

## Background of the respondent

Country of residence (compulsory)

France

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>) (compulsory)

ÎLE DE FRANCE

TEN-T components/major infrastructure most involved with (you can choose more than one) (compulsory)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Road                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Inland waterways                         |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High-Speed Rail   | <input type="checkbox"/> Maritime                                 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conventional Rail | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Co-modal                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air                          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Intelligent Transport Systems |

Name: (compulsory)

Berger

 Name of your organisation (compulsory)

Alstom

 Type of Organization (compulsory)

- Public
- Private

 Type of involvement in the TEN-T/major transport infrastructure matters (compulsory)

- Infrastructure manager
- Commercial transport service provider
- User for business purposes
- Industry

- Infrastructure financing
- Consultancy / research
- Business representation
- NGO
- Other

## Green Paper Questionnaire

Q01.- Should the Commission's assessment of TEN-T development to date cover any other factors? (optional)

Yes, it should cover the following factors:

- Congestion vs traffic provision
- Rail/road/air: CO2 differential
- Efficiency of the logistic chain (including modal nodes)
- Noise nuisance

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? (optional)

- YES - the comprehensive network should be maintained
- NO - The comprehensive network should be abandoned
- No opinion

 Please justify your choice by answering the sub-questions of Q02 as comprehensive as possible (compulsory)

We are in favour of a comprehensive network because:

- It allows an access to networks of third countries for better rail competitiveness
- And an homogenisation of the European network (in density & quality) to maximise trans-european efficiency

 Please allocate the advantages as described above to the following categories: (optional)

- Important for access function and territorial cohesion
- Reference basis for structural policy objectives

- Basis for a broad range of transport policy objectives (Help: rail interoperability, road safety etc.)
- Large scope for identification of projects of common interest
- Broad reflection of national infrastructure planning
- Others (please specify above)

 Please allocate the disadvantages, as described above, to the following categories: (optional)

- Truly European planning is hardly possible
- Community instruments are insufficient to allow full network implementation
- Community added value of many projects of common interest is questionable
- Community action lacks visibility
- Others (please specify above)

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? (optional)

- YES - The priority network approach would be better than a priority projects approach
- NO - the priority network approach is not recommended; the current priority projects' approach should be further pursued
- No opinion

 Please justify your choice by answering the sub-questions of Q03 as comprehensive as possible (compulsory)

The advantages of a priority network approach, compared to a priority projects one, are the following:

- Global coherence, instead of isolated projects
- Coherent investment planning
- Homogeneity along the priority network

 Please allocate the arguments described above to the following categories:  
- Advantages of priority network approach (compared to priority projects approach) (optional)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> More rational planning approach at European level, including the possibility for coverage of network benefits | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Better focussed projects of common interest  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Possibility for coverage of all modes  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Coherence between instruments (financial and other) necessary for full network implementation and planning objectives as challenge for future TEN-T policy |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Possibility for coverage of nodes and inter-modal connections   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Enhanced possibilities for "environmental optimisation"  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Possibility of better reflection of major   | <input type="checkbox"/> Others (please specify above)   |

 Disadvantages of priority network approach (compared to priority projects approach) (optional)

- Difficult to plan such a network for reasons of planning methodology
- Difficult to combine with sovereign national responsibility for infrastructure development
- May become too large in scope to ensure sufficient Community funding; thus not much change compared to comprehensive network approach
- Others (please specify above)

 Elements that should be taken into account in the development of a priority network approach (planning method) (optional)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Traffic flows   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interoperability and infrastructure standards                                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Social, economic and geographical cohesion   | <input type="checkbox"/> Minimum capacity requirements   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Environmental protection / climate change                                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Intelligent transport systems and new technologies (infrastructure and vehicles) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Due coverage of all transport modes  | <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation capacities   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Inter-modal connections   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Harmonized cost-benefit analysis   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Connections between long distance transport and local transport / urban nodes | <input type="checkbox"/> Others (please specify above)   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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? (optional)

- YES - a flexible approach would be appropriate
- NO - the proposed flexible approach would be inappropriate for the TEN-T
- No opinion

 Please justify your choice by answering the sub-questions of Q04 as comprehensive as possible (compulsory)

A conceptual pillar would allow the EU to integrate all the different aspects of the EU transport policy, and not only the infrastructures. This pillar would bring additional coherence and a comprehensive approach for the TEN-T policy.

