

THE IMPACT OF EUROPEAN TERRITORIAL COOPERATION AND TRANS-EUROPEAN TRANSPORT NETWORK POLICIES ON CROSS-BORDER TRANSPORT

Beate Caesar

University of Kaiserslautern, beatecaesar@ru.uni-kl.de

Keywords: Coordination of EU-policy sectors, Trans-European Transport Networks, European Territorial Cooperation

Although ambitious goals have been formulated and efforts have been made to contribute to a good inner European transport system, the effects of the borders are still observable: bottlenecks and inefficient cross-linked transport at borders are the hard facts within large parts of the EU. Cross-border transport is supported by two major EU policy sectors: Cohesion Policy and Transport Policy. Both programmes have been running in parallel, often without interlinkages. In the new funding period there are attempts to link these two EU policy fields in a better way and to avoid duplications (European Parliament and Council of the European Union 2013c). This is a challenging aim because the two policy fields have always had contradicting interests (Robert et al. 2001).

Within this paper the contents and aims of EU policies are analysed by means of a document analysis as conducted in policy analyses (Jann and Wegrich 2003). Policies that address cross-border transport within the frame of the Trans-European Transport Networks (TEN-T) or European Territorial Cooperation (ETC) of the last (2007-2013) and current funding period (2014-2020) are taken into account with the purpose of analysing their aims and coordination. On that basis, the contribution of the ETC-policy to the establishment of the European transport network is evaluated. The paper concludes with recommendations on how the European cross-border transport can be improved by a further alignment of the two policy fields.

1. Introduction

EU policies show a high variety in terms of execution measures, evolution and spatial relevance. Intervention measures can be legal regulations and treaties, softer development guidelines, as well as financial incentives. The Trans-European Transport Networks are an example of guidelines and show a long-time perspective. EU policies have different spatial demarcations and impacts. The Cohesion Policy demarcates broader areas eligible for funding. The Transport Policy is focused on the improvement of certain infrastructures and has a direct spatial relevance with a linear or punctual concentration in the case of the TEN-T (Robert et al. 2001).

The establishment of a common European transport system is partly funded by the European Transport Policy (currently the Connecting Europe Facility), but also supported by other funds like the Structural Funds and the Cohesion Fund as well as the European Investment Fund, the European Investment Bank and the Horizon 2020 Programme (former Research Framework Programme) (Robert et al. 2001). This raises the question if the investment in Europe's transport infrastructure is conducted systematically and expedient or if no coordination exists.

In the following, challenges and potentials that occurred in the coordination of Cohesion and Transport Policy are presented first. Then the results of a document analysis on TEN-T policies and European Territorial Cooperation and their aims concerning cross-border transport are illustrated. In the conclusion, the contribution of the European Territorial Cooperation to the completion of the European transport network is evaluated and recommendations for the further support of cross-border transport through the additional alignment of the two EU policies are given.

2. Challenges and potentials of coordinating EU policy sectors and their related funding programmes in European cross-border transport

The Directorate Generals (DGs) of the different EU policy fields at the European Commission are responsible for the coordination of the European policies. These policies should be coherent and follow the defined aims and priorities of its president (Robert et al. 2001). Challenges and potentials of a coordination of cohesion policy and transport policy are discussed in the following based on a literature review.

2.1 Cohesion Policy

The EU and the Member States have a shared competence on Cohesion Policy (Mairate and Hall 2001). With the accession of more and more countries to the EU, the disparities between the Member States have been growing. In the Treaty of Rome a balanced development for the European territory has been anchored as a goal. Moreover less favoured regions are to be supported (Dunford et al. 2001). After the introduction of the European Single Market the competitiveness between the European regions has grown. Globalisation contributed additionally to an increased competition. The Cohesion Policy shall foster a balanced sustainable development of the EU territory and therefore has a spatial dimension (Peters 2003). The European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), introduced in 1975, was then the most important fund to support this aim (Dunford et al. 2001).

Cohesion Policy is a territorial and not a sectoral policy. Its aim is to support the development of the EU territory. In this context Cohesion Policy has several connections with other EU policy fields like environment and transport. It tries to make use of synergy effects by supporting the sectoral policies with its funds. However, this ambition has not always proven to be successful. In the past the programme was criticized as inflexible and highly bureaucratic. Furthermore, it was difficult to reach consensus for common aims among the different DGs of the European Commission and among the different administrative levels involved. Additionally, the contribution to its own aim of territorial balancing was questioned when donating its funds to the sectoral policies without taking into account less favoured regions (Robert et al. 2001).

