

---

## Scandria®2Act Strategic Corridor and Urban Node Dialogue Meeting – Region Skåne

WP4	Scandria Corridor Governance; activity 4.2: Strategic Corridor Node Dialogue Partner: Region Skåne
Venue	Hotel Clarion, Hyllie
Date	12 February 2018
Participants	Pat Cox, Scan Med Core Network Corridor Jakop Dalunde (MP), Member of the European Parliament Rikard Larsson (S), Member of the Swedish Parliament, The Committee on Transport Mätta Ivarsson (MP), Chairman of the Regional Development Board, Region Skåne Katrín Stjernfeldt Jammeh (S), Mayor of Malmö Lennart Andersson, Director Swedish Transport Administration South, Swedish Transport Administration Gunnar Eriksson, Head of Department, Transport Analysis Daniel Persson, Deputy Director of Regional Development, Region Skåne Stina Nilsson, Infrastructure Strategist, Region Skåne
	Scandria Corridor Governance; activity 4.2: Urban Corridor Node Dialogue Partner: Region Skåne
Venue	Regionhuset, Dockplatsen 26, Malmö
Date	26 November 2018
Participants	Bengt Nilsson, Infrastructure Strategist, Region Skåne Nicolas Cronberg, Infrastructure Strategist, Region Skåne Stina Nilsson, Infrastructure Strategist, Region Skåne Petra Stelling, Ph.D., Infrastructure Strategist, Region Skåne Jonas Brantefors, Coordinator GREAT, Region Skåne Emmy Harlid Westholm, Development Strategist, EU & International Relations, Region Skåne Maria Lindbom Senior Adviser, EU & International Relations, Region Skåne Elin Malm, Development Strategist, EU & International Relations, Region Skåne

## Corridor and Urban node dialogue summary

The urban node dialogue process in Skåne was initiated by Region Skåne in February 2018 in the form of a round table discussion together with Mr. Pat Cox, European Commission Coordinator of the Scan Med corridor and politicians at different levels (EU, national, regional and local MEP) as well as high level civil servants at national transport authorities. The round table discussion was followed up by a work shop in November 2018 with civil servants at Region Skåne.

The topics discussed focused on:

- Cross-border mobility and international perspectives
- The Swedish national perspective in transport
- The importance of cross-border mobility for Skåne
- Multi-level governance and financing methods
- High-speed train or not?
- New fixed links over Oresund
- An overview of Skåne's strategic links with the European continent and with different development corridors.

## Program of round table discussion

The round table discussion was formed around the following program:

14.30-14.35 Welcome, Mätta Ivarsson (MP), Chairman of the Regional Development Board, Region Skåne

14.35-14.40 Introduction, Moderator Stina Nilsson, Region Skåne, gives a short introduction to the meeting and presents the participants

14.40-14.50 Scan Med: EU-Perspective on Swedish Infrastructure, Pat Cox, EU Coordinator, Scan Med Core Network Corridor

14.50-15.00 Swedish infrastructure planning – status and next steps in an Scan Med perspective, Lennart Andersson, Swedish Transport Administration

15.00-16.30 Open Discussion, Led by Moderator Stina Nilsson, Region Skåne

Addressed topics:

- *Cross-border mobility* – How can the planning and implementation process be improved from the national and from the EU-perspective?
- *Financing* – What can we learn about financing infrastructure from an international perspective. Can Sweden find new ways of financing infrastructure?
- *High Speed Railways* – What impact will a future high-speed rail have on other countries in Europe? How will Fehmarn Belt fixed link together with a high speed railway in Sweden benefit enterprises in northern Europe?
- *New fixed links in the Oresund region* - Why is it important with new fixed links and how will new connections contribute to the development?

## Summary of the open discussion:

### *On Cross-border mobility – How can the planning and implementation process be improved from the national and from the EU-perspective?*

Inclusion of the EU-perspective in the Swedish national planning process, including cross border mobility has been rather poor and criticized by the Swedish National Audit Office. In 2014 the question was put into focus in a study from the Swedish government agency Transport Analysis, raising the question of how to take an international perspective on infrastructure planning. The result showed that there was little interest, both from private and public actors. Problems in southern Sweden were identified concerning rail planning and coordination with Denmark. Best practice examples of cooperation were found in the field of aviation between e.g. Denmark and Sweden. When evaluating proposals at national level, international perspectives were lacking in almost all cases. In the current national infrastructure plan, the government has however specifically pointed out the international perspective. A general impression around the table was that Sweden is not the worst in terms of missing the international perspective on infrastructure planning.

