

ESPON BSR-TeMo

Territorial Monitoring for the Baltic Sea Region

Scientific Platform and Tools Project 2013/3/9

Draft Final Report | Version 30/06/2013

Part C | Scientific Report

Volume C10 | Stakeholder involvement



This report presents the draft final results of a "Scientific Platform and Tools" Project conducted within the framework of the ESPON 2013 Programme, partly financed by the European Regional Development Fund.

The partnership behind the ESPON Programme consists of the EU Commission and the Member States of the EU27, plus Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway and Switzerland. Each partner is represented in the ESPON Monitoring Committee.

This report does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the members of the Monitoring Committee.

Information on the ESPON Programme and projects can be found on www.espon.eu

The web site provides the possibility to download and examine the most recent documents produced by finalised and ongoing ESPON projects.

This basic report exists only in an electronic version.

© ESPON & Nordregio, 2013.

Printing, reproduction or quotation is authorised provided the source is acknowledged and a copy is forwarded to the ESPON Coordination Unit in Luxembourg.

Table of Contents

10.1. Stakeholder activities	1
10.2. Report from workshop with Steering Committee	2
10.3. Q/A to steering committees comments on Interim report	5

10.1. Stakeholder activities

The TPG has maintained a continuous dialogue with the stakeholders, primarily through the hosted workshops and the meetings with the Steering Committee, consisting of VASAB, CBSS, ESPON and DG Regio. Where project advances were discussed. Obviously the stakeholders' comments on Inception and Interim Report has also been appreciated and taken into consideration during the project process.

Steering Committee meetings

1st Steering Committee Meeting, 20 March 2012, Rostock, Germany.

Participation: Lead partner.

2nd Steering Committee Meeting, 20 June 2012, Potsdam, Germany.

Participation: Lead partner.

3rd Steering Committee Meeting, 24 October 2012, St. Petersburg, Russian Federation..

Participation: Lead partner.

4th Steering Committee Meeting, 22 January 2013, Oslo, Norway.

Participation: Lead partner, Partner 2, 4 and 5.

Other stakeholder meetings

Workshop with the Steering Committee

Discussion on indicators, testing/case studies and dissemination activities.

21 June 2012, Potsdam, Germany.

Participation: Lead partner, partner 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7.

Meeting with the Russian Statistical Experts

Determining methodology and sources for Russian and Belarusian data.

17 January 2013, St. Petersburg, Russian Federation.

Participation: Partner 5.

Brainstorming workshop with VASAB members and the ESPON CU

Discussion on future institutionalization of the monitoring system.

29 April 2013, Stockholm, Sweden.

Participation: Partner 1 and 4.

10.2. Report from workshop with Steering Committee



ESPON 2013 Programme

Territorial Monitoring for the Baltic Sea Region ESPON BSR-TeMo

Work Shop with the Steering Committee 21st of June 2012 in Potsdam

Meeting place: Hotel Mercure, Potsdam

Main Outcomes

Visualisation

Decisions:

- NUTS3 is the starting scale for the monitoring system - the finer the better, but NUTS3 is acceptable.
- A range of visualization tools should be used
- Time-series is particularly interesting
- The urban-rural, East-West, and North-South divide is relevant
- No strong interest in other typologies such as island regions and border regions, and functional regions are difficult.

Concrete opinions on the types of map:

Flow maps are interesting, for instance on migration, and cohesion and integration.

Choropleth maps are probably the basic visualization but they have problems in that the large regions look to have problems but very few people live there

Point maps give a better picture.

Overview connection maps are also important to show infrastructure, pipelines etc.

Chart maps are sometimes difficult – so be careful here.

Plot diagrams with two dimensions are good

10.2. Report from workshop with Steering Committee

Indicators:

Decisions:

- The outlined policy approach was agreed upon
- NUTS3 is the desired level; but NUTS2 or national indicator can be necessary where regional indicators are not available.
- The Northern Dimension policy document and the new transnational programme are important to include in the determination of the policy domains
- Important to keep the territorial dimension
- Other organisations efforts (such as Helcom) should not be duplicated

Main points/outcome/ideas of group work on the suggested domains:

Particular sectoral policies are not the prime objective, selection of indicators should be well balanced.

Be specific on the territorial capital

Environment: from a planning perspective wind power is important and perhaps also some emission indicators.

Functional areas could be shifted to territorial governance.

Accessibility/quality of life should be split into two domains. Quality of life is of growing political interest.

Services should be taken into account as a perspective in quality of life.

Accessibility is an important domain - with a specific BSR profile.

