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Financial partners
The BSR TransGovernance project comes to an end in 2014, a year of strife and devastation all around the globe. In these times of great turbulence, any single project may seem comparatively insignificant. We believe, however, that the principles inspiring the teamwork within the project partnership also are the drivers for a desirable global development. Solidarity, integration, transparency, generosity - along with an absolute belief in a sustainable world realized by joint efforts - have been our guiding principles. Already from the start of the project, discussions with stakeholders outside the partnership have offered us invaluable support and the opportunity to put ideas to test.

As Lead Partner of the BSR TransGovernance, Region Blekinge wants to thank all the partner organisations for their commitment and hard work in the thematic and administrative parts of the project. The coordinators of Priority Area Transport (within the EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region) have given us great support by realizing the idea of true multi-level governance at a practical level. In order to develop the conditions for macroregional added-values within the transport sector in the region, they have established a vigorous dialogue with the project partners.

Several transport ministries in the member states around the Baltic Sea and representatives of the European Commission have been active project participators. The secretariat of the Northern Dimension Partnership on Transport and Logistics has brought invaluable insight to the macroregional discussions. Several other organisations have been active in the process, thus securing awareness of the specifics within every field of study.

When it comes to the prospects of multi-level governance within the EU, we are convinced that it indicates the direction for the future. More efficient cooperation between decision-making levels is the best way to secure both resource efficiency and successful implementation of initiatives.

Once again, we want to thank all contributors for their part in a successful attempt to explore the mysteries of multi-level governance. We hope that the work now coming to an end will be used both for inspiration in actual projects and as a future source of knowledge for continued improvement of multi-level governance schemes.

MATHIAS ROOS
Region Blekinge
Acting chair of the project steering committee
DECISION-MAKING IN A NEW LANDSCAPE
The emerging global economy has transformed the methods of governing in the societies. With governmental policies no longer developed in isolation, regulations and administrative instruments enacted with legal authority have gradually given way to decisions made in continuous interaction between groups of stakeholders.

The governmental responsibility for design and implementation of policies has been increasingly delegated to other levels - upwards (to the European Union) and downwards (to regions and municipalities) - and also shared outwards (the market and the civil society). Several autonomous initiatives are implemented by regional and local authorities. Political institutions have become more dependent on external players - companies, non-governmental organisations, pressure groups and international networks - tending to influence the policymaking processes.

This new landscape - a complex decision-making environment - brings a shift of paradigm. In order to implement the policies effectively, the traditional government-based systems need to interact with several other bodies. Multilateral agreements, co-funding schemes and shared responsibilities gradually emerge as solutions to challenges related e.g. to sustainable regional growth.

HOW DO WE DEFINE MULTI-LEVEL GOVERNANCE?
The vertical communication between the authorities with decision-making power - the EU, national states, regions and municipalities (and in some cases also sub-regional and sub-municipal levels) - and the horizontal interaction between players at a specific level (across the administrative borders and including social and economic partners) are two basic components of the multi-level governance setup.

Multi-level governance is a way to improve decision-making. Instead of applying rigid rules, it promotes interaction between stakeholders in order to facilitate the planning and implementation of development strategies, programmes, projects and measures.

Multi-level governance is defined in terms of e.g. networking, dialogue, negotiation and capacity building. It utilises the competences of the players by adding a mixture of reasoning, knowledge, responsibility, awareness, incentive and action. It is a flexible and efficient model, in contrast to rigid conventional decision-making structures where - due to the focus on institutions and regulatory frameworks - the unexpected option and the unforeseen impact are frequently neglected.

Multi-level governance allows gathering heterogeneous groups of players interested to find a solution to a common problem - regardless of nationality, legal competence and hierarchical position.
WHY DO WE NEED MULTI-LEVEL GOVERNANCE IN THE TRANSPORT SECTOR?

SIX PITFALLS IN THE BALTIC SEA REGION

The EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region (EUSBSR) was launched in order to intensify joint efforts and develop an integrated policy addressing several major challenges. Among them are transport bottlenecks.

One of the chapters (Priority Area Transport) in the EUSBSR Action Plan emphasises the need to ‘improve internal and external transport links’. The European Commission and the member states see the coordination of their national transport policies as one important step towards a harmonised transport system within the entire Baltic Sea Region.

The EU Strategy has stimulated stakeholders to discuss solutions to identified transport issues together. However, streamlining transport policies at various governance levels faces a number of problems:

- Lack of mechanisms for integrating recommendations from joint macro-regional studies (e.g. Baltic Transport Outlook) and joint territorial cooperation projects (Interreg) in the national, regional and local transport planning processes.
- Lack of consensus on how to align the implementation of the Priority Area Transport in the EU Strategy with the transport planning process of the Northern Dimension (Northern Dimension Partnership on Transport and Logistics) and the EU Eastern Neighbourhood Policy.
- Lack of routines ensuring a systematic exchange of information across borders in the national transport infrastructure planning processes.
- Lack of a consistent implementation framework for national, regional and local transport policies in emerging cross-border integration areas (e.g. in the Öresund area, between Helsinki and Tallinn) connecting transport development and infrastructure planning to land use planning.
- Lack of operational models harmonising transport policies at different governance levels with the logistic models of the business community. Such models are essential in order to combine seamless transport flows with sustainable development.
- Lack of experience in broader utilisation of the expertise accumulated in these transport corridor management structures by local stakeholders and business actors from several countries in the Baltic Sea Region - for the implementation of the TEN-T core network corridors.

AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITIES

- **EU:** policies, legislation (e.g. TEN-T core-network corridors, core network, comprehensive network, transport greening) and funding (e.g. Connecting Europe Facility)
- **National:** infrastructure development (rail, road, inland waterways, ports, clean fuels) and operation by major rail operators
- **Regional:** regional transport strategies and actions (e.g. greening transport, ports, transport planning)
- **Local:** location of major terminals, organisation of last mile transport, cross-border urban planning, interaction with communities (mitigating traffic externalities)
- **Private:** intermodal business models

In relation to the latter issue, the revised EU transport policy (EU White Paper on Transport) and its operational and funding instruments (TEN-T and Connecting Europe Facility) are going to affect the transport governance patterns in the Baltic Sea Region. For example, the TEN-T guidelines specify certain management approaches in order to boost the motivation of public and private stakeholders to achieve greener and more efficient transport flows. Also, a recent inclusion of intermodal terminals and urban mobility facilities in the European transport network requires an adequate policy response at various governance levels.
A TOOL FOR STREAMLINED TRANSITION

The coming implementation of TEN-T core network corridors is strongly dependent on joint efforts to identify the cross-border sections in urgent need for investment. This implies a subsequent necessity to allocate the funding resources, adopt relevant regulations and technical standards, gain acceptance for fiscal measures and improve the efficiency of intermodal services. The altering geographical pattern of transport flows adds to the challenges faced by the transport policies in the Baltic Sea Region, as exemplified by:

• The booming mining industry in the northernmost parts, offshore and in the Barents area.
• Better options to use the Northern Sea Route for intercontinental trade.
• Probable re-routing of logistic chains across the Baltic Sea Region due to the SECA (Sulphur Emission Control Area), regime binding from 2015 onwards.
• More widespread freight services by rail to southeastern Europe, central Asia and western China (east-west land bridge) are examples of drivers for a better policy alignment.

By stimulating the commitment of relevant public and private actors to the altered pattern of transport, multi-level governance approaches may become instrumental in the transition process.

THE BSR TRANSGOVERNANCE PROJECT

Several projects co-funded by the Baltic Sea Region Programme have devised measures to facilitate transports within the Baltic Sea Region. They arrived at the joint conclusion that several action plans, strategies or programmes developed by public authorities in the past have not been successful.

Some frequent causes of failure include:

• Insufficient human and financial resources for implementation/evaluation of the measures agreed upon.
• Imprecise definition of roles and responsibilities.
• Shortage of methods to evaluate progress in relation to goals.
• Lack of political ownership.
• Low degree of involvement from the end-users of the transport services.

The BSR TransGovernance project is a direct descendant of the TransBaltic (www.transbaltic.eu), EWTC II (www.euwtc2.eu) and Scandria (www.scandria.eu) projects. It also draws inspiration from a synergetic approach to the development of the transport infrastructure - exemplified by the cluster cooperation of transport and accessibility projects co-funded by the territorial cooperation programmes in the Baltic Sea Region (www.transportcluster.eu).

