

<b>EUSDR Priority area 1b: To improve mobility and multimodality: rail, road and air transport</b>
--

**MINUTES**  
**of the FIRST STEERING GROUP meeting**  
**22 June 2011; 10:00 – 16:30**  
**Ljubljana/Slovenia**

**Participants:** AT, CRO, CZ, DE, HU, SK, SI, SRB, CION; See list of participants.

Non-participating / Absent: BA, BG, ME, MD, RO, UE

**Chairman:** Mr. Franc Žepič, PAC 1b Slovenia

Co-chairman: Mr. Miodrag Poledica, PAC 1b Serbia

## **I. OPENING SESSION**

### **1. Welcome and introductory remarks**

The meeting was opened by chairman Mr. Žepič, PAC (Priority Area Coordinator) Slovenia.

### **2. Keynote speeches**

Ms Andreja Jerina, State Secretary and national EUSDR coordinator from the Government Office for Development and European Affairs welcomed the participants and informed them that on Friday the European Council will formally endorse the EU Strategy for the Danube Region (EUSDR). She stressed the importance of the Strategy for the cooperation in the Region, in particular in the field of transport. Her key message might be that until now the expectations were raised yet the results need to be delivered from now on. She reminded Slovenia also coordinates the "Priority area 10: To step up institutional capacity and cooperation" and she noted it is important to have in mind integrated approach between different areas within the Danube Strategy. In these context initiatives to strengthen certain institutions are important. She also thanked the Commission for all the assistance so far.

After welcoming the participants, Ms. Jana Lenarčič, Director General for International Affairs in the Slovenian Ministry of Transport said she believes that the Steering Group's (SG's) work will deliver visible and measurable results which will contribute towards more sustainable transport in the Danube region. In her opinion the Steering Group is to channel the work towards the Region's common transport policy as guidance for all transport modes activities. In addition the Group should search for opportunities to demonstrate synergies of 14 countries. She asked for the work approach that would not try to substitute or duplicate existing activities in other international or regional organisations.

In response to the speeches the floor took DG Regio (Ms Cruceru) who thanked both speakers for supporting tasks for early implementation of the Strategy. DG MOVE (Mr. Bernabei) said DG MOVE gives great interest into the EUSDR and sees integration of Member States and non-EU member states transport systems as very important.

The chairman thanked both keynote speakers for valuable contribution to the start of the first meeting.

## **II. WORKING SESSION**

### **3. Introduction of SG members**

As it was the first meeting of the Priority Area 1b Steering Group (PA1b SG) all the participants introduced themselves. The Chairman stated that members from Bulgaria and Romania excused their absence. He stressed membership is on a voluntary basis, yet he believes participants from other Danube countries will also take part at the next meetings.

#### **4. Approval of the agenda**

Agenda was unanimously approved.

#### **5. Views from the Commission on implementation phase**

DG Regio (Ms Cruceru) offered thoughts on the implementation of the Danube Strategy. The role of PAC (Priority Area Coordinator) and SG (Steering Group) from the Commission's point of view was presented. The role of PAC is day to day work, creating dialog between SG members, making the results visible, preparing report, representing a link between Institutions represented by SG members and the Commission. According to the Commission PAC is also expected to create a Web database. She said the role of SG should be: to decide on Priority Area activities, to decide on steps and deadlines, to structure the work (such as WGs, seminars, conferences), to carry out cross-cutting discussions with other relevant priority areas, to organize at least two SG meetings per year and to submit a letter of recommendation for projects of special importance for the Danube Strategy which would help in project preparation and that the Commission is preparing the standard form for this letter. She added the Commission supports the Interact Lab group which does a horizontal task for all eleven priority areas. Interact prepared and proposed a logo for Danube Strategy to be used, when appropriate, on a voluntary basis by those implementing the Strategy. She also explained the Commission will give symbolic technical assistance for the work of PACs because they need a certain level of independence.

Ms Cruceru concluded by explaining the Commission's, DG Regio's work program:

- 24 June 2011: European Council endorses the Strategy,
- October 2011: Financing working meeting,
- December 2011: Joint Meeting PACs and NCPs,
- March 2012: Annual forum (all stakeholders invited),
- May 2012: Joint Meeting PACs and NCPs,
- July 2012: The first report on EUSDR implementation by the Commission,
- December 2012: proposal for amendments for the Communication and the Action Plan.

DG MOVE (Mr. Bernabei) introduced main transport challenges in the Danube region. His presentation was divided into two parts.

Firstly he explained the TEN-T history, financial needs until 2020 and work on revision of Decision on TEN-T. As a solution for challenges it was mentioned: realisation of missing links, intermodality of the network, interoperability, better use of existing infrastructure and stringent framework for the TEN-T (such as: core network is commitment, use it or loose it principle, binding corridor decisions and greater responsibility of EU coordinators for the implementation of multimodal corridors). The Commission will adopt and submit to the Council and the European Parliament the new Guidelines (Decision) on September 2011.

Secondly three transport priorities within the EUSDR were stressed:

- integration of transport system between the EU Member States and non-EU States to be dealt with for the first time,
- importance of access to the region, including airports and ports,
- focus to be made on logistics and multimodality.

It was clearly stated that the Commission gives great importance to multimodal transport (possibility to have parallel modes), although intermodal transport (to move goods or passengers from one mode to another mode) remains important for sustainable transport. The completion of 30 priority projects remains the main goal to be achieved. All the priority corridors are to become part of the new core network as far as they apply to the methodology of the new Guidelines.

The Commission believes that the Danube Strategy offers opportunity for countries of the Region to coordinate national transport policies.

## 6. Governance and Funding

The Chairman briefly explained the Governance Structure and Funding possibilities. He explained that major role in the implementation of Strategy is expected from the PACs, supported by the Steering Group (2 PAC + 12 members + CION). A very important contribution should come also from Annual Forum of all stakeholders and Interact (<http://www.interact-eu.net>), in particular its Lab Group (<http://www.interact-eu.net/labgroup/476>).

The following funding possibilities were mentioned:

- National Budgets
- EU (Cohesion Fund, Structural funds (European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and European Social Fund (ESF)), TEN-T, INTERREG frameworks, Marco Polo II Programme, IPA, ENPI)
- The Banks (EIB, EBRD, WB)
- Alternative (e.g. PPP, bonds)

The Chairman stressed that the key task for all involved in the Strategy implementation is mobilisation and alignment of existing funds, particularly in relation to the present Financial Perspectives 2007-2013.

## 7. Presentation and discussion on targets (as presented in the Communication)

The Chairman said the targets are important for overall understanding of work to follow, since only by knowing where to go the results can be achieved. Targets as mentioned in the Communication on Danube Strategy (COM (2010)715 final) were presented as a basis for the discussion.

During the discussion it became obvious that the examples of targets presented are indeed a little too broad, but need no major changes. Serbia (Mr. Poledica) proposed that the target for "multimodal terminals" should be changed so that dry ports are explicitly mentioned as well. Serbia also proposed a new freight corridor starting in Germany (Bavaria) and continuing along X. pan-European corridor should be evaluated for adding to the list as it has added value in bringing together the EU and non-EU Member States.

In addition the Chairman asked SG members to think, for working purposes, of possible division of targets according to time needed for the execution. Example was given as follows:

- Short term:
  - Stock taking (inventory of projects),
  - Better cooperation - Common transport policy for the Region,
  - Removal of barriers for better mobility – shortening travel time by better cooperation between countries of the region,
- Medium term:
  - Plan for removal or removal of major bottlenecks (infrastructure),
  - Study of high speed train network and missing motorway links
- Long term:
  - Removal of all bottlenecks (infrastructure: rail, road, airports)
  - At least two airport hubs in the Eastern part of the Region.

Conclusion: All participants agreed examples of targets in the Communication need not to be amended, apart from addition of "dry ports" in the target related to multimodal terminals. For the purpose of added value for better railway transport connections between EU and non-EU States of the Danube region a new freight corridor starting in Germany and continuing along X. pan-European corridor to the border with Turkey should be evaluated for adding to the list.

However, for the purpose of efficient and measurable results of the work of the PA1b SG new “work targets” need to be agreed based on short, medium and long term planning of tasks within Priority area 1b. All PA1b SG members are invited to send ideas or proposals for “work targets”. These would be further discussed by e-mail and could be agreed at the second SG meeting in October.

## **8. Presentation and discussion on actions** (as proposed in the Action Plan)

The Chairman presented seven actions on rail, road, air transport and multimodal links from the Action Plan (SEC(2010)1489 final). He underlined the actions were carefully selected in the preparatory phase of the Action Plan. Hence any proposal for changes needs to be justified. Yet in case of a real need proposals could be taken onboard as the Action Plan is “a rolling one”.

After profound discussion the following conclusions were brought:

**Action 1** (completion the TEN-T): The PA1b SG waits for the adoption of TEN-T revision by the Commission to be able to look at the core network and main bottlenecks. An input from SEETO (<http://www.seetoint.org/>) on the core network for Southeast Europe is needed as well to discuss integration of both transport infrastructure systems. The Chairman on behalf of SG would invite the Commission (DG MOVE) and SEETO to report on TEN-T revision and SEETO core network at second SG meeting. Task: Chairman

**Action 2** (Rail Freight Corridors): SG supports freight corridors and possible extension of the initial list as presented in the Regulation 913/2010. Each SG member would reflect on existing list and may propose an idea for enlargement or new freight corridor. It is important to note that SG is fully aware that any proposal for adding or modifying the freight corridors can come only from the Member States. Task: all SG members

**Action 3** (air traffic): As SES (Single European Sky) and a part of it on FABs (Functional Airspace Blocks) is a demanding and complex technical issue, SG would contact the Commission to see if there is a political issue SG can contribute. Nevertheless, PAC and SG can promote interconnectivity between two FABs, namely FAB CE and Danube FAB. Task: Chairman, all members

**Action 4** (metropolitan transport): From the discussion it was clear that there are existing connections working, e.g. Vienna – Bratislava. It was concluded that Hungary (Mr. Gecse) will check on lead of the project presented as an example of this action. The Commission (DG MOVE) is invited to check with the staff from “mobility department” what can be the added value of PA1b SG. Task: HU, DG MOVE

**Action 5** (regional/local cross-border infrastructure): Before taking further steps the Commission (DG Regio and DG MOVE) is to be asked to check what projects are already under way and which programmes will issue a call. Task: DG Regio and DG MOVE

**Action 6** (nodal planning for multimodality): DG Regio suggests inviting relevant people who could present ongoing projects. Action plan offers the North-South Axis project as an example. SG members are invited to think of new proposals that would concentrate primarily on the Region. Task: all SG members

**Action 7** (Intelligent Traffic Systems): At EU level activities on this subject are clearly defined in the “Directive 2010/40/EU on the deployment of ITS”. All PA1b SG members will get familiar with the Directive. Link with DG MOVE in order to be informed of Advisory Group work is to be established. Austria will check the status of the project mentioned in the Action Plan. Task: Chairman, AT

Overall conclusion: It seems that several projects of relevance for the Danube Strategy could be identified. However the challenge to find lead partners and sufficient funding remains. All members are invited to present any new ideas by e-mail. All members will try to identify actions/projects that can be carried out in short term. The results, even partial, could be presented in the report to be prepared in July 2012 by the Commission.

