



CPMR **BALTIC SEA  
COMMISSION**



CPMR **NORTH SEA  
COMMISSION**

# **Report from Meeting of the Baltic Sea Commission and North Sea Commission Transport Working Groups Minutes**

---

**Stockholm, 5-6 April 2018**

## **List of participants**

Bosse ANDERSSON, Politician, Stockholm County Council  
Patrick ANVROIN, Director, CPMR  
Kai BEDRINGÅS, Civil Servant, Møre and Romsdal County  
Åsa BJERING, Executive Secretary, CPMR Baltic Sea Commission  
Christoffer von BOTHMER, Strategist Infrastructure, Region Gävleborg  
Niklas CEDERBY, Civil servant, Vestfold county  
Mårten EDBERG, Strategist on Infrastructure, Region Västerbotten  
Jon Halvard EIDE, Adviser, CPMR North Sea Commission Transport Working Group, Vest-Agder  
Preben FRIIS-HAUGE, Councillor, Region of Southern Denmark  
Melissa FRÖDIN, Assistant Executive Secretary, CPMR NSC  
Kai HOLMBERG, Chairman of the BSC Transport Working Group, Kymenlaakso  
Fredrik IDEVALL, Head of Unit, Region Örebro County  
Erik JOHANSSON, Politician, Region Örebro County  
Dino KELJALIC, Senior Advisor Transport, Region Örebro County  
Jan LAHENKORVA, Vice-President, Regional Sustainable Committee, Region Gävleborg  
Kjartan Alexander LUNDE, Councillor, Rogaland City Council  
Robert NORDEVI, Civil Servant, Stockholm County Council  
Anders ÖBERG, Vice-Chair of the Region Norrbotten, Region Norrbotten  
Erik ØRSKOV, Senior Consultant, Region of Southern Denmark  
Malla PAAJANEN, Chief adviser, Helsinki-Uusimaa Regional Council  
Kåre PETTERSEN, Vice-Chair, NSC Transport Working Group, Vestfold county  
Yasa RATNAYEKE, Team Leader, Aberdeen  
John REYNOLDS, Councillor, Aberdeen City Council  
Terje SKRATTALSRUD, Leader of section sea. Dept. of transportation, Trøndelag fylkeskommune  
Philip SMART, Transport Strategy Advisor, Aberdeenshire Council  
Johan SÖDERLING, Vice-Chair BSC Transport Working Group  
Toni VANHALA, Head of International Affairs, Kymenlaakso  
Valentine WILLMANN, Policy & Projects Officer, HyER - Hydrogen, fuel cells and electro-mobility in European regions

## 5 April 2018

### Welcome

#### **Kai Holmberg, Chair of the BSC Transport Working Group**

Kai was pleased that the Members of the two Working Groups had an opportunity to meet. Closer cooperation between the North Sea and Baltic Sea Commissions is part of the Work Plan of the BSC Transport Working Group. Kai also thanked Stockholm for organising the meeting.

"Save the Sea" is high on the Agenda in the Baltic Sea Region and Kai emphasised that a lot of work remains to achieve this.

He referred to a seminar in the Baltic Ports Organisation: How to organise the different transport modes in a sustainable way. He concluded by expressing his clear hope for a fruitful meeting.

#### **Preben Friis-Hauge, Chair of the NSC Transport Working Group**

Preben was delighted to see such a high number of participants. He thanked Åsa, Jon Halvard and Stockholm County Council for the preparation of the programme. He was also happy to see the attendance of the CPMR Director for Transport, Patrick Anvoin and Melissa Frödin from the NSC Secretariat.

He mentioned that the NSC Transport Working Group has started preparing input to the TEN-T revision post-2020. Preben thought that the meeting would be a good opportunity to exchange views on this issue. He believed that the meeting could also be useful as an input to the revision of the NSC strategy post-2020 which is starting later this year.

#### **Welcome to Stockholm County Council, Bosse Andersson, Vice-Chair of the BSC Transport Working Group**

Robert Nordevi gave the presentation on behalf of Bosse, who was unable to attend due to unforeseen circumstances.

Robert started the presentation by sharing the [good news](#) that the Swedish Government, had requested the EC to include the link from Stockholm to Oslo as well as the Bothnian link in the ScanMed corridor, something that the Regions of the CPMR has worked for.

