

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	584139011201511909
Invitation Ref.	
Status	N

Background of the respondent	
Country of residence	Slovakia
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)	Nitriansky samosprávny kraj, Západné Slovensko (SK02)
TEN-T components/major infrastructure most involved with (you can choose more than one)	Road Conventional Rail Co-modal
Name:	Nitriansky samosprávny kraj
Please, write down the name of the Public Authority	Nitriansky samosprávny kraj
Type of Public Authority	Regional

Green Paper Questionnaire	
Q01.- Should the Commission's assessment of TEN-T development to date cover any other factors?	YES, by re-allocation of the Slovak Highway n. R3 to the route Stúrovo-Levice-Hronsky Bežadik, it is possible to use more effectively multi-modal transport systems. Speaking in concrete terms, the railway transport can be used, in particular by higher usage of railway trans-ship station in the town of Stúrovo. This would particularly enhance usage of multi-modal transport, since this town is also a strategic inland port located at the river Danube. This is why we kindly propose to assess the possibility to change planned route of Highway n. R3 in Slovakia, envisaged to cross the border with Poland in Trstená, then continuing to Kráľovany, Martin, Turčianske Teplice, Žiar n. Hronom, Zvolen and Šahy. We are not in favour of building a route via Zvolen, Krupina and Šahy, which is longer, but we strongly support using a shorter, less demanding route, with a possibility to combine railway and inland waterway transport via Žiar n. Hronom, Levice and Stúrovo. This route, in our opinion, would not only increase use of multi-modal transport systems in Slovakia and other EU-countries w
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?	
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>Since the combination of all of the modes of transport is possible, as well as its usage in the territory, we are of the opinion that the priority network approach is more convenient than current priority projects' approach.</p>
<p>Please allocate the arguments described above to the following categories:
 - Advantages of priority network approach (compared to priority projects approach)</p>	<p>Possibility for coverage of all modes Possibility for coverage of nodes and inter-modal connections</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 Environmental protection / climate change Due coverage of all transport modes 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>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 are of the opinion that it is needed to take in account the future challenges. In particular, attention in the overall conception of development of the TEN-T policy shall be paid to the areas designated for building logistic centres with combination of inland waterways, air transport and freight logistics, since it is necessary to distinguish among demands on transport of goods nad persons in the TEN-T policy.</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>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>Yes, the should be widened, taking into account technical improvements in the sector of vehicle design. We believe that this technical progress calls for inclusion of demands on construction of infrastructure, development and cohesion needs of regions and usage of expert methods and advanced materials in construction.</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	Yes, in our opinion it is feasible. We provide advantages below. As for the disadvantages, we particularly point your attention to the issue of finding a proper planning method.
To which categories would you allocate the main advantages?	Strengthening the European planning approach Capturing benefits of a network Integrating transport infrastructure and transport policy developments in the best possible way
To which categories would you allocate possible disadvantages?	Difficulties regarding an appropriate planning method 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?	Common transport policy needs Financing capacities Most efficient infrastructure use
Q09.01- How can the financial needs of TEN-T as a whole - in the short, medium and long term - be established?	We see EU funding as a major opportunity to provide funding for the financial needs of TEN-T as a whole.
Q09.02.- What form of financing - public or private, Community or national - best suits what aspects of TEN-T development?	In our opinion, the best way of financing of TEN-T development are PPP projects.
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?	Yes, we believe that involvement of the private sector in the infrastructure delivery shall be further encouraged, in particular by support of PPP-projects.
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)?	Since we are a regional representation, we focus your attention to the fact, that major experience in the usage of TEN-T budget, ERDF and EIB loans has Slovak Ministry of Transport, Mail and Telecommunications and National Highway Company, as well as Slovak Road Administration. Regions particularly use Regional Operational Programme for reconstruction and modernization of county and local B-roads (in the Slovak classification, roads of the category II and III)
Q11.02.- Is there a need for new financial instruments (including "innovative" instruments)?	YES
Please explain	Yes, we strongly support development of new financial instruments aiming at support and sustainability of the B-roads (in the Slovak classification, roads of the category II and III)
Q12.01.- How could existing non-financial instruments be improved?	
Q12.02.- Which new non-financial instruments should be introduced, for what reason?	
Please classify your proposal above:	
Q13.- Which of the options for developing the TEN-T is the most suitable, and for what reason?	

Q14.- Would you like to make any further comment or proposal?