



ERB Conference in Gdansk 2-3 December 2004 Conclusions from the work shops

Workshop 1

The draft JTDP in the light of EU territorial cohesion

Moderator: Mr Knud Andersen

Summary and conclusion of discussion

- Fundamental that that the ERB Joint Transnational Development Programme (JTDP) really can add value to the member regions strategies. One important way at this stage is to enhance the options for EU funding.
- The draft JTDP priority areas was not questioned – but regarded as a right direction to follow in developing effective cooperation within the ERB. They meet well the EU cohesion policy aims.
- The draft JTDP suffers from weak analyses regarding EU-Russian dimensions and also regarding other EU policies like the internal market aspects of ERB cooperation
- The draft JTDP has to be developed concerning internal logic of proposals
- In depth analyses should be conducted on how ERB and the member regions can – an cannot- influence on different policy areas, as a basis for proposals to prioritize.
- The local dimension of ERB cooperation must be stressed
- Tourism should be highlighted, not as a new priority but as a key area for ERB measures within the field of business development activities
- Regarding measures enhancing labour market mobility within ERB, education as a mean to strengthen the labour market force should be highlighted like also the legal aspects.
- Measures enhancing communication within the ERB should be stressed for improved cooperation.

Lars Öhrman

Workshop 2

How to develop Innovative environments and Clusters in ERB, including Local Development Centres in smaller towns?

Moderator: Ms Eva-Lisa Ahnström

Summary and conclusion of discussion

- Presentation by Mr Petter Boye
 - Report “*The role of regional industrial platforms and clusters in the development of the Euroregion Baltic* (Executive summary, full report on web soon)
 - Few comments:
 - Key success factors
 - Results are scalable (Science Parks and smaller settings)
 - Local adaptation
 - But, if local adaptation, why work together in ERB?
 - Because:
 - Need for continued knowledge building, exchange of experiences leading to ”real” co-operation, companies, researchers
 - Mr Jacek Jettmar:
 - Regional innovation strategies (to be included in written workshop report)
 - Comments on the draft JTDP
 - Proposed study analysing the research institutions and resources in ERB. OK
 - Concrete model for the start-up phase: Modify. Not only one model...local adaptation.
 - Triple Helix-**like** models. Also need to establish good conditions for cluster development
 - Good conditions for network working with **specific tasks** needed to enable a sustainable further cooperation. Base in WP3.
 - Proposal for new project:
 - Kaliningrad Center on Innovation and Technology
 - New funding for deeper, actual partnership for the business sector.
 - Final reflection:
ACTION!
Make use of background material, established contacts

Workshop 3

Tourism Development – the potential to attract visitors to our region: what do we have to offer?

Moderator: Ms. Annelise Molin

The goals of the workshop:

- To conduct the discussions concerning the tourism development issues in the Euro Region Baltic;
- To identify the potentials, destinations and come up with the tourist products;

Summaries of the presentations:

Mr. Tomasz Studzieniecki, “Euro Region Baltic – With New Transnational Destination?”

The Baltic Sea Region is the transnational area. The general opinion in Europe is that it is the most efficient region as the cooperation is well developed then compare to other regions in Europe. The region includes some part of Germany, Denmark, Sweden, Finland, Russia (in some documents it is written that two parts of Russia belongs here: Kaliningrad Oblast and Leningrad (St. Petersburg) Oblast), Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia and Poland. The region is characterized by high variety of diverse concepts, diverse points of views.

The history is the heritage and can be transferred into an interesting tourism product, but it is only theory. Looking at the history, culture, and traditions Euro Region Baltic consists of two big sub regions the north and the south. The northern part is famous for achievements in cooperation and integration. The history is also the source of motives to create attractions and create products; and the periods of Nordic development give guidelines for tourism experts to show different products, as good examples of transnational cooperation that the Nordic countries have. But South is totally different. Twenty years ago Poland had the neighbors that do not exist anymore; these were GDR, Czechoslovakia, and USSR, now it has 7 neighbors. There is the concept of South Baltic Arc, which is also the type of integration in the southern Baltic Sea part. As to the tourism development, there is also great diversity and these are identified in different regional tourism networks: Network of Baltic Countries, Baltic Sea Cooperation, and Union of Baltic Cities-UBC.

In 1992 the Council of Europe elected 2 among 22 European cultural routes which both are in the Euro Region Baltic: Vikings and Normans European heritage and Hanseatic sites routes and monuments, which are mostly for Northern part of the Baltic Sea Region. However, Baltic Sea Tourism Commission promoted the local products of 110 tourist attractions and 4 transborder roads (routes). One of them is Amber road (Riga, Nepean, Kaliningrad, Gdansk), which is particularly significant, because Amber is the Gold of the Baltic Sea from the Hanseatic era. This road will refer to not only transnational destination but also European destination referring the historical Amber routes. There is even the symbol created the sterling silver and amber. The Amber can be one of the transnational motives in creating the tourist products.

