



**Results of questionnaire about complementary governance
sent to TEN-T Scandinavian-Mediterranean Corridor
Forum participants Dec 2015 – Jan 2016**

By
Maria Öberg

Department of Civil, Environmental and Natural Resources Engineering
Division of Architecture and Water
2016-03-24

Maria Öberg, PhD Candidate
Phone: +46 920 49 15 61 E-mail: maria.o.oberg@ltu.se
Luleå University of Technology
971 87 Luleå, Sweden
www.ltu.se

Summary

This is the result from a qualitative analysis of 8 answers to a questionnaire sent to Scandinavian-Mediterranean (ScanMed) Corridor Forum participants of the meeting 8th of December 2015. The main concern of the questionnaire was to investigate need of complementary governance structure and processes for sustainable development of the ScanMed corridor. Complementary meaning additional, in relation to governance arrangements for Core network corridors (CNC) set out in the EU regulation No. 1315/2013 (i.e. co-ordinator, Corridor Forum, work plan).

The questions covered the following aspects: the respondents and his/her organisations participation in the CNC development process; benefits of CNC; perception of sustainability and a sustainable transport system; views on need of complementary governance structures and if so how they would be shaped; how governance can support a sustainable corridor, including which organisations and activities are specifically important to involve.

The respondents views of what a sustainable transport system mean include both specific qualities of the transport system (fast, reliable) and a more holistic view of sustainability as a political aim where mobility is to be achieved while minimizing negative impact on human life. Perceived integration of the economic dimension of sustainability in the ScanMed development process gets the highest grading followed by the ecologic dimension and least the social dimension.

Considering how governance structures and processes best could support an integrated approach to ecological, economic and socially sustainable development the respondents gave the following opinions:

- Including users into governance structures.
- Use of information and communication.
- Commonly approved planning and investment decisions.
- Establishing Key Performance Indicators (KPI).

Among the respondents there are both those whose organisations are involved in pre-meetings to the Corridor Forums and those who are not. The respondents give examples of meetings held in connection to the Corridor Forums on national, regional and local levels. The interest for additional complementary structures is inconclusive, but suggestions for complementary structures from respondents from the regional level include:

- Better inclusion of the private sector mainly enhancing rail/road terminal cooperation.
- Better communication between stakeholders on all levels of governance and CNC and EUBSR (EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region) coordinators through a stable communication structure.
- Better regional/local communication in CNC Nodes through regular meetings.

The answers will serve as a basis for the interviews planned in the next step of the research.

Innehållsförteckning

1	Background and aim.....	3
2	Method and implementation.....	3
3	Results	4

1 Background and aim

This research is part of a larger research project. The main aim of the research project is to clarify how governance structures and processes can support an economic, ecologic and social sustainable development of major European transport corridors. How diverse stakeholders can be involved in, and affect the development process is therefore of high interest.

Results from this orientating questionnaire will be used as a basis for forthcoming interviews. Interviews will cover stakeholders located on the major European transport Core Network Corridors (CNC), in the immediate area of influence and in the peripheral area of influence. The interviewees will be related to three of the CNC corridors, the Scandinavian-Mediterranean corridor, the North Sea-Baltic corridor and the Baltic-Adriatic corridor, and represent both public and private stakeholders mainly on a regional/local level. The research aims to clarify: Stakeholders' expectations of advantages/disadvantages of development of the CNC; how governance structures and processes can support an integrated ecological, economic and socially sustainable development; need of complementary governance; possible involvement of the interviewed stakeholder in the CNC development process.

2 Method and implementation

The study started with participation at the ScanMed Corridor Forum in Brussels 8th of December 2015 as an observer. Then a short presentation was given at the meeting about the research, which concern governance for sustainable major transport corridors. The planned questionnaire to be used in this survey was introduced to the ScanMed Corridor Forum participants and organizers. At the end of the meeting business cards from the Corridor Forums participants was collected in order to get their contact information to distribute a questionnaire.

The questionnaire comprised a total of eleven questions, where the main topic concerned the need of complementary governance in the ScanMed process. Close-ended check questions were used, as well as entirely open-ended questions and check questions with an open-ended possibility named "other". In one question a rating scale was used.

The questionnaire was sent by e-mail to 40 of the 57 participants and organizers (consultants excluded) on the 16th of December 2015. This was followed by a reminder the 18th of January 2016 asking for a reply at the latest 27th of January 2016. Totally 11 answers was received of which 3 informed me that they were unable to provide their answer to the questionnaire.

The 8 remaining answers have been qualitatively examined and will serve as a basis for the interviews planned in the next step of the research. The survey initially aimed for a quantitative approach, but with the limited number of responses a qualitative analysis was chosen.

3 Results

The respondents are representatives from regions, ports, EU member state or Norway (national ministerial level) and rail administration. It can be noted though, that the respondents have been informed that their answers represent their own opinion, and does not prejudice the official position of the organisation/company they are representing.

