

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

Background of the respondent	
Country of residence	Italy
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)	lazio
TEN-T components/major infrastructure most involved with (you can choose more than one)	Road High-Speed Rail Conventional Rail Air
Name:	gerardo marletto
Name of your organisation	associazione per una mobilità urbana alternativa
Register ID of your organisation	21092911393-73
Type of involvement	NGO

Green Paper Questionnaire	
Q01.- Should the Commission's assessment of TEN-T development to date cover any other factors?	TEN-T should become part of the European transport and environment policy (instead of being a policy in itself) Bettering the sustainability of urban and regional transport systems should be the main aim of such a policy More specifically, a new TEN-T approach should lead to a new infrastructure moratorium to reduce long haul transport demand and its negative impacts on the environment (In particular for environmentally sensitive areas (e.g. the Alps, the Mediterranean Sea, etc.) - decrease the financemnt to mega-projects and increase those to urban and local integrated (transport+environment) initiatives
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?	No opinion
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

<p>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?</p>	<p>New infrastructure moratorium to reduce long-haul transport demand and its negative impacts on the environment In particular for environmentally sensitive areas (e.g. the Alps, the Mediterranean Sea, etc.)</p>
<p>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?</p>	
<p>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?</p>	<p>No opinion</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>No opinion</p>
<p>Q09.01- How can the financial needs of TEN-T as a whole - in the short, medium and long term - be established?</p>	<p>Shift from mega-projects designed for long-haul transport, to small projects, in particular for those dedicated to urban, local and regional transport</p>
<p>Q09.02.- What form of financing - public or private, Community or national - best suits what aspects of TEN-T development?</p>	<p>A multi-level approach: European and National financing, monitoring and evaluation; local planning and implementation No private financing</p>
<p>Q10.01- What assistance can be given to Member States to help them fund and deliver projects under their responsibility?</p>	
<p>Q10.02.- Should private sector involvement in infrastructure delivery be further encouraged? If so, how?</p>	<p>No. It should be reduced because it alters democratic decisions about transport planning</p>
<p>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)?</p>	
<p>Q11.02.- Is there a need for new financial instruments (including "innovative" instruments)?</p>	<p>No opinion</p>
<p>Q12.01.- How could existing non-financial instruments be improved?</p>	
<p>Q12.02.- Which new non-financial instruments should be introduced, for what reason?</p>	<p>Guidelines about urban and local integrated (transport+environment)planning (in particular for ex-ante, in-itinere and ex-post evaluation) Benchmarking and diffusion of best-practices on urban and local integrated (transport+environment)planning</p>

Please classify your proposal above:

Sharing of best practices
Benchmarking
Other

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?