

FINAL NARRATIVE REPORT

1. Description

- 1.1. Name of beneficiary of grant contract: Ministry of Regional Development and Local Government, Latvia (Reģionālās attīstības un pašvaldību lietu ministrija).
- 1.2. Name and title of the Contact person: Mr Vladislavs Vesperis.
- 1.3. Name of partners in the Action: St. Petersburg Administration (Администрация Губернатора Санкт-Петербурга) [2], Russian Economic Developers Association (ASSET) (Ассоциация специалистов по экономическому развитию территорий) [3], Immanuel Kant State University of Russia (Российский государственный университет имени И. Канта) [4], Ministry of the Environment, Danish Forest and Nature Agency¹, Denmark (Miljøministeriet, Skov- og Naturstyrelsen) [5], Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Housing, Germany (Bundesministeriums für Verkehr, Bau und Stadtentwicklung) [6], Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communication, Sweden (Näringsdepartementet) [7], Nordic Centre for Spatial Development (NORDREGIO) [8], Ministry of Regional Development, Poland (Ministerstwo Rozwoju Regionalnego) [9], Maritime Institute, Poland (Instytut Morski) [10].
- 1.4. Title of the Action: East-West Window (EWW).
- 1.5. Contract number: Grant Contract for European Community External Actions **2007/132-845**.
- 1.6. Start date and end date of the reporting period²: 15.06.2007 – 15.12.2008.
- 1.7. Target country(ies) or region(s): **North-West Russia in particular: St. Petersburg, Leningrad region and Kaliningrad region**; to some extent also Belarus and North-West Russia adjacent countries (mainly for collecting good practices and dissemination of the project results).
- 1.8. Final beneficiaries &/or target groups³ (if different). The target audience/recipients of the project findings are: decision-makers (ministries responsible for spatial planning and development in the BSR, including the federal government in Russia, regional authorities in

¹ The name of the partner 5 was changed during the EWW project execution **from** Ministry of the Environment, Danish Forest and Nature agency **to** Ministry of the Environment, Agency for Spatial and Environmental Planning (Miljøministeriet, By- og Landskabsstyrelsen).

² The entire implementation period of the Action

³ “Target groups” are the groups/entities who will be directly positively affected by the project at the Project Purpose level, and “final beneficiaries” are those who will benefit from the project in the long term at the level of the society or sector at large.

NW Russia, pan-Baltic organisations such as VASAB 2010). The final beneficiaries are local and regional governments in the Baltic Sea region (BSR) operators in the chosen thematic fields (e.g. businesses in WP1 and transport operators in WP2) in NW Russia and in the BSR. The divide into men and women of different project activities is provided separately.

- 1.9. Country (ies) in which the activities take place (if different from 1.7): Russia (St. Petersburg and Kaliningrad Oblast), Poland and Latvia.

2. Assessment of implementation of Action activities

- 2.1. Activities and results (for the whole reporting period including last narrative interim report)

Activity 1: Kick off of the work of Working Group no 1 on business development and innovation affecting spatial development,

1.1. First meeting of the WG1 (1 day) took place on 25 June 2007 in Riga which was according to the schedule. The meeting was planned in advance in late June so participants postponed their holidays which in this part of the BSR starts with so called Midsummer. The meeting was attended by 12 participants representing partners 1,3,4,5,6,8,9,10 and eight invited guests. The main aim was to discuss the analysis and further WG1 work in detail, to achieve clarity about division of labour between the partners, to make sure that duplication with other project is avoided (instead to aim at using results achieved by other projects) and to start the process of contracting the external experts. The following outputs were produced or achieved:

- Report how to avoid duplication with other INTERREG III B projects in the field of business development and innovation affecting spatial development had been prepared before the meeting by the project coordinator, discussed by the meeting and delivered to the Responsible (Lead) Partner.
- TORs for seven ASSET staff members, eight Kaliningrad University staff members, one Belarus expert and four external experts together with tender documentation (if necessary) have been prepared by project coordinator as result of the meeting. Tender procedures for the four external experts had been started resulting in contracting one external expert from Poland, one from Sweden, one from Latvia and one from Denmark. In addition the Belarus expert was contracted by the partner no. 8 without tender (contract below 5000 Euro).
- The main scope of analysis was proposed and discussed. Unfortunately too many question marks and uncertainties appeared during the June meeting so the additional meeting was organized in Riga in September and discussion on analysis continued till the second WG1 meeting (December 2007).
- Text for EWW section at to the VASAB website was decided, technically EWW link at VASAB website was created in September 2007.
- Project flyer was designed and edited including information on WG1 activities (300 copies were printed in October 2007).

Comments: The WG1 started the discussion on its work (i.e. necessary analysis, results to be achieved) but the topic was too broad for one day meeting in addition to many technical questions were raised. The decision was to continue the discussion when the experts contracted by tender would be available. The main problem was to what extend the achievement of the EWW goal (i.e. *to promote territorial integration of NW Russia into the BSR in the field of business development*)

required concentration on analysis concerning exclusively NW Russia and to what extent the broader BSR picture was necessary if integration should mean reciprocal relations (i.e. affecting both sides). The latter opinion prevailed and was accepted by the meeting. The WG1 considered that for producing the main output of the analytical phase (i.e. a *compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") with assessment of unexploited innovation potential in NW Russia, assessment of the potential for regional integration and with identification of spatial problems in NW Russia and BSR*) some BSR analysis as the background material should be done as well. The meeting also discussed the policy related role of the project i.e. better highlighting the EWW results on NW Russia role in the “Long Term Perspective” to be prepared by VASAB on CBSS demand. The WG1 leaders promised to ensure smooth transfer of the EWW results to the BSR strategy i.e. Long Term Perspective till 2030 (to be prepared by VASAB in 2009). The Responsible Partner declared that he would invite VASAB Secretariat to the most important meetings of the EWW to ensure smooth transfer of the project results to the “Long Term Perspective”.

- 1.2. Partnership Agreement Preparation. This action was related to all work packages and took place in June, July, August, and September 2007 and was ended in October 2007 with signing partnership agreements between Lead Partner and all other partners of the EWW project. The most difficult was signing Partnership Agreement with partners from St. Petersburg due to problems related to tax and system in Russia, conversion of EUR into rubels, banking system requirements etc. Finally two agreements, based on the results of additional working meeting (in Riga) discussions, were prepared and signed between Lead Partner and RU (ASSET) Partner and between German Partner and RU (ASSET) Partner. So at the end of the day there were 9 partnership agreements signed regulating relations between the EWW partners.
- 1.3. Quality Workshop (1 day) for Project leaders organised by INTERREG III B Secretariat and EU Delegation from Moscow in Riga on 26 September 2007 was attended by project coordinator (partner no.10), one representative of Russian partners (partner no.2) and representatives appointed by the Responsible Partner. Main guidelines from EC Delegation and INTERREG III B Secretariat on TACIS rules, payments schemes and communication experiences were presented during the seminar and later on at individual consultations. The meeting between Responsible Partner and the Russian partners was organized back to back with the workshop for discussing main technicalities of their participation in the project.

Activity 2: Analysis(WG1)

- 2.1. WG1 additional meeting (1 day) took place on 25 September 2007 in Riga to continue discussion on the scope of analysis. The meeting was attended by four WG1 members (including two external experts, project coordinator and the representative of the Russian partners) and three participants representing Responsible Partner. At the meeting in depth discussion on case studies on innovation, outsourcing and urban-rural relations in Russia took place and the detailed scope of the work of Russian partners and external experts were agreed. Also a draft outline structure of the WG1 analytical report was presented by the WG1 Coordinator and discussed in depth.
- 2.2. Data collection and interpretation started only in December 2007 after the second WG1 meeting. In this phase 34 people from all partners were involved (except partner no.7 who acted through partner no. 8). Their involvement differed. The main bulk of analytical work was done by partners no. 3, 4 and 8 and the external experts whereas the other people acted mainly as a reference group reading reports, making comments and asking for improvements. This was the task first of all of partners no. 1, 2, 5, 6, 9 and 10 representing mainly policy making side in the project and project coordination. Also VASAB Secretariat was invited by partner 1 (Responsible Partner) to participate in this process. The analysis (data collection) in principle were ended in March 2008 but some of them (requiring surveys) due to formal reasons (tenders) were completed in April 2008. Interpretation of data was done in April

2008 for all important cases (but some analysis e.g. the benchmarking studies and urban-rural analysis continued till September 2008). In fact in April and even in May and June the fine tuning of analysis (removing mistakes noticed by the other partners) still continued. The reason was that some partners from the reference group were very demanding asking for many improvements even if they had found little inconsistencies after second or third reading of the reports. Therefore the final synthesis report (draft discussion paper) from the analytical phase was completed only in July 2008 and even slightly changed after the WG1 September 2008 meeting and as the result of the EWW final/closing Conference in October 2008.

The outputs have been following:

(i) interim:

- Data (including public surveys) and draft analytical report on “Baltic” metropolitan areas with focus on the role of Kaliningrad and St. Petersburg;
- In depth study on St. Petersburg and Kaliningrad and their developmental potentials in the BSR context (focus on innovation and outsourcing) in which: trends and present policies for innovations nested in NW Russia and outsourcing were analysed, barriers for innovations perceived by business and public administration were identified (based on surveys), and cases on transfer of innovations between NW Russia and other parts of the BSR were described;
- Case studies (reports) on Russian and Belarus small and medium sized cities – covering: Novgorod, Gatchina, Chernyakhovsk, Gusev, Sovetsk, Svetly, Berezovka, Zaslavl;
- Reports on demographic trends in North-West Russia, in St. Petersburg and in Kaliningrad and in Belarus as well;
- Reports on case studies on urban-rural relations in Russia;
- Report on INTERREG III B projects results relevant for work of the WG1 group;
- Benchmarking studies concerning situation in Poland, Germany and Latvia on the issues relevant for the WG1 recommendations .

(ii) A compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") with assessment of unexploited innovation potential in NW Russia, assessment of the potential for regional integration and with identification of spatial problems in NW Russia and BSR.

Comments:

a) All the planned outcomes were achieved. However, during the analytical phase became clear that for the NW Russia innovation is more promising path for integration within the BSR than outsourcing, therefore more efforts were done to analyse this challenge. The list of outputs was enlarged (in comparison to the planned ones) by analysis of the role of the NW Russia in the BSR context (as the result of the WG1 discussions what analysis are necessary to achieve the EWW goal). Also urban structures and functional urban areas of not only large but also some small cities were analysed. The most interesting case appeared to be Gatchina as an example of science intensive cluster in Russia located in a small city. The some other cases illustrated urban-rural relations in Russia (and Belarus).

b) While working with data it became clear that translating data into policy recommendations can not be done by each working group separately. Therefore at the meeting of the WG leaders in December it was proposed that for the starting work on recommendation a workshop for all WGs would be necessary. The Responsible Partner was asked to organize such a workshop on 31st of January 2008 instead of simple WG1 seminar (planned for that date).

c) The work was delayed by some formal constraints such as tender procedures, requirement of separate EUR accounts (very difficult for Ministries) etc.

Activity 3: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR (WG1)

- 3.1. Kick off Conference of the project (1,5 day) for broad public took place on 18-19 October 2007 (according schedule) in St. Petersburg as a part of the well known VI Forum of Strategic Planning Leaders of Cities and Regions of Russia. This allowed project to reach the planned target group. The project: its assumptions and the planned outputs were presented to the Russian decision makers - mainly city mayors and chief planners. Conference participants expressed a deep hope that EWW project would diminish knowledge gaps within the Baltic Sea Region on the character of development potential of the NW Russia, its synergies and complementarities with potentials of other countries of the region, and on methods how this potential could be efficiently connected within the BSR. It was expressed in Conference recommendations that EWW project results should be presented in 2008 at the final Conference within VII Forum of Strategic Planning Leaders of Cities and Regions of Russia. The kick off conference was attended by 259 participants mainly Russian mayors and city planners. Among them there were 57 persons outside Russia. From EWW project 20 persons participated including Latvian State Secretary representing the Responsible Partner. So EWW reached the planned target of **200** Russian decision makers and professionals involved in discussion on the project.
- 3.2. Stakeholder Seminar for WG1 (0,5 day) was organised on 23 April 2008 in Riga (instead of beginning of May as originally planned). The preliminary results of the analytical phase were presented and the first discussions on the recommendations were started. The seminars for all working groups of EWW were arranged back to back with the VASAB annual conference financed by the Latvian Ministry of Regional Development and Local Government from its own means i.e. outside the EWW budget (from the EWW budget some partners only covered their travelling to the EWW seminars). The described above arrangement resulted in very impressive participation in the seminars and allowed to reach a planned target of **100** decision makers and businessman from BSR EU countries involved in discussion of the project findings and recommendations. The conference and seminars were attended by 167 participants including 26 persons directly involved in the EWW project (although the Responsible Partner was represented by some more employees). The participants came mainly from Latvia, Lithuania, and Finland but also from Azerbaijan, Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, EU Commission, Germany, Hungary, Norway, Poland, Russia and Sweden.
- 3.3. Closing(final) Conference of the project (1 day) for broad public took place on 21st October 2008 (according schedule) in St. Petersburg. The title of the conference was “Promoting territorial integration of the North West Russia into the Baltic Sea Region”. The main organiser was ASEET together with the EWW Responsible Partner. This Conference was a part of rich spectrum of the conferences and seminars taking place under umbrella (the same premises) of the VII All-Russia Forum of Strategic Planning Leaders “Strategic Planning in Regions and Cities of Russia”. In the event 631 participants took place out of it 582 from Russia. The forum was organized by: State Duma of the Russian Federation; Ministry for Regional Development of the Russian Federation; Ministry for Economic Development of the Russian Federation; St Petersburg City Administration; Center of Strategic Research; ISCER Leontief Centre. It was opened by Mr Dmitry Kozak, Minister of Regional Development, who underlined that “Forum is becoming the public debating platform for improving the strategic planning system of social and economic development in Russian regions”. The Conference “Promoting territorial integration of the North West Russia into the Baltic Sea region” was composed of four sessions attended by large number of the participants not only from Russia but also from other Baltic Sea Region countries. Some sessions were joint ventures with other organisations, forums and bodies interested in the subjects raised by the EWW project. The names of the sessions were following:
 - “Accessibility and innovations as motors of integration of the NW Russia into the Baltic Sea Region” (presentation of the results of the WG1 and the WG2),

- “Special Features of coastal regional strategies” (presentation of the WG3 results and dialogue with all key persons in Russia dealing with ICZM and maritime spatial planning),
- “Partnership mechanisms in local economic policy implementation” (presentation of the WG1 results with regard to urban-rural partnership).

In addition to that EWW results were presented at the key session of the Forum “Prospects for Federal Okrug Development: Challenges, priorities, threats and constraints. North-West Federal Okrug” attended by key decision makers from the North-West Federal Okrug.

Comments:

The choice of the formula of the kick-off and closing conferences appeared to have very positive results on ability of the project to deliver results to the key target groups in Russia. The Conference was also attended by the Ministerial partners from the EWW project. The EWW results were mirrored in the Forums resolutions. Some interested questions were raised requiring further discussion and examination.

- 3.4. Final publication The book summing up the results of the investigations available for the stakeholders in Kaliningrad and St.Petersburg was edited in October, November and printed in December 2008 by partner no.4.

Comments:

The number of books published was smaller (100) than assumed in the application (400), although the whole budget allocated to this purpose was used. There were several reasons why the printing was more expensive than expected. Some of them were of technical reasons: i.e. the book had more coloured pictures (maps) than estimated and was thicker than planned (more than 300 pages in comparison to 150 pages planned), but the main reason was of vis mayor nature. In 2008 in Russia an unexpected inflation and economic crisis appeared which could not be taken into account at the stage of budget planning. This resulted in much higher printing costs. However, the partner no.4 is ready to print additional copies of the book if demanded. The available copies will be distributed to the most active in the EWW Russian stakeholders and to the project partners of the EWW.

Activity 4: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations and action plan (WG1)

- 4.1. Steering Group Meeting (1 day) took place on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg according to schedule. The meeting was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1,2,3,5,6,7,9,10 and seven invited guests. The Steering Group discussed the project progress. The work was lagging behind the schedule. Although the WG1 started on time it became involved in lengthy discussions about the necessary scope of analysis and detailed division of labour between working groups. The Steering Group decided therefore not to start the work on recommendations before improving synergy between the work of the working groups. This task was given to the meeting of the WGs leaders organised in Riga back to back with the WG2 (5 December 2007) and the WG1 (6-7 December 2007) meetings. The meeting also discussed details of project presentation to the kick-off conference held next day.
- 4.2. WG1 second meeting (1,5 day) took place on 6-7 December 2007 in Riga (instead of late November). The meeting was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10, two external consultants and six invited guests. The meeting concentrated on discussing analytical phase of the project (the decision was that the lagging behind analysis would make necessary to postpone by two months the next WG1 meeting i.e. till the end of analytical phase). However, the WG 1 also started examining the way of preparation of the recommendations out of the analysis conducted. For the starting work on recommendation it was agreed that a workshop for all WGs would be necessary and the

Responsible Partner was asked to organize such a workshop (synergy meeting) on 31st of January 2008 instead of a simple WG1 seminar (scheduled for beginning of February).

- 4.3. Synergy meeting no.1 (1 day) took place in Riga on 31 of January 2008 (replacing the WG1 seminar scheduled for February). It was attended by fourteen project partner members representing partners no.1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, three external experts and six invited guests. The facilitator was hired by the Responsible Partner. During the meeting the participants agreed that all three working groups were in need of a common frame. This should be given by the vision of the BSR till 2030 with full integration of the North-West Russia. The participants managed to prepare an outline of such a vision requiring further work. The meeting asked for one more working day for finishing common visionary frame which should allow preparing meaningful recommendations.
- 4.4. Steering Group Meeting 2 took place on 1 of February 2008 in Riga. It was attended by seven project partner members representing partners no. 1,3,5,6,7, 9, 10 one external expert and seven invited guests. The results of the synergy meeting were discussed i.e. synergy between the work of the working groups. It was decided to organise one more synergy meeting to continue work on the common frame for all WGs, i.e. vision of the BSR till 2030 with full integration of the North-West Russia. An agenda of the April Conference proposed by the Responsible Partner was discussed together with some technical issues. The progress in analytical phase was reviewed.
- 4.5. Synergy meeting no. 2 (1 day) took place in Liepaja on 14th of March 2008. It was attended by ten project partner members representing partners no. 1,3,5,6,9, 10 one external expert and five invited guests. The facilitator was hired by the Responsible Partner but paid from Responsible Partner own means. The final draft of the vision was discussed and shared by participants giving stable frame for analytical part and allowing proper work on recommendations.
- 4.6. WG1 fourth meeting (1 day) took place on 3-4 April 2008 in Riga. It was attended by nine project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 8, 10, two external experts and two invited guests. The meeting was convened on demand of Russian partners who started finalisation of analytical part and wanted to discuss the preliminary results among themselves. It was also important for conceptualization of the recommendations i.e. discussing what findings from analytical phase should be taken into consideration while working on recommendations.
- 4.7 WG1 fifth meeting (one day) took place on 24 April 2008 in Riga. It was attended by fifteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, four external experts and six invited guests. The WG1 before the meeting concentrated mainly on analytical work. At the fifth meeting analyses were summed up and the work on recommendations were started. However, one more meeting was requested (autumn 2008) in order to discuss the final draft of the recommendations and action programme. Due to delay in the work on urban-rural relations in Russia the relevant reports were not presented to the WG1 at this meeting. Only an overview of the progress and main findings were reported. It was decided that for synergy reasons the reports would be presented on seminar on urban-rural relations in Russia to be organised as a joint event with the SeBCo project in Kaliningrad in June 2008. This was realised and such presentation took place and was regarded as a great success by meeting participants.
- 4.8. Steering Group Meeting 3 (one day) took place on 20 May 2008 in Riga. It was attended by five project partner members representing partners no. 1, 5, 9, 10, and five invited guests. The Steering Group discussed the project progress. The results of the second synergy meeting and the April Conference were examined as well as a draft vision of the BSR till 2030 with full integration of the North-West Russia. The Steering Group decided to close analytical part and start the work on recommendations. However, the WG3 leaders asked for additional benchmark study on the results of the INTERREG projects in the field of competences of the WG3 with focus on the German experience. This was to diminish discrepancies between the WGs, since the WG1 and the WG2 already had such type of

expertises included in their work. The problems with travelling budget of Russian partners were discussed once more together with a problem of disappeared financial manager. The Steering Group also continued a discussion on political use of the EWW results i.e. incorporation of the results into the Long Term Perspective of VASAB to be produced in 2009. The output achieved:

- first draft recommendation papers (in outline format) of WG1 and WG2.

4.9. WG1 sixth meeting (one day) took place on 03 September 2008 in Jurmala. It was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, four external experts and seven invited guests. They discussed the final draft of the recommendations and action programme prepared during holiday time 2008 by ASSET, Immanuel Kant State University of Russia (Kaliningrad), Nordregio staff, and external experts. The whole work on urban-rural relations in Russia the relevant analytic reports were presented to the WG1 at this meeting as well. The WG1 discussed and improved the following documents:

- Recommendations how to improve innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Recommendations how to improve settlement policies in NW Russia (urban rural partnership) from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Action plan how to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration.

4.10. Steering Group Meeting 4 (one day) took place on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg. It was attended by 7 project partner members representing partners no. 2, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10 one external expert and 6 invited guests. The group discussed the shape of final publications of the EWW project, the use of the analytical materials and endorsed the recommendations and action proposed by the project. The main discussion was on the proper use of the EWW results for the Long Term Perspective (LTP) of VASAB elaboration of which was started few month ago (August 2008). The EWW results were placed to the different parts of the LTP outcomes. The VASAB consultant responsible for facilitating the LTP process was invited to the Steering Group meeting. It was also discussed how to use EWW outcomes for the process of preparation of the BSR EU Strategy. The partner no.5 arranged a meeting with the EU Commission on that topic. It was decided that the EWW results would be incorporated in the VASAB non-paper to be presented to the EU Commission in November/December 2008 in order to influence strategy preparation. The outputs achieved (as results of the meeting):

- Final draft of the recommendations how to improve innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Final draft of recommendations how to improve settlement policies in NW Russia (urban rural partnership) from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Final draft of the action plan how to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration,
- Final draft of recommendations on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR including concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR,
- Final action plan how to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational sea use planning and ICZM,
- Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic,
- Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application,
- Forwarding (transferring of EWW results) to important BSR processes namely: EU BSR Strategy and VASAB Long Term Perspective.

Activity 5: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 2 on accessibility

5.1. WG2 first meeting (one day) took place on 10 October 2007 in Riga It was attended by five project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 8, 10, one external expert and three

invited guests. The main aim was to discuss the scope of analysis (concrete meaning of accessibility) and the further work of the WG2 step by step, to achieve clarity about division of labour between the partners, to make sure that duplication with other project was avoided (instead to aim at using results achieved by other projects) and to start the process of contracting the external experts. The following outputs were produced or achieved:

- Report how to avoid duplication with other INTERREG III B projects in the field of accessibility was prepared by the project coordinator, discussed at the meeting and accepted by the Responsible Partner;
- TORs for four Kaliningrad University staff members, one Belarus expert and TORs for three external experts together with tender documentation (if necessary) have been prepared and approved. Procurement and contracting procedures for the one external expert was finished in September. Two other experts were also contracted (latter on);
- The main scope of analysis were proposed and discussed. The discussion on analysis continued among the partners (by e-mails) till the second WG2 meeting (December 2007);
- EWW link at the VASAB website was created (see activity 1.1);
- The content of the project flyer was loaded by short information about the WG2 activities.

Comments: The WG2 started its work behind the schedule. Due to the late project start (mid of June 2007), the first period of the project coincided with a holiday season. Therefore the real work of the WG2 (by phone, e-mails etc) started only in September 2007 i.e. three month later than planned. In addition to that, for some partners it was very inconvenient (e.g. celebrations of anniversary of establishment of the Kaliningrad University) and this postponed the start of formal work by one or two month further on i.e. till October 2007. In the meantime the preparation of the WG2 detailed analysis was started. To this end a pre meeting on 22nd of August 2007 was organised (partners 1, 7,8) to prepare tentative proposals on the substance of the work of the WG2. This meeting was paid outside the EWW budget. Although the WG2 (similarly to the WG1) came to the opinion that broader BSR picture was necessary to promote *territorial integration of NW Russia into the BSR in the field of transport and ITC*. The WG2 members also shared the WG1 concern on importance of smooth transfer of the EWW results to the BSR strategy till 2030 i.e. Long Term Perspective to be prepared by VASAB in 2009. The characteristic feature of the WG2 was a long discussion about the meaning of the notion of accessibility. As the result accessibility to energy was also considered to be an important element of the analysis.

Activity 6: Analysis(WG2)

6.1. The discussion on the scope and method of analysis (indicators, pilot studies) had been continued from October till beginning of December 2007. The manuals and guidelines were discussed many times. The main method was e-mail exchanges. As the result the manuals and blue prints were produced by partners 1 and 8 to facilitate collecting data and information:

- A blue print on screening transport policy,
- A manual for collecting data and information on accessibility.

Comments: The majority of time of the initial period was allocated to discussing the notion of accessibility. This was done in order to avoid problems when data and information collection would be started. Due to the rise of energy prices also this issue was considered as important factor for the NW Russia integration to the BSR. The second issue heavily discussed was scarcity of comparable data in Russia. Partner no 8 having a very well developed data base on transport data for the BSR was in a difficult position checking (in dialogue with partner 4) existence of similar data in Russia. This required more resources and more work load than estimated at the

beginning. But finally this allowed presenting Russia at the broader BSR picture. The phase 6.1. ended with second meeting of the WG2 (December 2007 in Riga).

6.2. Data collection and interpretation started only in December 2007 after the second WG 2 meeting. Basic data were collected by mid February 2008 but some work continued (fine tuning of reports) till May/June 2008. A draft discussion paper was ready for the Riga Stakeholder Conference in April 2008. However, it was a working document amended after each important EWW meeting, till the final/closing Conference. In this work (phase 6.1 and 6.2) seventeen people (including three external experts) were involved. Their involvement differed. The main bulk of analytical work was done by partners no. 4 and 8 and the external experts whereas the other participants acted mainly as a reference group reading reports, making comments and asking for improvements. This was done first of all by partners no. 1, 6, 7 and 10 representing mainly policy making side in the project and project coordination. Also VASAB Secretariat was invited by partner 1 (Responsible Partner) to participate in this process.

The following outputs were achieved:

(i) interim:

- Mapping of transport infrastructure policies at the federal and regional level, policies in development of the soft accessibility (to knowledge and information) and policies on clusters in NW Russia (however clusters were analysed by the WG1 in fact), also policies and situation in the field of accessibility to energy was examined;
- Identification of bottlenecks and constraints for transport (and through transport for business development) in NW Russia;
- Assessment of the policy correlation with the strategic documents at the BSR level (mainly by analysing outcomes of Strategic INTERREG III B projects pursued by VASAB, BDF, BSSSC and CPMR);
- Examining the results of other INTERREG III B projects relevant for the WG2 work;
- Feasibility assessment of connecting TEN-T with the pan-European corridors.

The planned verification of the accessibility perspective and of present (current) and forecast trade flows in NW Russia and Belarus (vis-a-vis BSR reports) was less successful. The main reason were missing data concerning predicted trade flows in NW Russia and Belarus⁴. The accessibility perspective instead was analysed using BSR outlook to show how NW-Russia is connected with the rest of the BSR.

(ii) A compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") presenting situation, development trends and political objectives in the fields of transport and accessibility in NW RU and Belarus and their consequences for BSR cohesion and business development

Comments:

The most important planned outputs were achieved (although one output was slightly modified). In addition to that, accessibility to energy was touched as important future factor of the BSR integration that should determine in great extent the NW Russia integration into the BSR. The analysis lasted longer than expected. The main constraint was lack of regional reliable data in NW Russia. The main reason of the delay was in insufficient data availability but also to some extent larger than expected amount of available background information (e.g. results of the BSR projects) that should be digested and analysed.

Activity 7: Pilot studies (WG2)

Since the analytical phase (activity 6) was delayed also pilot projects were postponed. The aim of the activity 7 was to analyse more in depth the most promising solutions developed during the analytical

⁴ The work on trade flows was done in co-operation with WG1 and the BSR perspective was used.

phase and prioritised during stakeholder dialogue. Therefore only in May 2008 the more concrete work on pilot studies (pre-feasibility studies) could start. The WG2 selected two (in line with the output indicators listed in the application) topics for pre-feasibility studies. The topics were following:

- a) BSR passenger railway connectivity with focus on the Eastern part of the BSR,
- b) examination of implementation of the transport part of Tallinn vision of VASAB with focus on the eastern part of the BSR.

For the pilot studies a tender procedure was used and contracts were signed in late June 2008. The results were delivered in late August 2008 and discussed by the WG2 group meeting in September. The following reports were produced:

- *Study on international rail passenger traffic development: Possibilities in the context of development of cities in the Baltic Sea Region* (Contract: 5-13/66, of 18.6.2008) elaborated by SIA "AC Konsultācijas",
- *Evaluation of implementation of the VASAB 2010 vision in the area of mobility network and energy supply* (Contract: 5-13/74, of 23.7.2008) elaborated by SIA "AC Konsultācijas".

The results of the studies were presented to the closing/final conference of the EWW and will serve as an input for the Long Term Spatial Development Perspective. They were also presented in advance to the WG2 members working on recommendation in order to shape the WG2 recommendations.

Comments:

An additional barrier delaying activity no.7 was obligation of tendering the contractors due to internal law of Latvia where partner no.1 (responsible for the WG2 work) is located. The WG2 decisions were taken in May 2008, but the contracts were signed only 1,5- 2 months latter coinciding once more with a holiday season. The first preliminary results of the activity no.7 were delivered in August and the final results in October/November 2008.

Activity 8: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR

The same as activity no. 3

Activity 9: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG2)

- 9.1. Steering Group Meeting (1 day) took place on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg according to schedule (for details see action 4.1).
- 9.2. WG2 second meeting (1 day) took place on 5 December 2007 in Riga (instead of late November). The meeting was attended by seven project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 7, 8, 10 and four invited guests. The meeting concentrated on discussing analytical phase of the project. The manuals and blue prints for collecting data and information were agreed. For starting work on recommendation it was discussed that the idea of Steering Group (of its first meeting in October 2007) of workshop for all WGs should be implemented and the Responsible Partner was asked to organize such a workshop (synergy meeting) in January 2008.
- 9.3. Synergy meeting no.1 (1 day) took place in Riga on 31st of January 2008 (see action 4.3. for details).
- 9.4. Steering Group Meeting 2 on 1st of February 2008 in Riga (see action 4.4. for details).
- 9.5. Synergy meeting no. 2 (1 day) took place in Liepaja on 14th of March 2008. (see action 4.5. for details).
- 9.6. Steering Group Meeting 3 (one day) took place on 20 May 2008 in Riga. (for details see action 4.8).
- 9.7. WG2 third meeting (one day) took place on 21 May 2008 in Riga according to schedule. It was attended by five project partner members representing partners no. 1, 7, 8, 10, one external expert and three invited guests. The WG2 before the third meeting concentrated

mainly on analytical work. At this meeting analyses were summed up and the work on recommendations started. It was decided that recommendations (with elements of the action programme) would be prepared for Russia and for the whole BSR with focus on better integration of NW Russia. One additional meeting was requested (autumn 2008) in order to discuss the final draft of the recommendations. The meeting also discussed the pilot actions (pre-feasibility studies) agreeing on concrete items. The outputs achieved:

- a first draft recommendations paper (in outline format),
- TOR for two most important pilot studies.

9.8. WG2 fourth meeting (one day) took place on 4th September 2008 in Jurmala. It was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, three external experts and six invited guests. They discussed the final draft of the recommendations (with elements of the action programme) prepared by Immanuel Kant State University of Russia (Kaliningrad) and Nordregio staff. The WG2 discussed and improved the following documents:

- Recommendations on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR including concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR.
- Study on international rail passenger traffic development: Possibilities in the context of development of cities in the Baltic Sea Region,
- Evaluation of implementation of the VASAB 2010 vision in the area of mobility network and energy supply,
- Overview of results of INTERREG III B projects in the field of accessibility .

9.9. Steering Group Meeting 4 (one day) took place on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg (please see action 4.10)

Activity 10: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 3 on ICZM and transnational sea use planning

10.1. WG3 preparatory meeting took place on 24 July 2007 in Kaliningrad. It was attended by nine project partner members representing partners no. 4, 10, and five invited guests. The meeting was used for preparation of the WG3 first meeting, and the pilot action in particular for presentation and discussion with the Kaliningrad partners the results of the INTERREG project BaltCoast of which recommendations should form main backbone of the work of the WG3. The preparatory meeting was organised during the holiday season due to indicated by the Kaliningrad partner necessity of postponing the WG3 first meeting till October because of the celebrations of 750th anniversary of establishment of the university (lack of experts) in early autumn 2007. So the preparatory meeting was a vehicle to start the work of the WG3 even in slightly less formal way. The main subject of discussion was the BaltCoast recommendations, TORs for experts and other guidelines necessary for elaboration of the WG3 analysis. The outputs were following:

- Decision on TORs and blue prints,
- Clarifying division of labour,
- Project flyer was discussed (and then edited) - see activity 1.1.

10.2 WG 3 first meeting (1,5 day) took place on 30-31 October 2007 in Kaliningrad i.e. with four month delay. The reason was the celebrations of 750th anniversary of establishment of the Albertina University (today Immanuel Kant State University of Russia) in Kaliningrad. The meeting was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 4, 9, 10 and to some extent also partner no.1, one external expert and fifteen invited guests mainly from Russia but also from Latvia, Germany and Finland. The main aim was to discuss the analysis and the further WG3 work in detail, to achieve clarity about division of labour between the partners, to make sure that duplication with other project was avoided (instead to aim at using results achieved by other projects) and to start the process of contracting the external experts. Instead of preparing TORs for separate experts the WG3 at pre meeting decided to make only

two TORs (one for external expert and one for the whole pilot project). For conducting analysis it was agreed that blue prints should be used. Such blue prints were prepared by partner no. 10 in advance presented at the meeting, and then improved/discussed by e-mails and approved in December 2007. The following outputs were produced or achieved:

- Report (in form of power point presentations) – presenting an overview of existing and available documentation on the chosen themes in NW Russia and at the BSR level;
- Two blue prints (for further analysis and discussions);
- Two TORs (one for external expert and one for the whole pilot project);
- One external expert was contracted by the partner no 1 covering by his expertise BSR and HELCOM perspective;
- EWW link at the VASAB website was created (see activity 1.1).

Also Kaliningrad stakeholders who attended the second part of the meeting were informed about the EWW project together with showing them the relevant BSR experience in ICZM and maritime spatial planning. They formed important part of the reference network for dialogue on project findings and recommendations. The meeting was also a starting point for executing analysis.

Activity 11 Analysis (WG 3)

11.1 The discussion on the scope and method of analysis had been continued from October till beginning of December 2007. The discussion resulted in shifting focus more from ICZM to maritime spatial planning as the most important transnational issue related to sea use in the nearest future. The blue prints (to be followed by Russian colleagues) presented by partner 10 were discussed many times. The main method was e-mail exchanges. As the result the two blue prints were agreed:

- A blue print on spatial planning legislation on the sea covering Poland,
- A blue print on potentials and conflicts on the sea covering Poland.

11.2. Gathering and compiling the WG3 information started in December 2007 after blue prints approval. Fourteen people representing partners no. 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10 were involved in the information collecting. Their involvement differed. The main bulk of analytical work was done by partners no.10 and 4 and by external expert whereas the other participants acted mainly as a reference group reading reports, making comments and asking for improvements. This was done first of all by partners no. 5,6 and 7 representing mainly policy making side in the project. The analysis in principle were ended in March. The situation of the WG3 was different than the WG1 and the WG2. The WG3 did not collect statistical information but rather qualitative information and the broad BSR background was discussed, sorted out and clarified at the first meeting by examining BaltCoast results. Therefore, the analytical work could be done in parallel with an initial phase of recommendation preparation. But also in the WG3 the completing analytical reports took more time than expected. Although first draft reports were ready in March their fine tuning continued in April and even in May and June. This was slightly learning by doing in particular for Russian experts who had little contact with maritime spatial planning in the past. The outputs were following:

- The legal systems were screened and regulations, responsibilities for offshore planning at all levels in NW Russia were identified;
- System of mapping to improve access to relevant information from NW Russia and its uploading to the pilot system made in the INTERREG III B BaltCoast project were tested (the results can be seen in the WG3 reports done by Russian colleagues);
- Actual (current) sea use in NW RU (Kaliningrad) according to the BaltCoast standards (potentials and conflicts) were described in a separate paper and conflicts and potentials were detected;

- A compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") with assessment of compatibility of the Russian regulatory framework to the legislation and practice in a pan-Baltic perspective in the field of ICZM and sea use planning was elaborated.