He went on to present Stockholm County, with 26 municipalities and 2.2 million inhabitants. The county covers a large area – also including rural areas. Stockholm is keen on protecting green and blue infrastructure and on promoting sustainable transport. The Region is experiencing high population growth. The regional development plan RUF5 2050 defines goals for spatial orientation towards 2050. The approach is to concentrate housing and service developments around public transport nodes.

It is furthermore a challenge to handle freight transport. The regional freight and logistic structure consists of various combi terminals - with emphasis on facilitating "last mile" transports. It is also an ambition to secure a sustainable catchment area for Stockholm Arlanda airport.

### **Questions:**

A question was asked about the conditions for intra-regional logistics?

Robert informed participants that a regional freight strategy is currently under public consultation. The demand for freight services is huge, and it will be challenging to provide the necessary infrastructure. There are plans for a new harbour in the southern part of the Region. It is also important to have good cooperation with neighbouring Regions, such as for example Region Örebro County.

### **Short presentation of participants**

The participants (see above list) briefly presented themselves.

### **Presentation of the agenda and speakers, by Åsa Bjering, BSC Executive Secretary**

Åsa mentioned that this joint meeting had been planned for a long time, and the Chairs and Advisers had met in conjunction with the CPMR General Assembly in Helsinki last October to plan the meeting. The BSC Transport Working Group (TWG) has included cooperation with the NSC counterpart as a separate item in the Work Plan. She then briefly went through the three main topics on the agenda and the corresponding speakers.

### **History of cooperation between the two Working Groups, by Jon Halvard Eide, Adviser NSC Transport Group**

Jon Halvard provided a brief overview of the history of cooperation between the two Working Groups since he started as Coordinator in 2001.

- The Coordinator of the BSC TWG in Nordland (NO) also participated in the NSC TWG during 2001 – 2003;
- The two Working Groups organised a joint seminar in Klaipeda (LT) in 2004, with emphasis on the development of transport corridors and maritime transport. The CPMR Secretariat was represented by Patrick Anvrouin who also attended that seminar;
- Jon Halvard has regularly attended meetings of the BSC TWG over the last decade or so;
- Region Örebro County (Erik Johansson and Fabian Ilgner) has participated in both Working Groups for the last few years;
- Regions from the two Working Groups have also cooperated together in projects under the BSR programme;
- The Chairs, Advisers and other Officers have been regularly interacting in the context of the CPMR Inter-Commission TWG for many years. The work was particularly intense around 2009-2010 in the process of formulating CPMR input to the TEN-T policy for 2014–2020;
- The two Working Groups organised a joint meeting in conjunction with the CPMR GA in Umeå in 2014. Seven of the participants at the meeting today also took part in this meeting.
- Finally, the Chairs and Advisers met during the CPMR GA in Helsinki last year to prepare this meeting.

## **Presentations of the activities in the two Transport Working Groups**

### **BSC TWG, by Åsa Bjerling**

The [presentation](#) is available on the BSC website.

The priorities of the Working Group have remained the same for a long time. TEN-T and revision has been at the core of the work for the last 5 years. The group is also concerned with regional airports through the CPMR and would like to take a broader perspective on aviation. The TWG is also concerned with 3<sup>rd</sup> country connections (Arctic, Russia and Far East) – which is naturally out of a Baltic Sea Region perspective.

The Working Group is contributing to defending BSC positions in Brussels, and it was emphasised that the CPMR depends on a clear position from the Regions.

The TWG is also working in the context of the EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region (EUSBSR) and has established relations with the Priority Area Coordinator for Transport. The Working Group is also supporting projects under the Interreg BSR programme, related to the EUSBSR as flagship. The Interreg BSR launched a new type of Calls to further strengthen coordination and clustering. Helsinki-Uusimaa Region/lead partner of the Interreg BSR Project NSB Core have a leading role in the new platform initiative on Transport. The CPMR BSC have signed a letter of commitment. The Platform application has also been receiving letters of support from the Corridor coordinators from both the NSB Corridor and the Scan-Med Corridor Cooperation with the Platform and its partners will be of high importance for the TWG over the coming year.

