Capitalising on TEN-T core network corridors for prosperity, growth and cohesion
Project background

TEN-T core network corridors:

- New instrument of EU transport policy
- Improve mobility, intermodality and interoperability on 9 corridors
- Remove bottlenecks by 2030
- Involve stakeholders along the corridors
About TENTacle

Aim:

Improve stakeholder capacity to reap benefits of the TEN-T core network corridors implementation for the prosperity, sustainable growth and territorial cohesion in the Baltic Sea Region

- 2016-2019, EUSBSR flagship
- Over 80 organisations involved, 11 countries
- 7 regional pilot cases
- Solutions to extend the CNCs north- and eastwards
- Macroregional measures
Complementing perspectives of challenges for CNC implementation

The perspective by European Coordinators

1. Weak coordination on cross-border links (standards and procedures)
2. Infrastructure financing gap (needs vs. available funds)
3. Difficult planning and prioritisation of investments (to achieve European high value projects)
4. How to develop corridors in a sustainable way (innovation, ITS, energy, urban nodes)

The Interreg perspective

1. Passive corridor players, low understanding of roles, responsibilities and consequences
2. Insufficient vertical/cross-sectoral dialogue, society involvement?
3. Hindered access for areas and stakeholders outside the corridors
4. CNCs vs. national growth corridors? Urban nodes and their access links?
5. Wider socio-economic benefits of corridors (development zones? gains for the whole BSR?)
6. CNC-EUSBSR synergies?
Regional pilot cases

- Address key growth challenge
- Interact between public and market players
- Interlink with peer cases!
- Develop place-based actions for better access
- Deliver replicable solutions

- Corridor void areas
- Corridor catchment areas
- Corridor node & transit areas
Pilot cases supporting the European Coordinators in CNC implementation

Fehmarnbelt Fixed Link (DE/DK)

**DEELIVERABLE:** Report: Fehmarn Belt as an impulse for regional development

**SHOWCASE:** How to complement the CNC missing link investment with local/regional growth measures and new intermodal logistics models

Westpomerania-Skåne (PL/SE)

**DEELIVERABLE:** Action plan: Boosting logistics along the green and blue transport corridor

**SHOWCASE:** How to functionally extend the CNC across the sea (via MoS links) and facilitate business cooperation in the enlarged corridor area, also using the EGTC tool

Gdynia (PL)

**DEELIVERABLE:** Pilot action plan: Gdynia CNC urban/transport node

**SHOWCASE:** How to (1) develop the integrated urban/transport node on the CNC (port-city gateway) and (2) functionally extend the CNC across the sea (via MoS links)
TENTacle Fehmarnbelt Pilot Activities

Analyses and studies on the market and future developments
- Fehmarnbelt modal split drivers
- Synergies and roles of the fixed link and short sea traffic
- Forecast of transport flows in 2030 using a cargo traffic simulation tool (including transport links to Norway)

Dialogue with ports and city administrations and operators
- Input of stakeholders and further plans to deal with the fixed link impacts
- Personal meetings, interviews, roundtable discussions

Guldborgsund region local activities
- Impact on cargo flows and deriving market perspectives
- New opportunities for investments, Business Park Falster
- North Falster intermodal potentials, incl. biogas and LNG
- Action plans for Guldborgsund Harbours

Rostock/Mecklenburg-Vorpommern region local activities
Impact of the fixed link and recommended actions for different cargo groups:
- Paper business
- Steel and metal production
- New build cars

General stakeholder interaction and case main output
TENTacle Fehmarnbelt Pilot Output

*Guidance Paper*

“Fehmarnbelt as an impulse for regional development”

**Contents**

- **Summary of the results** of the activities
- Highlighting **best practices and recommendations** on how to use the fixed link as impulse for local/regional growth, incl.
  - new + more efficient transport and logistics solutions
  - new logistics models
- **Place-based measures** addressing development measures in areas which might see negative flow displacement effects

**Aims**

- Guidance for logistics/port and local/regional development planning, to facilitate land use, traffic and logistics investment plans based on business and growth opportunities
- Help business players to **adjust business strategies and supply chain models** to new conditions
- Deliver input to the European coordinators and national authorities
Pilot cases supporting the European Coordinators in CNC implementation

**Blekinge (SE)**

**DELIVERABLE**: International component of the revised regional transport plan 2018-2029

**SHOWCASE**: How to ensure the interoperability between the three CNCs crossing the BSR (e.g. via the MoS links)

**Vidzeme - Valga (LV/EE)**

**DELIVERABLE**: Vidzeme regional mobility investment plan 2030

**SHOWCASE**: How to use the proximity to a CNC to mitigate economic decline processes and negative business development trends
Pilot cases supporting the European Coordinators in CNC implementation

Central Scandinavia borderland (SE/NO)

