

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

Meta Informations	
Creation date	30-04-2009
Last update date	
User name	null
Case Number	002819528351512009
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 <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> )	ES51
TEN-T components/major infrastructure most involved with (you can choose more than one)	Road High-Speed Rail Maritime Conventional Rail Co-modal Air Intelligent Transport Systems
Name:	Josep-Lluís Carod-Rovira, co-president del comitè de pilotatge de l'Eurodistricte de l'Espai Català Transfronterer
Please, write down the name of the Public Authority	Comitè de Pilotatge de l'Eurodistricte de l'Espai Català Transfronterer
Type of Public Authority	Regional

Green Paper Questionnaire	
Q01.- Should the Commission's assessment of TEN-T development to date cover any other factors?	Harmonised key performance indicators and benchmarking on the contribution of TEN-T to Commission's agenda on growth and jobs, to realise the internal market and to strengthen economic and social cohesion in Europe should be considered. As part of a territorial and social cohesion analysis of TEN T, contribution to cross-border joint services and territorial cooperation should also be considered. In addition, an assessment on TEN-T contribution to sustainable use of resources and competitiveness should also be considered. Impact of TEN-T on European exports to Asia, America and Africa should also be quantified. All aspects above should be part of a European added Value analysis.
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>We strongly support green paper's foreseen move from the current priority projects approach towards a priority network approach which links through all transportation networks (but especially freight transportation through railway) main airports and ports. EU involvement in Cross-border sections of this approach should be stronger, considering direct management or joint planning alongside with national and regional authorities. Involvement of European Grouping for Territorial Cooperation (EGTC) on planning and executing cross-border sections of the network should also be considered, alongside with an increase of interreg funding for this purpose. Network approach should also allow EU funding for related projects outside priority projects, such as inter-modal connection points, or new proximity fast cross-border services, which will clearly serve a European cohesion goal. Goals of the new approach should include major improvements on sustainability, cross-border connection, European connection of major traffic flows from Europe to the rest of the world (specially in</p>
<p>Please allocate the advantages as described above to the following categories:</p>	<p>Important for access function and territorial cohesion 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>Community instruments are insufficient to allow full network implementation Community action lacks visibility</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>European Added Value and visibility for citizens and companies is clearer with a priority network approach. A stronger EU approach and role involving funding, planning and executing specially in cross-border sections, will also force member states to meet their own dead lines. Besides, funding of different scale projects (long, mid and short term, for example) will also increase EU visibility and efficiency and force Member States to meet their dead lines more efficiently.</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          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>Difficult to combine with sovereign national responsibility for infrastructure development</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          Implementation capacities          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>The conceptual pillar approach is a good solution for identifying projects of common interest, alongside with the idea of differing passenger and freight traffic and focus also on nodes as transfer points, and on inland railway connections of ports. Planning at community level should consider and Open Method of Coordination including not only Member States' representatives, but also regional authorities' representatives involved in planning, European Grouping for Territorial Cooperation's representatives and stakeholders' representatives</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 )</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>We strongly support differing passenger and freight traffic where possible. TENT-T policy should develop different requirements for freight and passengers. In addition, differing cost of transportation along the priority networks should also be considered when establishing funding criteria, when European cohesion and competitiveness is at stake.</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>Research on the different implementation possibilities of ITS should be funded.</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>As we mentioned in question 5, transport pricing should be included within the concept of an (infrastructure) project of common interest.</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>This kind of core network must be feasible if the EU is to contribute to an EU wide social cohesion and comply with Lisbon goals. As we pointed in question 4 Planning at community level should consider and Open Method of Coordination including not only Member States' representatives, but also regional authorities' representatives involved in planning, European Grouping for Territorial Cooperation's representatives and stakeholders' representatives.</p>

To which categories would you allocate the main advantages?	<p>Strengthening the European planning approach</p> <p>Capturing benefits of a network</p> <p>Strengthening the network planning methodology</p> <p>Combining the "traditional" infrastructure approach (essentially priority network) and a more flexible "conceptual" approach</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> <p>Other</p>
To which categories would you allocate possible disadvantages?	Difficulties regarding an appropriate planning method
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>Common transport policy needs</p> <p>Most efficient infrastructure use</p>
Q09.01- How can the financial needs of TEN-T as a whole - in the short, medium and long term - be established?	Participation of European Grouping for Territorial Cooperation should be involved with the mid-short term scenario, and interreg funding should be available for TEN-T related projects.
Q09.02.- What form of financing - public or private, Community or national - best suits what aspects of TEN-T development?	If passenger and freight transport is differed, private funding co-finance of projects will be more feasible. EU funding for Cross-border sections of the Network should increase according with the strongest role we have proposed for the EU.
Q10.01- What assistance can be given to Member States to help them fund and deliver projects under their responsibility?	EU should consider a more active role on funding, planning, executing and managing the priority network, specially in cross-border sections. In addition, EU could submit to Member States a proposal to create a new common fund for priority network projects refundable when deadlines are met by Member States.
Q10.02.- Should private sector involvement in infrastructure delivery be further encouraged? If so, how?	Yes. If passenger and freight transport is differed, private funding co-finance of projects will be more feasible.
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 weakness of existing Community financial instruments is that it does not represent an incentive strong enough for Member States to meet their dead lines with the implementation of TEN-T projects and overcome strictly national interests. Instruments should be redefined accordingly.
Q11.02.- Is there a need for new financial instruments (including "innovative" instruments)?	YES
Please explain	Financial instruments should be redefined in order to introduce new incentive for Member States to act according to EU common interest. In addition, Participation of European Grouping for Territorial Cooperation should be involved with the mid-short term scenario, and interreg funding should be available for TEN-T related projects. If an Open Method of Coordination is established regional authorities and European Grouping for Territorial Cooperation should have a role.
Q12.01.- How could existing non-financial instruments be improved?	

<p>Q12.02.- Which new non-financial instruments should be introduced, for what reason?</p>	<p>Financial instruments should be redefined in order to introduce new incentive for Member States to act according to EU common interest. If an Open Method of Coordination is established regional authorities and European Grouping for Territorial Cooperation should have a role.</p>
<p>Please classify your proposal above:</p>	<p>Corridor coordination Open method of coordination Setting of investment targets</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>Option C is the most suitable to overcome existing acknowledge difficulties on the implementation of TEN-T policy, often related to Member States lack of capacity to meet established dead lines and to the lack of a clear assesment of projects' European added value and visibility.</p>
<p>Q14.- Would you like to make any further comment or proposal?</p>	<p>The Eurodistricte de l'Espai Català Transfrontere, which is at the moment working to become a European Grouping for Territorial Cooperation (EGTC) remains at full disposal of the EC. We are ready and eager to participate all along the process of revising TEN-T policy.</p>