## **9. Presentation and discussion on received projects**

Prior to the meeting the Chairman sent out project forms to all member countries. The aim of this exercise is to prepare an inventory of all ongoing and planned projects. Project ideas for projects that can bring added value to the region are also welcomed.

The received projects were filed by AT, BG, HU, SK, SI, SRB and RO. All together 41 projects were received of which: 19 are ongoing, 17 are planned and 5 are project ideas. These were not discussed.

Instead the discussion was about the challenges: how to deal with the great number of projects that might be received, do we need criteria, who should decide what projects are particularly relevant to the Strategy, which projects to promote, to whom the projects can be presented and when? It was obvious there were too many questions to be answered at the first meeting.

However, all participants agreed it would be of great value to create an inventory of ongoing projects, planned projects and project ideas by latest December this year. In addition projects may be sorted as follows: a) projects of general interest (strategic / policy important), b) visible projects and projects deliverable to the people and c) the rest of the projects.

It was also proposed that the number of projects should be reduced, so that only those of high relevance to the Danube Strategy would be included, i.e. those that cover all Region and benefit all 14 countries. The proposal was not adopted as the members need time to reflect on it.

Conclusion: The Chairman concluded that all received projects contribute or can contribute to the improvement of transport in the Danube region. However the level of added value has not been evaluated yet. It was also agreed that more time is needed for countries to prepare and submit the projects. New deadline for submission of projects is 16 September 2011. It was made clear that already sent projects can be amended or updated and send as corrigenda ones. The discussion on project selection and promotion will continue at the next PA1b SG meeting. Unsolved issue remains what projects could be labelled as Danube Strategy projects and benefit from it?

The list of all received projects will be made by PAC and distributed to all members. No deadline was set.

It is of great importance that all participants agree that the PA1b SG is not selecting the projects but rather to give the opinion on which projects have relevance for the Strategy. The PA1b SG may also explain why there is an added value for the Danube Region i.e. the PA1b SG offers its own evaluation of projects.

The PA1b SG would try to prepare criteria for projects. This exercise is to be started by PAC but work should be performed with all interested members with the help of e-mail. Final decision on criteria should be brought at second SG meeting.

All members of SG are encouraged to submit any idea that might help discussion on projects.

It is clear at this stage that SG can not do much more than to collect information on projects. Where projects are ongoing lead partners should be asked: how can the Strategy help to conclude the project(s)?

## **10. Discussion on the work program**

As a key planned activities in 2011 the Chairman mentioned:

- Taking stock of ongoing projects and studies (inventory)
- Review of targets
- Re-examination of actions
- Draft Work programme
- Meetings (including conferences, seminars)
  - PA1b SG (second meeting)
  - Stakeholders conference (possibly only on transport)
  - Active participation on invited events (if/when possible).

The discussion was brief as the heavy agenda showed time needed to profoundly discuss all the items was underestimated.

Conclusion: Views have been exchanged on the work program. Apart of planned meetings of SG, it was agreed that inventory of projects will be created. The basis will be prepared by PAC and list of projects will be updated by all SG members. This exercise will be done by e-mail. The result will be presented and discussed at the next SG meeting. The discussion on several items started today should be hopefully agreed at second meeting, such as on targets and actions.

## **11. Next steps**

A tentative Time table of meetings / conferences proposed by PAC in 2011 would as follows:

- Second meeting of PA1b SG in Serbia (October 2011)
- (poss.) Meeting of four PACs (SRB, SI, RO, AT) and the Commission, overview of activities of PA 1a and 1b (before end 2011)
- (poss.) Stakeholders conference - transport (2011/2012)

It was agreed that the next meeting of PA1b SG will be held in Belgrade, Serbia in October this year. Date of the meeting will be circulated at later stage.

It is without saying the activities related to both PA1a and PA1b need to be agreed mutually by PACs prior to take any actions for organization of event(s).

## **12. Other issues**

There was no item under AOB.

## **13. Closing of the meeting**

The Chairman thanked all participants for valuable contributions, explained that those Danube countries which were not able to participate at today's meeting will be promptly informed of work and expressed hope that absent members will be able to attend next Steering group meetings.

The Chairman closed the meeting at 4.30 p.m. by wishing all safe return back home.

---

Place, Date

Ljubljana, 22 June 2011

---

Chairman:

---

Franč Žepič, PAC 1b

Annex:

- list of participants



EU STRATEGY FOR DANUBE REGION (EUSDR)  
**PRIORITY AREA 1b: rail, road and air transport**

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**  
**of the 1<sup>st</sup> Steering Group Meeting**  
**22.06.2011; 10:00 – 16:30**  
**Ljubljana/Slovenia**

No	Country	Name of Participant	Participant's Status / Role	e-mail
1	Austria	Mr. Thomas Spiegel	Member	<a href="mailto:thomas.spiegel@bmvit.gv.at">thomas.spiegel@bmvit.gv.at</a>
2	Croatia	Ms Ana Barišić	Member / Substitute	<a href="mailto:ana.barisic@mmpi.hr">ana.barisic@mmpi.hr</a>
3	Czech Republic	Ms Anna Batulkova	Member	<a href="mailto:anna.batulkova@mdcr.cz">anna.batulkova@mdcr.cz</a>
4	DG REGIO	Ms Irina Cruceru	Member	<a href="mailto:Irina.Cruceru@ec.europa.eu">Irina.Cruceru@ec.europa.eu</a>
5	DG MOVE	Mr. Cesare Bernabei	Member	<a href="mailto:cesare.bernabei@ec.europa.eu">cesare.bernabei@ec.europa.eu</a>
6	Germany	Mr. Mario Soos	Observer - DE Embassy LJ	<a href="mailto:v@laib.diplo.de">v@laib.diplo.de</a>
7	Hungary	Mr. Gergely Gecse	Member	<a href="mailto:gergely.gecse@nfm.gov.hu">gergely.gecse@nfm.gov.hu</a>
8	Serbia	Mr. Miodrag Poledica	Co-chairman	<a href="mailto:poledica@mi.gov.rs">poledica@mi.gov.rs</a>
9	Slovakia	Mr. Miloš Prochazka	Member	<a href="mailto:milos.prochazka@mindop.sk">milos.prochazka@mindop.sk</a>
10	Slovakia	Mr. Richard Vojna	Member	<a href="mailto:richard.vojna@mindop.sk">richard.vojna@mindop.sk</a>
11	Slovenia	Mr. Fedor Černe	observer	<a href="mailto:fedor.cerne@gov.si">fedor.cerne@gov.si</a>
12	Slovenia	Mr. Igor Mally	NCP	<a href="mailto:igor.mally@gov.si">igor.mally@gov.si</a>
13	Slovenia	Mr. Franc Žepič	Chairman	<a href="mailto:franc.zepic@gov.si">franc.zepic@gov.si</a>
<p><b>ABSENT:</b> <i>Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria (excused), Moldova, Montenegro, Romania (excused), Ukraine</i></p>				

<b>EUSDR Priority area 1b: To improve mobility and multimodality: rail, road and air transport</b>
--

**MINUTES**  
**of the SECOND STEERING GROUP meeting**  
**20 October 2011; 09:00 – 16:30**  
**Belgrade, Serbia**

**Participants:** AT, BG, DE, HU, SK, SI, SRB, RO, CION; See list of participants.

Non-participating / Absent: BA, CRO, CZ, ME, MD, UE

**Chairman:** Mr Miodrag Poledica, PAC 1b Serbia

Co-chairman: Mr Franc Žepič, PAC 1b Slovenia

## **I. OPENING SESSION**

### **1. Welcome and introductory remarks**

The 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting of the Priority Area 1b Steering Group (PA1b SG) was opened by the Chairman Mr Poledica, PAC (Priority Area Coordinator) from Serbia.

### **2. Keynote speeches**

Mr Božidar Đelić, Deputy Prime Minister for EU Integration and national EUSDR coordinator at the Government of the Republic of Serbia, welcomed the participants and said that Danube is the best proof that Serbia is geographically a part of Europe, which is why Serbia should give its full contribution to Danube Strategy being a success. The Deputy Prime Minister thanked the EU for entrusting Serbia with an important role within the EUSDR and stressed the fact that since EUSDR is a macroregional strategy, it is extremely important to think in macro-regional terms and focus on making the Danube region more competitive, above all by focusing on projects with regional and Pan-European aspects. The Deputy Prime Minister is of the opinion that projects which are only national or bilateral in nature may not receive funding, so an effort is to be made to find big, flagship projects. A way need to be found how to best use what the European Union is making available as Structural and Pre-Accession funds and reminded that financing in the 2014-2020 period will be extremely difficult. He suggested careful reading of a new integrated instrument for investing in EU infrastructure priorities "the Connecting Europe Facility". With respect to the proposed projects, Mr Đelić emphasised that projects should be more intelligible for everyday people and that the arc with Turkey and the Middle East represents a chance for growth for the whole of Europe, with its demographic and economic dynamism. The Deputy Prime Minister said he believes it is our duty to propose within the EUSDR a re-link to these fast growing markets and that for successful transportation two or three rail corridors are needed. Mr Đelić expressed hope that the Transport Community of South East Europe will soon be signed, providing a clear path forward in this area and that we also need to ensure that flights across the Danube area are as cheap as possible. Mr Đelić concluded by emphasising the importance of intermodality, close cooperation between PA1b and PA1a groups, as well as of good governance and decision-making.