Åsa also emphasised that BSC positions are heard in the CPMR. The Working Group has been promoting the inclusion of the Oslo-Stockholm corridor in ScanMed, as well as Bothnian corridor extensions. The Working Group is glad to have obtained support from the Finnish and Swedish Governments on these corridors. The CPMR has been used as a channel to promote these corridors. The Brussels offices of the Member Regions have also had joint cooperation on this issue towards European policy-makers.

### **Mårten Edberg, Region Västerbotten**

As the CNC coordinators themselves proposed the mentioned extensions, the prospects of these links being included in the end were considered to be good. It is important in this context that the Norwegian Government is also supporting the prolongation to Narvik. Mårten also mentioned that there is currently a big project on the procurement of a new ferry between Umeå (SE) and Vaasa (FI).

He considered Interreg projects in the BSR programme (Scandria2Act, TEN-Tacle and NSB Core) as a stepping stone into the TEN-T and to facilitate partnerships along the corridors. The BSC TWG is also supporting an application from these projects to establish a common "platform project" under the BSR programme (similar to "cluster projects" in the NSR programme 2007–2013).

### **NSC Transport Working Group, by Jon Halvard Eide**

Jon Halvard presented the mission, membership, priorities and activities of the NSC Transport group. The [presentation](#) is available on the BSC website.

### **Presentation of CPMR positions and activities regarding Transport and Accessibility and post-2020, by Patrick Anvroin, CPMR Director for transport**

#### **Preparation of input to the Multi-Annual Financial Framework (MFF) post 2020**

Patrick informed participants that the CPMR has started to formulate positions on the MFF and CEF post-2020. The President has submitted [letters](#) to Transport Commissioner Bulc and to the Transport Committee in the EP in January.

#### **Amending CEF corridors**

The regulation is due to be published on 29 May 2018. The CEF is currently at 24 bn Euros, which accounts for only 2% of the EU budget. 50 bn Euros are dedicated to transport in national and regional ERDF programmes, incl. ETC. He referred to a questionnaire from the CPMR Secretariat on the future of ETC, which the Geographical Commissions are requested to answer. In that respect, participants were also encouraged to argue for the inclusion of transport as a priority in relevant Interreg programmes post-2020. There are indications that the ETC budget could be reduced by 20%, and that there will no longer be dedicated cross-border maritime programmes.

The CPMR Political Bureau (PB) will address and react to these issues at the meeting on 21 June 2018. The Secretariat will also contact the respective *Rapporteurs* and Political Advisers for the CEF in the EP.

Patrick then went on to present a summary of the positions adopted by the PB in Patras on 8 March 2018.

Main message on CEF: The CPMR agrees to a strong CEF budget, provided that more support is given to Core Corridors issues, CEF corridors are amended (cf. CPMR position from 2017), the coordination of Cohesion and Transport Policy is improved, and that Regional Authorities are better integrated in the governance of the Core Network corridors. Core Corridor concerns could be used to promote investments in maritime transport and ports, and higher co-financing (from 20 to 40%) rates could be justified for ports as "cross-border entities per definition".

The CPMR believes that the mid-term (MT) review of the CEF reveals a lack of territorial focus on the part of DG MOVE. Only 4% of the budget has been dedicated to maritime transport, whereas 73% is allocated to rail. As most of the funding is exhausted, it will be impossible to redress this modal imbalance.

The Member States are in the front line for corridor alignments. Two main issues: 1) 3<sup>rd</sup> generation of corridor work plans to be published at the TEN-T days in Ljubljana on 25–27 April 2018. 2) Revision of current corridors post-2020 (annex to CEF regulation).

It is also considered important to follow up on the next CEF Calls to be presented in Ljubljana – dealing with multimodality and digitalisation. There is also likely to be a Call next year to spend remaining/unspent funds.

The CPMR has asked for a revival of support schemes for modal shift in line with the Marco Polo programme (2000–2013), ref. to a CEF-funded study "Med-Atlantic Eco Bonus". Patrick hoped to have a presentation of this project by the Spanish Lead Partner at the next meeting of the CPMR Transport Working Group on 7 June 2018.

