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ANNEXES to the
SCIENTIFIC REPORT
ANNEX 1 – LIST of INDICATORS

Two sets of indicators, one for each sectoral policy considered.

1. Transport policies indicators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>Productivity of inland transport infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>Productivity of airports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>Economic growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>Congestion costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Traffic passing through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Market opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1</td>
<td>Landscape fragmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I2</td>
<td>Exposure to external visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I3</td>
<td>Regional integration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. CAP indicators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>Economic growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>Unemployment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>Tourism diversification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Environmental quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Community viability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Risk of soil erosion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1</td>
<td>Landscape diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I2</td>
<td>Community identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I3</td>
<td>Heritage products</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Regional cut in P1 = 0,2*0,4*Share of regional P1*Average Annual (2007-2013) National P1 budget
Regional increase in P2= (0,25*National P1 CUT)*(Share of regional P2).
Data on P1 and P2 regional shares are derived from ESPON DATABASE 2007, ESPON Project 2.1.3.
ANNEX 2 – LIST of DATABASE

The datasets uploaded on the ESPON INTRANET are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File name</th>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Metadata</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESPON_2013_1_6_TIPTAP TRANSPORT DATA 01</td>
<td>A – baseline</td>
<td>PIM</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPON_2013_1_6_TIPTAP TRANSPORT DATA 02</td>
<td>A – baseline</td>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPON_2013_1_6_TIPTAP TRANSPORT DATA 03</td>
<td>A – baseline</td>
<td>Desiderability</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPON_2013_1_6_TIPTAP TRANSPORT DATA 04</td>
<td>A – baseline</td>
<td>Vulnerability</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPON_2013_1_6_TIPTAP TRANSPORT DATA 05</td>
<td>A – baseline</td>
<td>TIM</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPON_2013_1_6_TIPTAP TRANSPORT DATA 06</td>
<td>A – baseline</td>
<td>TIM – PM</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPON_2013_1_6_TIPTAP TRANSPORT DATA 07</td>
<td>A – baseline</td>
<td>Flags</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPON_2013_1_6_TIPTAP TRANSPORT DATA 08</td>
<td>B – Infrastructure</td>
<td>PIM</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPON_2013_1_6_TIPTAP TRANSPORT DATA 09</td>
<td>B – Infrastructure</td>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPON_2013_1_6_TIPTAP TRANSPORT DATA 10</td>
<td>B – Infrastructure</td>
<td>Desiderability</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPON_2013_1_6_TIPTAP TRANSPORT DATA 11</td>
<td>B – Infrastructure</td>
<td>Vulnerability</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPON_2013_1_6_TIPTAP TRANSPORT DATA 12</td>
<td>B – Infrastructure</td>
<td>TIM</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPON_2013_1_6_TIPTAP TRANSPORT DATA 13</td>
<td>B – Infrastructure</td>
<td>TIM – PM</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPON_2013_1_6_TIPTAP TRANSPORT DATA 14</td>
<td>B – Infrastructure</td>
<td>Flags</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPON_2013_1_6_TIPTAP TRANSPORT DATA 15</td>
<td>C – Pricing</td>
<td>PIM</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPON_2013_1_6_TIPTAP TRANSPORT DATA 16</td>
<td>C – Pricing</td>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPON_2013_1_6_TIPTAP TRANSPORT DATA 17</td>
<td>C – Pricing</td>
<td>Desiderability</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPON_2013_1_6_TIPTAP TRANSPORT DATA 18</td>
<td>C – Pricing</td>
<td>Vulnerability</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPON_2013_1_6_TIPTAP TRANSPORT DATA 19</td>
<td>C – Pricing</td>
<td>TIM</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPON_2013_1_6_TIPTAP TRANSPORT DATA 20</td>
<td>C – Pricing</td>
<td>TIM – PM</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPON_2013_1_6_TIPTAP TRANSPORT DATA 21</td>
<td>C – Pricing</td>
<td>Flags</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPON_2013_1_6_TIPTAP_CAP_DATA 1.xls</td>
<td>CAP</td>
<td>PIM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPON_2013_1_6_TIPTAP_CAP_DATA 2.xls</td>
<td>CAP</td>
<td>Normalised PIM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPON_2013_1_6_TIPTAP_CAP_DATA 3.xls</td>
<td>CAP</td>
<td>TIM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPON_2013_1_6_TIPTAP_CAP_DATA 4.xls</td>
<td>CAP</td>
<td>Desiderability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPON_2013_1_6_TIPTAP_CAP_DATA 5.xls</td>
<td>CAP</td>
<td>Vulnerability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPON_2013_1_6_TIPTAP_CAP_DATA 6.xls</td>
<td>CAP</td>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 3 – LIST of MAPS (Maps marked with (*) are included in the core text of the SCIENTIFIC REPORT ONLY, maps marked with (**) are included in the core text of BOTH REPORTS; the numbering follows the one in the scientific report). All maps, also those not included in the text of the report, are uploaded on the ESPON INTRANET.

