

# EAP Task Force

## **Ministerial Consultation on Environmental Policy-making in Central and Eastern Europe June 19, 2000 Szentendre, Hungary**

### **Background Document No. (2000) 3**

#### **Scoping for the Strategic Environmental Assessment of VI. Multi-Modal Transport Corridor Warsaw-Budapest Draft Regional Synthesis Report**

**Agenda item: 1b**

**Secretariat of the EAP Task Force:**

The Regional Environmental Center for Central and Eastern Europe • Ady Endre ut 9-11 • 2000 Szentendre • Hungary  
Tel: (36-26) 311 199 • Fax: (36-26) 311 294 • E-mail: [info@rec.org](mailto:info@rec.org) • Website: <http://www.rec.org/programs/eapf/>  
*in cooperation with*

Environment Directorate, OECD • 2, rue André-Pascal • 75775 Paris CEDEX 16 • France  
Tel: (33 1) 45 24 81 85 • Fax: (33 1) 45 24 96 71 • E-mail: [env.contact@oecd.org](mailto:env.contact@oecd.org) • Website: <http://www.oecd.org/env/eap/>

## **Scoping for the Strategic Environmental Assessment of VI. Multi-Modal Transport Corridor Warsaw-Budapest**

### Draft Regional Synthesis Report

---

#### **Executive Summary**

One of the main challenges of the EU accession process is to ensure that various accession-related sectoral strategies take advantage of synergies among them. Environmental quality and mobility are two of the key concerns for the citizens today, therefore, the environmental and transport strategies, at minimum, must find a way not to conflict each other or prevent practical achievement of the agreed environmental and transport goals, and at maximum should seek ways for meeting those objectives in a synergistic way.

The issue of integration of international transport and environment planning in CEE region was raised by the 11<sup>th</sup> Environmental Action Programme (EAP) Task Force meeting, held in Szentendre, October 18-19, 1999. As a consequence, the EAP Task Force has mandated the Regional Environmental Center to initiate a strategic environmental assessment of transport policies in Central and Eastern Europe. Given the complexity of the national and international transport planning in CEE and the limited time and resources available, it was decided to narrow down the focus and to carry out a scoping of the VI<sup>th</sup> Multi-Modal Transport Corridor Warsaw-Budapest. It was felt that even such limited scope would enable to effectively study current transport planning approaches, their environmental implications and available tools for integration of environmental and transport planning.

Because of the fact that the selected corridor is already part of the national and international planning documents and is at an advanced stage of approval, the SEA scoping was carried out as an *ad interim* assessment, rather than as an ex-ante evaluation. The scoping phase was carried in the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Slovakia. It took into account both national and international planning documents.

#### **The main findings are as follows:**

##### Planning of Transport Policies

1. Transport planning in the CEE countries typically pays limited attention to environmental issues and provides passive reaction to increased motorisation and multi-modal alternatives.
2. National transport policies and strategies are heavily focused on the extension of Trans-European Networks, which is biased towards motorways.
3. Recommendations of the first stage of Transport Infrastructure Needs Assessment (TINA) are being rapidly incorporated into national transport policies, transport sections of national development, regional development documents and national strategies for the use of ISPA in spite of the fact that socio-economic and environmental impacts of these recommendations have not been assessed.
4. The possible changes to predicted transport flows, as a result of, for example, developments in information technology, are not carefully considered and taken into account.
5. Alternative transport policies are usually not given serious consideration.
6. The existing bias towards road building, notably motorways, in transport policy planning of CEE as well as the EU, has heavily influenced priority setting of the projects submitted for ISPA funding.

##### Setting Environmental Goals and Objectives

1. In number of instances, national environmental goals and objectives are poorly defined, which make it impossible to assess severity of cumulative environmental impacts.

2. Most transport policies lack specific environmental goals and targets and it was impossible to clearly establish a link between the environmental policies and the transport policies.
3. Many policies and strategies lacked internal consistency between their stated environmental objectives and the proposed implementation actions.

#### Possible Environmental, Health and Socio-Economic Impacts

1. Cumulative environmental, health and socio-economic impacts of the transport policies are unknown.
2. While the need to carry out strategic environmental assessment for these policies is generally acknowledged, it is unclear how this will be done.
3. Implementation of the transport policies is widely expected to have substantial socio-economical, environmental and health impacts.