Patrick informed participants that the work of the CPMR TWG is shifting towards green transport, cf. the agenda for the meeting on 28 November last year. The next meeting on 7 June 2018 will see presentations by HyER (Hydrogen) and potential new emissions zones for Sulphur in shipping (SECAS). The meeting will also address how relevant projects could be funded by the EU, through exploring options in the Juncker plan (financial instruments), which has introduced options for small cross-border infrastructure projects, addressing special risks.

### Aviation

This is a new area for the CPMR Secretariat. An event on aviation will be organised in the 2<sup>nd</sup> semester of 2018 – to be prepared by experts from Västerbotten (Mårten Edberg), Cornwall, Sardinia and Stockholm (Robert Nodevi). The expert team and the CPMR Secretariat will meet DG MOVE in Brussels on 11 April 2018. DG Competition should also be involved in this work when it comes to State Aid issues.

### Future activities:

- Provide input to the revision of TEN-T maps before 2023. This process is likely to start in early 2021. It will be useful to start working early next year;
- Work to reword Article 21 of the MoS Regulation to the benefits of ports of the Comprehensive Network.

The [presentation](#) is available on the BSC website.

### Questions & comments:

Participants pointed to the interfaces between the BSC Maritime and Transport Working Groups, which should entail a closer coordination and cooperation between the Groups.

Patrick Anvroin informed participants that the Secretariat had started to engage in aviation at the request of Member Regions. The Secretariat does not have any expertise on this topic and is thus dependent upon expertise in the Geographical Commissions. When asked, Patrick said that it is not up to him to say whether the NSC should start to engage more in aviation. He noted that the interests in aviation vary between the Geographical Commissions and Member Regions, and that no NSC Region wanted to be a Member of the CPMR aviation group.

Toni Vanhala informed participants that there is likely to be a budget cut for the ETC programmes. Finnish Regions are concerned about geographically overlapping programmes. There are discussions to cut 3 cross-border programmes in the BSR, but to keep the Øresund-Kattegat-Skagerrak (NO-SE-DK) programme. He believed that other Regions should also lobby the EC on this.

Patrick informed participants that the CPMR General Secretariat is currently working on a response to these rumours. The Presidents of the Geographical Commissions will be invited to sign a letter to the EC in defence of the maritime cross-border programmes. It is also important to argue for inclusion of transport in Interreg post-2020.

Jon Halvard observed that the CEF budget post-2020 could be further stretched if additional corridors are included in the Core Network. An alternative approach would be to increase the budget for the Comprehensive Network. He also suggested that the CPMR should start to look into the options of applying financial instruments and blended funding in light of the fact that such schemes are gaining prominence in the EU. He claimed that one should also consider if and how transport investments under national and regional ERDF programmes could be geared towards supporting the TEN-T network.

#### **Clean Transport 14:50 – 17:00 [responsible: NSC]**

##### **General introduction on NSC priorities and activities, by Jon Halvard Eide**

Jon Halvard made a general introduction to NSC priorities and activities within clean and inclusive transport. He presented examples of policies, objectives, projects and practices in the NSC Member Regions.

The [presentation](#) is available on the BSC website.

##### **Clean shipping, by Kai Bedringås, Adviser, Møre og Romsdal County Council in Norway**

Kai presented his function as the Task Holder for clean shipping in the NSC TWG. He mentioned that the Working Group is now conducting a survey on clean shipping practices among ports and shipping lines in NSC Member Regions and listed some preliminary results. Kai outlined the different aspects of clean shipping and his presentation focused on air pollution. He elaborated on EU Directives and schemes for shore side power in ports. Several examples on the use of sustainable shipping fuels were presented, including LNG, electricity and hydrogen. In addition, examples of autonomous vessels were addressed. He concluded by pointing out how the NSC and BSC TWGs could cooperate on clean shipping.

The [presentation](#) is available on the BSC website.

##### **Policy Area Ship on clean shipping, EUSBSR, by Åsa Bjering**

The EU Strategy of the Baltic Sea Region has three main goals; Save the Sea, Increase Prosperity and Enhance the Accessibility of the Region. It also has 17 Policy Areas, one of them is Policy Area Ship, currently coordinated by the Danish Maritime Agency. They were invited to the meeting but due to other commitments were not able to attend. They had sent a presentation and had a discussion with Åsa, who presented the report.