Comments:

The all planned outputs were achieved.

Activity 12 Pilot Action (WG 3)

Pilot action was started in October 2007 and continues till the end of August 2008. The twelve project partners staff members representing partners no. 1,4,6,7,9,10 and one external expert were involved. Partners no. 1,6,7 have acted mainly as a reference group while the main role was played by partners no. 4,9,10. The pilot action aimed at preparing a system of joint ICZM and maritime spatial planning in Gdańsk Bay between Poland and Russia. This task was discussed at the kick off meeting with various Russian stakeholders. The prevailing opinion was that due to the dispersed responsibilities in Russia in ICZM and sea space management (versus concrete central Agency in Poland responsible for sea space and regional governments responsible for ICZM activities) such goal could not be achieved in the project time span. Nowadays there is no single institution in Russia responsible for sea space management (like Maritime Offices in Germany or Poland). The WG3 came to the opinion that agreements between Polish and Russian relevant state institutions on co-operation in sea use planning and management might be too ambitious and premature as the WG3 output. Instead pilot actions were focused on the preconditions for establishment of such agreements in future, by exchange of good practices, deepening mutual understanding and preparing necessary tools and necessary institutional structures i.e. centres of excellence in both countries dealing with maritime spatial planning. It was decided that the starting point should be an agreement between Russian and Polish institutions from NGO or research domain to co-operate on promotion of integrative approach to sea space and coast in both countries. In this context a sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application was discussed. It was considered as an important tool for showing to Russian decision-makers a usefulness of maritime spatial planning. The WG3 decided to limit it to the Baltic Sea around Kaliningrad Oblast. The register was prepared by partner no. 4 and 10 in a form of GIS atlas. The following outputs were produced in the reporting period:

- The exchange of bi-lateral experience was started e.g. Polish pilot sea use plan (covering Puck Bay) elaborated in 2008 under PlanCoast INTERREG III B project was shown to the RU experts;
- The experience with the BaltCoast project of INTERREG III B was shared;
- Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application was first discussed then agreed and then produced and presented to the final/closing conference of the EWW in St. Petersburg on 21st October 2008;
- Agreement between Maritime Institute in Gdańsk and Russian partners on permanent co-operation in the future (including joint projects and policy related work) aiming at establishment of a system of joint ICZM and maritime spatial planning in Gdańsk Bay between Poland and Russia was prepared in autumn 2008. The partners of the agreement will act as an centres of excellence in their countries with regard to maritime spatial planning and ICZM.

Comments:

The pilot action had to be modified. But the actions started within EWW project will be continued after the project closure thanks to established under the EEW contacts. The aim of establishment of the system of joint ICZM and maritime spatial planning in Gdańsk Bay between Poland and Russia is still valid and will be realised in the future. What was done under EWW project was to start this process by exchange of experience, awareness rising, gathering

stakeholders and discussing with them the problem and by preparation of some necessary tools which will convince Russian decision-makers that an integrative coastal and sea space management would be important. Despite difficulties the main outputs promised in the EWW application were produced: i.e. (i) a sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application and (ii) agreements between Polish and Russian relevant institutions on co-operation in sea use planning and management.

Activity 13: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR

The same as activity no. 3

Activity 14: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG3)

- 14.1. Steering Group Meeting (1 day) took place on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg according to schedule (for details see action 4.1).
- 14.2. Synergy meeting no.1 (1 day) took place in Riga on 31st of January 2008 (see action 4.3. for details). This meeting was used by the WG3 also for development of a first outline of recommendation paper which was discussed afterwards by e-mail exchange.
- 14.3. Steering Group Meeting 2 on 1st of February 2008 in Riga (see action 4.4. for details).
- 14.4. Synergy meeting no 2 (1 day) took place in Liepaja on 14th of March 2008 (see action 4.5. for details).
- 14.5. WG3 second meeting (1,5 day) took place on 27-28 March 2008 in Kaliningrad (instead of late November 2007). It was attended by sixteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 7, 9, 10., one external expert and two invited guests. The meeting assessed the progress of the analytical work, discussed the interim reports of Russia and tried to relate the WG3 work towards the EU Integrated Maritime Policy (Blue Book). The final draft of recommendation paper was discussed and agreed. The acknowledgement of the project results at the political level was also examined. The WG3 group joined the WG1 and the WG2 wish to present its results at policy level by introducing them to the “Long Term Perspective” of VASAB. However, partner 9 was also asked to transfer the results to the EU BSR Strategy and to the EU work on integrated maritime policy. During the WG3 meeting a workshop with Russian stakeholders on off-shore planning and ICZM was organised in Kaliningrad on 27th of March 2008 as a joint venture of all projects dealing with this subject i.e. EWW, POWER and SDI-4-SEB as a part of the conference (“Integrated management, sustainable development indicators, spatial planning and monitoring of the South-Eastern Baltic coastal regions”), which took place in Kaliningrad on 26th - 30th of March 2007. Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic were elaborated by EWW project participants beforehand and proposed to stakeholders attending this conference. The recommendations were unanimously adopted by the participants including regional and local authorities from Russia. This seemed to be an important step towards introducing integrative approach towards the sea space and coastal zone in Russia.

The output achieved was following:

- Recommendation paper discussed and adopted by the Russian stakeholder (Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic).
- 14.6. Steering Group Meeting 3 (1day) took place on 20 May 2008 in Riga (for details see action 4.8).
 - 14.7. WG3 third meeting (1 day) took place on 4-5 June 2008 in Gdańsk almost according to schedule (few days later than planned originally). It was attended by fifteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 9, 10, one external expert and five invited guests. At the meeting analytical phase was summed up. The meeting was also used for examining the

experience and good practices of the Balance project in maritime spatial planning. The experts from Denmark introduce the project to the WG3 members. However, the WG3 main discussion concentrated on the 'action plan' following the recommendations adopted in March 2008. The opinions were dispersed. Some participants considered elaboration of an action plan as premature having in mind lack of legal provisions in Russia regulating sea use in an integrative way and dispersion of responsibility for sea management among many institutions. Some others proposed to focus action plan on methodological issues i.e. issues indispensable to introduce sea use planning in Russia and methodology of such planning suited for Russian conditions. After the e-mail exchange in June 2008 the partner no 9 responsible for the WG3 work decided to take the risk to prepare a draft action plan and to discuss it in September 2008 with the WG 3 members. Therefore an additional meeting was requested to be held in September 2008, to conclude the recommendation phase. The following outputs were achieved:

- The experience with Balance project of INTERREG III B was shared.

After the WG3 third meeting the partner no 9 and 10 organised (late June beginning of July 2008) consultation about the follow up of the WG3 in a form of a joint project. In the consultation the information on different ETC Programmes in the BSR were analysed and compared. The results were presented to the WG3 fourth meeting.

- 14.8. WG3 fourth meeting (one day) took place on 2nd September 2008 in Gdańsk. It was attended by thirteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 7, 9, 10 and one external expert. The meeting discussed the final draft of the action programme prepared by the staff of partners no 4 and 10 (Maritime Institute from Gdańsk and Immanuel Kant State University of Russia from Kaliningrad). Also final draft of the sea use register was presented by the partner no.4. The WG3 discussions tackled also the future use of the WG3 results. The presentations to the final/closing conference of EWW were agreed. It was also decided that the WG3 analysis should serve for broader popularization of the issue of maritime spatial planning in the Baltic Sea Region. The partner no 9. agreed to edit (by the end of 2008) from its own resources a *Compendium on Maritime Spatial Planning systems in the Baltic Sea Region countries* composed of two parts: part 1 *Survey of the national instruments and tools for the management of the sea space in the BSR countries* describing legal and institutional aspects of maritime spatial planning systems in the BSR countries and part 2 entitled *Examples of national cases of sea spatial conflicts and potentials*. Partner no.9 promised to invite to this book all other BSR countries while using the WG3 results as the core input. The WG3 also analysed different possibilities of continuation of the WG3 work. After the lively discussion it was decided to use two vehicles for further co-operation: The project BaltSeaPlan already submitted to the BSR Programme (although slightly too abstractive) and the new project to be submitted to the ENPI Programme Lithuania–Poland–Russian Federation on concrete planning work as continuation of the WG3 pilot activities. It was decided that transnational maritime planning should concentrate on Vistula/Kaliningrad lagoon and on Kursiu lagoon.

The WG3 discussed and improved the following documents during its fourth meeting:

- Action plan how to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational sea use planning and ICZM;
- Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application.

- 14.9. Steering Group Meeting 4 (one day) took place on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg (please see action 4.10)

2.2. Assessment of the results of the Action

The central objective of the Action was to promote territorial integration of NW Russia (i.e. the entire Northwest Federal District, including Kaliningrad) into the Baltic Sea region (BSR) in the identified three fields of (1) business development, (2) transport / ICT development and (3) sea use planning and Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM). The starting point was relatively impressive but

slightly idle (from the BSR perspective) developmental potential (in terms of human capital, scientific achievements etc.) of the North West Russia. The task was to develop solutions how to use the potential of the NW Russia for the benefit of the BSR economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development.

The action was successful to that extend that it managed to identify economic and spatial development needs in the NW Russia from the perspective of public authorities and businesses, requiring to be tackled by at the transnational level. This findings were benchmarked against existing good practice solutions based on experience of other BSR countries. The search was also done in order to detect economic and spatial trends, relevant for connecting territorial potentials between the NW Russia and the BSR. However, the picture coming from analysis appeared less promising than expected (see point 2.9). But even in those rather difficult circumstances the recommendations for three mentioned above fields were formulated and action plans were outlined. The main results delivered to the external audience having policy relevance are presented below:

The results achieved	The results intended	Explanation of differences
Recommendations how to improve innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration	Recommendation" paper with suggestions on policy improvements and legislative changes to improve settlement and innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration	The results achieved put less attention to legislative changes than to policy improvements. This is outcome of the survey done in order to learn from Russian businessman what are the main obstacles for them to innovate.
Recommendations how to improve settlement policies in NW Russia (urban rural partnership) from the perspective of BSR integration,		The focus of the result achieved is on urban-rural partnership as key for integrative development of settlement structure in Russia.
Action plan how to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration,	A paper with fields for further concrete actions ("action plan") to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration	Done in line with plans
Recommendations on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR including concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR,	1.Recommendation" paper with suggestions on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR 2. A paper with fields for further concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia and in BY in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR	The recommendations and action plan were merged. The reason is that Russia has very concrete plans and actions in this field for the future years so the WG2 decided to focus on long-term recommendations.
Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic	Recommendation" paper on upgrading the instruments and tools and institutional arrangements for transnational sea use planning and ICZM at the BSR level based on the completed pilot action	More ambitious recommendations were produced than expected i.e. more in line with the real situation in Russia with regard to ICZM and maritime spatial planning
Action plan how to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational sea use planning and	A paper with fields for further concrete actions ("action plan") to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational	Done in line with plans

ICZM	sea use planning and ICZM	
Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application	A sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application - based on the completed system mapping.	Done in line with plans
Agreement between maritime Institute in Gdańsk and Immanuel Kant State University of Russia on further co-operation in the field of maritime spatial planning	Agreements between Polish and Russian relevant institutions on co-operation in sea use planning and management	Done in line with plans

The most important EWW achievement is delivery of main messages resulting from the Action to the important Russian decision makers, planning professionals and scientific sector as well as to the key pan-Baltic organizations such as HELCOM or VASAB. Through VASAB also the EU BSR strategy was influenced.

2.3. The outcome on both final beneficiaries and/or target group and the situation of the target group/target region which the action addressed

The target audience/recipients of the project findings have been decision-makers (ministries responsible for spatial planning and development in the BSR, including the federal government in Russia, regional authorities in NW Russia, pan-Baltic organisations such as VASAB 2010). Thanks to the action they have received a better picture on the situation with regard to the North-West Russia integration into the Baltic Sea region (BSR). This knowledge has been already used for policy making by VASAB in production of the Long Term Spatial Development Perspective and it seems that it will be also useful for the EU Commission in elaboration of the EU BSR strategy and for HELCOM for implementation of the Baltic Sea Action Plan. In fact the Action played a tremendous role in validation of the planning methodologies and strategic documents at the pan-Baltic level based on the NW Russia perspective. The Action gave a proper insight on main drivers and obstacles of integration of the North West Russia into the BSR. The Action findings and recommendations were also delivered to the Russian decision makers and VASAB will continue its efforts to convince them that the BSR integration is beneficial for the North-West Russia. At least in the field of maritime spatial planning as the result of the Action one can see increased capacity and competence basis to take up joint transnational initiatives between the NW Russia partners and institutions from other BSR countries.

The final beneficiaries local and regional governments in the Baltic Sea region (BSR) operators in the chosen thematic fields (e.g. businesses in WP1 and transport operators in WP2) in NW Russia and in the BSR will be influenced mainly through the actions of pan-Baltic organisations mainly VASAB and its Long Term Spatial Development Perspective. This will allow for incorporation of the BSR perspective in the national/regional/local policies in the NW Russia.

2.4. Publications

The following publications were produced:

Name	Number of copies	Distribution channels
The East-West Window brochure informing about the project	300	Distributed during the project events in particular kick-off conference, stakeholder seminar, the Conference "Baltic Sea Region Programme 2007-2013: new partnership opportunities for Russian and Belarusian regions" and many other events
Атлас использования прибрежных акваторий российской части Юго-восточной Балтики (Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application – <i>edited on CD rom</i>)	200	Distributed for free during the EWW final (closing) conference, available for free from partner no.4

The book in Russian: Северо-Запад России в Регионе Балтийского моря: Проблемы и перспективы экономического взаимодействия и сотрудничества (North West Russia in the Baltic Sea region. Problems and perspectives of co-operation and mutual influence) presenting main results of the project	100	Distributed for free by partners no.4 among the project partners and participants of the EWW events. Sent to Russian relevant Ministries and main libraries.
--	-----	--

2.5. Contracts (works, supplies, services) above 5000€ awarded for the implementation of the action since the last interim report

Only one contract above 5000€ was awarded since the last interim report.

	Contract	Amount	Procedure	Winner
1	Audit Services Contract	5 131,94	“negotiated procedure without publication”	<i>SIA Rodl and Partner</i>

2.6. Continuation of the Action after ending the support from the European Community

The action will be continued after ending the EU support for the East West Window project. Durability of the project results has been ensured by the direct participation or the support of the national ministries responsible for spatial planning and development around the BSR, acting under VASAB 2010. Through their co-operation with other relevant stakeholders, the project rendered available concrete recommendations for policy-making in the chosen thematic fields in the NW Russia and at the BSR level. Through intensive dialogue with the target audience, the project influenced planners in Russia neighbouring countries by including the perspective of NW Russia. It also served for modification of pan-Baltic strategic policy papers, long-term visions and development plans on the very same account.

In particular the EWW results were used by VASAB for elaboration of the Long Term Perspective for Spatial Development of the BSR. Thanks to the EWW this will be the document with proper outlook on North-West Russia. Due to the EWW the collaboration between VASAB (ministries) and other EWW partners (research institutes) will be strengthened. The EWW results will be also used for discussing with HELCOM an idea of maritime spatial planning in the Baltic Sea Region.

Follow-up activities in effect of the project will be initiated and promoted by VASAB 2010. This includes starting up of possible new project(s) covering the whole BSR and taking into consideration the needs and perspectives of NW Russia, identified and referred to in the present project. The WG3 work will be continued in a form of the BaltSeaPlan project already approved by the BSR Programme (will start around December 2008). The WG3 partners will also plan to submit the project on elaboration of concrete maritime spatial plans for Vistula and Kursiu Lagoons in the framework of the ENPI Programme Lithuania–Poland–Russian Federation. Despite finishing the work of the WG3 the partner no.9 responsible for its leading has already declared to continue the efforts in a broader BSR set up and started elaboration of the BSR wide “Compendium on Maritime Spatial Planning systems in the Baltic Sea Region countries” using the WG3 results and experience.

2.7. Gender equality, disabilities

Where relevant, the perspective of equal opportunities was taken into account for the thematic work (especially in the fields of business and transport). Due efforts were made to secure involvement of both men and women in the composition of the project management structures, daily work and in the dialogue fora with relevant stakeholders in NW Russia and at the overall BSR level. Spatial planning forming a substance of the project from its definition cares for gender equality, prevention or exclusions of handicapped from the normal life. Although, gender equality and disabilities were not the main focus of the EWW project one can assume that the realisation of the project objectives (integration of the NW Russia into the BSR) will be beneficial in a long run also for attracting attention of Russian decision makers and Russian society to those above mentioned horizontal goals. They are placed very high at civil agenda in particular in the Nordic countries and integration means also convergence in values and way of living so it means better acceptance of these horizontal goals in Russia as well. The same has happened in Poland, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia after their accession to EU (strengthening their European integration).

2.8. Monitoring and evaluation of the activities

Monitoring of activities was done on routine basis by the project Steering Group. The group worked very effectively guiding the project and proposing the changes if necessary. The group (ministerial part) provided also an excellent piece of advice with regard to use of the EWW project results for policy making. However, one should also admit the important role of Committee on Spatial Development of the Baltic Sea Region which was among the main recipients of the project results. The advice from this body and the VASAB Secretariat which took part in majority of the EWW events (on their own money) helped a lot in proper shaping the EWW work and focusing on the policy relevant results (e.g. providing links to HELCOM, EU BSR Strategy etc.).

Also important were feedbacks received from beneficiaries during the kick-off and final (closing) conference. In the Annex 2 quotations from the Conference resolutions are attached (in Russian).

2.9. What has been learned from the Action

The main lesson from the action is that integration of the NW Russia into the Baltic Sea Region (BSR) will not be an easy process. Russia is a global player looking for global organizations and bodies as its partners. Even the regional level i.e. St. Petersburg has sufficient potential to play an important role at the global arena. This is clearly seen in the St. Petersburg government policy and strategic documents. BSR is not the main field of St. Petersburg strategic activity. Slightly different situation is with regard to Kaliningrad, but its potential is sufficient to strengthen rather cross-border than pan-Baltic integration of Russian Federation. The main integrative processes between Russia and the rest of the BSR are hardly due to market forces or conscious decisions of the Russian enterprises but rather thanks to EU financial support in form of transnational and cross-border programmes. The only field in which one can expect more or less natural co-operation between Russia and the other BSR countries is maritime spatial planning as long as it affects coastal defence, fish stock and state of the coastal nature. Russia is very active now in HELCOM where the questions of maritime spatial planning have been already raised.

Therefore strengthening integration of the North-West Russia into the BSR requires further development of the Russian medium size cities such as e.g. Kaliningrad or Pskov, their partnership with adjacent regions, and development of the maritime spatial planning institutions which in natural way will seek for the relations with their closest neighbours.

3. Partners and other Co-operation

- 3.1. How do you assess the relationship between the formal partners of this Action (i.e. those partners which have signed a partnership statement)? Please specify for each partner organisation

St. Petersburg Administration [2] – partner active for discussing policy relevant documents and organising meetings in St. Petersburg in the field of analysis acting through partner no.3 . Important contribution to the stakeholder dialogue. In fact this partner will be one of the main recipients of the project results.

Russian Economic Developers Association (ASSET) [3] – very demanding from formal point of view but also very experience partner in analytical work. A great bulk of the WG1 recommendations were proposed by this partner. The partner is a great interface between science and policy making in Russia in particular in St. Petersburg. Important role in dissemination activities thanks to good contacts with decision-makers in Russia at local and regional level.

Immanuel Kant State University of Russia [4] – very reliable and enthusiastic partner being a source of many data and information excellent in scientific work acquiring great experience during the EWW project how to translate analysis into policy findings, but in fact majority of recommendations of the WG2 and the WG3 were rooted in partner no. 4 thinking.

Ministry of the Environment, Danish Forest and Nature Agency, Denmark [5] – very active and experienced partner (being responsible in the past for the USUN project) leading the WG 1 work and ensuring proper presentation of EWW at the highest BSR political level.

Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Housing, Germany [6] – very active and experienced partner responsible for urban-rural investigations under the WG1, ensuring proper presentation of EWW at the highest BSR political level.

Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communication, Sweden [7] – partner ensuring link to the EU BSR strategy (use of EWW results also there), acting mainly through partner 8 but very active in the WG2 , active in the WG3 (with very high quality inputs) and contributing to policy relevant findings in the EWW.

Nordic Centre for Spatial Development (NORDREGIO) [8] – one of key drivers for analytical work, competent, flexible with a large knowledge and experience in spatial and regional development.

Ministry of Regional Development, Poland [9] – partner leading the WG3 but active in other work groups, very experienced and very flexible contributing to the work additional resources if project resources are not sufficient.

Maritime Institute, Poland [10] – key resource for maritime spatial planning and ICZM in the project supporting actively the WG3 and coordinating the whole project from content point of view in very reasonable way.

3.2. Is the partnership to continue

The partnership will continue in a form of BSR Programme and ENPI Programme projects on maritime spatial planning. The co-operation agreement between partners no 4 and 10 will serve to this end. The BaltSea Plan was approved by the BSR programme. The project will serve as a continuation and dissemination of the WG3 work and results since both partners no 4 and 10 are among its key drivers.

The EWW project results were also used within the VASAB framework. This means that new partners such as Nordregio, ASSET or Immanuel Kant State University of Russia have joined the VASAB work and their involvement will continue.

3.3. How would you assess the relationship between your organisation and State authorities in the Action countries? How has this relationship affected the Action?

Since majority of the partners are state high level institutions those relations were fine. The partners representing state authorities knew each other for many years before starting the project as the members of the VASAB co-operation (Co-operation of Ministers for spatial planning and development in the BSR countries). The new input was given by the scientific institutions. This was a great added value of the project, mutual learning how to translate analysis into policy relevant actions. The research oriented partners were quite flexible and willing to reshape analysis or repeat them if asked by policy making partners.

3.4. Where applicable, describe your relationship with any other organisations involved in implementing the Action:

- Associate(s) (if any) - no
- Sub-contractor(s) (if any). Some of the work was given to the external contractors. However an idea was that majority of work should be done by the partners themselves since the partners had sufficient qualification to execute the project and achieve its goals. Contractors were used mainly for technical issues and for bringing knowledge from INTERREG projects. Only some partners (9) and (5) used contractors more intensively (for some concrete work) due to shortages in their human resources. In principle the relation with contractors were positive with one exception (i.e. Rumanian contractor who won a tender for the EWW financial management disappeared after few month of serving the project)
- Final Beneficiaries and Target groups. Those relations were fine thanks to sue of well established and prominent conferences for presentation of the EWW. This gave the project access to the target group necessary for the project success.
- Other third parties involved. Important was a link of the project to the VASAB Secretariat and VASAB work on the Long Term Perspective. VASAB Secretariat promoted also project and its results externally on request of the Responsible Partner.

3.5. Where applicable, outline any links you have developed with other actions.

The project ambition was to develop link to other important projects in order to make use of their results (BaltCoast, PlanCoast, Balance, USUN, SeBCo – their experts were invited to the project meetings) or to make joint meetings to better reach target groups (SeBCo POWER and SDI-4-SEB). These projects represented different INTERREG strands.

3.6. If your organisation has received previous EC grants in view of strengthening the same target group, in how far has this Action been able to build upon/complement the previous one(s)? (List all previous relevant EC grants).

The Ministries involved in the project previously received a grant from INTERREG II C to prepare an Action Plan for implementation of the VASAB strategy adopted in 1994. The project was called VASAB Plus and ended in 2000. The EWW used the VASAB Plus experience but its focus was different. This time the target geographical area was the NW Russia and its integration to the BSR. The lesson learned under the VASAB Plus (where Russia had no financial resources for analysis) showed that preparation of a pan-Baltic documents with very differentiate resources might result in uneven involvement of the countries and then uneven ownership of the agreed actions or strategies. Therefore the EWW was invented to avoid such a mistake and to give Russian colleagues resources for considering their role in the BSR integration.

4. Visibility

How is the visibility of the EU contribution being ensured in the Action?

At the project start a press release was done by the Responsible Partner. Visibility was ensured by placing proper information that the EWW project was part-financed by the EU together with the EU logo and logo of INTERREG III B. This was done on printing materials, power point presentation and on the project web site. There was also some information in the Latvian radio. On demand of Russian colleagues the project was presented at the Conference “Baltic Sea Region Programme 2007-2013: new partnership opportunities for Russian and Belarusian regions” in St. Petersburg as one of the most successful INTERREG projects with Russian participation. To strengthen the project visibility a special project banner was produced and displayed on many occasions (e.g. Conference “Baltic Sea region Spatial Development Policies avenues to the Long Term Perspective” in Riga on 23 April 2007, and already mentioned conference “Baltic Sea Region Programme 2007-2013: new partnership opportunities for Russian and Belarusian regions” in St. Petersburg on 16-17 April 2008 and in many other events). The book with the project analysis and recommendations was printed in December 2008. But the most important is that the project results will be used for producing “Long Term Perspective” for the BSR which will be presented to CBSS and all important pan-Baltic organizations. Thanks to EWW NW Russia will be properly highlighted in this strategy.

The European Commission may wish to publicise the results of Actions. Do you have any objection to this report being published on Europe Aid Co-operation Office website? If so, please state your objections here.

Name of the contact person for the Action: **Vladislavs Vesperis**

Signature:Location: **Riga, Latvia**

Date report due:Date report sent:

Update of action plan

Activity	Months																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Activity 1: Kick off of the work of Working Group no 1 on business development and innovation affecting spatial development,	X	X	X	X														
Activity 2: Analysis(WG1)				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Activity 3: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR (WG1)					X						X						X	
Activity 4: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations and action plan (WG1)					X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Activity 5: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 2 on accessibility				X														
Activity 6: Analysis(WG2)					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Activity 7: Pilot studies (WG2)												X	X	X	X	X		
Activity 8: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR					X						X						X	X
Activity 9: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG2)					X	X		X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Activity 10: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 3 on ICZM and transnational sea use planning		X			X													
Activity 11 Analysis (WG 3)					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					
Activity 12 Pilot Action (WG 3)					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
Activity 13: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR					X						X						X	
Activity 14: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG3)					X			X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		

EWV events: participation of man and woman

Participants			
Event	Woman	Man	Total
Kick off meeting of the work of WG1, on 25 June 2007 in Riga	9	11	20
WG1 meeting 25 September 2007 in Riga	4	3	7
WG1 analysis (people involved)	11	23	34
Steering Group meeting on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg	7	11	18
St Petersburg kick off conference on 18-19 October 2007	112	146	259
St Petersburg Closing conference on 21 October 2008	231	400	631
WG1 second meeting on 6-7 December 2007 in Riga	9	10	19
Synergy meeting no.1 on 31 January 2008 in Riga	10	13	23
Steering Group Meeting no.2 on 1 February 2008 in Riga	4	11	15
Synergy meeting no 2 in Liepaja on 14 th of March 2008	8	8	16
WG1 fourth meeting on 3-4 April 2008 in Riga	6	7	13
Riga Stakeholders seminars (WG3 and WG1 + WG2) on 23 April 2008	83	84	167
WG1 fifth meeting on 24 April 2008 in Riga	13	12	25
Steering Group Meeting no. 3 on 20 May 2008 in Riga	4	6	10
Steering Group Meeting no. 4 on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg	3	10	13
WG1 sixth meeting on 3 rd September 2008 in Jurmala	11	11	22
WG2 first meeting on 10 October 2007 in Riga	3	6	9
WG2 analysis	6	11	17
WG2 second meeting on 5 December 2007 in Riga	4	7	11
WG2 third meeting on 21 May 2008 in Riga	2	7	9
WG2 fourth meeting on 4 th September 2008 in Jurmala	9	11	20
WG3 preparatory meeting on 24 July 2007 in Kaliningrad	4	10	14
WG 3 first meeting on 30-31 October 2007 in Kaliningrad	12	15	27
WG3 analysis	3	11	14
Pilot Action (WG 3)	3	10	13
WG3 second meeting on 27-28 March 2008 in Kaliningrad	6	13	19
WG3 third meeting on 4-5 June 2008 in Gdańsk	6	15	21
WG3 fourth meeting 2 September 2008 in Gdańsk	3	11	14

Quotations from the Conference resolutions (in Russian) in direct relations to the EAST West Window.

1. Kick Off Conference

Продвижение европейского опыта в рамках программ Европейского Инструмента Соседства и Партнерства усилит инновационный потенциал и влияние Северо-Западного региона России на процессы территориальной интеграции на внешних границах ЕС, в частности, в регионе Балтийского моря. В этих целях целесообразна активизация участия России в таких международных объединениях, как VASAB 2010, Балтийский форум развития (BDF), Программа транснационального сотрудничества региона Балтийского моря 2007-2013.

Зарубежный опыт свидетельствует о значительной роли малых и средних городов в продвижении инноваций и гармонизации территориального развития. Этот факт должен учитываться при разработке инновационных стратегий в России как на федеральном, так и на региональном уровнях. Необходимо уделять больше внимания развитию малых и средних городов, как это происходит в странах ЕС, и адаптировать европейский опыт применительно к ситуации в России (в частности, концепцию сельско-городского партнерства «ESDP Concept of Rural-Urban Partnership»). Доступ к знаниям и информации, возможность обмена идеями должны стать основой формирования территориальных моделей развития России.

/.../

Участники Форума согласились со следующим:

- необходимо особое единое государственное управление морскими прибрежными зонами страны (обеими их составляющими: морской и сухопутной) исходя из повсеместного успешного мирового опыта подобной деятельности и соответствующих рекомендаций организаций системы ООН и международных форумов на высшем уровне. Руководствуясь этим, рекомендовать: 1) создание нормативной правовой и институциональной базы для разработки и реализации комплексных программ развития и управления прибрежными зонами в рамках комплексных программ социально-экономического развития приморских субъектов Федерации и программ развития прибрежных муниципальных образований в целях активизации участия последних в освоении прибрежных и морских ресурсов; 2) адаптацию и освоение современных управленческих технологий (методология Комплексного управления прибрежными зонами (КУПЗ)) в применении к богатейшим по ресурсам и разнообразным по природным и социально-экономическим условиям прибрежным зонам страны; 3) разработку и реализацию пилотных программ КУПЗ конкретных побережий страны; 4) использование опыта сотрудничества стран Балтийского региона, в частности рекомендаций Проекта BaltCoast BSR INTERREG III B по управлению прибрежными зонами и разработке совместных стратегических проектов;
- рекомендовать использование кластерного подхода в качестве инструмента реализации стратегий развития территорий и повышения конкурентоспособности региональной и муниципальной экономики, включая выявление и диагностику потенциальных кластеров, разработку программ их развития, создание организаций по сотрудничеству. В органах власти необходимо формирование межотраслевых рабочих групп для координации развития кластеров и снятия ведомственных и отраслевых ограничений. Целесообразно более широкое использование международных программ и инструментов повышения конкурентоспособности кластеров;
- необходимо развитие региональной и муниципальной статистики, в частности для целей выработки эффективной кластерной политики и оценки результатов реализации кластерных инициатив в регионе и/или муниципалитете, формирования действенных

инструментов планирования и управления, ориентированного на результат на субфедеральных уровнях;

- при реализации федеральных, региональных и местных программ экономического развития необходимо стимулировать участие организаций инновационной инфраструктуры в российских и зарубежных сетевых организациях, которые оказывают содействие в предоставлении услуг компаниям и научным организациям в сфере инновационной бизнес-кооперации и трансфера технологий (примерами могут служить Российская сеть трансфера технологий RTTN, Европейская сеть бизнес-инновационных центров EBN). Участие в сетевом сотрудничестве должно быть нацелено на повышение качества и содержания услуг для местных компаний и НИИ. Федеральным и региональным органам власти необходимо поддерживать инициативы по развитию сетевого взаимодействия между организациями инновационной региональной инфраструктуры (создание региональных сетей) с целью уменьшения дублирования функций, повышения качества услуг и снижения расходов бюджета на их субсидирование;
- рекомендовать и стимулировать участие российских центров коммерциализации, инновационных центров в реализации Competitiveness Innovation Program (CIP) Европейского союза в части проектов, ориентированных на развитие инновационных сетей и сетей трансфера технологий (IRC, IRE, EBN и др.);
- считать целесообразным использование в России европейского опыта реализации региональных инновационных стратегий, обеспечивающих выявление спроса на инновации среди компаний и ориентацию научного сектора и инновационной инфраструктуры на удовлетворение этого спроса. (...);
- в целях совершенствования государственного и муниципального управления по обеспечению перехода Российской Федерации на инновационный путь развития рекомендовать Комиссии при Президенте Российской Федерации по вопросам совершенствования государственного управления и правосудия, Министерству регионального развития Российской Федерации, другим заинтересованным федеральным и региональным органам власти осуществить экспертизу полномочий органов государственной власти субъектов Российской Федерации и органов местного самоуправления в части выявления проблемных вопросов, препятствующих обеспечению перехода России на режим инновационного развития, и законодательно обеспечить активизацию участия в реализации государственной научно-технической политики органов государственной власти субъектов Федерации и органов местного самоуправления, рассмотреть возможность разработки национальной программы, ориентированной на содействие российским регионам в подготовке и реализации региональных инновационных стратегий и формирование российской сети инновационных регионов;
- рекомендовать заинтересованным федеральным и региональным органам государственной власти реализовать систему мер по поддержке технопарков и процессов коммерциализации научных разработок. В частности: разработать законодательную базу для развития технопарков на федеральном уровне; предоставить налоговые льготы компаниям-резидентам технопарков, например, аналогичные льготам для резидентов ОЭЗ; упростить процедуру предоставления земельных участков для технопарков; законодательно разрешить НИИ, вузам и университетам создавать малые предприятия - start-up'ы;
- рекомендовать органам регионального и муниципального управления активно использовать инструменты международной технической и финансовой помощи, предоставляемой по линии Института Всемирного Банка, АМР США, Европейского Инструмента Соседства и Партнерства (ENPI) и других программ Европейского Союза для реализации стратегических приоритетов и планов территориального развития, поддержки инноваций;
- отметить необходимость выработки механизма интеграции документов стратегического планирования муниципального, регионального и федерального уровней;
- одобрить инициативы Комитета по пространственному развитию региона Балтийского моря (CSD/BSR) VASAB 2010 по территориальной интеграции Северо-Запада России и реализации совместных проектов в таких приоритетных сферах как развитие бизнеса, транспорта, ИКТ, управление прибрежными зонами. Отметить актуальность проекта «Окно

Восток-Запад", который позволит восполнить пробелы в оценке инновационного потенциала Северо-Запада России и расширит возможности синергии инновационных потенциалов стран Балтийского региона.

- предложить Комитету VASAB 2010 использовать Форум лидеров стратегического планирования городов и регионов России в качестве референтной группы для обсуждения Стратегии пространственного развития региона Балтийского моря.

2. Closing Conference

2.1. «Перспективы развития Северо-Западного федерального округа: вызовы, приоритеты, угрозы и ограничения»

Участники рекомендуют:

- 1) в целях максимального учёта сложившихся межсубъектовых экономических связей, обеспечения увязки общегосударственных и региональных планов и прогнозов социально-экономического развития, целесообразно предусмотреть **разработку стратегических документов долгосрочного социально-экономического развития на уровне федеральных округов**. Для преодоления ведомственной и региональной разобщённости целесообразно поручить эту работу Ассоциациям экономического взаимодействия соответствующих федеральных округов. Это позволит точнее формулировать цели регионального развития в увязке с имеющимися общими ресурсами, объективно сформировать перечень основных межрегиональных проектов, обеспечивающих достижение общих целей развития. Подобные документы могут стать основой для последующей разработки Концепции долгосрочного социально-экономического развития Российской Федерации;
- 2) для ускорения социально-экономического развития территорий требуется **активизация межрегионального взаимодействия**. Зачастую депрессивные регионы (субъекты Федерации) экономически тесно связаны с успешными регионами (транспортные подходы к инфраструктурным объектам, наличие сырьевой базы для обрабатывающих производств и т.п.). В этом случае целесообразно оказывать федеральную помощь (налоговые и иные льготы, государственные гарантии под привлекаемые кредиты, первоочередное финансирование проектов в рамках действующих ФЦП и др.) для инфраструктурного развития депрессивных территорий по поддерживаемым видам и направлениям экономической деятельности, а также для реализации проектов способствующих комплексному развитию двух и более субъектов Федерации;
- 3) необходимым условием развития и Северо-Западного федерального округа и страны в целом является **совершенствование работы транспортного комплекса**. Требуется системный подход к формированию единой стратегии развития транспортно-логистического комплекса страны в увязке с развитием отраслей экономики и внешнеэкономической ситуацией.