This shows that the aims of the Cohesion Policy have not been easy to reach: The idea of a balanced development has been in conflict with the fostering European competitiveness. As the Cohesion Policy is a territorial policy, it influences the sectoral EU policies.

2.2 Transport Policy

Although Transport Policy is a sectoral European policy and mainly focuses on the European transport development, it has a strong impact on the European territory. It is therefore tied to the European Cohesion Policy. The Cohesion Policy Funds ERDF and Cohesion Fund are spent to support both policies. They contribute so much to the Transport Policy that the policy is dependent on this financial support while following its own policy aims (Robert et al. 2001).

Transport is directly connected to the economy but also to the quality of life. Without a good access to transport infrastructure and services the economic production would be strongly hampered and the quality of life would be reduced. To provide a good transport system, a physical infrastructure and its operation, long-term investments have to be made, coordinated, planned and regulated. This was traditionally done by the national levels of the Member States without taking into account neighbouring countries. Therefore at the beginning of the European Union the infrastructures across national borders were in a poor state. To reach the aim of non-discrimination and competitiveness on a European scale, the establishment of a common European Transport Policy was decided by the EU Member States in 1957. Disadvantaged regions should be supported in their transport development to contribute to the minimization of disparities within the EU. However, the influence of the European

Transport Policy turned out to be very low in the beginning. The establishment of the Internal Market was a new impetus to the common Transport Policy. In 1992 an integrated European transport system became an item of the political agenda together with the aim of European social and economic Cohesion. In political practice, however, it was criticized that European Cohesion was not treated as a main focus and goal of European Transport Policy: It was taken into account rather marginally and not often implemented into practice (McGowan 2001).

To calculate the impact of the Transport Policy to European Cohesion is hard. The contribution of the Trans-European Network investments to European Cohesion is measured by the change in accessibility. This evaluation method, however, shows several shortcomings: Although the accessibility might have grown in urban agglomerations, the effect is much lower for rural regions far away from the network. Furthermore, a region covered by a TEN-T does not necessarily benefit from being close to the network if it does not have an access point. Having no access point can mean being less attractive (Economic and Social Committee of the European Communities 1995; McGowan 2001).

The historical development of European Transport Policy shows that there have been several attempts to coordinate Transport Policy and Cohesion Policy. However, it has proved to be a challenge in practice.

2.3 Coordination of the two policy fields

In scientific literature the existence of different, contradicting development aims at EU level is criticized: These might lead to conflicts in the implementation of policies. An example of the discrepancy of EU aims is the funding of Trans-European Network priority projects on the one hand and the aims of Cohesion Policy on the other hand. The funding of priority projects focuses on the most important transport links in the EU core and invests in their further upgrading. Cohesion Policy, on the contrary, wants to reach a balanced European development and supports disadvantaged regions outside the EU core (Peters 2003). It is proposed to minimize the strong concentration effects of the TEN-T by supporting several smaller transport projects (Robert et al. 2001) and to establish a broad spatial investment strategy for the TEN-T. The latter especially focuses on the connection to secondary networks and making use of all benefits (European Commission 1996).

There are further points of criticism: If EU funds were spent on cross-border transport sections they often supported already well developed border regions and not geographically disadvantaged regions lagging behind (Assembly of European Regions 1995; Robert et al. 2001). Therefore it is proposed to develop secondary networks that ensure the access of all European citizens to the transport network. Investments in these areas should be prioritized to secure their realization. Although the TEN-T guidelines aimed to establish good connections between core and secondary transport networks, the funds did not focus on the implementation of this goal but on sectoral issues and the core network instead. The Cohesion Policy and its funds - in contrast - have a stronger integration focus and aim at supporting the secondary networks. Therefore it would be an opportunity to establish a better linkage between EU Transport Policy and spatial planning (Robert et al. 2001).

Most important in terms of legislation for the European Transport Development is the European Transport Policy. In the funding of infrastructure investments, however, also the Cohesion Policy with its Structural Funds is decisive together with EIB and EIF support. The different funds apply different territorial assignments. The Transport Policy supports the linear and nodal investment of transport axes and Cohesion Policy distributes its funds on NUTS level (Robert et al. 2001). This might lead to contradictions and complicate a policy coordination. At the same time this can be seen as a chance to coordinate the funds and contribute to a balanced spatial impact of transport investments.