The project has taken on the mission to improve the understanding and promotion of the benefits brought by multi-level governance in transport planning and management. The project partners have stipulated, that so called transgovernance may improve the efficiency of strategic transport planning across the national borders by:

• Development of solutions based on mutually accepted data and methods.
• Development of shared progress evaluation schemes.
• Discussions on funding principles, administrative procedures and steering mechanisms when launching the solutions in the legal/normative environments.
• Development of cooperation platforms for joint policy decisions.

The project has defined four reference scales in order to demonstrate how transgovernance models, tools and approaches can contribute to better alignment of the transport policies at various administrative levels - and also to
AIM AND CONTENT OF THIS REPORT

This report is a final product of the BSR TransGovernance project. It summarises the outcome of the stakeholder management processes, launched by the project partners at the respective reference scales in order to test and demonstrate practical benefits of transgovernance (multi-level governance in transport).

The first chapter is devoted to the corridors. This specific reference scale draws the most political attention - not least because of the ambitious Commission plans to implement the TEN-T core network corridors. Consequently, substantial volumes of EU funding are earmarked for this purpose, aimed to leverage national and private resources. In addition to this, some corridor governance schemes are expected to support joint preparation and supervision of the development measures.

The following chapter looks at intermodal terminals as a means to integrate the logistics supply chains of enterprises, reduce costs in the long-distance relations sustained by the corridors and improve access to distribution areas in and around the urban centres of the corridors.

Next, the report moves upwards again and takes aim at policy frameworks resulting from - or potentially leading to - high-cost transport infrastructure investments in order to match the mobility and commercial interaction in the cross-border metropolitan areas. In functional terms, such areas form crossings and last-mile sections of the corridors.

Finally, at the macroregional level, the report dwells on potential synergies between the existing intergovernmental transport cooperation structures and systemic contribution to national transport planning frameworks from Interreg projects. The contextual element in that respect is a network of transnational multimodal transport corridors in the Baltic Sea Region, composed of TEN-T core network corridors and auxiliary links.

SCOPE AND PERSPECTIVE

Each chapter takes off from an inventory of challenges within every reference scale that the transport policies will have to address for the sake of greener and more efficient transports, better connectivity, sustainable regional growth and territorial cohesion. It then presents the key findings from the stakeholder management process and some interesting stories behind them. This latter part leads to a brief generalised guideline with recommended steps - intended for all future stakeholders interested in building a successful case through a multi-level governance process.

The report contains pieces of advice for policymakers at all administrative levels dealing with transport management, strategic planning, infrastructure development, socio-economic growth, spatial planning and land-use planning. It addresses entrepreneurs within the transport and logistics fields who wish to participate in policymaking dialogue with the public sector.

The experience gathered from the project implementation in the partnership of local and regional authorities, national governments, research institutions and business organisations is expected to enhance stakeholder cooperation in the featured geographical areas. However, the lessons learned may also be helpful for those stakeholders interested to take on a transport development challenge in order to build a successful case through the multi-level governance process.

Finally, the report shall be seen as a tool and a manual for the next generation of territorial cooperation projects, willing to contribute to the efforts of the European Commission and the national governments to implement the TEN-T policy and accomplish a sustainable multimodal transport system in the Baltic Sea Region.
Multimodal transport corridors

Case 1: How do we stimulate the commercial development of a multimodal freight corridor?

Example of the East-West Transport Corridor.

THE CHALLENGES
The East-West Transport Corridor (EWTC) is an international multimodal freight corridor stretching from Esbjerg (Denmark) and Sassnitz (Germany) through Öresund, southern Sweden and Klaipeda to Vilnius (Lithuania). From there, the corridor connects eastwards to Russia, Kazakhstan and China and south-eastwards to Belarus, Ukraine and Turkey - thus serving as a trade gateway between the Baltic Sea Region and Asia.

According to prognoses on trade development in the countries it crosses, the EWTC has an obvious potential to even double the present freight flows. However, in order to meet the demand from customers in a diversity of markets along the corridor route (the Nordic-Baltic area, the Black Sea area and the Central Asia/Far East area) the corridor has to offer high quality infrastructure and logistics services necessary for building intercontinental supply chains.

For that reason, the EWTC is a challenging case. It implies the development of an effective management model accommodating the goals of seamless flows, 'green' performance, harmonised operational standards and interoperability across the borders of countries with different political and socio-economic settings (EU member states, EU neighbouring countries and Asian economies). The model requires public policies to be coordinated both between the countries involved and within the frameworks of intergovernmental agreements (e.g. the EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region, the EU Eastern Neighbourhood Policy and the Northern Dimension policy). Further, the policies need to take into account expectations raised by the end-users of the infrastructure and services in order to accomplish the elimination of infrastructural bottlenecks and administrative barriers and to achieve the market integration along the corridor.

The policy status of the corridor adds to the complexity of the management and public funding issues. The EU part of the EWTC has sections with a diverging priority status in the TEN-T network - a fact excluding the option to see a TEN-T European Coordinator leading the development process. The EWTC Association (established in 2010) is a cooperation platform of commercial, academic and public organisations interested in promoting commercial opportunities and ensuring high quality of transport and logistics services in the corridor for the sake of dynamic trade exchange between Europe and Asia. With a broad representation of stakeholders from more than a dozen countries, the Association seeks to work out an optimum governance and management model for the EWTC - i.e. one that allows integration of different business and policy approaches, development of a joint strategy with agreed priority action areas for the corridor invigoration and raising of a common voice of the members on the international and national arenas.

KEY FINDINGS
Generally, the strength of any network organisation stimulating commercial development of a transport corridor lies in coordinated planning and communication - both internally and externally.
Since a transport corridor is the sum of facilities supplied and offered through the partnership, a core parameter of the corridor management is the quality of cooperation between stakeholders and the ability to expand the activities. Given the complexity of the issues determining the performance of transport corridors, its managing body should primarily focus on practical, short-term measures yielding cost reductions or increased revenues.

At the previous stages of the corridor development process (the EWTC and EWTC II projects), several important results were delivered: joint business concepts, recommendations for infrastructure improvements, a joint action programme for logistics centres and a ‘green corridor manual’ guiding any transport corridor towards efficiency improvement and environmental sustainability.

In a stakeholder dialogue the set of ‘green’ corridor measures were assessed according to their suitability for the EWTC. In effect, six domains were given priority by the EWTC community:
1. Cross-border planning of infrastructure
2. Establishment and financing of cross-border infrastructure
3. Facilitated border crossings
4. Railway shuttle development
5. ICT platform development
6. Use of KPIs (Key Performance Indicators) to monitor corridor development

Also, a potential role of the EWTC Association in addressing these measures, bearing in mind the organisational and financial capacity available, was subject of discussion.

In the area of transport infrastructure - where the governments are the main owner and sources of funding - the EWTC Association can act as an information broker, supporting national and regional authorities with data and creating ground for mutual communication during the planning process. An important role for such a network is to maintain and present a vision and a strategy for the future development of the corridor - and also to connect corridor stakeholders, the EU and international organisations with competence in schemes facilitating trade (e.g. UNECE, United Nations Economic Commission for Europe).

In the domain of facilitated trade, the Association may strive to collect and provide access to the tools simplifying document procedures and document alignment (e.g. developed by the UN Centre for Trade Facilitation and Electronic Business, UN/CEFACT). A business process analysis (BPA) to map administrative routines and foster the way towards a single-window solution for the whole transport corridor may become the Association’s area of responsibility. At the same time, however, such single-window solutions have often proved difficult to implement as they are dependent on long-term political backing and commitment from the national governments.

As regards the other priority domains, a network structure like the EWTC Association may offer resources to help link the competences and skills of private and public actors - as exemplified in a success story of the VIKING shuttle train. In that relation, the business players are experienced in focusing on results while...
the administration representatives may provide long-term perspectives, political support and necessary momentum for institutional reform and adjustment.

**TO ACHIEVE THE GOAL:**
- Ensure a well-defined leadership and promote a joint vision/strategy for the corridor development.
- Mobilise relevant public and private stakeholders interested in commercial development of the corridor and identify their expectations concerning: governance, priorities, roles and decision-making procedures.
- Investigate existing cooperation schemes and obstacles to efficient cross-border governance along the corridor.
- Discuss an optimum management model for the corridor, based on the capacity of the network structure and best practices for implementation of the priority measures.
- Define a role for the management as an influencing force on investment decisions taken by public and private actors.
- Assume the role as information broker between sectors and between actors at different spatial levels regarding joint cross-border planning of infrastructure.
- Provide management tools for evaluation of corridor performance, identification of the weakest links and for simplification and harmonisation of administrative procedures allowing smoother freight flows across borders.
- Focus on a limited number of measures and choose small, simple solutions (low-hanging fruits) yielding cost reduction or raised revenue in the commercial activities.
MULTIMODAL TRANSPORT CORRIDORS

Case 2: How do we enhance sustainable regional growth along the TEN-T Core Network Corridors?

