

Sandro Fabbro *Editor*

Mega Transport Infrastructure Planning

European Corridors in Local-Regional
Perspective

 Springer

Sandro Fabbro
Editor

Mega Transport Infrastructure Planning

European Corridors in Local-Regional
Perspective

Afterword by Klaus R. Kunzmann

 Springer



Editor
Sandro Fabbro
Department of Civil Engineering
and Architecture
University of Udine
Udine
Italy

ISBN 978-3-319-16395-6 ISBN 978-3-319-16396-3 (eBook)
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-16396-3

Library of Congress Control Number: 2015938601

Springer Cham Heidelberg New York Dordrecht London

© Springer International Publishing Switzerland 2015

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made.

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer International Publishing AG Switzerland is part of Springer Science+Business Media
(www.springer.com)

Contents

1 Local-Regional Perspective in Mega Transport Infrastructure Planning	1
Sandro Fabbro	
Part I Conceptualizations, Policies and Tools	
2 The Need for a Turning Point in Megaprojects Planning and Appraisal Practices—The Case of the Italian Section of the Mediterranean Corridor	25
Marco Dean	
3 Mega Transport Infrastructure Differentiation Along the Mediterranean Corridor	39
Lara Brunello	
4 Influence on Spatial Development by Building TEN Networks in Slovenia	57
Samo Drobne, Mojca Foški and Alma Zavodnik Lamovšek	
5 The Metropolitan System Along the Mediterranean Corridor in Northern Italy—The Problem of Magnitude and the Need of New Territorial Governance	73
Piero Pedrocco	
6 Spatial Planning and Multinational Implementation of European Mega Transport Infrastructure—The Case of the European Strategy for the Danube Region	89
Thomas Dillinger	
7 Territorial Cooperation and Multilevel Governance in the Brenner Base Tunnel Project	99
Bruno Zanon	

8 Action Planning and Equality in Mega Transport Infrastructure Projects	123
Petra Hirschler and Nina Svanda	
9 Governance Approaches to Raise the Renewable Energy Source Share in Mega Transport Infrastructure	137
Hartmut Dumke	
10 TEKNOSS: A Territorial Knowledge Sharing System in the Poly5 Framework	149
Igor Jogan and Felice Ferrara	
11 Preparing the Future: Visioneering in the Planning Process of Mega Transport Infrastructure	161
Sibylla Zech and Chiara Andreotta	
12 Step-by-Step Design of a Local Spatial Strategy for a Mega Transport Infrastructure Project	177
Kristina Erhard, Michael Dross and Alain Thierstein	
Part II Local-Regional Experiences Along the Corridor	
13 The 'Démarche Grand Chanter' in France—How to Reduce the Impacts of Mega Transport Infrastructure Projects and Enhance Territorial Development	191
Bernard Barnéoud	
14 The "Territorialization" of Mega Transport Infrastructure Projects—The Results Achieved by the Turin–Lyon Technical Observatory	203
Giannicola Marengo, Susanne Nilsson and Paolo Picco	
15 Integrating Mega Transport Infrastructures with the Complex Territories of the Veneto Region—A Weighted Programmatic Approach	215
Andrea Ballarin, Marilanda Bianchini, Federica Di Piazza and Raffaella Lioce	
16 The Baltic–Adriatic Corridor and Its Economic Importance for the Interested Regions	225
Hans Schuschnig	

17 Conceptualization and Planning of the Friuli Venetia Giulia Region as a "Territorial Strategic Platform" on the North Adriatic Gateway	235
Sandro Fabbro	
18 Mega Transport Infrastructure Projects as an Opportunity for Local Cohesion	243
Flavio Gabrielcig and Milan Turk	
19 Afterword. TENs and Visions for Cohesion of the European Space	251
Klaus R. Kunzmann	

Contributors

Chiara Andreotta Vienna University of Technology, Vienna, Austria

Andrea Ballarin Veneto Region, Venice, Italy

Bernard Barnéoud General Board of Savoie, Savoie, France

Marilanda Bianchini Venice, Italy

Lara Brunello Department of Civil Engineering and Architecture, University of Udine, Udine, Italy