#### Policy Recommendations

1. The growing negative impacts of transport on environment and health of population require a more comprehensive policy approach at the international level. Because of the concerns regarding national competitiveness and common market, there is a strong need for coordinated setting of national environmental and health objectives for the transport sector, including the targets for emissions of greenhouse gases, NO<sub>x</sub>, particulates, urban air quality, habitat conservation etc. The setting of these objectives could build on the success of the Heavy Metals Protocol to LRTAP Convention and the Lead Phase-Out Strategy adopted by the Environmental Ministers in Aarhus in 1998.
2. The scope of the EU transport policy should be expanded beyond the Trans European Networks, if it is to achieve the already proclaimed environmental and health objectives. Another option is that some of the other policy areas need to fill such gaps as the promotion of urban public transport and replacement of classic transport with communication technology.
3. The idea of Trans-European Networks needs to be implemented in its entirety, including the integration of the railways across Europe to secure their competitiveness versus road both for freight and passenger transport.
4. Projects achieving the environmental and health objectives of the transport policies should be a priority for the community funding mechanisms such as ISPA (Cohesion Fund) and PHARE (Structural Funds) in the Candidate Countries.
5. Socio-economic, environmental and health impacts of planned development of transport infrastructure in CEE should be assessed through a detailed Strategic Environmental Assessment of TINA, as recommended in the TINA Final Report and required by the Structural Funds Regulation. Such an assessment should be carried out as a matter of priority, independently on the timeframe for the continuation of the TINA process.
6. SEA of transport sections of National Development Plans of accession countries should be carried out in addition to SEA of TINA.
7. Coherent and quantifiable environmental objectives and targets for transport sector in CEE should be developed as a matter of priority. Development. Application of concept similar to the TERM (Transport and Environment Reporting Mechanism) of the European Environmental Agency would be particularly useful in the CEE region.
8. The Ministers of Environment may find it useful to establish a joint working group of senior governmental officials to monitor implementation of their decisions on the points above. The working group should seek close cooperation with the European Commission and with transport authorities in CEE.

#### Background

The EU Accession Process is the main driver of change in Central and Eastern Europe. Structural change and new investment is taking place in all sectors from political systems and economy to infrastructure at an unprecedented pace. Countries are racing to adapt to the European Union's common market, legislation and policies. Within this rapid process, many of the historic environmental problems of the CEE countries will be solved through new infrastructure, economic restructuring and implementation of the EU *Acquis Communautaire*. On the other hand, new environmental problems are emerging connected to the economic growth. Some of these problems (e.g. urban air pollution, loss of habitat) are connected to the growing traffic, resulting from the increasing affluence of the population and international commerce.

One of the main challenges of the EU accession process is to ensure that various accession-related sectoral strategies take advantage of synergies among them, and that they, in the end effect, improve the quality of life of the citizens of enlarged Europe and the competitiveness of Europe as a whole on the global market. Environmental quality and mobility are two of the key concerns for the citizens today, therefore, the environmental and transport strategies, at minimum, must find a way not to conflict each other or prevent practical achievement of the agreed environmental and transport goals, and at maximum should seek ways for meeting those objectives in a synergistic way.

The Accession process has spurred development of new environmental and transport policies in the EU Accession Countries and in the whole CEE region. The scope of environmental commitments is laid down in national environmental accession strategies and related environmental policies (e.g. National Environmental Policy, National Environmental Action Programme, National Environmental and Health Action Programme, environmental sections of National Development Plans, etc.). These strategies generally point out the need for the implementation of a wide variety of EU environmental directives, which would provide solution to the main environmental problems in the countries.

In a similar manner, key transport commitments of the accession countries are being newly defined in national accession strategies in field of transport, new national transport policies and transport sections of National Development Plans. These programming documents generally state the need for incorporation of the transport infrastructure of the accession countries into the overall European transport infrastructure, especially into Trans-European Networks.

While attempts to ensure consistency of national policies in the field of transport and environment were made on national level, transport planning in the CEECs has been coordinated through an assessment of regional consistency of the proposed transport infrastructure, called the Transport Infrastructure Needs Assessment (TINA). This process was carried out jointly by the EU Commission and representatives of the transport authorities in the CEECs, and focused mainly on transports needs and the assessment of transport infrastructure. It is envisaged that its direct follow-up, also called TINA, but meaning Transport Infrastructure Network Adaptation, will concentrate on environmental and socio-economic assessment of the TINA-needs assessment recommendations. Existing recommendations of TINA process, therefore, do not currently address environmental implications of the proposed developments of transport systems in CEECs.

