

Integrated Trans-European Transport Network at the Service of the Common

Meta Informations	
Creation date	29-04-2009
Last update date	
User name	null
Case Number	138419216551211909
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 <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> )	F118, SE1, SE2, DK0, DE1, DE2, DE3, DE4, DE5, DE6, DE7, DE8, DE9, DEA, DEB, DEC, DED, DEF, DEG, NL, BE, LU0, UKH, UKI, UKJ, FR1, FR2, FR3, FR4, FR7, FR81, FR82, ITC1, ITC2, ITC3, ES24, ES5, ES61, ES62 and Switzerland.
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:	Mr. Joan Amoros (Secretary General of FERRMED Association)
Name of your organisation	FERRMED
Register ID of your organisation	91066821549-63
Type of involvement	NGO

Green Paper Questionnaire	
Q01.- Should the Commission's assessment of TEN-T development to date cover any other factors?	The general policy of TEN-T is good but unfortunately the priority projects related are not European oriented enough, and also in some cases are more political oriented than business oriented. Reaching the Lisbon Strategy targets requires a big effort in order to increase the EU competitiveness. Logistics costs are a key issue. A good rail network with preference for freight "fully business oriented" (freight traffic basically is determined by EU Locomotive Economic Regions and main ports in Northern Sea, Baltic Sea and Western Mediterranean Sea), is a key issue in order to improve the EU competitiveness and to solve the environmental challenges. In the network we require a set of common standards so as to facilitate freight transportation all over the EU. We strongly insist on the progressive implementation of FERRMED standards, which are ambitious but "possible". In summary, we would like that the TEN-T policy include the factors that determine the rail freight network fully business oriented and that the FERRMED standards be progressively implemented all over the EU
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

<p>Please justify your choice by answering the sub-questions of Q02 as comprehensive as possible</p>	<p>FERRMED considers that the first issue is to define a European oriented reticular and polycentric Priority Network in all transportation systems: railway, road, inland waterways, motorways of the sea and aerial. This network has to link the EU Locomotive Economic Regions (EULERS), and the main ports and airports. As we said in Q01, this priority network should be fully business oriented, particularly in the case of freight transportation. The comprehensive or base network could be maintained at national level and only the projects related to transborder links considered at EU level.</p>
<p>Please allocate the advantages as described above to the following categories:</p>	<p>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</p>
<p>Please allocate the disadvantages, as described above, to the following categories:</p>	
<p>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?</p>	<p>YES - The priority network approach would be better than a priority projects approach</p>
<p>Please justify your choice by answering the sub-questions of Q03 as comprehensive as possible</p>	<p>Priority network approach (business oriented) is much better than only priority project approach, because it is clear that the second one is basically the addition of national priority projects. European cohesion and competitiveness need a powerful priority transportation network, reticular and polycentric, linking the EULERS and the main ports and airports with European vision. Then FERRMED clearly is of the opinion that network approach is the best solution. As we said in Q02, the priority projects should be concentrated in the European priority network and only in some transborder links concerning the comprehensive or basic network. The best solution would be that all the EU Priority Network be defined by EC (and even the investments directly made by the EC). The national and regional governments could be only in charge of the basic network at country level.</p>
<p>Please allocate the arguments described above to the following categories: &lt;br&gt; - Advantages of priority network approach (compared to priority projects approach)</p>	<p>More rational planning approach at European level, including the possibility for coverage of network benefits Better focussed projects of common interest Coherence between instruments (financial and other) necessary for full network implementation and planning objectives as challenge for future TEN-T policy Possibility of better reflection of major European traffic flows and Cohesion objectives</p>
<p>Disadvantages of priority network approach (compared to priority projects approach)</p>	

<p>Elements that should be taken into account in the development of a priority network approach (planning method)</p>	<p>Traffic flows  Interoperability and infrastructure standards  Social, economic and geographical cohesion  Minimum capacity requirements  Environmental protection / climate change  Intelligent transport systems and new technologies (infrastructure and vehicles)  Due coverage of all transport modes  Inter-modal connections  Harmonized cost-benefit analysis  Connections between long distance transport and local transport / urban nodes  Links to third countries</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>YES - a flexible approach would be appropriate</p>
<p>Please justify your choice by answering the sub-questions of Q04 as comprehensive as possible</p>	<p>As we said in Q03, FERRMED considers that the EU Priority Network has to be decided (and even financed and managed) by the EC. The "conceptual pillar" approach (looking for projects of EU members of common interest and optimizing the use of existing infrastructure), could be a good measure to go forward on the way of FERRMED proposal.</p>
<p>Please allocate the advantages, as described above, to the following categories:</p>	<p>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 )  Allows for flexibility where necessary to facilitate the development of commercially viable services</p>
<p>Please allocate the disadvantages, as described above, to the following categories:</p>	
<p>How could the "conceptual pillar" be best reflected in planning at Community level?</p>	<p>Through objectives and criteria set out in the TEN-T Guidelines</p>