Marco Dean Bartlett School of Planning, University College London, London, UK

Thomas Dillinger Department of Spatial Planning, Vienna University of Technology, Vienna, Austria

Samo Drobne Faculty of Civil Engineering and Geodesy, University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana, Slovenia

Michael Dross Munich University of Technology, Munich, Germany

Hartmut Dumke Department for Spatial Planning, Vienna University of Technology, Vienna, Austria

Kristina Erhard Munich University of Technology, Munich, Germany

Sandro Fabbro Department of Civil Engineering and Architecture, University of Udine, Udine, Italy

Felice Ferrara University of Udine, Udine, Italy

Mojca Foški Faculty of Civil Engineering and Geodesy, University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana, Slovenia

Flavio Gabrielcig Province of Gorizia, Gorizia, Italy

Petra Hirschler Department of Spatial Planning, Vienna University of Technology, Vienna, Austria

Igor Jogan Department of Civil Engineering and Architecture, University of Udine, Udine, Italy

Klaus R. Kunzmann TU Dortmund, Potsdam, Germany

Raffaella Lioce TEA Engineering, Padova, Italy

Giannicola Marengo Province of Turin, Turin, Italy

Susanne Nilsson Quesite and Province of Turin, Turin, Italy

Piero Pedrocco Department of Civil Engineering and Architecture, University of Udine, Udine, Italy

Federica Di Piazza Theorema Sas, Venice, Italy

Paolo Picco Province of Turin, Turin, Italy

Hans Schuschnig Department of Transport planning at the Regional Government of Carinthia, BATCo Lead Partner, Klagenfurt, Austria

Nina Svanda Department of Spatial Planning, Vienna University of Technology, Vienna, Austria

Alain Thierstein Munich University of Technology, Munich, Germany

Milan Turk Municipality Šempeter-Vrtojba, Šempeter pri Gorici, Slovenia

Bruno Zanon Department of Civil, Environmental and Mechanical Engineering, University of Trento, Trento, Italy

Alma Zavodnik Lamovšek Faculty of Civil Engineering and Geodesy, University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana, Slovenia

Sibylla Zech Vienna University of Technology, Vienna, Austria

Chapter 6

Spatial Planning and Multinational Implementation of European Mega Transport Infrastructure—The Case of the European Strategy for the Danube Region

Thomas Dillinger

6.1 Introduction

Dealing with the implementation challenges of Corridor 5 within the Poly5 project, it became evident that a multinational spatial strategy for the involved regions was missing. Planning for this mega transport infrastructure (MTI) was elaborated in sector-based planning approaches, where effects on the environment, economic and regional settlement structure have not (or lately) been considered. Thus, a series of difficulties appeared while building this important piece of the Trans-European Networks (TEN). Would the implementation have not been so conflicting if the interests of regions and local communities and the effects of this MTI were considered in a common spatial strategy? This question could not be answered, since the implementation of this MTI already started and no one can say if things would have been done better with such a spatial strategy. However, the idea came up on the possibility to get some answers from another strategy which is just about to be implemented—the European Union Strategy for the Danube Region (EUSDR). This chapter will investigate whether the EUSDR could contribute to the implementation of MTI in the Danube region.

6.2 The European Union Strategy for the Danube Region

To give an idea of the complexity, a brief description of the Danube region is provided. In many aspects, the Danube region is a very heterogeneous area with one common element: the Danube River. This river connects 14 states: nine EU member

T. Dillinger (✉)

Department of Spatial Planning, Vienna University of Technology, Vienna, Austria
e-mail: thomas.dillinger@tuwien.ac.at

© Springer International Publishing Switzerland 2015
S. Fabbro (ed.), *Mega Transport Infrastructure Planning*,
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-16396-3_6

states (Austria, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia); two accession candidates (Montenegro and Serbia) and three other countries (Bosnia-Herzegovina, Republic of Moldavia and Ukraine). About 115 million people live in the Danube region and about 20 different languages with three different alphabets are spoken in this area from people belonging to five different confessions.

In the last century only, borders have changed several times. State systems have been established and then removed, more or less peacefully, with strong impacts on the maintenance and updating of road and rail infrastructures, which are needed as backbone for the development of the region. Nowadays, large parts of the Danube region have to tackle important economic, social and environmental challenges. So the question is: How to support development in such a fragmented region? Learning from the lessons taught by the Baltic Sea Region, the idea was to do something similar.