Example of the Scandria®-Corridor Initiative.

THE CHALLENGES
The Scandria®-Corridor is a political initiative of regions and municipalities located on the transport axis between the Baltic Sea Region and the Mediterranean area. It is closely aligned to the Scandinavian-Mediterranean Corridor - one of the nine Core Network Corridors defined by the EU Transport Policy (TEN-T). In geographical terms, this specific corridor forms a crucial transport artery between the northern and the southern parts of Europe - linking fourteen metropolitan regions with about 100 million inhabitants.

While all TEN-T Core Network Corridors will be addressed with implementation plans to eliminate bottlenecks, add missing cross-border connections and promote modal integration and interoperability, the vast demographic and economic potential of the area along the Scandinavian-Mediterranean Corridor calls for a wider policy context.

The corridor encompasses several creative urban centres and leading clusters (e.g. within life science, clean-tech, windpower, transport and automotive). The development measures should therefore aim not only to achieve seamless connections for the sake of efficient and high-quality transport services for citizens and economic operators. More ambitiously, they ought to build a foundation for economic development within the corridor regions and to stimulate business cooperation between them.

The challenge consists in designing a multi-level governance scheme for the TEN-T Scandinavian-Mediterranean Corridor accommodating both top-down approaches (associated with the transport development and led by the European Coordinator in cooperation with the national authorities) with bottom-up actions (regarding transport as a pre-requisite for regional development led by the regions).

In that respect, it is essential to find the means to integrate a number of isolated transport cooperation initiatives at various levels into one coherent framework for the purpose of streamlined funding and investment policies. The planning processes are presently not coordinated well enough, which makes it hard to synchronise the process. Another difficulty lies in overcoming institutional and administrative barriers as well as differences in mindset and decision-making culture across the borders.

DID YOU KNOW THAT...
Stakeholder interests in the TEN-T Scandinavian-Mediterranean Corridor tend to concentrate upon transport infrastructure issues.

Still, despite very advanced cross-border cooperation initiatives on infrastructure (e.g. Oslo-Gothenburg, Öresund, Guldborgsund-Rostock, Fehmarn Belt, Brenner Corridor) there is no coordination between them.

DID YOU KNOW THAT...
In the cross-border infrastructure planning the involvement of regional level and business stakeholders is very limited.

Despite a primary role of metropolitan areas and urban centres in the corridor flows (as origin, junction and destination nodes), their authorities are not assigned any formal membership in the corridor management structures (e.g. core network corridor forums and rail freight corridor consortia).
regional actors. Their involvement is essential for the successful implementation of a European policy in this field.

KEY FINDINGS
The mapping of policy processes along the Scandinavian-Mediterranean Corridor revealed a high number of initiatives, both sectoral (e.g. on transport infrastructure, alternative fuels, business, innovation) or confined to certain geographical areas. Major governance gaps have been identified within the interface of national governments and regional stakeholders - as well as between administrative and business stakeholders. There has been no single initiative covering the whole corridor and connecting transport with regional development.

During the series of regional and thematic workshops, corridor stakeholders identified the three transport-related issues most suitable for being addressed in the corridor context:
- Consolidated, just-in-time intermodal transports
- Seamless and fast passenger transport on rail, with good points of interchange
- Greening of transports, incl. an alternative fuel infrastructure across borders.

For business development institutions tending to focus on local priorities, the corridor approach may provide a stable ground for intensified cross-sectoral cooperation and exchange of experience with cluster support and business cooperation.

The Scandria stakeholders prefer no new formal institution, but an agreement-based and informal cooperation structure open to players from various governance levels, national administrations and infrastructure managers as well as private companies. It should support and complement the European Commission and the Member States in their efforts to implement the TEN-T core network corridors by streamlining regional interests along the corridor. Currently, the creation of such a structure is being discussed.

The corridor development needs to be carried out at both the strategic and the operational level. The former requires a strong personalised political leadership and a steering group ensuring the commitment of regional stakeholders and a dialogue with European and national decision-makers to address policy issues and to optimise infrastructure investments.

At the operational level, it should be able to handle information flows between numerous regional, cross-border and transnational activities in the corridor efficiently. In that regard, stakeholders from the business sector need to be involved in the thematic task forces and project groups to assure solutions that will work under market conditions.

As a result from the stakeholder discussion process, the Scandria®-Corridor development will be set to operate through the Scandria®-Alliance Coordination Board. It will aim to:
- Facilitate communication and political agreements between various initiatives and projects along the TEN-T Scandinavian-Mediterranean Corridor.
- Set up working groups taking comprehensive measures to spread growth impulses derived from the transport corridor development (e.g.: urban nodes, cluster cooperation, workforce mobility and labour market integration).
- Connect to upper level stakeholders (e.g. the European Commission, the Baltic Sea Region intergovernmental networks and national governments) in order to inform on status and infrastructural needs in cross-border sections of the corridor.
- Initiate projects, coordinate the funding and monitor the progress of the corridor development.

During an annual corridor conference, the dialogue with national and European-level stakeholders should be conducted. A web-based communication platform (www.scandria-corridor.eu) (already established) will promote regional, cross-border and transnational activities in the Scandria®-Corridor and will bundle information.

DID YOU KNOW THAT...
The Scandria®-Corridor regions have a high ambition to become sustainable with respect to transport?
Oslo, Copenhagen, the region of Skåne and Berlin-Brandenburg has launched strategies to become carbon-neutral and fossil-free by 2020-2025. If these policy approaches are interconnected, the Scandria®-Corridor can become a pioneer for electromobility and clean fuel solutions.
TO ACHIEVE THE GOAL:

- Make an inventory of relevant policy initiatives in the TEN-T core network corridor (name, topics, regional coverage, members, formalisation, time span) and analyse existing interfaces.
- Organise a series of workshops with local stakeholders and thematic experts along the corridor to (1) enable first contacts, (2) identify the cooperation expectations and interests of the relevant groups of stakeholders, (3) define synergy potentials between the different initiatives addressing transport and regional development in the corridor and (4) propose thematic areas where the corridor approach would bring an added value.
- Present outcomes in a framework report - understood as a living document systematically updated through ongoing dialogue and/or in bilateral talks with interested partners) containing a stakeholder view on the cooperation objectives and thematic areas in the corridor.
- Discuss a possible role of a corridor-level body in streamlining regional interests along the corridor and supporting the existing organisations and institutions at the EU, international, national and regional levels - particularly in relation to the implementation structures for the TEN-T core network corridors.
- Launch an organisational model to sustain cooperation between the corridor stakeholders within the chosen thematic areas.
- Agree on a strategic setting in a formal document defining: vision and objectives (broad or specific), geographical coverage (open or exclusive territory), time perspective (short or long-term) and hierarchy of issues and tasks.
- Make a design for the operational setting. Identify and involve partners (core and auxiliary) necessary to realise the strategic vision, develop an organisational set-up (informal, agreement-based or formal), define leadership, executive body and working bodies, adopt a binding cooperation framework, secure the resources to fulfil the tasks and ensure efficient and transparent information flows.
- Deploy a central communication website dedicated to corridor activities as well as available funding instruments (e.g. the European Territorial Cooperation, Horizon 2020 and the Connecting Europe Facility).
Intermodal terminals

How do we ensure that intermodal terminals are strategically located in the transport network?

How do we best use their services for sustainable growth?

THE CHALLENGES

Traditionally, policies shaping the planning and development of intermodal terminals used to be developed within the domains of local authorities. They selected the locations, built the site infrastructure, negotiated the operational terms and helped identify companies interested in terminal services.

Recently, however, intermodal (freight) terminals have been brought to attention in the EU transport policy (TEN-T guidelines). Referred to as 'structures equipped for transshipment between at least two transport modes and for temporary storage of freight', terminals have been accredited the role of mode connectors and boosters of multimodal transport. The TEN-T guidelines further stipulate that the freight terminals should be open to all operators and that they should provide access to terminal services in a non-discriminatory way.

The development of new inland intermodal terminals can hardly be completed as a purely private initiative - mainly due to high start-up costs, low return expectations and fierce competition from the road sector. Consequently, planning and management of intermodal terminals have become issues to be dealt with by various stakeholders - both public and private - in order to secure sound financing in the early development stage and to ensure the profitability of terminal services in the long run. Yet, a clash of interests and views on the role and prosperity potential of intermodal terminals may compromise the returns of the investment.

As research reports have demonstrated, intermodal solutions become most competitive to single mode transportation in a mid-to-long geographical range (600 km - 800 km). This implies that intermodal transport is coordinated

DID YOU KNOW THAT...

