

Integrated Trans-European Transport Network at the Service of the Common

Meta Informations	
Creation date	21-04-2009
Last update date	
User name	null
Case Number	547253102311411109
Invitation Ref.	
Status	N

Background of the respondent	
Country of residence	Finland
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)	F1181
TEN-T components/major infrastructure most involved with (you can choose more than one)	Road
Name:	Risto Kulmala
Name of your organisation	VTT
Type of Organization	Public
Type of involvement in the TEN-T/major transport infrastructure matters	Consultancy / research

Green Paper Questionnaire	
Q01.- Should the Commission's assessment of TEN-T development to date cover any other factors?	
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 European network is a necessity for the mobility of goods and people in Europe
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:	Community instruments are insufficient to allow full network implementation Community action lacks visibility
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?	NO - the priority network approach is not recommended; the current priority projects' approach should be further pursued
Please justify your choice by answering the sub-questions of Q03 as comprehensive as possible	Deployment is quicker and more efficient with the priority projects approach
Please allocate the arguments described above to the following categories: - Advantages of priority projects' approach	Has proven successful (with some exceptions) as principal part of the TEN-T policy Takes better account of expected financial constraints

Disadvantages of priority projects' approach	Limited possibility for coverage of all modes, nodes and inter-modal connections Piecemeal approach to European infrastructure planning
Elements that should be taken into account in the updating of the priority projects	Traffic flows Better coverage of traffic modes Others (please specify above)
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 approach would be flexible but it can not work unless the member states are willing in the first place to invest in the project in question.
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?	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?	The role of the public sector is much stronger in passenger transport, whereas in goods transport the public sector is just providing for the prerequisites of freight business, which is almost solely operated by the private sector. Hence, these should be treated separately in some cases
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?	The role of ITS especially in the road sector is undermined in the current TEN-T. ITS is a necessity, and the need and possibilities to operate the European network with the help of ITS should be recognised in the program. This offers a way to improve network performance in a sustainable manner.

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.	Vehicles are becoming part of the transport infrastructure with the ICT technologies embedded in them. The concept of infrastructure and related project should thereby be widened.
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	It is always useful to have a core network defined as we need to prioritise in any way. To use that as a sole basis for TEN-T is not feasible, though. To define it requires a lengthy consultation and validation round with several iterations.
To which categories would you allocate the main advantages?	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
To which categories would you allocate possible disadvantages?	High degree of complexity and diversity of projects involved, requiring a too broad range of means for implementation Too many network development priorities
What basis could be used for its conception?	Expert groups Other (please specify above)
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?	It should, yes.
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	New financial instruments should always be considered when such become feasible.
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?

No opinion

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

TEN-T is very much infrastructure oriented in a very conventional and old-fashioned way. It should direct more emphasis in accomplishing the TEN performance also with other tools and measures that the traditional infrastructure building measures.