2.2. «Специфика стратегий приморских регионов»

Участники считают, что

- 1) Необходимо совершенствование стратегического планирования применительно к морской деятельности и приморским регионам и муниципалитетам, предусматривающее:

на федеральном уровне:

- применение интегральных подходов к планированию и управлению в морском природопользовании. Это позволит преодолеть фрагментарность, присущую отраслевому подходу, учесть взаимосвязанность видов морского природопользования, способствовать связям и межотраслевой гармонизации в морской деятельности исходя из анализа конфликтного использования ресурсов, обеспечить многоцелевую ориентацию и соответствие

деятельности природоохранным целям, участие всех заинтересованных сторон в разработке стратегий и программ развития;

- создание нормативной правовой и институциональной базы для разработки и реализации комплексных программ развития и управления прибрежными зонами, основанных на интегральных подходах, в рамках стратегий и программ социально-экономического развития приморских субъектов Федерации и программ развития прибрежных муниципальных образований. Это позволит реализовать особое единое государственное управление морскими прибрежными зонами страны (обеими их составляющими: морской и сухопутной) исходя из повсеместного успешного мирового опыта подобной деятельности и соответствующих рекомендаций организаций системы ООН и международных форумов на высшем уровне;

на региональном уровне:

- адаптацию и освоение современных управленческих технологий (методология Комплексного управления прибрежными зонами - КУПЗ) в применении к богатейшим по ресурсам и разнообразным по природным и социально-экономическим условиям прибрежным зонам страны;
- разработку и реализацию пилотных программ КУПЗ конкретных побережий страны.

Реализация этих мер позволит реализовать естественные природные конкурентные преимущества морских акваторий и прибрежных территорий в обеспечении дополнительного экономического роста, конкурентоспособности, инвестиционной привлекательности, занятости, повышения комфортности и качества жизни, охраны окружающей среды и уменьшения ущерба от природных и техногенных катастроф, а также безопасности страны

- 2) Необходимо совершенствование нормативной правовой базы, регулирующей градостроительную деятельность, в части учета специфики этой деятельности на морских акваториях, находящихся под суверенитетом и юрисдикцией Российской Федерации.
- 3) Необходимо развивать международное сотрудничество в стратегическом планировании морского природопользования, учитывая единство и экосистемный характер морских процессов, и широко использовать международный опыт в этой сфере.

FINAL NARRATIVE REPORT

5. Description

- 5.1. Name of beneficiary of grant contract: Ministry of Regional Development and Local Government, Latvia (Reģionālās attīstības un pašvaldību lietu ministrija).
- 5.2. Name and title of the Contact person: Mr Vladislavs Vesperis.
- 5.3. Name of partners in the Action: St. Petersburg Administration (Администрация Губернатора Санкт-Петербурга) [2], Russian Economic Developers Association (ASSET) (Ассоциация специалистов по экономическому развитию территорий) [3], Immanuel Kant State University of Russia (Российский государственный университет имени И. Канта) [4], Ministry of the Environment, Danish Forest and Nature Agency⁵, Denmark (Miljøministeriet, Skov- og Naturstyrelsen) [5], Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Housing, Germany (Bundesministeriums für Verkehr, Bau und Stadtentwicklung) [6], Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communication, Sweden (Näringsdepartementet) [7], Nordic Centre for Spatial Development (NORDREGIO) [8], Ministry of Regional Development, Poland (Ministerstwo Rozwoju Regionalnego) [9], Maritime Institute, Poland (Instytut Morski) [10].
- 5.4. Title of the Action: East-West Window (EWW).
- 5.5. Contract number: Grant Contract for European Community External Actions **2007/132-845**.
- 5.6. Start date and end date of the reporting period⁶: 15.06.2007 – 15.12.2008.
- 5.7. Target country(ies) or region(s): **North-West Russia in particular: St. Petersburg, Leningrad region and Kaliningrad region**; to some extent also Belarus and North-West Russia adjacent countries (mainly for collecting good practices and dissemination of the project results).
- 5.8. Final beneficiaries &/or target groups⁷ (if different). The target audience/recipients of the project findings are: decision-makers (ministries responsible for spatial planning and development in the BSR, including the federal government in Russia, regional authorities in

⁵ The name of the partner 5 was changed during the EWW project execution **from** Ministry of the Environment, Danish Forest and Nature agency **to** Ministry of the Environment, Agency for Spatial and Environmental Planning (Miljøministeriet, By- og Landskabsstyrelsen).

⁶ The entire implementation period of the Action

⁷ “Target groups” are the groups/entities who will be directly positively affected by the project at the Project Purpose level, and “final beneficiaries” are those who will benefit from the project in the long term at the level of the society or sector at large.

NW Russia, pan-Baltic organisations such as VASAB 2010). The final beneficiaries are local and regional governments in the Baltic Sea region (BSR) operators in the chosen thematic fields (e.g. businesses in WP1 and transport operators in WP2) in NW Russia and in the BSR. The divide into men and women of different project activities is provided separately.

- 5.9. Country (ies) in which the activities take place (if different from 1.7): Russia (St. Petersburg and Kaliningrad Oblast), Poland and Latvia.

6. Assessment of implementation of Action activities

- 6.1. Activities and results (for the whole reporting period including last narrative interim report)

Activity 1: Kick off of the work of Working Group no 1 on business development and innovation affecting spatial development,

1.4. First meeting of the WG1 (1 day) took place on 25 June 2007 in Riga which was according to the schedule. The meeting was planned in advance in late June so participants postponed their holidays which in this part of the BSR starts with so called Midsummer. The meeting was attended by 12 participants representing partners 1,3,4,5,6,8,9,10 and eight invited guests. The main aim was to discuss the analysis and further WG1 work in detail, to achieve clarity about division of labour between the partners, to make sure that duplication with other project is avoided (instead to aim at using results achieved by other projects) and to start the process of contracting the external experts. The following outputs were produced or achieved:

- Report how to avoid duplication with other INTERREG III B projects in the field of business development and innovation affecting spatial development had been prepared before the meeting by the project coordinator, discussed by the meeting and delivered to the Responsible (Lead) Partner.
- TORs for seven ASSET staff members, eight Kaliningrad University staff members, one Belarus expert and four external experts together with tender documentation (if necessary) have been prepared by project coordinator as result of the meeting. Tender procedures for the four external experts had been started resulting in contracting one external expert from Poland, one from Sweden, one from Latvia and one from Denmark. In addition the Belarus expert was contracted by the partner no. 8 without tender (contract below 5000 Euro).
- The main scope of analysis was proposed and discussed. Unfortunately too many question marks and uncertainties appeared during the June meeting so the additional meeting was organized in Riga in September and discussion on analysis continued till the second WG1 meeting (December 2007).
- Text for EWW section at to the VASAB website was decided, technically EWW link at VASAB website was created in September 2007.
- Project flyer was designed and edited including information on WG1 activities (300 copies were printed in October 2007).

Comments: The WG1 started the discussion on its work (i.e. necessary analysis, results to be achieved) but the topic was too broad for one day meeting in addition to many technical questions were raised. The decision was to continue the discussion when the experts contracted by tender would be available. The main problem was to what extend the achievement of the EWW goal (i.e. *to promote territorial integration of NW Russia into the BSR in the field of business development*)

required concentration on analysis concerning exclusively NW Russia and to what extent the broader BSR picture was necessary if integration should mean reciprocal relations (i.e. affecting both sides). The latter opinion prevailed and was accepted by the meeting. The WG1 considered that for producing the main output of the analytical phase (i.e. a *compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") with assessment of unexploited innovation potential in NW Russia, assessment of the potential for regional integration and with identification of spatial problems in NW Russia and BSR*) some BSR analysis as the background material should be done as well. The meeting also discussed the policy related role of the project i.e. better highlighting the EWW results on NW Russia role in the “Long Term Perspective” to be prepared by VASAB on CBSS demand. The WG1 leaders promised to ensure smooth transfer of the EWW results to the BSR strategy i.e. Long Term Perspective till 2030 (to be prepared by VASAB in 2009). The Responsible Partner declared that he would invite VASAB Secretariat to the most important meetings of the EWW to ensure smooth transfer of the project results to the “Long Term Perspective”.

- 1.5. Partnership Agreement Preparation. This action was related to all work packages and took place in June, July, August, and September 2007 and was ended in October 2007 with signing partnership agreements between Lead Partner and all other partners of the EWW project. The most difficult was signing Partnership Agreement with partners from St. Petersburg due to problems related to tax and system in Russia, conversion of EUR into rubels, banking system requirements etc. Finally two agreements, based on the results of additional working meeting (in Riga) discussions, were prepared and signed between Lead Partner and RU (ASSET) Partner and between German Partner and RU (ASSET) Partner. So at the end of the day there were 9 partnership agreements signed regulating relations between the EWW partners.
- 1.6. Quality Workshop (1 day) for Project leaders organised by INTERREG III B Secretariat and EU Delegation from Moscow in Riga on 26 September 2007 was attended by project coordinator (partner no.10), one representative of Russian partners (partner no.2) and representatives appointed by the Responsible Partner. Main guidelines from EC Delegation and INTERREG III B Secretariat on TACIS rules, payments schemes and communication experiences were presented during the seminar and later on at individual consultations. The meeting between Responsible Partner and the Russian partners was organized back to back with the workshop for discussing main technicalities of their participation in the project.

Activity 2: Analysis(WG1)

- 2.3. WG1 additional meeting (1 day) took place on 25 September 2007 in Riga to continue discussion on the scope of analysis. The meeting was attended by four WG1 members (including two external experts, project coordinator and the representative of the Russian partners) and three participants representing Responsible Partner. At the meeting in depth discussion on case studies on innovation, outsourcing and urban-rural relations in Russia took place and the detailed scope of the work of Russian partners and external experts were agreed. Also a draft outline structure of the WG1 analytical report was presented by the WG1 Coordinator and discussed in depth.
- 2.4. Data collection and interpretation started only in December 2007 after the second WG1 meeting. In this phase 34 people from all partners were involved (except partner no.7 who acted through partner no. 8). Their involvement differed. The main bulk of analytical work was done by partners no. 3, 4 and 8 and the external experts whereas the other people acted mainly as a reference group reading reports, making comments and asking for improvements. This was the task first of all of partners no. 1, 2, 5, 6, 9 and 10 representing mainly policy making side in the project and project coordination. Also VASAB Secretariat was invited by partner 1 (Responsible Partner) to participate in this process. The analysis (data collection) in principle were ended in March 2008 but some of them (requiring surveys) due to formal reasons (tenders) were completed in April 2008. Interpretation of data was done in April

2008 for all important cases (but some analysis e.g. the benchmarking studies and urban-rural analysis continued till September 2008). In fact in April and even in May and June the fine tuning of analysis (removing mistakes noticed by the other partners) still continued. The reason was that some partners from the reference group were very demanding asking for many improvements even if they had found little inconsistencies after second or third reading of the reports. Therefore the final synthesis report (draft discussion paper) from the analytical phase was completed only in July 2008 and even slightly changed after the WG1 September 2008 meeting and as the result of the EWW final/closing Conference in October 2008.

The outputs have been following:

(i) interim:

- Data (including public surveys) and draft analytical report on “Baltic” metropolitan areas with focus on the role of Kaliningrad and St. Petersburg;
- In depth study on St. Petersburg and Kaliningrad and their developmental potentials in the BSR context (focus on innovation and outsourcing) in which: trends and present policies for innovations nested in NW Russia and outsourcing were analysed, barriers for innovations perceived by business and public administration were identified (based on surveys), and cases on transfer of innovations between NW Russia and other parts of the BSR were described;
- Case studies (reports) on Russian and Belarus small and medium sized cities – covering: Novgorod, Gatchina, Chernyakhovsk, Gusev, Sovetsk, Svetly, Berezovka, Zaslavl;
- Reports on demographic trends in North-West Russia, in St. Petersburg and in Kaliningrad and in Belarus as well;
- Reports on case studies on urban-rural relations in Russia;
- Report on INTERREG III B projects results relevant for work of the WG1 group;
- Benchmarking studies concerning situation in Poland, Germany and Latvia on the issues relevant for the WG1 recommendations .

(ii) A compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") with assessment of unexploited innovation potential in NW Russia, assessment of the potential for regional integration and with identification of spatial problems in NW Russia and BSR.

Comments:

a) All the planned outcomes were achieved. However, during the analytical phase became clear that for the NW Russia innovation is more promising path for integration within the BSR than outsourcing, therefore more efforts were done to analyse this challenge. The list of outputs was enlarged (in comparison to the planned ones) by analysis of the role of the NW Russia in the BSR context (as the result of the WG1 discussions what analysis are necessary to achieve the EWW goal). Also urban structures and functional urban areas of not only large but also some small cities were analysed. The most interesting case appeared to be Gatchina as an example of science intensive cluster in Russia located in a small city. The some other cases illustrated urban-rural relations in Russia (and Belarus).

b) While working with data it became clear that translating data into policy recommendations can not be done by each working group separately. Therefore at the meeting of the WG leaders in December it was proposed that for the starting work on recommendation a workshop for all WGs would be necessary. The Responsible Partner was asked to organize such a workshop on 31st of January 2008 instead of simple WG1 seminar (planned for that date).

c) The work was delayed by some formal constraints such as tender procedures, requirement of separate EUR accounts (very difficult for Ministries) etc.

Activity 3: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR (WG1)

- 3.1. Kick off Conference of the project (1,5 day) for broad public took place on 18-19 October 2007 (according schedule) in St. Petersburg as a part of the well known VI Forum of Strategic Planning Leaders of Cities and Regions of Russia. This allowed project to reach the planned target group. The project: its assumptions and the planned outputs were presented to the Russian decision makers - mainly city mayors and chief planners. Conference participants expressed a deep hope that EWW project would diminish knowledge gaps within the Baltic Sea Region on the character of development potential of the NW Russia, its synergies and complementarities with potentials of other countries of the region, and on methods how this potential could be efficiently connected within the BSR. It was expressed in Conference recommendations that EWW project results should be presented in 2008 at the final Conference within VII Forum of Strategic Planning Leaders of Cities and Regions of Russia. The kick off conference was attended by 259 participants mainly Russian mayors and city planners. Among them there were 57 persons outside Russia. From EWW project 20 persons participated including Latvian State Secretary representing the Responsible Partner. So EWW reached the planned target of **200** Russian decision makers and professionals involved in discussion on the project.
- 3.2. Stakeholder Seminar for WG1 (0,5 day) was organised on 23 April 2008 in Riga (instead of beginning of May as originally planned). The preliminary results of the analytical phase were presented and the first discussions on the recommendations were started. The seminars for all working groups of EWW were arranged back to back with the VASAB annual conference financed by the Latvian Ministry of Regional Development and Local Government from its own means i.e. outside the EWW budget (from the EWW budget some partners only covered their travelling to the EWW seminars). The described above arrangement resulted in very impressive participation in the seminars and allowed to reach a planned target of **100** decision makers and businessman from BSR EU countries involved in discussion of the project findings and recommendations. The conference and seminars were attended by 167 participants including 26 persons directly involved in the EWW project (although the Responsible Partner was represented by some more employees). The participants came mainly from Latvia, Lithuania, and Finland but also from Azerbaijan, Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, EU Commission, Germany, Hungary, Norway, Poland, Russia and Sweden.
- 3.3. Closing(final) Conference of the project (1 day) for broad public took place on 21st October 2008 (according schedule) in St. Petersburg. The title of the conference was “Promoting territorial integration of the North West Russia into the Baltic Sea Region”. The main organiser was ASEET together with the EWW Responsible Partner. This Conference was a part of rich spectrum of the conferences and seminars taking place under umbrella (the same premises) of the VII All-Russia Forum of Strategic Planning Leaders “Strategic Planning in Regions and Cities of Russia”. In the event 631 participants took place out of it 582 from Russia. The forum was organized by: State Duma of the Russian Federation; Ministry for Regional Development of the Russian Federation; Ministry for Economic Development of the Russian Federation; St Petersburg City Administration; Center of Strategic Research; IS CER Leontief Centre. It was opened by Mr Dmitry Kozak, Minister of Regional Development, who underlined that “Forum is becoming the public debating platform for improving the strategic planning system of social and economic development in Russian regions”. The Conference “Promoting territorial integration of the North West Russia into the Baltic Sea region” was composed of four sessions attended by large number of the participants not only from Russia but also from other Baltic Sea Region countries. Some sessions were joint ventures with other organisations, forums and bodies interested in the subjects raised by the EWW project. The names of the sessions were following:
 - “Accessibility and innovations as motors of integration of the NW Russia into the Baltic Sea Region” (presentation of the results of the WG1 and the WG2),

- “Special Features of coastal regional strategies” (presentation of the WG3 results and dialogue with all key persons in Russia dealing with ICZM and maritime spatial planning),
- “Partnership mechanisms in local economic policy implementation” (presentation of the WG1 results with regard to urban-rural partnership).

In addition to that EWW results were presented at the key session of the Forum “Prospects for Federal Okrug Development: Challenges, priorities, threats and constraints. North-West Federal Okrug” attended by key decision makers from the North-West Federal Okrug.

Comments:

The choice of the formula of the kick-off and closing conferences appeared to have very positive results on ability of the project to deliver results to the key target groups in Russia. The Conference was also attended by the Ministerial partners from the EWW project. The EWW results were mirrored in the Forums resolutions. Some interested questions were raised requiring further discussion and examination.

- 3.4. Final publication The book summing up the results of the investigations available for the stakeholders in Kaliningrad and St.Petersburg was edited in October, November and printed in December 2008 by partner no.4.

Comments:

The number of books published was smaller (100) than assumed in the application (400), although the whole budget allocated to this purpose was used. There were several reasons why the printing was more expensive than expected. Some of them were of technical reasons: i.e. the book had more coloured pictures (maps) than estimated and was thicker than planned (more than 300 pages in comparison to 150 pages planned), but the main reason was of vis mayor nature. In 2008 in Russia an unexpected inflation and economic crisis appeared which could not be taken into account at the stage of budget planning. This resulted in much higher printing costs. However, the partner no.4 is ready to print additional copies of the book if demanded. The available copies will be distributed to the most active in the EWW Russian stakeholders and to the project partners of the EWW.

Activity 4: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations and action plan (WG1)

- 4.1. Steering Group Meeting (1 day) took place on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg according to schedule. The meeting was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1,2,3,5,6,7,9,10 and seven invited guests. The Steering Group discussed the project progress. The work was lagging behind the schedule. Although the WG1 started on time it became involved in lengthy discussions about the necessary scope of analysis and detailed division of labour between working groups. The Steering Group decided therefore not to start the work on recommendations before improving synergy between the work of the working groups. This task was given to the meeting of the WGs leaders organised in Riga back to back with the WG2 (5 December 2007) and the WG1 (6-7 December 2007) meetings. The meeting also discussed details of project presentation to the kick-off conference held next day.
- 4.2. WG1 second meeting (1,5 day) took place on 6-7 December 2007 in Riga (instead of late November). The meeting was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10, two external consultants and six invited guests. The meeting concentrated on discussing analytical phase of the project (the decision was that the lagging behind analysis would make necessary to postpone by two months the next WG1 meeting i.e. till the end of analytical phase). However, the WG 1 also started examining the way of preparation of the recommendations out of the analysis conducted. For the starting work on recommendation it was agreed that a workshop for all WGs would be necessary and the

Responsible Partner was asked to organize such a workshop (synergy meeting) on 31st of January 2008 instead of a simple WG1 seminar (scheduled for beginning of February).

- 4.3. Synergy meeting no.1 (1 day) took place in Riga on 31 of January 2008 (replacing the WG1 seminar scheduled for February). It was attended by fourteen project partner members representing partners no.1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, three external experts and six invited guests. The facilitator was hired by the Responsible Partner. During the meeting the participants agreed that all three working groups were in need of a common frame. This should be given by the vision of the BSR till 2030 with full integration of the North-West Russia. The participants managed to prepare an outline of such a vision requiring further work. The meeting asked for one more working day for finishing common visionary frame which should allow preparing meaningful recommendations.
- 4.4. Steering Group Meeting 2 took place on 1 of February 2008 in Riga. It was attended by seven project partner members representing partners no. 1,3,5,6,7, 9, 10 one external expert and seven invited guests. The results of the synergy meeting were discussed i.e. synergy between the work of the working groups. It was decided to organise one more synergy meeting to continue work on the common frame for all WGs, i.e. vision of the BSR till 2030 with full integration of the North-West Russia. An agenda of the April Conference proposed by the Responsible Partner was discussed together with some technical issues. The progress in analytical phase was reviewed.
- 4.5. Synergy meeting no. 2 (1 day) took place in Liepaja on 14th of March 2008. It was attended by ten project partner members representing partners no. 1,3,5,6,9, 10 one external expert and five invited guests. The facilitator was hired by the Responsible Partner but paid from Responsible Partner own means. The final draft of the vision was discussed and shared by participants giving stable frame for analytical part and allowing proper work on recommendations.
- 4.6. WG1 fourth meeting (1 day) took place on 3-4 April 2008 in Riga. It was attended by nine project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 8, 10, two external experts and two invited guests. The meeting was convened on demand of Russian partners who started finalisation of analytical part and wanted to discuss the preliminary results among themselves. It was also important for conceptualization of the recommendations i.e. discussing what findings from analytical phase should be taken into consideration while working on recommendations.
- 4.7 WG1 fifth meeting (one day) took place on 24 April 2008 in Riga. It was attended by fifteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, four external experts and six invited guests. The WG1 before the meeting concentrated mainly on analytical work. At the fifth meeting analyses were summed up and the work on recommendations were started. However, one more meeting was requested (autumn 2008) in order to discuss the final draft of the recommendations and action programme. Due to delay in the work on urban-rural relations in Russia the relevant reports were not presented to the WG1 at this meeting. Only an overview of the progress and main findings were reported. It was decided that for synergy reasons the reports would be presented on seminar on urban-rural relations in Russia to be organised as a joint event with the SeBCo project in Kaliningrad in June 2008. This was realised and such presentation took place and was regarded as a great success by meeting participants.
- 4.8. Steering Group Meeting 3 (one day) took place on 20 May 2008 in Riga. It was attended by five project partner members representing partners no. 1, 5, 9, 10, and five invited guests. The Steering Group discussed the project progress. The results of the second synergy meeting and the April Conference were examined as well as a draft vision of the BSR till 2030 with full integration of the North-West Russia. The Steering Group decided to close analytical part and start the work on recommendations. However, the WG3 leaders asked for additional benchmark study on the results of the INTERREG projects in the field of competences of the WG3 with focus on the German experience. This was to diminish discrepancies between the WGs, since the WG1 and the WG2 already had such type of

expertises included in their work. The problems with travelling budget of Russian partners were discussed once more together with a problem of disappeared financial manager. The Steering Group also continued a discussion on political use of the EWW results i.e. incorporation of the results into the Long Term Perspective of VASAB to be produced in 2009. The output achieved:

- first draft recommendation papers (in outline format) of WG1 and WG2.

4.9. WG1 sixth meeting (one day) took place on 03 September 2008 in Jurmala. It was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, four external experts and seven invited guests. They discussed the final draft of the recommendations and action programme prepared during holiday time 2008 by ASSET, Immanuel Kant State University of Russia (Kaliningrad), Nordregio staff, and external experts. The whole work on urban-rural relations in Russia the relevant analytic reports were presented to the WG1 at this meeting as well. The WG1 discussed and improved the following documents:

- Recommendations how to improve innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Recommendations how to improve settlement policies in NW Russia (urban rural partnership) from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Action plan how to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration.

4.10. Steering Group Meeting 4 (one day) took place on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg. It was attended by 7 project partner members representing partners no. 2, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10 one external expert and 6 invited guests. The group discussed the shape of final publications of the EWW project, the use of the analytical materials and endorsed the recommendations and action proposed by the project. The main discussion was on the proper use of the EWW results for the Long Term Perspective (LTP) of VASAB elaboration of which was started few month ago (August 2008). The EWW results were placed to the different parts of the LTP outcomes. The VASAB consultant responsible for facilitating the LTP process was invited to the Steering Group meeting. It was also discussed how to use EWW outcomes for the process of preparation of the BSR EU Strategy. The partner no.5 arranged a meeting with the EU Commission on that topic. It was decided that the EWW results would be incorporated in the VASAB non-paper to be presented to the EU Commission in November/December 2008 in order to influence strategy preparation. The outputs achieved (as results of the meeting):

- Final draft of the recommendations how to improve innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Final draft of recommendations how to improve settlement policies in NW Russia (urban rural partnership) from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Final draft of the action plan how to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration,
- Final draft of recommendations on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR including concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR,
- Final action plan how to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational sea use planning and ICZM,
- Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic,
- Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application,
- Forwarding (transferring of EWW results) to important BSR processes namely: EU BSR Strategy and VASAB Long Term Perspective.

Activity 5: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 2 on accessibility

5.1. WG2 first meeting (one day) took place on 10 October 2007 in Riga It was attended by five project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 8, 10, one external expert and three

invited guests. The main aim was to discuss the scope of analysis (concrete meaning of accessibility) and the further work of the WG2 step by step, to achieve clarity about division of labour between the partners, to make sure that duplication with other project was avoided (instead to aim at using results achieved by other projects) and to start the process of contracting the external experts. The following outputs were produced or achieved:

- Report how to avoid duplication with other INTERREG III B projects in the field of accessibility was prepared by the project coordinator, discussed at the meeting and accepted by the Responsible Partner;
- TORs for four Kaliningrad University staff members, one Belarus expert and TORs for three external experts together with tender documentation (if necessary) have been prepared and approved. Procurement and contracting procedures for the one external expert was finished in September. Two other experts were also contracted (latter on);
- The main scope of analysis were proposed and discussed. The discussion on analysis continued among the partners (by e-mails) till the second WG2 meeting (December 2007);
- EWW link at the VASAB website was created (see activity 1.1);
- The content of the project flyer was loaded by short information about the WG2 activities.

Comments: The WG2 started its work behind the schedule. Due to the late project start (mid of June 2007), the first period of the project coincided with a holiday season. Therefore the real work of the WG2 (by phone, e-mails etc) started only in September 2007 i.e. three month later than planned. In addition to that, for some partners it was very inconvenient (e.g. celebrations of anniversary of establishment of the Kaliningrad University) and this postponed the start of formal work by one or two month further on i.e. till October 2007. In the meantime the preparation of the WG2 detailed analysis was started. To this end a pre meeting on 22nd of August 2007 was organised (partners 1, 7,8) to prepare tentative proposals on the substance of the work of the WG2. This meeting was paid outside the EWW budget. Although the WG2 (similarly to the WG1) came to the opinion that broader BSR picture was necessary to promote *territorial integration of NW Russia into the BSR in the field of transport and ITC*. The WG2 members also shared the WG1 concern on importance of smooth transfer of the EWW results to the BSR strategy till 2030 i.e. Long Term Perspective to be prepared by VASAB in 2009. The characteristic feature of the WG2 was a long discussion about the meaning of the notion of accessibility. As the result accessibility to energy was also considered to be an important element of the analysis.

Activity 6: Analysis(WG2)

6.1. The discussion on the scope and method of analysis (indicators, pilot studies) had been continued from October till beginning of December 2007. The manuals and guidelines were discussed many times. The main method was e-mail exchanges. As the result the manuals and blue prints were produced by partners 1 and 8 to facilitate collecting data and information:

- A blue print on screening transport policy,
- A manual for collecting data and information on accessibility.

Comments: The majority of time of the initial period was allocated to discussing the notion of accessibility. This was done in order to avoid problems when data and information collection would be started. Due to the rise of energy prices also this issue was considered as important factor for the NW Russia integration to the BSR. The second issue heavily discussed was scarcity of comparable data in Russia. Partner no 8 having a very well developed data base on transport data for the BSR was in a difficult position checking (in dialogue with partner 4) existence of similar data in Russia. This required more resources and more work load than estimated at the

beginning. But finally this allowed presenting Russia at the broader BSR picture. The phase 6.1. ended with second meeting of the WG2 (December 2007 in Riga).

6.2. Data collection and interpretation started only in December 2007 after the second WG 2 meeting. Basic data were collected by mid February 2008 but some work continued (fine tuning of reports) till May/June 2008. A draft discussion paper was ready for the Riga Stakeholder Conference in April 2008. However, it was a working document amended after each important EWW meeting, till the final/closing Conference. In this work (phase 6.1 and 6.2) seventeen people (including three external experts) were involved. Their involvement differed. The main bulk of analytical work was done by partners no. 4 and 8 and the external experts whereas the other participants acted mainly as a reference group reading reports, making comments and asking for improvements. This was done first of all by partners no. 1, 6, 7 and 10 representing mainly policy making side in the project and project coordination. Also VASAB Secretariat was invited by partner 1 (Responsible Partner) to participate in this process.

The following outputs were achieved:

(i) interim:

- Mapping of transport infrastructure policies at the federal and regional level, policies in development of the soft accessibility (to knowledge and information) and policies on clusters in NW Russia (however clusters were analysed by the WG1 in fact), also policies and situation in the field of accessibility to energy was examined;
- Identification of bottlenecks and constraints for transport (and through transport for business development) in NW Russia;
- Assessment of the policy correlation with the strategic documents at the BSR level (mainly by analysing outcomes of Strategic INTERREG III B projects pursued by VASAB, BDF, BSSSC and CPMR);
- Examining the results of other INTERREG III B projects relevant for the WG2 work;
- Feasibility assessment of connecting TEN-T with the pan-European corridors.

The planned verification of the accessibility perspective and of present (current) and forecast trade flows in NW Russia and Belarus (vis-a-vis BSR reports) was less successful. The main reason were missing data concerning predicted trade flows in NW Russia and Belarus⁸. The accessibility perspective instead was analysed using BSR outlook to show how NW-Russia is connected with the rest of the BSR.

(ii) A compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") presenting situation, development trends and political objectives in the fields of transport and accessibility in NW RU and Belarus and their consequences for BSR cohesion and business development

Comments:

The most important planned outputs were achieved (although one output was slightly modified). In addition to that, accessibility to energy was touched as important future factor of the BSR integration that should determine in great extent the NW Russia integration into the BSR. The analysis lasted longer than expected. The main constraint was lack of regional reliable data in NW Russia. The main reason of the delay was in insufficient data availability but also to some extent larger than expected amount of available background information (e.g. results of the BSR projects) that should be digested and analysed.

Activity 7: Pilot studies (WG2)

Since the analytical phase (activity 6) was delayed also pilot projects were postponed. The aim of the activity 7 was to analyse more in depth the most promising solutions developed during the analytical

⁸ The work on trade flows was done in co-operation with WG1 and the BSR perspective was used.

phase and prioritised during stakeholder dialogue. Therefore only in May 2008 the more concrete work on pilot studies (pre-feasibility studies) could start. The WG2 selected two (in line with the output indicators listed in the application) topics for pre-feasibility studies. The topics were following:

- c) BSR passenger railway connectivity with focus on the Eastern part of the BSR,
- d) examination of implementation of the transport part of Tallinn vision of VASAB with focus on the eastern part of the BSR.

For the pilot studies a tender procedure was used and contracts were signed in late June 2008. The results were delivered in late August 2008 and discussed by the WG2 group meeting in September. The following reports were produced:

- *Study on international rail passenger traffic development: Possibilities in the context of development of cities in the Baltic Sea Region* (Contract: 5-13/66, of 18.6.2008) elaborated by SIA “AC Konsultācijas”,
- *Evaluation of implementation of the VASAB 2010 vision in the area of mobility network and energy supply* (Contract: 5-13/74, of 23.7.2008) elaborated by SIA “AC Konsultācijas”.

The results of the studies were presented to the closing/final conference of the EWW and will serve as an input for the Long Term Spatial Development Perspective. They were also presented in advance to the WG2 members working on recommendation in order to shape the WG2 recommendations.

Comments:

An additional barrier delaying activity no.7 was obligation of tendering the contractors due to internal law of Latvia where partner no.1 (responsible for the WG2 work) is located. The WG2 decisions were taken in May 2008, but the contracts were signed only 1,5- 2 months latter coinciding once more with a holiday season. The first preliminary results of the activity no.7 were delivered in August and the final results in October/November 2008.

Activity 8: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR

The same as activity no. 3

Activity 9: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG2)

- 9.1. Steering Group Meeting (1 day) took place on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg according to schedule (for details see action 4.1).
- 9.2. WG2 second meeting (1 day) took place on 5 December 2007 in Riga (instead of late November). The meeting was attended by seven project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 7, 8, 10 and four invited guests. The meeting concentrated on discussing analytical phase of the project. The manuals and blue prints for collecting data and information were agreed. For starting work on recommendation it was discussed that the idea of Steering Group (of its first meeting in October 2007) of workshop for all WGs should be implemented and the Responsible Partner was asked to organize such a workshop (synergy meeting) in January 2008.
- 9.3. Synergy meeting no.1 (1 day) took place in Riga on 31st of January 2008 (see action 4.3. for details).
- 9.4. Steering Group Meeting 2 on 1st of February 2008 in Riga (see action 4.4. for details).
- 9.5. Synergy meeting no. 2 (1 day) took place in Liepaja on 14th of March 2008. (see action 4.5. for details).
- 9.6. Steering Group Meeting 3 (one day) took place on 20 May 2008 in Riga. (for details see action 4.8).
- 9.7. WG2 third meeting (one day) took place on 21 May 2008 in Riga according to schedule. It was attended by five project partner members representing partners no. 1, 7, 8, 10, one external expert and three invited guests. The WG2 before the third meeting concentrated

mainly on analytical work. At this meeting analyses were summed up and the work on recommendations started. It was decided that recommendations (with elements of the action programme) would be prepared for Russia and for the whole BSR with focus on better integration of NW Russia. One additional meeting was requested (autumn 2008) in order to discuss the final draft of the recommendations. The meeting also discussed the pilot actions (pre-feasibility studies) agreeing on concrete items. The outputs achieved:

- a first draft recommendations paper (in outline format),
- TOR for two most important pilot studies.

9.8. WG2 fourth meeting (one day) took place on 4th September 2008 in Jurmala. It was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, three external experts and six invited guests. They discussed the final draft of the recommendations (with elements of the action programme) prepared by Immanuel Kant State University of Russia (Kaliningrad) and Nordregio staff. The WG2 discussed and improved the following documents:

- Recommendations on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR including concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR.
- Study on international rail passenger traffic development: Possibilities in the context of development of cities in the Baltic Sea Region,
- Evaluation of implementation of the VASAB 2010 vision in the area of mobility network and energy supply,
- Overview of results of INTERREG III B projects in the field of accessibility .

9.9. Steering Group Meeting 4 (one day) took place on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg (please see action 4.10)

Activity 10: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 3 on ICZM and transnational sea use planning

10.1. WG3 preparatory meeting took place on 24 July 2007 in Kaliningrad. It was attended by nine project partner members representing partners no. 4, 10, and five invited guests. The meeting was used for preparation of the WG3 first meeting, and the pilot action in particular for presentation and discussion with the Kaliningrad partners the results of the INTERREG project BaltCoast of which recommendations should form main backbone of the work of the WG3. The preparatory meeting was organised during the holiday season due to indicated by the Kaliningrad partner necessity of postponing the WG3 first meeting till October because of the celebrations of 750th anniversary of establishment of the university (lack of experts) in early autumn 2007. So the preparatory meeting was a vehicle to start the work of the WG3 even in slightly less formal way. The main subject of discussion was the BaltCoast recommendations, TORs for experts and other guidelines necessary for elaboration of the WG3 analysis. The outputs were following:

- Decision on TORs and blue prints,
- Clarifying division of labour,
- Project flyer was discussed (and then edited) - see activity 1.1.

10.2 WG 3 first meeting (1,5 day) took place on 30-31 October 2007 in Kaliningrad i.e. with four month delay. The reason was the celebrations of 750th anniversary of establishment of the Albertina University (today Immanuel Kant State University of Russia) in Kaliningrad. The meeting was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 4, 9, 10 and to some extent also partner no.1, one external expert and fifteen invited guests mainly from Russia but also from Latvia, Germany and Finland. The main aim was to discuss the analysis and the further WG3 work in detail, to achieve clarity about division of labour between the partners, to make sure that duplication with other project was avoided (instead to aim at using results achieved by other projects) and to start the process of contracting the external experts. Instead of preparing TORs for separate experts the WG3 at pre meeting decided to make only

two TORs (one for external expert and one for the whole pilot project). For conducting analysis it was agreed that blue prints should be used. Such blue prints were prepared by partner no. 10 in advance presented at the meeting, and then improved/discussed by e-mails and approved in December 2007. The following outputs were produced or achieved:

- Report (in form of power point presentations) – presenting an overview of existing and available documentation on the chosen themes in NW Russia and at the BSR level;
- Two blue prints (for further analysis and discussions);
- Two TORs (one for external expert and one for the whole pilot project);
- One external expert was contracted by the partner no 1 covering by his expertise BSR and HELCOM perspective;
- EWW link at the VASAB website was created (see activity 1.1).

Also Kaliningrad stakeholders who attended the second part of the meeting were informed about the EWW project together with showing them the relevant BSR experience in ICZM and maritime spatial planning. They formed important part of the reference network for dialogue on project findings and recommendations. The meeting was also a starting point for executing analysis.