More than one third of the interviewed Latvian intermodal terminal stakeholders mentioned Lithuania as a success story in developing a strong cooperation between business and national levels.

The Lithuanian government has a leading role in developing the country’s intermodal terminals and integrating them in the Baltic Sea Region network.

An established commission with representatives of public and business actors allows for taking into account all interests and opinions in the development and supervision work.
within a wider group of actors over a more extensive territory – and that decisions on the location of the intermodal terminals should be considered from a comprehensive view. Otherwise, immediate local socio-economic benefits brought by a terminal in one specific municipality may generate socio-economic losses over time, due to lack of sufficient cargo volumes for long-run profitability.

Since intermodal terminals need a certain operational area to reach cost-efficiency, conflicting interests of municipalities and regions concerning the location of terminals (often neglecting the market potential), can slow down or even wreck the establishing process. Therefore, multi-level governance approaches may prove instrumental when defining the group of stakeholders within a wider geographical area for intermodal services and in finding the way to involve them in the decision-making. At some territories (e.g. in case of the Lahti region), multi-level governance may also help put more attention on better use of existing terminal infrastructure rather than on the development of new sites.

**DID YOU KNOW THAT...**
The BSR TransGovernance project counts among first initiatives to define the roles and responsibilities of public and private stakeholders in developing intermodal terminals.

The two worlds are far apart. Knowledge of business needs in the public administration and - in the opposite direction - awareness of public decision-making processes in the companies - is very limited.

**KEY FINDINGS**
The BSR TransGovernance project selected altogether eight cases, which are geographically spread through the Baltic Sea Region and address different planning/operational stages in the establishment of intermodal terminals. The intention has been to test how multi-level governance instruments could facilitate a dialogue between relevant stakeholders in an effort to optimise the performance of intermodal terminals - so they can generate the best effects for sustainable regional growth.
Surveys conducted among public and commercial stakeholders in the chosen cases point out the different types of administrative institutions involved in the planning and implementation process for intermodal terminals. This structure depends largely upon the legal framework for decision-making and ownership in the given country. Still, nearly all the cases feature three groups of stakeholders: the national government, the local stakeholders and the private companies. Such a setup allows for a wider scope in the discussion on the terminal location and benefits - and also for a specific focus on the socio-economic effects brought by the terminals to the local communities. It may also facilitate arrival at more realistic traffic volume estimates than in cases conducted by the companies alone.

In some cases (e.g. Lithuania), intermodal terminal projects are initiated by the national government in cooperation with municipalities. Specific implementing bodies are selected, for instance the National Rail Administration. Moreover, through the investigated case of Warmia-Mazury Region (North-East Poland) it has been proved that regional stakeholders can play a significant role in the planning phase and establishing process of the intermodal infrastructure. The government of this region took a leading responsibility to capitalise on the two rail-road terminal locations (Braniewo and Ełk) indicated by the European Commission in the TEN-T comprehensive network as nodes connecting to the Rail/Via Baltica transport axis. For that purpose local partners (municipalities) and business stakeholders (multimodal operators, manufacturing companies) were invited to a closer cooperation. In effect, both locations may see considerable investment in the 2014-2020 perspective to resolve the still existing bottlenecks in the logistics infrastructure in the north-eastern part of Poland. This area may therefore serve better as a gateway to the markets of the Baltic States and the Russian Federation.

In contrast to this structure, absence of governmental involvement and lack of a national strategy for development of intermodal terminals will result in a situation where the process is carried out solely locally (as demonstrated in the analysed cases in Denmark and Sweden). The process will be driven by individual motives and attitudes - and therefore leads to a suboptimal terminal network struggling to achieve consolidation of cargo and benefits of scale. Also, participation by private companies, technical

**DID YOU KNOW THAT...**


The BSR TransGovernance project took this opportunity to apply multilevel governance tools in the planning and development of rail-road terminal infrastructure in two TEN-T designated locations in the Warmia-Mazury Region (NE Poland). In effect, the investment may see earmarked funds from the CEF (Connecting Europe Facility) and the national budget in the 2014-2020 perspective.
operators, shippers, forwarders, and carriers in the terminal planning work seems to be rare - despite the fact that they can contribute with extensive data and competence related to the planning of supply network logistics. In the development of terminals, stakeholders will promote their own perspectives - which are obviously related to their specific interests and needs. While freight forwarders and carriers focus on efficiency, cost reduction, higher turnover and international competitiveness, the governmental bodies concentrate more on infrastructure and traffic safety. The general public, in turn, is most interested in an attractive living environment. Also, the time horizon for decision-making tends to differ considerably between the administrative and commercial sectors.

To manage this risk of conflict, some projects have brought in external consultants and have drawn on their expertise to align priorities in the intermodal terminal process. Another measure applied is launching an international cooperation project. In many cases, past project experience helped elevate the terminal location dialogue to a more strategic level.

The discussion initiated by the project was in many cases the first opportunity for the involved stakeholders to define their roles and responsibilities in the context of multi-level governance. As demonstrated in the case of Latvia and Denmark, private companies and business organisations perceive the benefits of being involved in the decision-making process. Still, they sometimes lack sufficient knowledge on the subject. This most likely due to a low national interest in managing the terminal planning process and to insufficient information exchange. As underlined by Latvian stakeholders, there is a lack of publicly available information (e.g. on TEN-T planning or distribution of cargo flows) and insufficient transparency concerning the terminal development process.

The advantage of multi-level governance for development of intermodal terminals is perceived as an opportunity to interact with a broad range of persons in a network not operated on a basis of binding regulations or directives. Dialogue between public and industry actors - established at an early planning stage and executed through joint planning platforms - may help balance the short-term economic gains and long-term benefits of regional growth. It will also facilitate mutual understanding - of business needs among the administrative entities and of public decision-making among the involved companies (as demonstrated in the case of the Karlshamn terminal).

A certain level of ambiguity in the cooperation allows each actor to extract some positive aspects and interpret them in a way fitting their respective organisations. This may help change the initially negative view of some stakeholders on the cooperation purposes, as observed in the case of Helsingborg area.

The public-private coordination applied already during the planning phase may result in a tailor-made infrastructure and a more efficient legal framework, while the involvement of business experts with entrepreneurial skills may ensure better service performance.

**TO ACHIEVE THE GOAL:**

- Appoint a coordinating body for the stakeholder management process, preferably representing a regional/local level public organisation.
- Identify public and commercial stakeholders located within the geographical area of services planned for the intermodal terminal (within a mid-to-long range) including: private logistics operators and cargo owners (with competence in traffic volumes and operational aspects), regional and local authorities (land-use planning), national authorities (national infrastructure planning and links to the TEN-T policy) and EU agencies (EU transport policy measures for the given territory).
- Organise meetings and workshops evaluating the individual strategies and cooperation experience of the stakeholders and defining the optimal roles in the development process of intermodal terminals within the given geographical area.
- Employ methods to deepen the knowledge on public decision-making within the involved companies and on commercial processes in the terminal development and operation within the public authorities.
- Assess the transparency of the information flow and decision-making procedures between the groups of identified stakeholders. Define conflict lines between the individual perspectives and discuss the means to address them (via a joint project, a trustworthy and legitimising actor or a leveraging cooperation framework - e.g. a European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation or European Economic Interest Grouping).
- Evaluate the inland intermodal terminal plans and volume expectations in the stakeholder group in order to provide realistic data, leading to rational investment decisions. Consider an option to utilise the existing infrastructure until volumes reach a level calling for heavy infrastructure investments. Discuss the most useful management model.
- Suggest cooperation improvements in the development process of intermodal terminals, with due consideration to:

**Key message**

*A more coordinated development of intermodal terminals in the Baltic Sea Region requires that the countries prepare consistent national intermodal transport strategies*
- The availability of European/national planning materials for all decision-making levels and the business sector - in order to ensure that the location of inland intermodal terminal complies with the EU policies and the national transport plans - while the access to the road and rail network is secured (inclusive the TEN-T links).

- Access to information (at an early development stage) on intermodal terminal projects to all stakeholders - including inhabitants of nearby districts as well as land and property owners.

- A meeting platform for national, regional, local and private actors for the sake of an active and constructive dialogue.

- Shared learning - exchange of positive cooperation examples between relevant stakeholders during the development process.

- Marketing and information campaigns by the public authorities to inform entrepreneurs on the benefits arising from intermodal transport - in order to make them utilise the services of the intermodal terminal fully.

- Public consultation on the location of the terminal at an early stage of planning.
Cross-border integration areas

Case 1: Should an already prosperous region make new cross-border infrastructure investments - and who should lead the transport development process?