To look at the theoretical point of view the Euro Region Baltic can hardly be the destination, the question is whether promote this region as a destination or not? Perhaps it is better to leave the regional concept as a political umbrella of the activities, including the tourism activities. On this stage perhaps it is better to concentrate on the limitations in the tourism

development. Every national component in the region has the potential but there is no transnational product. But the experience is vivid and it should be exchanged and learned from the ones who have already achieved tourism development on their local level, e.g. experiences from Bornholm.

Pomeranian Region has identified 40 tourism products. Others also have many different tourism products, which most of them do not have the transnational character. Besides, there is the strong competition in the Baltic among the tourist institutions as all apply for the same EU funds and there is the lack of political initiative, political willingness at the level of Euro Region Baltic to promote and to integrate tourism development in the region. How can transnational tourism be developed when the nationally based problems still exist (Kaliningrad border, lack of amenities)?

And finally, 3 A-s are crucial for the basis of tourism development:

1 A – is Accessibility: there is the poor accessibility; to develop tourism the accessibility has to improve.

2 A – is Attractions: there is the potential of good tourist attractions in the region but they are hidden, unknown, in different places. Tourists do not have the information.

3 A – is Amenities: the amenities are developed on the national level but not transnational level.

The model of tourism emerges system of organization, it consists of several levels, this is national level, regional level, and 5 sectors: government administration, self-government administration, education, business sector and non-profit sector. However, the improvement of 3 A-s is very much depended on all levels.

Annelise Molin, “Brief description of tourism development on Bornholm”

There were historical commonalities among all the regions in Baltic Sea Region, there were long time knowledge and cooperation as well; nowadays the relationships are still on different levels, at the political level, as well as at the level of local fisherman communities. There is the sea, which can either increase the distances or even make the regions and nations closer. There is the common problem of accessing each other and if ERB wants to develop tourism in the region, there should be common understanding that this region is not natural destination and to promote it more creativity should be involved. Therefore, the discussion on the workshop shouldn't start from identifying the regional destinations, but from that point of how to promote the destinations that already exist on the local levels. There is a great diversity among the regions in Euro Region Baltic, and there is also not much information in some regions about their attractions not only for the international tourists but also for the people in the region. It is too early to focus much on the particular destinations, but it is the time to start discussions on how to develop tourism together in the region. However, later on, when the regions have worked together and had good cooperation in the tourism sector, the development of some tourism destinations and the products can become the issue of discussion. There are some destinations already well-known and popular (like Bornholm), but there are also great potential and attractions which there is difficult to access. Perhaps discussion should also cover the ways the regions can help each other in development of tourism or in promotion. Mainly the discussion on the tourism development should be at the political level, as in most of the cases governments are willing but do not create the policy initiatives, or financial support as an input for this willingness, however, the cooperation should be also at the level of people working within tourism by starting making networks, and etc.

There is a great example of how tourism developed on Bornholm that consists of two periods, which is quite common for the tourism development process.

First, the initiative started around 100 years ago from the small cities and villages situated on the coastline that started to make local tourist information agencies owned by the local private people who created local tourism communities. However, the promotion of the local destinations was only on the national level, and was not accessible for the international tourists. Later the state involved itself in investing some money in this sector. The national organization was established, which started to promote the country on the international tourism market, however, tourists had access to the local information when they have entered Denmark. Later, 10-15 years ago, the state decided to give the local authorities financial initiatives to integrate local tourism attractions into one tourism destination in a bigger area, with the preconditions that local governments were also pay part. The initiative was to continue for 7-8 years and the state paid less every year. Local governments raised the money through the private sector involvement. The policy initiative was successful in Bornholm as well. Bornholm local government started to create the tourism institutions, first the Welcome Centre “Destination Bornholm”, situated at the Rønne harbor, and the centre did the coordination and marketing of the tourism on Bornholm. After some time the centre achieved good results in promotion and good marketing at the international level. However, the local information agencies remained and were still run by private local tourism communities, which were responsible on promoting their products and booking and selling the tickets. 10 years ago there was the crisis in the fishing industry on Bornholm and the state initiated different opportunities to develop on Bornholm, one of them was tourism. Therefore, the Centre for Regional and Tourism Research was established on this basis. The establishment of the Centre has been quite beneficial for the island. Besides this is the only research centre in tourism in whole Denmark. The centre is doing the research in Tourism not only on Bornholm but in all the Nordic countries, in Baltic Sea Region, etc. The centre has helped the local tourism businesses as well as local government to emphasize the methods and techniques regarding the tourism business, regional planning, improving the marketing, developing the qualitative aspects in tourist products and services. Nowadays, there is more intention towards improving the quality of the products in order to increase the competitiveness of the island on the international tourism market.