Activity 11 Analysis (WG 3)

11.1 The discussion on the scope and method of analysis had been continued from October till beginning of December 2007. The discussion resulted in shifting focus more from ICZM to maritime spatial planning as the most important transnational issue related to sea use in the nearest future. The blue prints (to be followed by Russian colleagues) presented by partner 10 were discussed many times. The main method was e-mail exchanges. As the result the two blue prints were agreed:

- A blue print on spatial planning legislation on the sea covering Poland,
- A blue print on potentials and conflicts on the sea covering Poland.

11.2. Gathering and compiling the WG3 information started in December 2007 after blue prints approval. Fourteen people representing partners no. 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10 were involved in the information collecting. Their involvement differed. The main bulk of analytical work was done by partners no.10 and 4 and by external expert whereas the other participants acted mainly as a reference group reading reports, making comments and asking for improvements. This was done first of all by partners no. 5,6 and 7 representing mainly policy making side in the project. The analysis in principle were ended in March. The situation of the WG3 was different than the WG1 and the WG2. The WG3 did not collect statistical information but rather qualitative information and the broad BSR background was discussed, sorted out and clarified at the first meeting by examining BaltCoast results. Therefore, the analytical work could be done in parallel with an initial phase of recommendation preparation. But also in the WG3 the completing analytical reports took more time than expected. Although first draft reports were ready in March their fine tuning continued in April and even in May and June. This was slightly learning by doing in particular for Russian experts who had little contact with maritime spatial planning in the past. The outputs were following:

- The legal systems were screened and regulations, responsibilities for offshore planning at all levels in NW Russia were identified;
- System of mapping to improve access to relevant information from NW Russia and its uploading to the pilot system made in the INTERREG III B BaltCoast project were tested (the results can be seen in the WG3 reports done by Russian colleagues);
- Actual (current) sea use in NW RU (Kaliningrad) according to the BaltCoast standards (potentials and conflicts) were described in a separate paper and conflicts and potentials were detected;

- A compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") with assessment of compatibility of the Russian regulatory framework to the legislation and practice in a pan-Baltic perspective in the field of ICZM and sea use planning was elaborated.

Comments:

The all planned outputs were achieved.

Activity 12 Pilot Action (WG 3)

Pilot action was started in October 2007 and continues till the end of August 2008. The twelve project partners staff members representing partners no. 1,4,6,7,9,10 and one external expert were involved. Partners no. 1,6,7 have acted mainly as a reference group while the main role was played by partners no. 4,9,10. The pilot action aimed at preparing a system of joint ICZM and maritime spatial planning in Gdańsk Bay between Poland and Russia. This task was discussed at the kick off meeting with various Russian stakeholders. The prevailing opinion was that due to the dispersed responsibilities in Russia in ICZM and sea space management (versus concrete central Agency in Poland responsible for sea space and regional governments responsible for ICZM activities) such goal could not be achieved in the project time span. Nowadays there is no single institution in Russia responsible for sea space management (like Maritime Offices in Germany or Poland). The WG3 came to the opinion that agreements between Polish and Russian relevant state institutions on co-operation in sea use planning and management might be too ambitious and premature as the WG3 output. Instead pilot actions were focused on the preconditions for establishment of such agreements in future, by exchange of good practices, deepening mutual understanding and preparing necessary tools and necessary institutional structures i.e. centres of excellence in both countries dealing with maritime spatial planning. It was decided that the starting point should be an agreement between Russian and Polish institutions from NGO or research domain to co-operate on promotion of integrative approach to sea space and coast in both countries. In this context a sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application was discussed. It was considered as an important tool for showing to Russian decision-makers a usefulness of maritime spatial planning. The WG3 decided to limit it to the Baltic Sea around Kaliningrad Oblast. The register was prepared by partner no. 4 and 10 in a form of GIS atlas. The following outputs were produced in the reporting period:

- The exchange of bi-lateral experience was started e.g. Polish pilot sea use plan (covering Puck Bay) elaborated in 2008 under PlanCoast INTERREG III B project was shown to the RU experts;
- The experience with the BaltCoast project of INTERREG III B was shared;
- Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application was first discussed then agreed and then produced and presented to the final/closing conference of the EWW in St. Petersburg on 21st October 2008;
- Agreement between Maritime Institute in Gdańsk and Russian partners on permanent co-operation in the future (including joint projects and policy related work) aiming at establishment of a system of joint ICZM and maritime spatial planning in Gdańsk Bay between Poland and Russia was prepared in autumn 2008. The partners of the agreement will act as an centres of excellence in their countries with regard to maritime spatial planning and ICZM.

Comments:

The pilot action had to be modified. But the actions started within EWW project will be continued after the project closure thanks to established under the EEW contacts. The aim of establishment of the system of joint ICZM and maritime spatial planning in Gdańsk Bay between Poland and Russia is still valid and will be realised in the future. What was done under EWW project was to start this process by exchange of experience, awareness rising, gathering

stakeholders and discussing with them the problem and by preparation of some necessary tools which will convince Russian decision-makers that an integrative coastal and sea space management would be important. Despite difficulties the main outputs promised in the EWW application were produced: i.e. (i) a sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application and (ii) agreements between Polish and Russian relevant institutions on co-operation in sea use planning and management.

Activity 13: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR

The same as activity no. 3

Activity 14: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG3)

- 14.1. Steering Group Meeting (1 day) took place on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg according to schedule (for details see action 4.1).
- 14.2. Synergy meeting no.1 (1 day) took place in Riga on 31st of January 2008 (see action 4.3. for details). This meeting was used by the WG3 also for development of a first outline of recommendation paper which was discussed afterwards by e-mail exchange.
- 14.3. Steering Group Meeting 2 on 1st of February 2008 in Riga (see action 4.4. for details).
- 14.4. Synergy meeting no 2 (1 day) took place in Liepaja on 14th of March 2008 (see action 4.5. for details).
- 14.5. WG3 second meeting (1,5 day) took place on 27-28 March 2008 in Kaliningrad (instead of late November 2007). It was attended by sixteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 7, 9, 10., one external expert and two invited guests. The meeting assessed the progress of the analytical work, discussed the interim reports of Russia and tried to relate the WG3 work towards the EU Integrated Maritime Policy (Blue Book). The final draft of recommendation paper was discussed and agreed. The acknowledgement of the project results at the political level was also examined. The WG3 group joined the WG1 and the WG2 wish to present its results at policy level by introducing them to the “Long Term Perspective” of VASAB. However, partner 9 was also asked to transfer the results to the EU BSR Strategy and to the EU work on integrated maritime policy. During the WG3 meeting a workshop with Russian stakeholders on off-shore planning and ICZM was organised in Kaliningrad on 27th of March 2008 as a joint venture of all projects dealing with this subject i.e. EWW, POWER and SDI-4-SEB as a part of the conference (“Integrated management, sustainable development indicators, spatial planning and monitoring of the South-Eastern Baltic coastal regions”), which took place in Kaliningrad on 26th - 30th of March 2007. Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic were elaborated by EWW project participants beforehand and proposed to stakeholders attending this conference. The recommendations were unanimously adopted by the participants including regional and local authorities from Russia. This seemed to be an important step towards introducing integrative approach towards the sea space and coastal zone in Russia.

The output achieved was following:

- Recommendation paper discussed and adopted by the Russian stakeholder (Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic).
- 14.6. Steering Group Meeting 3 (1day) took place on 20 May 2008 in Riga (for details see action 4.8).
 - 14.7. WG3 third meeting (1 day) took place on 4-5 June 2008 in Gdańsk almost according to schedule (few days later than planned originally). It was attended by fifteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 9, 10, one external expert and five invited guests. At the meeting analytical phase was summed up. The meeting was also used for examining the

experience and good practices of the Balance project in maritime spatial planning. The experts from Denmark introduce the project to the WG3 members. However, the WG3 main discussion concentrated on the 'action plan' following the recommendations adopted in March 2008. The opinions were dispersed. Some participants considered elaboration of an action plan as premature having in mind lack of legal provisions in Russia regulating sea use in an integrative way and dispersion of responsibility for sea management among many institutions. Some others proposed to focus action plan on methodological issues i.e. issues indispensable to introduce sea use planning in Russia and methodology of such planning suited for Russian conditions. After the e-mail exchange in June 2008 the partner no 9 responsible for the WG3 work decided to take the risk to prepare a draft action plan and to discuss it in September 2008 with the WG 3 members. Therefore an additional meeting was requested to be held in September 2008, to conclude the recommendation phase. The following outputs were achieved:

- The experience with Balance project of INTERREG III B was shared.

After the WG3 third meeting the partner no 9 and 10 organised (late June beginning of July 2008) consultation about the follow up of the WG3 in a form of a joint project. In the consultation the information on different ETC Programmes in the BSR were analysed and compared. The results were presented to the WG3 fourth meeting.

- 14.8. WG3 fourth meeting (one day) took place on 2nd September 2008 in Gdańsk. It was attended by thirteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 7, 9, 10 and one external expert. The meeting discussed the final draft of the action programme prepared by the staff of partners no 4 and 10 (Maritime Institute from Gdańsk and Immanuel Kant State University of Russia from Kaliningrad). Also final draft of the sea use register was presented by the partner no.4. The WG3 discussions tackled also the future use of the WG3 results. The presentations to the final/closing conference of EWW were agreed. It was also decided that the WG3 analysis should serve for broader popularization of the issue of maritime spatial planning in the Baltic Sea Region. The partner no 9. agreed to edit (by the end of 2008) from its own resources a *Compendium on Maritime Spatial Planning systems in the Baltic Sea Region countries* composed of two parts: part 1 *Survey of the national instruments and tools for the management of the sea space in the BSR countries* describing legal and institutional aspects of maritime spatial planning systems in the BSR countries and part 2 entitled *Examples of national cases of sea spatial conflicts and potentials*. Partner no.9 promised to invite to this book all other BSR countries while using the WG3 results as the core input. The WG3 also analysed different possibilities of continuation of the WG3 work. After the lively discussion it was decided to use two vehicles for further co-operation: The project BaltSeaPlan already submitted to the BSR Programme (although slightly too abstractive) and the new project to be submitted to the ENPI Programme Lithuania–Poland–Russian Federation on concrete planning work as continuation of the WG3 pilot activities. It was decided that transnational maritime planning should concentrate on Vistula/Kaliningrad lagoon and on Kursiu lagoon.

The WG3 discussed and improved the following documents during its fourth meeting:

- Action plan how to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational sea use planning and ICZM;
- Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application.

- 14.9. Steering Group Meeting 4 (one day) took place on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg (please see action 4.10)

6.2. Assessment of the results of the Action

The central objective of the Action was to promote territorial integration of NW Russia (i.e. the entire Northwest Federal District, including Kaliningrad) into the Baltic Sea region (BSR) in the identified three fields of (1) business development, (2) transport / ICT development and (3) sea use planning and Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM). The starting point was relatively impressive but

slightly idle (from the BSR perspective) developmental potential (in terms of human capital, scientific achievements etc.) of the North West Russia. The task was to develop solutions how to use the potential of the NW Russia for the benefit of the BSR economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development.

The action was successful to that extend that it managed to identify economic and spatial development needs in the NW Russia from the perspective of public authorities and businesses, requiring to be tackled by at the transnational level. This findings were benchmarked against existing good practice solutions based on experience of other BSR countries. The search was also done in order to detect economic and spatial trends, relevant for connecting territorial potentials between the NW Russia and the BSR. However, the picture coming from analysis appeared less promising than expected (see point 2.9). But even in those rather difficult circumstances the recommendations for three mentioned above fields were formulated and action plans were outlined. The main results delivered to the external audience having policy relevance are presented below:

The results achieved	The results intended	Explanation of differences
Recommendations how to improve innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration	Recommendation" paper with suggestions on policy improvements and legislative changes to improve settlement and innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration	The results achieved put less attention to legislative changes than to policy improvements. This is outcome of the survey done in order to learn from Russian businessman what are the main obstacles for them to innovate.
Recommendations how to improve settlement policies in NW Russia (urban rural partnership) from the perspective of BSR integration,		The focus of the result achieved is on urban-rural partnership as key for integrative development of settlement structure in Russia.
Action plan how to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration,	A paper with fields for further concrete actions ("action plan") to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration	Done in line with plans
Recommendations on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR including concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR,	1.Recommendation" paper with suggestions on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR 2. A paper with fields for further concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia and in BY in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR	The recommendations and action plan were merged. The reason is that Russia has very concrete plans and actions in this field for the future years so the WG2 decided to focus on long-term recommendations.
Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic	Recommendation" paper on upgrading the instruments and tools and institutional arrangements for transnational sea use planning and ICZM at the BSR level based on the completed pilot action	More ambitious recommendations were produced than expected i.e. more in line with the real situation in Russia with regard to ICZM and maritime spatial planning
Action plan how to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational sea use planning and	A paper with fields for further concrete actions ("action plan") to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational	Done in line with plans

ICZM	sea use planning and ICZM	
Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application	A sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application - based on the completed system mapping.	Done in line with plans
Agreement between maritime Institute in Gdańsk and Immanuel Kant State University of Russia on further co-operation in the field of maritime spatial planning	Agreements between Polish and Russian relevant institutions on co-operation in sea use planning and management	Done in line with plans

The most important EWW achievement is delivery of main messages resulting from the Action to the important Russian decision makers, planning professionals and scientific sector as well as to the key pan-Baltic organizations such as HELCOM or VASAB. Through VASAB also the EU BSR strategy was influenced.

6.3. The outcome on both final beneficiaries and/or target group and the situation of the target group/target region which the action addressed

The target audience/recipients of the project findings have been decision-makers (ministries responsible for spatial planning and development in the BSR, including the federal government in Russia, regional authorities in NW Russia, pan-Baltic organisations such as VASAB 2010). Thanks to the action they have received a better picture on the situation with regard to the North-West Russia integration into the Baltic Sea region (BSR). This knowledge has been already used for policy making by VASAB in production of the Long Term Spatial Development Perspective and it seems that it will be also useful for the EU Commission in elaboration of the EU BSR strategy and for HELCOM for implementation of the Baltic Sea Action Plan. In fact the Action played a tremendous role in validation of the planning methodologies and strategic documents at the pan-Baltic level based on the NW Russia perspective. The Action gave a proper insight on main drivers and obstacles of integration of the North West Russia into the BSR. The Action findings and recommendations were also delivered to the Russian decision makers and VASAB will continue its efforts to convince them that the BSR integration is beneficial for the North-West Russia. At least in the field of maritime spatial planning as the result of the Action one can see increased capacity and competence basis to take up joint transnational initiatives between the NW Russia partners and institutions from other BSR countries.

The final beneficiaries local and regional governments in the Baltic Sea region (BSR) operators in the chosen thematic fields (e.g. businesses in WP1 and transport operators in WP2) in NW Russia and in the BSR will be influenced mainly through the actions of pan-Baltic organisations mainly VASAB and its Long Term Spatial Development Perspective. This will allow for incorporation of the BSR perspective in the national/regional/local policies in the NW Russia.

6.4. Publications

The following publications were produced:

Name	Number of copies	Distribution channels
The East-West Window brochure informing about the project	300	Distributed during the project events in particular kick-off conference, stakeholder seminar, the Conference "Baltic Sea Region Programme 2007-2013: new partnership opportunities for Russian and Belarusian regions" and many other events
Атлас использования прибрежных акваторий российской части Юго-восточной Балтики (Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application – <i>edited on CD rom</i>)	200	Distributed for free during the EWW final (closing) conference, available for free from partner no.4

The book in Russian: Северо-Запад России в Регионе Балтийского моря: Проблемы и перспективы экономического взаимодействия и сотрудничества (North West Russia in the Baltic Sea region. Problems and perspectives of co-operation and mutual influence) presenting main results of the project	100	Distributed for free by partners no.4 among the project partners and participants of the EWW events. Sent to Russian relevant Ministries and main libraries.
--	-----	--

6.5. Contracts (works, supplies, services) above 5000€ awarded for the implementation of the action since the last interim report

Only one contract above 5000€ was awarded since the last interim report.

	Contract	Amount	Procedure	Winner
1	Audit Services Contract	5 131,94	“negotiated procedure without publication”	<i>SIA Rodl and Partner</i>

6.6. Continuation of the Action after ending the support from the European Community

The action will be continued after ending the EU support for the East West Window project. Durability of the project results has been ensured by the direct participation or the support of the national ministries responsible for spatial planning and development around the BSR, acting under VASAB 2010. Through their co-operation with other relevant stakeholders, the project rendered available concrete recommendations for policy-making in the chosen thematic fields in the NW Russia and at the BSR level. Through intensive dialogue with the target audience, the project influenced planners in Russia neighbouring countries by including the perspective of NW Russia. It also served for modification of pan-Baltic strategic policy papers, long-term visions and development plans on the very same account.

In particular the EWW results were used by VASAB for elaboration of the Long Term Perspective for Spatial Development of the BSR. Thanks to the EWW this will be the document with proper outlook on North-West Russia. Due to the EWW the collaboration between VASAB (ministries) and other EWW partners (research institutes) will be strengthened. The EWW results will be also used for discussing with HELCOM an idea of maritime spatial planning in the Baltic Sea Region.

Follow-up activities in effect of the project will be initiated and promoted by VASAB 2010. This includes starting up of possible new project(s) covering the whole BSR and taking into consideration the needs and perspectives of NW Russia, identified and referred to in the present project. The WG3 work will be continued in a form of the BaltSeaPlan project already approved by the BSR Programme (will start around December 2008). The WG3 partners will also plan to submit the project on elaboration of concrete maritime spatial plans for Vistula and Kursiu Lagoons in the framework of the ENPI Programme Lithuania–Poland–Russian Federation. Despite finishing the work of the WG3 the partner no.9 responsible for its leading has already declared to continue the efforts in a broader BSR set up and started elaboration of the BSR wide “Compendium on Maritime Spatial Planning systems in the Baltic Sea Region countries” using the WG3 results and experience.

6.7. Gender equality, disabilities

Where relevant, the perspective of equal opportunities was taken into account for the thematic work (especially in the fields of business and transport). Due efforts were made to secure involvement of both men and women in the composition of the project management structures, daily work and in the dialogue fora with relevant stakeholders in NW Russia and at the overall BSR level. Spatial planning forming a substance of the project from its definition cares for gender equality, prevention or exclusions of handicapped from the normal life. Although, gender equality and disabilities were not the main focus of the EWW project one can assume that the realisation of the project objectives (integration of the NW Russia into the BSR) will be beneficial in a long run also for attracting attention of Russian decision makers and Russian society to those above mentioned horizontal goals. They are placed very high at civil agenda in particular in the Nordic countries and integration means also convergence in values and way of living so it means better acceptance of these horizontal goals in Russia as well. The same has happened in Poland, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia after their accession to EU (strengthening their European integration).

6.8. Monitoring and evaluation of the activities

Monitoring of activities was done on routine basis by the project Steering Group. The group worked very effectively guiding the project and proposing the changes if necessary. The group (ministerial part) provided also an excellent piece of advice with regard to use of the EWW project results for policy making. However, one should also admit the important role of Committee on Spatial Development of the Baltic Sea Region which was among the main recipients of the project results. The advice from this body and the VASAB Secretariat which took part in majority of the EWW events (on their own money) helped a lot in proper shaping the EWW work and focusing on the policy relevant results (e.g. providing links to HELCOM, EU BSR Strategy etc.).

Also important were feedbacks received from beneficiaries during the kick-off and final (closing) conference. In the Annex 2 quotations from the Conference resolutions are attached (in Russian).

6.9. What has been learned from the Action

The main lesson from the action is that integration of the NW Russia into the Baltic Sea Region (BSR) will not be an easy process. Russia is a global player looking for global organizations and bodies as its partners. Even the regional level i.e. St. Petersburg has sufficient potential to play an important role at the global arena. This is clearly seen in the St. Petersburg government policy and strategic documents. BSR is not the main field of St. Petersburg strategic activity. Slightly different situation is with regard to Kaliningrad, but its potential is sufficient to strengthen rather cross-border than pan-Baltic integration of Russian Federation. The main integrative processes between Russia and the rest of the BSR are hardly due to market forces or conscious decisions of the Russian enterprises but rather thanks to EU financial support in form of transnational and cross-border programmes. The only field in which one can expect more or less natural co-operation between Russia and the other BSR countries is maritime spatial planning as long as it affects coastal defence, fish stock and state of the coastal nature. Russia is very active now in HELCOM where the questions of maritime spatial planning have been already raised.

Therefore strengthening integration of the North-West Russia into the BSR requires further development of the Russian medium size cities such as e.g. Kaliningrad or Pskov, their partnership with adjacent regions, and development of the maritime spatial planning institutions which in natural way will seek for the relations with their closest neighbours.

7. Partners and other Co-operation

7.1. How do you assess the relationship between the formal partners of this Action (i.e. those partners which have signed a partnership statement)? Please specify for each partner organisation

St. Petersburg Administration [2] – partner active for discussing policy relevant documents and organising meetings in St. Petersburg in the field of analysis acting through partner no.3 . Important contribution to the stakeholder dialogue. In fact this partner will be one of the main recipients of the project results.

Russian Economic Developers Association (ASSET) [3] – very demanding from formal point of view but also very experience partner in analytical work. A great bulk of the WG1 recommendations were proposed by this partner. The partner is a great interface between science and policy making in Russia in particular in St. Petersburg. Important role in dissemination activities thanks to good contacts with decision-makers in Russia at local and regional level.

Immanuel Kant State University of Russia [4] – very reliable and enthusiastic partner being a source of many data and information excellent in scientific work acquiring great experience during the EWW project how to translate analysis into policy findings, but in fact majority of recommendations of the WG2 and the WG3 were rooted in partner no. 4 thinking.

Ministry of the Environment, Danish Forest and Nature Agency, Denmark [5] – very active and experienced partner (being responsible in the past for the USUN project) leading the WG 1 work and ensuring proper presentation of EWW at the highest BSR political level.

Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Housing, Germany [6] – very active and experienced partner responsible for urban-rural investigations under the WG1, ensuring proper presentation of EWW at the highest BSR political level.

Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communication, Sweden [7] – partner ensuring link to the EU BSR strategy (use of EWW results also there), acting mainly through partner 8 but very active in the WG2 , active in the WG3 (with very high quality inputs) and contributing to policy relevant findings in the EWW.

Nordic Centre for Spatial Development (NORDREGIO) [8] – one of key drivers for analytical work, competent, flexible with a large knowledge and experience in spatial and regional development.

Ministry of Regional Development, Poland [9] – partner leading the WG3 but active in other work groups, very experienced and very flexible contributing to the work additional resources if project resources are not sufficient.

Maritime Institute, Poland [10] – key resource for maritime spatial planning and ICZM in the project supporting actively the WG3 and coordinating the whole project from content point of view in very reasonable way.

7.2. Is the partnership to continue

The partnership will continue in a form of BSR Programme and ENPI Programme projects on maritime spatial planning. The co-operation agreement between partners no 4 and 10 will serve to this end. The BaltSea Plan was approved by the BSR programme. The project will serve as a continuation and dissemination of the WG3 work and results since both partners no 4 and 10 are among its key drivers.

The EWW project results were also used within the VASAB framework. This means that new partners such as Nordregio, ASSET or Immanuel Kant State University of Russia have joined the VASAB work and their involvement will continue.

7.3. How would you assess the relationship between your organisation and State authorities in the Action countries? How has this relationship affected the Action?

Since majority of the partners are state high level institutions those relations were fine. The partners representing state authorities knew each other for many years before starting the project as the members of the VASAB co-operation (Co-operation of Ministers for spatial planning and development in the BSR countries). The new input was given by the scientific institutions. This was a great added value of the project, mutual learning how to translate analysis into policy relevant actions. The research oriented partners were quite flexible and willing to reshape analysis or repeat them if asked by policy making partners.

7.4. Where applicable, describe your relationship with any other organisations involved in implementing the Action:

- Associate(s) (if any) - no
- Sub-contractor(s) (if any). Some of the work was given to the external contractors. However an idea was that majority of work should be done by the partners themselves since the partners had sufficient qualification to execute the project and achieve its goals. Contractors were used mainly for technical issues and for bringing knowledge from INTERREG projects. Only some partners (9) and (5) used contractors more intensively (for some concrete work) due to shortages in their human resources. In principle the relation with contractors were positive with one exception (i.e. Rumanian contractor who won a tender for the EWW financial management disappeared after few month of serving the project)
- Final Beneficiaries and Target groups. Those relations were fine thanks to sue of well established and prominent conferences for presentation of the EWW. This gave the project access to the target group necessary for the project success.
- Other third parties involved. Important was a link of the project to the VASAB Secretariat and VASAB work on the Long Term Perspective. VASAB Secretariat promoted also project and its results externally on request of the Responsible Partner.

7.5. Where applicable, outline any links you have developed with other actions.

The project ambition was to develop link to other important projects in order to make use of their results (BaltCoast, PlanCoast, Balance, USUN, SeBCo – their experts were invited to the project meetings) or to make joint meetings to better reach target groups (SeBCo POWER and SDI-4-SEB). These projects represented different INTERREG strands.

7.6. If your organisation has received previous EC grants in view of strengthening the same target group, in how far has this Action been able to build upon/complement the previous one(s)? (List all previous relevant EC grants).

The Ministries involved in the project previously received a grant from INTERREG II C to prepare an Action Plan for implementation of the VASAB strategy adopted in 1994. The project was called VASAB Plus and ended in 2000. The EWW used the VASAB Plus experience but its focus was different. This time the target geographical area was the NW Russia and its integration to the BSR. The lesson learned under the VASAB Plus (where Russia had no financial resources for analysis) showed that preparation of a pan-Baltic documents with very differentiate resources might result in uneven involvement of the countries and then uneven ownership of the agreed actions or strategies. Therefore the EWW was invented to avoid such a mistake and to give Russian colleagues resources for considering their role in the BSR integration.

8. Visibility

How is the visibility of the EU contribution being ensured in the Action?

At the project start a press release was done by the Responsible Partner. Visibility was ensured by placing proper information that the EWW project was part-financed by the EU together with the EU logo and logo of INTERREG III B. This was done on printing materials, power point presentation and on the project web site. There was also some information in the Latvian radio. On demand of Russian colleagues the project was presented at the Conference “Baltic Sea Region Programme 2007-2013: new partnership opportunities for Russian and Belarusian regions” in St. Petersburg as one of the most successful INTERREG projects with Russian participation. To strengthen the project visibility a special project banner was produced and displayed on many occasions (e.g. Conference “Baltic Sea region Spatial Development Policies avenues to the Long Term Perspective” in Riga on 23 April 2007, and already mentioned conference “Baltic Sea Region Programme 2007-2013: new partnership opportunities for Russian and Belarusian regions” in St. Petersburg on 16-17 April 2008 and in many other events). The book with the project analysis and recommendations was printed in December 2008. But the most important is that the project results will be used for producing “Long Term Perspective” for the BSR which will be presented to CBSS and all important pan-Baltic organizations. Thanks to EWW NW Russia will be properly highlighted in this strategy.

The European Commission may wish to publicise the results of Actions. Do you have any objection to this report being published on Europe Aid Co-operation Office website? If so, please state your objections here.

Name of the contact person for the Action: **Vladislavs Vesperis**

Signature:Location: **Riga, Latvia**

Date report due:Date report sent:

Update of action plan

Activity	Months																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Activity 1: Kick off of the work of Working Group no 1 on business development and innovation affecting spatial development,	X	X	X	X														
Activity 2: Analysis(WG1)				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Activity 3: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR (WG1)					X						X						X	
Activity 4: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations and action plan (WG1)					X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Activity 5: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 2 on accessibility				X														
Activity 6: Analysis(WG2)					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Activity 7: Pilot studies (WG2)												X	X	X	X	X		
Activity 8: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR					X						X						X	X
Activity 9: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG2)					X	X		X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Activity 10: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 3 on ICZM and transnational sea use planning		X			X													
Activity 11 Analysis (WG 3)					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					
Activity 12 Pilot Action (WG 3)					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
Activity 13: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR					X						X						X	
Activity 14: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG3)					X			X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		

EWV events: participation of man and woman

Participants			
Event	Woman	Man	Total
Kick off meeting of the work of WG1, on 25 June 2007 in Riga	9	11	20
WG1 meeting 25 September 2007 in Riga	4	3	7
WG1 analysis (people involved)	11	23	34
Steering Group meeting on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg	7	11	18
St Petersburg kick off conference on 18-19 October 2007	112	146	259
St Petersburg Closing conference on 21 October 2008	231	400	631
WG1 second meeting on 6-7 December 2007 in Riga	9	10	19
Synergy meeting no.1 on 31 January 2008 in Riga	10	13	23
Steering Group Meeting no.2 on 1 February 2008 in Riga	4	11	15
Synergy meeting no 2 in Liepaja on 14 th of March 2008	8	8	16
WG1 fourth meeting on 3-4 April 2008 in Riga	6	7	13
Riga Stakeholders seminars (WG3 and WG1 + WG2) on 23 April 2008	83	84	167
WG1 fifth meeting on 24 April 2008 in Riga	13	12	25
Steering Group Meeting no. 3 on 20 May 2008 in Riga	4	6	10
Steering Group Meeting no. 4 on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg	3	10	13
WG1 sixth meeting on 3 rd September 2008 in Jurmala	11	11	22
WG2 first meeting on 10 October 2007 in Riga	3	6	9
WG2 analysis	6	11	17
WG2 second meeting on 5 December 2007 in Riga	4	7	11
WG2 third meeting on 21 May 2008 in Riga	2	7	9
WG2 fourth meeting on 4 th September 2008 in Jurmala	9	11	20
WG3 preparatory meeting on 24 July 2007 in Kaliningrad	4	10	14
WG 3 first meeting on 30-31 October 2007 in Kaliningrad	12	15	27
WG3 analysis	3	11	14
Pilot Action (WG 3)	3	10	13
WG3 second meeting on 27-28 March 2008 in Kaliningrad	6	13	19
WG3 third meeting on 4-5 June 2008 in Gdańsk	6	15	21
WG3 fourth meeting 2 September 2008 in Gdańsk	3	11	14

Quotations from the Conference resolutions (in Russian) in direct relations to the EAST West Window.

3. Kick Off Conference

Продвижение европейского опыта в рамках программ Европейского Инструмента Соседства и Партнерства усилит инновационный потенциал и влияние Северо-Западного региона России на процессы территориальной интеграции на внешних границах ЕС, в частности, в регионе Балтийского моря. В этих целях целесообразна активизация участия России в таких международных объединениях, как VASAB 2010, Балтийский форум развития (BDF), Программа транснационального сотрудничества региона Балтийского моря 2007-2013.

Зарубежный опыт свидетельствует о значительной роли малых и средних городов в продвижении инноваций и гармонизации территориального развития. Этот факт должен учитываться при разработке инновационных стратегий в России как на федеральном, так и на региональном уровнях. Необходимо уделять больше внимания развитию малых и средних городов, как это происходит в странах ЕС, и адаптировать европейский опыт применительно к ситуации в России (в частности, концепцию сельско-городского партнерства «ESDP Concept of Rural-Urban Partnership»). Доступ к знаниям и информации, возможность обмена идеями должны стать основой формирования территориальных моделей развития России.

/.../

Участники Форума согласились со следующим:

- необходимо особое единое государственное управление морскими прибрежными зонами страны (обеими их составляющими: морской и сухопутной) исходя из повсеместного успешного мирового опыта подобной деятельности и соответствующих рекомендаций организаций системы ООН и международных форумов на высшем уровне. Руководствуясь этим, рекомендовать: 1) создание нормативной правовой и институциональной базы для разработки и реализации комплексных программ развития и управления прибрежными зонами в рамках комплексных программ социально-экономического развития приморских субъектов Федерации и программ развития прибрежных муниципальных образований в целях активизации участия последних в освоении прибрежных и морских ресурсов; 2) адаптацию и освоение современных управленческих технологий (методология Комплексного управления прибрежными зонами (КУПЗ)) в применении к богатейшим по ресурсам и разнообразным по природным и социально-экономическим условиям прибрежным зонам страны; 3) разработку и реализацию пилотных программ КУПЗ конкретных побережий страны; 4) использование опыта сотрудничества стран Балтийского региона, в частности рекомендаций Проекта BaltCoast BSR INTERREG III B по управлению прибрежными зонами и разработке совместных стратегических проектов;
- рекомендовать использование кластерного подхода в качестве инструмента реализации стратегий развития территорий и повышения конкурентоспособности региональной и муниципальной экономики, включая выявление и диагностику потенциальных кластеров, разработку программ их развития, создание организаций по сотрудничеству. В органах власти необходимо формирование межотраслевых рабочих групп для координации развития кластеров и снятия ведомственных и отраслевых ограничений. Целесообразно более широкое использование международных программ и инструментов повышения конкурентоспособности кластеров;
- необходимо развитие региональной и муниципальной статистики, в частности для целей выработки эффективной кластерной политики и оценки результатов реализации кластерных инициатив в регионе и/или муниципалитете, формирования действенных

инструментов планирования и управления, ориентированного на результат на субфедеральных уровнях;

- при реализации федеральных, региональных и местных программ экономического развития необходимо стимулировать участие организаций инновационной инфраструктуры в российских и зарубежных сетевых организациях, которые оказывают содействие в предоставлении услуг компаниям и научным организациям в сфере инновационной бизнес-кооперации и трансфера технологий (примерами могут служить Российская сеть трансфера технологий RTTN, Европейская сеть бизнес-инновационных центров EBN). Участие в сетевом сотрудничестве должно быть нацелено на повышение качества и содержания услуг для местных компаний и НИИ. Федеральным и региональным органам власти необходимо поддерживать инициативы по развитию сетевого взаимодействия между организациями инновационной региональной инфраструктуры (создание региональных сетей) с целью уменьшения дублирования функций, повышения качества услуг и снижения расходов бюджета на их субсидирование;
- рекомендовать и стимулировать участие российских центров коммерциализации, инновационных центров в реализации Competitiveness Innovation Program (CIP) Европейского союза в части проектов, ориентированных на развитие инновационных сетей и сетей трансфера технологий (IRC, IRE, EBN и др.);
- считать целесообразным использование в России европейского опыта реализации региональных инновационных стратегий, обеспечивающих выявление спроса на инновации среди компаний и ориентацию научного сектора и инновационной инфраструктуры на удовлетворение этого спроса. (...);
- в целях совершенствования государственного и муниципального управления по обеспечению перехода Российской Федерации на инновационный путь развития рекомендовать Комиссии при Президенте Российской Федерации по вопросам совершенствования государственного управления и правосудия, Министерству регионального развития Российской Федерации, другим заинтересованным федеральным и региональным органам власти осуществить экспертизу полномочий органов государственной власти субъектов Российской Федерации и органов местного самоуправления в части выявления проблемных вопросов, препятствующих обеспечению перехода России на режим инновационного развития, и законодательно обеспечить активизацию участия в реализации государственной научно-технической политики органов государственной власти субъектов Федерации и органов местного самоуправления, рассмотреть возможность разработки национальной программы, ориентированной на содействие российским регионам в подготовке и реализации региональных инновационных стратегий и формирование российской сети инновационных регионов;
- рекомендовать заинтересованным федеральным и региональным органам государственной власти реализовать систему мер по поддержке технопарков и процессов коммерциализации научных разработок. В частности: разработать законодательную базу для развития технопарков на федеральном уровне; предоставить налоговые льготы компаниям-резидентам технопарков, например, аналогичные льготам для резидентов ОЭЗ; упростить процедуру предоставления земельных участков для технопарков; законодательно разрешить НИИ, вузам и университетам создавать малые предприятия - start-up'ы;
- рекомендовать органам регионального и муниципального управления активно использовать инструменты международной технической и финансовой помощи, предоставляемой по линии Института Всемирного Банка, АМР США, Европейского Инструмента Соседства и Партнерства (ENPI) и других программ Европейского Союза для реализации стратегических приоритетов и планов территориального развития, поддержки инноваций;
- отметить необходимость выработки механизма интеграции документов стратегического планирования муниципального, регионального и федерального уровней;
- одобрить инициативы Комитета по пространственному развитию региона Балтийского моря (CSD/BSR) VASAB 2010 по территориальной интеграции Северо-Запада России и реализации совместных проектов в таких приоритетных сферах как развитие бизнеса, транспорта, ИКТ, управление прибрежными зонами. Отметить актуальность проекта «Окно

Восток-Запад", который позволит восполнить пробелы в оценке инновационного потенциала Северо-Запада России и расширит возможности синергии инновационных потенциалов стран Балтийского региона.

- предложить Комитету VASAB 2010 использовать Форум лидеров стратегического планирования городов и регионов России в качестве референтной группы для обсуждения Стратегии пространственного развития региона Балтийского моря.