Recommendations of the Transport Infrastructure Needs Assessment, however, seemed to be very quickly incorporated into national transport strategies and related programming documents. This raises concerns in the environmental sector, since Trans European Networks are just one of the aspects of a comprehensive transport strategy, and should be balanced with the national and local concerns such as urban infrastructure and mitigation of negative environmental and health impacts of transport.

A classic example is the public transport systems in the cities of Central and Eastern Europe, which are losing passengers because of their obsolescence and rising prices in competition with newly acquired cars. Yet these systems have preserved a lot of infrastructure that has been dismantled in the Western countries in the last decades, and is being built again at very high cost in face of the persistent congestion in the cities. It would be desirable if the CEE cities can invest in and maintain this infrastructure, but since TENs are the only common EU policy on transport, there are no practical mechanisms available for Community support. And the Community support for TENs is drawing the limited national resources primarily towards construction of long distance infrastructure, notably highways.

The issue of integration of international transport and environment planning in CEE region was raised by the 11<sup>th</sup> Environmental Action Programme (EAP) Task Force meeting, held in Szentendre, October 18-19, 1999.

The meeting stressed the fact that environmental impacts of current strategies for development of transport infrastructure in CEE should be made explicit. The meeting also took notice of the conclusions by the ECTM/OECD workshops on SEA in Transport Sector (Warsaw, October 1999) which calls for priority application of strategic environmental assessment for transport infrastructure development plans laid down in TINA recommendations.

As a consequence, the EAP Task Force has mandated its Secretariat – provided by the REC – to initiate a strategic environmental assessment of transport policies in Central and Eastern Europe. The results of such study were to be presented to the Consultation of Environment Ministers from the EU and CEE on June 19, 2000 in Szentendre, Hungary.

### **Objectives of the Study**

The EAP Task Force has defined the objectives of the study as follows:

1. To identify potential impacts of the proposed development of transport infrastructure in CEE on environmental commitments of CEE countries,
2. To suggest suitable tools for integration of environment and transport (with specific focus on potential application of SEA for international transport planning in CEE),
3. To suggest practical provisions for effective coordination of environmental and transport planning on CEE-regional level.

### **Scope of the Study**

The original assignment was to assess environmental impacts of transport policies for the entire CEE region. This, however, proved to be too ambitious given the complexity of the national and international transport planning in CEE and the limited time and resources available. A solution, which would enable to meet stated objectives effectively, was to narrow the scope of work and focus on a selected multi-modal transport corridor instead.

It was felt that a well-chosen corridor would provide, if not representative, than at least indicative evidence of the potential environmental problems faced by the rest of the region as a consequence of the conflicts between transport and environmental policies. In addition, even such limited scope would enable to effectively study current transport planning approaches, their environmental implications and available tools for integration of environmental and transport planning.

Using preliminary selection criteria and based on a review of available options, it was decided that the study would focus on the planned transport infrastructure between Warsaw and Budapest along the VI. Multi-Modal Transport Corridor.

Because of the fact that the selected corridor is already part of the national and international planning documents and is at an advanced stage of approval, the SEA was to be carried out as an *ad interim* assessment, rather than as an *ex-ante* evaluation which would normally be carried out in parallel with the early planning stages. In particular, the study involved an *ad interim* scoping phase with a broad remit:

1. To discuss and identify the environmental and transport policy context of the corridor;
2. To discuss and identify the environmental and sustainability objectives relevant to the corridor;
3. To discuss and identify the likely/desirable alternative proposals for the corridor;
4. To discuss and identify the practical measures which will be necessary to undertake a full-scale SEA for the corridor.

The scoping phase was carried in the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Slovakia. It focused on national and international planning documents which determine the proposed transport infrastructure of the corridor since individual corridor-related plans do not exist. The original focus of the scoping was therefore altered from purely corridor-focused analysis to analysis of both national and corridor-related plans since the specific corridor-related plans cannot be separated for general transport strategies.

