Future governance of transport corridors

First results of the BSR TransGovernance project

NLC Conference, Vaasa-Umeå, 23 May 2013
First highlights

• Project approved 12 June 2012 and led by Region Blekinge
• 23 partners, several associated organisations
• Results to be seen in September 2014
• Objective: use multi-level governance instruments to better align transport policies in the BSR and include the business perspective
• Part of the EU Baltic Sea Strategy (Priority Area Transport + Horizontal Action on MLG)
• High expectations by external stakeholders
• Interpreted as a follow-up to acknowledged transport development processes led by the regions
A descendant of long cooperation process...

- **InterBaltic**
- **STBR**
- **BALTIC GATEWAY**
- **TransBaltic**
- **EAST WEST TRANSPORT CORRIDOR II**
- **RBGC**
- **Baltic Air CargoNet**
- **Bothnian Green Logistic Corridor**
- **BSR InnoShip**
- **BSR TransGovernance**

Timeline:
- → 2006
- 2005-2007
- 2009-2012
- 2012 →
Understanding the MLG concept...

- Focus on decision-making process - crucial for the implementation of programmes, strategies and action plans

- Coordination of policies and actions to ensure a harmonised approach to a development

- But at the same time: cooperation of public and private actors is required!

- Multi-level governance - a way to improve decision-making

- MLG = governments (institutions & regulations) + market + interacting + networking BUT with a clear framework (awareness, vision, aims, knowledge, responsibility, engagement and action)

- MLG better than conventional systems where the ‘sudden change’ and the unforeseen impact are frequently excluded

- Good timing: MLG results in BSR TransGovernance to help shape the EU Baltic Sea Strategy and the BSR Programme 2014-2020
Reference scales

- Transnational transport corridors: showcase of freight flows management between EU and non-EU countries (N-E)
- Cross-border integration areas with high dynamics of flows
- Transnational transport corridors: showcase of development axis connecting the BSR with the Med area (N-S)
- Sites of intermodal terminals

The overall BSR area
Main outputs

- Implementation and management framework for strategies and action programmes at the MACRO level (BTO ↔ MTAP by TransBaltic)

- Implementation and management framework for strategies and action programmes at the MESO levels
  - Öresund area
  - Helsinki-Tallinn area
  - Eastern Norway area

- Operational MLG model for the corridors:
  - EWTC, incl. financial toolbox
  - SCANDRIA, incl. smaller scale action plans

- Operational MLG model for intermodal terminal sites

- Recommendations to ECOM on core network corridors
  - Freight management development axis

BSR TransGovernance
First investigation (WP3)

• Topics:
  – Constraints in implementation of past strategic transport development actions
  – European experience in joint transport planning & development for corridors and integration areas

• Aims:
  – Identify problems
  – Define key success/failure factors
  – Set a departure point for reference scale analyses

• Discussion with stakeholders to validate some hypotheses
• Interviews with selected case representatives
• Reports available on the website (www.transgovernance.eu)
Identified implementation constraints (Task 3.1 report)

- Human and financial resources
- Roles and responsibilities
- Political ownership
- Lack of financial instrument at the regional level
- Stakeholders (willingness, understanding)

LESSONS LEARNED

- Clarify the purpose from the beginning
- Find way to involve stakeholders: early stage work! (identify important actors, discuss the implementation stage)
Task 3.2 - Selection of cases and approach

- Past/ongoing initiatives
- Diversified rationale
- Varied formation & implementation stages, geographical areas, legal structures
- Cross-border & transnational scales
- Monosectoral or multi-actor perspective
- Uniform template for result presentation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical location</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contact person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purpose/aim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Main activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management setup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future plans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Dialogue with case representatives to identify success factors and added value
The pool of cases

- Baltic-Adriatic Axis
- CETC-ROUTE65
- CODE 24
- Scandinavian Arena
- Magistrale for Europe
- SEETAC
- SETA
- Green Corridor Brenner
- EWTCA
- STRING

BSR TransGovernance

European Corridor
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
Multi-level governance in transport

- Helps reach decisions through collaboration between several partners, in a more or less organised manner
- Defragments policy implementation, with dominant infrastructure supply approach at all policy levels, including the national transport policy
- Supports and facilitates desired behavioural changes → decisions are taken in a constant interaction between the levels
- Central in addressing transnational problems
- Optimum form of the network to be decided at early planning stage
- Leadership and reflexive argumentation/communication as two main drivers!
- Chain of steps recommended:

  vision → personal contacts → identification of stakeholders and needs → common interests and consensus building → EU level guidance → stakeholder platform → cooperation framework → communication of shared goals → projects and business cases → expert platforms/observatories
Thank you for your attention!
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