Summary of the discussion:

According to the speeches, Annelise Molin started discussion and raised the questions, which were not on development of particular tourism products, but more at the level of political cooperation. At the beginning discussion started about what were the other experiences that the participants wanted to share. At this point Jaroslaw Szczukowski (Chairman of International Relations Commission of the Regional Parliament in Pomeranian) described how the Pomeranian tourism strategy has been elaborated and he emphasized that there was the lack of interregional understanding even between Pomeranian and Warmia-Mazurian regions, which share many tourism attractions and products or activities. He raised the issue on the regional cooperation in tourism and proposed to create open working group, which could work on specific themes of tourism, prepare some documents, and even prepare the projects, to achieve common understanding of tourism development in the ERB.

This idea was lifted and expanded; therefore Kenneth Johannesson raised the issue on the possibilities for exchanging the information and learning from each other, as well as identifying the common interests, and local interests. Annelise Molin confirmed Mr.

Johannesson's point by bringing the example about the Centre for Regional and Tourism Research, which have studied local people's interest and desires to make a rational use of the existing resources that population could also support. On the exchanging the information, Nino J. Larsen emphasized the local characteristic of the tourism product and diversities in priorities among the regions, and proposed to work together to elaborate common methods and tools that all regions can use in their tourism planning and marketing and also develop the products at the local level. Here Tomasz Studzieniecki agreed the discussion and emphasized the synergy affect of this cooperation. Besides, he mentioned that there were already some Baltic Sea tourism institutions and was interesting to learn from them. Bo Frank (Deputy Mayor of City Vaxjo) commented that the marketing of the regional destinations was highly important and suggested to include in the cooperation.

According to this discussion Nino J. Larsen summarized that there was the need for regional cooperation, which included exchange the experience and establish the networks, conduct research, arrange educational and training programs and underlining the marketing importance.

Annelise Molin reminded that the there was the need to find out how to help each other to achieve development, to have common strategy as a ground to achieve things together. Here Nino J. Larsen added that it was only possible if establishing the working group as mentioned at the beginning should be prioritized and the tourism development issues should be promoted on the ERB board.

Annelise Molin suggested the participants to talk about the priorities and she confirmed that right after achieving the consensus on how can the regions help each other, the setting up the working group should be the next step and thirdly, she proposed to make a new program. At that point Bo Frank confirmed that the Seagull program was going to end and this proposal should be introduced to the ERB board. Afterwards, the participants talked about the importance of well-planned activities, and involvement of right number of qualified people. The funding issue was also raised and Nino J. Larsen proposed to ask ERB Board to identify the stakeholders from each region and from each sector (public, private, civil society) who can participate in the working group meetings, discussions, establish the networks and be responsible for the exchanging the information, arrange the activities and projects to support the tourism development in the ERB. Participants agreed on this proposal and even came up with the idea that one of the ways to exchange the information was to make the tourism event monthly calendar and publish them in the regional local newspapers for free. As the last aspect, Steen Schoneman emphasized the possibilities to get financial input for this cooperation from the renewed structural funds.

Conclusion:

1. There is the urgent need for stronger and more systematic cooperation
2. There is the need for developing the network in the tourism sector;
3. There is the need for openness and exchange of the information
4. There is the need for exchanging the knowledge and experience
5. There is the need for setting up common tourism development strategies, which is acceptable at the national or/and regional level
6. There is the need for marketing, plan destination development, regional promotion, etc...

Proposal:

Centre for Regional and Tourism Research from Bornholm elaborated the brief proposal based on the workshop discussions, which is **attached** to this report. The full proposal will be provided for the ERB board meeting in January, 2005.

Prepared by:

Nino Javakhishvili Larsen
Consultant

Centre for Regional and Tourism Research
Stenbrudsvej 55
Nexø, 3730
Denmark
Tel.: +45 56 44 00 28
Cellular: +45 27 40 72 31
Fax: +45 56 49 46 24
e-mail: Nino@crt.dk
Attachment:

Establishment of Tourism Development Working Group in ERB

PROPOSAL BRIEF

According to the discussions on Tourism Development Workshop No. 3 at the ERB-Seagull Conference in Gdańsk on 2 December 2004, Centre for Regional and Tourism Research elaborated the brief draft of the proposal to be introduced to ERB board.

The conclusions from the workshop clarified the needs for:

7. stronger and more systematic cooperation
8. developing the network in the tourism sector
9. openness and exchange of the information
10. exchanging the knowledge and experience
11. setting up common tourism development strategies, which is adoptable at the national or/and regional level
12. Marketing, plan destination development, regional promotion, etc...