Ms Mirjana Trifunović, Assistant Minister for Infrastructure and Energy for EU Integration, welcomed the participants on behalf of Minister for Infrastructure and Energy, Mr Milutin Mrkonjić, emphasising that the Ministry officially supports the PA1b meeting. Ms Trifunović stressed that important objective of the EUSDR is the use of Danube as a resource for sustainable development of the Danube region and that the position of the Republic of Serbia, at the intersection of corridors VII and X, offers an opportunity for development of all transport modes. Ms Trifunović said Serbia is fully committed to regional activities and cooperation, as well as European integration processes. By connecting the West and East, the Corridor VII (the Danube river and its waterway network) is a potentially important



factor for economic development, transport policy and strategy of the Republic of Serbia. European transport development plans and intention to shift the transport of goods from road to river and rail traffic indicate that the development of waterway, rail and road transport in Serbia is one of key objectives of the Republic of Serbia. In order to achieve better transportation of the corridors, the Republic of Serbia is ready to achieve cooperation with competent institutions of the Danube countries and with the development of transport infrastructure. Ms Trifunović concluded by thanking the member governments for their strong support in the implementation of the EUSDR.

The chairman thanked both keynote speakers for their contribution at the start of the second SG PA1b meeting.

## **II. WORKING SESSION**

### **3. Approval of the agenda and adoption of the first SG meeting minutes**

At the beginning of the working session of the second PA1b SG meeting all participants introduced themselves. The Chairman invited all members of the steering group to propose ideas freely during the meeting and stressed that each contribution is welcome.

Agenda for the second SG PA1b meeting and the minutes of the first meeting held in Ljubljana on 22 June 2011 were unanimously approved.

### **4. State of play of implementation of the EUSDR: results until today and challenges ahead**

Ms Irina Ploeg-Cruceru (DG REGIO) gave a short overview on the implementation of the EUSDR. Ms Ploeg-Cruceru then informed the SG members of a High-Level Group (HLG) meeting to be held in Brussels on 21 November 2011. The HLG is composed of EU27. The countries from the Danube region which are not EU member states will participate as observers. High on the agenda of the HLG are the revised EUSDR targets (proposing new targets and validating existing ones).

The second meeting of the national contact points (NCPs) and PACs for all priority areas will most likely be held in Bucharest on 30-31 January 2012. It will be organized by the Ministry of External Affairs of Romania and Interact. The main goal of the meeting is to check the progress in all priority areas, identify best practices and to provide assistance to PACs if needed.

Towards the end of February a meeting on financing sources called "Bratislava 2" will be held in Vienna with the managing authorities of Objective 1 and 2 programmes. Objective 3 cooperation programmes will be also invited, as well as EIB and other banks. There was a lot of interest from private banks in Europe, although the extent of private sector participation has yet to be decided upon.

A training programme for PACs has been suggested, with respect to project management, particularly for flagship projects.

The European Parliament is providing technical assistance to PACs and the European Commission has already received documentation from all priority areas which is needed for agreements. Upon signature the expenses become eligible. The amount for each priority area is EUR 200,000 for the period of maximum 2 years.

Ms Ploeg-Cruceru proposed a joint meeting of PA1a and PA1b steering groups and thanked all SG PA1b members for coming, as this PA is important for many countries, and strongly encouraged members to continue their attendance.

The Chairman said that financial institutions have been in contact with PACs and are prepared to fund projects, so the challenge is finding "real" projects which will be supported by the Steering group. In particular, EIB expressed interest for PA1b projects.

## **TARGETS AND ACTIONS**

### **5. Formal adoption of targets**

The chairman explained that in June 2011 in Ljubljana two targets (targets 3 and 4) were amended. In discussion that followed Mr Žepič pointed out that targets of Commission Communication on Strategy are agreed by PA1b SG, yet that for daily work targets need to be more concrete and include a (measurable) implementation timeframe.

In discussion that followed Mr Adelsberger (DG MOVE) explained that for the core network a 2030 timeframe has been accepted and that it would be useful for other projects to be in line with this timeframe. Mr Spiegel agreed with the co-chairman's proposal to have more concrete targets but suggested adopting a timeframe only for concrete targets, or to have a timeframe for the development of concepts only. Mr Poledica explained that the targets are merely examples and that wider approach is needed. Mr Adelsberger agreed with Mr Spiegel and proposed focusing on what is feasible and can be achieved by 2030: first by developing concepts by 2013 and then implementing them by 2030. Ms Ploeg-Cruceru proposed to keep the targets as they are for the time being, without introducing concepts. Mr Spiegel explained that the concept is not a target, but an intermediate (measurable) step. Ms Ploeg-Cruceru said that if targets are left as they are, intermediate steps can still be introduced later as internal priority steps. Ms Lazić (Interact) said members of the Interact labgroup expressed their wish that PACs create targets or milestones for priorities or programmes at the level of the steering group in order to select the best projects. The chairman, Mr Poledica, added that the SG agreed in Ljubljana to leave the targets as they are, develop concepts, soft and hard measures, as well as short term projects, but to keep the targets as they are.

In conclusion the targets as agreed at the 1<sup>st</sup> SG meeting were unanimously adopted. PACs will look for possible operational targets.

### **6. What is progress related to actions from the action plan?**

Mr Poledica then opened the discussion on actions from the Action Plan and reminded the SG members that it was agreed in Ljubljana to check the status of possible developments between the meetings.

The co-chairman proposed to follow the agenda and discuss the developments which took place between the meetings. The co-chairman stressed that one of the key tasks of the PAC and SG is supporting and promoting projects. The number of projects received so far is huge, which is why the SG has to find a way to deal with them, as well as to select "flagship" projects which would receive full support in and also out of the Region. The co-chairman said that the key to this would be the letter of recommendation for the projects that the SG would decide are of the highest importance. It was explained also that the Commission would like to limit this support to up to ten projects.

Mr Žepič emphasised that technical assistance by the Commission is extremely important in this time of crisis, since there have been a number of conferences which the PACs were not able to attend. The important task is also promotion i.e. making people aware of the EUSDR. Last but not least Mr Žepič said that one of the key issues the coordinators are facing is gathering all 14 members at one meeting and expressed his thanks to all group members who contributed with projects proposals.

Coming to actions the co-chairman said that the first action deals with the completion of the TEN-T network and that presentation of new proposed "TEN-T regulation on core network" (Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on Union guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network COM(2011)650 adopted by the Commission on 19 October 2011) is to be presented, as well as planned

activities of SEETO network. Efforts are to be made that a map of the Danube region transport network is prepared for the next SG meeting. (Note: see item 7!)

Co-chairman then elaborated on Action 2 from the Action Plan and informed the members on the status of the proposal for "the Western Balkan corridor: Munich – Salzburg – Zagreb – Belgrade – Sofia – Istanbul". Preparations for signature of Letter of intent of all involved countries are under way in order to add the new corridor to the initial list of freight corridors in accordance with Regulation 913/2010. The progress is to be followed by PA1b SG and new corridor supported.

Action 3 deals with aviation. It was agreed that SG members send their ideas and proposal for what can be done. The Commission was contacted and responded that they support any contribution for FAB implementation in Serbia and Montenegro. No information is available from Ukraine and Moldova. According to the available information negotiations on comprehensive air service agreement between EU and Moldova are to be initialled soon and so integrating Moldova into wider ECAA (European Common Aviation Area). Similar negotiations on extension of ECAA to Ukraine are ongoing. Mr Žepič then gave floor to Ms Čokorilo (Serbia), who informed the SG that a working group was formed in Serbia, with the representatives from SMATSA (regional provider) and the Ministry of Infrastructure. There is still debate which FAB to join: the Central European FAB, Blue Med or the Danube FAB, or even to create a new FAB, the deadline being June 2012.

Mr Žepič then moved on to Action 4 and gave floor to Mr Gecse (Hungary), who explained that the projects within the "Danube Express framework" are at an early stage, with the possible exception of the Bratislava-Vienna area. Mr Adelsberger (DG MOVE) was tasked with checking the Commission staff if there are any ongoing projects.

With respect to the Action 5, Ms Ploeg-Cruceru explained that the Romania-Serbia crossborder programme has launched an EUSDR specific call, which is ongoing, with five projects to be selected (environment and transport). South East Europe programme launched the final call in October, and Ms Ploeg-Cruceru invited the members to contribute, as there are few projects in the transport field. Ms Ploeg-Cruceru will inform the SG by email on all ongoing transnational and crossborder projects.

With respect to Action 6 (nodal planning) Mr Žepič said that only a few received project proposals would fit the description of this action. As possible projects of regional or transnational importance, Mr Poledica suggested the development of intermodal terminals, including creation of terminals and establishing intermodal connections between the operators and major cities. Mr Poledica proposed to draft a project proposal on this subject to see whether it would be supported by the entire SG.

Moving on to Action 7, Mr Žepič informed the SG that of the 96 projects received so far, none had to do with ITS. There have been no new developments. Mr Spiegel suggested adding the EDITS project to the list which deals with border crossing information systems for all modes of transport.

## **7. Infrastructure in the Danube Region – Planned Core Network**

The state-of-play of the TEN-T network and SEETO network which are covering majority of the Danube region was presented by Mr Adelsberger (DG MOVE) and Mr Nikolić (SEETO).

