

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	387071225421212009
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)	Etelä-Suomi
TEN-T components/major infrastructure most involved with (you can choose more than one)	Road High-Speed Rail Maritime Conventional Rail Co-modal Air Intelligent Transport Systems
Name:	Leo Stranius
Name of your organisation	Uudenmaan ympäristönsuojelupiiri
Register ID of your organisation	3182630432-54
Type of involvement	NGO

Green Paper Questionnaire	
Q01.- Should the Commission's assessment of TEN-T development to date cover any other factors?	"Green infrastructure": ecological networks and corridors should be taken better into account when planning TEN-T. There have been many conflicts between TEN-T and NATURA 2000 network. These problems could be avoided by better planning in advance.
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 - The comprehensive network should be abandoned
Please justify your choice by answering the sub-questions of Q02 as comprehensive as possible	We have to reduce freight transportation in the future because of environmental problems and climate change. It's better to invest more on environmental friendly local sustainable transportation like public transport and information technology instead of building new motor highways or airports.
Please allocate the disadvantages, as described above, to the following categories:	Community added value of many projects of common interest is questionable Community action lacks visibility
Please allocate the advantages, as described above, to the following categories:	Basis for a broad range of transport policy objectives (Help: rail interoperability, road safety etc.)

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	The priority network approach could help to get rid off the current projects which are often priority for local governments. This could help to put more priority on the EU level approach and environmental issues.
Please allocate the arguments described above to the following categories: - Advantages of priority network approach (compared to priority projects approach)	More rational planning approach at European level, including the possibility for coverage of network benefits Better focussed projects of common interest Enhanced possibilities for "environmental optimisation"
Disadvantages of priority network approach (compared to priority projects approach)	Difficult to combine with sovereign national responsibility for infrastructure development
Elements that should be taken into account in the development of a priority network approach (planning method)	Environmental protection / climate change
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?	No opinion
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 biggest future challenge in the transport sector is to reduce CO2-emissions. So how we can find the way to move carbon neutral society in transport sector. In the future we have to develop more possibilities to arrange conferences and meetings via internet.
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?	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.	Concept of transportation is more service in the future than just highways.

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	Compatibility with the green infrastructure (NATURA 2000 network) and climate challenges + other environmental policy targets need to take into account better.
To which categories would you allocate the main advantages?	Strengthening the European planning approach
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?	Climate change and other environmental objectives 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?	
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)?	Too much money to unsustainable transportation investments (infrastructure) instead of environmental protection, climate change, education, telecommunication etc.
Q11.02.- Is there a need for new financial instruments (including "innovative" instruments)?	No opinion
Q12.01.- How could existing non-financial instruments be improved?	More environmental regulation.
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?	