DELIVERABLE: Prosperity and Growth Strategy

SHOWCASE: How to organise bottom-up growth and prosperity processes motivating infrastructure investments in the primary network

Päijät-Häme – North Karelia (FI)

DELIVERABLE: Development plan for a better transport access to CNC hubs

SHOWCASE: How to organise the regional level ‘idea laboratories’ to match the CNC implementation process and generate bottom-up growth processes to better connect the given territory to the CNC port/airport hubs
Macroeconomic dimension

- Mobilise stakeholders
- Help expand CNCs and fill it with business life
- Create synergies with the EUSBSR
- Improve transport planning
- Inspire other macroregions

**Multilevel governance in corridors - lessons learned**

**Impacts of the CNCs**

**Catching the goods transports from the northern areas to CNCs**

**Interactions: CNCs vs. transport networks of the Eastern Partnership countries**

**Conclusions from 7 regional showcases**

**Enriching the strategic transport policies**

**Package of policy and action measures to help BSR territories capitalise on the CNCs**
Contacts

Wiktor Szydarowski, Project Manager
Phone: +46 (0) 455 32 13 26
wiktor.szydarowski@regionblekinge.se

Mathias Roos, Lead Partner
Phone: +46 (0) 455 30 50 53
mathias.roos@regionblekinge.se

Adina Cailliaux, Communication Manager
Phone: +49 (0) 40 37709 172
cailiaux@hafen-hamburg.de
TransBaltic in brief

- **Strategic project** in the Baltic Sea Region Programme 2007-2013 led by Region Skåne (Sweden)
- 51 financial and associated organisations from all BSR countries
- Part of the EU Baltic Sea Strategy (Priority Area Transport)
- **Target:** sustainable multimodal transport system in the BSR
- **New knowledge:**
  - Vision of the system + green scenario
  - Network of green and efficient multimodal transport corridors
  - Impact of transcontinental flows (China, India, Central Asia, Russia)
  - Pilot business cases to green the corridors
  - Hard and soft measures to develop the system
- **Final outcome:** Macroregional Transport Action Plan
Towards an integrated transport system in the Baltic Sea Region

The policy framework

To develop a sustainable multimodal transport system in the Baltic Sea Region

To make the system more consolidated
INTERNAL DIMENSION
- LINKS
- NODES
- SERVICES
- SYSTEM TOOLS

To make the system more consolidated
EXTERNAL DIMENSION
- LINKS
- NODES
- SERVICES
- SYSTEM TOOLS

19 policy actions

6 key policy messages
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Expected effects
Follow-up initiatives

umbrella → transport cluster cooperation under the BSR Programme

- **Headline:** Sustainable, multimodal and green transport corridors
- Lead partners of 8 projects, support from other project initiatives
- Cluster leader: Region Skåne
- **Purpose:** Share knowledge, bridge activities, communicate achievements
- **Duration:** September 2012 - September 2013
- Expected to update and extend the MTAP document

the ’BSR TransGovernance’ project

- **Objective:** use multi-level governance instruments to better align transport policies in the BSR and include the business perspective
- **Initiators:** TransBaltic, EWTC II, Scandria
- **23 partners, several associated organisations**
- **Project leader:** Region Blekinge
- **Purpose:** Achieve greener and more efficient transport in the BSR, in line with the EU Baltic Sea Strategy
- **Duration:** September 2012 - September 2014
- Expected to help streamline the MTAP policy actions with BTO key messages

Project part-financed by the European Union (European Regional Development Fund)
On transgovernance
Reference scales for the demo cases

- Baltic Sea Region
- Cross-border metro areas with high flow volumes
- Intercontinental freight corridor (West-East)
- Development axis between the BSR and the Med area (North-South)
- Intermodal terminal sites

MACRO
MESO
CORRIDOR
MICRO
Researching the MLG - Task 3.1

- **Purpose:** Analyse the constraints in implementation of strategic transport development actions by investigating past/ongoing transport development processes/initiatives

- **Aims**
  - Identify the problems with implementation
  - Identify the critical factors for successful effects
  - Gather and gain knowledge of lessons to be learned
  - Set the departure point for further work