4. Closing Conference

4.1. «Перспективы развития Северо-Западного федерального округа: вызовы, приоритеты, угрозы и ограничения»

Участники рекомендуют:

- 4) в целях максимального учёта сложившихся межсубъектовых экономических связей, обеспечения увязки общегосударственных и региональных планов и прогнозов социально-экономического развития, целесообразно предусмотреть **разработку стратегических документов долгосрочного социально-экономического развития на уровне федеральных округов**. Для преодоления ведомственной и региональной разобщённости целесообразно поручить эту работу Ассоциациям экономического взаимодействия соответствующих федеральных округов. Это позволит точнее формулировать цели регионального развития в увязке с имеющимися общими ресурсами, объективно сформировать перечень основных межрегиональных проектов, обеспечивающих достижение общих целей развития. Подобные документы могут стать основой для последующей разработки Концепции долгосрочного социально-экономического развития Российской Федерации;
- 5) для ускорения социально-экономического развития территорий требуется **активизация межрегионального взаимодействия**. Зачастую депрессивные регионы (субъекты Федерации) экономически тесно связаны с успешными регионами (транспортные подходы к инфраструктурным объектам, наличие сырьевой базы для обрабатывающих производств и т.п.). В этом случае целесообразно оказывать федеральную помощь (налоговые и иные льготы, государственные гарантии под привлекаемые кредиты, первоочередное финансирование проектов в рамках действующих ФЦП и др.) для инфраструктурного развития депрессивных территорий по поддерживаемым видам и направлениям экономической деятельности, а также для реализации проектов способствующих комплексному развитию двух и более субъектов Федерации;
- 6) необходимым условием развития и Северо-Западного федерального округа и страны в целом является **совершенствование работы транспортного комплекса**. Требуется системный подход к формированию единой стратегии развития транспортно-логистического комплекса страны в увязке с развитием отраслей экономики и внешнеэкономической ситуацией.

4.2. «Специфика стратегий приморских регионов»

Участники считают, что

- 4) Необходимо совершенствование стратегического планирования применительно к морской деятельности и приморским регионам и муниципалитетам, предусматривающее:

на федеральном уровне:

- применение интегральных подходов к планированию и управлению в морском природопользовании. Это позволит преодолеть фрагментарность, присущую отраслевому подходу, учесть взаимосвязанность видов морского природопользования, способствовать связям и межотраслевой гармонизации в морской деятельности исходя из анализа конфликтного использования ресурсов, обеспечить многоцелевую ориентацию и соответствие

деятельности природоохранным целям, участие всех заинтересованных сторон в разработке стратегий и программ развития;

- создание нормативной правовой и институциональной базы для разработки и реализации комплексных программ развития и управления прибрежными зонами, основанных на интегральных подходах, в рамках стратегий и программ социально-экономического развития приморских субъектов Федерации и программ развития прибрежных муниципальных образований. Это позволит реализовать особое единое государственное управление морскими прибрежными зонами страны (обеими их составляющими: морской и сухопутной) исходя из повсеместного успешного мирового опыта подобной деятельности и соответствующих рекомендаций организаций системы ООН и международных форумов на высшем уровне;

на региональном уровне:

- адаптацию и освоение современных управленческих технологий (методология Комплексного управления прибрежными зонами - КУПЗ) в применении к богатейшим по ресурсам и разнообразным по природным и социально-экономическим условиям прибрежным зонам страны;
- разработку и реализацию пилотных программ КУПЗ конкретных побережий страны.

Реализация этих мер позволит реализовать естественные природные конкурентные преимущества морских акваторий и прибрежных территорий в обеспечении дополнительного экономического роста, конкурентоспособности, инвестиционной привлекательности, занятости, повышения комфортности и качества жизни, охраны окружающей среды и уменьшения ущерба от природных и техногенных катастроф, а также безопасности страны

- 5) Необходимо совершенствование нормативной правовой базы, регулирующей градостроительную деятельность, в части учета специфики этой деятельности на морских акваториях, находящихся под суверенитетом и юрисдикцией Российской Федерации.
- 6) Необходимо развивать международное сотрудничество в стратегическом планировании морского природопользования, учитывая единство и экосистемный характер морских процессов, и широко использовать международный опыт в этой сфере.

FINAL NARRATIVE REPORT

9. Description

- 9.1. Name of beneficiary of grant contract: Ministry of Regional Development and Local Government, Latvia (Reģionālās attīstības un pašvaldību lietu ministrija).
- 9.2. Name and title of the Contact person: Mr Vladislavs Vesperis.
- 9.3. Name of partners in the Action: St. Petersburg Administration (Администрация Губернатора Санкт-Петербурга) [2], Russian Economic Developers Association (ASSET) (Ассоциация специалистов по экономическому развитию территорий) [3], Immanuel Kant State University of Russia (Российский государственный университет имени И. Канта) [4], Ministry of the Environment, Danish Forest and Nature Agency⁹, Denmark (Miljøministeriet, Skov- og Naturstyrelsen) [5], Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Housing, Germany (Bundesministeriums für Verkehr, Bau und Stadtentwicklung) [6], Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communication, Sweden (Näringsdepartementet) [7], Nordic Centre for Spatial Development (NORDREGIO) [8], Ministry of Regional Development, Poland (Ministerstwo Rozwoju Regionalnego) [9], Maritime Institute, Poland (Instytut Morski) [10].
- 9.4. Title of the Action: East-West Window (EWW).
- 9.5. Contract number: Grant Contract for European Community External Actions **2007/132-845**.
- 9.6. Start date and end date of the reporting period¹⁰: 15.06.2007 – 15.12.2008.
- 9.7. Target country(ies) or region(s): **North-West Russia in particular: St. Petersburg, Leningrad region and Kaliningrad region**; to some extent also Belarus and North-West Russia adjacent countries (mainly for collecting good practices and dissemination of the project results).
- 9.8. Final beneficiaries &/or target groups¹¹ (if different). The target audience/recipients of the project findings are: decision-makers (ministries responsible for spatial planning and development in the BSR, including the federal government in Russia, regional authorities in

⁹ The name of the partner 5 was changed during the EWW project execution **from** Ministry of the Environment, Danish Forest and Nature agency **to** Ministry of the Environment, Agency for Spatial and Environmental Planning (Miljøministeriet, By- og Landskabsstyrelsen).

¹⁰ The entire implementation period of the Action

¹¹ “Target groups” are the groups/entities who will be directly positively affected by the project at the Project Purpose level, and “final beneficiaries” are those who will benefit from the project in the long term at the level of the society or sector at large.

NW Russia, pan-Baltic organisations such as VASAB 2010). The final beneficiaries are local and regional governments in the Baltic Sea region (BSR) operators in the chosen thematic fields (e.g. businesses in WP1 and transport operators in WP2) in NW Russia and in the BSR. The divide into men and women of different project activities is provided separately.

- 9.9. Country (ies) in which the activities take place (if different from 1.7): Russia (St. Petersburg and Kaliningrad Oblast), Poland and Latvia.

10. Assessment of implementation of Action activities

10.1. Activities and results (for the whole reporting period including last narrative interim report)

Activity 1: Kick off of the work of Working Group no 1 on business development and innovation affecting spatial development,

1.7. First meeting of the WG1 (1 day) took place on 25 June 2007 in Riga which was according to the schedule. The meeting was planned in advance in late June so participants postponed their holidays which in this part of the BSR starts with so called Midsummer. The meeting was attended by 12 participants representing partners 1,3,4,5,6,8,9,10 and eight invited guests. The main aim was to discuss the analysis and further WG1 work in detail, to achieve clarity about division of labour between the partners, to make sure that duplication with other project is avoided (instead to aim at using results achieved by other projects) and to start the process of contracting the external experts. The following outputs were produced or achieved:

- Report how to avoid duplication with other INTERREG III B projects in the field of business development and innovation affecting spatial development had been prepared before the meeting by the project coordinator, discussed by the meeting and delivered to the Responsible (Lead) Partner.
- TORs for seven ASSET staff members, eight Kaliningrad University staff members, one Belarus expert and four external experts together with tender documentation (if necessary) have been prepared by project coordinator as result of the meeting. Tender procedures for the four external experts had been started resulting in contracting one external expert from Poland, one from Sweden, one from Latvia and one from Denmark. In addition the Belarus expert was contracted by the partner no. 8 without tender (contract below 5000 Euro).
- The main scope of analysis was proposed and discussed. Unfortunately too many question marks and uncertainties appeared during the June meeting so the additional meeting was organized in Riga in September and discussion on analysis continued till the second WG1 meeting (December 2007).
- Text for EWW section at to the VASAB website was decided, technically EWW link at VASAB website was created in September 2007.
- Project flyer was designed and edited including information on WG1 activities (300 copies were printed in October 2007).

Comments: The WG1 started the discussion on its work (i.e. necessary analysis, results to be achieved) but the topic was too broad for one day meeting in addition to many technical questions were raised. The decision was to continue the discussion when the experts contracted by tender would be available. The main problem was to what extend the achievement of the EWW goal (i.e. *to promote territorial integration of NW Russia into the BSR in the field of business development*)

required concentration on analysis concerning exclusively NW Russia and to what extent the broader BSR picture was necessary if integration should mean reciprocal relations (i.e. affecting both sides). The latter opinion prevailed and was accepted by the meeting. The WG1 considered that for producing the main output of the analytical phase (i.e. a *compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") with assessment of unexploited innovation potential in NW Russia, assessment of the potential for regional integration and with identification of spatial problems in NW Russia and BSR*) some BSR analysis as the background material should be done as well. The meeting also discussed the policy related role of the project i.e. better highlighting the EWW results on NW Russia role in the “Long Term Perspective” to be prepared by VASAB on CBSS demand. The WG1 leaders promised to ensure smooth transfer of the EWW results to the BSR strategy i.e. Long Term Perspective till 2030 (to be prepared by VASAB in 2009). The Responsible Partner declared that he would invite VASAB Secretariat to the most important meetings of the EWW to ensure smooth transfer of the project results to the “Long Term Perspective”.

- 1.8. Partnership Agreement Preparation. This action was related to all work packages and took place in June, July, August, and September 2007 and was ended in October 2007 with signing partnership agreements between Lead Partner and all other partners of the EWW project. The most difficult was signing Partnership Agreement with partners from St. Petersburg due to problems related to tax and system in Russia, conversion of EUR into rubels, banking system requirements etc. Finally two agreements, based on the results of additional working meeting (in Riga) discussions, were prepared and signed between Lead Partner and RU (ASSET) Partner and between German Partner and RU (ASSET) Partner. So at the end of the day there were 9 partnership agreements signed regulating relations between the EWW partners.
- 1.9. Quality Workshop (1 day) for Project leaders organised by INTERREG III B Secretariat and EU Delegation from Moscow in Riga on 26 September 2007 was attended by project coordinator (partner no.10), one representative of Russian partners (partner no.2) and representatives appointed by the Responsible Partner. Main guidelines from EC Delegation and INTERREG III B Secretariat on TACIS rules, payments schemes and communication experiences were presented during the seminar and later on at individual consultations. The meeting between Responsible Partner and the Russian partners was organized back to back with the workshop for discussing main technicalities of their participation in the project.

Activity 2: Analysis(WG1)

- 2.5. WG1 additional meeting (1 day) took place on 25 September 2007 in Riga to continue discussion on the scope of analysis. The meeting was attended by four WG1 members (including two external experts, project coordinator and the representative of the Russian partners) and three participants representing Responsible Partner. At the meeting in depth discussion on case studies on innovation, outsourcing and urban-rural relations in Russia took place and the detailed scope of the work of Russian partners and external experts were agreed. Also a draft outline structure of the WG1 analytical report was presented by the WG1 Coordinator and discussed in depth.
- 2.6. Data collection and interpretation started only in December 2007 after the second WG1 meeting. In this phase 34 people from all partners were involved (except partner no.7 who acted through partner no. 8). Their involvement differed. The main bulk of analytical work was done by partners no. 3, 4 and 8 and the external experts whereas the other people acted mainly as a reference group reading reports, making comments and asking for improvements. This was the task first of all of partners no. 1, 2, 5, 6, 9 and 10 representing mainly policy making side in the project and project coordination. Also VASAB Secretariat was invited by partner 1 (Responsible Partner) to participate in this process. The analysis (data collection) in principle were ended in March 2008 but some of them (requiring surveys) due to formal reasons (tenders) were completed in April 2008. Interpretation of data was done in April

2008 for all important cases (but some analysis e.g. the benchmarking studies and urban-rural analysis continued till September 2008). In fact in April and even in May and June the fine tuning of analysis (removing mistakes noticed by the other partners) still continued. The reason was that some partners from the reference group were very demanding asking for many improvements even if they had found little inconsistencies after second or third reading of the reports. Therefore the final synthesis report (draft discussion paper) from the analytical phase was completed only in July 2008 and even slightly changed after the WG1 September 2008 meeting and as the result of the EWW final/closing Conference in October 2008.

The outputs have been following:

(i) interim:

- Data (including public surveys) and draft analytical report on “Baltic” metropolitan areas with focus on the role of Kaliningrad and St. Petersburg;
- In depth study on St. Petersburg and Kaliningrad and their developmental potentials in the BSR context (focus on innovation and outsourcing) in which: trends and present policies for innovations nested in NW Russia and outsourcing were analysed, barriers for innovations perceived by business and public administration were identified (based on surveys), and cases on transfer of innovations between NW Russia and other parts of the BSR were described;
- Case studies (reports) on Russian and Belarus small and medium sized cities – covering: Novgorod, Gatchina, Chernyakhovsk, Gusev, Sovetsk, Svetly, Berezovka, Zaslavl;
- Reports on demographic trends in North-West Russia, in St. Petersburg and in Kaliningrad and in Belarus as well;
- Reports on case studies on urban-rural relations in Russia;
- Report on INTERREG III B projects results relevant for work of the WG1 group;
- Benchmarking studies concerning situation in Poland, Germany and Latvia on the issues relevant for the WG1 recommendations .

(ii) A compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") with assessment of unexploited innovation potential in NW Russia, assessment of the potential for regional integration and with identification of spatial problems in NW Russia and BSR.

Comments:

a) All the planned outcomes were achieved. However, during the analytical phase became clear that for the NW Russia innovation is more promising path for integration within the BSR than outsourcing, therefore more efforts were done to analyse this challenge. The list of outputs was enlarged (in comparison to the planned ones) by analysis of the role of the NW Russia in the BSR context (as the result of the WG1 discussions what analysis are necessary to achieve the EWW goal). Also urban structures and functional urban areas of not only large but also some small cities were analysed. The most interesting case appeared to be Gatchina as an example of science intensive cluster in Russia located in a small city. The some other cases illustrated urban-rural relations in Russia (and Belarus).

b) While working with data it became clear that translating data into policy recommendations can not be done by each working group separately. Therefore at the meeting of the WG leaders in December it was proposed that for the starting work on recommendation a workshop for all WGs would be necessary. The Responsible Partner was asked to organize such a workshop on 31st of January 2008 instead of simple WG1 seminar (planned for that date).

c) The work was delayed by some formal constraints such as tender procedures, requirement of separate EUR accounts (very difficult for Ministries) etc.

Activity 3: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR (WG1)

- 3.1. Kick off Conference of the project (1,5 day) for broad public took place on 18-19 October 2007 (according schedule) in St. Petersburg as a part of the well known VI Forum of Strategic Planning Leaders of Cities and Regions of Russia. This allowed project to reach the planned target group. The project: its assumptions and the planned outputs were presented to the Russian decision makers - mainly city mayors and chief planners. Conference participants expressed a deep hope that EWW project would diminish knowledge gaps within the Baltic Sea Region on the character of development potential of the NW Russia, its synergies and complementarities with potentials of other countries of the region, and on methods how this potential could be efficiently connected within the BSR. It was expressed in Conference recommendations that EWW project results should be presented in 2008 at the final Conference within VII Forum of Strategic Planning Leaders of Cities and Regions of Russia. The kick off conference was attended by 259 participants mainly Russian mayors and city planners. Among them there were 57 persons outside Russia. From EWW project 20 persons participated including Latvian State Secretary representing the Responsible Partner. So EWW reached the planned target of **200** Russian decision makers and professionals involved in discussion on the project.
- 3.2. Stakeholder Seminar for WG1 (0,5 day) was organised on 23 April 2008 in Riga (instead of beginning of May as originally planned). The preliminary results of the analytical phase were presented and the first discussions on the recommendations were started. The seminars for all working groups of EWW were arranged back to back with the VASAB annual conference financed by the Latvian Ministry of Regional Development and Local Government from its own means i.e. outside the EWW budget (from the EWW budget some partners only covered their travelling to the EWW seminars). The described above arrangement resulted in very impressive participation in the seminars and allowed to reach a planned target of **100** decision makers and businessman from BSR EU countries involved in discussion of the project findings and recommendations. The conference and seminars were attended by 167 participants including 26 persons directly involved in the EWW project (although the Responsible Partner was represented by some more employees). The participants came mainly from Latvia, Lithuania, and Finland but also from Azerbaijan, Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, EU Commission, Germany, Hungary, Norway, Poland, Russia and Sweden.
- 3.3. Closing(final) Conference of the project (1 day) for broad public took place on 21st October 2008 (according schedule) in St. Petersburg. The title of the conference was “Promoting territorial integration of the North West Russia into the Baltic Sea Region”. The main organiser was ASEET together with the EWW Responsible Partner. This Conference was a part of rich spectrum of the conferences and seminars taking place under umbrella (the same premises) of the VII All-Russia Forum of Strategic Planning Leaders “Strategic Planning in Regions and Cities of Russia”. In the event 631 participants took place out of it 582 from Russia. The forum was organized by: State Duma of the Russian Federation; Ministry for Regional Development of the Russian Federation; Ministry for Economic Development of the Russian Federation; St Petersburg City Administration; Center of Strategic Research; ISCER Leontief Centre. It was opened by Mr Dmitry Kozak, Minister of Regional Development, who underlined that “Forum is becoming the public debating platform for improving the strategic planning system of social and economic development in Russian regions”. The Conference “Promoting territorial integration of the North West Russia into the Baltic Sea region” was composed of four sessions attended by large number of the participants not only from Russia but also from other Baltic Sea Region countries. Some sessions were joint ventures with other organisations, forums and bodies interested in the subjects raised by the EWW project. The names of the sessions were following:
 - “Accessibility and innovations as motors of integration of the NW Russia into the Baltic Sea Region” (presentation of the results of the WG1 and the WG2),

- “Special Features of coastal regional strategies” (presentation of the WG3 results and dialogue with all key persons in Russia dealing with ICZM and maritime spatial planning),
- “Partnership mechanisms in local economic policy implementation” (presentation of the WG1 results with regard to urban-rural partnership).

In addition to that EWW results were presented at the key session of the Forum “Prospects for Federal Okrug Development: Challenges, priorities, threats and constraints. North-West Federal Okrug” attended by key decision makers from the North-West Federal Okrug.

Comments:

The choice of the formula of the kick-off and closing conferences appeared to have very positive results on ability of the project to deliver results to the key target groups in Russia. The Conference was also attended by the Ministerial partners from the EWW project. The EWW results were mirrored in the Forums resolutions. Some interested questions were raised requiring further discussion and examination.

- 3.4. Final publication The book summing up the results of the investigations available for the stakeholders in Kaliningrad and St.Petersburg was edited in October, November and printed in December 2008 by partner no.4.

Comments:

The number of books published was smaller (100) than assumed in the application (400), although the whole budget allocated to this purpose was used. There were several reasons why the printing was more expensive than expected. Some of them were of technical reasons: i.e. the book had more coloured pictures (maps) than estimated and was thicker than planned (more than 300 pages in comparison to 150 pages planned), but the main reason was of vis mayor nature. In 2008 in Russia an unexpected inflation and economic crisis appeared which could not be taken into account at the stage of budget planning. This resulted in much higher printing costs. However, the partner no.4 is ready to print additional copies of the book if demanded. The available copies will be distributed to the most active in the EWW Russian stakeholders and to the project partners of the EWW.

Activity 4: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations and action plan (WG1)

- 4.1. Steering Group Meeting (1 day) took place on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg according to schedule. The meeting was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1,2,3,5,6,7,9,10 and seven invited guests. The Steering Group discussed the project progress. The work was lagging behind the schedule. Although the WG1 started on time it became involved in lengthy discussions about the necessary scope of analysis and detailed division of labour between working groups. The Steering Group decided therefore not to start the work on recommendations before improving synergy between the work of the working groups. This task was given to the meeting of the WGs leaders organised in Riga back to back with the WG2 (5 December 2007) and the WG1 (6-7 December 2007) meetings. The meeting also discussed details of project presentation to the kick-off conference held next day.
- 4.2. WG1 second meeting (1,5 day) took place on 6-7 December 2007 in Riga (instead of late November). The meeting was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10, two external consultants and six invited guests. The meeting concentrated on discussing analytical phase of the project (the decision was that the lagging behind analysis would make necessary to postpone by two months the next WG1 meeting i.e. till the end of analytical phase). However, the WG 1 also started examining the way of preparation of the recommendations out of the analysis conducted. For the starting work on recommendation it was agreed that a workshop for all WGs would be necessary and the

Responsible Partner was asked to organize such a workshop (synergy meeting) on 31st of January 2008 instead of a simple WG1 seminar (scheduled for beginning of February).

- 4.3. Synergy meeting no.1 (1 day) took place in Riga on 31 of January 2008 (replacing the WG1 seminar scheduled for February). It was attended by fourteen project partner members representing partners no.1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, three external experts and six invited guests. The facilitator was hired by the Responsible Partner. During the meeting the participants agreed that all three working groups were in need of a common frame. This should be given by the vision of the BSR till 2030 with full integration of the North-West Russia. The participants managed to prepare an outline of such a vision requiring further work. The meeting asked for one more working day for finishing common visionary frame which should allow preparing meaningful recommendations.
- 4.4. Steering Group Meeting 2 took place on 1 of February 2008 in Riga. It was attended by seven project partner members representing partners no. 1,3,5,6,7, 9, 10 one external expert and seven invited guests. The results of the synergy meeting were discussed i.e. synergy between the work of the working groups. It was decided to organise one more synergy meeting to continue work on the common frame for all WGs, i.e. vision of the BSR till 2030 with full integration of the North-West Russia. An agenda of the April Conference proposed by the Responsible Partner was discussed together with some technical issues. The progress in analytical phase was reviewed.
- 4.5. Synergy meeting no. 2 (1 day) took place in Liepaja on 14th of March 2008. It was attended by ten project partner members representing partners no. 1,3,5,6,9, 10 one external expert and five invited guests. The facilitator was hired by the Responsible Partner but paid from Responsible Partner own means. The final draft of the vision was discussed and shared by participants giving stable frame for analytical part and allowing proper work on recommendations.
- 4.6. WG1 fourth meeting (1 day) took place on 3-4 April 2008 in Riga. It was attended by nine project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 8, 10, two external experts and two invited guests. The meeting was convened on demand of Russian partners who started finalisation of analytical part and wanted to discuss the preliminary results among themselves. It was also important for conceptualization of the recommendations i.e. discussing what findings from analytical phase should be taken into consideration while working on recommendations.
- 4.7 WG1 fifth meeting (one day) took place on 24 April 2008 in Riga. It was attended by fifteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, four external experts and six invited guests. The WG1 before the meeting concentrated mainly on analytical work. At the fifth meeting analyses were summed up and the work on recommendations were started. However, one more meeting was requested (autumn 2008) in order to discuss the final draft of the recommendations and action programme. Due to delay in the work on urban-rural relations in Russia the relevant reports were not presented to the WG1 at this meeting. Only an overview of the progress and main findings were reported. It was decided that for synergy reasons the reports would be presented on seminar on urban-rural relations in Russia to be organised as a joint event with the SeBCo project in Kaliningrad in June 2008. This was realised and such presentation took place and was regarded as a great success by meeting participants.
- 4.8. Steering Group Meeting 3 (one day) took place on 20 May 2008 in Riga. It was attended by five project partner members representing partners no. 1, 5, 9, 10, and five invited guests. The Steering Group discussed the project progress. The results of the second synergy meeting and the April Conference were examined as well as a draft vision of the BSR till 2030 with full integration of the North-West Russia. The Steering Group decided to close analytical part and start the work on recommendations. However, the WG3 leaders asked for additional benchmark study on the results of the INTERREG projects in the field of competences of the WG3 with focus on the German experience. This was to diminish discrepancies between the WGs, since the WG1 and the WG2 already had such type of

expertises included in their work. The problems with travelling budget of Russian partners were discussed once more together with a problem of disappeared financial manager. The Steering Group also continued a discussion on political use of the EWW results i.e. incorporation of the results into the Long Term Perspective of VASAB to be produced in 2009. The output achieved:

- first draft recommendation papers (in outline format) of WG1 and WG2.

4.9. WG1 sixth meeting (one day) took place on 03 September 2008 in Jurmala. It was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, four external experts and seven invited guests. They discussed the final draft of the recommendations and action programme prepared during holiday time 2008 by ASSET, Immanuel Kant State University of Russia (Kaliningrad), Nordregio staff, and external experts. The whole work on urban-rural relations in Russia the relevant analytic reports were presented to the WG1 at this meeting as well. The WG1 discussed and improved the following documents:

- Recommendations how to improve innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Recommendations how to improve settlement policies in NW Russia (urban rural partnership) from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Action plan how to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration.

4.10. Steering Group Meeting 4 (one day) took place on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg. It was attended by 7 project partner members representing partners no. 2, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10 one external expert and 6 invited guests. The group discussed the shape of final publications of the EWW project, the use of the analytical materials and endorsed the recommendations and action proposed by the project. The main discussion was on the proper use of the EWW results for the Long Term Perspective (LTP) of VASAB elaboration of which was started few month ago (August 2008). The EWW results were placed to the different parts of the LTP outcomes. The VASAB consultant responsible for facilitating the LTP process was invited to the Steering Group meeting. It was also discussed how to use EWW outcomes for the process of preparation of the BSR EU Strategy. The partner no.5 arranged a meeting with the EU Commission on that topic. It was decided that the EWW results would be incorporated in the VASAB non-paper to be presented to the EU Commission in November/December 2008 in order to influence strategy preparation. The outputs achieved (as results of the meeting):

- Final draft of the recommendations how to improve innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Final draft of recommendations how to improve settlement policies in NW Russia (urban rural partnership) from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Final draft of the action plan how to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration,
- Final draft of recommendations on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR including concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR,
- Final action plan how to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational sea use planning and ICZM,
- Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic,
- Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application,
- Forwarding (transferring of EWW results) to important BSR processes namely: EU BSR Strategy and VASAB Long Term Perspective.

Activity 5: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 2 on accessibility

5.1. WG2 first meeting (one day) took place on 10 October 2007 in Riga It was attended by five project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 8, 10, one external expert and three

invited guests. The main aim was to discuss the scope of analysis (concrete meaning of accessibility) and the further work of the WG2 step by step, to achieve clarity about division of labour between the partners, to make sure that duplication with other project was avoided (instead to aim at using results achieved by other projects) and to start the process of contracting the external experts. The following outputs were produced or achieved:

- Report how to avoid duplication with other INTERREG III B projects in the field of accessibility was prepared by the project coordinator, discussed at the meeting and accepted by the Responsible Partner;
- TORs for four Kaliningrad University staff members, one Belarus expert and TORs for three external experts together with tender documentation (if necessary) have been prepared and approved. Procurement and contracting procedures for the one external expert was finished in September. Two other experts were also contracted (latter on);
- The main scope of analysis were proposed and discussed. The discussion on analysis continued among the partners (by e-mails) till the second WG2 meeting (December 2007);
- EWW link at the VASAB website was created (see activity 1.1);
- The content of the project flyer was loaded by short information about the WG2 activities.

Comments: The WG2 started its work behind the schedule. Due to the late project start (mid of June 2007), the first period of the project coincided with a holiday season. Therefore the real work of the WG2 (by phone, e-mails etc) started only in September 2007 i.e. three month later than planned. In addition to that, for some partners it was very inconvenient (e.g. celebrations of anniversary of establishment of the Kaliningrad University) and this postponed the start of formal work by one or two month further on i.e. till October 2007. In the meantime the preparation of the WG2 detailed analysis was started. To this end a pre meeting on 22nd of August 2007 was organised (partners 1, 7,8) to prepare tentative proposals on the substance of the work of the WG2. This meeting was paid outside the EWW budget. Although the WG2 (similarly to the WG1) came to the opinion that broader BSR picture was necessary to promote *territorial integration of NW Russia into the BSR in the field of transport and ITC*. The WG2 members also shared the WG1 concern on importance of smooth transfer of the EWW results to the BSR strategy till 2030 i.e. Long Term Perspective to be prepared by VASAB in 2009. The characteristic feature of the WG2 was a long discussion about the meaning of the notion of accessibility. As the result accessibility to energy was also considered to be an important element of the analysis.

Activity 6: Analysis(WG2)

6.1. The discussion on the scope and method of analysis (indicators, pilot studies) had been continued from October till beginning of December 2007. The manuals and guidelines were discussed many times. The main method was e-mail exchanges. As the result the manuals and blue prints were produced by partners 1 and 8 to facilitate collecting data and information:

- A blue print on screening transport policy,
- A manual for collecting data and information on accessibility.

Comments: The majority of time of the initial period was allocated to discussing the notion of accessibility. This was done in order to avoid problems when data and information collection would be started. Due to the rise of energy prices also this issue was considered as important factor for the NW Russia integration to the BSR. The second issue heavily discussed was scarcity of comparable data in Russia. Partner no 8 having a very well developed data base on transport data for the BSR was in a difficult position checking (in dialogue with partner 4) existence of similar data in Russia. This required more resources and more work load than estimated at the

beginning. But finally this allowed presenting Russia at the broader BSR picture. The phase 6.1. ended with second meeting of the WG2 (December 2007 in Riga).

6.2. Data collection and interpretation started only in December 2007 after the second WG 2 meeting. Basic data were collected by mid February 2008 but some work continued (fine tuning of reports) till May/June 2008. A draft discussion paper was ready for the Riga Stakeholder Conference in April 2008. However, it was a working document amended after each important EWW meeting, till the final/closing Conference. In this work (phase 6.1 and 6.2) seventeen people (including three external experts) were involved. Their involvement differed. The main bulk of analytical work was done by partners no. 4 and 8 and the external experts whereas the other participants acted mainly as a reference group reading reports, making comments and asking for improvements. This was done first of all by partners no. 1, 6, 7 and 10 representing mainly policy making side in the project and project coordination. Also VASAB Secretariat was invited by partner 1 (Responsible Partner) to participate in this process.

The following outputs were achieved:

(i) interim:

- Mapping of transport infrastructure policies at the federal and regional level, policies in development of the soft accessibility (to knowledge and information) and policies on clusters in NW Russia (however clusters were analysed by the WG1 in fact), also policies and situation in the field of accessibility to energy was examined;
- Identification of bottlenecks and constraints for transport (and through transport for business development) in NW Russia;
- Assessment of the policy correlation with the strategic documents at the BSR level (mainly by analysing outcomes of Strategic INTERREG III B projects pursued by VASAB, BDF, BSSSC and CPMR);
- Examining the results of other INTERREG III B projects relevant for the WG2 work;
- Feasibility assessment of connecting TEN-T with the pan-European corridors.

The planned verification of the accessibility perspective and of present (current) and forecast trade flows in NW Russia and Belarus (vis-a-vis BSR reports) was less successful. The main reason were missing data concerning predicted trade flows in NW Russia and Belarus¹². The accessibility perspective instead was analysed using BSR outlook to show how NW-Russia is connected with the rest of the BSR.

(ii) A compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") presenting situation, development trends and political objectives in the fields of transport and accessibility in NW RU and Belarus and their consequences for BSR cohesion and business development

Comments:

The most important planned outputs were achieved (although one output was slightly modified). In addition to that, accessibility to energy was touched as important future factor of the BSR integration that should determine in great extent the NW Russia integration into the BSR. The analysis lasted longer than expected. The main constraint was lack of regional reliable data in NW Russia. The main reason of the delay was in insufficient data availability but also to some extent larger than expected amount of available background information (e.g. results of the BSR projects) that should be digested and analysed.

Activity 7: Pilot studies (WG2)

Since the analytical phase (activity 6) was delayed also pilot projects were postponed. The aim of the activity 7 was to analyse more in depth the most promising solutions developed during the analytical

¹² The work on trade flows was done in co-operation with WG1 and the BSR perspective was used.

phase and prioritised during stakeholder dialogue. Therefore only in May 2008 the more concrete work on pilot studies (pre-feasibility studies) could start. The WG2 selected two (in line with the output indicators listed in the application) topics for pre-feasibility studies. The topics were following:

- e) BSR passenger railway connectivity with focus on the Eastern part of the BSR,
- f) examination of implementation of the transport part of Tallinn vision of VASAB with focus on the eastern part of the BSR.

For the pilot studies a tender procedure was used and contracts were signed in late June 2008. The results were delivered in late August 2008 and discussed by the WG2 group meeting in September. The following reports were produced:

- *Study on international rail passenger traffic development: Possibilities in the context of development of cities in the Baltic Sea Region* (Contract: 5-13/66, of 18.6.2008) elaborated by SIA “AC Konsultācijas”,
- *Evaluation of implementation of the VASAB 2010 vision in the area of mobility network and energy supply* (Contract: 5-13/74, of 23.7.2008) elaborated by SIA “AC Konsultācijas”.

The results of the studies were presented to the closing/final conference of the EWW and will serve as an input for the Long Term Spatial Development Perspective. They were also presented in advance to the WG2 members working on recommendation in order to shape the WG2 recommendations.

Comments:

An additional barrier delaying activity no.7 was obligation of tendering the contractors due to internal law of Latvia where partner no.1 (responsible for the WG2 work) is located. The WG2 decisions were taken in May 2008, but the contracts were signed only 1,5- 2 months latter coinciding once more with a holiday season. The first preliminary results of the activity no.7 were delivered in August and the final results in October/November 2008.

Activity 8: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR

The same as activity no. 3

Activity 9: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG2)

- 9.1. Steering Group Meeting (1 day) took place on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg according to schedule (for details see action 4.1).
- 9.2. WG2 second meeting (1 day) took place on 5 December 2007 in Riga (instead of late November). The meeting was attended by seven project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 7, 8, 10 and four invited guests. The meeting concentrated on discussing analytical phase of the project. The manuals and blue prints for collecting data and information were agreed. For starting work on recommendation it was discussed that the idea of Steering Group (of its first meeting in October 2007) of workshop for all WGs should be implemented and the Responsible Partner was asked to organize such a workshop (synergy meeting) in January 2008.
- 9.3. Synergy meeting no.1 (1 day) took place in Riga on 31st of January 2008 (see action 4.3. for details).
- 9.4. Steering Group Meeting 2 on 1st of February 2008 in Riga (see action 4.4. for details).
- 9.5. Synergy meeting no. 2 (1 day) took place in Liepaja on 14th of March 2008. (see action 4.5. for details).
- 9.6. Steering Group Meeting 3 (one day) took place on 20 May 2008 in Riga. (for details see action 4.8).
- 9.7. WG2 third meeting (one day) took place on 21 May 2008 in Riga according to schedule. It was attended by five project partner members representing partners no. 1, 7, 8, 10, one external expert and three invited guests. The WG2 before the third meeting concentrated

mainly on analytical work. At this meeting analyses were summed up and the work on recommendations started. It was decided that recommendations (with elements of the action programme) would be prepared for Russia and for the whole BSR with focus on better integration of NW Russia. One additional meeting was requested (autumn 2008) in order to discuss the final draft of the recommendations. The meeting also discussed the pilot actions (pre-feasibility studies) agreeing on concrete items. The outputs achieved:

- a first draft recommendations paper (in outline format),
- TOR for two most important pilot studies.

9.8. WG2 fourth meeting (one day) took place on 4th September 2008 in Jurmala. It was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, three external experts and six invited guests. They discussed the final draft of the recommendations (with elements of the action programme) prepared by Immanuel Kant State University of Russia (Kaliningrad) and Nordregio staff. The WG2 discussed and improved the following documents:

- Recommendations on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR including concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR.
- Study on international rail passenger traffic development: Possibilities in the context of development of cities in the Baltic Sea Region,
- Evaluation of implementation of the VASAB 2010 vision in the area of mobility network and energy supply,
- Overview of results of INTERREG III B projects in the field of accessibility .

9.9. Steering Group Meeting 4 (one day) took place on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg (please see action 4.10)

Activity 10: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 3 on ICZM and transnational sea use planning

10.1. WG3 preparatory meeting took place on 24 July 2007 in Kaliningrad. It was attended by nine project partner members representing partners no. 4, 10, and five invited guests. The meeting was used for preparation of the WG3 first meeting, and the pilot action in particular for presentation and discussion with the Kaliningrad partners the results of the INTERREG project BaltCoast of which recommendations should form main backbone of the work of the WG3. The preparatory meeting was organised during the holiday season due to indicated by the Kaliningrad partner necessity of postponing the WG3 first meeting till October because of the celebrations of 750th anniversary of establishment of the university (lack of experts) in early autumn 2007. So the preparatory meeting was a vehicle to start the work of the WG3 even in slightly less formal way. The main subject of discussion was the BaltCoast recommendations, TORs for experts and other guidelines necessary for elaboration of the WG3 analysis. The outputs were following:

- Decision on TORs and blue prints,
- Clarifying division of labour,
- Project flyer was discussed (and then edited) - see activity 1.1.