Against such a diverse background, the EUSDR was launched by the European Commission in 2010 and adopted by the European Council in 2011 with the aim of providing an additional frame for regions that face common challenges in the Danube macro-region. Basically the target of the strategy is to connect people, modernise transport interconnections and improve informatics access. Energy should be cheaper and more secure and the environment protected. Disparities in education and employment should be overcome. Trade and enterprise should increase and risks and disasters minimised (CEC 2010a). The strategy aims to contribute to the overall goals set out in the "Europe 2020" strategy, namely "smart, sustainable and inclusive growth". Via enhanced cooperation efforts, the EUSDR is also expected to increase the level of economic, social and territorial cohesion and support third countries in the Danube river basin on their current (or potential) EU accession path.

Drawing from the lessons of the Baltic Sea region macro-strategy, the EUSDR operates within the existing institutional framework and financial resources and seeks to promote cooperation across the regions and sectors of society. In particular, it aims at finding innovative partnerships to unleash additional or, thus far, untapped financial resources from the public and private sectors as well as at better aligning existing strategies and instruments.

The EUSDR is organised in 11 priority areas which are grouped into four broad pillars: (a) connecting the regions, (b) protecting the environment, (c) building prosperity and (d) strengthening the region, as shown in Table 6.1.

Priority area 1b (PA1b) under pillar (a) is dedicated to improve mobility and multimodality—road, rail and air links. Its overall aim is to improve the road infrastructure, complemented by air and rail transport to avoid congestion and ensure an efficient and environmentally sustainable transport system in the region. Priority area 1a under pillar (a) is dealing with waterway transport especially on the Danube River.

A defining feature of the EUSDR is its output-orientation and its focus on realistic transnational and interregional cooperation projects with visible mutual benefits for the people of the region. This is reflected in the Action Plan attached to the EC Communication, which lists projects to be implemented by stakeholders at all levels



Table 6.1 EUSDR's 4 pillars/11 priority areas. (<http://wbc-inco.net/object/link/10305>)

(CEC 2010b). This Action Plan is seen as an “integrated response” to overcome the challenges in the Danube region and is “the heart of the proposed strategy” (CEC 2010b). Thus, the EUSDR “underlines an integrated approach to sustainable development” (CEC 2010a). Moreover, a sector approach was chosen for its implementation and an “integrated place-based” approach is emphasised in the EUSDR. Good links between urban and rural areas, fair access to infrastructures and services, and comparable living conditions will promote territorial cohesion, now an explicit EU objective (CEC 2010a).

So, the EUSDR has on the one hand the aim to follow an integrated place-based approach and on the other hand the work within the EUSDR is organised in thematic sectors. In so doing, the work within the 11 priorities seemed to be done very independently and dialog between the different priorities appeared weak. For this reason, the so-called EUSDR Laboratory Group (Lab Group)¹ was established in the year 2011, similarly to the Lab Group of the EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region (EUSBS). But does the EUSDR Lab Group ensure an integrated approach? Basically, this informal discussion platform contributes “in terms of concrete implementation support and guidance for benefit of the implementing bodies for the strategy, in the first place the designated priority area coordinators (PACs), the programme implementers and the financing institutions” (<http://admin.interact-u.net>). The Lab Group will focus on key issues such as identifying and labelling existing projects and even generating, designing and funding of EUSDR projects to ensure an integrated implementation process of the EUSDR is not an explicitly mentioned task.

As shown, the EUSDR should contribute to an integrated approach; however, this aim seems hard to reach. Why? There are for sure many answers to this question, but planning practice showed that work organised in thematic sectors in general does not support integrated results. This does not mean that this approach cannot achieve such an aim, but that there is always a possibility that actors working in their thematic field concentrate on their main issue, forgetting the integrated dimension of specific challenges. The risk is that members of the working group, who are in general experts in their specific thematic subject, do not have the knowledge to work integrated and cross thematically. However, structuring the work in the EU-

¹ The core group consists of some 20 representatives of national and regional authorities responsible for objective 1, 2, 3 and IPA programmes, including coordination units, ENPI CBC, European Commission DG Regional Policy, interested PACs (exchanging information with all PACs), as well as the EIB and other financing institutions.