However the lack of international perspectives in national planning is not unique for Sweden, many countries do not have national plans at all. At the same time other countries with national transport plans have shown a high level of integration with EU corridors; e.g. Germany, including impact assessments among other things. Germany retrieved information on bottlenecks from coordinators from six different EU corridors going through Germany. All priorities on the EU corridor lists were then included in the German transport plan. This practical method has achieved good results.

The problem in Sweden is twofold; there is the question of how Sweden implements investments in transport corridors, such as electrification and measures for longer trains. The second question concerns the planning for cross border mobility. At a national level there is a cooperation with Denmark and Norway, which has deepened since with assignments from the respective governments. For example by 2020, a deeper analysis will be delivered about an additional fixed link over Oresund, the HH tunnel planned to stretch between Helsingborg in Sweden and Elsinore in Denmark. The analysis will provide input on benefits and transport flows. Regarding local and regional level in southern Sweden, it is noticeable in the everyday life that there is not a proper functional cross-border transport. From a regional perspective, cross-border mobility is important for the cross-border labour market. The Oresund Bridge is the best example. Before the bridge there were 2000 commuters, 10 years later there are 20,000. The major European research facility, the European Spallation Source would never have been placed in southern Sweden without the Oresund Bridge.

It is also stated that the cross border issue is important for the question of modal split as there is a political paradigm shift concerning the main modes of transport seen from a sustainable perspective i.e. planes vs. rail/shipping etc. The cost structure of different modes of transport is however an issue; especially regarding freight, where road transport is much cheaper than for example rail, and the question to what extent external effects are internalised.

In the longer perspective there will be a massive technological development for road transport. Self-driving or semi-self-driving trucks will be available, with a 24/7 capacity. The point is that the future transport system in Europe cannot be planned after yesterday's technology, adapting

existing systems to an EU-wide standard is important as well as adaption to how other transport markets evolve. There is a need to digitize much more in order to improve the conditions. The political discussion and political legacy surrounding each of these discussions must be handled, to avoid risking slowing down investment processes and avoid the risk of developing sub optimal systems.

### *On Financing – What can we learn about financing infrastructure from an international perspective? Can Sweden find new ways of financing infrastructure?*

Financing cross-border communications is an issue that is highly live, referring to the revision of the CEF, but is also a present topic in Sweden. There are massive infrastructure needs in Sweden, which have to be financed. However, the Swedish financial framework does not allow all needs to be considered e.g. high speed railway. The need of more railway capacity is immediate and financing the high speed railway the traditional way, risks displacing other necessary railway investments. Hence, alternative ways of financing might be one way of meeting the needs, e.g. favourable loans are available at state level and might be one solution. Some of the more innovative ideas for financing large scale infrastructure investments include pension funds together with government funding in combination with a repayment system.

Transport Analysis have arranged roundtable discussions on the national level regarding financing of infrastructure. The conclusion from these high level meetings is that there is potential in co-financed ventures; not so much in rural areas but probably in bigger cities.

Within the EU there are attempts to increase funding for sustainable infrastructures, e.g. to make air transport pay extra for emissions and use the funding to help countries invest in sustainable infrastructure. There is a discussion on a possible inclusion of freight transport in the emission allowance system, ETS. That trucks should pay for their climate costs and road wear is supported by the European Parliament. Transport Analysis has investigated how much tax is charged along the corridors, and the conclusion is that both Sweden and Norway have very low tax rates. For example Austria and Italy, responsible for the Brenner Basis Tunnel have much higher rates.

### *On High Speed Railways – What impact will a future high-speed rail have on other countries in Europe? How will Fehmarn Belt fixed link together with a high speed railway in Sweden benefit enterprises in northern Europe?*

Sustainability is one major argument in favour of high speed railway. High-speed rail is important in southern Sweden to reduce domestic air transport (main destination is Stockholm and to which is difficult to reduce the traffic from the northern parts of Sweden due to the longer distances). A second argument is that more capacity in the rail system as a whole is needed. There is the option to invest in new tracks, or to invest in new high-speed tracks. High speed tracks is more costly but the utility is larger. The difference between 250 kmph and 320 kmph might not be so distinct within Skåne, but it is for Sweden. Only with 320 kmph the railway can compete with airplanes. Studies show that three million travellers would choose the train instead of flying if it was quicker. With 250 kmph only half as many would choose the train. With 320 kmph most people in Skåne would reach Stockholm within 3 hours but with 250 kmph only 440.000 would reach Stockholm within 3 hours. Only with 320 kmph a bigger labour market for

the region can be achieved. Only with 320 kmph the railway can be climate neutral 10 years after completion.