10.2 WG 3 first meeting (1,5 day) took place on 30-31 October 2007 in Kaliningrad i.e. with four month delay. The reason was the celebrations of 750th anniversary of establishment of the Albertina University (today Immanuel Kant State University of Russia) in Kaliningrad. The meeting was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 4, 9, 10 and to some extent also partner no.1, one external expert and fifteen invited guests mainly from Russia but also from Latvia, Germany and Finland. The main aim was to discuss the analysis and the further WG3 work in detail, to achieve clarity about division of labour between the partners, to make sure that duplication with other project was avoided (instead to aim at using results achieved by other projects) and to start the process of contracting the external experts. Instead of preparing TORs for separate experts the WG3 at pre meeting decided to make only

two TORs (one for external expert and one for the whole pilot project). For conducting analysis it was agreed that blue prints should be used. Such blue prints were prepared by partner no. 10 in advance presented at the meeting, and then improved/discussed by e-mails and approved in December 2007. The following outputs were produced or achieved:

- Report (in form of power point presentations) – presenting an overview of existing and available documentation on the chosen themes in NW Russia and at the BSR level;
- Two blue prints (for further analysis and discussions);
- Two TORs (one for external expert and one for the whole pilot project);
- One external expert was contracted by the partner no 1 covering by his expertise BSR and HELCOM perspective;
- EWW link at the VASAB website was created (see activity 1.1).

Also Kaliningrad stakeholders who attended the second part of the meeting were informed about the EWW project together with showing them the relevant BSR experience in ICZM and maritime spatial planning. They formed important part of the reference network for dialogue on project findings and recommendations. The meeting was also a starting point for executing analysis.

Activity 11 Analysis (WG 3)

11.1 The discussion on the scope and method of analysis had been continued from October till beginning of December 2007. The discussion resulted in shifting focus more from ICZM to maritime spatial planning as the most important transnational issue related to sea use in the nearest future. The blue prints (to be followed by Russian colleagues) presented by partner 10 were discussed many times. The main method was e-mail exchanges. As the result the two blue prints were agreed:

- A blue print on spatial planning legislation on the sea covering Poland,
- A blue print on potentials and conflicts on the sea covering Poland.

11.2. Gathering and compiling the WG3 information started in December 2007 after blue prints approval. Fourteen people representing partners no. 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10 were involved in the information collecting. Their involvement differed. The main bulk of analytical work was done by partners no.10 and 4 and by external expert whereas the other participants acted mainly as a reference group reading reports, making comments and asking for improvements. This was done first of all by partners no. 5,6 and 7 representing mainly policy making side in the project. The analysis in principle were ended in March. The situation of the WG3 was different than the WG1 and the WG2. The WG3 did not collect statistical information but rather qualitative information and the broad BSR background was discussed, sorted out and clarified at the first meeting by examining BaltCoast results. Therefore, the analytical work could be done in parallel with an initial phase of recommendation preparation. But also in the WG3 the completing analytical reports took more time than expected. Although first draft reports were ready in March their fine tuning continued in April and even in May and June. This was slightly learning by doing in particular for Russian experts who had little contact with maritime spatial planning in the past. The outputs were following:

- The legal systems were screened and regulations, responsibilities for offshore planning at all levels in NW Russia were identified;
- System of mapping to improve access to relevant information from NW Russia and its uploading to the pilot system made in the INTERREG III B BaltCoast project were tested (the results can be seen in the WG3 reports done by Russian colleagues);
- Actual (current) sea use in NW RU (Kaliningrad) according to the BaltCoast standards (potentials and conflicts) were described in a separate paper and conflicts and potentials were detected;

- A compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") with assessment of compatibility of the Russian regulatory framework to the legislation and practice in a pan-Baltic perspective in the field of ICZM and sea use planning was elaborated.

Comments:

The all planned outputs were achieved.

Activity 12 Pilot Action (WG 3)

Pilot action was started in October 2007 and continues till the end of August 2008. The twelve project partners staff members representing partners no. 1,4,6,7,9,10 and one external expert were involved. Partners no. 1,6,7 have acted mainly as a reference group while the main role was played by partners no. 4,9,10. The pilot action aimed at preparing a system of joint ICZM and maritime spatial planning in Gdańsk Bay between Poland and Russia. This task was discussed at the kick off meeting with various Russian stakeholders. The prevailing opinion was that due to the dispersed responsibilities in Russia in ICZM and sea space management (versus concrete central Agency in Poland responsible for sea space and regional governments responsible for ICZM activities) such goal could not be achieved in the project time span. Nowadays there is no single institution in Russia responsible for sea space management (like Maritime Offices in Germany or Poland). The WG3 came to the opinion that agreements between Polish and Russian relevant state institutions on co-operation in sea use planning and management might be too ambitious and premature as the WG3 output. Instead pilot actions were focused on the preconditions for establishment of such agreements in future, by exchange of good practices, deepening mutual understanding and preparing necessary tools and necessary institutional structures i.e. centres of excellence in both countries dealing with maritime spatial planning. It was decided that the starting point should be an agreement between Russian and Polish institutions from NGO or research domain to co-operate on promotion of integrative approach to sea space and coast in both countries. In this context a sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application was discussed. It was considered as an important tool for showing to Russian decision-makers a usefulness of maritime spatial planning. The WG3 decided to limit it to the Baltic Sea around Kaliningrad Oblast. The register was prepared by partner no. 4 and 10 in a form of GIS atlas. The following outputs were produced in the reporting period:

- The exchange of bi-lateral experience was started e.g. Polish pilot sea use plan (covering Puck Bay) elaborated in 2008 under PlanCoast INTERREG III B project was shown to the RU experts;
- The experience with the BaltCoast project of INTERREG III B was shared;
- Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application was first discussed then agreed and then produced and presented to the final/closing conference of the EWW in St. Petersburg on 21st October 2008;
- Agreement between Maritime Institute in Gdańsk and Russian partners on permanent co-operation in the future (including joint projects and policy related work) aiming at establishment of a system of joint ICZM and maritime spatial planning in Gdańsk Bay between Poland and Russia was prepared in autumn 2008. The partners of the agreement will act as an centres of excellence in their countries with regard to maritime spatial planning and ICZM.

Comments:

The pilot action had to be modified. But the actions started within EWW project will be continued after the project closure thanks to established under the EEW contacts. The aim of establishment of the system of joint ICZM and maritime spatial planning in Gdańsk Bay between Poland and Russia is still valid and will be realised in the future. What was done under EWW project was to start this process by exchange of experience, awareness rising, gathering

stakeholders and discussing with them the problem and by preparation of some necessary tools which will convince Russian decision-makers that an integrative coastal and sea space management would be important. Despite difficulties the main outputs promised in the EWW application were produced: i.e. (i) a sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application and (ii) agreements between Polish and Russian relevant institutions on co-operation in sea use planning and management.

Activity 13: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR

The same as activity no. 3

Activity 14: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG3)

- 14.1. Steering Group Meeting (1 day) took place on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg according to schedule (for details see action 4.1).
- 14.2. Synergy meeting no.1 (1 day) took place in Riga on 31st of January 2008 (see action 4.3. for details). This meeting was used by the WG3 also for development of a first outline of recommendation paper which was discussed afterwards by e-mail exchange.
- 14.3. Steering Group Meeting 2 on 1st of February 2008 in Riga (see action 4.4. for details).
- 14.4. Synergy meeting no 2 (1 day) took place in Liepaja on 14th of March 2008 (see action 4.5. for details).
- 14.5. WG3 second meeting (1,5 day) took place on 27-28 March 2008 in Kaliningrad (instead of late November 2007). It was attended by sixteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 7, 9, 10., one external expert and two invited guests. The meeting assessed the progress of the analytical work, discussed the interim reports of Russia and tried to relate the WG3 work towards the EU Integrated Maritime Policy (Blue Book). The final draft of recommendation paper was discussed and agreed. The acknowledgement of the project results at the political level was also examined. The WG3 group joined the WG1 and the WG2 wish to present its results at policy level by introducing them to the “Long Term Perspective” of VASAB. However, partner 9 was also asked to transfer the results to the EU BSR Strategy and to the EU work on integrated maritime policy. During the WG3 meeting a workshop with Russian stakeholders on off-shore planning and ICZM was organised in Kaliningrad on 27th of March 2008 as a joint venture of all projects dealing with this subject i.e. EWW, POWER and SDI-4-SEB as a part of the conference (“Integrated management, sustainable development indicators, spatial planning and monitoring of the South-Eastern Baltic coastal regions”), which took place in Kaliningrad on 26th - 30th of March 2007. Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic were elaborated by EWW project participants beforehand and proposed to stakeholders attending this conference. The recommendations were unanimously adopted by the participants including regional and local authorities from Russia. This seemed to be an important step towards introducing integrative approach towards the sea space and coastal zone in Russia.

The output achieved was following:

- Recommendation paper discussed and adopted by the Russian stakeholder (Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic).
- 14.6. Steering Group Meeting 3 (1day) took place on 20 May 2008 in Riga (for details see action 4.8).
 - 14.7. WG3 third meeting (1 day) took place on 4-5 June 2008 in Gdańsk almost according to schedule (few days later than planned originally). It was attended by fifteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 9, 10, one external expert and five invited guests. At the meeting analytical phase was summed up. The meeting was also used for examining the

experience and good practices of the Balance project in maritime spatial planning. The experts from Denmark introduce the project to the WG3 members. However, the WG3 main discussion concentrated on the 'action plan' following the recommendations adopted in March 2008. The opinions were dispersed. Some participants considered elaboration of an action plan as premature having in mind lack of legal provisions in Russia regulating sea use in an integrative way and dispersion of responsibility for sea management among many institutions. Some others proposed to focus action plan on methodological issues i.e. issues indispensable to introduce sea use planning in Russia and methodology of such planning suited for Russian conditions. After the e-mail exchange in June 2008 the partner no 9 responsible for the WG3 work decided to take the risk to prepare a draft action plan and to discuss it in September 2008 with the WG 3 members. Therefore an additional meeting was requested to be held in September 2008, to conclude the recommendation phase. The following outputs were achieved:

- The experience with Balance project of INTERREG III B was shared.

After the WG3 third meeting the partner no 9 and 10 organised (late June beginning of July 2008) consultation about the follow up of the WG3 in a form of a joint project. In the consultation the information on different ETC Programmes in the BSR were analysed and compared. The results were presented to the WG3 fourth meeting.

- 14.8. WG3 fourth meeting (one day) took place on 2nd September 2008 in Gdańsk. It was attended by thirteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 7, 9, 10 and one external expert. The meeting discussed the final draft of the action programme prepared by the staff of partners no 4 and 10 (Maritime Institute from Gdańsk and Immanuel Kant State University of Russia from Kaliningrad). Also final draft of the sea use register was presented by the partner no.4. The WG3 discussions tackled also the future use of the WG3 results. The presentations to the final/closing conference of EWW were agreed. It was also decided that the WG3 analysis should serve for broader popularization of the issue of maritime spatial planning in the Baltic Sea Region. The partner no 9. agreed to edit (by the end of 2008) from its own resources a *Compendium on Maritime Spatial Planning systems in the Baltic Sea Region countries* composed of two parts: part 1 *Survey of the national instruments and tools for the management of the sea space in the BSR countries* describing legal and institutional aspects of maritime spatial planning systems in the BSR countries and part 2 entitled *Examples of national cases of sea spatial conflicts and potentials*. Partner no.9 promised to invite to this book all other BSR countries while using the WG3 results as the core input. The WG3 also analysed different possibilities of continuation of the WG3 work. After the lively discussion it was decided to use two vehicles for further co-operation: The project BaltSeaPlan already submitted to the BSR Programme (although slightly too abstractive) and the new project to be submitted to the ENPI Programme Lithuania–Poland–Russian Federation on concrete planning work as continuation of the WG3 pilot activities. It was decided that transnational maritime planning should concentrate on Vistula/Kaliningrad lagoon and on Kursiu lagoon.

The WG3 discussed and improved the following documents during its fourth meeting:

- Action plan how to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational sea use planning and ICZM;
- Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application.

- 14.9. Steering Group Meeting 4 (one day) took place on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg (please see action 4.10)

10.2. Assessment of the results of the Action

The central objective of the Action was to promote territorial integration of NW Russia (i.e. the entire Northwest Federal District, including Kaliningrad) into the Baltic Sea region (BSR) in the identified three fields of (1) business development, (2) transport / ICT development and (3) sea use planning and Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM). The starting point was relatively impressive but

slightly idle (from the BSR perspective) developmental potential (in terms of human capital, scientific achievements etc.) of the North West Russia. The task was to develop solutions how to use the potential of the NW Russia for the benefit of the BSR economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development.

The action was successful to that extend that it managed to identify economic and spatial development needs in the NW Russia from the perspective of public authorities and businesses, requiring to be tackled by at the transnational level. This findings were benchmarked against existing good practice solutions based on experience of other BSR countries. The search was also done in order to detect economic and spatial trends, relevant for connecting territorial potentials between the NW Russia and the BSR. However, the picture coming from analysis appeared less promising than expected (see point 2.9). But even in those rather difficult circumstances the recommendations for three mentioned above fields were formulated and action plans were outlined. The main results delivered to the external audience having policy relevance are presented below:

The results achieved	The results intended	Explanation of differences
Recommendations how to improve innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration	Recommendation" paper with suggestions on policy improvements and legislative changes to improve settlement and innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration	The results achieved put less attention to legislative changes than to policy improvements. This is outcome of the survey done in order to learn from Russian businessman what are the main obstacles for them to innovate.
Recommendations how to improve settlement policies in NW Russia (urban rural partnership) from the perspective of BSR integration,		The focus of the result achieved is on urban-rural partnership as key for integrative development of settlement structure in Russia.
Action plan how to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration,	A paper with fields for further concrete actions ("action plan") to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration	Done in line with plans
Recommendations on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR including concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR,	1.Recommendation" paper with suggestions on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR 2. A paper with fields for further concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia and in BY in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR	The recommendations and action plan were merged. The reason is that Russia has very concrete plans and actions in this field for the future years so the WG2 decided to focus on long-term recommendations.
Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic	Recommendation" paper on upgrading the instruments and tools and institutional arrangements for transnational sea use planning and ICZM at the BSR level based on the completed pilot action	More ambitious recommendations were produced than expected i.e. more in line with the real situation in Russia with regard to ICZM and maritime spatial planning
Action plan how to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational sea use planning and	A paper with fields for further concrete actions ("action plan") to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational	Done in line with plans

ICZM	sea use planning and ICZM	
Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application	A sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application - based on the completed system mapping.	Done in line with plans
Agreement between maritime Institute in Gdańsk and Immanuel Kant State University of Russia on further co-operation in the field of maritime spatial planning	Agreements between Polish and Russian relevant institutions on co-operation in sea use planning and management	Done in line with plans

The most important EWW achievement is delivery of main messages resulting from the Action to the important Russian decision makers, planning professionals and scientific sector as well as to the key pan-Baltic organizations such as HELCOM or VASAB. Through VASAB also the EU BSR strategy was influenced.

10.3. The outcome on both final beneficiaries and/or target group and the situation of the target group/target region which the action addressed

The target audience/recipients of the project findings have been decision-makers (ministries responsible for spatial planning and development in the BSR, including the federal government in Russia, regional authorities in NW Russia, pan-Baltic organisations such as VASAB 2010). Thanks to the action they have received a better picture on the situation with regard to the North-West Russia integration into the Baltic Sea region (BSR). This knowledge has been already used for policy making by VASAB in production of the Long Term Spatial Development Perspective and it seems that it will be also useful for the EU Commission in elaboration of the EU BSR strategy and for HELCOM for implementation of the Baltic Sea Action Plan. In fact the Action played a tremendous role in validation of the planning methodologies and strategic documents at the pan-Baltic level based on the NW Russia perspective. The Action gave a proper insight on main drivers and obstacles of integration of the North West Russia into the BSR. The Action findings and recommendations were also delivered to the Russian decision makers and VASAB will continue its efforts to convince them that the BSR integration is beneficial for the North-West Russia. At least in the field of maritime spatial planning as the result of the Action one can see increased capacity and competence basis to take up joint transnational initiatives between the NW Russia partners and institutions from other BSR countries.

The final beneficiaries local and regional governments in the Baltic Sea region (BSR) operators in the chosen thematic fields (e.g. businesses in WP1 and transport operators in WP2) in NW Russia and in the BSR will be influenced mainly through the actions of pan-Baltic organisations mainly VASAB and its Long Term Spatial Development Perspective. This will allow for incorporation of the BSR perspective in the national/regional/local policies in the NW Russia.

10.4. Publications

The following publications were produced:

Name	Number of copies	Distribution channels
The East-West Window brochure informing about the project	300	Distributed during the project events in particular kick-off conference, stakeholder seminar, the Conference "Baltic Sea Region Programme 2007-2013: new partnership opportunities for Russian and Belarusian regions" and many other events
Атлас использования прибрежных акваторий российской части Юго-восточной Балтики (Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application – <i>edited on CD rom</i>)	200	Distributed for free during the EWW final (closing) conference, available for free from partner no.4

The book in Russian: Северо-Запад России в Регионе Балтийского моря: Проблемы и перспективы экономического взаимодействия и сотрудничества (North West Russia in the Baltic Sea region. Problems and perspectives of co-operation and mutual influence) presenting main results of the project	100	Distributed for free by partners no.4 among the project partners and participants of the EWW events. Sent to Russian relevant Ministries and main libraries.
--	-----	--

10.5. Contracts (works, supplies, services) above 5000€ awarded for the implementation of the action since the last interim report

Only one contract above 5000€ was awarded since the last interim report.

	Contract	Amount	Procedure	Winner
1	Audit Services Contract	5 131,94	“negotiated procedure without publication”	<i>SIA Rodl and Partner</i>

10.6. Continuation of the Action after ending the support from the European Community

The action will be continued after ending the EU support for the East West Window project. Durability of the project results has been ensured by the direct participation or the support of the national ministries responsible for spatial planning and development around the BSR, acting under VASAB 2010. Through their co-operation with other relevant stakeholders, the project rendered available concrete recommendations for policy-making in the chosen thematic fields in the NW Russia and at the BSR level. Through intensive dialogue with the target audience, the project influenced planners in Russia neighbouring countries by including the perspective of NW Russia. It also served for modification of pan-Baltic strategic policy papers, long-term visions and development plans on the very same account.

In particular the EWW results were used by VASAB for elaboration of the Long Term Perspective for Spatial Development of the BSR. Thanks to the EWW this will be the document with proper outlook on North-West Russia. Due to the EWW the collaboration between VASAB (ministries) and other EWW partners (research institutes) will be strengthened. The EWW results will be also used for discussing with HELCOM an idea of maritime spatial planning in the Baltic Sea Region.

Follow-up activities in effect of the project will be initiated and promoted by VASAB 2010. This includes starting up of possible new project(s) covering the whole BSR and taking into consideration the needs and perspectives of NW Russia, identified and referred to in the present project. The WG3 work will be continued in a form of the BaltSeaPlan project already approved by the BSR Programme (will start around December 2008). The WG3 partners will also plan to submit the project on elaboration of concrete maritime spatial plans for Vistula and Kursiu Lagoons in the framework of the ENPI Programme Lithuania–Poland–Russian Federation. Despite finishing the work of the WG3 the partner no.9 responsible for its leading has already declared to continue the efforts in a broader BSR set up and started elaboration of the BSR wide “Compendium on Maritime Spatial Planning systems in the Baltic Sea Region countries” using the WG3 results and experience.

10.7. Gender equality, disabilities

Where relevant, the perspective of equal opportunities was taken into account for the thematic work (especially in the fields of business and transport). Due efforts were made to secure involvement of both men and women in the composition of the project management structures, daily work and in the dialogue fora with relevant stakeholders in NW Russia and at the overall BSR level. Spatial planning forming a substance of the project from its definition cares for gender equality, prevention or exclusions of handicapped from the normal life. Although, gender equality and disabilities were not the main focus of the EWW project one can assume that the realisation of the project objectives (integration of the NW Russia into the BSR) will be beneficial in a long run also for attracting attention of Russian decision makers and Russian society to those above mentioned horizontal goals. They are placed very high at civil agenda in particular in the Nordic countries and integration means also convergence in values and way of living so it means better acceptance of these horizontal goals in Russia as well. The same has happened in Poland, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia after their accession to EU (strengthening their European integration).

10.8. Monitoring and evaluation of the activities

Monitoring of activities was done on routine basis by the project Steering Group. The group worked very effectively guiding the project and proposing the changes if necessary. The group (ministerial part) provided also an excellent piece of advice with regard to use of the EWW project results for policy making. However, one should also admit the important role of Committee on Spatial Development of the Baltic Sea Region which was among the main recipients of the project results. The advice from this body and the VASAB Secretariat which took part in majority of the EWW events (on their own money) helped a lot in proper shaping the EWW work and focusing on the policy relevant results (e.g. providing links to HELCOM, EU BSR Strategy etc.).

Also important were feedbacks received from beneficiaries during the kick-off and final (closing) conference. In the Annex 2 quotations from the Conference resolutions are attached (in Russian).

10.9. What has been learned from the Action

The main lesson from the action is that integration of the NW Russia into the Baltic Sea Region (BSR) will not be an easy process. Russia is a global player looking for global organizations and bodies as its partners. Even the regional level i.e. St. Petersburg has sufficient potential to play an important role at the global arena. This is clearly seen in the St. Petersburg government policy and strategic documents. BSR is not the main field of St. Petersburg strategic activity. Slightly different situation is with regard to Kaliningrad, but its potential is sufficient to strengthen rather cross-border than pan-Baltic integration of Russian Federation. The main integrative processes between Russia and the rest of the BSR are hardly due to market forces or conscious decisions of the Russian enterprises but rather thanks to EU financial support in form of transnational and cross-border programmes. The only field in which one can expect more or less natural co-operation between Russia and the other BSR countries is maritime spatial planning as long as it affects coastal defence, fish stock and state of the coastal nature. Russia is very active now in HELCOM where the questions of maritime spatial planning have been already raised.

Therefore strengthening integration of the North-West Russia into the BSR requires further development of the Russian medium size cities such as e.g. Kaliningrad or Pskov, their partnership with adjacent regions, and development of the maritime spatial planning institutions which in natural way will seek for the relations with their closest neighbours.

11. Partners and other Co-operation

11.1. How do you assess the relationship between the formal partners of this Action (i.e. those partners which have signed a partnership statement)? Please specify for each partner organisation

St. Petersburg Administration [2] – partner active for discussing policy relevant documents and organising meetings in St. Petersburg in the field of analysis acting through partner no.3 . Important contribution to the stakeholder dialogue. In fact this partner will be one of the main recipients of the project results.

Russian Economic Developers Association (ASSET) [3] – very demanding from formal point of view but also very experience partner in analytical work. A great bulk of the WG1 recommendations were proposed by this partner. The partner is a great interface between science and policy making in Russia in particular in St. Petersburg. Important role in dissemination activities thanks to good contacts with decision-makers in Russia at local and regional level.

Immanuel Kant State University of Russia [4] – very reliable and enthusiastic partner being a source of many data and information excellent in scientific work acquiring great experience during the EWW project how to translate analysis into policy findings, but in fact majority of recommendations of the WG2 and the WG3 were rooted in partner no. 4 thinking.

Ministry of the Environment, Danish Forest and Nature Agency, Denmark [5] – very active and experienced partner (being responsible in the past for the USUN project) leading the WG 1 work and ensuring proper presentation of EWW at the highest BSR political level.

Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Housing, Germany [6] – very active and experienced partner responsible for urban-rural investigations under the WG1, ensuring proper presentation of EWW at the highest BSR political level.

Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communication, Sweden [7] – partner ensuring link to the EU BSR strategy (use of EWW results also there), acting mainly through partner 8 but very active in the WG2 , active in the WG3 (with very high quality inputs) and contributing to policy relevant findings in the EWW.

Nordic Centre for Spatial Development (NORDREGIO) [8] – one of key drivers for analytical work, competent, flexible with a large knowledge and experience in spatial and regional development.

Ministry of Regional Development, Poland [9] – partner leading the WG3 but active in other work groups, very experienced and very flexible contributing to the work additional resources if project resources are not sufficient.

Maritime Institute, Poland [10] – key resource for maritime spatial planning and ICZM in the project supporting actively the WG3 and coordinating the whole project from content point of view in very reasonable way.

11.2. Is the partnership to continue

The partnership will continue in a form of BSR Programme and ENPI Programme projects on maritime spatial planning. The co-operation agreement between partners no 4 and 10 will serve to this end. The BaltSea Plan was approved by the BSR programme. The project will serve as a continuation and dissemination of the WG3 work and results since both partners no 4 and 10 are among its key drivers.

The EWW project results were also used within the VASAB framework. This means that new partners such as Nordregio, ASSET or Immanuel Kant State University of Russia have joined the VASAB work and their involvement will continue.

11.3. How would you assess the relationship between your organisation and State authorities in the Action countries? How has this relationship affected the Action?

Since majority of the partners are state high level institutions those relations were fine. The partners representing state authorities knew each other for many years before starting the project as the members of the VASAB co-operation (Co-operation of Ministers for spatial planning and development in the BSR countries). The new input was given by the scientific institutions. This was a great added value of the project, mutual learning how to translate analysis into policy relevant actions. The research oriented partners were quite flexible and willing to reshape analysis or repeat them if asked by policy making partners.

11.4. Where applicable, describe your relationship with any other organisations involved in implementing the Action:

- Associate(s) (if any) - no
- Sub-contractor(s) (if any). Some of the work was given to the external contractors. However an idea was that majority of work should be done by the partners themselves since the partners had sufficient qualification to execute the project and achieve its goals. Contractors were used mainly for technical issues and for bringing knowledge from INTERREG projects. Only some partners (9) and (5) used contractors more intensively (for some concrete work) due to shortages in their human resources. In principle the relation with contractors were positive with one exception (i.e. Rumanian contractor who won a tender for the EWW financial management disappeared after few month of serving the project)
- Final Beneficiaries and Target groups. Those relations were fine thanks to sue of well established and prominent conferences for presentation of the EWW. This gave the project access to the target group necessary for the project success.
- Other third parties involved. Important was a link of the project to the VASAB Secretariat and VASAB work on the Long Term Perspective. VASAB Secretariat promoted also project and its results externally on request of the Responsible Partner.

11.5. Where applicable, outline any links you have developed with other actions.

The project ambition was to develop link to other important projects in order to make use of their results (BaltCoast, PlanCoast, Balance, USUN, SeBCo – their experts were invited to the project meetings) or to make joint meetings to better reach target groups (SeBCo POWER and SDI-4-SEB). These projects represented different INTERREG strands.

11.6. If your organisation has received previous EC grants in view of strengthening the same target group, in how far has this Action been able to build upon/complement the previous one(s)? (List all previous relevant EC grants).

The Ministries involved in the project previously received a grant from INTERREG II C to prepare an Action Plan for implementation of the VASAB strategy adopted in 1994. The project was called VASAB Plus and ended in 2000. The EWW used the VASAB Plus experience but its focus was different. This time the target geographical area was the NW Russia and its integration to the BSR. The lesson learned under the VASAB Plus (where Russia had no financial resources for analysis) showed that preparation of a pan-Baltic documents with very differentiate resources might result in uneven involvement of the countries and then uneven ownership of the agreed actions or strategies. Therefore the EWW was invented to avoid such a mistake and to give Russian colleagues resources for considering their role in the BSR integration.

12. Visibility

How is the visibility of the EU contribution being ensured in the Action?

At the project start a press release was done by the Responsible Partner. Visibility was ensured by placing proper information that the EWW project was part-financed by the EU together with the EU logo and logo of INTERREG III B. This was done on printing materials, power point presentation and on the project web site. There was also some information in the Latvian radio. On demand of Russian colleagues the project was presented at the Conference “Baltic Sea Region Programme 2007-2013: new partnership opportunities for Russian and Belarusian regions” in St. Petersburg as one of the most successful INTERREG projects with Russian participation. To strengthen the project visibility a special project banner was produced and displayed on many occasions (e.g. Conference “Baltic Sea region Spatial Development Policies avenues to the Long Term Perspective” in Riga on 23 April 2007, and already mentioned conference “Baltic Sea Region Programme 2007-2013: new partnership opportunities for Russian and Belarusian regions” in St. Petersburg on 16-17 April 2008 and in many other events). The book with the project analysis and recommendations was printed in December 2008. But the most important is that the project results will be used for producing “Long Term Perspective” for the BSR which will be presented to CBSS and all important pan-Baltic organizations. Thanks to EWW NW Russia will be properly highlighted in this strategy.

The European Commission may wish to publicise the results of Actions. Do you have any objection to this report being published on Europe Aid Co-operation Office website? If so, please state your objections here.

Name of the contact person for the Action: **Vladislavs Vesperis**

Signature:Location: **Riga, Latvia**

Date report due:Date report sent:

Update of action plan

Activity	Months																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Activity 1: Kick off of the work of Working Group no 1 on business development and innovation affecting spatial development,	X	X	X	X														
Activity 2: Analysis(WG1)				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Activity 3: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR (WG1)					X						X						X	
Activity 4: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations and action plan (WG1)					X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Activity 5: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 2 on accessibility				X														
Activity 6: Analysis(WG2)					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Activity 7: Pilot studies (WG2)												X	X	X	X	X		
Activity 8: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR					X						X						X	X
Activity 9: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG2)					X	X		X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Activity 10: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 3 on ICZM and transnational sea use planning		X			X													
Activity 11 Analysis (WG 3)					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					
Activity 12 Pilot Action (WG 3)					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
Activity 13: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR					X						X						X	
Activity 14: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG3)					X			X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		

EWV events: participation of man and woman

Participants			
Event	Woman	Man	Total
Kick off meeting of the work of WG1, on 25 June 2007 in Riga	9	11	20
WG1 meeting 25 September 2007 in Riga	4	3	7
WG1 analysis (people involved)	11	23	34
Steering Group meeting on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg	7	11	18
St Petersburg kick off conference on 18-19 October 2007	112	146	259
St Petersburg Closing conference on 21 October 2008	231	400	631
WG1 second meeting on 6-7 December 2007 in Riga	9	10	19
Synergy meeting no.1 on 31 January 2008 in Riga	10	13	23
Steering Group Meeting no.2 on 1 February 2008 in Riga	4	11	15
Synergy meeting no 2 in Liepaja on 14 th of March 2008	8	8	16
WG1 fourth meeting on 3-4 April 2008 in Riga	6	7	13
Riga Stakeholders seminars (WG3 and WG1 + WG2) on 23 April 2008	83	84	167
WG1 fifth meeting on 24 April 2008 in Riga	13	12	25
Steering Group Meeting no. 3 on 20 May 2008 in Riga	4	6	10
Steering Group Meeting no. 4 on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg	3	10	13
WG1 sixth meeting on 3 rd September 2008 in Jurmala	11	11	22
WG2 first meeting on 10 October 2007 in Riga	3	6	9
WG2 analysis	6	11	17
WG2 second meeting on 5 December 2007 in Riga	4	7	11
WG2 third meeting on 21 May 2008 in Riga	2	7	9
WG2 fourth meeting on 4 th September 2008 in Jurmala	9	11	20
WG3 preparatory meeting on 24 July 2007 in Kaliningrad	4	10	14
WG 3 first meeting on 30-31 October 2007 in Kaliningrad	12	15	27
WG3 analysis	3	11	14
Pilot Action (WG 3)	3	10	13
WG3 second meeting on 27-28 March 2008 in Kaliningrad	6	13	19
WG3 third meeting on 4-5 June 2008 in Gdańsk	6	15	21
WG3 fourth meeting 2 September 2008 in Gdańsk	3	11	14

Quotations from the Conference resolutions (in Russian) in direct relations to the EAST West Window.

5. Kick Off Conference

Продвижение европейского опыта в рамках программ Европейского Инструмента Соседства и Партнерства усилит инновационный потенциал и влияние Северо-Западного региона России на процессы территориальной интеграции на внешних границах ЕС, в частности, в регионе Балтийского моря. В этих целях целесообразна активизация участия России в таких международных объединениях, как VASAB 2010, Балтийский форум развития (BDF), Программа транснационального сотрудничества региона Балтийского моря 2007-2013.

Зарубежный опыт свидетельствует о значительной роли малых и средних городов в продвижении инноваций и гармонизации территориального развития. Этот факт должен учитываться при разработке инновационных стратегий в России как на федеральном, так и на региональном уровнях. Необходимо уделять больше внимания развитию малых и средних городов, как это происходит в странах ЕС, и адаптировать европейский опыт применительно к ситуации в России (в частности, концепцию сельско-городского партнерства «ESDP Concept of Rural-Urban Partnership»). Доступ к знаниям и информации, возможность обмена идеями должны стать основой формирования территориальных моделей развития России.

/.../

Участники Форума согласились со следующим:

- необходимо особое единое государственное управление морскими прибрежными зонами страны (обеими их составляющими: морской и сухопутной) исходя из повсеместного успешного мирового опыта подобной деятельности и соответствующих рекомендаций организаций системы ООН и международных форумов на высшем уровне. Руководствуясь этим, рекомендовать: 1) создание нормативной правовой и институциональной базы для разработки и реализации комплексных программ развития и управления прибрежными зонами в рамках комплексных программ социально-экономического развития приморских субъектов Федерации и программ развития прибрежных муниципальных образований в целях активизации участия последних в освоении прибрежных и морских ресурсов; 2) адаптацию и освоение современных управленческих технологий (методология Комплексного управления прибрежными зонами (КУПЗ)) в применении к богатейшим по ресурсам и разнообразным по природным и социально-экономическим условиям прибрежным зонам страны; 3) разработку и реализацию пилотных программ КУПЗ конкретных побережий страны; 4) использование опыта сотрудничества стран Балтийского региона, в частности рекомендаций Проекта BaltCoast BSR INTERREG III B по управлению прибрежными зонами и разработке совместных стратегических проектов;
- рекомендовать использование кластерного подхода в качестве инструмента реализации стратегий развития территорий и повышения конкурентоспособности региональной и муниципальной экономики, включая выявление и диагностику потенциальных кластеров, разработку программ их развития, создание организаций по сотрудничеству. В органах власти необходимо формирование межотраслевых рабочих групп для координации развития кластеров и снятия ведомственных и отраслевых ограничений. Целесообразно более широкое использование международных программ и инструментов повышения конкурентоспособности кластеров;
- необходимо развитие региональной и муниципальной статистики, в частности для целей выработки эффективной кластерной политики и оценки результатов реализации кластерных инициатив в регионе и/или муниципалитете, формирования действенных

инструментов планирования и управления, ориентированного на результат на субфедеральных уровнях;

- при реализации федеральных, региональных и местных программ экономического развития необходимо стимулировать участие организаций инновационной инфраструктуры в российских и зарубежных сетевых организациях, которые оказывают содействие в предоставлении услуг компаниям и научным организациям в сфере инновационной бизнес-кооперации и трансфера технологий (примерами могут служить Российская сеть трансфера технологий RTTN, Европейская сеть бизнес-инновационных центров EBN). Участие в сетевом сотрудничестве должно быть нацелено на повышение качества и содержания услуг для местных компаний и НИИ. Федеральным и региональным органам власти необходимо поддерживать инициативы по развитию сетевого взаимодействия между организациями инновационной региональной инфраструктуры (создание региональных сетей) с целью уменьшения дублирования функций, повышения качества услуг и снижения расходов бюджета на их субсидирование;
- рекомендовать и стимулировать участие российских центров коммерциализации, инновационных центров в реализации Competitiveness Innovation Program (CIP) Европейского союза в части проектов, ориентированных на развитие инновационных сетей и сетей трансфера технологий (IRC, IRE, EBN и др.);
- считать целесообразным использование в России европейского опыта реализации региональных инновационных стратегий, обеспечивающих выявление спроса на инновации среди компаний и ориентацию научного сектора и инновационной инфраструктуры на удовлетворение этого спроса. (...);
- в целях совершенствования государственного и муниципального управления по обеспечению перехода Российской Федерации на инновационный путь развития рекомендовать Комиссии при Президенте Российской Федерации по вопросам совершенствования государственного управления и правосудия, Министерству регионального развития Российской Федерации, другим заинтересованным федеральным и региональным органам власти осуществить экспертизу полномочий органов государственной власти субъектов Российской Федерации и органов местного самоуправления в части выявления проблемных вопросов, препятствующих обеспечению перехода России на режим инновационного развития, и законодательно обеспечить активизацию участия в реализации государственной научно-технической политики органов государственной власти субъектов Федерации и органов местного самоуправления, рассмотреть возможность разработки национальной программы, ориентированной на содействие российским регионам в подготовке и реализации региональных инновационных стратегий и формирование российской сети инновационных регионов;
- рекомендовать заинтересованным федеральным и региональным органам государственной власти реализовать систему мер по поддержке технопарков и процессов коммерциализации научных разработок. В частности: разработать законодательную базу для развития технопарков на федеральном уровне; предоставить налоговые льготы компаниям-резидентам технопарков, например, аналогичные льготам для резидентов ОЭЗ; упростить процедуру предоставления земельных участков для технопарков; законодательно разрешить НИИ, вузам и университетам создавать малые предприятия - start-up'ы;
- рекомендовать органам регионального и муниципального управления активно использовать инструменты международной технической и финансовой помощи, предоставляемой по линии Института Всемирного Банка, АМР США, Европейского Инструмента Соседства и Партнерства (ENPI) и других программ Европейского Союза для реализации стратегических приоритетов и планов территориального развития, поддержки инноваций;
- отметить необходимость выработки механизма интеграции документов стратегического планирования муниципального, регионального и федерального уровней;
- одобрить инициативы Комитета по пространственному развитию региона Балтийского моря (CSD/BSR) VASAB 2010 по территориальной интеграции Северо-Запада России и реализации совместных проектов в таких приоритетных сферах как развитие бизнеса, транспорта, ИКТ, управление прибрежными зонами. Отметить актуальность проекта «Окно

Восток-Запад", который позволит восполнить пробелы в оценке инновационного потенциала Северо-Запада России и расширит возможности синергии инновационных потенциалов стран Балтийского региона.

