

**Position Paper**  
**of TINA Vienna Urban Technologies & Strategies**  
  
**on the**  
  
**Open Consultation on the Future Trans-European  
Transport Network Policy**

Mr Rainer Mueller  
Project Manager  
TINA Vienna Urban Technologies & Strategies  
Anschuetzgasse 1  
AT-1150 Vienna  
[rainer.mueller@tinavienna.at](mailto:rainer.mueller@tinavienna.at)

TINA Vienna Urban Technologies & Strategies (former TINA Vienna Transport Strategies) is a limited company under Austrian law, which was founded in February 1997. TINA VIENNA is affiliated to the City of Vienna and since June 2003 a company of the "WienHolding".

The purpose of the foundation of the company was the implementation of the PHARE project "Transport Infrastructure Needs Assessment" (TINA)-process in Central and Eastern Europe as a technical support body for the European Commission. From May 1997 to November 1999 the TINA Secretariat worked in close co-operation with the European Commission (former DGs IA, VII and XVI) to advance, monitor and supervise the technical work of the TINA Senior Officials Group consisting of all Member States and the candidate countries for accession (Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia), chaired by the EC. The most important deliverable of this project was the identification and comprehensive presentation of the transport infrastructure network components for extending the EU's Trans-European Transport Network to the new Member States.

TINA Vienna's core competencies in transport strategy and planning include policy analysis, technical evaluation, strategy development and project management. This competence was shown within several projects related to the European transport policy and development and monitoring of the European transport networks:

- Implementation Report on the TEN-T Guidelines - aiming at the provision of data for the elaboration of "Report from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee, and the Committee of the Regions on the Implementation of the TEN-Guidelines for the Period 2004-2005"
- TINA Turkey - Technical Assistance to Transportation Infrastructure Needs Assessment for Turkey
- Implementation Report on the TEN-T Guidelines - aiming at the provision of data for the elaboration of "Report from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee, and the Committee of the Regions on the Implementation of the TEN-Guidelines for the Period 2002-2003"
- Status of the Pan-European Transport Corridors and Transport Areas - Developments and Activities in 2000 and 2001
- TINA (Transport Infrastructure Needs Assessment) and TINA for Malta - European Commission/PHARE and European Commission DG Enlargement
- Monitoring the Development of the Pan-European Transport Corridors and Areas in the NIS
- Status of the Pan-European Transport Corridors and Transport Areas

TINA Vienna also represents the City of Vienna on international organizations in the area of transport and mobility, especially in the Danube region.

In 2003 TINA Vienna became a subsidiary of Wien Holding GmbH and during the last years its focus expanded to include all types of urban technologies. In this role TINA Vienna helps to identify innovative urban technologies developed and used in Vienna, describe how these technologies can be successfully used and share this know-how with other cities and regions.

## INTRODUCTION

Basically the efforts of the European Commission to reform the process of planning the trans-European networks is welcomed. In the following preliminary remarks some points are stated that should be amended. Further on the questions put by the European Commission are answered.

The position that the TEN-T should promote the origin of an integrated and intermodal European transport system is fully supported by TINA Vienna.

A planning process aiming at integration

- takes into consideration the interaction between the various transport modes
- operates with uniform assessment methods in the different Member States (this should already start at planning of international transport and traffic models) and
- combines infrastructure planning with regional and urban planning and economic factors.

Within the working document further reduction of the CO<sub>2</sub>-emissions of vehicles is envisaged. However, a far more effective and sustainable strategy the shifting of transport to environmental-friendly transport modes is not considered.

TINA Vienna would focus future TEN-T planning not only in the connection of important relations between west and east, but also on connections between north and south.

Especially the connection of the main transport nodes or capitals with each other leads to a coherent European Core Network. To take into consideration the principle of the integration already at the choice of the future priority projects the importance and effectiveness of the project on the whole network should be an essential criterion. A first draft criterion could be the number of interfaces with other priority projects/axes. A criterion of higher value would be the volumes of traffic (international, national, regional, and local) going through the TEN-nodes as well as the envisaged intensity of the traffic relations with other priority projects crossing.

The anticipation of sectoral networks for freight traffic (decision of the European Parliament) is seen as not very conducive, as the premature commitment of sectoral freight traffic axis hinders an integrated overall transport planning process.

The intended prioritisation of TEN-T projects in a Core Network with European added value is welcomed. However, it is pointed out that the quality of the regional feeders can be evaluated as a positive choice criterion for TEN-T funding but not in the current shape. Thus, it must be assessed only in a "package" with the respective TEN-T project, which has to be implemented together, if necessary.

In this context the extension of the mandate of EU coordinators also makes sense. As the present assignment of EU coordinators for single priority projects was successful, the extension of these mandates is conceivable as long as no restriction of the scope of action of the Member States occurs.

In the working document good attempts are demonstrated for assessment criteria. However, for the assessment of TEN-T projects they should be amended by further measurable quality criteria and thresholds. Such criteria, including a clear weighting, could be the definition of TEN-T nodes, completion of missing links, minimum standards of infrastructure, parallel alignments, density of network, operation criteria, overall benefit, possible alternatives. As

soon as a completed criterion catalogue is available, an involvement of the Member States is unavoidable within the further consultation process.

The coordination of EU funds for financing priority projects is welcomed. In order to gain more security for financing a suggestion for coupling the financial preview with the whole planning horizon or an implementation plan in phases including the financial plan should be supported.