Consequently, the two policy fields European Cohesion Policy and European Transport Policy are strongly interrelated. However, they do not exclusively follow the same aims and often contradict each

other. As both are very important for the territorial and economic development of the EU, the policies should be coordinated to contribute to a sustainable European development.

3. Aims of EU policies on cross-border transport between 2007 - 2013 and 2014 - 2020

In this chapter EU policy documents that address cross-border transport within the frame of the Trans-European Transport Network (TEN-T) or European Territorial Cooperation (ETC) within the current and last funding period are analysed with the purpose of comparing the development of their aims and of detecting possible cross-references.

3.1 Funding period 2007-2013

In the funding period 2007-2013 the **ETC Policy** regards a good transport infrastructure to be of high importance for European Cohesion as it is said to contribute to a higher attractiveness of the European regions and to economic growth. As the support of the Cohesion Policy is dedicated to cross-border and transnational regions, cross-border TEN-T projects should be supported. Reasons for a support of cross-border transport projects are diverse. First, it is considered to support the integration of the domestic markets of the Member States and the European identity. Second, Cohesion Policy is needed to manage the cooperation to achieve a solution to a common challenge because cross-border transport projects concern several Member States. Therefore an integrated approach is needed. Third, a good cross-border infrastructure is seen as prerequisite for cross-border cooperation and is expected to develop an added value for cooperations. In the transnational cooperation the zoning of the cooperation areas has been amended. It is to take into account functional spaces within the EU based on commonalities like the crossing of a common area by a transport corridor. This shall enable the transnational space to react jointly on possible challenges and opportunities. Commonly conducted transport projects in the transnational cooperation are expected to contribute to the cross-linkage of European regions. Especially highlighted is the establishment of European transport corridors. ETC projects should be used to support TEN-T projects and transport connections of strategic importance under the premise that they contribute to economic growth and competitiveness (Council of the European Union 2006)

The ERDF shall support ETC projects that lead to a higher accessibility. This can be reached by establishing links to the TEN-T and improved transport services. Transnational projects can also support TEN-T cross-border sections and secondary networks. With these projects the sustainable development of the EU territory shall be guaranteed (European Parliament and Council of the European Union 2006).

The **European TEN-T Policy** between 2007 and 2013 also accredits a high importance to cross-border transport. Cross-border projects are considered to be less profitable and cost-effective but of high European added value. Therefore they should be financially supported. Border regions often contained bottlenecks because the national systems still had a nationally centred view in 2001. Cross-border infrastructure planning and a common approach for the concept, financing and evaluation was missing (European Commission 2001).

The 'White Paper on European Transport Policy for 2010' focuses on some more technical problems of cross-border infrastructures like operating problems. Transport infrastructures that link the EU to its accession countries are of highest priority and should get the highest financial support (European Commission 2001).

The TEN-T guidelines from 2004 contain many references to cross-border sections and ascribe them also a high importance. The aim followed by the TEN-T guidelines is the completion of the Single Market, especially in the light of the European enlargement in 2004. The Member States are called to define important border crossings in their countries. One of the priorities of the TEN-T is

the completion of the TEN-T by establishing missing links and removing bottlenecks especially in the cross-border sections of the most important routes (European Parliament and Council of the European Union 2004).

Furthermore, the policy documents contain several measures to facilitate the implementation process of cross-border transport projects. First, they should benefit from a speeded-up strategic environmental impact assessment procedure. Second, European Coordinators shall simplify and coordinate the infrastructure implementation. The defined TEN-T priority projects shall contribute to the implementation of the main transport corridors and concentrate their support on border crossings (European Parliament and Council of the European Union 2004).

Concerning cross-border transport not many changes were introduced to the amended TEN-T guidelines from 2010. It was still considered as an important priority. One novelty was the idea to employ the European Coordinators also in whole transport corridors (European Parliament and Council of the European Union 2010a).

Also the aim to enlarge European competitiveness is a reason for the support of the TEN-T and cross-border transport projects. Because of missing connections between some Member States, not all countries are said to be able to benefit from the internal market. This is expected to be negative for economic growth. Therefore especially cross-border linkages need to be improved. This is also a reason why the EU dedicates a higher funding rate to cross-border sections (European Parliament and Council of the European Union 2007).