SDR in a more integrated manner might achieve better and more comprehensive results.

Besides the issue whether the EUSDR as such is able to implement an integrated approach, another question needs to be discussed, that is, does the work in the field of Priority Area 1b (PA1b), mobility and multimodality, contribute to an integrated and multinational approach?

According to the EUSDR Action Plan, mobility “goes beyond technical aspects and infrastructure. It includes organisational issues, meeting overall transport demand and seasonal/daily traffic peaks, spatial planning, lifestyles, innovations [...]”. An appropriate transport policy has to take into account all these, promoting multimodality, while also considering environmental respect, economic growth and social development” (CEC 2010b). Furthermore, Salet explicitly stated that: “it requires consideration of consequences not directly tied to the functional purpose of an infrastructure project. For instance, one should not just focus on infrastructure effects for a new railway but consider ancillary interactive effects on environment, economic development and settlement patterns” (Salet et al. 2012, p.42). Thus, analysing the reports of PA1b, we get a sobering observation: The coordination of multinational planning of technical infrastructures (e.g. roads and railways) in the Danube region is weak. Mobility issues in a broader, integrated approach cannot be discussed, because basic elements of multinational infrastructure planning have yet to be elaborated. For roads and railways, infrastructure is often not efficient or simply missing, especially regarding cross-border connections (to which national authorities do not give priority). It is explicitly mentioned that “problems are largely linked to a lack of coordinated planning, funding and implementation” (EUSDR, PA1b 2012).

The PA1b created maps (with the support of DG MOVE, TENtec team²) of the transport infrastructure system of the Danube region. This is a very important first step to have a clear picture of the existing transport infrastructure and the missing links, identified by all states in the region. More than 130 projects from 9 countries have been collected and evaluated. It is mentioned in the report that projects have a very wide diversity. It is stated that all of them contribute in a certain way to improve connectivity and mobility. But it is clear that it is difficult to evaluate them without having an idea of how the mobility in the Danube region should be organised in the future. Therefore, the “need for the common picture on the transport system in the region (common transport vision)” is a crucial next step for the future identified work. “This picture should give a basis to the group to identify critical projects for the region and to assure coordination with other priority areas” (EUSDR PA1a 2012).

In the 2013 report, the work on this common transport vision, named *Transdanubios*, and the intermodal transport strategy development (DRIS) are mentioned as “basic tools for improving efficiency and effectiveness of the strategy [...] projects

² TENtec is the information system of the European Commission to coordinate and support the TEN-T policy.

with significant impact on two or more countries [...] projects of great transnational and institutional impact" (EUSDR PA1a 2013).

We can conclude that PA1b is working hard to achieve a multinational perspective on roads and railways infrastructure; however, a multisector perspective to overcome challenges in the Danube region in terms of mobility and multimodality is still weak.

6.3 EUSDR—A Solution for Better Implantation of MTI?

Returning to the initial question whether the Danube strategy is a multinational approach to connect spatial planning and implementation of European MTI. From a spatial planner's perspective, it can be summarised below.

The EUSDR—as a macro-regional strategy—is following a sector approach. It offers a good multinational platform to sector-related activities and projects. However, the multisector dimension is weak, even if one main aim of the EUSDR is to enhance integrative approaches. Furthermore, the spatial planning dimension within the EUSDR is practically nonexistent. But spatial planning could be the key element to harmonise the sector-related and regional interests. Following the argumentation of Dühr, "it would be useful to build-in spatial planning as a central consideration in future strategies [EU macro-regional strategies] from the beginning, as retrofitting such an important coordination task to ongoing actions and projects seems to be a major challenge" (CEC 2013). Thus, from a spatial planner's point of view there is need of a "spatial vision for the EUSDR", since a common strategy, a framework or reference, pillars and priority actions, which can direct and guide activities, are missing. Such a spatial vision should concentrate on issues of multilateral importance of the macro-region. Also the DG Regio "has emphasised that new initiatives should be explicitly supported by a clear and common strategy, bottom-up developed and in response to clearly identified shared challenges of the macro-region" (Dühr 2011, p. 10). Such a spatial vision could be the missing link to bring added value to EUSDR. Otherwise, the EUSDR might become another platform for sector-based multinational cooperation.