Innovation: It was stressed that innovation is often measured by education, investment in RD but this does not necessarily led to innovation. Be aware of the ESPON Kit project in this regard. Cluster is a tricky theme to handle and maybe we should talk about nodes or agglomeration.

General: benchmarking is important. Perhaps also in a global context, particularly innovation.

Balancing territorial development is important. Four subdomains were identified: demography (including age structure, migration), economy (innovation), accessibility (transport, social, ICT) and services, and city network and relations.

E-connections and ICT are of particular importance in rural areas.

It could be interesting to measure the relation btw. potentials of cities/regions and the ability to utilize these potentials.

Territorial Governance: perhaps not a key domain but rather a subdomain.

The groups' input on the full range of domains:

- Functional areas should not be a domain. Functional areas are a tricky concept - what are functional areas defined by?
- Perhaps culture should also be included, culture as an asset; trust, rich cultural identity.
- Urban-rural relations are another wish.
- Polycentric is a tricky theme and at which scale.

10.2. Report from workshop with Steering Committee

Testing/case studies:

Decisions:

- Including Russia and/or Belarus in the cases is important to show that the system works for the whole BSR.
- Benchmarking against other macro-regions such as Danube is not a main priority.
- Although the aim is not to provide analytical results but rather to test the system, a content-filled benchmarking case would be preferred.

Concrete suggestions for the case studies:

- Benchmarking: the North Sea, another macro-region, Alpine Space
 - Thematic tests: Migration, Accessibility, Flows – something not too traditional
 - Specific locations: A border region including Russia and/or Belarus (based on one cross-border-cooperation-programme region or more). TPG makes investigation into what is suitable for this. Rural areas are also of great interest.
 - Cross-cutting issues: Rapid development, Rural areas' potential for performing, Growth of secondary cities vs. mono-centric development, Territorial cohesion (a cross-cutting theme in itself)
-

Dissemination:

Decisions:

- The handbook should be translated into Russian
- The final seminar should not be held in Russia or Belarus.
- Fine with two publications: a technical user manual – perhaps as part of the final report – and a more user-oriented publication. Both only available online.

Other ideas for dissemination:

- The VASAB web site for online dissemination
 - Presentation on the Russian annual event held in October.
 - Presentation on the BSR strategic forum.
 - The final seminar could be co-hosted by VASAB – perhaps in Lithuania when they have the presidency and will have the December-ESPON seminar anyway.
 - Distribution of the final report via the national/ministerial web pages
-

Towards the next VASAB meeting:

If possible, VASAB will receive a status on the domains before the October meeting.

At the next meeting, VASAB has to discuss the calendar in relation to the new chairmanship. Here they will decide whether to have the final TeMo event separately of the ESPON seminar or in connection with another VASAB event.

VASAB will decide whether there should be a separate meeting to discuss TeMo in St. Petersburg or if the discussion will be taken during the regular VASAB meeting. They will also come back on the presentation in Russia on the 23rd of October.

“Questions and Answers”

Our summary of VASAB
representatives comments on
the Interim Report

With TPG replies

1

- East-West, North-South and Urban-Rural divide has not been sufficiently highlighted. Identification of relevant indicators to measure these structures and trends are definitely needed.

1

- We see this not as an issue of the indicators in the monitoring system as such, but as a selection of methods or techniques that allow for identifying such divides. Each of the presently included indicators can be analysed in this manner.
- Test case 4 in particular will address this issue and demonstrate the usability of such analytic techniques on the indicators of the system.
- The divides could be implemented conceptually similar to regional typologies, i.e. each region will be attributed as east or west, north or south, urban or rural, and performance of each indicator for each of these sub-types can then be analysed.
- Our indicators are conventional but this is their strength. They will show whether the given divide is diminishing or becoming stronger.

2

- Clarify the distinction between functional areas and regional typologies, and how regional typologies will be used in the analysis and/or benchmarking.

