



**CENTRAL  
EUROPE**  
COOPERATING FOR SUCCESS.



**EUROPEAN UNION**  
EUROPEAN REGIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT FUND

## 1CE055P2 - SoNorA



### **O.6.2.5 – Start up Input for Transnational Coordination Effectiveness Evaluation**

Work Package	WP 6 – Transnational Cooperation Platform				
Action	A6.2 – Core Output Validation				
Author	PP 8 – South Bohemia Region				
<i>Version</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>12.10.2010</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Final</i>

## Document Approval Chronology

Document			Revision / Approval	
Version	Date	Status	Date	Status
1	22.07.2010	draft	28.07.2010	LP Revision
2	06.08.2010	draft	26.08.2010	LP Revision
3	12.10.2010	final	20.01.2011	LP Approved

## Index

1	Objectives of the consultation.....	4
2	Consultation process .....	4
2.1	Relevant topics .....	4
2.2	Accepted consultations .....	5
2.2.1	Consultation with the Czech transport ministry representatives .....	5
2.2.2	Consultation with the TEN-T priority project No.27 coordinator – Mr. P.Telička.....	6
2.2.3	Consultation with the chairman of the PEC VI – Mr. W.Zarnoch .....	6
2.2.4	Other consultations and dialogues .....	7
2.3	Invited and requested consultations without acceptance .....	7
3	Consultation Results .....	7
4	Lessons learned .....	8

# 1 Objectives of the consultation

In order to provide set of outputs for action “Sustaining N-S Corridor Integrity” under development in work package 4, consultations with relevant stakeholders were carried out in the scope of the SoNorA consortium. Involvement of these stakeholders in the consultation process depends on their interest on the SoNorA outcomes as stated in the overall WP6 methodology.

Set of measures was designed in order to catch the stakeholder interest, such as direct discussion during regular SoNorA consortium meetings, formal requests in the letterform, direct interviews on the SoNorA topics and questionnaires.

This output focuses on description of the dialogue proceedings, circumstances of the involvement acceptance and areas of the stakeholders interests than on the technical outcomes and conclusions of the consultations, as they have been included in other outputs already, especially the “Evaluation of impact and effectiveness of transnational coordination” (O4.2.3).

## 2 Consultation process

Several consultations have been designed, scheduled and taken during the SoNorA project based on the proactive approach of the SoNorA consortium members. However, some of the invited and requested meetings and dialogue have not been accepted from the external stakeholders side.

### 2.1 Relevant topics

In order to measure the consultation outcomes a set of topic relevant questions was designed in cooperation of the PP8 (SBR) and LP external experts. The initial aim of the consultation process was an adequate response to these questions given by the stakeholders involved. Following questions were included in the questionnaire mask:

- What types of coordination activities is your institution involved in? (*TEN-T PP, PEC, cross-border projects, specific transport corridors, etc.*)
- What are the tools of coordination mechanisms that are currently used for your priority corridors development and how often are they carried out? (*high-level meetings, workshops, interventions into planning procedures, technical consultations, promotion and dissemination*)

- Which authorities / other players are active in realized coordination activities? (*ministries, regional administrations, investors / operators, non-governmental institutions*)
- What are the outcomes of realized coordination activities? (*obligatory decisions, signed documents, action plans, funding schedules, etc.*)
- How would you describe the benefits of coordination activities realized so far? (*consensus building, increasing political and public acceptance, technical assistance, support in EU-funding schemes utilization, etc.*)
- Which aspects do you consider the key limiting factors disabling a more efficient coordination? (*non-binding legislative framework, intergovernmental agreements missing, personal changes in decision-making positions, political will, administrative procedures, etc.*)
- To what extent the commitments made during coordination sessions (if any) are being really implemented? (*sufficiently, progressively, facing procedural / administrative constraints, delayed, refused*)
- What do you consider as a major challenge to overcome in future in order to reach more effective coordination of infrastructural projects of transnational importance? (*pushing forward “corridor coordination” concept, extending the number of coordinated projects, raising competences of coordinators, legislative steps, etc.*)
- Which are the areas where a proactive coordination could help the most? (*harmonization of time frames, standardization of methodologies – e.g. SEA, EIA, CBA, cross-border synchronization, elimination of non-infrastructural bottlenecks*)

## 2.2 Consultations

### 2.2.1 Consultation with the Czech transport ministry representatives

This meeting was organised in order to discuss the transnational coordination issues with the Czech transport ministry representatives upon concrete cases in the Czech republic. It took place on the Ministry of Transport – Department for strategy on 9 April 2009.