## Approach and Methodology

The study was implemented through preliminary SEA scoping which focused on the existing CEE-regional and in-country plans for development of transport infrastructure along the corridor. The scoping focused on the following issues:

*1. Analysis of transport planning related to the corridor.* Analysis of transport planning documents setting up VI. Multi-Modal Transport Corridor was carried out in order to fully understand extent of the planned transport infrastructure along the corridor and to determine main strategic options of the corridor. The analysis focused on the National Transport Policy and related national transport planning documents, Transport Infrastructure Needs Assessment Final Report, transport section of the National Development Plan, relevant regional development documents and alternative transport strategies (prepared by NGOs or independent institutes).

*2. Identification of alternatives.* A preliminary evaluation of transport objectives set out in all relevant transport strategies was carried out in order to determine all relevant strategic options of the corridor, including non-structural options (e.g. potential options based on legal and economic support for combined transport, public transport, restructuring of railways, etc.). This enabled identification of potential strategic options as well as specific spatial alternatives of the corridor.

*3. Identification of existing environmental objectives and targets for the transport sector and recommended environmental objectives for the corridor.* This analysis focused on the existence of specific environmental goals and targets for the transport sector that provide benchmark for assessment of strategic impacts of the corridor on the environmental policy targets. General environmental objectives and targets for the transport sector and specific environmental objectives and targets for the corridor were determined through public participation process and review of the transport related environmental goals in national environmental policies (National Environmental Policy, National Environmental Action Programme, National Environmental and Health Action Programme), national transport strategies and regional development documents.

*4. Approaches for to assessment of conflicts between the proposed strategic alternatives of the corridor and the environmental goals.* In-country scoping focused on possible methodological approaches that can be used in assessment of corridor in respect to meeting environmental goals for the transport sector. The rather wide scoping stage designed for this project, addressed the following methodological issues related to SEA for the corridor:

1. Who should be responsible for initiating and organising the SEA?
2. What alternative transport strategies, plans, policies and programmes, environmental goals and objectives should be reviewed?
3. What steps should be taken to carry out the SEA (especially with regards to public consultations)?
4. Who should review and approve SEA Documents?
5. How should the SEA results be used in the planning process?

Within the regional review of in-country scoping documents, new policy tools for reconciliation of environmental and transport planning besides of SEA were suggested (such as the need of integrated transport and environment planning or need for reconsideration of general EU funding priorities for development of transport systems in CEE). These suggestions result from expert judgements of the REC review team and do not constitute part of in-country analytical work.

The study was carried out by an international expert team, which was comprised of the following individuals:

- Jiri Dusik, Miroslav Chodák (overall project management)
- Urszula Rzeszot, Waldemar Madej, Krzysztof Kacprzyk, Jolanta Wójcik, and Malgorzata Koziarek (in-country SEA scoping in Poland)
- Tomas Gremlica and Simona Šulcová (in-country SEA scoping in the Czech Republic)
- Maroš Finka, Maria Kozová, Ingrid Belcakova, Dagmar Periková, Peter Barek, Eva Pauditsova and Richard Filcák, (in-country SEA scoping in the Slovak Republic)
- Tamas Fleischer and Laszlo Perneczky (in-country SEA scoping in Hungary)

The overall project management has benefited from the input the following persons who provided general comments of the approach and methodology:

- Stephen Perkins (ECMT)
- Olivia Bina (ERM, with support of the European Commission, DG Environment)
- William Kennedy and Mikko Venermo (EBRD)
- Nenad Mikulic (Chair of the Sofia EIA Initiative)

### **Public Participation Procedure**

Preliminary SEA scoping of the VI. Multi-Modal Transport Corridor Warsaw-Budapest begun in January 2000. It was carried out in Poland, Slovakia, Czech Republic and Hungary through a process based on expert evaluation of the current planning situation and consultations with key stakeholders adhering to the principles of Article 7 of the Aarhus Convention (UN/ECE Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters). Within the public participation component of the SEA scoping, comments from various stakeholders were obtained. The public participation procedure is outlined in the Annex 1 to this report.

### **Main Findings**

The findings below summarise general comments, which were derived on the basis of preliminary in-country scoping documents for the VI. Multi-modal Transport Corridor Warsaw-Budapest. They reflect preliminary REC judgements about features of the transport and environmental planning in the four affected countries and may not necessarily reflect views of individual experts or institutions involved in the scoping process.

