

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	376590659071712009
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)	NUTS1(Region Brussels-Representing EU territory)
TEN-T components/major infrastructure most involved with (you can choose more than one)	Road Inland waterways Maritime Co-modal Air Intelligent Transport Systems
Name:	The American Chamber of Commerce (AmCham EU)
Name of your organisation	The American Chamber of Commerce to the EU (AmCham EU)
Register ID of your organisation	5265780509-97
Type of involvement	Industry

Green Paper Questionnaire	
Q01.- Should the Commission's assessment of TEN-T development to date cover any other factors?	Through free movement of people, goods and services, mobility is essential for Europe's prosperity. AmCham EU welcomes the Green Paper "TEN-T: a policy review - Towards a better integrated Transeuropean transport network at the service of the common transport policy". A fundamental review of TEN-T policy to invest in the interconnection of national networks, develop infrastructure and improve transport efficiency is of the utmost importance to leverage growth and jobs in an economic recession. All transport modes (air, sea, road, rail, inland waterway transport...) and the supporting infrastructure are essential for the smooth functioning of the European internal market. Transport helps create jobs and grow productivity and is essential for worker mobility and market connectivity between European member states and the rest of the world. Investing in infrastructure is beneficial to the economy in the short term. It also creates the conditions to make Europe more competitive in the long term. Increasing transport infrastructure capacity encourages progress , creates more jobs, increases trade
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?
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?
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?
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?
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?
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?
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)?	
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?	
Q14.- Would you like to make any further comment or proposal?	The AmCham EU position on the revision of the TEN-T will be sent to you separately via e-mail (to the TREN-B1-GREEN-PAPER-TEN-T@ec.europa.eu)