The workshop participants proposed to establish the ***Tourism Development Working Group (TDWG)*** (The name and status will change according to the agreements with all parties)

The Overall Vision:

The ***Tourism Development Working Group (TDWG)*** is the entity which coordinates and supports the tourism development in the ERB geographic area.

The Possible Responsibilities and Activities of the TDWG:

1. Conduct the group meetings, where the group members discuss the problems in tourism development in the region; the ways and methods to tackle these problems; as well as perspectives, resources, sustainable development, etc...
2. Establish the tourism institutional network, where all the tourism institutions will be connected: local, regional, public, private, NGOs, educational/research institutions, indirectly related institutions, etc... This network is supposed to support the openness and information exchange in the tourism sector (suggestion was to make the tourism events calendar monthly and publish in each regions local newspaper for free, as well as using other methods of communication, such as bulletins, website, brochures, e-mails, etc...)
3. Initiate the exchange of knowledge and experience in the region: organize the educational programs, training courses, study tours, academic conferences, etc...
4. Conduct discussions on the tools and methods of marketing and region's promotion, elaboration of the destination plan
5. Plan the specific projects/activities and find the funding opportunities for their preparation and implementation

Proposed Preparation Phases:

- I. Identifying the partners/actors and problems/issues of relevance for the network to explore/address and design the next phases (including preparation of application(s) for funding)

[**Note:** As the establishment of TDWG might involve the complications regarding the diverse interests and view points of all the countries in the ERB, also it will require involvement of large human or financial resources, therefore Centre for Regional and Tourism Research proposes to make the *pilot project* and test the ground of the cooperation. The pilot project is considered to be *the study trip and first workshop*, where the potential representatives of each country in ERB will meet for the first time and will identify the common interests or themes in tourism development in ERB, as well as discuss the ways of organizing the TDWG. The Centre offers to make the proposal for this type of pilot project to the Baltic Education Island Funding Program (Danish Ministry of Education) for the small grants. This project will prove whether the cooperation in the Tourism Development issues in ERB and establishment of TDWG is realistic, or not. According to these results the proposal can be transferred into the longer term perspectives.]

- II. Strengthen the network based on analyses of the issues as well as workshops, seminars and so on (from here on other sources of funding are needed).
- III. Evaluation of the network and the potential for and relevance of future cooperation on tourism development (responsibility of the Board, but evaluation should of course be funded as part of the project in phase II).

The coordination:

The coordination of establishing and leading the Tourism Development Working Group is proposed to be carried out by Centre for Regional and Tourism Research (CRT)

Why CRT?

1. The expertise in tourism and regional development and consultancy
2. The expertise in the Baltic Sea Region
3. Successful integration of science (academic expertise) and practice

4. Experience in cooperative activities and partnerships with the regions in the Baltic Sea
5. Research facilities
6. Long-term experience working in EU programs and projects
7. ...For detailed information visit: www.crt.dk

This proposal has been acceptable for Regional Municipality of Bornholm and ERB Board members from the Danish side.

For further questions regarding the proposal, please contact

Ms. Nino Javakhishvili Larsen

Centre for Regional and Tourism Research
Stenbrudsvej 55
3730 Nexø, Bornholm
Denmark
Tel.: +45 56 44 11 44
Direct: +45 56 44 00 28
Cellular: +45 27 40 72 31
Fax: +45 56 49 46 24
e-mail: Nino@crt.dk

Ms. Annelise Molin

Regional Municipality of Bornholm
Ullasvej 15,
3700 Rønne, Bornholm
Denmark
Tel.: +45 56 92 13 03
Cellular: +45 24 27 06 11
E-mail: Annelise.molin@brk.dk

Workshop 4

Why local mobilization – Rural development and bottom up approach in an EU perspective

Moderator: Karl-Erik Nilsson

Material

Report: Rural development in ERB, Folder: Toolbox to local mobilisation project in ERB
Handouts from presentations, Proposal for ERB Academy on Rural Development, Draft of Joint Transnational Development Plan

Participants

24 participants, participant list is attached

Introduction

The experts were introduced and the moderator stressed the importance of a free discussion, the main objective for the workshop.

Karl-Erik Nilsson gave a brief introduction to the Swedish Committee for rural development. The moderator is the chairman of the Committee.

Peter Hogla, European Office Kronoberg County

Peter argued that local mobilization and bottom-up perspective are essential when building a common future in Europe and the concepts are important aspects when legitimising the European Union and its policies among local citizens. EU stands in front of great challenges, some of them linked to structural changes, but also the need for a reform of the CAP, unemployment and much more. Some challenges are linked to the gap between politicians, the public administration, the mass media and the citizens. It is shown very clear in the process of debating and not to mention the implementation of the EU- constitution. EU is having difficulties in reaching out to its citizens.