### **Planning of Transport Policies**

1. Transport planning in the CEE countries is primarily based on transport strategies developed during the mid-1990s. These strategies typically paid limited attention to environmental issues and provided passive reaction to increased motorisation. They suggested rapid development of extensive road schemes while neglecting analytical comparison between multi-modal alternatives.
2. The process of EU Accession fostered the development of new transport strategies in CEE, including new national transport policies, transport sections of National Development Plans and national strategies for the use of ISPA subsidies for transport infrastructure. While these strategies generally emphasise the need to mitigate environmental and health impact of transport and to balance inter-modal splits, their implementation plans are heavily focused on the extension of Trans-European Networks to Central and Eastern Europe, which is biased towards building long-distance infrastructure, most notably motorways.
3. Recommendations of the first stage of Transport Infrastructure Needs Assessment (TINA) are being rapidly incorporated into national transport policies, transport sections of national development, regional development documents and national strategies for the use of ISPA in spite of the fact that socio-economic and environmental impacts of these recommendations will not be assessed until four years from now. The specific procedure for strategic environmental assessment of TINA proposals, including the institutional set up of such assessment, has not yet been clarified. In number of instances, the perceived high political value attributed by the CEE countries to the TINA recommendations effectively override national transport strategies.
4. Most transport policies are based on the approximate modelling of transport flows and use a presumption that transport infrastructure will have to address maximum predicted transport flows. The possible changes to predicted transport flows, as a result of, for example, developments in information technology, are not carefully considered and taken into account.

5. Alternative transport policies, which are based on more balanced multi-modal splits, make use of combined transportation, focus on preserving urban public transportation infrastructure, improve rail management systems to make them more competitive and promote use of pedestrian zones and bicycle routes, are usually not given serious consideration.
6. The existing bias towards road building, notably motorways, in transport policy planning of CEE as well as the EU, has heavily influenced priority setting of the projects submitted for ISPA funding.

### ***Setting Environmental Goals and Objectives***

7. In a number of instances, national environmental goals and objectives have been found to be poorly defined, especially from the point of view of their applicability for strategic discussions on environmental impacts of transport systems. Missing environmental targets or lack of their quantified indicators make it impossible to assess severity of cumulative environmental impacts.
8. Most transport policies lacked specific environmental goals and targets and it was impossible to clearly establish a link between the environmental policies and the transport policies. Strategic environmental goals seemed to lack specificity and consistency.
9. Additionally, many policies and strategies lacked internal consistency between their stated environmental objectives and the proposed implementation actions.

### ***Possible Environmental, Health and Socio-Economic Impacts***

10. Cumulative environmental, health and socio-economic impacts of the transport policies (including programs for funding priorities under TINA and ISPA) are yet unknown. While the need to carry out such strategic environmental assessment for these policies is generally acknowledged, it is unclear what procedure will be applied, when it is expected to take place and who should be responsible for undertaking and for reviewing of the SEA findings.
11. Implementation of the transport policies is widely expected to have substantial environmental and health impacts. The following impacts should be studied in order to determine main environmental implications of proposed transport activities:
  - Urban air, particularly NO<sub>x</sub> and greenhouse gases due to the use of combustion engines in cars
  - Hot spot areas where ambient air quality standards are in danger of being regularly exceeded as a result of ring road and city congestions
  - Areas where noise limits are in danger of being exceeded
  - Dangers to nature protected areas and biodiversity due to fragmentation and elimination of bio-corridors
12. Assessment of socio-economic implications of the proposed transport strategies should be carried out in addition to environmental assessment. The socio-economic assessment should employ most up-to-date methodologies, such as those currently reviewed by the ECMT-OECD (e.g. findings under Benefits of Transport programme). Socio-economic impact assessment should pay adequate attention to:
  - Socio-economic impacts of limited development of new transport infrastructure (e.g. zero alternative) accompanied by the alternative use of the proposed subsidies for transport for direct stimulation of local and regional economy.
  - Socio-economic impacts of rapid development of 'non-transportation' means of transport (such as the use of Internet).
  - Socio-economic impacts of urban sprawl induced by urban transport infrastructure investments.
  - Impact of transport infrastructure on economic disparities among regions (e.g. local socio-economic impacts of increased accessibility of under-developed regions).
  - Inclusion of externalities to the costs of transport infrastructure
  - Socio-economic impacts of greater use of pedestrian zones and bicycle routes.

- Socio-economic impacts of a expanded use of public transportation.
- Socio-economic impacts of improving railway management, focusing on issues of competitiveness and international processes.