6.4 Spatial Visions to Improve the Implementation of MTI

As long as there is no common spatial vision, how is it possible to develop the territory of the Danube region? The implementation would be based more on national than on macro-regional interests, and the European Union (EU) perspective would be missing. Thus, whether it is useful to build an MTI, it can only be answered if you look at the issue in a cross-regional and cross-national perspective. Where are the most important economic areas, where are the international hubs, where are the

main agglomerations, which need to be connected or need improvement in their existing technical infrastructure network? Those are examples for basic questions with clear spatial impact. Also, Dühr mentioned that "a debate on the role of spatial planning in the context of the EUSDR would therefore be useful, on which basis the various calls for a better and more integrated and coordinated spatial vision may be considered" (CEC 2013). It is well understood that these questions are difficult to answer and many obstacles are on the way. Different national and regional interests have to be negotiated; thematic perspectives have to be compromised. But how could such a spatial vision be drafted? Some very first thoughts for the drafting process of such a spatial framework are provided as follows. In any regard, the process design for such an intention has to be carefully considered. In general, two approaches are possible: (i) drafting a common spatial vision out of sector concepts; and (ii) drafting a common spatial vision involving stakeholders of the thematic sectors from the very beginning, as better explained below:

- (i) Given the sector-based structure of the EUSDR, there might be one possibility to form a common spatial concept out of the sector concepts. It might happen when sector concepts coming out of the work of the 11 priority areas, like the mentioned common transport vision *Transdanubios*, are linked and combined to a general spatial vision of the Danube region. This is a possible approach but it holds high risks. In fact, there is no guarantee that the sector-based concepts at the end of the day are effortless to combine;
- (ii) Another approach underlines the integrative task of a common spatial vision. Sector stakeholders contribute from their specific thematic and national views to the spatial vision. One starting point for this discussion and negotiation process could be the respective spatial development strategies of the member states. As a rule, these strategies are sector integrated and result from an integration process in the member states. In so doing, different national aims and interests from the member states will be confronted. It will certainly be a difficult and crucial task to agree on one common spatial vision. However, this "would ensure a stronger focus and clearer prioritisation of the actions and projects, and ensure that the transnational spatial dimension is the key driving force", as Dühr already noticed (CEC 2013).

Spatial planning experiences on the national, regional or even local level show how complicated such an approach can be. However, spatial planning teaches that, without such a procedure, an integrated development of a territory can hardly be managed. Another great advantage derives from the member states having elaborated spatial planning systems, embedded in a legal and institutional framework. In general, member states have national and regional spatial plans to support an integrated approach for development.

In such a way, macro-regional or European-level transport infrastructure can have direct regional and even local impact. For instance, a corridor (e.g. a motor highway) can be interpreted as a series of constructions on several buildings in different territories which are aligned next to each other. From the perspective of the macro-region or the European level, it is a corridor. From the perspective of a

municipality, it is a building on their territory, which has to be embedded in the Spatial Development Programme of the municipality, finally in a land-use plan. This aspect needs to be considered from the beginning, when drafting corridors for MTI. Not doing that, it should not be a surprise if we face problems in the construction phase of MTI. Therefore, states should develop instruments and mechanisms in the discipline of spatial planning systems to be able to avoid these kinds of implementation problems.

In general, state planning systems give municipalities a very predominant position regarding spatial planning, even in more centrally organised planning systems. As mentioned before, there are instruments and mechanism to ensure the building of transport infrastructure of regional and national interest. However, when it comes to the point of implementation, the voice of the municipality is finally very important. Thus, it is important to link the spatial vision to the legal and institutional spatial planning framework of the member states in the macro-region. According to their legal and institutional spatial planning framework, the states have planning instruments at different levels (national, regional, local). These instruments are interrelated and getting more and more precise regarding their spatial predication. Within this logic, a spatial vision for a macro-region is an additional spatial instrument as framework for the spatial planning at the state level. In a systematic hierarchy of planning instruments, this system could look as follows:

- Spatial vision macro-region (Macro-region level)
- Spatial Development Programme (State level)
- Spatial Regional Development Programme (Regional level)
- Spatial Municipal Development Programme (Municipality level)

As described earlier, the elaboration process of such a spatial macro-regional vision might be a delicate matter, and another consideration might be helpful for efficient implementation. Since the Danube region covers a large territory, which makes the drafting process of a spatial vision quite complicated, it might be helpful to follow a step-by-step approach and elaborate spatial visions for parts of the territory, for example, spatial vision for the upper, the middle and the lower Danube region. Subsequently connecting these spatial visions should be an easier task to handle.

