

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

Meta Informations	
Creation date	28-04-2009
Last update date	
User name	null
Case Number	833998847201011809
Invitation Ref.	
Status	N

Background of the respondent	
Country of residence	France
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)	France / Europe
TEN-T components/major infrastructure most involved with (you can choose more than one)	Road High-Speed Rail Conventional Rail Co-modal Intelligent Transport Systems
Name:	SNCF
Name of your organisation	Société Nationale des Chemins de Fer Français - SNCF
Register ID of your organisation	97914681026-14
Type of involvement	Industry

Green Paper Questionnaire	
Q01.- Should the Commission's assessment of TEN-T development to date cover any other factors?	Globally the SNCF shares the Commission's assessment (too broad dispersal of Community funding, lack of environmental criteria, etc.) but regrets the lack of "business orientation" in the identification of priority projects.
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
Please justify your choice by answering the sub-questions of Q02 as comprehensive as possible	The comprehensive network gives a wider approach of the European projects and preserves the benefits of the current TEN-T policy.
Please allocate the advantages as described above to the following categories:	
Please allocate the disadvantages, as described above, to the following categories:	
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

<p>Please justify your choice by answering the sub-questions of Q03 as comprehensive as possible</p>	<p>The priority network allows the concentration of Community funding on a reduced number of projects (this principle could allow to increase the co-financing rates to induce a real acceleration and a catalytic effect) and a better "business orientation". Moreover a clarification of the criterion and assessment methods, which takes into account essential additional criterion (environment, co-modality, modal shift, etc.) will offer a better visibility for the TEN-T policy. Comments: - The suppression of bottlenecks is a condition sine qua non to the development of efficient transport infrastructures in Europe. Every bottleneck (even not situated on the priority network) will affect the fluidity of the traffics on these axes. - The integration of long distance traffic as well as urban traffic is important to ensure the efficiency of the transport from start to end of the line, while keeping into consideration the specificities of regional markets. - The harmonized costs-benefits analysis should not be limited to economics facts, but should also take into consideration the environmental impacts</p>
<p>Please allocate the arguments described above to the following categories:
 - Advantages of priority network approach (compared to priority projects approach)</p>	<p>Better focussed projects of common interest 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"</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 Minimum capacity requirements Environmental protection / climate change Due coverage of all transport modes Implementation capacities Inter-modal connections Harmonized cost-benefit analysis 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>The concept of “conceptual pillar” allows to orientate Member States decision of investments towards “high European added-value” projects and to take into consideration some crucial criteria for the European transport policy (business orientation, environment, co-modality, modal shift, etc.). It goes without saying that this approach leaves the Member States free to decide on any other investment in transport infrastructure. However this flexibility should not encourage the implementation of road projects, as those are more a step by step achievement.</p> <p>Comments: - The concept of “axis performance” is central because it allows aligning the characteristics of the infrastructure from start till end of the line. The SNCF considers that this global vision, suggested by the European Commission, should also be applied to socio-economic studies of infrastructure projects, based on long distance traffic flows. - The evolution toward a harmonisation of the track access charge systems in Europe is highly recommended. The structuring and the multiannual contracting of the trac</p>
<p>Please allocate the advantages, as described above, to the following categories:</p>	<p>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>Other</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>- The integration of long distance traffic as well as regional and urban traffic, while keeping into consideration the specificities of regional markets. - The European Commission underlines accurately the necessity to take into consideration the different needs of passenger and freight transport. The SNCF raises the attention of the European Commission on the specific difficulties caused by the cohabitation of these two types of traffic (on mixed lines and in the bottlenecks) and the need to adopt a global approach and not a sequential one. The SNCF reminds its strong wish for the implementation, on a European level, of conditions allowing the competitiveness (and accordingly the development) of rail freight as well as the setting-up of a European high-speed network, which is the condition of a modal shift from road to rail for goods and passengers - The development of a wider co-modality, in particular through the development of intermodal nodes should be encouraged. The European Community should support this development.</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 Intelligent Transport Systems in the railway sector should not be reduced to ERTMS. It should also take into account the research projects on other Intelligent Transport Systems, as for instance, the tracing of wagons, optimisation of traffic system, etc. - The Intelligent Transport Systems should be deployed in all transport modes. The financial incentives to development and deployment should not only be attributed to the road sector.</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?	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.	This shift should be done, so that the financing of the investments on the infrastructure could include their direct financial consequences on the investments of the others stakeholders. For example, ERTMS equipment implies track side investments, but foremost puts a heavy financial burden as regards the on-board equipment of rolling-stock. It is estimated that ERTMS equipment consists in 70% for on-board equipment and 30% for track side equipment. Thus, it is absolutely essential to ensure that, provided that technical questions are solved, the cost-benefit analysis does not threaten the viability of the transport operator. As a consequence, the investments of the railways undertaking in ERTMS on-board equipment should be able to benefit from TEN-T and national funds in order to facilitate the implementation of the European single market.