 Please allocate the advantages, as described above, to the following categories: (optional)

- 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
- Others (please specify above)

 Please allocate the disadvantages, as described above, to the following categories: (optional)

- Entails uncertainties regarding the specific definition of projects of common interest (consequently uncertainties in terms of cost, needs and possibilities for Community support)
- Others (please specify above)

 How could the "conceptual pillar" be best reflected in planning at Community level? (optional)

- Through objectives and criteria set out in the TEN-T Guidelines
- Through links to relevant Community legislation
- Through Comitology measures 
- Other

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? (optional)

Alstom believes the European Commission should optimise intermodality on a cost-benefit analysis:  
 The costs can be: initial investment, nuisances, life cycle cost analysis  
 and the benefits: efficiency (speed, modal transfers), cost per passenger or per tonne

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? (optional)

ERTMS contributes to the development of priority networks (no stop at the borders). It could lead to an improved competitiveness for rail transport, as well as infrastructures and rolling stock. ERTMS should be mandatory on priority projects (or network).

Concerning Intelligent Transport Systems, their development will have a positive impact on intermodal communication means. Alstom particularly believes that intelligent transport systems have a role to play in urban mobility: the intermodal connections between urban transport, rail transport, airports etc, for increased competitiveness and mobility.

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? (optional)

- YES - the current concept of the infrastructure project of common interest should be widened.
- NO - there is no need for widening the current concept of the infrastructure project of common interest.
- No opinion

 Please justify your choice, and describe how such a widened concept should be defined. (compulsory)

Interoperability is very important in the definition of a project of common interest. For instance, homologation of signalling or rolling stock is often an obstacle to enter a Member States (administrative burden)

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? (optional)

- YES - a core network approach would be feasible.
- NO - a core network approach would not be feasible
- No opinion

Given the above, we consider that a "core network" will be useful and feasible.

- 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)
- Other

- 
- Difficulties regarding an appropriate planning method
  - High degree of complexity and diversity of projects involved, requiring a too broad range of means for implementation
  - Too much flexibility
  - Too many network development priorities
  - Other

- 
- Best practice from national methods (please specify above)
  - Available research (please specify above)
  - New research (please specify above)
  - Expert groups
  - Other (please specify above)

- 
- Infrastructure needs in relation to the Lisbon strategy
  - Climate change and other environmental objectives
  - Common transport policy needs
  - Member States' infrastructure master plans
  - Financing capacities
  - Most efficient infrastructure use
  - 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? (optional)

The European Commission should conduct a study to assess the needs and costs, and seek adapted solutions.

Q09.02.- What form of financing - public or private, Community or national - best suits what aspects of TEN-T development? (optional)

Public private partnership is not the best solution.  
Projects must be bankable.  
National and EU contribution is crucial.

Q10.01- What assistance can be given to Member States to help them fund and deliver projects under their responsibility? (optional)

Using more turnkey projects would ease the implementation of more efficient TEN-T projects. Increasing projects size is also necessary to ensure economies of scale.

Q10.02.- Should private sector involvement in infrastructure delivery be further encouraged? If so, how? (optional)

Yes, through PPPs, as one solution among others (but not the panacea).

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)? (optional)

TEN-T budget does not cover the needs of the projects: few priority projects has been achieved yet and the financial means are not sufficient. On the other hand, Members States are not bridging the financial gap to complete the projects.

The other financing instruments do not support enough the TEN-T modal priority to

Q11.02.- Is there a need for new financial instruments (including "innovative" instruments)? (optional)



YES



NO



No opinion



Please explain (compulsory)

Innovative instruments could be:  
- Earmarking of revenues dedicated to TEN-T from ETS  
- Eurovignette revenues to TEN-T

Q12.01.- How could existing non-financial instruments be improved? (optional)

Non financial instruments could be improved by providing assistance to Member States to implement projects financed by the EU.  
It could also be possible to evaluate the economic and environmental impact of rail vs air/road in the evaluation of projects.

Q12.02.- Which new non-financial instruments should be introduced, for what reason? (optional)

Shorter or stricter deadlines for the projects could be introduced, as well as additional incentives to reach the objectives.  
The EU and Member States should also take into account a broader scope for the projects (turnkey).

Please classify your proposal above: (optional)

Corridor coordination

The Open Method of Coordination, as one of the instrument of the Lisbon strategy, provides a new framework for co-operation between the Member States, whose national policies can thus directed towards certain common objectives. Under this intergovernmental method, Member States are evaluated by one another with the Commission's role being limited to surveillance.  Open method of coordination 

Sharing of best practices

Benchmarking

Setting of investment targets

Other

Q13.- Which of the options for developing the TEN-T is the most suitable, and for what reason? (optional)

Option A: Dual layer: comprehensive network and priority projects (current structure)

Option B: Single layer: priority projects - possibly in extended form

Option C: Dual layer: comprehensive network and "core network"

No opinion

 Please justify (compulsory)

Option C is the most suitable one, as it will lead to focused actions on critical points, and it will create multimodal mega corridors.

Q14.- Would you like to make any further comment or proposal? (optional)

We would favor an "option D" which would be: Priority projects integrated to a priority network.