## Policy Recommendations

1. Currently, the scope of international cooperation in the field of transport in Europe is limited to technical standards and transnational networks. Also the EU transport policies are primarily centered on the Trans European Networks. While this cooperation has an important value for the European integration, the growing negative impacts of transport on environment and health of population in spite of proclaimed objective of most national transport policies, require a more comprehensive policy approach at the international level. Because of the concerns regarding national competitiveness and common market, there is a strong need for coordinated setting of national environmental and health objectives for the transport sector, including the targets for emissions of greenhouse gases, NO<sub>x</sub>, particulates, urban air quality, habitat conservation etc. The setting of these objectives could build on the success of the Heavy Metals Protocol to LRTAP Convention and the Lead Phase-Out Strategy adopted by the Environmental Ministers in Aarhus in 1998.
2. EU Enlargement provides an excellent opportunity for the Candidate Countries to avoid some of the mistakes in the transport development the current EU Members are trying to rectify at high costs, such as the abandonment of public transport infrastructure and services in favour of individual use of cars. The scope of the EU transport policy should be expanded beyond the Trans European Networks, if it is to achieve the already proclaimed environmental and health objectives. Another option is that some of the other policy areas need to fill such gaps as the promotion of urban public transport and replacement of classic transport with communication technology.
3. The idea of Trans-European Networks needs to be implemented in its entirety, including the integration of the railways across Europe to secure their competitiveness versus road both for freight and passenger transport. The enlargement process can provide a unique opportunity to achieve this in the candidate countries with a set of appropriate incentives and political attention from the Commission and EU Member States.
4. Projects achieving the environmental and health objectives of the transport policies should be a priority for the community funding mechanisms such as ISPA (Cohesion Fund) and PHARE (Structural Funds) in the Candidate Countries. Such signals could mobilize the efforts and resources behind the urban transport and railway development projects which are usually more difficult to prepare and implement than simple road building projects.
5. Transport Infrastructure Needs Assessment (TINA) provides a very valuable data for national and pan-European environmental policy making by indicating extend of the forthcoming environmental pressure from transport sector. Environmental impacts of planned development of transport infrastructure in CEE should be assessed through a detailed Strategic Environmental Assessment of TINA, as recommended in the TINA Final Report and required by the Structural Funds Regulation. European Commission, TINA Senior Officials Group, and International Finance Institutions involved in the TINA process, in cooperation with Ministries of Environment should make sure that such an assessment is carried out as a matter of priority, independently on the timeframe for the continuation of the TINA process. Such an assessment should incorporate economic, social and environmental valuation as interdependent and equal aspects in further planning of the transport infrastructure. The suggested format of strategic environmental assessment of TINA recommendations is laid down in the Annex 2 to this report.
6. SEA of transport sections of National Development Plans of accession countries should be carried out in addition to SEA of TINA. National Governments of the accession countries and the European Commission should make sure ex ante evaluations of NDPs properly addressing environmental impacts of NDPs are carried out.

7. Coherent and quantifiable environmental objectives and targets for transport systems in CEE region can substantially contribute to reporting of environmental implications of development of transport systems in CEE. Environmental objectives and targets for transport sector in CEE should be developed as a matter of priority. Development of such objectives and targets can substantially benefit from input of EU institutions involved in similar processes. Application of concept similar to the TERM (Transport and Environment Reporting Mechanism) of the European Environmental Agency would be particularly useful in the CEE region.
8. The Ministers of Environment may find it useful to establish a joint working group of senior governmental officials to monitor implementation of their decisions on the points above. The working group should seek close cooperation with the European Commission and with transport authorities in CEE.

**Annex 1**  
**SEA scoping of the VI. Multi-modal Transport Corridor Warsaw-Budapest**  
**Public Participation Procedure**

The SEA scoping was based on the following steps:

1. Draft In-country Scoping Documents were prepared in each affected country as a basis for public discussions on the impacts of corridor-related transport plans. They provided basic information about:
  - strategic alternatives of the corridor, based on the analysis of relevant transport-related plans,
  - key environmental objectives for the corridor, and
  - main environmental issues to be considered in SEA of the corridor.
2. Background materials for in-country Scoping Documents were distributed to relevant stakeholders in each country. All identified stakeholders were asked to provide either written comments or participate in public discussions on Draft Scoping Documents.
3. In-country Scoping Documents incorporated, where possible comments obtained during public review, and provided additional information requested by the REC.
4. Regional Synthesis Report (this document) summarises the key findings from In-country Scoping Documents.
5. Regional Synthesis Report will be sent for comments to all Governments involved in Environmental Action Program for CEE, as well as to environmental NGOs and potentially interested international organisations.
6. CEE-regional review of the Regional Synthesis Report will take place in Szentendre on June 18-19, 2000. Regional Synthesis Report will be discussed at NGOs Workshop on June 18, 2000 and will be presented as a background document for Ministerial consultation on June 19, 2000.
7. Regional Synthesis Report, and the comments on it obtained from the CEE-regional review, will be put on Internet and will be made available for the use by NGOs and public authorities dealing with transport and environment issues.