Mr Adelsberger gave an overview of the results of the TEN-T workgroup, which were presented in Brussels on 19 October 2011 and said it was an important milestone in the development of transeuropean networks. TEN-T is a part of the Connecting Europe Facility funding framework for infrastructure (energy, telecommunication and transport) for the 27

member states. The greatest share of funding is for transport, EUR 31.7 billion, but the total estimated cost of TEN-T is EUR 500 billion up to 2030, and EUR 250 billion up to 2020. The initial funding will be focused on border crossings and rail. In the guidelines of the new proposal non-member states (Norway, Iceland, Switzerland, Turkey and the Western Balkans) are also included in the maps. Mr Adelsberger stressed the need for a new infrastructure policy, part of a new transport policy, in order to cope with the growing demand. The new proposal is a two-layer concept with a comprehensive network and on top a core network. Mr Adelsberger said that present priority projects do not cover the whole region coherently and are mostly at the level of member states, which is not a planned perspective from the European point of view. Existing priority project system is not very multimodal and interconnected. This existing patchwork ought to be replaced with a network. The core network will be the physical backbone of this sustainable transport system within which corridors were defined (10 corridors). The network will link 85 economic centres, 138 ports and 28 crossborder points, with high infrastructure standards. Mr Adelsberger said that the key issue is the implementation of the core network. The implementation will include innovative governance structures, while emphasis should be on the efficient use of infrastructure, on project implementation and growing traffic demand. The comprehensive network should be ready by 2050 and the core network by 2030. The EU funding will amount to almost EUR 32 billion, out of which EUR 10 billion will be for cohesion countries. Out of total volume, 80-85% shall be distributed in multiannual calls for three horizontal priorities which are given in the Annex of the Connecting Europe Facility proposal, core network corridors and cross-border sections, and 15-20% for other projects of the core and comprehensive network.

The Chairman thanked Mr Adelsberger and stressed that linking 85 economic centres will be very important for the region. Mr Ploeg-Cruceru asked Mr Adelsberger to clarify how the non-cohesion EU funding, totalling EUR 21.7 billion, will be divided up. Mr Adelsberger explained that both cohesion and non-cohesion funding will be available for cohesion countries, for a total of EUR 31.7 billion. Mr Žepić asked Mr Adelsberger to clarify the relation between the Connecting Europe Facility and the TEN-T corridors, and the status of corridor coordinators. Mr Adelsberger explained that CEF has to go through parliamentary procedure and be adopted, while the TEN-T and the Guidelines will have to be adopted by the European Council. Additional links may be added to the core network, making the budget smaller. Mr Adelsberger explained that CEF will be used to fund TEN-T. Since existing corridors were altered and new corridors have been added to the core network, coordinators and their responsibilities may change. Ms Patrichi said that in the regulation it was mentioned that each country will have its own corridor platform. Mr Adelsberger responded that corridor platforms will be on corridors and not on member state level.

The Chairman then gave floor to Mr Nikolić (SEETO), who gave an overview of the SEETO, SEETO comprehensive network, investments into the SEETO network and list of priority projects of regional importance that SEETO is maintaining. Mr Nikolić explained that SEETO was established in order to connect the Western Balkan network with other countries' networks, namely the TEN-T comprehensive network. Mr Nikolić said that during the 7<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of Ministers in Antwerp the next multi-annual plan for the year 2012 will be presented, as well as the greatest achievement of the SEETO cooperation, the inclusion of the SEETO Comprehensive Network into the TEN-T guidelines maps. SEETO actively participated in the TEN-T revision process consultations, and SEETO Steering Committee decided to use term SEETO Comprehensive Network instead of the former South East Europe Core Regional Transport Network to represent real character of regional network and to be in line with TEN-T revision process. Mr Nikolić said that from 2005 to 2010 a total of EUR 5.6 billion was implemented in projects, most of it in road infrastructure and much less in rail network (14%). Mr Nikolić explained that every year participants spend around EUR 300 million on network maintenance. It is expected that airport investment will go up during the next year (several concession contracts), as well as in eco-friendly modes. Every year

SEETO prepares the Regional Transport Network Development Plan, in order to track high-level multimodal network developments, give traffic indicators and assess the performance of the SEETO Comprehensive Network. Mr Nikolić informed the SG participants that the Multi-Annual Plan for 2012 contains a list of 35 priority programmes and projects (57% are environmentally friendly), with the total value of EUR 8.4 billion. In particular, Mr Nikolić stressed the importance of several identified horizontal measures, which go beyond infrastructure and integrate the network for better traffic performance.

Chairman thanked Mr Nikolić and emphasised that it is necessary to establish close cooperation of SEETO with the Danube Strategy. Although SEETO Comprehensive Network is surrounded by EU countries, transport and transport infrastructure should not recognize borders, so connection between SEETO Comprehensive Network and TEN-T network should be as efficient as possible, the chairman said, and praised the significant investment of SEETO in the region.

Mr Adelsberger proposed that the cleaning up of deficiencies in the connections between the Western Balkans and the EU be done as soon as possible. Mr Žepić asked Mr Nikolić to elaborate on the SEETO plans for the core network. Mr Nikolić explained that SEETO is considering possible corridors for the future core network, but that he believes that the main solution lies in the discussions with the Commission and SEETO Steering Committee. Mr Spiegel asked Mr Nikolić to explain what methodology will be used for the SEETO network. Mr Nikolić explained that the same methodology as for the TEN-T will be used for the Western Balkan region.

## **8. Transport in the Danube Region – how to improve transport of goods and people (brainstorming session)**

The chairman then opened the discussion on transport in the Danube region. The co-chairman, Mr Žepić, proposed the creation of a website, which would contain data, figures and facts, but which would also be accessible for non-experts. With respect to the available infrastructure in the region at this point, Mr Žepić informed the Steering Group that at this time rough estimation is there exists 50 000 kilometres of railways and 11 000 km of motorways (mostly in Austria and Germany) in the Danube region. There are 66 international airports. Mr Žepić proposed that the SG members fill out a questionnaire with details on transport infrastructure in their respective countries in order to obtain exact data. Mr Nikolić and Mr Adelsberger asked Mr Žepić to clarify the transport network calculation, as SEETO and TEN-T have their own data and can provide it to the SG members. In conclusion the co-chairman and DG MOVE and SEETO agreed to have the DG MOVE and SEETO send the transport network data to the PACs and SG members.

Mr Poledica stressed the importance of operational side for achieving efficient transportation and proposed adopting (both soft and hard) measures, for e.g. establishing a multi-modal framework, for providing information and management system, for introducing “one window” and “one stop shop” at the border, and so on. One such example was the improved border control between Serbia and Bulgaria, prior to Bulgarian entry into the EU. Chairman then opened the discussion on transport operators. Mr Žepić stressed that a lot of attention was devoted to infrastructure, but that there is a need to overcome the issues with borders as well. All SG members are invited to contribute their ideas regarding the operational side of transport in the Danube Region. With respect to the freight transport, Mr Spiegel added that concrete work has to be done at the corridor level, using existing approaches, whereas in the case of passenger transport, service issues have to be dealt with on a transnational level (taking into account the Schengen agreement).

## **8. Challenge: do we need Common Transport Policy for the Danube Region?**



The Chairman then opened the discussion on the Common Transport Policy and pointed out that each country has its own transport policy, in addition to the Danube strategy and the Common Transport Policy (which are not interchangeable). A Common Transport Policy may address some of the transport issues which were previously discussed. Mr Žepič expressed his doubt that a common perspective (needed for the Common Transport Policy) exists at this time. However he is of the opinion that the key issue is whether the Common Transport Policy would bring any added value. Ms Patrichi proposed the drafting of a special action plan. Mr Adelsberger made a distinction between two questions: does the Region need the Common Transport Policy or do we need a common view on the Region's development of transport. Realistically, only the second question can be successfully achieved, Mr Adelsberger believes. Several ideas were proposed by SG members, such as a vision, a view, an action plan, an expert opinion. The SG agreed to have the chairman and the co-chairman work on the issue in order to draft a proposal for the next meeting.

## **9. Presentation on Interact Lab Group Work**

After the lunch break, the Chairman gave floor to Ms Ivana Lazić, from Interact Vienna, who presented the results of the Interact Labgroup to the SG. Interact Labgroup is a think tank support structure set up by INTERACT and EU Commission, which aims to provide support to PACs and financing programmes/institutions with EUSDR-projects, to help with funding opportunities for new projects, to measure and report on progress, to help building up and managing networks and to inform external target groups via [www.danube.region.eu](http://www.danube.region.eu). So far a total of three labgroup meeting were held. The kickoff meeting was held in Vienna, followed by a working paper and a meeting in Budapest. After the meeting in Budapest, the Guidelines were created, a document summarising tips and suggestions from PACs and programmes. The last meeting was held in Belgrade, and the summary is not yet available. Ms Lazić informed the SG members that the [www.danube.region.eu](http://www.danube.region.eu) website was created as a result of these discussions. It is a collaborative website designed to be a "one-stop shop" for the Danube strategy, using the Group spaces platform. Each group creates its own page and provides information (managers and/or users), which are synchronised on the homepage (e.g. events). Ms Lazić explained that it is easy to use, no IT skills are needed. Other features include customised public/private settings (membership, view/edit), a contact database (send out meeting invitations, etc) and announcement of events and news. The platform is (can be) free and is ad-supported. The Interact Labgroup has also designed visual identity materials and templates for the Danube Strategy.

## **10. Discussion on projects: Comments on the list of received projects**

Mr Poledica thanked Ms Lazić on her presentation and gave the floor to Mr Žepič, who opens the discussion on projects. So far 96 projects from 8 member countries were submitted, out of which 3 from Austria, 12 from Bulgaria, 7 from Croatia, 6 from Hungary, 6 from Slovakia, 4 from Slovenia, 30 from Serbia and 28 from Romania. The majority of projects deal with railways (48), much fewer with road transport (23), aviation (9) and intermodal transport (8). Of the total of 96 projects 50 are currently ongoing, while 43 of them are in the planning phase. Some of the projects presented have secured financing, while others do not. Ms Patrichi (Romania) gave a presentation on the rail, road and aviation projects currently ongoing or planned by Romania and which are proposed to be introduced under EUSDR. All SG members agreed to analyse the submitted projects during the next meeting in more detail, as there was not enough time during this meeting. It is concluded that the project list has grown considerably and cannot be supervised by PACs alone. Co-chairman proposes a Working group to be established for project analysis.

## **11. Next steps and conclusion**



The SG members agreed to continue creation a detailed inventory of ongoing projects and studies as well as to do financing alignment. A report on SG results has to be submitted to the Commission (a task for PACs from Serbia and Slovenia) by mid 2012.