The example of the Öresund area.

THE CHALLENGES
The Öresund multilevel governance model shows a blend of formal and informal contacts (built on trust) with functional networks and working groups cooperating on single issues - even without formal mandates. Still, they are tied to more permanent platforms (pooling authorities) providing a comprehensive vision for the cross-border region and keeping up momentum even after a working group has disbanded. The pooling authorities are:

- **The Öresund Committee** - provides a flexible platform for governance networks, acts as a broker (observatory) of development issues, tracks the implementation progress and serves as a storage for the organisational memory.
- **ÖresundDirekt** - helps professionals and residents with issues related to cross-border taxation, commuting, housing, and work related issues.
- **Örestat** - provides statistical data for regional planning.
- **The Öresund Institute** - spreads good practice examples and knowledge of the region.
- **The Öresund Media Platform** - an independent news resource for the region.

The Öresund Bridge has invigorated cross-border cooperation between Denmark and Sweden. Still it has left many players with a feeling of unexplored opportunities for deeper integration. New prospects nevertheless emerge with a vision of the Öresund area as a transport hub and urban node on the route of the TEN-T Scandinavian-Mediterranean Corridor - eligible for funding of projects related to bottlenecks and missing links by the Connecting Europe Facility budget. Also, the fixed Fehmarn Belt link between Denmark and Germany - expected to be in operation by 2021 - will generate favourable conditions for logistics services to and from the Öresund area.
Further cross-border infrastructure projects on the regional planning agenda (the Helsingborg-Elsinore fixed link and a Copenhagen-Malmö metro line) are expected to offer convenient commuting options between the cities of Copenhagen and Malmö and to integrate the northern part of the region better. Thereby, these projects are considered as a possible step forward to strengthen the ties and enhance regional development in the Öresund area.

The benefits apart from transportation aspects (e.g. decreased commuting time, higher capacity of the Öresund Bridge for high-speed passenger and freight trains and an increased service area for the Copenhagen Airport), point towards development of a more competitive and larger cross-border region matching the economic performance of metropolitan areas like Oslo, Hamburg, Stockholm and Helsinki.

These two transport infrastructure projects have so far not succeeded to mobilise support at the national level. Conflicting views concerning capacity shortage on the Öresund Bridge and its feeder connections - as well as uncoordinated political backing and vaguely defined leadership for the transport development process in the Öresund region - are some of the obstacles raised.

Also, investment priorities at the national level seem to focus on the capitals and on the most important foreign markets. This may explain the relatively low interest from the Danish government to build further cross-border links across Öresund.

It remains uncertain whether arguments claiming insufficient capacity in the Öresund transport system (predominant in the regional debate and in several studies) are strong enough to convince the two national governments to realise new cross-border transport links.

**KEY FINDINGS**

12 years after the opening of the Malmö-Copenhagen fixed link and the start-up of the Öresund commuter train service, the investment cost - defined in terms of socio-economic benefits - is calculated to have been paid back more than twice already. The most significant impact is a more extensive labour market for the Öresund community due to reduced travel time.

The link has been important for the spatial development on both sides, as exemplified with new urban and industrial areas established in its vicinity. Also, it has expanded the service area of the Copenhagen Airport and has facilitated new logistics supply chains following the merger of seaports in Malmö and Copenhagen. A wide spectrum of affected economy sectors indicates the huge potential impact of major infrastructure projects and the role of multi-level governance in involving the relevant players.

Through the interest mapping, some organisational levels have been found missing or inactive in the Öresund transport development process:

The Öresund case helped identify the crucial questions for the multilevel governance, should supplementary infrastructure projects be planned:

- What is the need for new transport infrastructure assets and capacity additions?
- Should transport infrastructure be seen as a means to meet transportation demand or as a tool for further regional development and cross-border integration?
- How should transport infrastructure projects and facilities be governed, organised and financed?
- Through national, regional or local levels - or even by the private sector?
- Would an increased regional responsibility improve political or functional efficiency?

A balance must be achieved between differing public and private interests, reflected in a clash between:

- Functionality of transport infrastructure (aspects: optimum utilisation of resources and user needs/satisfaction)
- Its contribution to sustainable regional growth (aspects: international competitiveness, cross-border labour market, branding of the cross-border functional region).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CROSS-BORDER INTEGRATION AREAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Öresund Bridge</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transnational level; I.e. Nordic or EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An overall organisational body for cross-border transport planning and policy-making in the Öresund area should therefore be seriously committed to the pursuit of:

- The best governance solution for each present and any future cross-border transport link, bearing in mind the balance needed between functionality and regional growth.
- Leadership and representation of the involved/received public and private stakeholders built on existing organisational structures - e.g. by strengthening of the Öresund Committee.

**TO ACHIEVE THE GOAL:**

- Map the interests of the target stakeholders (EU, national, regional, local, business) in the management of the existing and planned transport infrastructure.
- Broaden the perspective by moving from the discussion on transport system capacity in the cross-border integration area to recognition of the transport infrastructure as catalyst for regional integration, sustainable socio-economic growth and further cooperation.
- Introduce governance aspects of the present and planned cross-border infrastructure projects (optimum management structures, organisation forms and financing).
- Re-define the roles and responsibilities of the target stakeholders, involve national governments and ensure a clear overall leadership in the transport development process in the area.

**DID YOU KNOW THAT...**

There is no formal long-term strategic planning cooperation for public transport and infrastructure in the Öresund region.

The main reason is the difference in institutional setting and planning horizons. For example, responsibility for the train service in the Swedish part is carried by Region Skåne, while the Danish part is handled by the Ministry of Transport.

Instead, the two sides have developed a pragmatic approach to solving specific problems.
Case 2: How do we manage the dynamic transport development without a fixed link in place? Any hints to be taken from the Öresund region?

Example of the Helsinki-Tallinn area.

THE CHALLENGES
Helsinki and Tallinn have a long history of interaction. The past two decades have seen a dramatic growth of the cross-border labour market, of tourism and of business activities. This was achieved thanks to economic incentives and infrastructure improvements. However, in contrast to the Öresund region, a fixed link between Helsinki in Tallinn is not in place as a driver for the cooperation.

The Helsinki-Tallinn area lacks an institutionalised vision - based on a clear value proposition and a regional identity - as a framework for cooperation between the local, regional and national authorities and the private sector. Public cooperation seems dependent on external funding without sustainable sources of domestic financing. Helsinki, Tallinn and their two capital regions differ regarding financing systems, infrastructure ownership, budget flexibility, decision-making competencies and support from the national level. On the other hand, the cooperation within the private sector is innovative and growing.

This lack of public alignment has made cooperation very difficult - especially so in the absence of cross-border mechanisms sustaining cooperation and institutional memory. There is also a difference between the Finnish and Estonian parts in planning culture, commitment to long-term planning and capacity for pragmatic problem-solving based on mutual trust.

KEY FINDINGS
A key inspirational feature of the Öresund system to be possibly replicated elsewhere is the ‘depolitisisation’ of decision-making. For more than two decades, the governance of the Öresund region has developed into a patchwork of functional collaborative practices, informal groups, ad hoc committees, and permanent bodies assisting in the support of cross-border partnership in transport planning and regional integration.

With the lack of symmetry in an institutional setting for long-term transport planning (Case 1), the Danish and Swedish partners have developed a pragmatic approach to specific problems (e.g. through joint meetings at both the managerial and the operational level with regular intervals). So called ‘special purpose vehicles’ have been formed. They are working groups aimed to harmonise some technical matters (e.g. concerning power supply, security, signalling and joint emergency action plans). At the same time, the strategic level of cooperative efforts in the Öresund region remains informal.

In the Helsinki-Tallinn cooperation, a strategic choice has to be made. Should the vision of the cross-border interaction be concentrated - i.e. with focus set exclusively on transport technicalities? Or should it be wider and set focus on the forming of a twin-city region?

It seems that without greater institutional development, the more narrow vision will provide the most likely scenario. Nonetheless, the lessons learned from the Öresund region can help to inform, inspire and support the Helsinki-Tallinn partnership to more extensive and more ambitious planning processes.
TO ACHIEVE THE GOAL:

- In the early stage of integration (no fixed link yet), involve the local network of players in both hard and soft infrastructure aspects.
- Establish a cross-border agency serving as an observer and an information clearing central (at the technical level) for cross-border transport planning matters.
- Identify relevant stakeholders and initiate a dialogue focusing initially on minor cooperation obstacles and practical solutions (‘low-hanging fruits’).
- Create communication channels connecting stakeholders and providing information to individual citizens.
- Set up an independent platform for stakeholder meetings. The platform could help instigate a broad dialogue and build trust among stakeholders by repeated interaction. It would require a permanent staff and sustainable financial sources in order to support political priorities and long-term cooperation of working groups via independent research, communication, and logistic services.
- Initiate informal working groups with a pre-set schedule including the use of ‘special purpose vehicles’ integrating the decision-making within the national structures.
- Identify the value proposition to stakeholders and turn it into a vision for the region. This step should be based on a direct dialogue with representative stakeholder groups and on mapping of their interests.

