

For 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	987345059541611909
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)	Brussels
TEN-T components/major infrastructure most involved with (you can choose more than one)	Inland waterways Co-modal Intelligent Transport Systems
Name:	Karin De Schepper
Name of your organisation	Inland Navigation Europe
Register ID of your organisation	1811573195-25
Type of involvement	Other

Green Paper Questionnaire	
Q01.- Should the Commission's assessment of TEN-T development to date cover any other factors?	Despite modest attempts at change, the TEN-T strategy today, on the one hand reflects a transport vision of 30 years ago (modal development, prestige projects and traditional vehicles and energy consumption) and on the other hand reflects a financial gap between investment aspirations and capital attracted. We see the development of inland waterway transport and its infrastructure in integrating strategies. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The first layer of strategy is to link transport modalities and nodes into an effective co-modal network for better movement of goods and people. Transport is a means to a competitive and free-flowing economy, not an end in itself. • The second layer of strategy is to integrate the trans-European networks (energy, information and transport) as well as other fields where synergies can generate win-wins. A smart vision on co-modal transport infrastructure can act as a multiplier for regional and inter-regional development, since swift effective accessibility, mobility and communication are the cornerstones of prosperous and competitive societies. For waterways, the Seine-Scheldt project a
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>The so-called comprehensive network has led to an improvement of some access infrastructure, but the result has been too much of a patchwork of national and single modal projects which as a sum is far from a comprehensive transportation network. This means the comprehensive network should not be abandoned, but the scope should change. As for inland waterways, the network is not so dense, so every waterway is of importance within the network and requires an optimal connection to the overall co-modal and trans-European network in the definition of sound criteria. This also means abandoning the current modal outline plans and traffic management systems and replacing them with regional cross-modal maps with interconnective planning including intelligent transport systems. Finally, criteria should reflect the purpose and strategy of the future TEN: to enhance a strong, free-flowing and sustainable economy, prioritising integration, innovation deployment and multi-disciplinary approaches which support this objective. Remaining focused on modal fragmentation is not the answer to creating a strong and sustainable i</p>
<p>Please allocate the advantages as described above to the following categories:</p>	<p>Important for access function and territorial cohesion</p>
<p>Please allocate the disadvantages, as described above, to the following categories:</p>	<p>Truly European planning is hardly possible Community added value of many projects of common interest is questionable</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>The current priority projects are too modally oriented and part of the old transport policy. A network approach can enable us to build upon demand across the modes while taking other criteria such as sustainability and innovation deployment into account. The urban dimension should not be too easily dismissed or looked at in isolation. With more than 70% of EU citizens living in cities and negative externalities from transport getting worse, it is crucial to connect inter-regional networks with urban networks via interchange transport hubs. Rather than building brand new infrastructure in areas where there is no space, it makes more sense to take away bottlenecks that hamper the development of integrated transportation systems and to optimise and share existing capacity at a lower cost. For example, a lot of cities are served by waterways which can carry consolidated freight flows into inland ports from where clean vehicles can transport them to the last mile. This means innovative logistics organisation concepts can be strongly encouraged (or killed) by infrastructure policy enabling cutting costs and greenh</p>