Politicians, the administration, the mass media all play a vital role in the establishment, development and daily work of local groups. Local mobilization is therefore essential when implementing EU and other policies that directly or indirectly affect every citizen. Local mobilization is one of the most important methods/instruments in order to legitimise EU. The role of mass media in local mobilization was discussed. Hans Jörgen Jensen raised the question of local mobilization as a tool for saving resources. He argued that local mobilization is a heavy job and it needs financial support.

Pavel Elizarov, Ozersk Municipality: Added value of ERB cooperation on local mobilisation

For Ozersk municipality stagnation is the main problem, Pavel Elizarov stated. From that perspective the bottom up perspective is essential. In the rural municipalities there is a lack of activity, initiatives and experience. That's one reason to cooperate in the frames of ERB – the

opportunity to get experience from other regions and work together strategically against the stagnation. Another problem is the absence of strategies.

- You can't just close your eyes and shoot, said Pavel and stressed the importance of long term strategies for development.

The involvement of the municipality and the mobilization of the inhabitants are important preconditions in the process of elaborating a strategic plan.

The concrete dimension – to show a concrete result – is as well most important. The advice centre for SMEs that has been established in Ozersk municipality can give the new entrepreneurs concrete advice and help. The idea started three years ago and it is fruitful to discuss a small idea in the ERB-context in order to take part of broader experience. The centre is very well anchored in the region and has several regional stakeholders like the Regional fund for SMEs, the regional employment office and the Regional Administration.

Involvement of municipality, Strategic planning (in ERB) how to mobilize the inhabitants.

The importance of local mobilization was discussed by Raisa Guseva, representative from an NGO in Kaliningrad, underlined the need for us to take the initiative ourselves and start for example agricultural cooperatives.

Alex Ursatyi, The Federal state Employment service in Kaliningrad region stressed the importance of mobilization of the labour market. The situation in the rural areas in Kaliningrad Region is extremely harsh with approximately 1700 unemployed persons in the rural areas. The need for common projects in the field of labour market was discussed.

Marina Gomez, European Office in Kronoberg County underlined the importance of support from the public sector in order to achieve local mobilization.

Ulf Andersson, Seagull project leader stressed that WP4 has been very successful and claimed that ERB need to have a rural development network or a rural development academy. It is important to describe the common issues in this field in the JTDP.

***Karl-Erik Hällstrand, Head of Technical department in Emmaboda Municipality and secretary in The Lyckeby River Association
Carolina Gunnarsson, Project Leader, Seagull, WP2:***

Local mobilization in the field of water management: Lyckebyån

Karl-Erik Hällstrand and Carolina Gunnarsson gave an introduction to local mobilization in the field of water management. Carolina described the restoration of Långasjön where voluntary work played a crucial role. The method is a triple helix model on a local level. In the municipality of Långasjö several other voluntary projects has been completed, for example youth hostel, riding school and local newspaper.

Lyckeby River Association was established 1988 and has the following members: municipalities, power plants, industries, drainage companies and fishery conservation associations. The Association runs several projects that aim at make citizens aware of the importance of the river for their own fresh water supply, for example school projects. The success factors for local mobilization in the field of water management are Creativity, Co-operation and a small amount of stubbornness.

Hans Jörgen Jensen, project manager in Leader Bornholm: Local mobilisation in Gudhiem, results from Leader+ Bornholm

Hans Jörgen Jensen gave an introduction to the Leader+ Programme in Bornholm that has three focus areas: Local food, Local handicraft and Network among small enterprises. He described a concrete project in Gudhiem - a summer tourism village in Bornholm. The big challenge was to make Gudhiem a good village all year around. The project mobilized all inhabitants in the village and made a great job to identify problems and a common development strategy. They used a strategic tree to illustrate the strategy and the different working groups. Hans Jörgen Jensen stressed that it has been a big job but the result is satisfying. Now Gudhiem even arrange international conferences, arrange a youth film festival, has it's own university and so on. The village is as well more beautiful in the summer and the winter.

Grzegorz Gola, Regional Information Centre, Gdansk: Mobilization of the small local communities in the rural areas

Grzegorz Gola gave some experiences from the Pomeranian Region in the field of local mobilization. He advised all to use EU funds or even ERB funding for development of mobilization.

The big question is how to proceed from the big words to the local understanding?

What means words like Social and economic cohesion to local people?

It is all about implementing the main EU principle – subsidiary. It must be implemented on local level.

We have to spread the attitude; If you have a problem – solve it yourself! You can use funds, try first local funds and if it is needed there is EU funding to gain.