Key message:
The Helsinki-Tallinn area needs a joint vision based on a clear value-added definition for the cooperation.
**Case 3: How do we succeed with a corridor context in the national infrastructure planning process?**

*The example of the Oslo metropolitan area.*

**THE CHALLENGES**

The Norwegian National Transport Plan 2014-2023 gives high priority to the development of fast train services on the IC (InterCity) routes in the south-eastern part of Norway. The government intends to extend the double-track lines connecting the capital city of Oslo gradually to the surrounding urban centres, in order to connect to the cities of Lillehammer, Skien and Halden by 2030.

The investments planned on the IC stretches are expected to meet the soaring demand for transport resulting from the population growth in the Oslo metropolitan area. They are expected to offer a wide range of benefits within the domestic transport system (shorter commuting time, higher traffic frequency, reduced number of accidents and better capacity for rail freight). This is good for the environment, but also for the economic growth. These investments will probably also reduce pressure on the housing market in the urban areas and stimulate business development in the more remote parts.

The regional authorities interacting within the Eastern Norway County Network (ENCN) have for a long time kept lobbying in order to integrate the IC investments in a long-term planning framework. Seen as one consistent project, the so-called InterCity Triangle will contribute to the development of a polycentric metropolitan area with an integrated housing and labour market.

With rapidly growing goods transport volumes across the border to Sweden along with dynamic cross-border business and labour exchange, the InterCity Triangle is a key link to the neighbouring countries - and also a section of the TEN-T core network corridor (Scandinavian - Mediterranean).

A vital challenge is motivating decision-makers to acknowledge the InterCity Triangle as one single infrastructure project - and not a series of single railway investments on the outward routes from Oslo. In competition with other National Transport Plan projects for funding, this calls for a targeted information campaign and a more efficient planning process to avoid delays in the implementation of the project.

Early involvement of all stakeholders is a must in order to detect and solve conflicts of interests. Objections to planning proposals must be given as early as possible to allow for handling without severe delays by the responsible actors. In the case of Oslo metropolitan area, a cooperation group - involving political leaders from the local and regional levels, one of the country governors and heads of national rail administration - was established. Since many objections are usually related to the county governor level of responsibility - i.e. environment protection, natural diversity, agricultural areas and cultural heritage - the national plans in Norway or Sweden to upgrade this section with double rail tracks.

**KEY FINDINGS**

Pursuing an extensive infrastructure venture like the InterCity Triangle project needs to be put on a stable planning and building agenda, with predictable funding. The challenge to work out more effective planning processes must be managed together by the local, regional and national authorities. This requires a combination of traditional public steering measures (resulting in regulations) and multi-level governance approaches (resulting in agreements).

**DID YOU KNOW THAT...**

Four sections of the IC Triangle project were under construction in 2013. The remaining parts of 230 km in total, across 21 cities or urban areas, face the challenge of ensuring efficient planning processes in order to be prepared for the construction stage from 2018.
county governor together with the National Rail Administration took on the special responsibility of discussing new procedures with the other county governors in the Eastern Norway County area.

As a consequence of its importance for international transports and the priority attention given by the Norwegian transport ministry, the InterCity Triangle project has to be positioned in the corridor context. It indicates a considerable potential to stimulate cross-border economics and labour market integration towards development of wider commuting area. For that reason, a co-ordinated planning approach is required at all levels to avoid long planning processes. This may be achieved through harmonised spatial planning mechanisms, local area planning with a participative approach and coordinated cross-border planning schemes and schedules.

National interest in cross-border investments need to be improved. While the TEN-T corridor management platform and the bottom-up corridor cooperation structures (driven by COINCO II North and Scandria in the case of the InterCity Triangle project) may support bilateral agreements for specific cross-border investments, the commitment of national policymakers is crucial. Therefore, the Inter City Triangle project needs to be regarded as a building-block for smooth cross-border freight and streamlined passenger flows.

**TO ACHIEVE THE GOAL:**
- Prepare for a pre-planning stage in order to gather the relevant stakeholders, while supporting the understanding of the planned investment phases as one consistent project – provided they serve the same purpose.
- Produce manuals for further planning processes (e.g. municipal sub-plans followed by local zoning plans, if relevant) defining the coordination needs with other stakeholders in cities and urban areas.
- Prepare a joint communication plan targeting inhabitants, NGOs and business actors (including their networks and associations) to be adopted officially by the political leaders of the local and regional authorities.
- Engage public and social media in the communication campaign in order to keep inhabitants in general and especially commuters well informed.
- Schedule a series of meetings between political representatives at the local and regional levels and representatives of the decision-making bodies.

**DID YOU KNOW THAT...**
In the communication campaign for the InterCity Triangle project, the Eastern Norway County Network used a Facebook site to involve commuters. It generated more than 2500 press articles and other media releases on the project only in the second half of 2012.

Also, 40 mayors from the municipalities along the three InterCity lines together with political leaders from the county authorities marched to the Parliament, where they had a meeting with representatives from all the political parties.

**Effective integration of the Oslo metropolitan area in the TEN-T core network corridor requires a better coordination of cross-border transport planning between Swedish and Norwegian governments.**
Case 4: How do we stimulate functional integration of cities served by a single ferry line in routing of a TEN-T core network corridor?

The example of the Rostock-Guldborgsund cooperation.

THE CHALLENGES
The regions of Rostock and Southern Denmark have maintained close relations for years. Contacts used to be facilitated by a ferry link across the strait between Rostock and Gedser (located in the Guldborgsund municipality) on the route of the Berlin-Copenhagen passenger train connection, established already in 1886. When the ferry port was relocated from Rostock-Warnemünde to the main port in Rostock in 1995, the priority given by the ferry line operator to the cargo traffic made passenger transport merely a marginal addition. In consequence, train services between Nyköbing (Falster) and the ferry port in Gedser on the Danish side - as well as between the Rostock main station and the Rostock ferry port on the German side - were closed down.

On its way between the two metropolitan areas of Berlin and Copenhagen, the cargo traffic barely transits Rostock and Guldborgsund. Consequently it brings negligible benefits for sustainable development within the cross-border area. Meanwhile, the potential of passenger transports to stimulate cross-border integration has decreased substantially.

One of the major challenges faced by the municipalities of Rostock and Guldborgsund is to keep their appeal as a cross-border growth pole between the metropolitan area of Hamburg, Copenhagen and Berlin. An improved cross-border public transport offer is an important measure in this context, so both municipalities therefore strive to attract and implement relevant investments. The most important ones so far have been:
• Modernisation of the Rostock main station as a point of passenger interchange.
• Construction of new passenger terminals in Rostock and Gedser.

DID YOU KNOW THAT...
A high-frequency ferry service is a vital pre-requisite, but not a driver in itself, for cross-border integration.

A ‘reasons to go’ campaign, as launched by the municipalities of Guldborgsund and Rostock, stimulates car-free passenger travels across the borders and contributes to the transformation of a whole multimodal transport corridor into a regional development axis.
• Synchronised timetables for the local public transport and ferries (bound for Trelleborg and Gedser) in the Rostock terminal.
• Release of a single combined ticket valid for: all public transport fares within Rostock, crossing with a Scandlines ferry to Gedser, bus transfer to Nyköbing and all public transport fares in Nyköbing (InterCombi-Ticket).

Despite these infrastructural and organisational initiatives, the use of public transport between Rostock and Guldborgsund is still unsatisfactory and calls for joint efforts in order to encourage tourists and residents to change their travel habits. Apart from promotion campaigns, this requires attractive cross-border ticketing and passenger traffic information systems, synchronised public transport and ferry departure times, and comfortable on-land premises for passengers. The measures generating the transition from a bottleneck on an important European transport corridor into a cross-border regional development axis need to be coordinated with investment and management actions to be implemented within the framework of the TEN-T Scandinavian-Mediterranean core network corridor (one of the 9 core network corridors defined by the European Commission).