Map 3.2.1.1. Road infrastructure development in Baseline Scenario, 2030. (**)
Map 3.2.1.2. Rail infrastructure development in Baseline Scenario, 2030. (**)
Map 3.2.1.3. Road infrastructure development in the High Growth Scenario compared to Baseline, 2030. (**)
Map 3.2.1.4. Rail infrastructure development in the High Growth Scenario compared to Baseline, 2030. (**)

Map 5.1.1.1. Territorial Impact of CAP Policy - Economic growth – E1. (**)
Map 5.1.1.2. Territorial Impact of CAP Policy – Tourism diversification – E3. (**)
Map 5.1.1.3. Territorial Impact of CAP Policy - Unemployment – E2. (*)
Map 5.1.1.4. Territorial Impact of CAP Policy – Community viability – Q2. (*)
Map 5.1.1.5. Territorial Impact of CAP Policy – Environmental quality – Q1. (**)
Map 5.1.1.7. Territorial Impact of CAP Policy – Landscape diversity – I1. (*)
Map 5.1.1.8. Territorial Impact of CAP Policy – Community identity – I2. (*)
Map 5.1.2.1. Territorial Impact of CAP Policy – Territorial efficiency – TE. (**)
Map 5.1.2.2. Territorial Impact of CAP Policy – Territorial quality – TQ. (*)
Map 5.1.2.3. Territorial Impact of CAP Policy – Territorial efficiency, According to Policy Makers’ Priorities – TE. (*)
Map 5.2.1.1. Territorial Impact of Transport policy – Economic growth – E3a. (**)
Map 5.2.1.2. Territorial Impact of Transport policy – Regional integration – I3a. (*)
Map 5.2.1.3. Territorial Impact of Transport policy – Regional integration – I3b. (*)
Map 5.2.1.4. Territorial Impact of Transport policy – Congestion costs – E4a. (*)
Map 5.2.1.5. Territorial Impact of Transport policy – Congestion costs – E4c. (**)
Map 5.2.1.6. Territorial Impact of Transport policy – Safety – Q3a. (*)
Map 5.2.1.7. Territorial Impact of Transport policy – Market opportunities – Q4b. (**)