When you deal with mobilization of the small local communities it is essential to stress the importance of their own work. The local work is one precondition for the external funding. Actually, structural funds aiming at local development. There are as well additional funds, for, for example renewal of rural areas and the Leader+ programme.

In the region there is a special program for mobilization: Pomeranian Program of renewal. It is possible to get 20% co-financing but it doesn't cover all the local communities.

A prerequisite for funding is that local council will take a decision on starting a project.

Grzegorz Gola pointed out the contradiction between local needs and needs for strategy elaboration.

As well he raised questions about cultural heritage and local identity. What is local identity when the inhabitants have mixed ethnical background?

The most important thing is to find reason for living in an area and to development of the image of the village.

ggola@indygo.com.pl

Discussion

The participants agreed on that local mobilization is a most important question for ERB. It was stressed that mobilization is an essential question for the strategic development of the area. Different measures to encourage local mobilization were discussed.

Erica Månsson introduced the idea of establishing a Rural Development Academy in ERB in order to create an arena for exchange of experience, network building and research and make this Academy available for the European Commission as a test laboratory. The ERB region can be available as an interesting pilot region for the Commission to test for example the new Common Agriculture Policy.

Hans Jørgen Jensen, Bornholm, agreed with the idea and added that there is a big need for a common development project foura and it can be completed with a partnership database. Alexey Ursaty, Federal State Employment Service, Kaliningrad Region, agreed with the idea and stressed that they have already gained a lot of new experiences from the Seagull project. Peter Hogla stressed the importance of specifying what we want with the area. From the Swedish governmental perspective it is most important that the proposal for a Rural Development Academy is stated in the JTDP. Grzegorz Gola found the idea of a Rural development Academy good and underlined that one task must be to transform this information to the rural areas. Another important function for the Academy is promoting the ERB among local people. The moderator closed the meeting and thanked all experts and the participants for a very fruitful and interesting workshop.

Erica Månsson

Workshop 6

Water management and transboundary co-operation.

The future role of ERB.

Moderator: Mr Bo Frank

Transboundary water co-operation within the ERB region.

Based on a co-operation between Kaliningrad and Poland.

Mr Andrzej Lewandowski, Ph. D., Geosciences and Marine research & consulting.

REDUCTION OF NUTRIENT

DIFFUSE SOURCES agriculture and other:

Proper fertilization of fields (less mineral more natural)

Proper storage of manure, urine, slurry

Education of farmers in good agricultural practices (financial support: cheap loans, etc.)

ATMOSPHERE

Reduction of N emissions

SEDIMENT / WATER INTERACTIONS

Studies necessary

CONCLUSIONS

AS IT HAS BEEN PROVED BY RESULTS OF SCENARIOS CALCULATIONS IN ORDER TO MITIGATE THE NEGATIVE EFFECT OF POTENTIAL ANIMAL AND YIELD PRODUCTION INCREASE SOME ACTIONS AND CHANGES IN EXISTING AGRICULTURAL PRACTICES SHOULD TAKE PLACE:

- Straw should be incorporated in the soil – not burned how it is now a very common practice
- Crop rotation should change a little from cereals after cereals rotation
- Manure should be stored on appropriately prepared places – not on bared soil
- Urine and slurry tanks should be thigh and has sufficient storage capacity (at least 6 months according to Nutrient Directive)

Shared watersheds and legislative issues as a realm of cooperation between Kaliningrad and EU members in ERB

Mr. Boris Chubarenko, Ph.D., Atlantic Branch of P.P.Shirshov Institute of Oceanology of Russian Academy of Sciences

EU Water Framework Directive (2000)	Russian Water Code (1996)
Water basin is to be defined and is a elementary object of management	Basin approach is announced only
Ecosystem approach	Resources exploitation approach
Explicit formulation of necessity for elaboration of environmental objectives and development of the action plans	No demands on objectives and planning
Individual approach for water objects and basins	The same approach for all water objects in the country
Including wetlands and ground waters in the managed basin	Separate treating of groundwater resources
Clear document regulated the way toward “desirable future”	Not an all-sufficient document, many references to other legislative acts (some of them are still not putted into action)

<u>EU Water Framework Directive</u>	<u>Russian Water Code</u>
Overall goal is the same	
Objectives are to be defined for each water object and basin	Objectives = water quality standards already defined for different types of water
<i>Methods</i>	
Basin approach Clear procedure written in a form of order Time schedule	Basin approach Recommendation mood No time schedule
Both legislation are in agreement	
Harmonization is possible and needed with using of WFD as basis document !!!	

Where to co-operate?

Transboundary basins and coastal waters

Pilot areas for cooperation between EU members and Kaliningrad
in water sector in ERB

What to do?