The TEN-T policy concentrates its scarce funds on priority areas that ensure a European added value. Border-section projects should be given special attention and support. Especially, joint projects by several Member States shall be funded that aim to complete cross-border sections. To ensure the implementation of a cross-border project, the involved Member States should sign a declaration on the completion of the missing link (European Parliament and Council of the European Union 2007). The amended rules on Community Aid for the TEN-T from 2010 contain fewer references to cross-border transport. Still the cross-border projects are eligible for funding and shall receive more funds when being part of a priority project defined in 1996. These projects shall contribute to the completion of the internal market in the EU-27. To be eligible for funding, cross-border projects should contain a schedule of implementation for its sub-projects (European Parliament and Council of the European Union 2010b).

Both funding programmes related to the two policy fields attribute a high priority to cross-border projects. The TEN-T documents show a stronger technical focus and a higher grade of detail than the Cohesion Policy documents and define the funding prerequisites for cross-border transport projects more clearly. A direct reference to the TEN-T also exists in the ETC documents. Even the ERDF can support parts of TEN-T projects and is not solely dedicated to the establishment of secondary networks. This illustrates an overlap of both policy fields. Inverse, there is no funding of the ETC transport projects by the TEN-T fund. The funds of the TEN-T policy, however, are strongly enriched by the ERDF¹.

Comparing the general aims connected with the support of European cross-border transport (Table 1), both, the policy documents related to Cohesion Policy and Transport Policy, show references to the economic development as an increased competitiveness of the EU, a contribution to the completion of the Single European Market and an improvement of the accessibility and interconnectedness of the European Member States and regions. The Cohesion Policy, however, also refers to rather soft factors like the contribution to the European identity by improving European mobility as well as to the European sustainable development of its territory. The comparison shows that the general aims connected with the support of cross-border transport do not contradict each other on the level of EU policy formulation. After the implementation of these

¹ In eligible countries the Cohesion Fund also plays a major role in addition to the ERDF.

policies in the respective corridor- and cooperation area-programmes, however, differences in the interpretation may occur.

Table 1. Comparison of aims of the support of cross-border transport (2007-2013)

ETC Policy (Cohesion)	TEN-T Policy (Transport)
Increased attractiveness of the regions	Competitiveness
Economic growth	
Completion of the Single Market	Completion of the Single Market
Cohesion by accessibility and interconnectedness	Completion of the TEN-T
European identity	-
Territorial sustainable development	-

The TEN-T-policy focuses on the implementation of the TEN-T axes and priority projects, defined in 1996. ETC support can be dedicated to TEN-T axes as well. At the same time cross-border projects in secondary networks can be funded if they have a European added value. Transnational cooperation focuses on the development of transport corridors. Cross-border cooperation usually supports smaller (sub-) projects in border regions.

3.2 Funding period 2014-2020

The policy documents for the new funding period changed especially in their organisation. This is connected with the introduction of the Europe 2020 Strategy that strongly concentrates on certain goals to be reached until 2020. Therefore it defines a stronger focus on certain priority sectors on which all EU policies should be aligned to achieve better results. Additionally, it contains a stronger evaluation component. Output indicators are defined to monitor the results of the financed actions as a measure for a better implementation (European Commission 2014a). This thematic concentration is strongly mirrored in the ETC- and TEN-T policy documents.

The **ETC policy documents** intend to reach a concentration on certain priority areas. This shall lead to more perceivable results. The ETC programmes on cross-border and transnational cooperation can choose freely out of 11 priorities but they can only choose 4 at the most. At least 80% of the funding has to be concentrated on these four.² The removal of bottlenecks and sustainable transport in key transport infrastructures is one of the ETC aims that can be chosen (European Parliament and Council of the European Union 2013c; European Parliament and Council of the European Union 2013a). The amount of support of cross-border transport through the ETC depends on the decision of the Member States and cooperation areas. However, in general it is still possible to spend money on the improvement of cross-border transport.

² Under the 'Investment for growth and jobs'-goal of European Cohesion Policy, the ERDF should be spent mainly on 4 priorities. Here, support in cross-border transport infrastructure is less important (European Parliament and Council of the European Union 2013b, art.4).

Another novelty of the new funding period is the introduction of output indicators in the ETC policy documents: the number of constructed or upgraded infrastructure kilometres is to be calculated (European Parliament and Council of the European Union 2013a).