### *On New fixed links in the Oresund region - Why is it important with new fixed links and how will new connections contribute to the development?*

New fixed links will be an important part of the TEN-T corridor and those initiatives is needed for increased capacity and to reduce system sensitivity. This is crucial for the labour market and also for freight transport. A more reliable and robust system will expand the region in both directions. For fixed connections, there has to be a clear business case. New fixed links are important, not only for environmental issues but also for security, redundancy and societal sustainability.

### *Conclusions*

Some of the main conclusions include:

- Energy efficiency, specifically in transports is crucial for the future. Cooperation and common investments within Europe and across borders is needed to make the entire system sustainable.
- More cooperation, especially cross border, when analysing and making forecasts is needed.
- The European level should be considered a leverage for cooperation. The EU dimension has brought us closer to cross-border cooperation. For Skåne it might be efficient not just to focus on cross-border between Sweden and Denmark.
- More policy and regulations needs to be introduced, making it easier for people to travel.
- The management of TEN-T is a partnership between stakeholders, there is no ownership. The plans are revised according to new priorities almost every day, it matures and changes. However if something is already listed as belonging to the core network, there is a funding list that looks at which projects can be funded. The core network will be revised in early 2020 meaning that there is an opening for influencing the future network.
- The Swedish national plan will arrive at a good time, and if a venture is on the core network, it may be listed on the next Connecting Europe Facility.
- Sea transports have not been included in the discussion around the table so far, but there is a great potential of using the sea more. Three quarters of all goods passing through Scan Med is short sea shipping. The largest amount goes by shipping, then road transport and the smaller part via rail.

### *Urban Node Dialogue*

The Urban Node Dialogue was held in view of the Round table discussion on the 19<sup>th</sup> of February and international transport-infrastructure networks where Region Skåne is a member. The discussion was focused on which measures need to be taken by Region Skåne in 2019+.

Region Skåne takes part in several cooperation platforms focusing on the work within the EU on transport corridors. The largest ones are:

- Greater Copenhagen and Skåne Committee (GCSC)
- STRING
- Central European Transport Corridor (CETC- EGTC)
- Scandria Alliance

Region Skåne is also member of Conference of Peripheral Maritime Regions (CPMR) and its Baltic Sea Commission (BSC), with one profile area being transport- & infrastructure. A brief overview of priorities in each cooperation platform is presented below.

### *Greater Copenhagen and Skåne Committee*

After Region Halland joins in January 2019, the cooperation will consist of four regions - two Swedish and two Danish - and 85 municipalities. As a result of Halland's membership, the Greater Copenhagen Board changes names from the Greater Copenhagen & Skåne Committee to the Greater Copenhagen Committee.

Greater Copenhagen is facing several important investments in new infrastructure, not least the Fehmarn Belt connection. Better roads, new railways and fixed connections provide new opportunities for growth and development, which the region will benefit from in the near future. In Germany, the Fehmarn Belt project is expected to receive the environmental approval of the authorities, while the Swedish and Danish state are in the process of conducting a strategic analysis of a future fixed link between Helsingør and Helsingborg. At the same time, the possibilities for an Oresund metro are being explored, and Copenhagen Airport undergoes a comprehensive expansion to reach a capacity of 40 million passengers annually. A Greater Copenhagen infrastructure organization must be closely linked internally and externally, as mobility and accessibility are crucial to economic success. Railways, roads and bridges tie people and regions closer together and create new opportunities for cooperation and development.

The overall aim of the Traffic Charter is to create a more cohesive region with shorter travel times and expanded critical mass giving the region international, sustainable impact and competitiveness. A well-functioning and robust infrastructure shall enable residents and businesses to move from and within. The cross-border strategy shall prevent the infrastructure from becoming a barrier to economic development, nationally as well as internationally. Greater Copenhagen shall be a port for passenger and freight transport from Scandinavia to Europe, utilizing positive effects of transit traffic, increased airline and ferry connections, as well as opportunities for ports, distribution centres, logistics companies. Common aims are increased accessibility to metropolitan regions as Hamburg, Aarhus, Goteborg, Stockholm and Oslo, stronger interaction between networks of smaller cities, transition to more environmentally friendly transport solutions, alternative fuels and better utilization of rail freight transport.

