

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

Meta Informations	
Creation date	04-05-2009
Last update date	14-05-2009
User name	null
Case Number	802534705281312409
Invitation Ref.	
Status	N

Background of the respondent	
Country of residence	Portugal
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 <a href="http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2007:039:0001:0037:EN:PDF">http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2007:039:0001:0037:EN:PDF</a> )	PT171
TEN-T components/major infrastructure most involved with (you can choose more than one)	Road Inland waterways High-Speed Rail Maritime Conventional Rail Co-modal Air Intelligent Transport Systems
Name:	Caminhos de Ferro Portugueses, EP
Name of your organisation	Caminhos de Ferro Portugueses, EP
Type of involvement in the TEN-T/major transport infrastructure matters	Commercial transport service provider

Green Paper Questionnaire	
Q01.- Should the Commission's assessment of TEN-T development to date cover any other factors?	Yes, part of the TEN-T's success is supported by the European legislation, as well as by the European financial tools. Therefore the European Commission would have create a more efficient tools to monitor the expected gains of the projects linking the European funding to the real gains generated by the project and to the contribute from this in the improvement of the European global network
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 current model did not allow to obtain the maximum value of the investments made so far i.e. the real gains and the increase of the European value added were not always visible. It has the disadvantage of not optimizing the network effect at the European level nor reassure a full execution of the project's deadlines, once that it is very dependent on the commitment level of the member states. An increased coordination is necessary by the Commission both in the legislative level and in the support level to the member states in the achievement of the projects.
Please allocate the advantages as described above to the following categories:	

Please allocate the disadvantages, as described above, to the following categories:	
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	It allows an approach of common interests of the projects catalysing the policy and the network effects. It's the easiest way to combine national with European planning. Assures the optimization of the combination of all the modes of transport and the use of intelligent systems allowing a more efficient use of the infrastructure.
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)	
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	A flexible approach is appropriate and necessary. It allows the incorporation in the TEN-T of relevant aspects of the infrastructure and adjusted to the market changes.
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?	
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?	Concerning the transport logistics of freight, we fully support a solution of the green corridors mentioned in the Green Paper considering the ambitious goals defined by the European Union and by the railway sector regarding the reduction of the green house gas emissions. Therefore the financial support to the road sector must only be granted if they are a part of a multimodal project. Regarding the passenger transport the construction of support infrastructures to the stations (car parks, etc) must be promoted.

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 implementation of intelligent transports brings real benefits by raising in a significant way the safety allowing at the same time economies of scale promoting the rationalization of means. The use of ITS contributes in a decisive way to the success of the TEN-T both in passenger and freight activities. Public transport, not being able to do the door to door without freight breakdown (which is one the strengths of the individual roads transports) requires integrated an intelligent information system in real time about the services which the client intends to use or is using on his journey and that allows answers to his specific needs (how to know at what time his transport arrives, how is the journey going, if it has links to the next journey, if there are problems and which alternatives exist). It also requires integrated systems of payment of those services that make the process simple and transparent for example without the need to purchase individual transports tickets for each stage of his journey. The use of these systems in the operative part allows the links between the several mo
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 infrastructure must be established in the terms of the number 3 of the annex i.e. by a global network and by a base network therefore reflecting the need of interaction between infrastructure vehicles and the market where they are integrated. However if a project of major interests not initially considerate comes up this must be integrated.
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	Considering that is necessary to have a quality network any new projects that have this attributes must be considered. Therefore the adaptability factor must always be secured. A change of circumstances like, for example, in the present situation must be a reason for a revision of the proposed budget.
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?	The definition of the funding needs must be objective and clear and the European institutions must define the more suitable model having account of the circumstances and the execution deadline of the project, for example, a search of alternative funding sources not burdening the European budget and allowing revenues to the member states. The application of revenues generated by the use of infrastructures by the road transports (Eurovignette) can be one of the tools to apply. It will also be fundamental that members states consider the possibility that in some projects include the participation of private capital.
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)?	
Q12.01.- How could existing non-financial instruments be improved?	The European Union must provide more financial funding to support state members to apply the TEN-T policy, for example, applying part of other financial resources. As referred above the internalization of external costs and its taxation is also a possible finance funding source.
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?	Option C: Dual layer: comprehensive network and "core network"
Please justify	We think that option free may bring an increase to the TEN-T because it allows an interaction between the several projects. A division between "geographic pillar" that includes a "priority network" may promote multimodality of transport and also a connection between the several member states besides it may increase the major European projects (ERTMS, Galileo, ITS, Development of European Railway Corridors, among others) and "conceptual pillar" that will allow a better and objective rationalization.
Q14.- Would you like to make any further comment or proposal?	