The [presentation](#) is available on the BSC website.

## **Initiatives and projects on Hydrogen in the transport sector: Valentine Willmann, HyER - Hydrogen, fuel cells and electro-mobility in European Regions**

Valentine presented HyER and its mission and membership. She then went on to talk about the features and role of Hydrogen (H<sub>2</sub>), and the benefits and challenges as a transport fuel. H<sub>2</sub> was treated in the wider EU policy context of the greening of transport and legislation on alternative fuels. Valentine also presented several local examples and projects on fuel cell buses and trains, garbage trucks, taxis and car sharing schemes.

The [presentation](#) is available on the BSC website.

### **Questions and comments**

Valentine was asked about the availability of filling stations and the affordability of H<sub>2</sub> vehicles. She said that the situation is improving, but there are still not nation-wide networks in place. Private cars are still expensive but are getting cheaper with the growth in supply. However, private vehicles are probably not the best business case for H<sub>2</sub>.

Preben found it very interesting that fuel cell trains could serve as a viable alternative to full electrification of the rail network (easier and cheaper) and believed that this could be an option in his own Region in South Denmark, where H<sub>2</sub> could be produced fully sustainably from offshore wind power.

## **Sustainable transport in rural areas, by Philip Smart, Aberdeenshire Council**

Rural areas are taking up majority of the surface of the NSR. As a joint exercise with Region Orebro, Aberdeenshire had previously compiled a database of relevant European clean transport projects but discovered that at the time only 12% concerned rural areas. This has led to calls for greater emphasis on the rural perspective.

G-PaTRA project is the first NSRP project focused on addressing these issues in the context of "greening of transport". One core observation is that even subsidised public transport services have to be economically sustainable to be environmentally friendly in all respects. There is a focus on optimising and improving what there is already provided. Fuel platforms being tested include Electric and H<sub>2</sub>. along with or independent of efficiency of operations: Combining school and health transport, ride-sharing schemes, in order to achieve efficiency gains.

In the context of building a platform for exchange of rural transport solutions between the Regions it was noted that population density is surprisingly not always the main issue in peripheral areas – areas with different densities have potential for using similar solutions. there is potential for sharing and transferring solutions across regions, even if they have different population densities.

## **Discussion on possibilities for cooperation between the two Working Groups**

Jon Halvard introduced this possibility by referring to the recommendations on cooperation activities from the previous joint meeting in 2014.

These include:

- Mutual attendance of Advisers/Executive Secretaries at group meetings;
- Exchange of agendas, minutes, reports and Policy Positions – and invite the other Working Groups to provide input;
- Exchange of project ideas and of results from projects in which the Members are involved;
- Coordination of positions within the CPMR TWG, and in relation to the PB and General Assembly. Act as a "northern platform" within the CPMR;
- Organisation of events with transport stakeholders and business representatives.

Erik Johansson believed that there are many benefits to sharing practices and experiences. However, he emphasised the most relevant area of cooperation is that the Working Groups should join forces on common interests, exemplified by the recent decision of the Swedish Government to call for the inclusion of Oslo–Stockholm in ScanMed. This demonstrates that the Geographical Commissions have lobby power. In addition, coordination prior to the CPMR Political Bureau meetings and the General Assembly was mentioned.

Helsinki-Uusimaa provided information on an application to the BSR programme to establish an "Access platform" between relevant corridor projects. Such bundling of similar projects would serve to better exploit results and promote dissemination to common stakeholders and end-users. A joint platform could also be envisaged for transport projects between the BSR and the NSR programmes, or even across more programmes. Such a recommendation could be forwarded to Interact. The CPMR Secretariat could be a suitable platform for facilitating exchanges across several transnational programmes.

Åsa believed that the questionnaire on clean shipping could act as a basis for exchange and policy development. It is important to think about the use of such questionnaires for lobbying work and/or project development.

The groups should have a continuous and more intense dialogue on how we could capitalise on our experiences as a basis for developing Policy Positions and projects.

As the two groups are having complementary priorities and competence, there is room for exploiting synergies and mutual learning. On the one hand, the NSC could benefit from the BSC within the fields of 3<sup>rd</sup> country connections and aviation – whereas the BSC could learn from the NSC activities on clean transport and shipping.

