry driver can spend as much time entering and leaving a city as it does on the TEN-T leg of a cross-border journey!) and equally importantly help address the issue of rebalancing modes in order to achieve a more sustainable mobility. These are key objectives of transport policy at all levels (local, national and EU). For this purpose, the Commission's assessment should
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	A priority network is better than the current priority projects as it brings in the main sources of transport demand (major intermodal hubs such as airports and ports and nodes including urban interfaces). This should help reinforce the intermodal dimension of TEN T, at least if the priority networks are conceived as fully intermodal integrated networks, and not as poorly interconnected modal networks (e.g. priority road network, priority rail network).
Please allocate the arguments described above to the following categories: - Advantages of priority network approach (compared to priority projects approach)	
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)	Social, economic and geographical cohesion Environmental protection / climate change Intelligent transport systems and new technologies (infrastructure and vehicles) Inter-modal connections Connections between long distance transport and local transport / urban nodes
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 flexible approach, as proposed with the 'conceptual pillar' is appropriate since it would allow giving a greater importance to policy objectives and criteria for the development of the TEN-T network. It is therefore likely to lead to more efficient investments accelerating the achievement of the European transport policy.
Please allocate the advantages, as described above, to the following categories:	
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?	Polis: The interface with urban areas is important for all three sectors from both a spatial and ITS perspective. Airports are typically located on the outskirts of major cities and air travelers often use urban public transport or roads for onward journeys. Public authorities are encouraging the use of waterways for the goods movement in order to take the strain off road and rail, and urban authorities are increasingly taking advantage of rivers and canals to transport people. With regards to freight transport, the impact of heavy goods vehicles on congestion, accidents and air pollution in urban areas is inducing many urban authorities to introduce measures to control the access of such vehicles, through measures such as restricted access, environmental zones and sustainable urban delivery concepts, including consolidation centers, electric vans, etc. As states by a European region, the Trans-European transport network is only of value if it is relevant to local communities and businesses. For this reason among others, and to ensure the smooth and sustainable flow
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?	Polis: ITS is an important enabler in the transport field in terms of contributing to seamless journeys for people and goods and optimising network capacity. From a TEN-T perspective, ITS plays a significant role when moving from the long distance network onto the local network (it is worth remembering that most journeys start and end in urban areas). Real-time, multi-modal information can enable long-distance travelers to make informed choices about the mode and timing of any onward journey. Multi-modal journey planners are becoming common place in cities and at national level but these are essentially local/national by nature and do not lend themselves well to cross-border journey planning. For what concerns non-road based transport, integrated inter-modal ticketing can further contribute to the seamless journey. ITS is also a great enabler for freight vehicles in terms of providing information on the traffic situation (through an on-board unit or VMS) and guidance on the most appropriate routes to take, which is especially important in urban areas, while it would also allow to gather data on freight movements
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.	The concept of the TEN-T network should certainly cover non-physical infrastructure such as communications between vehicles and infrastructures. It should however preserve the principle according to which the infrastructure managers are responsible for communications, services and traffic on this infrastructure.
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 core network would be feasible and would reinforce the consideration given to European policy objectives, allowing to define them unambiguously. It would allow to use a much needed set of objectively defined criteria for the identification of the core network.
To which categories would you allocate the main advantages?	
To which categories would you allocate possible disadvantages?	
What basis could be used for its conception?	
Which are the three aspects that need to be given highest priority in the core network development method?	
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)?	YES
Please explain	The coordination between the various European financial instruments could be reinforced if a stronger consideration is given to European policy objectives. When appropriate, a better connection between the TEN-Ts and the local network, reinforcing intermodality and the integration between the long distance and local networks should be considered as important criteria for the allocation of structural funds in the framework of the European regional policy. Given the current situation in the financial markets, any initiative to reiterate and innovate infrastructure financing is welcomed. Issues related to Stability Pact agreements and major infrastructure investments could be further looked into.
Q12.01.- How could existing non-financial instruments be improved?	

Q12.02.- Which new non-financial instruments should be introduced, for what reason?	Polis encourages strengthening the exchange of good practices and benchmarking between projects. Polis is available to support these activities, in particular on the issue of the integration between local and long distance transport networks. In general, the Commission could use the TEN-T in a more strategic way to research, test, demonstrate and deploy measures that are originating from other EC strategies and action plans (e.g. internalisation of external costs, road safety, ITS, fuels and energy). The TEN-T could provide the geographical backbone for implementing new EU standards (eg, infrastructure safety) and other initiatives, which should spill over in time into neighbouring (non TEN-T) infrastructure and networks. Initiatives such as Field Operational Tests for ITS or pilot projects for integrated ticketing/charging scheme adapted to the TEN-T could fit into this, providing they do not disadvantage the TENs network at the advantage of other networks.
Please classify your proposal above:	Sharing of best practices Benchmarking Other
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?	