A further innovation to ensure the maturity and implementation of projects is the definition of ex-ante conditionalities. These need to be fulfilled by projects in order to be funded. In the case of transport projects the Member States need to develop a comprehensive plan on transport investments beforehand. This plan needs to contain plans at all administrative levels and take into account all transport modes. It needs to be in line with the respective environmental assessment provisions and should aim at fostering the Member State's infrastructure development and at improving the access to the comprehensive and core TEN-T network. The plan needs to contribute to the establishment of the Single European Transport Area and detail the planned investments in the TEN-T network, secondary networks and other projects. The envisaged projects should be mature and viable (European Parliament and Council of the European Union 2013c).

The ETC programmes should contribute to the achievement of the Europe 2020 Strategy goals and Cohesion. As before, the existing cross-border infrastructure should be described to determine missing links (European Parliament and Council of the European Union 2013a; European Parliament and Council of the European Union 2013c) and contribute to a “sustainable cross-border mobility” (European Parliament and Council of the European Union 2013a, preamble 17).

Beyond all the novelties, the ERDF provisions emphasize the fund's still remaining basic goal to contribute to a balanced territorial development of the EU by supporting territorially disadvantaged regions (European Parliament and Council of the European Union 2013b; European Parliament and Council of the European Union 2013a).

The tasks for ETC projects differ: The ERDF should especially contribute to the development of secondary and tertiary networks and their linkage to the core network (European Parliament and Council of the European Union 2013a). At the same time it is communicated that the Cohesion and Transport policy should be coordinated to ensure the joint implementation of the most important transport projects of European added value, i.e. the TEN-T priority projects. Furthermore, ETC projects should take on the task to facilitate a common and coherent planning and development process of transport infrastructure for a broader border region or a transnational region (European Parliament and Council of the European Union 2013c). Transport projects which are based on a high demand and contain cross-border sections should be supported preferentially. Missing connections and bottlenecks between Member States and regions shall be detected and improved (European Parliament and Council of the European Union 2013c).

One important demarcation of the aims of ERDF-funded ETC projects is the focus on the territorial support of the European regions (European Parliament and Council of the European Union 2013c).

The ETC policy documents contain more references to the TEN-T policies and funds than before. First, the Common Provisions cross-reference to the Connecting Europe Facility (CEF), which is the new financing instrument of the Transport Policy. The ESIF regulations should be coordinated with the CEF regulations to enlarge the European added value of transport projects. The aim of this coordination is a joint contribution of the funds to the establishment of the European transport network, i.e. a linkage of secondary or tertiary networks to the core network and to ensure the accessibility on all levels. Second, it is stated that the ERDF should respect the TEN-T guidelines. Therefore transnational ETC transport projects should be aligned to existing plans of the respective Core Network Corridors. The same is true for ETC support in macro-regional transport projects (European Parliament and Council of the European Union 2013c).

Compared to the last funding period, the ETC policy documents show some new elements. First, the policy documents contain calls for policy coordination with the TEN-T policies. This is a novelty because it concerns policy documents and not only the coordination of its funds as before. Second, the ETC documents contain strong references to the establishment of the TEN-T: The

network shall be supported. Third, the ETC documents contain more concrete descriptions on the possible design of transport projects. Fourth, output indicators have been defined to measure the impact of transport projects.

The policy documents contain some contradictions. The ERDF is supposed to contribute to a balanced development and support the accessibility of all regions and therefore aims at linking tertiary and secondary networks to the core network of the TEN-T. In the coordination with the CEF and TEN-T policy, however, the ERDF should be focused on the most important infrastructure routes. This implies a clear prioritisation of core areas which contradicts the balanced development of the EU.

The TEN-T policy documents also refer to the Europe 2020 Strategy. The strategy's aims are to be supported by the Connecting Europe Facility. The TEN-T are still supposed to support transport across national borders and therewith contribute to Cohesion (European Parliament and Council of the European Union 2013e).

The TEN-T guidelines from 2013 introduce a new two-layer structure: a Core Network and a Comprehensive Network. The Core Network should focus on projects with a high European added value that concentrate on cross-border sections, bottlenecks and missing links. These projects should contribute to the reduction of CO₂ emissions. The Core Network consists of connected nodes and contains the most important cross-border nodes - also at the EU's external borders³. Therefore cross-border connections are of high importance for the Core Network. Also the Comprehensive Network prioritizes the connection of transport axes through the removal of bottlenecks especially in border sections (European Parliament and Council of the European Union 2013d). Despite the division in these two layers, both contain border crossings that shall be supported.