The two Working Groups could also join forces regarding the European Parliament in the promotion of transport corridors under the TEN-T, and could consider organising some joint initiatives or events in relation to the EP.

To support the basis for cooperation, the presentations from this meeting should be published on the home pages of both Geographical Commissions.

It was also agreed that the groups should institutionalise joint meetings and organise joint meetings every 1.5 years or more often if the need is clear.

## 6 April 2018

The meeting on 6 April took place at Stockholm Arlanda Airport.

In the first session, the meeting heard several presentations from the Swedish airport company Swedavia, and on the developments at and around Arlanda airport.

[Presentation Fredrik Jaresved, CEO, Jannike Ludvigsson, Environmental Strategist, Airport City Stockholm](#)

The [presentation](#) is available on the BSC website.

The number of passengers at Arlanda has increased over several years and is now reaching 26 million. Arlanda is probably the fastest growing airport in Scandinavia, but the growth is forecasted to slow down. The growth is related to globalisation (50% of Swedish GDP comes from foreign trade) and developments in digital communications, which in itself creates demand for physical travel. The traffic is also growing due to an increasing number of visitors and businesses in Stockholm. The airport has engaged the business community to help attract airlines starting to fly direct routes.

Arlanda has started a large construction project 2017-2023, at a value of 13bn SEK, to increase the capacity of various facilities. The ambition is to use the airport as an engine for creating new businesses and jobs, with a potential for 50,000 jobs by 2030.

<http://www.airportcitystockholm.com/en/> The airport is also actively involved in cooperation with Stockholm Region and surrounding municipalities and businesses.

Arlanda is also acting as a test bed for innovative and sustainable transport solutions within the airport city area: For example, they are currently looking into "Podcars" (AV), autonomous buses, electrification of transport work (light vehicles already electrified but challenge with heavy vehicles). Post Nord is engaged in a project with fully electric trucks.

### **Jannike Ludvigsson, Environmental Strategist**

All Swedavia Airports have goals for zero emissions by 2020 and are certified at the highest low-carbon level.

The main environmental concerns at airports are: noise (green approaches, avoiding residential areas), water (waste water, de-icing material), chemicals, bio-diversity, energy, waste, climate, air quality.

There are also strategies for the roll-out of fossil-free vehicles and eco-driving practices.

There is also an ambition to have 100% sustainable energy supply from hydro power, wind and bio, as well as energy savings.

### Johan Lindsten, Head of land transports, surface access

Johan Lindsten presented the approach to manage and develop the surface access to Arlanda. The airport is mapping the passenger profile by gender, travel purpose, destination countries and travel modes. Rail is the number one choice, but the relative share is going down – possibly due to perceptions of poor reliability and high prices (€26) – the latter in particular affecting the choice of leisure travellers. The share of buses and taxis are growing.

The modal share is differing between business travellers (higher share of trains) and leisure travellers (more buses).

Future developments were presented in terms of passenger forecasts, employment in the airport city, the impact of a possible closing down of Stockholm's second airport Bromma, and planned infrastructure investments in roads and rail in the larger Region.

### **Process of developing CPMR positions in the field of aviation – by Patrick Anvoin and Mårten Edberg**

The following items had been identified as main priorities and concerns in a survey which was conducted among CPMR Members during autumn 2017:

1. Connectivity/PSOs/State Aids/slots allocation;
2. Sustainable aviation and climate;
3. European funding for airports.

Patrick presented the CPMR's work on aviation. A first Technical Paper - commenting on EU aviation strategies – was drafted on the basis of the above-mentioned survey. Eurocontrol had presented an air connectivity index at the meeting of the CPMR TWG on 28 November 2017 – to which the CPMR will provide input. A small number of Member Regions have volunteered to contribute to the work on aviation: Västerbotten and Stockholm (SE), Sardinia (IT) and Cornwall (UK).

These Regions and the CPMR General Secretariat are meeting with DG MOVE on 11 April 2018 to clarify the further course of CPMR activities and to better relate to the EU agenda for aviation. The involved Regions will deliver reports at the CPMR TWG meeting on 7 June 2018.