3
Map 5.2.1.8. Territorial Impact of Transport policy – Emissions – Q2a. (**) 
Map 5.2.1.9. Territorial Impact of Transport policy – Emissions – Q2c. (*) 
Map 5.2.1.10. Territorial Impact of Transport policy – Landscape fragmentation – I1a. (**) 
Map 5.2.2.1. Territorial Impact of Transport policy – Territorial Efficiency – TEc. (*) 
Map 5.2.2.2. Territorial Impact of Transport policy – Summative impact – SIa. (*) 
Map 5.2.2.3. Territorial Impact of Transport policy – Summative impact – SIa – According to Policy Makers’ Priorities. (*) 
Map 5.2.5.1. The Flag model: warnings about overcoming of congestion thresholds. (**) 
Map 5.2.5.2. The Flag model: warnings about overcoming of safety thresholds. (**) 
Map 5.2.5.3. The Flag model: warnings about emissions in the baseline scenario (a). (**) 
Map 5.2.5.4. The Flag model: warnings about emissions in the infrastructure scenario (b). (**) 
Map 5.2.5.5. The Flag model: warnings about emissions in the pricing scenario (c). (*)
ANNEX 4 – LIST of TABLES (Tables marked with (*) are included in the core text of the SCIENTIFIC REPORT ONLY, tables marked with (**) are included in the core text of BOTH REPORTS; the numbering follows the one in the scientific report)

Table 3.1.4.1. Modulation rate of direct payments per farm for the EU member states (%) (*)
Table 3.1.4.2. Impact criteria in territorial impact assessment - CAP policy (**) Table 3.2.1.1. Transport policy scenarios: main features (*)
Table 3.2.3.1. Impact criteria in territorial impact assessment - Transport policies (**) Table 4.1.1. Impact criteria in territorial impact assessment - Transport policies, TEQUILA1 model (*)
Table 4.1.2. Pair-wise comparison format - AHP Saaty’s method semantic scale (*)
Table 4.1.3 Experts’ weight values for Territorial efficiency, Territorial quality, Territorial identity (TEQUILA1) (*)
Table 4.1.4. Weight values of macro-criteria and criteria (revised TEQUILA1) – Experts judgements (*)
Table 4.1.5. Weight values for criteria belonging to Territorial efficiency (TEQUILA1) (*)
Table 4.1.6. Weight values for criteria belonging to Territorial quality (TEQUILA1) (*)
Table 4.1.7. Weight values for criteria belonging to Territorial identity (TEQUILA1) (*)
Table 4.1.8. Desirability of impacts for specific European regions (TEQUILA1) (*)
Table 4.1.9. Vulnerability of impacts for specific European regions (TEQUILA1) (*)
Table 4.2.1. Impact criteria in territorial impact assessment - Transport policies (**) Table 4.2.2. Experts’ weight values for Territorial efficiency, Territorial quality, Territorial identity (TEQUILA2 – Transport policies) (*)
Table 4.2.3. Weight values of macro-criteria and criteria (TEQUILA2 – Transport policies) – Experts judgements (*)
Table 4.2.4. Weight values for criteria belonging to Territorial efficiency (TEQUILA2 – Transport policies) (*)
Table 4.2.5. Weight values for criteria belonging to Territorial quality (TEQUILA2 – Transport policies) (*)
Table 4.2.6. Weight values for criteria belonging to Territorial identity (TEQUILA2 – Transport policies) (*)
Table 4.2.7. Desirability of impacts for specific European regions (TEQUILA2 – Transport policies) (*)

Table 4.2.8. Vulnerability of impacts for specific European regions (TEQUILA2 – Transport policies) (*)

Table 4.3.1. Impact criteria in territorial impact assessment – CAP policy (**) 

Table 4.3.2. Experts’ weight values for Territorial efficiency, Territorial quality, Territorial identity (TEQUILA2 – CAP policy) (*)

Table 4.3.3. Weight values of macro-criteria and criteria (TEQUILA2 – CAP policy) – Experts judgements (*)

Table 4.3.4. Weight values for criteria belonging to Territorial efficiency (TEQUILA2 – CAP policy) (*)

Table 4.3.5. Weight values for sub-criteria belonging to criterion Territorial quality (TEQUILA2 – CAP policy) (*)

Table 4.3.6. Weight values for criteria belonging to Territorial identity (TEQUILA2 – CAP policy) (*)

Table 4.3.7. Desirability of impacts for specific European regions (TEQUILA2 – CAP policy) (*)