Concerning what would be the greatest advantages of a fully developed ScanMed corridor for the respondents' organization/company the answers show broad expectations of benefits ranging from rather direct effects as better infrastructure and improved multi-modality and transport services, to more indirect effects as regional growth and scientific advantages. Better accessibility and connections to other regions and countries are expected to lead to economic, ecologic and social benefits. The answers have been grouped into themes emerging from the data, without internal order:

- Better infrastructure (upgraded infrastructure, better reliability, faster transports, improved European network, better hinterland connections)
- Economic advantages (better accessibility to other regions/countries, attract investments)
- Regional growth (economic and social development)
- Positioning of the area (improved connections to other areas)
- Improved multi-modality (rail-road and rail-sea)
- Scientific advantages (exchange of knowledge)
- Better services (improved international rail freight traffic)
- Way of handling increased traffic volumes
- Environmental aspects (shift from road to rail).

The respondents' previous attendance in Corridor Forum and working groups are diverse. Range of participating occasions is:

ScanMed Corridor Forum (including this)	: 1-6	times
Other Corridor Forum	: 0-9	times
ScanMed WG ports	: 0-3	times
ScanMed WG regions	: 0-3	times

There are both respondents who confirm that that their organisation is invited to pre-meetings before Corridor Forums and respondents that state their organization is not invited to such events. A following contingency question for those who confirmed invitations to pre-meetings concerned how these meetings are organised. This was asked for in check questions regarding represented organisations, facilitating level of governance as well as regularity. There was an opportunity to add other represented organisations than "attendees of the Corridor Forum" in an open-ended form. The following examples were given, where the purpose of the meeting is indicated in bold by the respondents in an open-ended form (country specific information excluded):

- **Preparation with ministry.** Represented organisations are attendees of the Corridor Forum. It is arranged on a national level and before every Corridor Forum.

- **Coordinating opinion and exchange experience.** Represented organisations are attendees of the Corridor Forum. It is arranged on a national level and before every Corridor Forum.
- **Corridor Forum.** Represented organisations are attendees of the Corridor Forum. It is arranged on a national level and on an ad hoc basis.
- **Regions within country.** Represented organisations are attendees of the Corridor Forum and others. It is arranged on a national level and before every Corridor Forum.
- **Working group on TEN-T Urban Node.** Represented organisations are attendees of the Corridor Forum and other stakeholders including regional and local authorities responsible for spatial development, transport and economy concerning the node, representatives of clusters and networks for transport and economic development. It is arranged on a regional level, both before every Corridor Forum and on an ad hoc basis.
- **Workshop and conferences-during 2016 combined with Interreg projects.** Represented organisations are ex. regional politicians, administrations and other stakeholders. It is arranged on a regional level and ad hoc basis.
- **Working meetings.** Represented organisations are attendees of the Corridor Forum and others. It is arranged on a local level and before every Corridor Forum.

Pre-meetings are held on national, regional and local levels. Meetings are held both on regular basis and as ad hoc meetings. The given examples on a national level can be overlapping or similar between countries.

Regarding what a sustainable transport system mean to the respondent the answers include both a detailed view concerning specific qualities of the transport system and a more holistic view of sustainability as a political aim where mobility is to be achieved while minimizing negative impact on human life. The question was open-ended and the answers have been grouped into themes emerging from the data, without internal order:

- Certain qualities of the transport system including a competitive traffic, low maintenance costs, less pollution, fast, reliable, safe and affordable transports with accessibility also in peripheral areas. Eco-efficiency and cost-efficiency.
- Multimodality as in choosing the most sustainable transport mode (although unclear how to weight different dimensions of sustainability).
- A wider perspective of transports in society. A political aim. Mobility without compromising the needs of future generations. Minimize negative impact on human health, society and environment. Alignment to international environmental policies and enabling a sustainable economic development.
- Dimensions of sustainability, including Ecology (emissions), economic (minimizing external costs, tolls) and interoperability (no border barriers)

The respondents were asked to grade integration of economic, ecological and social dimensions of sustainability in parts of the development process of the ScanMed corridor. The grading scale was 0=none, 1=a little and 2=much. Most of the respondents gave economic aspects the highest grading, and the social aspects the lowest grading.

Table 1. Respondents grading of economic, ecological and social dimensions of sustainability as integrated in the development process of the ScanMed corridor. Grading 0-2. (0=none, 1= a little, 2=much).