**List of experts and institutions who provided valuable input into in-country scoping reports:**

Poland: Andrzej Sieminski, Tadeusz Kopta, Andrzej Kassenberg, Grzegorz Kaminski, Anna Skibniewska-Rusinowska, Rafal Kosno, Witold Woloszyn.

Czech Republic: Milan Machac, Miroslav Martiš, Miroslav Patrik, Martin Robeš, Jiri Guth

Hungary: Representatives of the following institutions and individuals gave substantive comments of the draft in-country scoping reports on the in-country meeting or giving written contributions: Hungarian Ministry of Environment, Directorate of the Hungarian Road Management and Coordination, Hungarian Railway Company, Hungarian Research Institute for Transport Sciences, VATI Ltd. Hungarian Institute for Town and Regional Planning, of PESTTERV Ltd. Regional Planning Ent., ÖKO Company, and the Hungarian Traffic Club. Using their opinion does not mean that these institutions would be responsible for the general views incorporated into the in-country report.

**Annex 2**  
**Scoping for the Strategic Environmental Assessment of VI. Multi-Modal**  
**Transport Corridor Warsaw-Budapest**

**Suggested procedure for full-scale SEA**

1. SEA should be undertaken by the prime decision-makers of the proposed transport strategies. Ministries of Environment should advise on SEA procedure, review quality of SEA documents and possibly provide expertise. The European Commission should have a responsibility to ensure that the quality of SEA is adequate where it co-finances implementation of the transport strategies with the relevant EU funds.
2. SEA can be initiated, based on the request of Ministers of Environment of the countries affected by the proposed development of transport infrastructure. The request can be addressed to the following institutions:
  - request for SEA of TINA recommendations or of a specific transport corridor should address the European Commission, Ministers of Transport of CEE countries and International Finance Institutions that are expected to fund proposed transport systems. The request should call for start-up of the Transport Infrastructure Network Adaptation in Central and in Eastern Europe, based on strategic environmental assessment and socio-economic assessment, as proposed in the TINA Final Report.
  - request for SEA of transport sections of National Development Plans (NDPs) should address the European Commission and national authorities responsible for coordination of NDPs. The request should address the need of adequate application of ex-ante evaluation of NDPs, including proper environmental assessment of NDPs.
3. CEE-regional working group should be established to oversee the SEA process. The working group should comprise of senior officials from environment authorities and should seek participation of senior officials from transport and regional development authorities, while providing seats for NGO observers. The working group should be given the following mandate:
  - coordinate SEA with other assessments (e.g. socio-economic assessment) of the proposed transport schemes,
  - develop coherent transport-related environmental objectives and targets for the EU accession countries,
  - select main strategic alternatives of the transport systems to be analysed within the SEA process,
  - approve specific Terms of Reference for the SEA, supervise the selection of the SEA team and practical application of SEA,
  - review the outcomes of the SEA process.
4. The SEA should be carried out by independent team comprised of specialists in the field of:
  - transport planning,
  - environmental planning,
  - regional development planning,
  - strategic environmental assessment,
  - socio-economic assessment,
  - public participation.
5. SEA should be subject to thorough public participation consisting of the following means of communication and response gathering:
  - Public Access to Documents: All official texts related to proposed programmes, policies and plans as well as the draft SEA documents should be published on Internet. There should be no charge for downloading of the documents.
  - Written Commenting: Written comments will be gathered throughout the SEA process via ordinary mail and specially assigned e-mail address (for electronic documentation) Any interested person or institution will have a right to submit comments. All comments should undergo detailed content analysis.
6. Public Review should be organised in all affected countries and should consist of two stages. The first stage should focus on review of environmental objectives for the transport systems in CEE and on

strategic alternatives transport systems to be subject to SEA. The second stage should focus on review of the Draft Assessment Report.