Projects aiming to organization of transboundary basin councils (commissions), joint water management plans, their implementations and monitoring

The Transboundary Waters Programme
of the Swedish Environmental Protection
Agency 1997-2002 – Results and
Conclusions

General conclusions on transboundary water management

Although each basin is unique, the development of transboundary co-operation may be described as different phases:

1. Assessing the national institutional and legal framework, and resources and needs.
2. Developing relevant legal and institutional framework
3. Elaborating a basin management plan
4. Implementing the management plan
5. Compliance monitoring and evaluation.

Water within ERB

Status report and input to the Joint Transnational Development Programme
Ms Carolina Gunnarsson, project leader Seagull Water

Discussions

Water management and transboundary co-operation Important fields for future ERB co-operation Suggestion from water workshop, Gdansk December 2004

- **Drinking water**
- **Eutrophication**
 - Agriculture
 - Education of farmers
 - Small and private WWT
- **Oil pollution**
 - Maritime Safety
- **Hot Spots**
 - Kaliningrad WWT
 - Curonian and Vistula Lagoons
- **River basin based co-operation**
 - Water User Partnerships
- **Competence building activities**
 - Exchange civil servants
 - Water Forum (regional level) as a common platform
- **Monitoring and modelling (under development)**
- **Mobilisation**
 - Academic education
 - Use mass media!
 - Co-operation
 - Schools
 - NGOs
- **Economy, financing**
 - Preparing investments
 - Cost effective operation
 - Recovering of costs
- **Kaliningrad region**
 - Pilot area EU WFD
- **Trends for the future**

Most important: Water quality in general (WFD)
Strategy: Good structure, network co-operation etc, as a
base to reach real results.
Add responsible WFD institutions to the future co-operation

Many concrete suggestions for the JTDP were presented (see above). The workshop decided to highlight three issues.

1. Environmental adapted agriculture

The future development of the agriculture, especially in the new EU countries and Kaliningrad region, is a most strategic question for water and for the Baltic Sea. There is a need of education of farmers and advisers, how to adapt modern and ecological methods for farming, to decrease the eutrophication and avoid destroyed waters.

2. Creation of an ERB Water Forum

There are many different initiatives and ongoing projects concerning water and water management, but no place for exchange of experiences, information and contact between experts, project leaders and decision makers at different levels. The workshop suggests that ERB takes an initiative to an ERB Water Forum, as a way to avoid double work and as a way for the Euroregion to be more effective and co-ordinated.

3. Support to Kaliningrad region

There is also a huge need in supporting Kaliningrad Region in their work for a cleaner water. Kaliningrad Region is our “hot spot” and has huge needs for improvements in environmental infrastructure. This is a common interest for the whole ERB area.

Suggested changes in the draft JTDP:

Page 12:

Since Russia is not a member of the European Union it would be better to also express this strategic goal in terms of “*modern environment and energy policies*” in stead of only referring to the European Union.

Page 13, under Environment:

- *Promotion for development of water management plans for transboundary basins.*

Page 16:

Establishment of river basin water management bodies, *with great extend of public and academic participation*, is necessary in line with....

Carolina Gunnarsson

Workshop 7

Transport infrastructure conditions prevailing in ERB – need for improvement

Moderator: Mr Håkan Brynielsson

Conclusions from the workshop on infrastructure in the JTDP
Gdansk 2004-12-03

The seminar agreed to put forward the following suggestions for considerations

1. The ERB board should – based on a well documented in depth information – start a discussion on how the ERB should deal with and prioritize infrastructure issues in its long term work
2. A well thought through chapter concerning transport infrastructure should be inserted in the JTDP
3. The ERB should be used as an arena for offensive political discussions about infrastructure development
4. The ERB should act as a joint political body towards national governments not least in infrastructural issues – also in contacts with the EU level, the member regions and municipalities.

Lars Öhrman

Workshop 8

Labour market cooperation within ERB: European Employment Strategy

Moderator: Mr Janusz Gałęziak

- After a short presentation of his professional career in the area of social welfare expert defined the goal of the workshop and specified the main questions he would like to tackle:
 1. Can the European Employment strategy be helpful in the Euroregion Baltic co-operation?
 2. Definition of the European Employment Strategy
 3. What do we want to achieve by co-operating within the Euroregion Baltic?
- Regional policy is within the sphere of member states. Member states representatives meet once a year and decide on the main trends and directions. EES translates politicians' decisions into implementation. On this basis MSs have to prepare National Employment Plans. On the basis of those plans the EC prepares the basic document to be discussed at the summit of heads of governments;

EES was launched in 1997 at the Luxemburg summit It is based on four 'pillars':