- **18 cases (desk research & questionnaire)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transport initiative</th>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>Critical factors</th>
<th>Lessons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baltic Gateway</td>
<td>Lack of power for regional authorities to implement the strategy&lt;br&gt;Lack of instrument for implementation&lt;br&gt;No instrument for implementation</td>
<td>Consensus on the regional body</td>
<td>Human and financial resources, roles and responsibilities, political ownership, lack of instrument at regional level</td>
<td>Tools at the national level are a problem&lt;br&gt;Need transnational processes for implementation&lt;br&gt;Need recommendation how to create this process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framework for a BSR multimodal transport strategy (BSSSC)</td>
<td>Lack of joint strategies&lt;br&gt;Low activity and poor coordination from national level</td>
<td>Good - several project to raise this problem</td>
<td>Political ownership, will of stakeholders, stakeholders understanding</td>
<td>Easy to receive results if it is a question to reach a common policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Baltic Development Zone - South Baltic Arc</td>
<td>To create conditions for making Polish coastal regions competitive</td>
<td>Very good - joint position for Polish regions and Mecklenburg-Vorpommern</td>
<td>Human and financial resources</td>
<td>Adaption of a number of propositions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Swedish Green Corridor Initiative</td>
<td>Solutions based on the concept “green corridors”</td>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>Political ownership, quality of networking, stakeholders understanding</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem/challenge</td>
<td>Critical factors</td>
<td>Lessons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of power on the regional level</td>
<td>Human and financial resources</td>
<td>Necessary tools are often on the national level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of joint strategies</td>
<td>Roles and responsibilities</td>
<td>Clarify the purpose from the beginning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad coordination</td>
<td>Political ownership</td>
<td>How to involve important stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To establish contacts and networking</td>
<td>Lack of instrument on regional level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will of stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholders understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Researching the MLG - Task 3.2

• Purpose: Make an overview of European experience in joint transport planning & development for corridors and integration areas

• Aims
  – Help understand multi-level governance in transport
  – Define key success factors for participatory process
  – Set the departure point for further work

• 12 cases (desk research & questionnaire)
The pool of cases

Baltic-Adriatic Axis

CETC-ROUTE65

CODE 24

European Corridor

CORRIDOR 8

Scandinavian Arena

Magistrale for Europe

SEETAC

SETA

BSR TransGovernance

Green Corridor Brenner

STRING
Rationale and driving forces

**Reasoning behind:**

- Lobby for lagging behind or delayed investment
- No influence on decision-making at higher tiers, although forced to 'live with results'
- Catch up with global/European policies
- Induced cooperation on the ground among stakeholders
- Optimised/more structured development
- Earlier experience of bottom-up approach and cooperation across the borders

Source: www.teriin.org/div/ST_BriefingPap.pdf

- Regions very active - often ‘supervising’ development progress (incompatibilities between national frameworks, lagging behind cross-border parts, wider territorial context)

- Interreg a good tool to provide sound and evidence-based arguments for the investment

- Alliance/network felt a reasonable measure to put together individual interests and priorities, and to exert more pressure on higher decision-making levels

- **Formal structure** found important to:
  - avoid redundancy and prevent involvement from fading away
  - develop harmonised viewpoints towards higher governance levels

- Longing for **EGTC** - mobilise actors, increase commitment, improve dialogue with the national level?
Go for EGTC?

• The European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation:
  – cooperation structure acc. to EC Regulation No. 1082/2006 with
  – legal personality
  – to facilitate and promote territorial cooperation
  – public authorities in the EU (private - as associated)
  – does not replace any existing admin. level
  – suitable for implementing cross-border, transnational, interregional activities
  – unifunctional (manage programme/project) or multifunctional (e.g. governance of a cross-border territory or thematic network)
  – all members are even
  – assembly and director as minimum bodies

• No automatic access to EU funding but perceived a flexible tool to:
  – help react to changing needs and challenges
  – make cooperation more effective and successful
  – ensure a deeper identification and member involvement
  – enhance visibility (one strong voice)
  – offer a legitimate negotiation position towards IFIs

Source: www.interact-eu.net
Yet - preference for association...

What is, in your opinion, the optimum setup for managing the transport planning and development on a given transborder territory?

1. No formal structure; national authorities to lead the process; other actors to be open for dialogue
2. A lobbying organisation to maintain dialogue with national authorities
3. Joint association with all relevant public and private stakeholders and shared priorities
4. A formal EGTC structure with clear tasks and objectives
5. Other (please justify)
Conclusions

- **shared priorities** and quality of dialogue between national and regional/local levels the two most important success factors
- common understanding and agreement as a pre-requisite for consistent development (corridor as a whole)
- essential to moderate the individual, sometimes conflicting, interests and standpoints towards a common picture
- organising **capacities** fundamental to ensure high level and objective information exchange (professional staff and budget, Interreg as a support tool)
- involvement of **national level** crucial!

**Network benefits:**
- meeting place and learning/knowledge exchange arena
- broader and multi-sectoral basis for decision-making
- wider geographical area
- transport investment needs harmonised with socio-economic growth necessities

**Formal structure** to ensure an efficient coordination mechanism of individual stakeholder interests along the corridor
General conclusions

- Ensure leadership but be patient (build confidence)
- Start with ‘low-hanging fruits’
- Balance public and private interests (policies vs. market)
- Introduce multi-level governance processes to new territories (intermodal terminals)
- Add a corridor development context to cross-border integration areas
- Launch dialogue at early planning stage; distribute roles and responsibilities
- Involve regions and municipalities (they know how to work across the borders!)