The European Transport Corridors, being part of the Core Network, shall foster the implementation of the core. They should put an emphasis on transport interconnections across borders by eliminating bottlenecks and establishing missing-links. This shall contribute to a higher efficiency and sustainability as well as to European Cohesion by fostering territorial cooperation (European Parliament and Council of the European Union 2013d). This is especially important as most difficulties in the implementation of transport projects have been experienced in cross-border transport sections (European Commission 2014b). European Corridor Coordinators have been appointed to support the corridor development. They shall especially search for funding opportunities for cross-border transport projects and support their implementation within the corridor. Working groups can be set up for each transport corridor and facilitate the implementation of cross-border projects (European Parliament and Council of the European Union 2013d).

'Cross-border sections', in the understanding of the TEN-T, contain the space between the closest urban nodes at two sides of a border. All cross-border sections are said to be of common European interest because a good transport connection secures the continuity of European transport routes. Although these projects might have lower direct economic effects for the individual Member States, they need to be prioritized because of their European added value (European Parliament and Council of the European Union 2013d).

The TEN-T policy documents of 2014-2020 encourage the use of other funding programmes like the ERDF. The coordination of funds is said to contribute to the achievement of common goals like the implementation of cross-border projects (European Parliament and Council of the European Union 2013d; European Parliament and Council of the European Union 2013e; European Commission 2014b). Transport projects in cross-border sections get a higher financial assistance than other projects. Even road infrastructure can be funded in cross-border sections. 80% of the

³ The TEN-T guidelines from 2013 define the cross-border nodes to the external borders in Annex II 3.

funds, available from CEF and Cohesion Fund,⁴ are dedicated to the removal of bottlenecks, rail interoperability, establishment of missing-links and support cross-border connections (European Parliament and Council of the European Union 2013e).

Also the CEF defines output indicators to measure the outcome of cross-border transport projects: The number of improved cross-border sections and bottlenecks as well as the amount of kilometres of improved infrastructure need to be calculated (European Parliament and Council of the European Union 2013e).

In the current funding period the TEN-T policies introduced some new elements like the dual layer structure of the TEN-T and the definition of European Core Network Corridors. As in the ETC policies, reference to the Europe 2020 Strategy is made and output indicators have been defined. Furthermore, it is recommended to coordinate the TEN-T funds with other EU funds that support the European transport development as the Cohesion Fund and ERDF. Also reference is made to territorial cooperation and cohesion that shall be fostered by the support of TEN-T border sections. Cross-border transport sections are of a high priority in the TEN-T. This is true for the Comprehensive and Core Network as well as for the Core Corridors. Therefore cross-border projects get a higher financial support compared to other transport projects. They are generally considered to have a European added value.

Both the ETC and TEN-T policy documents for the funding period 2014-2020 still ascribe a high priority to the development of cross-border transport. However, the restriction of choice in the ETC – the Member States and cooperation areas must choose four out of 11 priorities - might lead to a loss of importance of transport topics in the operational programmes. As far as cross-border transport is concerned, the documents of both policy areas mutually refer to each other - especially in the case of funds. Additionally, it is recommended to coordinate the different policies to jointly reach common aims and contribute to the Europe 2020 Strategy.

Both policy fields define several reasons to support cross-border transport and some are very similar (Table 2). Others contradict each other. The Europe 2020 Strategy can be seen as a catalyst that leads to the convergence of aims and the establishment of a common focus. Both policy fields acknowledge for instance the importance of the reduction of CO₂ emissions.

Further reasons for the support of cross-border projects are a sustainable and efficient transport development and European Cohesion. Both policy fields contain references to the further completion of a continuous European transport network.

The ETC policy concentrates its funds mainly on the comprehensive network. The TEN-T policy fosters both layers. The European Territorial Cooperation additionally supports the establishment of secondary and tertiary networks and their linkage to the TEN-T.

The aim of an equal access throughout the EU is connected with the aim to contribute to a balanced development of the EU territory that is taken up by the ETC policy documents again. The TEN-T policy rather pursues the contradicting goal: It wants to concentrate scarce funds on key infrastructures.

Both policy fields see the need to cooperate in the field of cross-border transport: Aims, orientation of funding and common projects should be coordinated to achieve common goals and prevent contradictions.

Special tasks of ETC projects can be the support of cross-border transport projects to improve and establish a common planning process on cross-border infrastructures and services. Also the TEN-T policies consider improved territorial cooperation to be important for the development of cross-border transport.