Questions concerning the procedure of the evaluation of the existing network as well as the methodology for the prioritisation and the monitoring of the implementation are missing in the working document.

**Are the principles and criteria for designing the core network, as set out above, adequate and practicable? What are their strengths and weakness, and what else could be taken into account?**

Concerning the "new" methodology for the TEN-T planning we welcome the differentiation in a "Comprehensive Network" and a "Core Network", which has already been the core element of the methodology applied for the definition of the TEN-T within the CEEC and in Malta and the potential future TEN-T in Turkey.

While up to now during the planning and implementation of the trans-European network often the interests of the single state had priority, it is desirable and sensible to conceive the future Core Network at a higher European level and to transfer the coordination to the European Union with respect to that. The focus should lie on the European optimization of the network. The Comprehensive Network should remain in the competence of the Member States. Nevertheless, both networks should comply with national transport master plans.

The definition of the Comprehensive Network, which should connect „all EU regions in an adequate way, be multimodal and provide the infrastructural basis for co-modal services for passenger and freight“ is formulated too vague.

What is in this context the meaning of “in an adequate way”? Binding and clear criteria should be defined for example for minimum standards of infrastructure serving respective traffic flows. The formulation „multimodal“ should be extended to „all technically possible and economically feasible modes of transport“ to avoid any discrimination of single transport modes.

The competence of the European Commission in the future planning is not clearly defined within the working document and remains open. The local and regional authorities should be integrated anyway decisively into planning. The formulation „on the basis of the above criteria and conditions, elements for planning of the Comprehensive Network will be discussed with the Member State(s) whose territory is concerned“ is too unspecific.

The general principles<sup>1</sup> for designing the TEN-T to regulate the outline of the network elements show contradictory objectives. On the one hand the shape of the network should be determined by passenger and freight traffic demand and customers' needs, on the other hand it should contribute to the climate change goals and environmental issues. At this point it is problematic to combine the growing consumers' needs with a decreasing environmental impact. In a certain way an increased demand (new traffic) is generated by creation of new

---

<sup>1</sup> See Commission Working Document „Consultation on the Future trans-European Transport Network Policy“ COM (2010) 212/7, p.6

infrastructure. This originating induced traffic is to be adjusted in a special way with the environmental objectives of the European Union.

Having in mind decreasing budgets the concentration on improvements of offers and the operation management (soft measures) is beside the construction of infrastructure an important (cheaper) alternative to remove administrative and technical obstacles and deficits in quality. Specifically it concerns for example different track gauges, necessary knowledge of languages of train drivers or missing European-wide ticketing. In this context a smooth traffic and a reliable offer should be guaranteed when implementing cross-border projects. In addition for rail projects (but not only) trans-national concepts for operation have to be elaborated and the quality of the cross-border offers has to be defined in a long term.

**To what extent do the supplementary infrastructure measures contribute to the objectives of a future-oriented transport system, and are there ways to strengthen their contribution?**

As an additional infrastructure measure also e-mobility is favoured in the working document. For all new constructed infrastructure as well as the network elements for example relevant ITS applications or refuelling possibilities should be taken into consideration for new vehicle generations with liquid gas or other alternative fuels as well as loading stations for electric cars. In this context TINA Vienna points out that especially in conurbations (= nodes) new vehicle generations cannot become substitute for the problems of the increased space needs as well as the traffic jam problems and proposes for priority handling of the transport modes rail and water, as these reach a substantially higher efficiency with substantially lower space needs. A relevant weighting is missing.

**What specific role could TEN-T planning in general play in boosting the transport sector's contribution to the "Europe 2020" strategic objectives?**

The transport sector is substantially concerned by the climate change and energy goals (20-20-20) laid down in the "Europe 2020" strategy and, thus, must pay attention to a high degree to a reduction of the issues of climate gases and higher energy efficiency. Hence, for TEN-T planning these objectives must be taken into consideration increasingly. Beside new vehicle generations, alternative engines and technical solutions in traffic management the subjects of shifting of traffic and traffic avoidance also belong to it.

**In which way can the different sources of EU expenditure be better coordinated and/or combined in order to accelerate the delivery of TEN-T project and policy objectives?**

The coordination and grouping of the EU funding for financing priority projects is welcomed. In this context it is important to adjust time horizons of the EU programmes and funding schemes (for example the EU-cohesion fund 2007-2013) to pay attention to the more long-term planning horizons and implementation horizons of the projects to gain security for planning and financing. A kind of commitment of the EU for the several projects would be helpful.

**How can an EU funding strategy coordinate and/or combine the different sources of EU and national funding and public and private financing?**

Any grouping of the funds at EU level could also face a grouping of the funds at national level. Thus, it is suggested that national corridor coordinators with respective competences are provided to cooperate with the EU coordinators.

**Would the setting up of a European funding framework adequately address the implementation gap in the completion of TEN-T project and policy objectives?**

Yes.

**In which way can the TEN-T policy benefit from the new legal instruments and provisions as set out above?**

Through the new TEN-T Guidelines a shift of competences from the Member States to European level is prepared aiming at a higher commitment of the TEN-T Guidelines. In view of the subsidiary principle this is to be rejected. As long as no more funding is provided, it is referred to the responsibility of the Member States.

An increase of the competence of the European Commission can only go in line at most with an increase of the financial contribution – extending the co-financing – to raise the probability of realization of the projects.