Table 4.3.8. Vulnerability of impacts for specific European regions (TEQUILA2 – CAP policy) (*)

Table 5.1.2.1. Preferences concerning relevance of policy goals - CAP policies (**) 

Table 5.1.3.1. CAP policy: Average impacts by country (**) 

Table 5.1.4.1. CAP policy: Average impacts by type of regions (*)

Table 5.1.5.1: The relationship between level of Pillar 1 support and cohesion indicators: Correlation coefficients for EU15 at NUTS 3, 1999 (*)

Table 5.2.2.1. Transport policy: Synthetic impacts on all regions by criterion and scenario (**) 

Table 5.2.2.2. Preferences concerning relevance of policy goals - TRANSPORT policies (**) 

Table 5.2.2.3. Average summative impacts according to policy makers’ and experts’ weights (**) 

Table 5.2.3.1. Transport policy: Average impacts by country (Baseline scenario) (**) 

Table 5.2.4.1. Transport policy: Average impacts by type of regions and scenario (*)
ANNEX 5 – LIST of FIGURES (Figures marked with (*) are included in the core text of the SCIENTIFIC REPORT ONLY, figures marked with (**) are included in the core text of BOTH REPORTS; the numbering follows the one in the scientific report)

Figure 1.3.1. The seven steps in Multi Criteria Decision Assessment procedure (*)

Figure 1.4.1. The components of territorial cohesion (*)

Figure 1.4.2. An integrated strategy for territorial cohesion: objectives and assessment criteria (*)

Figure 4.1.1. Value function for criterion Economic growth (TEQUILA1) (*)

Figure 4.1.2. Value function for criterion External accessibility (TEQUILA1) (*)

Figure 4.1.3. Value function for criterion Internal connectivity (TEQUILA1) (*)

Figure 4.1.4. Value function for criterion Congestion (TEQUILA1) (*)

Figure 4.1.5. Value function for criterion Emissions (TEQUILA1) (*)

Figure 4.1.6. Value function for criterion Transport sustainability (TEQUILA1) (*)

Figure 4.1.7. Value function for criterion Creativity (TEQUILA1) (*)

Figure 4.1.8. Value function for criterion Cultural heritage (TEQUILA1) (*)

Figure 4.1.9. Value function for criterion Landscape fragmentation (TEQUILA1) (*)

Figure 4.2.1. Value function for criterion Productivity of internal infrastructure (TEQUILA2 – Transport policies) (*)

Figure 4.2.2. Value function for criterion Productivity of airports (TEQUILA2 – Transport policies) (*)

Figure 4.2.3. Value function for criterion GDP growth (TEQUILA2 – Transport policies) (*)

Figure 4.2.4. Value function for criterion Congestion costs (TEQUILA2 – Transport policies) (*)

Figure 4.2.5. Value function for criterion Road freight crossing region border (TEQUILA2 – Transport policies) (*)

Figure 4.2.6. Value function for criterion CO2 emissions (TEQUILA2 – Transport policies) (*)

Figure 4.2.7. Value function for criterion Safety (TEQUILA2 – Transport policies) (*)

Figure 4.2.8. Value function for criterion Market opportunities (TEQUILA2 – Transport policies) (*)
Figure 4.2.9. Value function for criterion Regional integration (TEQUILA2 – Transport policies) (*)

Figure 4.2.10. Value function for criterion Landscape fragmentation (TEQUILA2 – Transport policies) (*)

Figure 4.2.11. Value function for criterion Openness to daily visitors (TEQUILA2 – Transport policies) (*)

Figure 4.3.1. Value function for criterion Economic growth (TEQUILA2 – CAP policy) (*)

Figure 4.3.2. Value function for criterion Unemployment (TEQUILA2 – CAP policy) (*)

Figure 4.3.3. Value function for criterion Tourism diversification (TEQUILA2 – CAP policy) (*)