6.5 Conclusion

The EUSDR has so far no spatial dimension, and a sector-based approach in regard to MTI is predominant. The multinational setting should be of greater advance to get a better view on mobility demands in the Danube region. The common transport vision *Transdanuvios* and the DRIS is a first step to improve transport infrastructure.

A macro-regional approach such as the EUSDR can help in better implementation of MTI if a sector-integrated and spatial approach can be managed. A common spatial framework, such as the proposed spatial vision for the Danube region, also

defining MTI of macro-regional importance, would contribute to the implementation of MTI. This spatial vision has to be linked with the legal and institutional spatial planning framework of the member states. If the EUSDR will not be able to do so, the strategy would stay on the level of any other sector-based planning approach, facing well-known problems when implemented in the territory of the member states within the macro-region.

Analysing the so-far achieved results of the EUSDR, it cannot be said that an efficient multinational strategy has been reached or that it could be useful as an example for the Poly5 region to implement Corridor 5. Notwithstanding the presence of a strategy and a well-structured schema of multinational working groups, it seems to be very difficult to bring together different views and interests from the participating stakeholders. To get regions and municipalities involved in such a strategy is very challenging. But this involvement at an early stage is even more important for the implementation and acceptance of MTI, as we learned from the Poly5 project. Also, the integration of sector-based considerations and the elaboration of a strategy with a spatial dimension—another lesson learned in the Poly5 project—is extremely important, but practically not existing in the EUSDR, as investigated in this chapter.

Thus, it is a strong belief of the author that macro-regional strategies can contribute to a better implementation of MTI, such as Corridor 5 for the Poly5 region, but the achievements reached so far in the EUSDR give no reasonable answer to this question.

References

- CEC—Commission of the European Communities. (2010a). *European Union strategy for Danube region: Communication from the commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions*, COM(2010) 715 final. Brussels: CEC.
- CEC—Commission of the European Communities. (2010b). *Commission staff working document: Action plan. Accompanying document to European Union strategy for the Danube Region*. SEC(2010) 1489 final. Brussels: CEC.
- CEC—Commission of the European Communities. (2013). *Commission staff working document: Accompanying the document the report from the commission to the report from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions concerning the added value of macro-regional strategies*, COM(2013) 468 final. Brussels: CEC.
- Dühr, S. (2011). *Baltic Sea, Danube and macro-regional strategies: A model for transnational cooperation in the EU?* Notre Europe.
- EUSDR. (2012). EUSDR Report June 2012. Priority Area PA1b: To improve mobility and multimodality—road, rail and air links. EUSDR.
- EUSDR. (2013). EUSDR Report June 2013. Priority Area PA1b: To improve mobility and multimodality—road, rail and air links. EUSDR.

Salet, W., Bertolini, L., & Giezen, M. (2013). Complexity and uncertainty: Problem or asset in decision making of mega infrastructure projects? *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 37(6), 2012 (Urban Research Publications Limited).

http://admin.interact-u.net/downloads/4307/Presentation_Danube_Region_Labgroup_INTER-ACT.pdf. Accessed 13 Dec 2013.

<http://wbc-inco.net/object/link/10305>. Accessed 20 April 2015.



Thomas Dillinger completed his PhD in 2003 with a thesis on regional development in border regions. Since 2005, he is head of the Centre of Regional Planning and Development at the Vienna University of Technology. He is a lecturer and researcher with an interest in the fields of regional planning and policies in Middle and Eastern Europe, cross-border and inter-regional planning and endogenous regional development. Since 2010, he is head of the study commission for spatial planning.