⁴ The Cohesion Fund is solely dedicated to the Core Network (European Commission 2014b, 8)

Compared to the former funding period more aims and reasons for the funding of cross-border transport projects have been defined and the policies interrelated in a stronger way. Still some contradicting aims exist.

Table 2. Comparison of aims of the support of cross-border transport (2014-2020)

ETC Policy (Cohesion)	TEN-T Policy (Transport)
Europe 2020 Strategy	Europe 2020 Strategy
Reduction of CO ₂ emissions	Reduction of CO ₂ emissions
Sustainable transport	Sustainable and efficient transport
European Cohesion	European Cohesion
Single European Transport Area	Continuity of European transport axes
Support of comprehensive network (mainly)	Support of both layers
Access to the Comprehensive and Core Network, Balanced development	-
Better Coordination with CEF and TEN-T	Coordination of the transport funds
Common, coherent planning across borders	Territorial cooperation

4. Conclusions: Contribution of European Territorial Cooperation to the Completion of the European Transport Network and Recommendations for a further Improvement of Cross-border Transport

The European Territorial Cooperation (ETC) can support projects in the transport sector and already did so in the past. Also the new policy guidelines offer the possibility to do so in the cross-border and transnational cooperation. Besides the Cohesion Fund, the ERDF has been and will be an important financial contribution to the scarce funds of the TEN-T policy.

The ETC and the ERDF shall contribute to the balanced development of the EU territory and especially support disadvantaged border regions as well as foster the Cohesion in larger cooperation areas. Therefore in the cross-border cooperation secondary and tertiary transport networks should be funded. These shall generate the activation of positive effects of the existence of the TEN-T core corridors by linking border regions to them and by improving their accessibility. Transnational cooperation projects with a broader spatial scope might support the core transport corridors by linking the main transport routes with the regions they cross and foster the linkage to secondary networks. In the future an important task of ETC projects might be the establishment of transnational spatial planning strategies based on the transport development and effects of the core network corridors.

Therefore the ETC can promote the establishment of the European Transport Network by focusing on the lower scales. However, it should be taken into account that the TEN-T policy concentrates solely on cross-border transport links that connect the major transport routes. ETC projects, though, rather focus on transport networks on a lower scale or on the connection to the main corridors. An expansion of the ETC funds to major transport axes of the TEN-T should not be pursued because this would contradict its basic aims. Instead both policy fields and support mechanisms should join forces to support links between the two transport network levels. The economic added value of the European

transport corridors and main routes should be made use of. The corridors should not solely cross regions and connect main hubs but also connect all parts of the EU territory.

A better alignment of the development of cross-border transport could be reached by involving the Core Corridor Managers of the European Core Network Corridors. These managers should be informed about ETC projects conducted in the sphere of their corridor and then coordinate the aims of the projects and their linkage to the Core Network. Furthermore, the managers themselves could contact the ETC authorities of the respective regions and inform them about possible projects that could contribute to the linkage of the Core Network to secondary networks.

Based on the conducted document analysis it can be stated that the reference between the EU documents on cross-border transport in Cohesion Policy and Transport Policy has been strengthened. The importance of cross-border transport in both policy fields has remained stable and the coordination between the policy fields has been improved in the EU documents. Several references have been made in the current regulations to coordinate the aims and to support cross-border projects and the overall transport development of the EU. The Europe 2020 strategy has contributed as a catalyst because all EU policies of the current funding period have been oriented to the achievement of the strategy's goals. This is evaluated to be a positive development. However, it needs to be seen how these demands for coordination in the EU policy documents have been implemented by the Member States and which impacts can be reached in practice.

A further analysis of the adopted Operational Programmes in European Territorial Cooperation needs to be done to see how often the transport priority has been adopted by the cooperation areas. This decides about the possible amount of projects funded between 2014 and 2020 and about the ETC's contribution to the completion of the European Transport Network. Here it would also be interesting to see which tasks are connected to the transport objective and how this objective relates to the Trans-European Networks. Additionally, it needs to be investigated how the TEN-T projects refer to ETC projects that are conducted in their proximity. Based on the results of such an analysis the impact of the EU policies - calling for a coordination of policy areas - can finally be evaluated.