- employability
 - entrepreneurship
 - adaptability
 - equal opportunities
- and ten guidelines:
- unemployment prevention
 - promoting entrepreneurship
 - adopting to changes on the labour market
 - investments in human resources
 - promotion of workplaces
 - equal rights for women and men
 - preventing discrimination on the labour market
 - ensuring decent pays
 - preventing illegal employment
 - co-operation between regions – convergence difference and discrepancies

On the basis of the guidelines MSs prepare national Employment Plans

How can we define "strategy"? - it is partners being permanently in the process of debating, exchanging know-how, information and then trying to jointly define if they have anything in common and if there is anything they can do together. And so strategy – as a process – covers three stages:

- exchange of experience
- answering the question – why do we need the strategy?
- Evaluation of steps – how effective they have been

And so in the Euroregion Baltic we have to ask the following questions:

- What do we want to achieve through co-operation?
- Can we set clear goals?

For instance: - do we want a common labour market?

- ageing of society – can we do anything together in this respect – e.g employ innovative measures in this respect
- long-term unemployment and exclusion – what solutions, especially for the disabled. (Here we could use very positive Scandinavian experience).
- while talking about the process related to EES and national employment plans it is good to ask a question if they are really “national” – prepared via debate with the society or just decided by some specialists. Has the civil society been involved in their creation. Has there been a dialogue? From what I know the answer is negative maybe with the exception of Sweden.
- Given the above – what can be the valued added of co-operation within the ERB:
- It can help use funds from the EFS;
- It can help translate the ministerial “national” employment plans into truly national – bottom up process

It is extremely important in our deliberations and plans in this area not to forget about Kaliningrad Oblast and the fact that their conditions differ from the rest of the partners. They are not covered by the EES and they cannot use the EFS. But there can be resources for them – e.g NNI. Now it is still Interreg and Tacis.

It is also important, while talking about employment, to open to other sectors – education, culture, etc. They are interrelated.

Presentations of views from the participants followed:

- given the differences between EU members and Kaliningrad it is extremely important to co-ordinate actions within the EFS and NNI, especially in trilateral co-operation – Poland, Lithuania, Kaliningrad.
- It is extremely important to decide what topics we want to deal with.
- In the Euroregion Baltic we have never exchanged information on national employment plans – we should start with that and see if and what they have in common – to define basic joint steps or common interests. We should also get to know national operational programs and compare them. Again the same problem is with EQUAL – which could be another good source of funds. Each country has defined its needs in a different way – again we should compare. So we should get to know all the instruments and see if anything can be co-ordinated. It is the best time now as national employment plans are just now being updated.
- We do not care for plans or strategies. We are about real work. We care to create jobs on the ground – in small municipalities.
- One of the problems is immigration. If we want to allow them to come they should be covered by the same system as the citizens – have the same salaries, insurance, etc. Otherwise in a very short time in all our countries we will have Chinese or Hindus taking all our jobs.
- We need project with companies participating;
- In different countries we have different problems with labour force. In some it is a shortage of labour force – so we have to encourage those from abroad ensuring language and other courses. One of the projects could be about educational courses – preparing people for one labour market – in terms of skills, languages, cultures, etc.
- In the ERB we have to think how to take advantage of the existing well educated labour force. People from regions should identify one topic, concentrate on it and give it a try. We have to focus and see if we can be successful. Such a project should be reinforced by

politicians and society. – It is important to use the potential. Differences and disparities between regions can be seen as a potential for the win-win situations.

- Kaliningrad has great achievements in the field and we should not be forgotten when talking about co-operation. We have recently had a very good conference about migrations. We have also experience in obtaining sponsors. – In co-operation with Kaliningrad we should build on long-term experience in this co-operation and look now for new possibilities – especially how to finance further co-operation.
- Kaliningrad labour market is in a bad shape as there is a big discrepancy between what employee and employer wants. Each of us should first solve our own internal problems and only then look into co-operation. Social partnership are very important – in Kaliningrad we are establishing a social partnership centre on the basis of Polish and German experience. We also have good experience when it comes to arrangement of internships.
- Rural areas are extremely important when talking about employment. We need doers and not talkers and we have to start with learning. For instance language courses. Co-operation is possible only if we can find common values.
- There are shortages in the medical sector when it comes to labour force. The issue is sensitive but needs solving. What is very important is mutual recognition of vocational training. Examples were given by Bornholm (failure) and Kalmar (success in spite of sensitivities). When people on the labour market move they learn from each other and exchange know-how. These are win-win situations.
- It is important to talk about the concept of the common market, but we have to be careful in sectors in which there is enough labour force. Migration should mainly be for specialists.
- What is extremely important is life-long education
- We have to prevent risk of brain-draining in common areas