### *STRING*

STRING is a political cross-border partnership between Akershus County Council and Østfold County Council in Norway, Region Halland, Region Västra Götaland, Region Skåne and the City of Malmö in Sweden, the City of Copenhagen, the Capital Region of Denmark and Region Zealand in Denmark and Schleswig-Holstein and the City of Hamburg in Germany. In this respect the STRING cooperation covers the corridor between Oslo and Hamburg, overlapping completely with the northern part of the European Scan Med transport corridor.

The cooperation is a strong advocate for the Fehmarn Belt Fixed Link (FBFL) and has worked for the construction start for many years. With the enlargement of the cooperation in 2018 to

also include regions and cities between Malmö and Oslo the focus has been extended. Besides the FBFL the current single-track railway line from Oslo to Gothenburg and further to Malmö is currently a key bottleneck on the corridor. A high-speed double-track railway on this stretch would mean increased capacity for freight traffic and regional passenger traffic.

In August 2018 the string adopted its STRING Infrastructure Policy Paper which points out the following priorities:

- Full integration of transport infrastructure in the STRING Region with European transport networks
- Enabling a low emission transport infrastructure
- Approval and construction of the Fehmarn Belt Fixed Link
- More high-speed train services
- Inclusive mobility
- Integrated waterways
- Maximum EU funding

### *Central European Transport Corridor*

Region Skåne was, together with West Pomerania, one of the initiators to establish co-operation between regions in the corridor along the E65 route from the Baltic Sea to the Adriatic Sea: the Central European Transport Corridor (CETC). The aim was to establish permanent regional cooperation to strengthen members' economic development, increase employment, and improve the environment and living conditions. One objective is to secure a coherent transport infrastructure to reduce development barriers and develop new transport technologies, promote and develop intermodal transport and stimulate transmission of transport by road to multimodal transport.

In 2014, CETC-EGTC Ltd was established with its base in Szczecin. It is a more stable form of cooperation with clearly defined forms of responsibility, finance and decision making. In 2018-2020, the General Assembly will continue the efforts to achieve the goals adopted in 2014:

- Simplification and promotion of improved transport accessibility along the North-South axis for multimodal transport from the Baltic Sea to the Adriatic Sea within the CETC,
- Support the development of the economies of the regions concerned, for improving employment indicators and quality regarding the environment, living conditions,
- Measures to improve transport infrastructure between regions,
- Ensure support and conditions for the development of intermodal transport connections, disseminate environmentally friendly solutions.

### *Scandria Alliance*

**Scandria@Alliance** aims at cooperating with EU, the member states and key actors to implement a sustainable & multimodal transport system before 2030 in the Baltic Sea Region and the Scan Med regions. To reach this goal actions below are needed:

- Evaluation of an action plan to initiate common actions and support formulation of policy,
- To utilize Scandria Alliance as a central forum for commonly agreed interests and as a counterpart to the European Coordinator for the TEN-T Core Network Corridor Scan Med,
- Multi-level governance/coordination of European/National Transport Policies, Logistics and innovation, Railway infrastructure projects, freight/passenger services, interoperability, Green corridor development, Cluster cooperation, Urban node development, funding opportunities

- Common program proposals strengthening a sustainable multimodal transport system
- Contacts with other network

### *Perspectives of Region Skåne on added value, arguments and prioritized content of international transport platforms:*

Region Skåne has a long history of collaboration in projects and cross border networks that focus on cross border infrastructure, transport planning and governance issues. Today Region Skåne is involved in several cooperation platforms that handles the issues connected to the European Transport Network, TEN-T in general and the Scan Med and North Sea Baltic transport corridors in particular. With this comes many possibilities but also a need to coordinate the efforts internally to ensure Region Skånes contribution and gain from each cooperation platform. It is the hope of Region Skåne that the Scandria Alliance will contribute with a multi-level perspective and give added value to the already existing collaborations on the Scan Med corridor.

Conclusions are that Region Skåne need to:

- coordinate contributions to the different cooperation platforms, while also taking into account the regional and national planning processes,
- ensure that the priorities of the different platforms (Scandria Alliance, STRING, GCSC, CETC, CPMR) support each other as much as possible and are in line with the priorities of Region Skåne,
- achieve a strong political involvement in influencing EU programming period 2020+,
- identify relevant work group topics, members and adequate resources for the ScandriaAlliance. Identified possible WG-topics so far include: clean fuels, development of E-highways for heavy duty trucks, synchronised ticket system improvements, green multimodal transports and regional spatial planning,
- map the need for future cross-border studies, e.g. cross border transport flows, how to estimate value of cross border infrastructure investments, benchmarking and
- analyse of the joint objectives/aims of the partners both in terms of policy, legal and regulatory needs as well as traditional infrastructure needs.