With respect to the meetings, conferences and seminars, the following meetings are planned to take place:

- the regular PA1b SG meetings in spring and autumn of 2012;
- stakeholders conference on transport;
- (possibility) active participation on invited events.

A tentative Time table of SG meetings proposed by PACs in 2012 would be as follows:

- 3rd meeting of PA1b SG is planned for March/April 2012, Slovenia)
- 4th meeting of PA1b SG is planned for June/July 2012, Serbia
- 5th meeting of PA1b SG (October/ November 2012, Slovenia)

Date of the next (3<sup>rd</sup>) PA1b SG meeting will be circulated by PACs at later stage.

## **12. Other issues**

There was no item under AOB.

## **13. Closing of the meeting**

The Chairman thanked all participants for valuable contributions, explained that those Danube countries which were not able to participate at today's meeting will be promptly informed of work and expressed hope that absent members will be able to attend next Steering group meetings.

The Chairman officially closed the meeting at 16.30 hours and thanked all members for their participation.

---

Place, Date

Belgrade, 20 October 2011

---

Chairman:

---

Miodrag Poledica, PAC 1b

Annex:

- list of participants

EU STRATEGY FOR DANUBE REGION (EUSDR)  
**PRIORITY AREA 1b: rail, road and air transport**

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**  
**of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Steering Group Meeting**  
**20/10/2011; 09:00 – 16:30**  
**Belgrade, Serbia**

No	Country	Name of Participant	Participant's Status / Role	e-mail
1	<b>Austria</b>	Mr Thomas Spiegel	Member	<a href="mailto:thomas.spiegel@bmvit.gv.at">thomas.spiegel@bmvit.gv.at</a>
2	<b>Bulgaria</b>	Mr Petar Boyanov Benov	Member	<a href="mailto:pbenov@mtitc.government.bg">pbenov@mtitc.government.bg</a>
3	<b>Germany (Baden Württemberg)</b>	Mr Detlev Conrad	Member	<a href="mailto:detlev.conrad@mvi.bwl.de">detlev.conrad@mvi.bwl.de</a>
4	<b>Hungary</b>	Mr Gergely Gecse	Member	<a href="mailto:gergely.gecse@nfm.gov.hu">gergely.gecse@nfm.gov.hu</a>
5	<b>Romania</b>	Ms Monica Patrichi	Member	<a href="mailto:monica.patrichi@mt.ro">monica.patrichi@mt.ro</a>
6	<b>Romania</b>	Mr Vladan Mišić	Observer	<a href="mailto:constantza-port@ikomline.net">constantza-port@ikomline.net</a>
7	<b>Serbia</b>	Mr Miodrag Poledica	PAC, Member Chairman	<a href="mailto:poledica@mi.gov.rs">poledica@mi.gov.rs</a>
8	<b>Slovakia</b>	Mr Miloš Prochazka	Member	<a href="mailto:milos.prochazka@mindop.sk">milos.prochazka@mindop.sk</a>
9	<b>Slovenia</b>	Mr. Fedor Černe	Observer	<a href="mailto:fedor.cerne@gov.si">fedor.cerne@gov.si</a>
10	<b>Slovenia</b>	Mr Franc Žepič	PAC, Member Co-Chairman	<a href="mailto:franc.zepic@gov.si">franc.zepic@gov.si</a>
11	<b>DG REGIO</b>	Ms Irina Ploeg-Cruceru	Member	<a href="mailto:Irina.Cruceru@ec.europa.eu">Irina.Cruceru@ec.europa.eu</a>
12	<b>DG MOVE</b>	Mr Helmut Adelsberger	Member	<a href="mailto:helmut.adelsberger@ec.europa.eu">helmut.adelsberger@ec.europa.eu</a>
13	<b>SEETO</b>	Mr Nenad Nikolić	Observer	<a href="mailto:nnikolic@seetoint.org">nnikolic@seetoint.org</a>
14	<b>SEETO</b>	Mr Ana Šimecki	Observer	<a href="mailto:asimecki@seetoint.org">asimecki@seetoint.org</a>
15	<b>INTERACT</b>	Ms Ivana Lazić	Observer	<a href="mailto:ivana.lazic@interact-eu.net">ivana.lazic@interact-eu.net</a>

No	Country	Name of Participant	Participant's Status / Role	e-mail
16	<b>SURVEY - RS</b>	Mr Ile Kovačević	Observer	<a href="mailto:ile.kovacevic@pregled-rs.rs">ile.kovacevic@pregled-rs.rs</a>
17	<b>SURVEY - RS</b>	Mr Željko Ljiljak-Vukajlović	Observer	<a href="mailto:zeljko.radulovic@pregled-rs.rs">zeljko.radulovic@pregled-rs.rs</a>
18	<b>SURVEY - RS</b>	Mr Jelena Malenković	Observer	<a href="mailto:jelena.malenkovic@pregled-rs.rs">jelena.malenkovic@pregled-rs.rs</a>
19	<b>SURVEY - RS</b>	Mr Uroš Vasiljević	Interpreter	
20	<b>Faculty of Transport &amp; Engineering</b>	Mr Olja Čokorilo	Observer	<a href="mailto:oljav@sf.bg.ac.rs">oljav@sf.bg.ac.rs</a>
21	<b>Ministry of Infrastructure &amp; Energy</b>	Mr Dragan Nešić	Observer	<a href="mailto:nesic@mi.gov.rs">nesic@mi.gov.rs</a>
22	<b>Ministry of Infrastructure &amp; Energy</b>	Mr Sanja Marjanović	Observer	<a href="mailto:rail-intermodal@mi.gov.rs">rail-intermodal@mi.gov.rs</a>
23	<b>Ministry of Infrastructure &amp; Energy</b>	Mr Mirjana Trifunović	Observer	<a href="mailto:mirjana.trifunovic@mi.gov.rs">mirjana.trifunovic@mi.gov.rs</a>
24	<b>DPM Office Serbia</b>	Mr Vuk Dapčević	Observer	<a href="mailto:vdapcevic@gov.rs">vdapcevic@gov.rs</a>
<b>ABSENT:</b> <i>Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Moldova, Montenegro, Czech Republic, Ukraine</i>				

<b>EUSDR Priority area 1b: To improve mobility and multimodality: rail, road and air transport</b>
--

**MINUTES**  
**of the THIRD STEERING GROUP meeting**  
**20 February 2012; 09:00 – 17:00**  
**Ljubljana, Slovenia**

**Participants:** AT, BG, CRO, HU, SK, SI, SRB, RO, UE, CION; See list of participants.

Non-participating / Absent: BA, DE, CZ, ME, MD

**Chairman:** Mr Franc Žepič, PAC 1b Slovenia

**Co-chairman:** Mr Miodrag Poledica, PAC 1b Serbia

**1. Welcome and introductory remarks**

The Chairman welcomed the participants to the 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting of the Priority Area 1b Steering Group (PA1b SG), and in particular representative from Ukraine who was not able to be present at previous meetings.

- *The list of participants is attached (annex 1).*

The Chairman then gave the word to Ms Tina Fink, National contact point from Slovenia who thanked both PACs for organizing the third meeting. Ms Fink stressed the commitment of Slovenia for Danube Strategy implementation and expressed satisfaction on progress made so far, particularly with regard to the number of projects received. This clearly shows that a lot could be done in the Region to improve mobility.

**2. Approval of the agenda and adoption of the second SG meeting minutes**

Agenda for the third SG PA1b meeting and the minutes of the second meeting held in Belgrade on 20<sup>th</sup> October 2011 were unanimously approved.

- *The approved agenda and approved minutes of second SG meeting are attached (Annex 2 and 3).*

**3. Stock-taking on implementation of the EUSDR**

The Commission, DG Regio (Ms Olivier Baudelet) gave a short overview on the implementation of the EUSDR. Mr. Baudelet emphasised the key role of the work of SG and informed participants on planned activities in 2012, as follows: HGL (High Level Group) will meet in April in Berlin, meeting with Managing Authorities is planned in the autumn, another HLG meeting is going to take place in September and the Annual Forum will be held in November in Regensburg. In the autumn meeting of foreign ministers discussing the Danube strategy will take place. At planned autumn meeting with Managing Authorities possibilities to prepare a special call for projects of the region are to be explored, as well as to allocate part of the funds from existing programmes.

PACs should prepare the first report on work carried out by 30 June this year in which an important place should be given to projects and roadmaps. In addition the Commission wants the Council of the EU expresses "importance" to the Letter of Recommendation (LoR) for selected projects.

The Commission, DG Regio is also of the opinion that the presence of Danube region countries should be better represented and that representatives should be senior civil servants with power for decision making. The Commission also supports the idea for ministers to meet on annual basis, as well as to organize annually stakeholders' conference.

With regard to the roadmaps Mr. Baudelet said that roadmaps are of great importance for the implementation of Actions. He concluded that in the area of transport a challenge might be the need for immediate results while at the same time all are aware that transport projects (construction of railways and roads) is a long term process.

With regard to the "Letter of recommendation" (LoR) DG Regio explained that it was request of Member States, it is a challenge how to „link“ available funds with LoR (50% of structural funds not yet allocated). DG Regio also stresses that LoRs have to be credible, in order to bring positive effect on EUSDR which

implementation started „in the middle of a proces” (note: present Financial perspectives). An important condition for LoR should be influence of the project within region and it should be realistic concluded Mr. Baudelet.

#### **4. Completed tasks as agreed on the 2<sup>nd</sup> SG meeting**

The information on tasks performed on the basis of conclusions at the Second PA1b SG meeting was presented.

Action (1)-The completion of TEN-T: The Danube region maps for railways, roads, airports and inland waterways were prepared by DG MOVE. Mr. Adelsberger explained that work was done by the TENtec team, as well as that TENtec started work with Ukraine and Moldova in order to add the networks of these two states on the map. The Chairman expressed gratitude to DG MOVE for the production of the maps that represent the first step towards common infrastructure system.

**Conclusion:** Although the task is completed the countries are invited to check the maps in order to check for any mismatch, especially at border crossings and connections between EU Member States and non-EU Member States.