5. References

- Assembly of European Regions, 1995. Regions and Territories in Europe. The Region's View of the Territorial Effects of European Policies. With the assistance of R. Savy and C. Husson. Strasbourg: Assembly of European Regions.
- Council of the European Union, 2006. COUNCIL DECISION of 6 October 2006 on Community strategic guidelines on cohesion. (2006/702/EC).
- Dunford, M., R. Hall, A. Smith, and L. Tsoukalis. 2001. Introduction. In: R. Hall, A. Smith, and L. Tsoukalis, ed. Competitiveness and Cohesion in EU Policies. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, pp.1–28.
- Economic and Social Committee of the European Communities, 1995. Europe 2000+: Cooperation for European territorial development. Brussels.
- European Commission, 1996. First report on economic and social cohesion. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- European Commission, 2001. WHITE PAPER European transport policy for 2010. Time to decide.
- European Commission, 2014a. A new Cohesion Policy for jobs and growth in Europe. [online] Available at: <http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/information/cohesion-policy-achievement-and-future-investment/factsheet/en.pdf> [Accessed 13 May 2014].
- European Commission, 2014b. Communication from the Commission Building the Transport Core Network: Core Network Corridors and Connecting Europe Facility. COM(2013) 940 final.
- European Parliament and Council of the European Union. 2004. DECISION No 884/2004/EC OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 29 April 2004 amending Decision No

1692/96/EC on Community guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network.
884/2004/EC.

- European Parliament and Council of the European Union, 2006. REGULATION (EC) No 1080/2006 OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 5 July 2006 on the European Regional Development Fund and repealing Regulation (EC) No 1783/1999. 1080/2006.
- European Parliament and Council of the European Union, 2007. REGULATION (EC) No 680/2007 OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 20 June 2007 laying down general rules for the granting of Community financial aid in the field of the trans-European transport and energy networks. 680/2007.
- European Parliament and Council of the European Union, 2010a. DECISION No 661/2010/EU OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 7 July 2010 on Union guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network.
- European Parliament and Council of the European Union, 2010b. REGULATION (EC) No 67/2010 OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 30 November 2009 laying down general rules for the granting of Community financial aid in the field of trans-European networks. 67/2010.
- European Parliament and Council of the European Union, 2013a. REGULATION (EU) No 1299/2013 OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 17 December 2013 on specific provisions for the support from the European Regional Development Fund to the European territorial cooperation goal.
- European Parliament and Council of the European Union, 2013b. REGULATION (EU) No 1301/2013 OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 17 December 2013 on the European Regional Development Fund and on specific provisions concerning the Investment for growth and jobs goal and repealing Regulation (EC) No 1080/2006.
- European Parliament and Council of the European Union, 2013c. REGULATION (EU) No 1303/2013 OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 17 December 2013 laying down common provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund, the Cohesion Fund, the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development and the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund and laying down general provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund, the Cohesion Fund and the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund and repealing Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006.
- European Parliament and Council of the European Union, 2013d. Regulation (EU) No 1315/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 December 2013 on Union guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network and repealing Decision No 661/2010/EU.
- European Parliament and Council of the European Union, 2013e. REGULATION (EU) No 1316/2013 OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 11 December 2013 establishing the Connecting Europe Facility, amending Regulation (EU) No 913/2010 and repealing Regulations (EC) No 680/2007 and (EC) No 67/2010.
- Jann, W. and Wegrich K., 2003. Phasenmodelle und Politikprozesse: Der Policy Cycle. In: Lehrbuch der Politikfeldanalyse, K. Schubert and N.C. Bandelow, ed. Lehr- und Handbücher der Politikwissenschaft. Oldenbourg: Wissenschaftsverlag, pp. 75–103.
- Mairate, A. and Hall R., 2001. Structural Policies. In: R. Hall, A. Smith and L. Tsoukalis, ed. Competitiveness and Cohesion in EU Policies, pp. 316–48.
- McGowan, Francis. 2001. “Transport Policy.” In: R. Hall, A. Smith and L. Tsoukalis, ed. Competitiveness and Cohesion in EU Policies, pp. 217–44.
- Peters, D., 2003. Cohesion, Polycentricity, Missing Links and Bottlenecks: Conflicting Spatial Storylines for Pan-European Transport Investments. *European Planning Studies*, 11 (3), pp. 317–39.
- Robert, J., T. Stumm, J. M. de Vet, C. J. Reincke, M. Hollanders, and M. A. Figueiredo, 2001. SPATIAL IMPACTS OF COMMUNITY POLICIES AND COSTS OF NON-CO-ORDINATION: STUDY CARRIED OUT AT THE REQUEST OF THE DIRECTORATE-GENERAL “REGIONAL POLICY” EUROPEAN COMMISSION. Brussels.