<p>Please allocate the arguments described above to the following categories:
 - 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 Possibility for coverage of all modes Coherence between instruments (financial and other) necessary for full network implementation and planning objectives as challenge for future TEN-T policy Possibility for coverage of nodes and inter-modal connections Enhanced possibilities for "environmental optimisation" 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 Social, economic and geographical cohesion Environmental protection / climate change Intelligent transport systems and new technologies (infrastructure and vehicles) Due coverage of all transport modes Inter-modal connections Connections between long distance transport and local transport / urban nodes</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>It is obvious there should be stronger link between the strategic demands of a strong and free-flowing economy (which is not the same thing as short term business demands) and the EU's overall strategic transportation policy objectives on the one hand and infrastructure development on the other, but this will not immediately reverse the current investment gap. Underinvestment is the Achilles' heel in today's funding of transportation infrastructure. Member States still have to provide the majority of the resources. In INE's view, there are some routes to address the funding headache: § to map the added value of prioritising interconnective solutions (hubs and their connections, covering equally the interconnection of modal intelligent transport systems) which are cheaper than creating brand new infrastructures. § to link infrastructure investment decisions to a better deployment of sustainable transportation, increasing the efficiency rate of investments and reducing negative externalities. § transport projects and corridors should become more than just transport projects. Providing synergies with c</p>
<p>Please allocate the advantages, as described above, to the following categories:</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>It may be necessary to separate passengers and freight traffic in nodal points according to each specific case, but it is always important to focus on citizens' acceptance with regard to freight projects. Nowadays, residents in port cities and along waterways often feel that they carry an unfair environmental burden. They respond by placing increasing political and environmental pressure on local and regional authorities to slow down or restrict the increase in port and waterway traffic in spite of the positive role it plays in their local economy. For instance, thanks to the port of Brussels, 700,000 truck movements are annually avoided and EUR27.5 million external costs, while providing 12,000 local jobs. Permanently handing over key strategic sites to leisure and residential property development may undermine the creation of future co-modal networks and lead to more environmental headaches as citizens are also consumers, relying on the seamless provision of goods for housing and living. The port of Paris leads the way in elaborating and-and projects rather than or-or proje</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 same co-modal philosophy explicated above has to be taken with regards to intelligent systems such as river information services (RIS). Today several single modal intelligent traffic and transport systems are created and deployed but they do not yet talk to each other or do not plan to talk to each other. Integration of modal transport systems through flexible interfaces/nodes should apply both to physical and intelligence infrastructure. From an internal market perspective, it is of paramount importance to create interfaces so that intelligent transport systems like river information services (RIS) can operate swiftly across modes. Compatible cross-modal intelligent transport systems will boost multi-modal transport since they can simplify administrative procedures and raise the service level of the infrastructure. Real-time and forecasted information also provides more visibility in the transportation process. This enables logistics planners to optimise, to plan better, to go paperless, to consolidate freight flows by sharing which can result in shared warehousing and transporta</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>

Please justify your choice, and describe how such a widened concept should be defined.	<p>Infrastructure is a carrier, not a means in and of itself. The upgrade of infrastructure in the first place and the building of new infrastructure in the second should be evaluated by how much it helps to deploy and multiply as a carrier desirable innovation in transportation and beyond in terms of sustainability and competitiveness. The key to success remains free-flowing transport becoming clean. In practice, that means that intelligent transport systems can optimise existing infrastructure, but a long-lasting bottleneck such as a low bridge or a badly equipped port can hold up free-flowing and sustainable traffic in an entire corridor, and the costs of doing nothing may be much higher than the costs of lifting the bottleneck. The introduction of ever larger vehicles should also be evaluated against the higher cost impact they have on transport infrastructure.</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?	YES - a core network approach would be feasible.
Please justify your choice by answering the sub-questions of Q08 as comprehensive as possible	The core network should finally abandon the modal approach and become truly co-modal to serve a free-flowing and sustainable internal market. Such a policy approach is not necessarily in favour of or against a particular transportation mode but facilitates an optimal modal mix. It enhances the integration of inland waterways with road and rail through ports and terminals including interfacing between modal intelligent transport systems, all of them together forming a core co-modal network.
To which categories would you allocate the main advantages?	<p>Strengthening the European planning approach</p> <p>Capturing benefits of a network</p> <p>Integrating transport infrastructure and transport policy developments in the best possible way</p> <p>Establishing a strong basis for concentration of Community support (financial and non-financial)</p>
To which categories would you allocate possible disadvantages?	
What basis could be used for its conception?	<p>Expert groups</p> <p>Other (please specify above)</p>
Which are the three aspects that need to be given highest priority in the core network development method?	<p>Infrastructure needs in relation to the Lisbon strategy</p> <p>Climate change and other environmental objectives</p> <p>Common transport policy needs</p> <p>Financing capacities</p> <p>Most efficient infrastructure use</p> <p>Technological challenges and opportunities of the future (transport and energy, infrastructure and vehicle)</p>

