

## **The position of the Ministry of Transport, Communication and Energy of the Republic of Hungary on the Green Paper on the policy review of the trans-European transport network (TEN-T)**

Of the further TEN-T development options outlined in the TEN-T Green Paper, Hungary is in favour of the dual layer version no. 1, which includes the priority projects and the comprehensive network. The main rationale behind our proposal is the fact that while the TEN-T Directive of 2004 does not include the TEN-T maps (for the period until 2020) of the countries acceding in 2004, including Hungary, it, however, does include those of the subsequently acceding two Member States. Similarly, Hungary's Accession Treaty only includes our networks up to 2010, since no other agreement has been concluded so far. Consequently, the conditions of the development of a restricted core network are, on Member State level, unequal, i.e. unfavourable to Hungary.

The concept of the TEN-T, i.e. the network of 'common interest' according to the TEN-T Directive, was developed prior to Hungary's accession, by lengthy negotiations between the Commission and the Member States. Since this has remained the connection between priority projects, so rearranging the latter into a new Core network is not justified.

In our view the problem is that while we are unfamiliar with the content of the core network, the Commission is requesting a discretionary order, in anticipation, to a method that will not enable us, as a Member State, to exert any influence on the content of the core network determined using such method, since the elements of the core network would then be specified centrally, on the basis of a model. At the same time, in the future, this will define the most important transport directions the EU intends to provide support to on a priority or exclusive basis. For the cohesion countries, including Hungary, this is an issue of enormous importance, since, apart from the co-financing of EU projects, they have very little potential for the development of their transport networks. The situation is further heightened by the current economic crisis.

We have concerns about the central, and somewhat virtual, determination of the European Union's most important network, based exclusively on scientific estimates. Since the often criticised non-harmonised national data contents constitute the inputs of the model, such a model does not give due consideration to the historical links between the Member States. The network elements specified in the draft network deduced from the background models of the *TEN Connect Study* ordered by the Commission in order to substantiate the Green Paper were similarly unacceptable for Hungary and various other Member States.

We cannot accept the restricted core network unless it includes our collective achievements so far, i.e. the 30 Priority Projects and the Wider Europe Transnational axes. Both were preceded by and were the result of lengthy consultations between the Commission and the Member States in high-level working groups in the middle of this decade.

We also request a guarantee that support from the EU will not be limited to the restricted Core network and therefore at least the division under the effective TEN-T

financing regulatory action will remain in effect, i.e. financing from the Cohesion Fund will continue to be available for the wider comprehensive TEN-T network.

In our opinion, the Community network is a longer-term policy issue and should therefore be treated separately from the issues of the specific projects and their potential source of financing. As far as the latter are concerned, we believe that the more realistic scheduling of projects as was seen in the case of the Essen projects, including their re-scheduling in the event economic or financial difficulties arise, may resolve some of their contradictions.