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	According to the SNCF, a core network is feasible and would allow capturing the benefits of a network. Comments : - The concentration of Community funding on a reduced number of "high European added value" projects could allow, in the framework of the TEN-T policy review, to increase the co-financing rates and to induce a real acceleration and a catalytic effect to the realisation of the infrastructure; - the taking into consideration of several Community financial perspectives for long projects.
To which categories would you allocate the main advantages?	Capturing benefits of a network Establishing a strong basis for concentration of Community support (financial and non-financial)
To which categories would you allocate possible disadvantages?	
What basis could be used for its conception?	Best practice from national methods (please specify above) Expert groups Other (please specify above)
Which are the three aspects that need to be given highest priority in the core network development method?	Climate change and other environmental objectives Member States' infrastructure master plans Financing capacities
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?	<p>- The advisable funding forms vary from project to project and there is no general rule, which could apply for every infrastructure project. Nevertheless, the following principles can be held as generally true:</p> <p>* The majority of infrastructure projects can not be self-financed and need a financial participation from the public sector; * PPP can be a tool, in some cases, to accelerate the process by finding additional finances. However, when the risk of a project is high, PPPs raise the overall price of the project. - The evolution toward a harmonisation of the track access charge systems is highly recommended. The structuring and the multiannual contracting of the track access charges are indeed a condition sine qua non to mobilise private funds. In addition, this multiannual visibility (on the level of track access charge and on the quality of the infrastructure) and its coherence with the initial track access charge hypothesis are necessary for the railway undertakings to acquire the adapted rolling stock</p>
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?	As far as the infrastructure charging is viable for the transport operators, the SNCF has no opinion on how the private sector should be involved in infrastructure delivery.
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)?	EIB loan rate do not appears incentivising enough to impulse a leverage effect.
Q11.02.- Is there a need for new financial instruments (including "innovative" instruments)?	
Q12.01.- How could existing non-financial instruments be improved?	Europeans coordinators play already an important role and have influence. However, a reflexion on their roles and the ways to give them more power should be launched.
Q12.02.- Which new non-financial instruments should be introduced, for what reason?	The concept of "corridor coordination approach" should be introduced. This application of this concept, which is described in the Green Paper, associating of the relevant stakeholders (infrastructure managers, railway undertakings, customers, local and regional authorities) in the development of acceptable solutions that are technically, economically and financially feasible.
Please classify your proposal above:	Corridor coordination Sharing of best practices Benchmarking
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 SNCF believes that option C is necessary to achieve the expecting goals indicated in the Green Paper and serve the following principles: - the concentration of Community funding on a reduced number of “high European added-value” projects. In the framework of the TEN-T policy review, this principle could allow to increase the co-financing rates to induce a real acceleration and a catalytic effect to the realisation of the infrastructure; - the business orientation of the central network (as it is developed in the third scenario of the Green Paper, through the “conceptual pillar”); - the contribution to the environment objectives and the fight against climate change as well as the integration of the carbon offset in the criterion of selection of TEN-T projects. The SNCF underlines the importance to integrate as objective to the future TEN-T policy to allow modal shift from road to rail; - the development of wider co-modality, in particular through the development of intermodal nodes; - the suppression of bottlenecks; - the integration of long distance traffic as well as regional and urban traffic, w</p>
Q14.- Would you like to make any further comment or proposal?	<p>The SNCF welcomes the following principles, as they are specified below, in order to achieve the expecting goals indicated in the Green Paper: - the concentration of Community funding on a reduced number of “high European added-value” projects. In the framework of the TEN-T policy review, this principle could allow to increase the co-financing rates to induce a real acceleration and a catalytic effect to the realisation of the infrastructure; - the business orientation of the central network (as it is developed in the third scenario of the Green Paper, through the “conceptual pillar”); - the contribution to the environment objectives and the fight against climate change as well as the integration of the carbon offset in the criterion of selection of TEN-T projects. The SNCF underlines the importance to integrate as objective to the future TEN-T policy to allow modal shift from road to rail; - the development of wider co-modality, in particular through the development of intermodal nodes; - the suppression of bottlenecks; - the integration of long distance traffic as well as regional and urban traffic, w</p>