2

- Maybe here we first need to better explain the indicator definition (i.e. the number of catchment areas of main and secondary towns overlapping in each municipality), so we will have an indicator at LAU level. The higher the number of overlaps is, the greater opportunities for residents are to go to different cities or towns for shopping or for other activities. So, functional areas in our sense is not an typology but an indicator.
- Concerning typologies: first, we use existing ESPON typologies. According to these typologies, each NUTS-2/3 region is attributed a specific region type, and performance of indicators will then be analysed for groups of regions of the same type compared to groups of regions of all other types.
- Besides the Espon typologies may be there will be a wish for more specific BSR typologies, however the basic principle is again that each typology can be defined by it's performance according to specific indicators.
- Functional regions are functional according to a specific "functionality" , e.g. commuting (a city with its commuters catchment area). But the term is also use in extended understandings e.g. coastal areas. Here the functionality is more fluffy (maritime activities, tourism, protection etc.)
- There are two approaches to functional areas. One approach is to see functional areas as integrated areas beyond administrative borders. Few of our indicators (i.e. those on governance, population mobility) can do this. We can add some new indicators on a wish list i.e. on FDI at regional level. However such indicators of flows are basically non existing. The solution can be in qualitative indicators like in BDF reports but this is costly exercise. Another type of functional areas are based on typical dominating function i.e. rural areas, coastal zone etc and our system is able to make insight into their functioning in comparison to the chosen by VASAB benchmarks.

3

- The regional level should be even further emphasised and when possible we should move below NUTS 3.

3

- The feasibility of the update/maintenance of the forthcoming system requires that a large majority of the data can be collected from central sources rather than separately for 11 countries or parts thereof. Such sources, e.g. Eurostat or the OECD, do not generally operate below the NUTS 3 level.
- In addition, even when contacting national statistical offices, most data / indicators are not available below NUTS 3 level, and if so, we run into severe problems of data harmonization / data definition / reference year etc. This would make the maintenance of the system almost impossible, and would increase data acquisition costs significantly.
- Perhaps we can discuss deepening of the system for some spatial aspects chosen by VASAB i.e. for large cities. But here we will have problems of functional borders.

4

- There is still a mixture of indicators and themes in the list of indicators. Some “indicators” are not clear with regard to what is measured. Also, a distinction is needed between structure and development indicators.

4

- Yes, agreed. For some indicators a clear definition still needs to be provided.
- As a basic concept, our understanding is that we see all indicators as development indicators, i.e. in the sense that we strive to collect time series data for all indicators. However, we are aware that at the moment for some indicators only data for one point in time can be collected.

5

- Growth dynamics should be taken into consideration; e.g. *change* in GDP and employed persons.

5

- The indicators in the proposed system in most cases allow for both structural and dynamic analysis. The only issue is availability of data in time. This is also reason while we have chosen so called “conventional” indicators i.e. those used by many entities for ages. If we come up with some new specific indicators measuring dynamism can be difficult. The risk is in proposing “one time indicators”. But of course if such a new indicator will become popular the measurement of dynamics will be possible in future.

6

- Territorial cooperation and Governance: clearly number of INTERREG projects is not a sufficient (or even good?) indicator. What can be done?

6

- We can easily add 7th Framework projects (Horizon) We have looked into the TANGO project already when we started to define the indicators – and we have talked to the TPG of that project once again now. Although indicators defined and tested through a Delphi method are interesting and relevant they are not feasible to collect and include in this type of indicator based monitoring system. They are at the experimental stage and many of them will be qualitative and “one time indicators” if ever collected. We should however consider if we should even include the INTERREG indicators at all if we cannot make a suitable case about that they indicate some correlation with the more general topic of territorial cooperation or governance capability.
- We can also take some indicators on twin cities from the Euroreg project TERCO under ESPON but here is the same risk of one-time indicators. So we have to discuss whether on top of monitoring system we should deliver to VASAB such one time static pictures of BSR based on those projects.
- Another option can be use of indicator of flows of e-mails between computers. But the question is whether VASAB will have money to pay for computing such indicators in the future. They are not available in public domain.

7

- Access to train stations is not relevant in some areas where busses are more important: is it possible to augment with access to buses?

7

- Sure. But: our indicator reads precisely access to intercity train stations, so the idea being to get an idea about access to high-level train services, rather than every single train station.

8

- Territorial functionality might include also the aspect of population mobility, as well as the definition of urban-rural typologies to follow up on trends in this.

8

- Our indicator on ‘functional areas’ tries to pick up these aspects (see comment on point 2): the higher the number of overlaps in each municipality, the greater is the freedom of choice for residents to go to one or the other city centre. In this sense, the higher the number of overlaps, the higher are opportunities for personal mobility.
- At the same time, the indicator on ‘functional areas’ also highlights urban areas or agglomerations with high opportunities, opposed to rural or peripheral areas with low opportunities.

9

- Explain the browsing tool more – how does it relate to the ESPON Hyper Atlas?

