

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

| Meta Informations | |
|-------------------|--------------------|
| Creation date | 25-04-2009 |
| Last update date | |
| User name | null |
| Case Number | 081433954392311509 |
| Invitation Ref. | |
| Status | N |

| Background of the respondent | |
|--|-------------------------|
| Country of residence | Spain |
| 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) | Asturias |
| TEN-T components/major infrastructure most involved with (you can choose more than one) | Maritime |
| Name: | Humberto Moyano |
| Please, write down the name of the Public Authority | Port Authority of Gijon |
| Type of Public Authority | National |

| Green Paper Questionnaire | |
|--|--|
| Q01.- Should the Commission's assessment of TEN-T development to date cover any other factors? | What type of factors? This question is not clear |
| 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 | European transport is an intermodal and international issue that can not be solved by any individual region or MS. We need an integrated European approach |
| Please allocate the advantages as described above to the following categories: | Reference basis for structural policy objectives Broad reflection of national infrastructure planning |
| Please allocate the disadvantages, as described above, to the following categories: | Truly European planning is hardly possible Community instruments are insufficient to allow full network implementation |
| 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 - the priority network approach is not recommended; the current priority projects' approach should be further pursued |
| Please justify your choice by answering the sub-questions of Q03 as comprehensive as possible | Projects approach is clearer than "network" approach, that could involve several countries and transport modes hardly to manage |
| Please allocate the arguments described above to the following categories: - Advantages of priority projects' approach | Has proven successful (with some exceptions) as principal part of the TEN-T policy Allows strong concentration on major axes |
| Disadvantages of priority projects' approach | Limited possibility for coverage of all modes, nodes and inter-modal connections |
| Elements that should be taken into account in the updating of the priority projects | Social, economic and territorial cohesion Infrastructure standards and interoperability |

| | |
|--|---|
| 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? | YES – a flexible approach would be appropriate |
| Please justify your choice by answering the sub-questions of Q04 as comprehensive as possible | Is better to hold the current policies than to change before to see its true results TEN infrastrucutre network can not be establishes nor evaluated in a short timeframe. It needs a long-yterm perspective |
| Please allocate the advantages, as described above, to the following categories: | 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) |
| Please allocate the disadvantages, as described above, to the following categories: | |
| How could the "conceptual pillar" be best reflected in planning at Community level? | Through objectives and criteria set out in the TEN-T Guidelines |
| 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? | PORTS : usually are part of intermodal D2D supply chains. An emerging concept of maritime transport network to extend the maritime transport chain FREIGHT LOGISTIC is well addrssed in the LAP-2007 (Logistic Action Plan TENT Policy) should give emphasis to Freight transport. |
| 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? | Too many question in one paragraph It shopuld be individual not multiple questions ITS are the base for TEN-T (infrastructures) and also Transport Services. It includes GALILEO |
| 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? | No opinion |
| 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 | Nevertheless "core network" is not a clear defined concept it seems an extensio0n of the Priority projects network. |

| | |
|---|---|
| To which categories would you allocate the main advantages? | Strengthening the European planning approach Capturing benefits of a network |
| To which categories would you allocate possible disadvantages? | High degree of complexity and diversity of projects involved, requiring a too broad range of means for implementation |
| What basis could be used for its conception? | Expert groups |
| Which are the three aspects that need to be given highest priority in the core network development method? | Infrastructure needs in relation to the Lisbon strategy Common transport policy needs Technological challenges and opportunities of the future (transport and energy, infrastructure and vehicle) |
| Q09.01- How can the financial needs of TEN-T as a whole - in the short, medium and long term - be established? | Quite difficult to answer nowadays in the middle of one of the worst economy crisis of the last decades..... |
| Q09.02.- What form of financing - public or private, Community or national - best suits what aspects of TEN-T development? | Studies : Public European and National Infrastructures : Public and Private European and National Services : Public and Private European and National |
| Q10.01- What assistance can be given to Member States to help them fund and deliver projects under their responsibility? | BEI loans TENT Subsidies |
| Q10.02.- Should private sector involvement in infrastructure delivery be further encouraged? If so, how? | Yes Public Tenders |
| 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)? | ALI of them seems appropriate. Has been designed for intelligent people and has been refined along several years of implementation |
| Q11.02.- Is there a need for new financial instruments (including "innovative" instruments)? | NO |
| Please explain | Is better to concentrate and improve actual instruments |
| Q12.01.- How could existing non-financial instruments be improved? | What are the actual non-financial instruments???? |
| Q12.02.- Which new non-financial instruments should be introduced, for what reason? | What are the actual non-financial instruments???? |
| 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 A: Dual layer: comprehensive network and priority projects (current structure) |
| Please justify | It is the basis of all the answers I have given |
| Q14.- Would you like to make any further comment or proposal? | No further comments |