Participants of this meeting – representatives of the PP8 (South Bohemia Region), their external experts and the Czech ministry of transport discussed transnational coordination between the Czech republic and its neighbours on real cases of road and rail infrastructure.

### **2.2.2 Consultation with the TEN-T priority project No.27 coordinator – Mr. P.Telička**

This meeting was organised in order to discuss the transnational coordination issues with the European Commission coordinator upon concrete cases in the TEN-T network. It took place in the Prague office of Mr.Telicka on 6 November 2009.

Participants of this meeting – external experts of the PP8 (South Bohemia Region) and Mr.Telička – The TEN-T priority project No.27 coordinator discussed current roles of the EC coordinators and suggestions for cooperation with a hypothetical coordinator of the TEN-T priority project No.22 which have not been established yet.

### **2.2.3 Consultation with the chairman of the PEC VI – Mr. W.Zarnoch**

This meeting was organised in order to discuss the transnational coordination issues with the Pan-European Corridor VI executive upon concrete cases in the PEC network. It took place in Ostrava during the PETC VI steering committee meeting on 3 November 2009.

Participants of this meeting – external expert of the PP8 (South Bohemia Region) and Mr.Zarnoch discussed current roles of the PETC system.

### **2.2.4 Consultation with the chairman of the PEC IV – Mr. H.Adelsberger**

This consultation ran continuously since the SoNorA project beginning and was based upon non-direct communication – especially via emails and phone calls. The aim of this communication concerned specific advices and remarks to plans and designs of the actual communication ways for acquisition of inputs for this document. Participants of this communication count among SoNorA project partners involved in the WP6.

### 2.2.5 Other consultations and dialogues

Some of the relevant questions regarding the transnational coordination effectiveness evaluation were arisen during events initialized by the SoNorA consortium in a broader stakeholder audience, such as SoNorA Consortium meetings.

### 2.2.6 Invited and requested consultations without acceptance

Except the consultations mentioned above, the SoNorA partners have initialized several other contacts without adequate response from the stakeholders, such as formal letters to other TEN-T priority projects coordinators.

## 3 Consultation Results

Consultations with the stakeholders contributed to a further delivery of the SoNorA output “Evaluation of Impact and Effectiveness of Transnational Coordination” (O4.2.3). Key findings used for the scenario definition in the follow-up output are listed below:

- Interest of the concerned bodies (ministries and regions) on involvement into the cross-border coordination structures of the EU. The current state of communication between different neighbouring countries is often insufficient and should be improved in the future. Concrete cases discussed with the Czech transport ministry or representatives of the Polish – German border regions were enlisted. National plans and priorities (corridors) should be harmonized with the priority networks defined by the EC.
- Institutional structure and competencies set-up in the involvement areas concerning the transportation and regional development.
- Clarification of the tools portfolio of the EC coordinators through explanation by Mr.Telička upon concrete cases and tasks delivered for the TEN-T project No.27. Capabilities of the TEN-T coordination tools in the future were estimated accordingly.

- Clarification of roles and participants structure of the PECs steering committees through explanation by Mr.Zarnoch upon the PEC VI initiative. Capabilities of the PEC coordination tools in the future were estimated accordingly.
- There are some concerned bodies (ministries, regions), whose awareness of the European transport networks coordination is weak. Strengthening of their perception through adequate knowledge sharing and popularization would be helpful in the future, especially in the new era of the strategic European transport policy planed for 2011. This is a potential for the SoNorA project outputs dissemination.

## 4 Lessons learned

Results of the consultation process can be seen also in other areas, than in the actual contribution to the transnational coordination effectiveness evaluation. This concerns the lessons learned from a contact establishment and further communication with the high level representatives of the EC bodies:

- In general, non-personal communication such as formal letter or email correspondence or telephoning does not give necessary results. Therefore it is advised for any further consultations to set up a personal appointment with the stakeholder after providing of a short questionnaire in advance.
- Better acceptance of the calls for consultations can be reached when the interview is synchronized with the high level representatives time schedules in terms of appending of the interview meeting to some other duty event of the representative (such as steering committee meeting or other wider audience events).
- Sufficient and continual awareness spreading and image branding of the SoNorA project can help with the contact establishment for the further project stages.