Action (2)-Rail Freight Corridors: The Chairman informed the members on the status of Letter of Intent for the proposal of “the Western Balkans Corridor: Munich – Salzburg – Zagreb – Belgrade – Sofia - Istanbul”. Agreement on the content of the Letter to be signed by all involved countries is delayed for reasons of new governments (Croatia, Slovenia). After the Letter of Intent is signed the Commission will be informed in order that the new corridor is added to the initial list of freight corridors in accordance with Regulation 913/2010.

**Conclusion:** The progress is to be followed by PA1b SG. SG members (Austria, Bulgaria, and Croatia) are invited to check with responsible person at the Ministries on comments for the Letter.

Action (4)-Sustainable Transport systems: DG MOVE explained that there are no ongoing projects that are known to the Commission, DG MOVE. It is noted that regarding sustainable metropolitan transport the future Cohesion policy could finance the related project.

Action (5)-Cross-border infrastructure: The task remains. DG Regio will look for ongoing transnational and cross-border projects.

Action (6)-Nodal planning: Serbia prepared draft proposal for the Danube Region Intermodal Strategy (DRIS). It is already in the list of projects within the group of project ideas. The project is offered to all interested countries/partners for support and implementation.

Action (7) – ITS: Austria added the EDITS (European Digital Traffic Infrastructure Network for Intelligent Transport Systems) project to their list of projects. It is expected that local and regional authorities from AT, CZ, DE, HU, IT, SK, SI and PL will support the project as partners.

Common Transport Vision: The PACs prepared document which aim is to emphasis a few main reasons for need of common vision in order to obtain a joint view on the transport development in the Danube region. PA1a SG (inland waterways) should be informed on study planned and invited to contribute to the efforts of arriving to sustainable transport system in the Danube region. While the Commission (DG Regio, DG MOVE) supports the project i.e. study it made it clear that funding might be a serious problem. DG Regio explained that no funds are available while DG MOVE noted that call for TEN-T Priority Projects would be issued in the autumn of 2012. Austria (Mr. Spiegel) proposes to look for possible contribution from South East Europe Programme.

**Conclusion:** The PA1b SG agrees with the need for a joint policy oriented document that would serve as guidelines for future activities in the field of transport. The PA1b SG agrees to explore all funding possibilities for the study. In parallel Slovenia will work on ToR for the study.

*- The maps of transport infrastructure prepared by DG MOVE and document “A Common Transport Vision: Contribution by PACs” are attached (Annex 4 and 5).*

## 5. Report on Ad Hoc WG on projects and discussion

The Chairman presented the work and results of Ad hoc Working Group that met in Belgrade on 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> February. He explained that over 100 received projects were sorted into one of the PA1b actions and grouped according to the status of individual project. The conclusions of the Ad hoc WG were:

- a) *Actions need to be reviewed by the Steering Group and if needed proposals for amendments should be agreed before the end of 2012.*
- b) *All projects deserve to be labelled as the Danube region projects. It is up to the individual State to keep the project on the list.*
- c) *Projects that classify for the letter of recommendation are primarily those that are prepared for implementation (Group B1 and B2). Other projects are not excluded for receiving the Letter of Recommendation but a clear interest by the project promoter / leader has to be expressed..*
- d) *States of the Region are asked to propose selected number of ongoing projects for the promotion purposes. Each of these projects should in brief explain the project, photo(s) should be added and also a map with the location of project. These projects will serve as base for communication with media and will be also put at the Web page.*
- e) *Other: there is a need that projects lacking assured financing are presented at the workshop / conference where discussion on financial support from several financial institutions could take place. For project ideas it is proposed to be presented at the specific brokerage event.*

During the discussion on work done by Ad hoc WG it became clear that SG supports conclusions on labelling the projects and selected number of projects for promotion. However PA1b SG agreed that projects to be put on the list for Letter of Recommendation are those belonging to Groups B2 and C2 (prepared and planned projects for which financing is not assured). There are 43 projects belonging to the Group B2 and C2.

Serbia proposed to add also Group D (project ideas) to this list. However at the end SG was of the opinion that these projects should also reach the level of well prepared projects and so move to group B2 or C2 in order to get LoR.

Ukraine (Ms Gurylenko) explained that out of three projects Ukraine proposed the greatest need and support is for motorway from Odessa towards Romanian border along the Black Sea.

DG Regio (Mr. Baudalet) elaborated on great number of projects and concluded that each country should "filter" them.

### **Conclusion:**

Projects that are in Group B2 and C2 represent the list of projects eligible for LoR.

All countries check the list of projects in order to correct possible mistakes in the status of projects i.e. grouping of projects. PACs should be informed on all changes in the list of projects, as well as on selected proposed projects for LoR.

It is agreed that the first LoRs will be issued after approval by the SG at the next SG meeting which is tentatively planned at the end of May / beginning of June in Belgrade. If there is a need for the LoR to be issued not close to the date of next SG meeting approval by SG members via e-mail will be considered, *The SG members have to express a clear interest for LoR, meeting the criteria for EUSDR (see the EC paper "Good practices for the alignment of funding")*. Deadline: middle of April.

- *The Commission document "Good practices for the alignment of funding" is attached (Annex 6).*

## 6. Discussion on draft Roadmaps

The chairman started the discussion on Roadmaps that are to be prepared and agreed for each action of Action plan. The Chairman questioned also the real power of PAC and SG when it comes to milestones that might involve projects. DG Regio explained that roadmaps are needed "to know where we go" and to show there are results. Discussion that followed shows that roadmaps should be prepared taking into account reality and not only how things would work in ideal World. In particular responsibilities of SG could be carried out and valuable at raising the initiatives for cooperation between countries of the Region, while on the level of implementing the big infrastructure projects SG could only follow / monitor the developments.

The PA1b SG members then looked at draft roadmap for action (1): the completion of TEN-T. SG members agreed that common map is the first step, and that bottlenecks and missing links should be identified in the second. The latter is to be done with a help of Workshop on Action (1). When it come to



TEN-T projects SG could only look at planned and ongoing projects, follow call for tenders, report on progress and in case of delay (maybe) sent a motivation letter to responsible.

On the other hand DG Regio is of the opinion that SG need to be ambitious. PACs and SG are not powerless since Member States commit themselves / said at Council level the Danube strategy is crucial for their State.

**Conclusion:** SG agrees that roadmaps are beneficial for future work. However SG could take over responsibilities only on a strategic level and not on the level of projects. SG members will study all drafts of roadmaps and send comments to PACs. Final version of roadmaps should be finalized and approved at the next SG meeting.

## **7. Discussion on draft Work program**

The Chairman presented the work program for 2012 and 2013. It was explained that five objectives are to be followed i.e. 1) Priority area coordination, namely regular meetings of the SG and meetings of Ad hoc Working group according to needs 2) organization of workshops possibly for all PA1b actions, 3) organization of conferences, at least one for stakeholders and ministerial conference, 4) participation on invited events and 5) planning of joint projects.

Croatia (Ms. Čop Bajde) noted that multimodal projects should be discussed and planned together with the PA1a SG and that planned conferences should take into account the calendar of other transport events on the highest political level.

**Conclusion:** Work program was approved without item 5 i.e. planned projects.

- *The approved work program is attached (Annex 7).*

## **8. Other issues**

Under AOB the Chairman informed participants that there is a great interest in the Danube Strategy. This is reflected also through invitation to various events, e.g. CEI expressed interest to discuss possible cooperation on projects, The Danube Intergroup of the EU Committee of the Regions monitors the EUSDR, DeRC (Danube eRegion Conference) seek response mainly on cross-border projects, etc.

## **9. Closing of the meeting**

The Chairman thanked all participants for valuable contributions. Date of the next (4<sup>th</sup>) PA1b SG meeting is planned at the end of May or beginning of June 2012.

The Chairman officially closed the meeting at 17.00 hours and thanked all members for their participation.

---

Place, Date

---

Chairman:

Ljubljana, 20 February 2012

---

Franc Žepič, PAC 1b

Annex:

1. List of participants
2. The Agenda
3. The Minutes of 2<sup>nd</sup> PA1b SG
4. Maps Danube Region
5. Draft proposal for Common Transport Vision
6. Good practices for the alignment of funding
7. Work Program
8. Presentation PACs

EU STRATEGY FOR DANUBE REGION (EUSDR)  
**PRIORITY AREA 1b: rail, road and air transport**

**Annex 1**

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**  
**of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Steering Group Meeting**  
**20/02/2012; 09:00 – 17:00**  
**Ljubljana, Slovenia**

No	Country	Name of Participant	Participant's Status / Role	e-mail
1	<b>Austria</b>	Mr Thomas Spiegel	Member	<a href="mailto:thomas.spiegel@bmvit.gv.at">thomas.spiegel@bmvit.gv.at</a>
2	<b>Bulgaria</b>	Mr Petar Boyanov Benov	Member	<a href="mailto:pbenov@mtitc.government.bg">pbenov@mtitc.government.bg</a>
3	<b>Croatia</b>	Ms Katarina Čop Bajde	Member	<a href="mailto:katarina.copbajde@mmpi.hr">katarina.copbajde@mmpi.hr</a>
4	<b>Croatia</b>	Ms Ana Barišič	Member - Substitute	<a href="mailto:ana.barisic@mmpi.hr">ana.barisic@mmpi.hr</a>
5	<b>Hungary</b>	Mr Gergely Gecse	Member	<a href="mailto:gergely.gecse@nfm.gov.hu">gergely.gecse@nfm.gov.hu</a>
6	<b>Romania</b>	Ms Monica Patrichi	Member	<a href="mailto:monica.patrichi@mt.ro">monica.patrichi@mt.ro</a>
7	<b>Serbia</b>	Mr Miodrag Poledica	Member, PAC Co-Chairman	<a href="mailto:poledica@mi.gov.rs">poledica@mi.gov.rs</a>
8	<b>Slovakia</b>	Mr Miloš Prochazka	Member	<a href="mailto:milos.prochazka@mindop.sk">milos.prochazka@mindop.sk</a>
9	<b>Ukraine</b>	Ms Oksana Gurynenko	Member - Substitute	<a href="mailto:gurynenko@mtu.gov.ua">gurynenko@mtu.gov.ua</a>
10	<b>DG REGIO</b>	Mr Olivier Baudelet	Observer	<a href="mailto:Olivier.Baudelet@ec.europa.eu">Olivier.Baudelet@ec.europa.eu</a>
11	<b>DG MOVE</b>	Mr Helmut Adelsberger	Observer	<a href="mailto:helmut.adelsberger@ec.europa.eu">helmut.adelsberger@ec.europa.eu</a>
12	<b>Slovenia</b>	Ms Tina Fink	SI NCP, Observer	<a href="mailto:tina.fink@gov.si">tina.fink@gov.si</a>
13	<b>Slovenia</b>	Mr. Fedor Černe	Member - substitute	<a href="mailto:fedor.cerne@gov.si">fedor.cerne@gov.si</a>
14	<b>Slovenia</b>	Mr Franc Žepič	Member, PAC Chairman	<a href="mailto:franc.zepic@gov.si">franc.zepic@gov.si</a>
<b>ABSENT:</b> Bosnia and Herzegovina, Czech republic, Germany, Moldova, Montenegro				