- предложить Комитету VASAB 2010 использовать Форум лидеров стратегического планирования городов и регионов России в качестве референтной группы для обсуждения Стратегии пространственного развития региона Балтийского моря.

6. Closing Conference

6.1. «Перспективы развития Северо-Западного федерального округа: вызовы, приоритеты, угрозы и ограничения»

Участники рекомендуют:

- 7) в целях максимального учёта сложившихся межсубъектовых экономических связей, обеспечения увязки общегосударственных и региональных планов и прогнозов социально-экономического развития, целесообразно предусмотреть **разработку стратегических документов долгосрочного социально-экономического развития на уровне федеральных округов**. Для преодоления ведомственной и региональной разобщённости целесообразно поручить эту работу Ассоциациям экономического взаимодействия соответствующих федеральных округов. Это позволит точнее формулировать цели регионального развития в увязке с имеющимися общими ресурсами, объективно сформировать перечень основных межрегиональных проектов, обеспечивающих достижение общих целей развития. Подобные документы могут стать основой для последующей разработки Концепции долгосрочного социально-экономического развития Российской Федерации;
- 8) для ускорения социально-экономического развития территорий требуется **активизация межрегионального взаимодействия**. Зачастую депрессивные регионы (субъекты Федерации) экономически тесно связаны с успешными регионами (транспортные подходы к инфраструктурным объектам, наличие сырьевой базы для обрабатывающих производств и т.п.). В этом случае целесообразно оказывать федеральную помощь (налоговые и иные льготы, государственные гарантии под привлекаемые кредиты, первоочередное финансирование проектов в рамках действующих ФЦП и др.) для инфраструктурного развития депрессивных территорий по поддерживаемым видам и направлениям экономической деятельности, а также для реализации проектов способствующих комплексному развитию двух и более субъектов Федерации;
- 9) необходимым условием развития и Северо-Западного федерального округа и страны в целом является **совершенствование работы транспортного комплекса**. Требуется системный подход к формированию единой стратегии развития транспортно-логистического комплекса страны в увязке с развитием отраслей экономики и внешнеэкономической ситуацией.

6.2. «Специфика стратегий приморских регионов»

Участники считают, что

- 7) Необходимо совершенствование стратегического планирования применительно к морской деятельности и приморским регионам и муниципалитетам, предусматривающее:

на федеральном уровне:

- применение интегральных подходов к планированию и управлению в морском природопользовании. Это позволит преодолеть фрагментарность, присущую отраслевому подходу, учесть взаимосвязанность видов морского природопользования, способствовать связям и межотраслевой гармонизации в морской деятельности исходя из анализа конфликтного использования ресурсов, обеспечить многоцелевую ориентацию и соответствие

деятельности природоохранным целям, участие всех заинтересованных сторон в разработке стратегий и программ развития;

- создание нормативной правовой и институциональной базы для разработки и реализации комплексных программ развития и управления прибрежными зонами, основанных на интегральных подходах, в рамках стратегий и программ социально-экономического развития приморских субъектов Федерации и программ развития прибрежных муниципальных образований. Это позволит реализовать особое единое государственное управление морскими прибрежными зонами страны (обеими их составляющими: морской и сухопутной) исходя из повсеместного успешного мирового опыта подобной деятельности и соответствующих рекомендаций организаций системы ООН и международных форумов на высшем уровне;

на региональном уровне:

- адаптацию и освоение современных управленческих технологий (методология Комплексного управления прибрежными зонами - КУПЗ) в применении к богатейшим по ресурсам и разнообразным по природным и социально-экономическим условиям прибрежным зонам страны;
- разработку и реализацию пилотных программ КУПЗ конкретных побережий страны.

Реализация этих мер позволит реализовать естественные природные конкурентные преимущества морских акваторий и прибрежных территорий в обеспечении дополнительного экономического роста, конкурентоспособности, инвестиционной привлекательности, занятости, повышения комфортности и качества жизни, охраны окружающей среды и уменьшения ущерба от природных и техногенных катастроф, а также безопасности страны

- 8) Необходимо совершенствование нормативной правовой базы, регулирующей градостроительную деятельность, в части учета специфики этой деятельности на морских акваториях, находящихся под суверенитетом и юрисдикцией Российской Федерации.
- 9) Необходимо развивать международное сотрудничество в стратегическом планировании морского природопользования, учитывая единство и экосистемный характер морских процессов, и широко использовать международный опыт в этой сфере.

FINAL NARRATIVE REPORT

13. Description

13.1. Name of beneficiary of grant contract: Ministry of Regional Development and Local Government, Latvia (Reģionālās attīstības un pašvaldību lietu ministrija).

13.2. Name and title of the Contact person: Mr Vladislavs Vesperis.

13.3. Name of partners in the Action: St. Petersburg Administration (Администрация Губернатора Санкт-Петербурга) [2], Russian Economic Developers Association (ASSET) (Ассоциация специалистов по экономическому развитию территорий) [3], Immanuel Kant State University of Russia (Российский государственный университет имени И. Канта) [4], Ministry of the Environment, Danish Forest and Nature Agency¹³, Denmark (Miljøministeriet, Skov- og Naturstyrelsen) [5], Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Housing, Germany (Bundesministeriums für Verkehr, Bau und Stadtentwicklung) [6], Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communication, Sweden (Näringsdepartementet) [7], Nordic Centre for Spatial Development (NORDREGIO) [8], Ministry of Regional Development, Poland (Ministerstwo Rozwoju Regionalnego) [9], Maritime Institute, Poland (Instytut Morski) [10].

13.4. Title of the Action: East-West Window (EWW).

13.5. Contract number: Grant Contract for European Community External Actions **2007/132-845**.

13.6. Start date and end date of the reporting period¹⁴: 15.06.2007 – 15.12.2008.

13.7. Target country(ies) or region(s): **North-West Russia in particular: St. Petersburg, Leningrad region and Kaliningrad region**; to some extent also Belarus and North-West Russia adjacent countries (mainly for collecting good practices and dissemination of the project results).

13.8. Final beneficiaries &/or target groups¹⁵ (if different). The target audience/recipients of the project findings are: decision-makers (ministries responsible for spatial planning and development in the BSR, including the federal government in Russia, regional authorities in

¹³ The name of the partner 5 was changed during the EWW project execution **from** Ministry of the Environment, Danish Forest and Nature agency **to** Ministry of the Environment, Agency for Spatial and Environmental Planning (Miljøministeriet, By- og Landskabsstyrelsen).

¹⁴ The entire implementation period of the Action

¹⁵ “Target groups” are the groups/entities who will be directly positively affected by the project at the Project Purpose level, and “final beneficiaries” are those who will benefit from the project in the long term at the level of the society or sector at large.

NW Russia, pan-Baltic organisations such as VASAB 2010). The final beneficiaries are local and regional governments in the Baltic Sea region (BSR) operators in the chosen thematic fields (e.g. businesses in WP1 and transport operators in WP2) in NW Russia and in the BSR. The divide into men and women of different project activities is provided separately.

13.9. Country (ies) in which the activities take place (if different from 1.7): Russia (St. Petersburg and Kaliningrad Oblast), Poland and Latvia.

14. Assessment of implementation of Action activities

14.1. Activities and results (for the whole reporting period including last narrative interim report)

Activity 1: Kick off of the work of Working Group no 1 on business development and innovation affecting spatial development,

1.10. First meeting of the WG1 (1 day) took place on 25 June 2007 in Riga which was according to the schedule. The meeting was planned in advance in late June so participants postponed their holidays which in this part of the BSR starts with so called Midsummer. The meeting was attended by 12 participants representing partners 1,3,4,5,6,8,9,10 and eight invited guests. The main aim was to discuss the analysis and further WG1 work in detail, to achieve clarity about division of labour between the partners, to make sure that duplication with other project is avoided (instead to aim at using results achieved by other projects) and to start the process of contracting the external experts. The following outputs were produced or achieved:

- Report how to avoid duplication with other INTERREG III B projects in the field of business development and innovation affecting spatial development had been prepared before the meeting by the project coordinator, discussed by the meeting and delivered to the Responsible (Lead) Partner.
- TORs for seven ASSET staff members, eight Kaliningrad University staff members, one Belarus expert and four external experts together with tender documentation (if necessary) have been prepared by project coordinator as result of the meeting. Tender procedures for the four external experts had been started resulting in contracting one external expert from Poland, one from Sweden, one from Latvia and one from Denmark. In addition the Belarus expert was contracted by the partner no. 8 without tender (contract below 5000 Euro).
- The main scope of analysis was proposed and discussed. Unfortunately too many question marks and uncertainties appeared during the June meeting so the additional meeting was organized in Riga in September and discussion on analysis continued till the second WG1 meeting (December 2007).
- Text for EWW section at to the VASAB website was decided, technically EWW link at VASAB website was created in September 2007.
- Project flyer was designed and edited including information on WG1 activities (300 copies were printed in October 2007).

Comments: The WG1 started the discussion on its work (i.e. necessary analysis, results to be achieved) but the topic was too broad for one day meeting in addition to many technical questions were raised. The decision was to continue the discussion when the experts contracted by tender would be available. The main problem was to what extend the achievement of the EWW goal (i.e. *to promote territorial integration of NW Russia into the BSR in the field of business development*)

required concentration on analysis concerning exclusively NW Russia and to what extent the broader BSR picture was necessary if integration should mean reciprocal relations (i.e. affecting both sides). The latter opinion prevailed and was accepted by the meeting. The WG1 considered that for producing the main output of the analytical phase (i.e. a *compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") with assessment of unexploited innovation potential in NW Russia, assessment of the potential for regional integration and with identification of spatial problems in NW Russia and BSR*) some BSR analysis as the background material should be done as well. The meeting also discussed the policy related role of the project i.e. better highlighting the EWW results on NW Russia role in the “Long Term Perspective” to be prepared by VASAB on CBSS demand. The WG1 leaders promised to ensure smooth transfer of the EWW results to the BSR strategy i.e. Long Term Perspective till 2030 (to be prepared by VASAB in 2009). The Responsible Partner declared that he would invite VASAB Secretariat to the most important meetings of the EWW to ensure smooth transfer of the project results to the “Long Term Perspective”.

- 1.11. Partnership Agreement Preparation. This action was related to all work packages and took place in June, July, August, and September 2007 and was ended in October 2007 with signing partnership agreements between Lead Partner and all other partners of the EWW project. The most difficult was signing Partnership Agreement with partners from St. Petersburg due to problems related to tax and system in Russia, conversion of EUR into rubels, banking system requirements etc. Finally two agreements, based on the results of additional working meeting (in Riga) discussions, were prepared and signed between Lead Partner and RU (ASSET) Partner and between German Partner and RU (ASSET) Partner. So at the end of the day there were 9 partnership agreements signed regulating relations between the EWW partners.
- 1.12. Quality Workshop (1 day) for Project leaders organised by INTERREG III B Secretariat and EU Delegation from Moscow in Riga on 26 September 2007 was attended by project coordinator (partner no.10), one representative of Russian partners (partner no.2) and representatives appointed by the Responsible Partner. Main guidelines from EC Delegation and INTERREG III B Secretariat on TACIS rules, payments schemes and communication experiences were presented during the seminar and later on at individual consultations. The meeting between Responsible Partner and the Russian partners was organized back to back with the workshop for discussing main technicalities of their participation in the project.

Activity 2: Analysis(WG1)

- 2.7. WG1 additional meeting (1 day) took place on 25 September 2007 in Riga to continue discussion on the scope of analysis. The meeting was attended by four WG1 members (including two external experts, project coordinator and the representative of the Russian partners) and three participants representing Responsible Partner. At the meeting in depth discussion on case studies on innovation, outsourcing and urban-rural relations in Russia took place and the detailed scope of the work of Russian partners and external experts were agreed. Also a draft outline structure of the WG1 analytical report was presented by the WG1 Coordinator and discussed in depth.
- 2.8. Data collection and interpretation started only in December 2007 after the second WG1 meeting. In this phase 34 people from all partners were involved (except partner no.7 who acted through partner no. 8). Their involvement differed. The main bulk of analytical work was done by partners no. 3, 4 and 8 and the external experts whereas the other people acted mainly as a reference group reading reports, making comments and asking for improvements. This was the task first of all of partners no. 1, 2, 5, 6, 9 and 10 representing mainly policy making side in the project and project coordination. Also VASAB Secretariat was invited by partner 1 (Responsible Partner) to participate in this process. The analysis (data collection) in principle were ended in March 2008 but some of them (requiring surveys) due to formal reasons (tenders) were completed in April 2008. Interpretation of data was done in April

2008 for all important cases (but some analysis e.g. the benchmarking studies and urban-rural analysis continued till September 2008). In fact in April and even in May and June the fine tuning of analysis (removing mistakes noticed by the other partners) still continued. The reason was that some partners from the reference group were very demanding asking for many improvements even if they had found little inconsistencies after second or third reading of the reports. Therefore the final synthesis report (draft discussion paper) from the analytical phase was completed only in July 2008 and even slightly changed after the WG1 September 2008 meeting and as the result of the EWW final/closing Conference in October 2008.

The outputs have been following:

(i) interim:

- Data (including public surveys) and draft analytical report on “Baltic” metropolitan areas with focus on the role of Kaliningrad and St. Petersburg;
- In depth study on St. Petersburg and Kaliningrad and their developmental potentials in the BSR context (focus on innovation and outsourcing) in which: trends and present policies for innovations nested in NW Russia and outsourcing were analysed, barriers for innovations perceived by business and public administration were identified (based on surveys), and cases on transfer of innovations between NW Russia and other parts of the BSR were described;
- Case studies (reports) on Russian and Belarus small and medium sized cities – covering: Novgorod, Gatchina, Chernyakhovsk, Gusev, Sovetsk, Svetly, Berezovka, Zaslavl;
- Reports on demographic trends in North-West Russia, in St. Petersburg and in Kaliningrad and in Belarus as well;
- Reports on case studies on urban-rural relations in Russia;
- Report on INTERREG III B projects results relevant for work of the WG1 group;
- Benchmarking studies concerning situation in Poland, Germany and Latvia on the issues relevant for the WG1 recommendations .

(ii) A compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") with assessment of unexploited innovation potential in NW Russia, assessment of the potential for regional integration and with identification of spatial problems in NW Russia and BSR.

Comments:

a) All the planned outcomes were achieved. However, during the analytical phase became clear that for the NW Russia innovation is more promising path for integration within the BSR than outsourcing, therefore more efforts were done to analyse this challenge. The list of outputs was enlarged (in comparison to the planned ones) by analysis of the role of the NW Russia in the BSR context (as the result of the WG1 discussions what analysis are necessary to achieve the EWW goal). Also urban structures and functional urban areas of not only large but also some small cities were analysed. The most interesting case appeared to be Gatchina as an example of science intensive cluster in Russia located in a small city. The some other cases illustrated urban-rural relations in Russia (and Belarus).

b) While working with data it became clear that translating data into policy recommendations can not be done by each working group separately. Therefore at the meeting of the WG leaders in December it was proposed that for the starting work on recommendation a workshop for all WGs would be necessary. The Responsible Partner was asked to organize such a workshop on 31st of January 2008 instead of simple WG1 seminar (planned for that date).

c) The work was delayed by some formal constraints such as tender procedures, requirement of separate EUR accounts (very difficult for Ministries) etc.

Activity 3: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR (WG1)

- 3.1. Kick off Conference of the project (1,5 day) for broad public took place on 18-19 October 2007 (according schedule) in St. Petersburg as a part of the well known VI Forum of Strategic Planning Leaders of Cities and Regions of Russia. This allowed project to reach the planned target group. The project: its assumptions and the planned outputs were presented to the Russian decision makers - mainly city mayors and chief planners. Conference participants expressed a deep hope that EWW project would diminish knowledge gaps within the Baltic Sea Region on the character of development potential of the NW Russia, its synergies and complementarities with potentials of other countries of the region, and on methods how this potential could be efficiently connected within the BSR. It was expressed in Conference recommendations that EWW project results should be presented in 2008 at the final Conference within VII Forum of Strategic Planning Leaders of Cities and Regions of Russia. The kick off conference was attended by 259 participants mainly Russian mayors and city planners. Among them there were 57 persons outside Russia. From EWW project 20 persons participated including Latvian State Secretary representing the Responsible Partner. So EWW reached the planned target of **200** Russian decision makers and professionals involved in discussion on the project.
- 3.2. Stakeholder Seminar for WG1 (0,5 day) was organised on 23 April 2008 in Riga (instead of beginning of May as originally planned). The preliminary results of the analytical phase were presented and the first discussions on the recommendations were started. The seminars for all working groups of EWW were arranged back to back with the VASAB annual conference financed by the Latvian Ministry of Regional Development and Local Government from its own means i.e. outside the EWW budget (from the EWW budget some partners only covered their travelling to the EWW seminars). The described above arrangement resulted in very impressive participation in the seminars and allowed to reach a planned target of **100** decision makers and businessman from BSR EU countries involved in discussion of the project findings and recommendations. The conference and seminars were attended by 167 participants including 26 persons directly involved in the EWW project (although the Responsible Partner was represented by some more employees). The participants came mainly from Latvia, Lithuania, and Finland but also from Azerbaijan, Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, EU Commission, Germany, Hungary, Norway, Poland, Russia and Sweden.
- 3.3. Closing(final) Conference of the project (1 day) for broad public took place on 21st October 2008 (according schedule) in St. Petersburg. The title of the conference was “Promoting territorial integration of the North West Russia into the Baltic Sea Region”. The main organiser was ASEET together with the EWW Responsible Partner. This Conference was a part of rich spectrum of the conferences and seminars taking place under umbrella (the same premises) of the VII All-Russia Forum of Strategic Planning Leaders “Strategic Planning in Regions and Cities of Russia”. In the event 631 participants took place out of it 582 from Russia. The forum was organized by: State Duma of the Russian Federation; Ministry for Regional Development of the Russian Federation; Ministry for Economic Development of the Russian Federation; St Petersburg City Administration; Center of Strategic Research; IS CER Leontief Centre. It was opened by Mr Dmitry Kozak, Minister of Regional Development, who underlined that “Forum is becoming the public debating platform for improving the strategic planning system of social and economic development in Russian regions”. The Conference “Promoting territorial integration of the North West Russia into the Baltic Sea region” was composed of four sessions attended by large number of the participants not only from Russia but also from other Baltic Sea Region countries. Some sessions were joint ventures with other organisations, forums and bodies interested in the subjects raised by the EWW project. The names of the sessions were following:
 - “Accessibility and innovations as motors of integration of the NW Russia into the Baltic Sea Region” (presentation of the results of the WG1 and the WG2),

- “Special Features of coastal regional strategies” (presentation of the WG3 results and dialogue with all key persons in Russia dealing with ICZM and maritime spatial planning),
- “Partnership mechanisms in local economic policy implementation” (presentation of the WG1 results with regard to urban-rural partnership).

In addition to that EWW results were presented at the key session of the Forum “Prospects for Federal Okrug Development: Challenges, priorities, threats and constraints. North-West Federal Okrug” attended by key decision makers from the North-West Federal Okrug.

Comments:

The choice of the formula of the kick-off and closing conferences appeared to have very positive results on ability of the project to deliver results to the key target groups in Russia. The Conference was also attended by the Ministerial partners from the EWW project. The EWW results were mirrored in the Forums resolutions. Some interested questions were raised requiring further discussion and examination.

- 3.4. Final publication The book summing up the results of the investigations available for the stakeholders in Kaliningrad and St.Petersburg was edited in October, November and printed in December 2008 by partner no.4.

Comments:

The number of books published was smaller (100) than assumed in the application (400), although the whole budget allocated to this purpose was used. There were several reasons why the printing was more expensive than expected. Some of them were of technical reasons: i.e. the book had more coloured pictures (maps) than estimated and was thicker than planned (more than 300 pages in comparison to 150 pages planned), but the main reason was of vis mayor nature. In 2008 in Russia an unexpected inflation and economic crisis appeared which could not be taken into account at the stage of budget planning. This resulted in much higher printing costs. However, the partner no.4 is ready to print additional copies of the book if demanded. The available copies will be distributed to the most active in the EWW Russian stakeholders and to the project partners of the EWW.

Activity 4: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations and action plan (WG1)

- 4.1. Steering Group Meeting (1 day) took place on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg according to schedule. The meeting was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1,2,3,5,6,7,9,10 and seven invited guests. The Steering Group discussed the project progress. The work was lagging behind the schedule. Although the WG1 started on time it became involved in lengthy discussions about the necessary scope of analysis and detailed division of labour between working groups. The Steering Group decided therefore not to start the work on recommendations before improving synergy between the work of the working groups. This task was given to the meeting of the WGs leaders organised in Riga back to back with the WG2 (5 December 2007) and the WG1 (6-7 December 2007) meetings. The meeting also discussed details of project presentation to the kick-off conference held next day.
- 4.2. WG1 second meeting (1,5 day) took place on 6-7 December 2007 in Riga (instead of late November). The meeting was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10, two external consultants and six invited guests. The meeting concentrated on discussing analytical phase of the project (the decision was that the lagging behind analysis would make necessary to postpone by two months the next WG1 meeting i.e. till the end of analytical phase). However, the WG 1 also started examining the way of preparation of the recommendations out of the analysis conducted. For the starting work on recommendation it was agreed that a workshop for all WGs would be necessary and the

Responsible Partner was asked to organize such a workshop (synergy meeting) on 31st of January 2008 instead of a simple WG1 seminar (scheduled for beginning of February).

- 4.3. Synergy meeting no.1 (1 day) took place in Riga on 31 of January 2008 (replacing the WG1 seminar scheduled for February). It was attended by fourteen project partner members representing partners no.1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, three external experts and six invited guests. The facilitator was hired by the Responsible Partner. During the meeting the participants agreed that all three working groups were in need of a common frame. This should be given by the vision of the BSR till 2030 with full integration of the North-West Russia. The participants managed to prepare an outline of such a vision requiring further work. The meeting asked for one more working day for finishing common visionary frame which should allow preparing meaningful recommendations.
- 4.4. Steering Group Meeting 2 took place on 1 of February 2008 in Riga. It was attended by seven project partner members representing partners no. 1,3,5,6,7, 9, 10 one external expert and seven invited guests. The results of the synergy meeting were discussed i.e. synergy between the work of the working groups. It was decided to organise one more synergy meeting to continue work on the common frame for all WGs, i.e. vision of the BSR till 2030 with full integration of the North-West Russia. An agenda of the April Conference proposed by the Responsible Partner was discussed together with some technical issues. The progress in analytical phase was reviewed.
- 4.5. Synergy meeting no. 2 (1 day) took place in Liepaja on 14th of March 2008. It was attended by ten project partner members representing partners no. 1,3,5,6,9, 10 one external expert and five invited guests. The facilitator was hired by the Responsible Partner but paid from Responsible Partner own means. The final draft of the vision was discussed and shared by participants giving stable frame for analytical part and allowing proper work on recommendations.
- 4.6. WG1 fourth meeting (1 day) took place on 3-4 April 2008 in Riga. It was attended by nine project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 8, 10, two external experts and two invited guests. The meeting was convened on demand of Russian partners who started finalisation of analytical part and wanted to discuss the preliminary results among themselves. It was also important for conceptualization of the recommendations i.e. discussing what findings from analytical phase should be taken into consideration while working on recommendations.
- 4.7 WG1 fifth meeting (one day) took place on 24 April 2008 in Riga. It was attended by fifteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, four external experts and six invited guests. The WG1 before the meeting concentrated mainly on analytical work. At the fifth meeting analyses were summed up and the work on recommendations were started. However, one more meeting was requested (autumn 2008) in order to discuss the final draft of the recommendations and action programme. Due to delay in the work on urban-rural relations in Russia the relevant reports were not presented to the WG1 at this meeting. Only an overview of the progress and main findings were reported. It was decided that for synergy reasons the reports would be presented on seminar on urban-rural relations in Russia to be organised as a joint event with the SeBCo project in Kaliningrad in June 2008. This was realised and such presentation took place and was regarded as a great success by meeting participants.
- 4.8. Steering Group Meeting 3 (one day) took place on 20 May 2008 in Riga. It was attended by five project partner members representing partners no. 1, 5, 9, 10, and five invited guests. The Steering Group discussed the project progress. The results of the second synergy meeting and the April Conference were examined as well as a draft vision of the BSR till 2030 with full integration of the North-West Russia. The Steering Group decided to close analytical part and start the work on recommendations. However, the WG3 leaders asked for additional benchmark study on the results of the INTERREG projects in the field of competences of the WG3 with focus on the German experience. This was to diminish discrepancies between the WGs, since the WG1 and the WG2 already had such type of

expertises included in their work. The problems with travelling budget of Russian partners were discussed once more together with a problem of disappeared financial manager. The Steering Group also continued a discussion on political use of the EWW results i.e. incorporation of the results into the Long Term Perspective of VASAB to be produced in 2009. The output achieved:

- first draft recommendation papers (in outline format) of WG1 and WG2.

4.9. WG1 sixth meeting (one day) took place on 03 September 2008 in Jurmala. It was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, four external experts and seven invited guests. They discussed the final draft of the recommendations and action programme prepared during holiday time 2008 by ASSET, Immanuel Kant State University of Russia (Kaliningrad), Nordregio staff, and external experts. The whole work on urban-rural relations in Russia the relevant analytic reports were presented to the WG1 at this meeting as well. The WG1 discussed and improved the following documents:

- Recommendations how to improve innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Recommendations how to improve settlement policies in NW Russia (urban rural partnership) from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Action plan how to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration.

4.10. Steering Group Meeting 4 (one day) took place on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg. It was attended by 7 project partner members representing partners no. 2, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10 one external expert and 6 invited guests. The group discussed the shape of final publications of the EWW project, the use of the analytical materials and endorsed the recommendations and action proposed by the project. The main discussion was on the proper use of the EWW results for the Long Term Perspective (LTP) of VASAB elaboration of which was started few month ago (August 2008). The EWW results were placed to the different parts of the LTP outcomes. The VASAB consultant responsible for facilitating the LTP process was invited to the Steering Group meeting. It was also discussed how to use EWW outcomes for the process of preparation of the BSR EU Strategy. The partner no.5 arranged a meeting with the EU Commission on that topic. It was decided that the EWW results would be incorporated in the VASAB non-paper to be presented to the EU Commission in November/December 2008 in order to influence strategy preparation. The outputs achieved (as results of the meeting):

- Final draft of the recommendations how to improve innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Final draft of recommendations how to improve settlement policies in NW Russia (urban rural partnership) from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Final draft of the action plan how to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration,
- Final draft of recommendations on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR including concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR,
- Final action plan how to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational sea use planning and ICZM,
- Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic,
- Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application,
- Forwarding (transferring of EWW results) to important BSR processes namely: EU BSR Strategy and VASAB Long Term Perspective.

Activity 5: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 2 on accessibility

5.1. WG2 first meeting (one day) took place on 10 October 2007 in Riga It was attended by five project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 8, 10, one external expert and three

invited guests. The main aim was to discuss the scope of analysis (concrete meaning of accessibility) and the further work of the WG2 step by step, to achieve clarity about division of labour between the partners, to make sure that duplication with other project was avoided (instead to aim at using results achieved by other projects) and to start the process of contracting the external experts. The following outputs were produced or achieved:

- Report how to avoid duplication with other INTERREG III B projects in the field of accessibility was prepared by the project coordinator, discussed at the meeting and accepted by the Responsible Partner;
- TORs for four Kaliningrad University staff members, one Belarus expert and TORs for three external experts together with tender documentation (if necessary) have been prepared and approved. Procurement and contracting procedures for the one external expert was finished in September. Two other experts were also contracted (latter on);
- The main scope of analysis were proposed and discussed. The discussion on analysis continued among the partners (by e-mails) till the second WG2 meeting (December 2007);
- EWW link at the VASAB website was created (see activity 1.1);
- The content of the project flyer was loaded by short information about the WG2 activities.

Comments: The WG2 started its work behind the schedule. Due to the late project start (mid of June 2007), the first period of the project coincided with a holiday season. Therefore the real work of the WG2 (by phone, e-mails etc) started only in September 2007 i.e. three month later than planned. In addition to that, for some partners it was very inconvenient (e.g. celebrations of anniversary of establishment of the Kaliningrad University) and this postponed the start of formal work by one or two month further on i.e. till October 2007. In the meantime the preparation of the WG2 detailed analysis was started. To this end a pre meeting on 22nd of August 2007 was organised (partners 1, 7,8) to prepare tentative proposals on the substance of the work of the WG2. This meeting was paid outside the EWW budget. Although the WG2 (similarly to the WG1) came to the opinion that broader BSR picture was necessary to promote *territorial integration of NW Russia into the BSR in the field of transport and ITC*. The WG2 members also shared the WG1 concern on importance of smooth transfer of the EWW results to the BSR strategy till 2030 i.e. Long Term Perspective to be prepared by VASAB in 2009. The characteristic feature of the WG2 was a long discussion about the meaning of the notion of accessibility. As the result accessibility to energy was also considered to be an important element of the analysis.

Activity 6: Analysis(WG2)

- 6.1. The discussion on the scope and method of analysis (indicators, pilot studies) had been continued from October till beginning of December 2007. The manuals and guidelines were discussed many times. The main method was e-mail exchanges. As the result the manuals and blue prints were produced by partners 1 and 8 to facilitate collecting data and information:

- A blue print on screening transport policy,
- A manual for collecting data and information on accessibility.

Comments: The majority of time of the initial period was allocated to discussing the notion of accessibility. This was done in order to avoid problems when data and information collection would be started. Due to the rise of energy prices also this issue was considered as important factor for the NW Russia integration to the BSR. The second issue heavily discussed was scarcity of comparable data in Russia. Partner no 8 having a very well developed data base on transport data for the BSR was in a difficult position checking (in dialogue with partner 4) existence of similar data in Russia. This required more resources and more work load than estimated at the

beginning. But finally this allowed presenting Russia at the broader BSR picture. The phase 6.1. ended with second meeting of the WG2 (December 2007 in Riga).

6.2. Data collection and interpretation started only in December 2007 after the second WG 2 meeting. Basic data were collected by mid February 2008 but some work continued (fine tuning of reports) till May/June 2008. A draft discussion paper was ready for the Riga Stakeholder Conference in April 2008. However, it was a working document amended after each important EWW meeting, till the final/closing Conference. In this work (phase 6.1 and 6.2) seventeen people (including three external experts) were involved. Their involvement differed. The main bulk of analytical work was done by partners no. 4 and 8 and the external experts whereas the other participants acted mainly as a reference group reading reports, making comments and asking for improvements. This was done first of all by partners no. 1, 6, 7 and 10 representing mainly policy making side in the project and project coordination. Also VASAB Secretariat was invited by partner 1 (Responsible Partner) to participate in this process.

The following outputs were achieved:

(i) interim:

- Mapping of transport infrastructure policies at the federal and regional level, policies in development of the soft accessibility (to knowledge and information) and policies on clusters in NW Russia (however clusters were analysed by the WG1 in fact), also policies and situation in the field of accessibility to energy was examined;
- Identification of bottlenecks and constraints for transport (and through transport for business development) in NW Russia;
- Assessment of the policy correlation with the strategic documents at the BSR level (mainly by analysing outcomes of Strategic INTERREG III B projects pursued by VASAB, BDF, BSSSC and CPMR);
- Examining the results of other INTERREG III B projects relevant for the WG2 work;
- Feasibility assessment of connecting TEN-T with the pan-European corridors.

The planned verification of the accessibility perspective and of present (current) and forecast trade flows in NW Russia and Belarus (vis-a-vis BSR reports) was less successful. The main reason were missing data concerning predicted trade flows in NW Russia and Belarus¹⁶. The accessibility perspective instead was analysed using BSR outlook to show how NW-Russia is connected with the rest of the BSR.

(ii) A compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") presenting situation, development trends and political objectives in the fields of transport and accessibility in NW RU and Belarus and their consequences for BSR cohesion and business development

Comments:

The most important planned outputs were achieved (although one output was slightly modified). In addition to that, accessibility to energy was touched as important future factor of the BSR integration that should determine in great extent the NW Russia integration into the BSR. The analysis lasted longer than expected. The main constraint was lack of regional reliable data in NW Russia. The main reason of the delay was in insufficient data availability but also to some extent larger than expected amount of available background information (e.g. results of the BSR projects) that should be digested and analysed.

Activity 7: Pilot studies (WG2)

Since the analytical phase (activity 6) was delayed also pilot projects were postponed. The aim of the activity 7 was to analyse more in depth the most promising solutions developed during the analytical

¹⁶ The work on trade flows was done in co-operation with WG1 and the BSR perspective was used.

phase and prioritised during stakeholder dialogue. Therefore only in May 2008 the more concrete work on pilot studies (pre-feasibility studies) could start. The WG2 selected two (in line with the output indicators listed in the application) topics for pre-feasibility studies. The topics were following:

- g) BSR passenger railway connectivity with focus on the Eastern part of the BSR,
- h) examination of implementation of the transport part of Tallinn vision of VASAB with focus on the eastern part of the BSR.

For the pilot studies a tender procedure was used and contracts were signed in late June 2008. The results were delivered in late August 2008 and discussed by the WG2 group meeting in September. The following reports were produced:

- *Study on international rail passenger traffic development: Possibilities in the context of development of cities in the Baltic Sea Region* (Contract: 5-13/66, of 18.6.2008) elaborated by SIA “AC Konsultācijas”,
- *Evaluation of implementation of the VASAB 2010 vision in the area of mobility network and energy supply* (Contract: 5-13/74, of 23.7.2008) elaborated by SIA “AC Konsultācijas”.

The results of the studies were presented to the closing/final conference of the EWW and will serve as an input for the Long Term Spatial Development Perspective. They were also presented in advance to the WG2 members working on recommendation in order to shape the WG2 recommendations.

Comments:

An additional barrier delaying activity no.7 was obligation of tendering the contractors due to internal law of Latvia where partner no.1 (responsible for the WG2 work) is located. The WG2 decisions were taken in May 2008, but the contracts were signed only 1,5- 2 months latter coinciding once more with a holiday season. The first preliminary results of the activity no.7 were delivered in August and the final results in October/November 2008.

Activity 8: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR

The same as activity no. 3

Activity 9: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG2)

- 9.1. Steering Group Meeting (1 day) took place on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg according to schedule (for details see action 4.1).
- 9.2. WG2 second meeting (1 day) took place on 5 December 2007 in Riga (instead of late November). The meeting was attended by seven project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 7, 8, 10 and four invited guests. The meeting concentrated on discussing analytical phase of the project. The manuals and blue prints for collecting data and information were agreed. For starting work on recommendation it was discussed that the idea of Steering Group (of its first meeting in October 2007) of workshop for all WGs should be implemented and the Responsible Partner was asked to organize such a workshop (synergy meeting) in January 2008.
- 9.3. Synergy meeting no.1 (1 day) took place in Riga on 31st of January 2008 (see action 4.3. for details).
- 9.4. Steering Group Meeting 2 on 1st of February 2008 in Riga (see action 4.4. for details).
- 9.5. Synergy meeting no. 2 (1 day) took place in Liepaja on 14th of March 2008. (see action 4.5. for details).
- 9.6. Steering Group Meeting 3 (one day) took place on 20 May 2008 in Riga. (for details see action 4.8).
- 9.7. WG2 third meeting (one day) took place on 21 May 2008 in Riga according to schedule. It was attended by five project partner members representing partners no. 1, 7, 8, 10, one external expert and three invited guests. The WG2 before the third meeting concentrated

mainly on analytical work. At this meeting analyses were summed up and the work on recommendations started. It was decided that recommendations (with elements of the action programme) would be prepared for Russia and for the whole BSR with focus on better integration of NW Russia. One additional meeting was requested (autumn 2008) in order to discuss the final draft of the recommendations. The meeting also discussed the pilot actions (pre-feasibility studies) agreeing on concrete items. The outputs achieved:

- a first draft recommendations paper (in outline format),
- TOR for two most important pilot studies.