<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>As we have already said, the key issue is to have a EU priority network as a first level transportation system, and a comprehensive or basic network as a complementary one. Of course, as already stated, the EU Priority Network has to link all EULERS and main ports and airports all over the EU. FERRMED opinion is that freight requires different treatment than passenger transport. But this issue, in the case of railway, needs realistic solutions, starting with the optimization of the existing infrastructure capacity. The key matter is that in the main corridors two parallel lines (double track each) exist. One for fast moving trains (basically passenger and - in the future - light freight as well) and another one for conventional speed trains (mixing regional passenger trains with freight trains, but with some priority rules well balanced between freight and passengers). Additionally to these, in the surroundings of big cities, specific by-passes for freight trains will be necessary in order to avoid local/commuter passengers trains.</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>The implementation of ITS in all modes as a part of the TEN-T has many advantages, especially in transportation security and in capacity increase in main corridors. This issue is particularly important in the case of railway because capacity increase means at the same time transportation cost reduction. ITS system allows a tough and reliable tracking control of the transported goods in the complete intermodal chain of global added value / logistic chain. In the implementation of ITS, the combination of public and private sectors investment could be a good solution.</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>YES - the current concept of the infrastructure project of common interest should be widened.</p>
<p>Please justify your choice, and describe how such a widened concept should be defined.</p>	<p>In the case of rail freight transportation it is clear that rolling-stock needs to adopt new concepts in the design of locomotives and wagons. We need wagons that would be less noisy, lighter (in order to allow more load) and able for long and heavy trains. In that sense FERRMED has entrusted to key European research institutions and rolling stock manufacturing companies to develop the "FERRMED freight wagon concept" and the "FERRMED freight locomotive concept" compatible with FERRMED standards.</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>YES - a core network approach would be feasible.</p>
<p>Please justify your choice by answering the sub-questions of Q08 as comprehensive as possible</p>	<p>As we have already stated in the answers to previous questions, FERRMED would like to have a core network (EU Priority Network) as a result of a comprehensive transportation system improvement plan starting for the optimization of the existing network in the corridors selected as part of the EU Priority Network (market/business oriented).</p>

To which categories would you allocate the main advantages?	Strengthening the European planning approach Capturing benefits of a network Strengthening the network planning methodology Integrating transport infrastructure and transport policy developments in the best possible way
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?	Most efficient infrastructure use 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?	The financial needs of TEN-T, in short, medium and long term, have to be established according to a Priority Development Plan. This plan has to be the result of the analysis of different corridors/links in the EU transportation system fully business oriented (at least in the freight transportation). Fully business oriented means, to start with the projects which give the best profits from three points of view: economic, social and environmental.
Q09.02.- What form of financing - public or private, Community or national - best suits what aspects of TEN-T development?	If the EU Priority Network is established with European Union and with business oriented criteria, it will be very easy to identify the projects that could be of public and private co-financing (and even only private in some cases). The financing of the EU Priority Network should be at EC level with the corresponding agreements with the national governments involved.
Q10.01- What assistance can be given to Member States to help them fund and deliver projects under their responsibility?	FERRMED opinion is that EU Priority Network definition corresponds to the EC with previous consultation of national governments. National governments must be responsible for the base network. EC could help Member States in the basic network development establishing priority criteria to be taken into account: cohesion principle, transborder links and competitiveness improvement.
Q10.02. - Should private sector involvement in infrastructure delivery be further encouraged? If so, how?	Yes. The private sector involvement in infrastructure delivery has to be further encouraged considering the priority criteria established by business oriented procedures.
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)?	The key issue is that the EC Priority Network particularly for freight, has to clearly respond to business oriented criteria subjected to a harmonized and commonly recognized cost-benefit analysis that really represents "European added value".
Q11.02.- Is there a need for new financial instruments (including "innovative" instruments)?	YES
Please explain	Infrastructure financial instruments concentrated at EU level managed by EC (basically for the European Priority Network development).
Q12.01.- How could existing non-financial instruments be improved?	The coordination at corridor level has to be extended at "sub-network" level in the cases in which many corridors interlink in a specific zone.

<p>Q12.02.- Which new non-financial instruments should be introduced, for what reason?</p>	<p>In the case of the EC Priority Network development, it would probably be better to establish the coordination at sub-network level. This approach will be more efficient in order to solve all kinds of specific problems zone by zone in all the EU. A key issue is that these sub-network or zone levels be always of international character and big enough in order not to have more than 6 or 7 at EU level. We consider that our proposition of sub-network coordination level has to be approved and monitored at EC scale. Only in some specific cases could the "open method of coordination" be considered as a part of the sub-network coordination level. Interzonal coordination will be necessary, as well, with regard to interoperability and Priority Network interzonal links. Like it is already done in the air transport, transeuropean rail traffic needs a common management at EC level.</p>
<p>Please classify your proposal above:</p>	<p>Other</p>
<p>Q13.- Which of the options for developing the TEN-T is the most suitable, and for what reason?</p>	<p>Option C: Dual layer: comprehensive network and "core network"</p>
<p>Please justify</p>	<p>FERRMED opinion has been clearly stated in Q02. In fact it does not strickly correspond to any of the three options, but is quite close to Option 3.</p>
<p>Q14.- Would you like to make any further comment or proposal?</p>	<p>The results of the Supply/Demand, Technical and Socio-economic Global Study of rail freight FERRMED Great Axis Network, that will be finalized next September and presented in October 2009, could be of interest so as to distinguish between EU Priority Network and base network, as well as in order to define the best coordination procedure to develop the railway transportation system all over the EU. FERRMED remains at full disposal of the EC regarding all kind of information or comments related to this Global Study.</p>