Lobbying is the first objective of the CPMR, and then to facilitate cross-fertilisation between Members. A seminar on aviation is planned towards the end of the year.

Mårten Edberg thanked the CPMR for having adopted the issue of aviation, which is very important for the accessibility of North Sweden and Västerbotten. There are both Swedavia and non-Swedavia airports in Västerbotten. It is a challenge in this respect that figures for individual Swedavia airports are not available anymore. It is important to stress that "one size doesn't fit all". Measures would have to be adapted to different territorial contexts. Congestion in the air space is obviously not a problem in peripheral areas.

Robert Nordevi also thanked the CPMR for including this on the agenda and thanked them for the opportunity to work closely with the CPMR General Secretariat on this. Robert also informed participants that Stockholm County Council will continue dialogue with Swedavia, also being members of the Airport Regions Conference, and that they will attend a Conference in Gothenburg next week (<http://airportregions.org/>).

#### Discussion and input to the CPMR Policy Position process

The involved Regions (listed above) have submitted input to the DG MOVE meeting on 11 April 2018. Patrick will summarise the outcome of this meeting, which will also indicate the most relevant course of action in the future.

This will be sent out to the Members of the NSC and BSC Transport Working Groups. As mentioned earlier, the meeting on 7 June is important to set the next steps of action for the CPMR.

#### **Third Country Connections**

##### **General introduction to BSC priorities and activities, by Åsa Bjerling**

Third country connections are a long-term interest for the BSC, which has drafted several Position Papers, both in relation to the Silk Route (Far East) and the Arctic perspective – of which transport is a large component. It will also target the Swedish Government as the upcoming Chair in the Arctic Council (<https://www.arctic-council.org/index.php/en/>).

##### **Northern Dimension Partnership on Logistics and Transport (NDPTL) – Director Oddgeir Danielssen**

This presentation was not made as the speaker was unable to attend due to flight cancellations and delays.

Åsa will distribute a Paper from Mr Danielssen with a discussion on the possibilities for a joint position on the MoU of the NDPTL of the two Working Groups.

##### **Update on One Belt One Road initiative by Kai Holmberg, Kymenlaakso**

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/One\\_Belt\\_One\\_Road\\_Initiative](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/One_Belt_One_Road_Initiative)

Kai quoted some key figures including 2 routes, 6 main corridors, involving 65 countries and 900 infrastructure projects. He noted that recent investments are concentrated in the high-tech and services sector and take place in Germany, France, the UK and South West Europe. He explained China's role in the Baltic and Nordic economies as well as in the global economy.

He added that China is still developing corridors. He noted that the capacity of railways is limited compared to maritime transport. He also stressed that the capacity growth of container vessels seems to have stopped. He concluded that Gdansk could develop into a new hub.

The [presentation](#) is available on the BSC website.

### **Third country connections from the NSR, Philip Smart, Aberdeenshire Council**

Philip Smart didn't speak in the context of Brexit, but from a wider NSR perspective.

He displayed a map of the NSC position on the extensions of TEN-T & CEF corridors. In the context of connections with third countries, the NSC had been most concerned about connections from North Denmark to Norway, which were originally not even on the Core Network. They managed to have it included in the Core Network and is now working to include them in the CNC (ScanMed). He also highlighted benefits of connections between Aberdeen–Stavanger. The NSC has also addressed connections to Murmansk.

Displayed old map of 3rd country connections from the "High Level Group", demonstrating the consistency of the NSC position over a long time period and also where it was addressing some similar issues to BSC positions. Examples to third countries were highlighted also including the NMC. Philip mentioned sub-optimal examples of transport services not taking the most direct routes as a result of the nodal connectivity approach to third country borders.

Philip pointed out that the NSC and BSC are having complementary situations and perspectives on the rationale for connections with third countries and raising similar issues in the meeting when these connections were across maritime space.

The [presentation](#) and the [NSC map](#) are available on the BSC website.

### **Concluding remarks and next steps**

Preben Friis-Hauge referred to the agreed follow-up actions from 5 April. He felt that the meeting had been useful and informative, and hopefully also had contributed to the establishment of new contacts across the two Working Groups.

Jon Halvard, Melissa and Åsa will facilitate the implementation of the agreed follow-up actions and draft about the minutes of the meeting.