Q09.01- How can the financial needs of TEN-T as a whole - in the short, medium and long term - be established?	Reply covers 9-10! There is a question that should be asked before these. Why is it so difficult to raise money for transportation projects and how can we close the financing gap? We believe that a regional development perspective and a multi-disciplinary approach should be the paradigm for future network infrastructure development in Europe as it triggers more opportunities for both European and regional economies, enables a better coordination of funding and delivers more public and private return, since more stakeholders will benefit and even provide relationships from which other businesses might evolve. These are important factors to facilitate attracting the necessary public and private for investment. Investment cases with win-win visions and with clear returns for a wider range of public and private investors in other areas than transport have shown that attracting capital is also a matter of facilitating cross-cutting knowledge, cooperation and decision-making.
Q09.02.- What form of financing - public or private, Community or national - best suits what aspects of TEN-T development?	Combinations or public according to the case
Q10.01- What assistance can be given to Member States to help them fund and deliver projects under their responsibility?	- access to knowledge and networking - financial one-stop-shop
Q10.02.- Should private sector involvement in infrastructure delivery be further encouraged? If so, how?	yes
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)?	There is a range of options to strengthen existing Community financial instruments - One-stop-shop for financing - Better coordination between different funds, which makes even more sense when a single modal approach will be replaced by a multi-disciplinary approach - Bundle knowledge (EPEC) One should be careful with harmonised cost-benefit analyses. Bundling knowledge and resources should not be equal to one-size-fits- -all. Different projects yield different type of benefits which could be overlooked with a harmonised type of cost-benefit analysis. Take the example of waterway projects which often go beyond transport.
Q11.02.- Is there a need for new financial instruments (including "innovative" instruments)?	

Q12.01.- How could existing non-financial instruments be improved?	<p>We see an enlarged role for the European coordinators: § to take a cross-modal role to enhance integrated supply chains and serve the internal market rather than a single modal approach § to enhance free-flowing corridors by taking stock of the top priority bottlenecks (including administrative and regulatory) which pose most burdens on businesses and taking them away in coordination with involved authorities and users to create exemplary corridors; this will serve as best practices and incentives for other bottleneck plagued projects. § to integrate cross-modal corridors where possible with energy and information networks, as well as others fields where synergies can generate win-wins bringing actors together. Such a multi-disciplinary approach triggers more opportunities for both European and regional economies, enabling better coordination of funding and delivering more public and private return, since more stakeholders will benefit and even provide relationships from which other businesses might evolve. We see this flexible and bottom-up approach involving relevant stakeholders as more straightforward</p>
Q12.02.- Which new non-financial instruments should be introduced, for what reason?	
Please classify your proposal above:	Corridor coordination
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	<p>The final option should enable the Union to realise its objective of a free flowing and sustainable economy. At a public level, it is imperative to go beyond the purely business or modal oriented approach, because the internal and external costs of transportation are ultimately passed on to the consumers, ie the tax payers. That is why public authorities have to shape a long-term vision on infrastructure, so it can service a competitive economy in a societally responsible manner. This means looking forward how major challenges like globalisation, global warming, mobility, energy resources etc. can be addressed by designing and adapting infrastructure as an optimal carrier for regional development and the deployment and multiplication of desirable innovative distribution patterns to sustain a green and competitive economy. The instruments must follow these objectives. Thanks to the spare capacity, we see huge opportunities to integrate inland waterways with a limited amount of resources from taxpayers' money into co-modal supply chains yielding significant societal return (mobility, en</p>
Q14.- Would you like to make any further comment or proposal?	