Figure 4.3.4. Value function for criterion Environmental quality (TEQUILA2 – CAP policy) (*)

Figure 4.3.5. Value function for criterion Community viability (TEQUILA2 – CAP policy) (*)

Figure 4.3.6. Value function for criterion Emissions (TEQUILA2 – CAP policy) (*)

Figure 4.3.7. Value function for criterion Risk of soil erosion (TEQUILA2 – CAP policy) (*)

Figure 4.3.8. Value function for criterion Landscape diversity (TEQUILA2 – CAP policy) (*)

Figure 4.3.9. Value function for criterion Community viability (TEQUILA2 – CAP policy) (*)

Figure 4.3.10. Value function for criterion Heritage products (TEQUILA2 – CAP policy) (*)

Figure 5.1.2.1. Correlation between impacts on Territorial efficiency in two weighting systems (experts’ and policy makers’) (*)

Figure 5.1.2.2. Spreadsheet of TEQUILA2 on CAP policy: weights and summative impacts (**) 

Figure 5.2.2.1. Spreadsheet of TEQUILA2 on Transport policy – Baseline scenario: weights and summative impacts (*)

Figure 5.2.1.2. Spreadsheet of TEQUILA2 on Transport policy – Pricing scenario: weights and summative impacts (*)
Figure 5.2.1.3. Spreadsheet of TEQUILA2 on Transport policy – Infrastructure scenario: weights and summative impacts (*)

Figure 5.2.2.4. Correlation between impacts on Territorial efficiency in two weighting systems (experts’ and policy makers’) – Baseline scenario (*)

Figure 5.2.2.5. Correlation between impacts on Territorial efficiency in two weighting systems (experts’ and policy makers’) – Infrastructure scenario (*)

Figure 5.2.2.6. Correlation between impacts on Territorial efficiency in two weighting systems (experts’ and policy makers’) – Pricing scenario
ANNEX 6 – LIST of MISSING DATA

FOR CAP DATASETS:
CH, FR91-92-93-94, IS, LI, and NO

CAP DATASET – EU15
PIM_E1
BE10; DE30/50; ES53/63-4; FI18; UKI1
PIM_E2
BE10; DE30/50; ES53/63-4; FI18; UKI1; FI20; PT20/30
PIM_Q1
DEC0; DEE1-2-3; UKI-2; PT20/30
DATA in PIM_Q2 (TOT 25 MISSING)
BE10; DE30/50; ES53/63-4; FI18; UKI1; DEC0; DEE1-2-3; UKI-2; PT20/30; AT13; DE12/60/91-2/C0/D3
DATA in PIM_Q4 (TOT 40 MISSING)
BE10; ES30/63-4/70; FI13-8-9-A/20; GR30/41; PT20/30; SE11-2/21-2-3/31-2-3; UKI1-2; AT13; DE12/30/50/60/91-2/C0/D3/E1-2-3; UKI1-2
DATA in PIM_I1 (TOT 20 MISSING)
DEC0; DEE1-2-3; UKI-2; PT20/30; AT13; DE12/30/50/60/91-2/C0/D3/E1-2-3; UKI1-2
DATA in PIM_I2 (TOT 15 MISSING)
BE10; DE30/50; ES53/63-4; FI18; UKI1; FI20; PT20/30
DATA in PIM_I3 (TOT 81 MISSING)
BE10; DE30/41-2/50; ES53/63-4; FI18; UKI1; all BE; DE11-2-3-4/41-2/B1-2-3; all ES; all IE; all IT; PT16-7-8; all Se.