KEY FINDINGS
An attractive transport connection - affordable to all citizens - is probably the most important condition for a fast cross-border integration of the Rostock and Guldborgsund areas. Furthermore, due to its position in the TEN-T Scandinavian-Mediterranean Corridor, this connection will have an important interface function for interregional traffic to and from Scandinavia. The improving hinterland services towards Berlin and Copenhagen (mainly via trains and long distance buses) release an additional potential for cross-border passenger traffic.

Encouraging more tourists and residents to make use of an improved cross-border public transport offer calls for effective work with the demand side by development of ‘reasons to go’. This requires involving large parts of the civil society - including e.g. the tourist industry and the creative sectors. Also, exchange of visiting school classes between the two municipalities was found important to remove behavioural barriers for crossing the sea without a car and for cross-border cooperation along the transport corridor. Valuable inspiration was derived from comparable (Baltic Sea crossing) neighbourhood relationships - e.g. between Helsinki and Tallinn and between Umeå (Sweden) and Vaasa (Finland).

In order to include all affected development sectors, the cooperation process needs a wider scope of coordination, including e.g. transport infrastructure planning, energy production and consumption (renewable sources) and spatial planning (land-use) - as well as culture, sports, tourism, education and civil commitment.

The relevant sectors and methods of joint activities within integrated strategic planning will be specified in the twinning partnership between Rostock and Guldborgsund. The agreement will provide a cooperation framework - and also a fundament for institutionalising the growing cross-border integration. At this stage, a permanent monitoring committee with temporary working groups (involving: regional and municipal units, business sector, NGOs and civil society) seems to be the most practical governance form.

In the context of the TEN-T Scandinavian-Mediterranean Corridor activities, the partnership will be based upon the cooperation agreement between the Federal State of Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, the Danish administrative...
region of Zealand (Sjælland) and the Swedish region of Skåne on expansion of transport connections and economic and political cooperation in the corridor.

A public dialogue on the challenges and opportunities of the Rostock-Guldborgsund axis led to a designation of several joint measures in order to sustain the reactivated (car-free) cross-border passenger transport connection as a vital interface in the TEN-T Scandinavian-Mediterranean core network corridor. They include:

- Development of a high quality public transport offer - including continuous time-table management for public transports (e.g. between local buses, ferries and railway) and high frequency of public transport service to and from the ferry terminals.
- Intense marketing of public transport offers (e.g. InterCombi-Ticket) and integration of them into the ticket and tariff systems of adjacent regions and service providers (like Deutsche Bahn, Danish State Railways, Swedish Railways).
- Extension of (real-time) traffic information systems - including their integration with international systems (e.g. EU-Spirit).
- Development of a long-distance route bus strategy for Rostock and Guldborgsund in order to activate their potential as hub and transfer points.
- Cooperation projects for sustainable transport in the area - e.g. promotion and testing of e-mobility, intermodal mobility management and integrated parking solutions.
- Expansion of cross-border bicycle tourism.
- Additional measures using transport and infrastructure development as a fundament for cooperation (e.g. joint projects on urban waterfront development, joint art/culture projects and educational/tourist events).

In parallel to this, the stakeholder dialogue led to the identification of solutions to strengthen the role of the two ports in serving the combined transport.

The governance model for Rostock-Guldborgsund is a practical example of a cooperation framework supporting the transformation of a multimodal transport corridor into a regional development axis. It will contain different organisational and financial components and will suggest incentives for measures to be taken in order to set up and support cooperation structures and processes at various levels within the corridor. One example will be the Rostock-Guldborgsund Cooperation Action Plan as a follow-up to the outline cooperation plans and implemented thematic events. The model may also stimulate new cooperation structures (e.g. South Baltic Port Area cooperation based on Motorways of the Sea links).

TO ACHIEVE THE GOAL

- Adopt a cross-sectoral and multilevel approach to the planning and implementation of transport investments in order to fully match local transport needs and to enable positive development. This often requires action at higher levels or by business stakeholders (e.g. with regard to investments in seaports, railroads or ferries).
- Specify cross-border interfacing potentials in specific action plans and develop cooperation contracts that are binding for political stakeholders.
- Work more with the demand side (‘reasons to go’) in order to stimulate cross-border public passenger transports.
- Involve the broader public (e.g. schools) in order to reactivate contacts between the local communities.
- Set up a permanent body (e.g. monitoring committee) with working groups involving a wide spectrum of players supervising the progress in cross-border integration and recommending areas for action.
- Apply instruments of integrated strategic planning to ensure a coordinated use of funding instruments to improve the accessibility of the border region and to consolidate the cross-border section in the TEN-T core network corridor (or any other multimodal transport corridor) as a part of the regional development axis.

DID YOU KNOW THAT...

Pedestrian passengers travelling between Denmark (Nykøbing Falster) and Germany (Rostock) are offered an InterCombi-Ticket. It integrates the service of 6 public transport companies and a ferry line, and is supported by the world’s first real time cross-border intermodal passenger information system.

In the BSR TransGovernance project, the municipalities of Guldborgsund and Rostock closed partnership agreement and developed an action plan to further improve the comfort of travelling across borders for residents and tourists.
Macroeconomic cooperation

Case 1: Do we need a joint transport planning for the Baltic Sea Region?

How do we pool together the existing initiatives and make use of their individual strengths?

THE CHALLENGES
The Action Plan of the EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region (EUSBSR, version of February 2013) calls for improving the joint transport planning process in the area. Understandably, this requires a shared view of the future challenges for the transport system and planning tools that all countries can trust.

The document further claims, that the tools in place today are insufficient and that there is a lack of knowledge exchange between national strategic planners. The scattered traffic flow data and different methods and models applied for transport networks in individual countries stand out as obvious obstacles.

Recently, two reports presenting results of the intergovernmental cooperation in transport have been produced: the Baltic Transport Outlook, BTO (initiated by the Swedish government within the framework of the EUSBSR) and the NORDIM study (agreed by the state governments of the EU countries, Russia, Norway and Belarus, and the European Commission within the framework of the Northern Dimension Partnership on Transport and Logistics, NDPTL).

The BTO has suggested a strategic network for the Baltic Sea Region - a multimodal mobility network comprising road and rail links, ferry links, airports and seaports and terminals of transnational importance. The BTO Strategic Network correlates with the TEN-T core network, but also contains connections to other important locations in the BSR countries.

Similarly, the NDPTL Regional Transport Network connects the TEN-T with the transport networks of the neighbouring territories, linking the capitals and other major urban areas to ports, airports, and border-crossing points between EU and non-EU countries and to railroad terminals. This network is intended to ensure easier planning of infrastructure improvements on the most important routes for international traffic in Belarus, EU Member States, Norway and Russia.

In addition to this, the Macroeconomic Transport Action Plan developed by TransBaltic and agreed in the cluster of transport projects co-funded by the BSR Programme 2007-2013 contains policy actions for the pursuit of a green scenario and development of a network of sustainable, multimodal and green transport corridors. Such a network forms a non-exclusive grid of connection within and across the BSR. It yields, economic efficiency and lower environmental impact and needs a concerted policy intervention (harmonisation, steering mechanisms, quality supervision and operational management).

The three macroregional transport planning processes should be harmonised to allow a better exchange and for coordination of information and knowledge. As laid down in the EUSBSR Action Plan, this will help strategic planners make more efficient recommendations regarding infrastructure and transport systems in the BSR - both in the internal and external dimension.

KEY FINDINGS
The planning processes of the Baltic Transport Outlook and the NDPTL relate to the more or less the same geographical area and are backed by the very same national governments (although often different departments or even ministries). Yet, they show considerable differences in terms of approach, density of links and nodes as well as funding opportunities. As for the latter, project proposals located within the NDPTL Regional Network may be co-financed through the NDPTL Support Fund. The BSR Strategic Network has no direct link to any funding source. On the other hand, the network of sustainable, multimodal...
and green transport corridors promoted by TransBaltic and the cooperating projects has no exact routing and presents rather a symbolic visualisation of most important connections within and across the Baltic Sea Region based on bottom-up project initiatives.

To achieve synergies, the streamlining between the three initiatives ought to be built on the technical assets and specific competence areas. The three implementable synergy areas are:

- Facilitated elimination of bottlenecks (competence area of the NDPTL).

The NDPTL has a strong focus on implementation of projects eliminating infrastructural and non-infrastructural bottlenecks along transport corridors carrying the largest flows. The established NDPTL Support Fund may finance the necessary documentation to make the identified projects bankable and prepare them for an investment stage (through e.g. loans, national budgets or EU funding).

The projects applying for the NDPTL Support Fund can be initiated by national, regional or local administration and private actors and have to
be located within the NDPTL Regional Network. However, it might be possible to finance infrastructure and soft measure projects on some other links, provided they comply with the overall goals of the NDPTL. By adding specific projects, the NDPTL Regional Network may grow and also incorporate e.g. maritime connections (e.g. Motorways of the Sea and the Northern Sea Route).

