

## Response to questionnaire

From:

Name: Sarah Jane Fox

Email: sjfox1@tvalmansa.es

Country of residence (compulsory) Spain (ES 421)

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) (ES 421)

Your region is: (you can choose more than one) (compulsory)  
Rural, mountainous & central

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

*Road: air: intelligent transport systems*

You are a: (compulsory)

Citizen



Activity status (compulsory)

Student

## Towards a Better Integrated Trans-European Transport Network at the Service of the Common Transport Policy

---

 Main purpose of TEN-T use (you can choose more than one) (compulsory)

Leisure related

 I use TEN-T components / major transport infrastructure links and nodes: (compulsory)

- Frequently (daily to weekly)
- Occasionally (weekly to monthly)
- Rarely (a few times a year)

 I undertake trips across several Member States (compulsory)

- Frequently (daily to weekly)
- Occasionally (weekly to monthly)
- Rarely (a few times a year)

 My most frequent trips on TEN-T / major transport infrastructure links have the following average length (compulsory)

- Up to 100 km
- Up to 200 km
- Up to 500 km
- Up to 1000 km
- More than 1000 km

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

Yes; emphasis should be accorded within this development to maintaining, enforcement practices and safety & security of these networks in a bid to ensure more equality, comfort and protection to users. Potentially this

## Towards a Better Integrated Trans-European Transport Network at the Service of the Common Transport Policy

---

should be developed with the CTP.

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 comprehensive roots should be built on and developed.

### Advantages

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

### Disadvantages

Truly European planning is hardly possible

Community instruments are insufficient to allow full network implementation

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

This would be a natural development of the current approach but allow for the possibility of developing the TEN-T policy with the policy of the CTP. It would lead to more efficiency and harmonisation of both of these policy objectives and build upon the achievements of each.

### Advantages

- More rational planning approach at European level, including the possibility for coverage of network benefits
- Better focused projects of common interest
- Possibility for coverage of all modes

### Disadvantages

- 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

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

- Traffic flows
- Interoperability and infrastructure standards
- Due coverage of all transport modes
- 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'

## Towards a Better Integrated Trans-European Transport Network at the Service of the Common Transport Policy

---

individual infrastructure investment decisions? What further advantages and disadvantages could it have, and how could it best be reflected in planning at Community level?

The conceptual pillar approach should be further developed or redefined so as to bring some of the Transport policy objectives and TEN-T policies closer together. Individual Member States infrastructure linked to the TEN-T's policy would potentially stand to benefit users by more Community intervention.

### Advantages

- 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)

### Disadvantages

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

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?

Part 1 - No comment

Part 2 - Yes, there should be recognition given to the individual requirements of freight and passenger needs.

Part 3 - Continuing on from above, investment and incentive should be given to stimulating various modes of transport, particularly those that are under used. An equal quality of service, especially in respect of safety and security should be further developed across all modes.

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?

I believe one issue that should be tackled is to address the benefits of such systems to all users of the TEN-T's networks. At the moment a degree of scepticism surrounding such intelligent systems exist and the positive functions need to be more clearly explained in order to capitalize on such investments. The average user is unfamiliar with such terms and benefits of many ITS's. Potentially the scope for using such ITS's is still in its infancy and therefore there is a need for more private sector interest.

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, I believe this is a factor that should be given a high degree of priority so as to promote equality in all Member States to all mode users.

The example used was in respect of filling stations - *'New energy forms in transport may well call for infrastructure to be adapted.'* A comparison of filling stations in the UK and Spain that cater for LPG users aids to demonstrate this point adequately.

## Towards a Better Integrated Trans-European Transport Network at the Service of the Common Transport Policy

---

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, it should be feasible if it is widely accepted that this is the most viable of approaches. However, feasible does not equate to transferable.

Such a core network would stand to facilitate the objectives of both the transport policy and TEN-T policy more effectively.

Conception of such would call for a concerted effort from a variety of basis - such as all those listed.

Which are the three aspects that need to be given highest priority in the core network development method?

- Common transport policy needs
- 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?

And

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

I believe there is a need for various combinations of measures to meet short, medium and long-term projects. Likewise this will no doubt necessitate the use of public, private, and combined public-private arrangements, projects and partnerships together with Community or national funding suited to the specific needs and/or development of TEN-T. Therefore, in summary, I doubt if it is possible to accord one source of funding to a general overview.

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

I believe there is a need to further explore private sector involvement in infrastructure delivery and research initiatives.

Likewise there should be more transparency nationally and from an EU level to minimise the potential changes in alignment because of reasons associated with public acceptance in certain initiatives etc.

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

As per Q.09 and Q10.

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)?

There is a need to obtain the best value for money at all stages. There is also the need to reduce duplication on occasions.

As per question 10.01, transparency needs to be increased so as to prevent the realignment of projects and initiatives being undertaken for instance due to public acceptance.

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

- Yes.

I believe there is a need to reassess the present approach and so new financial instruments may well transpire.

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

Definitely by better coordination at all stages. I believe a combination of methods is needed including OMC with benchmarking and best practices.

## Towards a Better Integrated Trans-European Transport Network at the Service of the Common Transport Policy

---

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

None should be ruled out; potentially all could be suited to a different purpose.

- OMC
- Sharing of best practices
- Benchmarking

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

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

Should result in the most efficient and effective system, interconnecting the transport policy and the TEN-T, although also (probably) being the most difficult to coordinate.

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

- No