MISSING DATA CAP – EU12
DATA in PIM_E1
No missing
DATA in PIM_E2
all SI
DATA in PIM_E3
all SI NUTS
DATA in PIM_Q1
All BG and all RO
DATA in PIM_Q2
All BG, all RO , all SI
DATA in PIM_Q3
All BG and all RO
DATA in PIM_Q4
All BG and all RO, CY00, MT00, SK01
DATA in PIM_I1
All BG and all RO
DATA in PIM_I2
All SI NUTS
DATA in PIM_I3
All BG, CZ01, all EE, all HU, all MT, all PL, all RO, all SI.
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List of participants to the First Expert Meeting, VU University Amsterdam, March the 4th 2009
Prof. dr. Peter Nijkamp, Department of Spatial Economics, VU University Amsterdam.
Prof. dr. Piet Rietveld, Department of Spatial Economics, VU University Amsterdam.
Prof. dr. Roberto Camagni, Politecnico di Milano.
Dr. Henri de Groot, Department of Spatial Economics, VU University Amsterdam.
Dr. Jan Rouwendal, Department of Spatial Economics, VU University Amsterdam.
Dr. Frank Bruinsma, Department of Spatial Economics, VU University Amsterdam.
Dr. Gert-Jan Linders, Department of Spatial Economics, VU University Amsterdam.
Dr. Eveline van Leeuwen, Department of Spatial Economics, VU University Amsterdam.
Ceren Ozgen, Department of Spatial Economics, VU University Amsterdam.
Ahu Gulumser, Urban and Regional Planning Department, Istanbul Technical University
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Efrain Larrea, MCRIT Barcelona
Dr. Camilla Lenzi, Politecnico di Milano.
Marian Raley, School of Agriculture, Food and Rural Development, Newcastle University.
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Sergi Lozano Sole - IET (Institut d'Estudis Territorials) / Public enterprise.
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Andreu Orte - Diputació de Barcelona / Regional Government.
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List of participants to the Third Expert Meeting, University of Newcastle upon Tyne, Newcastle, May the 12th 2009

Lionel Hubbard, School of Agriculture, Food and Rural Development, Newcastle University.
Carmen Hubbard, School of Agriculture, Food and Rural Development, Newcastle University.
David Harvey, School of Agriculture, Food and Rural Development, Newcastle University.
Philip Cain, School of Agriculture, Food and Rural Development, Newcastle University.
Eric Ruto, School of Agriculture, Food and Rural Development, Newcastle University.
Charles Scott, School of Agriculture, Food and Rural Development, Newcastle University.
Mark Shucksmith, - School of Architecture, Planning and Landscape, Newcastle University.
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ANNEX 8 - LIST of ABBRAVIATIONS and GLOSSARY

CAP Common Agricultural Policy
CBA Cost Benefit Analysis
CTP Common Transport Policy
DG-ECFIN EC’s Directorate General for Economy and Finance
DGTREN EC’s Directorate General for Transport and Energy
DGREGIO EC’s Directorate General for Regional Policy
EC European Commission
EEA European Environmental Agency
EET European Energy and Transport
ETS EU Emissions Trading System
EU12 Czech Republic, Cyprus, Hungary, Slovakia, Slovenia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Malta, Romania, Bulgaria
EU15 Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain and United Kingdom, Austria, Finland and Sweden
HST High-Speed Trains
ICT Information and Communication Technology
IT information technology
ITS Intelligent Transport System
IWW Inland Water Ways
JRC European Commission’s Joint Research Centre
GDP Gross Domestic Product
GHG Greenhouse Gas
MCA Multi Criteria Analysis
NCT Neighbouring Countries in TRANS-TOOLS
NST/R Standard Goods Classification for Transport Statistics (Nomenclature uniforme des marchandises pour les statistiques des transports)
NUTS Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics
PB Pocket Book
PPP Public-Private Partnership
R&D Research and Development
RTD Research in Transport Development
S&T Science and Technology
SDS Sustainable Development Strategy
TEN-T Trans-European Network for Transport
SSS short sea shipping
TENs Trans European Transport Networks
TEM Trans European Motorways
TER Trans European Railways
TT TRANS-TOOLS
UCEs Units of Carbon Entitlements
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