9

- Of course, since we already started developing the browsing tool, there is not yet a final description of it available. The browsing tool will be developed over the next weeks/months.
- There is NO relation to the Hyper Atlas. The browsing tool is intended just as an easy-to-use tool to browse through and to illustrate the indicators, along with the metadata, in particular for those people/institutions who do not own GIS systems. It is not intended to replicate HyperAtlas, nor to GENERATE or CALCULATE indicators.
- The detailed functionalities of the browsing tool will be developed in the next project phase.

10

- The TPG should collaborate more with national statistical offices to go beyond the standard ESPON approach to collect data. Should also compare and assess the differences between Eurostat data and Russian statistics. Is it possible to work with census data; e.g .on material deprivation?

10

- While such cooperation is fully possible, it would in practice render the future update/maintenance of the forthcoming system unfeasible.

11

- a) Is the revised BSR strategy taken into account?
- b) Can we make the first chapter less detailed?
- c) Explain the indicator GVA/branch.
- d) Think again critically about using GERD as an indicator!
- e) Gender imbalances and territorial functionality: we should explain how we think about this.
- f) Reconsider the headline indicator for innovative territories domain.
- g) Test case 4: Consider the difference of convergence and cohesion.
- h) Think about the difference between an appropriate system and a feasible system: can we address the question by showing an appropriate system by means of case study or limited geographical area?

11

- a) yes at the stage at its development in September 2012. We can come back to cross-checking the new stage of strategy with our system next year.
- b) yes no problem we can shorten but for what? If the VASAB wants to use report for its own purposes lets indicate to us what part is important for CSPD and we delete the rest.
- c) Gross Value Added or GVA is a similar concept as GDP, but has the added value that it can be broken down on specific branches (primary production, manufacturing, etc). GVA differs from GDP only so, that GVA contains also subsidies on products but not (as does GDP) taxes on products. GVA specifically at basic prices (as is the case here) is the best suited and most commonly used indicator of an individual producer's, industry's or sector's contribution to the overall economy.
- d) Gross Expenditure on Research and Development or GERD is one of the principal input indicators used for monitoring the knowledge economy. While it as an indicator has many disadvantages (such as the often missing link between input and output/capitalisation) it nonetheless is included as a headline indicator in the EU 2020 strategy and as such cannot be overseen.
- f) We could statistically try to identify the most overarching of the proposed four indicators in the domain in order to assess which of them exerts the strongest influence on the remaining three.
- g) The two concepts of convergence and cohesion are interlinked, but not synonymous. There are numerous differing interpretations of them, but in the context of this project, the TPG considers cohesion as a *status* where existing disparities (between in our case different spatial entities) have been eroded. Convergence in turn would thus constitute the *dynamic process* toward this goal of cohesion, just as divergence would constitute a process in the opposite direction. In both cases, it is a matter of which particular analytic technique is utilised for statistically capturing the concepts, rather than which indicators are analysed with that particular technique.

12

- Is it possible to include “regional GHG emissions” and “soil sealing related to change in population” in the environmental domain?

12

- The precise definition of the indicator 'soil sealing' already is 'soil sealing per inhabitant in sqm through land take'.

13

- Is it possible to include a measure of “ability to absorb skilled foreign labour” in the domain on innovative territories?

13

- What is meant by ‘absorbing skilled foreign labour’?

14

- Look into the ESPON KITCASP project.

14

- The project “Key Indicators for Territorial Cohesion and Spatial Planning” was started in the same time as TeMo. So far only interim report is available. Sure we could organise some meeting with TPG but we would be even more happy for some hints from VASAB representatives about good practices from this Project according to CSPD members.

15

- Explain the idea of having all indicators on the same level and promoting the use of “headline” indicators instead (of having two modules of simple and complex indicators).

15

- The differentiation between simple and complex indicators relates to the project terms, where a simple and advanced module was asked for.
- Apart from this, 'simple' indicators might be understood as those indicators which can easily be collected from Eurostat or other statistical offices, compared to 'complex' indicators which involve certain modelling or calculation methods (like the indicators on accessibility potential), which thus are not easily available in statistics.
- A third aspect is the aspect of 'importance': Sure, we could label the most important indicators (whether they are simple to gather or complex to calculate) as 'headline' indicators.

16

- Discuss and clarify more the possibilities for institutional structure and maintenance of the indicators, visualisation, etc. after the life of the project. Also, discuss alternatives for the “size” of such a set up (cost).

www.espon.eu

The ESPON 2013 Programme is part-financed by the European Regional Development Fund, the EU Member States and the Partner States Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway and Switzerland. It shall support policy development in relation to the aim of territorial cohesion and a harmonious development of the European territory.

ISBN