**EUSDR Priority area 1b:**  
**To improve mobility and multimodality: rail, road and air transport**

**MINUTES**  
**of the FOURTH STEERING GROUP meeting**  
**14 June 2012; 09:00 – 16:30**  
**Belgrade, Serbia**

**Participants:** AT, BG, CRO, HU, SK, SI, SRB, RO, UE; See list of participants.

Non-participating / Absent: CZ, DE, BA, ME, MD, CION

**Chairman:** Mr Miodrag Poledica, PAC 1b Serbia

Co-chairman: Mr Franc Žepič, PAC 1b Slovenia

**1. Welcome and introductory remarks**

The Chairman opened the 4<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Priority Area 1b Steering Group (PA1b SG) and welcomed the participants. The absence of representatives from the European Commission (DG REGIO, DG MOVE) was noted.

- *The list of participants is attached (Annex 1).*

**2. Approval of the agenda**

The agenda of the 4<sup>th</sup> SG PA1b meeting was unanimously approved.

- *The approved agenda of the fourth SG meeting is attached (Annex 2).*

**3. Approval of the minutes of the 3<sup>rd</sup> SG meeting**

Minutes of the third meeting held in Ljubljana on 20 February 2012 were unanimously approved.

- *The approved minutes of the third SG meeting are attached (Annex 3).*

**4. Reporting on tasks as agreed on 3<sup>rd</sup> SG meeting**

An overview of tasks performed on the basis of conclusions of the Third PA1b SG meeting was presented.

Action (1) – The completion of TEN-T: The checking of the Danube region maps has been completed for the most part. The maps for all four modalities (railways, roads, airports and inland waterways), which were completed by the DG MOVE TENtec team, do not include Moldova and Ukraine. The Co-chairman informed the SG members that work with Ukraine and Moldova is currently under way in order to add the networks of these two states to the map. The Co-chairman once more acknowledged the great support of DG MOVE and added that readability of the maps could be improved in the future.

Conclusion: Although the task is completed for most countries, the checking of the maps is still ongoing. The maps for Moldova and Ukraine should be completed in due course.

Action (2) – Rail Freight Corridors: The Chairman informed the members on the status of Letter of Intent for the proposal of the Western Balkans Corridor: Munich – Salzburg – Zagreb – Belgrade – Sofia – Istanbul. The progress of the initiative, which requires an agreement on the content of the Letter to be signed by all countries involved, has been

halted for several reasons, one of which was the election of new governments (Croatia, Slovenia). The Co-chairman stressed that this initiative represents a unique opportunity to link EU and non-EU countries since the Corridor would significantly strengthen the connectivity within the Danube region. Croatia (Ms Barišić) informed the SG that the letter was received by the Directorate in charge. No comments on the initiative were delivered to the SG by Bulgaria. Austria (Ms Zimmermann) has submitted comments and explained that the new corridor cannot be supported until 2015 as it is shown in the roadmap for this action.

Conclusion: Feedback from all relevant ministries on the proposed railway freight corridor is needed as soon as possible. SG members are once more invited to check with responsible person at their Ministry for comments on the Letter.

Action (3) - Air traffic and shorter plane routes: No tasks were assigned for Action (3). The Chairman invited all SG members to propose their own tasks. Romania asked for the air traffic expert from Serbia.

Action (4) - Sustainable Transport systems: The Chairman explained that the related projects will likely be financed by the future Cohesion policy. No progress has been made on this task.

Action (5) - Cross-border infrastructure: The task has not been completed. So it is believed that DG REGIO is still looking for ongoing transnational and cross-border projects.

Action (6) - Nodal planning: A draft proposal for the Danube Region Intermodal Strategy (DRIS), prepared by Serbia, is offered to all interested countries/partners for support and implementation.

Action (7) - ITS: The EDITS (European Digital Traffic Infrastructure Network for Intelligent Transport Systems) regional project of Austria is the only ITS-related project. Austria is still looking for partners, particularly in local and regional authorities from AT, CZ, DE, HU, IT, SK, SI and PL.

## **5. Current situation on projects**

The PACs have prepared and presented to the group the list of all projects, as well as the list of projects that countries believe are eligible for the Letter of Recommendation (LoR). These lists will be updated in the future. More than 130 projects have been received so far (some of which cover more than one action). The Chairman proposed that a Microsoft Excel template be created by next meeting which can be filled with the necessary data for easier updating of project information. Presently, 47 projects are ongoing, 81 are in the planning stage, while 5 are in the project idea stage. The Co-chairman emphasised the difficulty of analysing unclear or incomplete project data and added. The Co-chairman expressed his regret at the fact that only few projects on aviation were received. The PACs stressed the importance of respecting deadlines for submitting project information and urged SG members to respect them.

With respect to the official PA1b INTERACT website, the PACs asked the members to provide the necessary materials as soon as possible, on two counts:

- (1) representative projects, both text and photos;
- (2) project list, which is non-existent as it requires member approval.

The PACs proposed a new table with fewer columns for the purpose of website publication.

Conclusion: The Excel file will be prepared and be sent to all SG members for updating of project data. In addition, the SG agreed to put project data in the new simplified table and publish it on the website (<http://groupspaces.com/MobilityRail-Road-Air/>).

## **6. Updating of the Regional Balkan Infrastructure Study (REBIS)**

SEETO (Mr Nikolić) has proposed a limited update of the REBIS study to determine how the systems are integrated and operating. Mr Nikolić emphasised the fact that the Western Balkans represents an integral part of the TEN-T comprehensive network. The study update will focus on how to improve the original formula and extend it by 2030.

Conclusion: The PACs support the proposed update, which will be useful for both the Steering Group and the SEETO database and stressed the need for continued cooperation.

Common Transport Vision: Slovenia (Mr Černe) gave an overview of the rationale for the Common Danube Transport Vision. Mr Černe stressed the importance of having a vision as a building block for transport policy and fostering of competitiveness. The main objectives should include the common transport system, which could be best presented on the Region's infrastructure map, and identification of main bottlenecks and missing links on the map. The Common Transport Vision should address these bottlenecks and missing links by means of coordinated implementation of projects. The main network, together with simplification of administrative procedures, should improve mobility, accessibility and cohesion through a single common transport system.

Conclusion: The PA1b SG agrees with the need for a joint policy oriented document that would serve as guidelines for future activities in the field of transport. The PA1b SG supports identifying all funding possibilities for the study. As early as possible one Ad hoc Working Group meeting should be devoted to the Common Danube Transport Vision.

## **7. EIB and PA1b of the EUSDR perspective**

Mr Andreas Beikos (European Investment Bank) gave an overview of funding possibilities for EUSDR and PA1b projects. Mr Beikos stressed that main responsibility for obtaining project financing lies with the countries, which must present a convincing case, i.e. an adequate business plan. Mr Beikos explained that the main focus of EIB is financing infrastructure, and that out of 12 EUSDR areas, 8 are eligible for financing. The core competencies of EIB include lending (transport, energy and water quality projects in particular), co-financing, and advising (WBIF, JASPERS). The EIB is currently very much engaged in the Danube region and will be for quite some time. Mr Beikos emphasised that viable projects need to be identified, and that the SG as a body must lobby for them. More than 100 sources have been identified for EUSDR funding. The focus of EIB is long-term financing, with the minimum funding of EUR 12.5 million. Mr Beikos explained that in this region EIB mainly lends to the public sector, while in the EU it lends mostly to the private sector.

The Chairman said that the PA1b SG recognizes the importance of Steering Group lobbying and emphasised the need to have project promoters. The Co-chairman added that the number of funding programmes for transport is much lower (approximately 10); further clarification is needed on what is meant by "viable projects". Mr Beikos explained that five criteria are used to determine whether a project can be considered viable: (1) macroeconomic, legal and regulatory context; (2) technical and environmental viability; (3) economic and financial viability; (4) project implementation and management capacity; and (5) overall risk profile.

Conclusion: Mr Beikos agreed to provide a link detailing all available funding sources. The PA1b SG recognizes the importance of having a national, as well as regional, strategy, which would serve as foundation for future investment.

## **8. Discussion and approval of roadmaps**

The PACs thanked the members who had submitted their comments on Roadmaps. Austria (Ms Zimmermann) pointed out that some of the milestones are not within the SG competences. No criteria are set in the milestones for issuing Letters of Recommendation (LoR). The Co-chairman said that three exemplary targets do not reflect all actions, and that as a consequence several projects/actions could not be linked to any target. Little information has been received so far on some actions, such as on shorter aviation routes and urban transport. In addition just one ITS-related project was identified. The Co-chairman briefly explained each of the roadmaps and stressed that they should be understood as a "rolling ones" as the roadmaps should be updated on a regular basis. Based on the comments received the roadmaps will be modified where needed.

The Co-chairman has already at the 3rd SG meeting in Ljubljana suggested that workshops for all actions be held throughout the region. Members were asked to inform PACs if their country is ready to organize one of workshops so that the activities would spread over the region. In this respect only Romania took the floor offering to host the workshop on ITS for which Romania would take care of the logistics but could not finance it.

Conclusion: The deadline for submitting comments and amendments to roadmaps is 21 June 2012; after that date the Roadmaps will be considered approved. Romania (Ms Patrichi) agreed to organize the first workshop and to provide logistics, but no financial support for this event.