Range of grading	Economic	Ecological/ Environmental	Social
In goals	1-2 (Average 1,875)	1-2 (Average 1,5)	1-2 (Average 1,25)
In activities	1-2 (Average 1,75)	1-2 (Average 1,375)	0-2 (Average 0,875)
In stakeholder representation	0-2 (Average 1,5)	0-2 (Average 1,125)	0-2 (Average 1,0)
In the ScanMed project list	1-2 (Average 1,625)	1-2 (Average 1,25)	0-2 (Average 1,0)
Other	-	-	-

The answers from the respondents reflect both unawareness and awareness of complementary governance structures for implementing the Core network corridors on a transnational, national, regional or local level. Complementary meaning additional, in relation to governance arrangements for Core network corridors set out in the EU regulation No. 1315/2013 on Union guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network (i.e. co-ordinator, Corridor Forum, work plan). The following examples of such complementary structures were given:

- Rail freight corridors
- Interreg VB Baltic Sea projects: Scandria2Act and TEntacle
- Brenner Corridor Platform
- Femern A/S
- Bilateral working groups with neighbouring states on infrastructure development
- National, regional and local through the infrastructure planning at each level
- National transport plan and operational programme 2014-20

There are shattered opinions in whether there is a need for additional complementary governance structures and processes for strengthening the implementation of the ScanMed corridor. Answers to the check question expressed views including “yes”, “no”, “I don’t know” and no answer. It can be noted that the respondents answering “yes” are representatives from the regions.

If complementary structures were regarded to be needed, the respondents were asked for more information on how these structures would look like. Check questions with a possibility to add “other” in an open-ended way were used regarding main purpose, how the structure would be defined (i.e. by topic), type of structure (i.e. network), and bridging to European level. Regularity of meetings, participating levels of governance, stakeholders’ geographical location and dimensions of sustainability addressed were presented as check questions alone. Naming of the structure, participating stakeholders and facilitators were open-ended questions. The following examples were given, where the respondents naming as an indication of the structures’ purpose is indicated in bold:

- **Private sector network.** The main purpose would be rail/road terminal cooperation. The structure would be defined by topic. The type of structure

would be network. The levels of governance participating would be European, and the participating stakeholders would be from the private sector. Stakeholders would be geographically located on the corridor. Economic and ecologic dimensions of sustainability would be addressed.

- **Combining the activities of the CNC Coordinators, the EUBSR (EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region) Coordinators with regional approaches by exchange and meetings.** The main purpose would be enhanced stakeholder interest in the corridor, best practice exchange, innovation, influence policy, financing and multi-level infrastructure planning. The structure would be defined by geographical area and topic. The type of structure would be network, forum, partnership and Interreg projects. There would be meetings on a regular basis. The levels of governance participating would be European, national, regional and local. Stakeholders would be geographically located on the corridor, in the immediate area of influence and in the peripheral area of influence. The structure would be facilitated by Interreg and own financing. The structure would be bridged to the European level by information exchange events and by building a stable communication structure preliminary fostered by Interreg. Economic, ecologic and social dimensions of sustainability would be addressed.
- **Regional and Urban Node communication structures by exchange and meetings.** The main purpose would be enhanced stakeholder interest in the corridor, innovation, influence policy, financing and multi-level infrastructure planning. The structure would be defined by geographical area. The type of structure would be network and forum. There would be meetings on a regular basis. The levels of governance participating would be regional and local. Stakeholders would be geographically located on the corridor and in the immediate area of influence. The structure would be bridged to the European level by information exchange events. Economic, ecologic and social dimensions of sustainability would be addressed.

The respondents were also asked about their opinions on how governance structures and processes best could support an integrated approach to ecological, economic and socially sustainable development. The question was open-ended. The following opinions were stated, without internal order:

- Including users into governance structures.
- Use of information and communication. Governance might best support an integrated approach when national/European levels of governance structures are not fully able to promote corridor development. Information and streaming of policy approaches across levels of governance and various sectors is stated.
- Commonly approved planning and investment decisions.
- Establishing Key Performance Indicators (KPI).

Further, opinions on which organisations that are specifically important to involve improving corridor sustainability were asked for in an open-ended question. The following organisations were stated, without internal order:

- European Commission
- EU Member states (ministries for transport)

- Infrastructure managers
- National safety authorities
- Regions/federal states/provinces
- Urban nodes
- Private sector
- Environmental specialist organisations
- Digitalisation specialists
- Future-research specialist organisations
- Those at present involved

Most of the organisations mentioned are already involved in the Corridor Forum, at least when located geographically on the corridor. However it is interpreted that the “private sector” is considered in a wider perspective than today involved in the Corridor Forums. Specialist organisations stated here, and to some extent the private sector, can be involved in research activities in parallel to the corridor process.

Finally, opinions on activities specifically important to improve corridor sustainability were asked for in an open-ended question. The following activities were stated, without internal order:

- Understanding the private sector.
- Assess and determine the right framework conditions for investment decisions.
- Monitoring and analysis of modal split, environmental data, traffic volumes etc.
- Minimizing border barriers.
- Climate summit related activities.
- National planning and allocation of investments.
- Removal of traffic bottlenecks.
- Developing Motorways of the seas and intelligent transport systems.
- Information and cross sectorial streamlining of policy approaches over all levels.

These activities are recognized in the current TEN-T Corridor development process. It can also be noted that some activities are also reflected in the answers to the question concerning how governance can support an integrated approach to sustainable development. Interpretation of what explicitly is meant by “understanding the private sector” or “the right framework conditions” has not been done, due to the present form of inquiry. That will be further investigated in the next step of the research.