This project-based mechanism to extend the NDPTL Regional Network on land and sea is an opportunity to make the BTO Strategic Network operable. It may also help deploy the Macroregional Transport Action Plan by investment in interfaces between the networks of the BSR countries (e.g. links across the Baltic Sea) in order to promote seamless transfer of cargo and passengers.

- A consistent database and prognostic tool (competence area of the BTO).

In the analytical work, the BTO and TransBaltic used the transport network model called TRANS-TOOLS, which covers all European countries and had been developed and tested in some previous EU level projects. The usefulness of this model for the macroregional planning, though, was considered as unsatisfactory.

The recommendation of the BTO project consortium was to develop a transport tool taking into account the specific traits of the BSR, including the maritime connections across the Baltic Sea. This could be achieved through a further upgrade of the TRANSTOOLS model, but other transport modelling work in the BSR should also be considered.

The tool shall cover all BSR countries, including the EU neighbours, and thus it shall be relevant also for the NDPTL process. Particular attention should be paid to interconnections between networks of the individual countries - over the national borders and across the Baltic Sea - as well as to links leading to more remote countries (e.g. Ukraine, Turkey, Kazakhstan etc.).

A step in that direction is the map presented by the BSR TransGovernance project at the EUSBSR Annual Summit in Turku (June 2014). It shows the location of transport infrastructure investments (listed in the programmes and plans of the BSR countries) vis-à-vis the TEN-T core network corridors and the projects under the NDPTL Support Fund. The map, systematically updated, should be a proper management tool for the PA Transport in the EUSBSR.

- Sustainable, multimodal and green transport corridors (competence area of the TransBaltic and attached projects).

The Macroregional Transport Action Plan (MTAP) contains specific proposals to interconnect corridor stakeholders, harmonise planning and management procedures, steer the quality of infrastructure and services and set up governance structures. In parallel to this, the BTO study contained some recommendations to strengthen cooperation between transport stakeholders in the Baltic Sea Region. Apart from outlining the necessity of speeding up infrastructural investments (e.g. EU priority projects), the study presents key issues on the greening of transports that might be integrated with the MTAP policy actions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Time horizon</th>
<th>Total budget</th>
<th>Budget for TEN-T core network corridors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>National transport plan 2014-2023</td>
<td>2014-2023</td>
<td>75.8 billion €</td>
<td>2.9 billion € TEN-T Scand-Med</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** National infrastructure projects that are listed in the latest national transport plans

** National infrastructure projects that are listed in the latest national transport plans
*** Source: NDPTL (http://www.ndptl.org/home)
As the set of corridor development suggestions in the two documents apply to the whole BSR area, they may raise interest of the NDPTL decision-makers. In practical terms, they may offer a wider thematic and geographical dimension for infrastructure investments and soft measures seeking financial support from the NDPTL Support Fund. For example, NDPTL actions to improve the efficiency of border crossings may be placed in the context of corridor development (with parameters as efficiency and reliability of supply chains in intercontinental relations, environmental performance or impact on regional growth).

**TO ACHIEVE THE GOAL:**

**Joint transport planning tool**

**Bottlenecks**
- Analyse the geographical coverage of the BTO Strategic Network and the NDPTL Regional Network.
- Identify crucial bottlenecks within the BTO network that might be considered for the NDPTL process because of crucial importance to the Northern Dimension area (e.g. Motorways of the Sea links).
- Develop a scheme to open up the NDPTL Support Fund as a financing alternative for bottleneck-related projects within the BTO network.

**Database and model**
- Analyse BTO/TransBaltic experience.
- Define requirements for the database/model (macroregional perspective).
- Set parameters for the database/model in cooperation with experts.
- Discuss feasible options for a host organisation (National administration? Research institute? International secretariat?).
- Develop a proposal for a joint database and a model support for the transport analysis in the BSR/NDPTL area (to be co-funded by the BSR Programme 2014-2020).

**Corridors**
- Discuss a uniform structure for the MTAP policy actions and the BTO recommendations/key issues.
- Develop a consistent communication material on the corridor development and transport greening actions under the EUSBSR.
- Initiate a dialogue with the NDPTL decision-makers on a corridor development context of bottleneck-related measures supported by the NDPTL process.
Case 2: How do we deploy the potential of territorial cooperation projects better?

How do we ensure their results are incorporated in the national transport planning process?

THE CHALLENGES
Strategic transport planning in the Baltic Sea Region is carried out at several levels, and by different actors. It involves private as well as public stakeholders. Although public institutions have been established to facilitate joint action in different scales, the transfer of knowledge between the decision-making levels and across borders does not function effectively. To change this, the topics addressed, lessons learned and results produced by various transnational transport initiatives must find their way into already established planning procedures at local, regional, national and European levels.

There is a need for a more proactive national attitude when it comes to incorporating the territorial perspectives, as they are relevant in many transport planning cases. The lack of schemes on how to interact with colleagues in other countries during the planning processes - as well as limited methods for cross-border analyses - reduce the capacity to collect information, technical knowledge and experience in neighbour regions abroad. Thus, the expected future demand on a specific link, hub or network is difficult to assess.

From a national point of view, however, planning across national borders is often difficult to accommodate within established structures and procedures. Therefore, focusing on the national role in the territorial cooperation is of crucial importance.

European territorial cooperation projects, one of the main EU instruments for stimulating territorial development across the national borders, could serve as a link between the planning spaces, and become a more important instrument in transport planning at the national level. They may play a significant role in the implementation of the TEN-T core network corridors.

KEY FINDINGS
European territorial cooperation projects adopt a systematic approach to the planning and management of international transport processes. A better commitment of the national authorities to their results may be achieved through a number of solutions.

The intergovernmental meetings to implement the priorities of the Northern Dimension Partnership on Transport and Logistics (NDPTL) and the stakeholder networking actions to execute the Action Plan of the EUSBSR provide good arenas for mutual cooperation and learning. These cooperation environments offer many opportunities for representatives of the national ministries in the BSR to prepare joint proposals and decisions to their respective governments and to the European level. At the same time, European territorial cooperation programmes and projects need to be open for actions resulting from the intergovernmental decisions.

DID YOU KNOW THAT...
A general observation from the interviews and workshops conducted by the BSR TransGovernance project is that European territorial cooperation projects are surprisingly unknown to a lot of people involved in the transport planning process at both the regional and the national level.

Better involvement of public authorities in the implementation of macroregional strategies and policies (EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region, Northern Dimension Partnership on Transport and Logistics) would help make the transport system in the Baltic Sea Region more consolidated and more resilient to future changes.
Another way to strengthen the harmonisation of transport planning processes across the borders is to apply the practice of transnational consultation around national and local/regional transport plans and strategies. To exemplify, there is already a promising experience of consulting the latest Swedish national transport plan with the Finnish authorities.

There is obviously a need for relevant and updated facts regarding transport flows in the Baltic Sea Region as well as for common methods to evaluate the performance of the transport networks. This could be facilitated through a joint transport tool processing and visualising the flow patterns now and in the future scenarios (Case 1).

A direct involvement of national planners in territorial cooperation projects would motivate the project partnerships to reach results of relevance for the planning processes at the national level. The inclusion of perspectives, challenges and opportunities pursued by national planners and decision-makers will likely increase the odds to see results of such projects embedded in the strategic and daily planning work. This can, for example, be achieved by ensuring that representatives for national level organisations can meet their counterparts in other countries. Another example is the provision of good analysis based on up-to-date and trustworthy facts, serving as basis for decisions in both private and public sector.

**TO ACHIEVE THE GOAL:**

- For national ministries and administration
  - Ensure information flow between the strategic macroregional frameworks (EUSBSR, NDPTL) and territorial cooperation programmes and projects.
  - Extend the exchange of national plans across the BSR in the consultation stage.
  - Develop tools to map transport flows and trends across national borders.
  - Integrate transnational aspects in the national planning and facilitate institutional learning.

- For project developers
  - Focus on important challenges of common interest to all levels (European/international, national, local/regional).
  - Be patient and think long term in developing trustful networks, identifying issues of common interest and in implementing joint actions.
  - Invite national transport planning agencies to the territorial cooperation projects for the sake of shared learning process.
  - Share and communicate new findings beyond the immediate cooperation network.

**DID YOU KNOW THAT...**

Only in the transnational Baltic Sea Region Programme 2007-2013 at least 20 projects address shared transport and accessibility challenges. Through dialogue with public and commercial actors they have worked out important proposals for improvement of transport policies at the various governance levels.