Dr Marko Mihić (Faculty of Organizational Sciences, Belgrade) gave a presentation on the use of Microsoft Project software for PA1b project coordination. The proposed solution will include a detailed information table and Gantt chart, as well as planning and tracking tools for all projects. The projects will be permanently updated and steered by the SG members, who will be responsible for updating files. MS Project templates have been prepared for all actions and projects.

## 9. Presentation and approval of projects to receive the Letter of Recommendation

With respect to Letters of Recommendation, the Chairman explained that the main issues regarding LoR were how many letters to issue and for which projects. The PACs emphasised that the process of issuing LoR is not over and that they can be issued at a later date, *i.e.* when needed. Although it was agreed to submit for LoR only projects from groups B2 and C2, some members submitted projects from group D as well.

A total of 29 projects were proposed for Letter. Romania has submitted 14 projects, Slovakia 11, Serbia 2, and Ukraine 2 projects for the issuing of LoR. One LoR (for Ukraine) was issued prior to the meeting by use of the written procedure. After the first selection 22 projects were deemed eligible for the issuing of LoR (Romania 8, Serbia 2, Slovakia 11, Ukraine 2). The PACs proposed the issuing of 16 Letters of Recommendation (Romania 5, Serbia 2, Slovakia 7, Ukraine 2).

- *The list of "LoR projects" is attached (Annex 4).*

Conclusion: A total of 17 projects received the official SG Letter of Recommendation.

- Romania received LoR for 6 projects (Sibiu - Pitesti Motorway, Rehabilitation and electrification of the Railway Line Bucureşti Nord – Jilava – Giurgiu – Frontieră for the traffic of the trains at a maximum speed of 160 km/h, Rehabilitation and electrification of the Railway Line Giurgiu – Videle – Bucureşti for the traffic of the trains at a maximum speed of 160 km/h, Priority project 22 - South Branch: Arad – Timisoara – Craiova – Calafat (rail), Priority Project 22 North Branch: Curtici – Brasov – Bucuresti – Constanta, Modernization of Tulcea "Danube Delta" Airport);
- Serbia received LoR for 2 projects (Construction of Intermodal Terminal in Belgrade, South-East Europe Heliport Network System Strategy);



- Slovakia received LoR for 6 projects (Public Terminals (4) of Intermodal Transport in Žilina, Košice, Bratislava and Leopoldov, Modernization of the Rail Track Krásno Nad Kysucou (Slovakia) – Čadca (Slovakia) - Slovakia-Czech Republic Border Crossing (Continuation to Czech Republic), the Road Bridge Komarno (Slovakia) – Komarom (Hungary), Motorway D3: Hričovské Podhradie – Skalité (Slovakia) / Zwardoń (Poland), Motorway D4 "Bratislava Zero By-pass, Railway: Bratislava Predmestie – Bratislava Filiálka – Bratislava Úns – M. R. Štefanik International Airport – Bratislava Petržalka, Speedway R3 : Chyžne (Poland) / Trstená (Slovakia) – Tvrdošín – Dolný Kubín – Martin – Zvolen – Šahy (Slovakia) / Parassapuszta, Hungary) and
- Ukraine received LoR for 2 projects (Construction of Highway "Odessa - Reni" (length - 261 km) to the 1st Category Parameters with the Bridge over Dniester Estuary (length - 5709.3 m), with one LoR issued prior to the meeting.

It was agreed that projects which did not receive LoR be revisited at a later date and LoRs be issued accordingly.

After the discussion and the SG approval of the LoR list the ceremony of signing the letters by PACs took place. The original Letters of recommendation were handed over to the members / representatives from Romania, Serbia, Slovakia and Ukraine.

## **10. Discussion on the first PA1b Progress Report**

With regard to the Progress Report, the draft version of the report was sent to the SG members and comments are needed on the overall text as well as on individual targets and actions. The deadline for the report to be submitted to the European Commission is 30 June 2012. The PACs stressed the importance of members' contribution. Feedback is needed on the direction of the report, which needs to be approved by all members. The draft report focuses on political support (which is judged as insufficient – members of several countries have not been present on SG meetings), financing (use of available funds for SG purposes) and future financial perspective 2014-2019 and macroregional strategies. At the PA1b level, it stresses the importance of common transport vision, attracting all countries and stimulating stakeholders to become leaders and promoters. The report also addresses cooperation with PA1a and PA5, promotion, funding (no new funding opportunities, however, many already exist) and next steps (Danube Stakeholder Conference, relevant project identification). Roadmaps are included as Annex 1 and projects approved by the SG as Annex 2. Bulgaria proposed the inclusion of the Transport Common Vision non-paper in the Report as an annex.

Conclusion: The SG agreed on the structure and directions for the Report. The deadline for comments and suggestions is 21 June 2012, and the second draft of the Progress Report will be prepared by 25 June 2012.

## **11. Other issues**

Co-chairman informed the SG that: a) a meeting between PA1a and PA1b coordinators was held on 3rd May in Bratislava and that minutes will be sent to all SG members, b) a symposium on railway projects in the Danube region is planned, organized by ÖVG and Vienna University of Technology, sponsored by a manufacturer of railroad equipment (all Austria). The participation at the symposium was proposed by PACs and supported by the SG.

The Chairman informed participants that the European Commissioner for Regional Policy, Johannes Hahn, will be visiting several of the Danube region countries at the end of June.

## **12. Closing of the meeting**

The Chairman thanked all participants for their contribution and officially closed the meeting at 16.30 hours.

---

Place, Date

Belgrade, 14 June 2012

---

Chairman:

---

Miodrag Poledica, PAC 1b

Annexes:

- list of participants (Annex 1),
- approved agenda of the 4<sup>th</sup> SG meeting (Annex 2),
- approved minutes of the 3<sup>rd</sup> SG meeting (Annex 3),
- list of LoR projects (Annex 4),
- presentations (Annex 5).

EU STRATEGY FOR DANUBE REGION (EUSDR)  
**PRIORITY AREA 1b: rail, road and air transport**

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**  
**of the 4<sup>th</sup> Steering Group Meeting**  
**14/06/2012; 09:00 – 16:30**  
**Belgrade, Serbia**

**Annex 1**

No	Country	Name of Participant	Participant's Status / Role	e-mail
1	<b>Austria</b>	Ms Barbara Zimmermann	Member - substitute	<a href="mailto:barbara.zimmermann@bmvit.gv.at">barbara.zimmermann@bmvit.gv.at</a>
2	<b>Bulgaria</b>	Mr Petar Boyanov Benov	Member	<a href="mailto:pbenov@mtitc.government.bg">pbenov@mtitc.government.bg</a>
3	<b>Croatia</b>	Ms Ana Barišić	Member - Substitute	<a href="mailto:ana.barisic@mmpi.hr">ana.barisic@mmpi.hr</a>
4	<b>Hungary</b>	Mr Gergely Gecse	Member	<a href="mailto:gergely.gecse@nfm.gov.hu">gergely.gecse@nfm.gov.hu</a>
5	<b>Romania</b>	Ms Monica Patrichi	Member	<a href="mailto:monica.patrichi@mt.ro">monica.patrichi@mt.ro</a>
6	<b>Serbia</b>	Mr Miodrag Poledica	PAC, Member Chairman	<a href="mailto:poledica@mi.gov.rs">poledica@mi.gov.rs</a>
7	<b>Slovakia</b>	Mr Miloš Prochazka	Member	<a href="mailto:milos.prochazka@mindop.sk">milos.prochazka@mindop.sk</a>
8	<b>Slovenia</b>	Mr Fedor Černe	Member - Substitute	<a href="mailto:fedor.cerne@gov.si">fedor.cerne@gov.si</a>
9	<b>Slovenia</b>	Mr Franc Žepič	PAC, Member Co-Chairman	<a href="mailto:franc.zepic@gov.si">franc.zepic@gov.si</a>
10	<b>Ukraine</b>	Mr Paratsa Volodymir	Member	<a href="mailto:paratsa@mtu.gov.ua">paratsa@mtu.gov.ua</a>
11	<b>Ukraine</b>	Ms Didkova Oksana	Member - Substitute	<a href="mailto:didkova@mtu.gov.ua">didkova@mtu.gov.ua</a>
12	<b>EIB</b>	Mr Andreas Beikos	Observer	<a href="mailto:a.beikos@eib.org">a.beikos@eib.org</a>
13	<b>SEETO</b>	Mr Nenad Nikolić	Observer	<a href="mailto:nnikolic@seetoint.org">nnikolic@seetoint.org</a>
14	<b>SEETO</b>	Ms Ana Šimecki	Observer	<a href="mailto:asimecki@seetoint.org">asimecki@seetoint.org</a>

No	Country	Name of Participant	Participant's Status / Role	e-mail
15	Faculty of transport and traffic engineering, University of Belgrade, Serbia	Ms Olja Čokorilo	Observer	<a href="mailto:oljav@sf.bg.ac.rs">oljav@sf.bg.ac.rs</a>
16	<b>SURVEY - RS</b>	Mr Ile Kovačević	Observer	<a href="mailto:ile.kovacevic@pregled-rs.rs">ile.kovacevic@pregled-rs.rs</a>
17	<b>SURVEY - RS</b>	Mr Željko Ljiljak-Vukajlović	Observer	<a href="mailto:zeljko.vukajlovic@pregled-rs.rs">zeljko.vukajlovic@pregled-rs.rs</a>
18	<b>Serbia</b>	Ms Vesna Stajković	Member of WG for EUSDR PA 1b	<a href="mailto:vesna.stajkovic@mi.gov.rs">vesna.stajkovic@mi.gov.rs</a>
19	<b>Serbia</b>	Ms Sanja Marjanović	Member of WG for EUSDR PA 1b	<a href="mailto:rail-intermodal@mi.gov.rs">rail-intermodal@mi.gov.rs</a>
20	<b>Serbia</b>	Mr Marko Mihić	Member of WG for EUSDR PA 1b	<a href="mailto:mihicm@fon.rs">mihicm@fon.rs</a>
<b>ABSENT:</b> Czech Republic, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Germany, Moldova, Montenegro, The Commission				