9.8. WG2 fourth meeting (one day) took place on 4th September 2008 in Jurmala. It was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, three external experts and six invited guests. They discussed the final draft of the recommendations (with elements of the action programme) prepared by Immanuel Kant State University of Russia (Kaliningrad) and Nordregio staff. The WG2 discussed and improved the following documents:

- Recommendations on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR including concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR.
- Study on international rail passenger traffic development: Possibilities in the context of development of cities in the Baltic Sea Region,
- Evaluation of implementation of the VASAB 2010 vision in the area of mobility network and energy supply,
- Overview of results of INTERREG III B projects in the field of accessibility .

9.9. Steering Group Meeting 4 (one day) took place on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg (please see action 4.10)

Activity 10: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 3 on ICZM and transnational sea use planning

10.1. WG3 preparatory meeting took place on 24 July 2007 in Kaliningrad. It was attended by nine project partner members representing partners no. 4, 10, and five invited guests. The meeting was used for preparation of the WG3 first meeting, and the pilot action in particular for presentation and discussion with the Kaliningrad partners the results of the INTERREG project BaltCoast of which recommendations should form main backbone of the work of the WG3. The preparatory meeting was organised during the holiday season due to indicated by the Kaliningrad partner necessity of postponing the WG3 first meeting till October because of the celebrations of 750th anniversary of establishment of the university (lack of experts) in early autumn 2007. So the preparatory meeting was a vehicle to start the work of the WG3 even in slightly less formal way. The main subject of discussion was the BaltCoast recommendations, TORs for experts and other guidelines necessary for elaboration of the WG3 analysis. The outputs were following:

- Decision on TORs and blue prints,
- Clarifying division of labour,
- Project flyer was discussed (and then edited) - see activity 1.1.

10.2 WG 3 first meeting (1,5 day) took place on 30-31 October 2007 in Kaliningrad i.e. with four month delay. The reason was the celebrations of 750th anniversary of establishment of the Albertina University (today Immanuel Kant State University of Russia) in Kaliningrad. The meeting was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 4, 9, 10 and to some extent also partner no.1, one external expert and fifteen invited guests mainly from Russia but also from Latvia, Germany and Finland. The main aim was to discuss the analysis and the further WG3 work in detail, to achieve clarity about division of labour between the partners, to make sure that duplication with other project was avoided (instead to aim at using results achieved by other projects) and to start the process of contracting the external experts. Instead of preparing TORs for separate experts the WG3 at pre meeting decided to make only

two TORs (one for external expert and one for the whole pilot project). For conducting analysis it was agreed that blue prints should be used. Such blue prints were prepared by partner no. 10 in advance presented at the meeting, and then improved/discussed by e-mails and approved in December 2007. The following outputs were produced or achieved:

- Report (in form of power point presentations) – presenting an overview of existing and available documentation on the chosen themes in NW Russia and at the BSR level;
- Two blue prints (for further analysis and discussions);
- Two TORs (one for external expert and one for the whole pilot project);
- One external expert was contracted by the partner no 1 covering by his expertise BSR and HELCOM perspective;
- EWW link at the VASAB website was created (see activity 1.1).

Also Kaliningrad stakeholders who attended the second part of the meeting were informed about the EWW project together with showing them the relevant BSR experience in ICZM and maritime spatial planning. They formed important part of the reference network for dialogue on project findings and recommendations. The meeting was also a starting point for executing analysis.

Activity 11 Analysis (WG 3)

11.1 The discussion on the scope and method of analysis had been continued from October till beginning of December 2007. The discussion resulted in shifting focus more from ICZM to maritime spatial planning as the most important transnational issue related to sea use in the nearest future. The blue prints (to be followed by Russian colleagues) presented by partner 10 were discussed many times. The main method was e-mail exchanges. As the result the two blue prints were agreed:

- A blue print on spatial planning legislation on the sea covering Poland,
- A blue print on potentials and conflicts on the sea covering Poland.

11.2. Gathering and compiling the WG3 information started in December 2007 after blue prints approval. Fourteen people representing partners no. 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10 were involved in the information collecting. Their involvement differed. The main bulk of analytical work was done by partners no.10 and 4 and by external expert whereas the other participants acted mainly as a reference group reading reports, making comments and asking for improvements. This was done first of all by partners no. 5,6 and 7 representing mainly policy making side in the project. The analysis in principle were ended in March. The situation of the WG3 was different than the WG1 and the WG2. The WG3 did not collect statistical information but rather qualitative information and the broad BSR background was discussed, sorted out and clarified at the first meeting by examining BaltCoast results. Therefore, the analytical work could be done in parallel with an initial phase of recommendation preparation. But also in the WG3 the completing analytical reports took more time than expected. Although first draft reports were ready in March their fine tuning continued in April and even in May and June. This was slightly learning by doing in particular for Russian experts who had little contact with maritime spatial planning in the past. The outputs were following:

- The legal systems were screened and regulations, responsibilities for offshore planning at all levels in NW Russia were identified;
- System of mapping to improve access to relevant information from NW Russia and its uploading to the pilot system made in the INTERREG III B BaltCoast project were tested (the results can be seen in the WG3 reports done by Russian colleagues);
- Actual (current) sea use in NW RU (Kaliningrad) according to the BaltCoast standards (potentials and conflicts) were described in a separate paper and conflicts and potentials were detected;

- A compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") with assessment of compatibility of the Russian regulatory framework to the legislation and practice in a pan-Baltic perspective in the field of ICZM and sea use planning was elaborated.

Comments:

The all planned outputs were achieved.

Activity 12 Pilot Action (WG 3)

Pilot action was started in October 2007 and continues till the end of August 2008. The twelve project partners staff members representing partners no. 1,4,6,7,9,10 and one external expert were involved. Partners no. 1,6,7 have acted mainly as a reference group while the main role was played by partners no. 4,9,10. The pilot action aimed at preparing a system of joint ICZM and maritime spatial planning in Gdańsk Bay between Poland and Russia. This task was discussed at the kick off meeting with various Russian stakeholders. The prevailing opinion was that due to the dispersed responsibilities in Russia in ICZM and sea space management (versus concrete central Agency in Poland responsible for sea space and regional governments responsible for ICZM activities) such goal could not be achieved in the project time span. Nowadays there is no single institution in Russia responsible for sea space management (like Maritime Offices in Germany or Poland). The WG3 came to the opinion that agreements between Polish and Russian relevant state institutions on co-operation in sea use planning and management might be too ambitious and premature as the WG3 output. Instead pilot actions were focused on the preconditions for establishment of such agreements in future, by exchange of good practices, deepening mutual understanding and preparing necessary tools and necessary institutional structures i.e. centres of excellence in both countries dealing with maritime spatial planning. It was decided that the starting point should be an agreement between Russian and Polish institutions from NGO or research domain to co-operate on promotion of integrative approach to sea space and coast in both countries. In this context a sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application was discussed. It was considered as an important tool for showing to Russian decision-makers a usefulness of maritime spatial planning. The WG3 decided to limit it to the Baltic Sea around Kaliningrad Oblast. The register was prepared by partner no. 4 and 10 in a form of GIS atlas. The following outputs were produced in the reporting period:

- The exchange of bi-lateral experience was started e.g. Polish pilot sea use plan (covering Puck Bay) elaborated in 2008 under PlanCoast INTERREG III B project was shown to the RU experts;
- The experience with the BaltCoast project of INTERREG III B was shared;
- Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application was first discussed then agreed and then produced and presented to the final/closing conference of the EWW in St. Petersburg on 21st October 2008;
- Agreement between Maritime Institute in Gdańsk and Russian partners on permanent co-operation in the future (including joint projects and policy related work) aiming at establishment of a system of joint ICZM and maritime spatial planning in Gdańsk Bay between Poland and Russia was prepared in autumn 2008. The partners of the agreement will act as an centres of excellence in their countries with regard to maritime spatial planning and ICZM.

Comments:

The pilot action had to be modified. But the actions started within EWW project will be continued after the project closure thanks to established under the EEW contacts. The aim of establishment of the system of joint ICZM and maritime spatial planning in Gdańsk Bay between Poland and Russia is still valid and will be realised in the future. What was done under EWW project was to start this process by exchange of experience, awareness rising, gathering

stakeholders and discussing with them the problem and by preparation of some necessary tools which will convince Russian decision-makers that an integrative coastal and sea space management would be important. Despite difficulties the main outputs promised in the EWW application were produced: i.e. (i) a sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application and (ii) agreements between Polish and Russian relevant institutions on co-operation in sea use planning and management.

Activity 13: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR

The same as activity no. 3

Activity 14: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG3)

- 14.1. Steering Group Meeting (1 day) took place on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg according to schedule (for details see action 4.1).
- 14.2. Synergy meeting no.1 (1 day) took place in Riga on 31st of January 2008 (see action 4.3. for details). This meeting was used by the WG3 also for development of a first outline of recommendation paper which was discussed afterwards by e-mail exchange.
- 14.3. Steering Group Meeting 2 on 1st of February 2008 in Riga (see action 4.4. for details).
- 14.4. Synergy meeting no 2 (1 day) took place in Liepaja on 14th of March 2008 (see action 4.5. for details).
- 14.5. WG3 second meeting (1,5 day) took place on 27-28 March 2008 in Kaliningrad (instead of late November 2007). It was attended by sixteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 7, 9, 10., one external expert and two invited guests. The meeting assessed the progress of the analytical work, discussed the interim reports of Russia and tried to relate the WG3 work towards the EU Integrated Maritime Policy (Blue Book). The final draft of recommendation paper was discussed and agreed. The acknowledgement of the project results at the political level was also examined. The WG3 group joined the WG1 and the WG2 wish to present its results at policy level by introducing them to the “Long Term Perspective” of VASAB. However, partner 9 was also asked to transfer the results to the EU BSR Strategy and to the EU work on integrated maritime policy. During the WG3 meeting a workshop with Russian stakeholders on off-shore planning and ICZM was organised in Kaliningrad on 27th of March 2008 as a joint venture of all projects dealing with this subject i.e. EWW, POWER and SDI-4-SEB as a part of the conference (“Integrated management, sustainable development indicators, spatial planning and monitoring of the South-Eastern Baltic coastal regions”), which took place in Kaliningrad on 26th - 30th of March 2007. Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic were elaborated by EWW project participants beforehand and proposed to stakeholders attending this conference. The recommendations were unanimously adopted by the participants including regional and local authorities from Russia. This seemed to be an important step towards introducing integrative approach towards the sea space and coastal zone in Russia.

The output achieved was following:

- Recommendation paper discussed and adopted by the Russian stakeholder (Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic).
- 14.6. Steering Group Meeting 3 (1day) took place on 20 May 2008 in Riga (for details see action 4.8).
 - 14.7. WG3 third meeting (1 day) took place on 4-5 June 2008 in Gdańsk almost according to schedule (few days later than planned originally). It was attended by fifteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 9, 10, one external expert and five invited guests. At the meeting analytical phase was summed up. The meeting was also used for examining the

experience and good practices of the Balance project in maritime spatial planning. The experts from Denmark introduce the project to the WG3 members. However, the WG3 main discussion concentrated on the ‘action plan’ following the recommendations adopted in March 2008. The opinions were dispersed. Some participants considered elaboration of an action plan as premature having in mind lack of legal provisions in Russia regulating sea use in an integrative way and dispersion of responsibility for sea management among many institutions. Some others proposed to focus action plan on methodological issues i.e. issues indispensable to introduce sea use planning in Russia and methodology of such planning suited for Russian conditions. After the e-mail exchange in June 2008 the partner no 9 responsible for the WG3 work decided to take the risk to prepare a draft action plan and to discuss it in September 2008 with the WG 3 members. Therefore an additional meeting was requested to be held in September 2008, to conclude the recommendation phase. The following outputs were achieved:

- The experience with Balance project of INTERREG III B was shared.

After the WG3 third meeting the partner no 9 and 10 organised (late June beginning of July 2008) consultation about the follow up of the WG3 in a form of a joint project. In the consultation the information on different ETC Programmes in the BSR were analysed and compared. The results were presented to the WG3 fourth meeting.

- 14.8. WG3 fourth meeting (one day) took place on 2nd September 2008 in Gdańsk. It was attended by thirteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 7, 9, 10 and one external expert. The meeting discussed the final draft of the action programme prepared by the staff of partners no 4 and 10 (Maritime Institute from Gdańsk and Immanuel Kant State University of Russia from Kaliningrad). Also final draft of the sea use register was presented by the partner no.4. The WG3 discussions tackled also the future use of the WG3 results. The presentations to the final/closing conference of EWW were agreed. It was also decided that the WG3 analysis should serve for broader popularization of the issue of maritime spatial planning in the Baltic Sea Region. The partner no 9. agreed to edit (by the end of 2008) from its own resources a *Compendium on Maritime Spatial Planning systems in the Baltic Sea Region countries* composed of two parts: part 1 *Survey of the national instruments and tools for the management of the sea space in the BSR countries* describing legal and institutional aspects of maritime spatial planning systems in the BSR countries and part 2 entitled *Examples of national cases of sea spatial conflicts and potentials*. Partner no.9 promised to invite to this book all other BSR countries while using the WG3 results as the core input. The WG3 also analysed different possibilities of continuation of the WG3 work. After the lively discussion it was decided to use two vehicles for further co-operation: The project BaltSeaPlan already submitted to the BSR Programme (although slightly too abstractive) and the new project to be submitted to the ENPI Programme Lithuania–Poland–Russian Federation on concrete planning work as continuation of the WG3 pilot activities. It was decided that transnational maritime planning should concentrate on Vistula/Kaliningrad lagoon and on Kursiu lagoon.

The WG3 discussed and improved the following documents during its fourth meeting:

- Action plan how to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational sea use planning and ICZM;
- Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application.

- 14.9. Steering Group Meeting 4 (one day) took place on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg (please see action 4.10)

14.2. Assessment of the results of the Action

The central objective of the Action was to promote territorial integration of NW Russia (i.e. the entire Northwest Federal District, including Kaliningrad) into the Baltic Sea region (BSR) in the identified three fields of (1) business development, (2) transport / ICT development and (3) sea use planning and Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM). The starting point was relatively impressive but

slightly idle (from the BSR perspective) developmental potential (in terms of human capital, scientific achievements etc.) of the North West Russia. The task was to develop solutions how to use the potential of the NW Russia for the benefit of the BSR economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development.

The action was successful to that extend that it managed to identify economic and spatial development needs in the NW Russia from the perspective of public authorities and businesses, requiring to be tackled by at the transnational level. This findings were benchmarked against existing good practice solutions based on experience of other BSR countries. The search was also done in order to detect economic and spatial trends, relevant for connecting territorial potentials between the NW Russia and the BSR. However, the picture coming from analysis appeared less promising than expected (see point 2.9). But even in those rather difficult circumstances the recommendations for three mentioned above fields were formulated and action plans were outlined. The main results delivered to the external audience having policy relevance are presented below:

The results achieved	The results intended	Explanation of differences
Recommendations how to improve innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration	Recommendation" paper with suggestions on policy improvements and legislative changes to improve settlement and innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration	The results achieved put less attention to legislative changes than to policy improvements. This is outcome of the survey done in order to learn from Russian businessman what are the main obstacles for them to innovate.
Recommendations how to improve settlement policies in NW Russia (urban rural partnership) from the perspective of BSR integration,		The focus of the result achieved is on urban-rural partnership as key for integrative development of settlement structure in Russia.
Action plan how to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration,	A paper with fields for further concrete actions ("action plan") to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration	Done in line with plans
Recommendations on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR including concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR,	1.Recommendation" paper with suggestions on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR 2. A paper with fields for further concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia and in BY in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR	The recommendations and action plan were merged. The reason is that Russia has very concrete plans and actions in this field for the future years so the WG2 decided to focus on long-term recommendations.
Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic	Recommendation" paper on upgrading the instruments and tools and institutional arrangements for transnational sea use planning and ICZM at the BSR level based on the completed pilot action	More ambitious recommendations were produced than expected i.e. more in line with the real situation in Russia with regard to ICZM and maritime spatial planning
Action plan how to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational sea use planning and	A paper with fields for further concrete actions ("action plan") to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational	Done in line with plans

ICZM	sea use planning and ICZM	
Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application	A sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application - based on the completed system mapping.	Done in line with plans
Agreement between maritime Institute in Gdańsk and Immanuel Kant State University of Russia on further co-operation in the field of maritime spatial planning	Agreements between Polish and Russian relevant institutions on co-operation in sea use planning and management	Done in line with plans

The most important EWW achievement is delivery of main messages resulting from the Action to the important Russian decision makers, planning professionals and scientific sector as well as to the key pan-Baltic organizations such as HELCOM or VASAB. Through VASAB also the EU BSR strategy was influenced.

14.3. The outcome on both final beneficiaries and/or target group and the situation of the target group/target region which the action addressed

The target audience/recipients of the project findings have been decision-makers (ministries responsible for spatial planning and development in the BSR, including the federal government in Russia, regional authorities in NW Russia, pan-Baltic organisations such as VASAB 2010). Thanks to the action they have received a better picture on the situation with regard to the North-West Russia integration into the Baltic Sea region (BSR). This knowledge has been already used for policy making by VASAB in production of the Long Term Spatial Development Perspective and it seems that it will be also useful for the EU Commission in elaboration of the EU BSR strategy and for HELCOM for implementation of the Baltic Sea Action Plan. In fact the Action played a tremendous role in validation of the planning methodologies and strategic documents at the pan-Baltic level based on the NW Russia perspective. The Action gave a proper insight on main drivers and obstacles of integration of the North West Russia into the BSR. The Action findings and recommendations were also delivered to the Russian decision makers and VASAB will continue its efforts to convince them that the BSR integration is beneficial for the North-West Russia. At least in the field of maritime spatial planning as the result of the Action one can see increased capacity and competence basis to take up joint transnational initiatives between the NW Russia partners and institutions from other BSR countries.

The final beneficiaries local and regional governments in the Baltic Sea region (BSR) operators in the chosen thematic fields (e.g. businesses in WP1 and transport operators in WP2) in NW Russia and in the BSR will be influenced mainly through the actions of pan-Baltic organisations mainly VASAB and its Long Term Spatial Development Perspective. This will allow for incorporation of the BSR perspective in the national/regional/local policies in the NW Russia.

14.4. Publications

The following publications were produced:

Name	Number of copies	Distribution channels
The East-West Window brochure informing about the project	300	Distributed during the project events in particular kick-off conference, stakeholder seminar, the Conference "Baltic Sea Region Programme 2007-2013: new partnership opportunities for Russian and Belarusian regions" and many other events
Атлас использования прибрежных акваторий российской части Юго-восточной Балтики (Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application – <i>edited on CD rom</i>)	200	Distributed for free during the EWW final (closing) conference, available for free from partner no.4

The book in Russian: Северо-Запад России в Регионе Балтийского Моря: Проблемы и перспективы экономического взаимодействия и сотрудничества (North West Russia in the Baltic Sea region. Problems and perspectives of co-operation and mutual influence) presenting main results of the project	100	Distributed for free by partners no.4 among the project partners and participants of the EWW events. Sent to Russian relevant Ministries and main libraries.
--	-----	--

14.5. Contracts (works, supplies, services) above 5000€ awarded for the implementation of the action since the last interim report

Only one contract above 5000€ was awarded since the last interim report.

	Contract	Amount	Procedure	Winner
1	Audit Services Contract	5 131,94	“negotiated procedure without publication”	<i>SIA Rodl and Partner</i>

14.6. Continuation of the Action after ending the support from the European Community

The action will be continued after ending the EU support for the East West Window project. Durability of the project results has been ensured by the direct participation or the support of the national ministries responsible for spatial planning and development around the BSR, acting under VASAB 2010. Through their co-operation with other relevant stakeholders, the project rendered available concrete recommendations for policy-making in the chosen thematic fields in the NW Russia and at the BSR level. Through intensive dialogue with the target audience, the project influenced planners in Russia neighbouring countries by including the perspective of NW Russia. It also served for modification of pan-Baltic strategic policy papers, long-term visions and development plans on the very same account.

In particular the EWW results were used by VASAB for elaboration of the Long Term Perspective for Spatial Development of the BSR. Thanks to the EWW this will be the document with proper outlook on North-West Russia. Due to the EWW the collaboration between VASAB (ministries) and other EWW partners (research institutes) will be strengthened. The EWW results will be also used for discussing with HELCOM an idea of maritime spatial planning in the Baltic Sea Region.

Follow-up activities in effect of the project will be initiated and promoted by VASAB 2010. This includes starting up of possible new project(s) covering the whole BSR and taking into consideration the needs and perspectives of NW Russia, identified and referred to in the present project. The WG3 work will be continued in a form of the BaltSeaPlan project already approved by the BSR Programme (will start around December 2008). The WG3 partners will also plan to submit the project on elaboration of concrete maritime spatial plans for Vistula and Kursiu Lagoons in the framework of the ENPI Programme Lithuania–Poland–Russian Federation. Despite finishing the work of the WG3 the partner no.9 responsible for its leading has already declared to continue the efforts in a broader BSR set up and started elaboration of the BSR wide “Compendium on Maritime Spatial Planning systems in the Baltic Sea Region countries” using the WG3 results and experience.

14.7. Gender equality, disabilities

Where relevant, the perspective of equal opportunities was taken into account for the thematic work (especially in the fields of business and transport). Due efforts were made to secure involvement of both men and women in the composition of the project management structures, daily work and in the dialogue fora with relevant stakeholders in NW Russia and at the overall BSR level. Spatial planning forming a substance of the project from its definition cares for gender equality, prevention or exclusions of handicapped from the normal life. Although, gender equality and disabilities were not the main focus of the EWW project one can assume that the realisation of the project objectives (integration of the NW Russia into the BSR) will be beneficial in a long run also for attracting attention of Russian decision makers and Russian society to those above mentioned horizontal goals. They are placed very high at civil agenda in particular in the Nordic countries and integration means also convergence in values and way of living so it means better acceptance of these horizontal goals in Russia as well. The same has happened in Poland, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia after their accession to EU (strengthening their European integration).

14.8. Monitoring and evaluation of the activities

Monitoring of activities was done on routine basis by the project Steering Group. The group worked very effectively guiding the project and proposing the changes if necessary. The group (ministerial part) provided also an excellent piece of advice with regard to use of the EWW project results for policy making. However, one should also admit the important role of Committee on Spatial Development of the Baltic Sea Region which was among the main recipients of the project results. The advice from this body and the VASAB Secretariat which took part in majority of the EWW events (on their own money) helped a lot in proper shaping the EWW work and focusing on the policy relevant results (e.g. providing links to HELCOM, EU BSR Strategy etc.).

Also important were feedbacks received from beneficiaries during the kick-off and final (closing) conference. In the Annex 2 quotations from the Conference resolutions are attached (in Russian).

14.9. What has been learned from the Action

The main lesson from the action is that integration of the NW Russia into the Baltic Sea Region (BSR) will not be an easy process. Russia is a global player looking for global organizations and bodies as its partners. Even the regional level i.e. St. Petersburg has sufficient potential to play an important role at the global arena. This is clearly seen in the St. Petersburg government policy and strategic documents. BSR is not the main field of St. Petersburg strategic activity. Slightly different situation is with regard to Kaliningrad, but its potential is sufficient to strengthen rather cross-border than pan-Baltic integration of Russian Federation. The main integrative processes between Russia and the rest of the BSR are hardly due to market forces or conscious decisions of the Russian enterprises but rather thanks to EU financial support in form of transnational and cross-border programmes. The only field in which one can expect more or less natural co-operation between Russia and the other BSR countries is maritime spatial planning as long as it affects coastal defence, fish stock and state of the coastal nature. Russia is very active now in HELCOM where the questions of maritime spatial planning have been already raised.

Therefore strengthening integration of the North-West Russia into the BSR requires further development of the Russian medium size cities such as e.g. Kaliningrad or Pskov, their partnership with adjacent regions, and development of the maritime spatial planning institutions which in natural way will seek for the relations with their closest neighbours.

15. Partners and other Co-operation

15.1. How do you assess the relationship between the formal partners of this Action (i.e. those partners which have signed a partnership statement)? Please specify for each partner organisation

St. Petersburg Administration [2] – partner active for discussing policy relevant documents and organising meetings in St. Petersburg in the field of analysis acting through partner no.3 . Important contribution to the stakeholder dialogue. In fact this partner will be one of the main recipients of the project results.

Russian Economic Developers Association (ASSET) [3] – very demanding from formal point of view but also very experience partner in analytical work. A great bulk of the WG1 recommendations were proposed by this partner. The partner is a great interface between science and policy making in Russia in particular in St. Petersburg. Important role in dissemination activities thanks to good contacts with decision-makers in Russia at local and regional level.

Immanuel Kant State University of Russia [4] – very reliable and enthusiastic partner being a source of many data and information excellent in scientific work acquiring great experience during the EWW project how to translate analysis into policy findings, but in fact majority of recommendations of the WG2 and the WG3 were rooted in partner no. 4 thinking.

Ministry of the Environment, Danish Forest and Nature Agency, Denmark [5] – very active and experienced partner (being responsible in the past for the USUN project) leading the WG 1 work and ensuring proper presentation of EWW at the highest BSR political level.

Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Housing, Germany [6] – very active and experienced partner responsible for urban-rural investigations under the WG1, ensuring proper presentation of EWW at the highest BSR political level.

Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communication, Sweden [7] – partner ensuring link to the EU BSR strategy (use of EWW results also there), acting mainly through partner 8 but very active in the WG2 , active in the WG3 (with very high quality inputs) and contributing to policy relevant findings in the EWW.

Nordic Centre for Spatial Development (NORDREGIO) [8] – one of key drivers for analytical work, competent, flexible with a large knowledge and experience in spatial and regional development.

Ministry of Regional Development, Poland [9] – partner leading the WG3 but active in other work groups, very experienced and very flexible contributing to the work additional resources if project resources are not sufficient.

Maritime Institute, Poland [10] – key resource for maritime spatial planning and ICZM in the project supporting actively the WG3 and coordinating the whole project from content point of view in very reasonable way.

15.2. Is the partnership to continue

The partnership will continue in a form of BSR Programme and ENPI Programme projects on maritime spatial planning. The co-operation agreement between partners no 4 and 10 will serve to this end. The BaltSea Plan was approved by the BSR programme. The project will serve as a continuation and dissemination of the WG3 work and results since both partners no 4 and 10 are among its key drivers.

The EWW project results were also used within the VASAB framework. This means that new partners such as Nordregio, ASSET or Immanuel Kant State University of Russia have joined the VASAB work and their involvement will continue.

15.3. How would you assess the relationship between your organisation and State authorities in the Action countries? How has this relationship affected the Action?

Since majority of the partners are state high level institutions those relations were fine. The partners representing state authorities knew each other for many years before starting the project as the members of the VASAB co-operation (Co-operation of Ministers for spatial planning and development in the BSR countries). The new input was given by the scientific institutions. This was a great added value of the project, mutual learning how to translate analysis into policy relevant actions. The research oriented partners were quite flexible and willing to reshape analysis or repeat them if asked by policy making partners.

15.4. Where applicable, describe your relationship with any other organisations involved in implementing the Action:

- Associate(s) (if any) - no
- Sub-contractor(s) (if any). Some of the work was given to the external contractors. However an idea was that majority of work should be done by the partners themselves since the partners had sufficient qualification to execute the project and achieve its goals. Contractors were used mainly for technical issues and for bringing knowledge from INTERREG projects. Only some partners (9) and (5) used contractors more intensively (for some concrete work) due to shortages in their human resources. In principle the relation with contractors were positive with one exception (i.e. Rumanian contractor who won a tender for the EWW financial management disappeared after few month of serving the project)
- Final Beneficiaries and Target groups. Those relations were fine thanks to sue of well established and prominent conferences for presentation of the EWW. This gave the project access to the target group necessary for the project success.
- Other third parties involved. Important was a link of the project to the VASAB Secretariat and VASAB work on the Long Term Perspective. VASAB Secretariat promoted also project and its results externally on request of the Responsible Partner.

15.5. Where applicable, outline any links you have developed with other actions.

The project ambition was to develop link to other important projects in order to make use of their results (BaltCoast, PlanCoast, Balance, USUN, SeBCo – their experts were invited to the project meetings) or to make joint meetings to better reach target groups (SeBCo POWER and SDI-4-SEB). These projects represented different INTERREG strands.

15.6. If your organisation has received previous EC grants in view of strengthening the same target group, in how far has this Action been able to build upon/complement the previous one(s)? (List all previous relevant EC grants).

The Ministries involved in the project previously received a grant from INTERREG II C to prepare an Action Plan for implementation of the VASAB strategy adopted in 1994. The project was called VASAB Plus and ended in 2000. The EWW used the VASAB Plus experience but its focus was different. This time the target geographical area was the NW Russia and its integration to the BSR. The lesson learned under the VASAB Plus (where Russia had no financial resources for analysis) showed that preparation of a pan-Baltic documents with very differentiate resources might result in uneven involvement of the countries and then uneven ownership of the agreed actions or strategies. Therefore the EWW was invented to avoid such a mistake and to give Russian colleagues resources for considering their role in the BSR integration.

16. Visibility

How is the visibility of the EU contribution being ensured in the Action?

At the project start a press release was done by the Responsible Partner. Visibility was ensured by placing proper information that the EWW project was part-financed by the EU together with the EU logo and logo of INTERREG III B. This was done on printing materials, power point presentation and on the project web site. There was also some information in the Latvian radio. On demand of Russian colleagues the project was presented at the Conference “Baltic Sea Region Programme 2007-2013: new partnership opportunities for Russian and Belarusian regions” in St. Petersburg as one of the most successful INTERREG projects with Russian participation. To strengthen the project visibility a special project banner was produced and displayed on many occasions (e.g. Conference “Baltic Sea region Spatial Development Policies avenues to the Long Term Perspective” in Riga on 23 April 2007, and already mentioned conference “Baltic Sea Region Programme 2007-2013: new partnership opportunities for Russian and Belarusian regions” in St. Petersburg on 16-17 April 2008 and in many other events). The book with the project analysis and recommendations was printed in December 2008. But the most important is that the project results will be used for producing “Long Term Perspective” for the BSR which will be presented to CBSS and all important pan-Baltic organizations. Thanks to EWW NW Russia will be properly highlighted in this strategy.

The European Commission may wish to publicise the results of Actions. Do you have any objection to this report being published on Europe Aid Co-operation Office website? If so, please state your objections here.

Name of the contact person for the Action: **Vladislavs Vesperis**

Signature:Location: **Riga, Latvia**

Date report due:Date report sent:

Update of action plan

Activity	Months																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Activity 1: Kick off of the work of Working Group no 1 on business development and innovation affecting spatial development,	X	X	X	X														
Activity 2: Analysis(WG1)				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Activity 3: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR (WG1)					X						X						X	
Activity 4: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations and action plan (WG1)					X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Activity 5: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 2 on accessibility				X														
Activity 6: Analysis(WG2)					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Activity 7: Pilot studies (WG2)												X	X	X	X	X		
Activity 8: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR					X						X						X	X
Activity 9: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG2)					X	X		X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Activity 10: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 3 on ICZM and transnational sea use planning		X			X													
Activity 11 Analysis (WG 3)					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					
Activity 12 Pilot Action (WG 3)					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
Activity 13: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR					X						X						X	
Activity 14: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG3)					X			X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		

EWV events: participation of man and woman

Participants			
Event	Woman	Man	Total
Kick off meeting of the work of WG1, on 25 June 2007 in Riga	9	11	20
WG1 meeting 25 September 2007 in Riga	4	3	7
WG1 analysis (people involved)	11	23	34
Steering Group meeting on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg	7	11	18
St Petersburg kick off conference on 18-19 October 2007	112	146	259
St Petersburg Closing conference on 21 October 2008	231	400	631
WG1 second meeting on 6-7 December 2007 in Riga	9	10	19
Synergy meeting no.1 on 31 January 2008 in Riga	10	13	23
Steering Group Meeting no.2 on 1 February 2008 in Riga	4	11	15
Synergy meeting no 2 in Liepaja on 14 th of March 2008	8	8	16
WG1 fourth meeting on 3-4 April 2008 in Riga	6	7	13
Riga Stakeholders seminars (WG3 and WG1 + WG2) on 23 April 2008	83	84	167
WG1 fifth meeting on 24 April 2008 in Riga	13	12	25
Steering Group Meeting no. 3 on 20 May 2008 in Riga	4	6	10
Steering Group Meeting no. 4 on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg	3	10	13
WG1 sixth meeting on 3 rd September 2008 in Jurmala	11	11	22
WG2 first meeting on 10 October 2007 in Riga	3	6	9
WG2 analysis	6	11	17
WG2 second meeting on 5 December 2007 in Riga	4	7	11
WG2 third meeting on 21 May 2008 in Riga	2	7	9
WG2 fourth meeting on 4 th September 2008 in Jurmala	9	11	20
WG3 preparatory meeting on 24 July 2007 in Kaliningrad	4	10	14
WG 3 first meeting on 30-31 October 2007 in Kaliningrad	12	15	27
WG3 analysis	3	11	14
Pilot Action (WG 3)	3	10	13
WG3 second meeting on 27-28 March 2008 in Kaliningrad	6	13	19
WG3 third meeting on 4-5 June 2008 in Gdańsk	6	15	21
WG3 fourth meeting 2 September 2008 in Gdańsk	3	11	14

Quotations from the Conference resolutions (in Russian) in direct relations to the EAST West Window.

7. Kick Off Conference

Продвижение европейского опыта в рамках программ Европейского Инструмента Соседства и Партнерства усилит инновационный потенциал и влияние Северо-Западного региона России на процессы территориальной интеграции на внешних границах ЕС, в частности, в регионе Балтийского моря. В этих целях целесообразна активизация участия России в таких международных объединениях, как VASAB 2010, Балтийский форум развития (BDF), Программа транснационального сотрудничества региона Балтийского моря 2007-2013.

Зарубежный опыт свидетельствует о значительной роли малых и средних городов в продвижении инноваций и гармонизации территориального развития. Этот факт должен учитываться при разработке инновационных стратегий в России как на федеральном, так и на региональном уровнях. Необходимо уделять больше внимания развитию малых и средних городов, как это происходит в странах ЕС, и адаптировать европейский опыт применительно к ситуации в России (в частности, концепцию сельско-городского партнерства «ESDP Concept of Rural-Urban Partnership»). Доступ к знаниям и информации, возможность обмена идеями должны стать основой формирования территориальных моделей развития России.

/.../

Участники Форума согласились со следующим:

- необходимо особое единое государственное управление морскими прибрежными зонами страны (обеими их составляющими: морской и сухопутной) исходя из повсеместного успешного мирового опыта подобной деятельности и соответствующих рекомендаций организаций системы ООН и международных форумов на высшем уровне. Руководствуясь этим, рекомендовать: 1) создание нормативной правовой и институциональной базы для разработки и реализации комплексных программ развития и управления прибрежными зонами в рамках комплексных программ социально-экономического развития приморских субъектов Федерации и программ развития прибрежных муниципальных образований в целях активизации участия последних в освоении прибрежных и морских ресурсов; 2) адаптацию и освоение современных управленческих технологий (методология Комплексного управления прибрежными зонами (КУПЗ)) в применении к богатейшим по ресурсам и разнообразным по природным и социально-экономическим условиям прибрежным зонам страны; 3) разработку и реализацию пилотных программ КУПЗ конкретных побережий страны; 4) использование опыта сотрудничества стран Балтийского региона, в частности рекомендаций Проекта BaltCoast BSR INTERREG III B по управлению прибрежными зонами и разработке совместных стратегических проектов;
- рекомендовать использование кластерного подхода в качестве инструмента реализации стратегий развития территорий и повышения конкурентоспособности региональной и муниципальной экономики, включая выявление и диагностику потенциальных кластеров, разработку программ их развития, создание организаций по сотрудничеству. В органах власти необходимо формирование межотраслевых рабочих групп для координации развития кластеров и снятия ведомственных и отраслевых ограничений. Целесообразно более широкое использование международных программ и инструментов повышения конкурентоспособности кластеров;
- необходимо развитие региональной и муниципальной статистики, в частности для целей выработки эффективной кластерной политики и оценки результатов реализации кластерных инициатив в регионе и/или муниципалитете, формирования действенных

инструментов планирования и управления, ориентированного на результат на субфедеральных уровнях;

- при реализации федеральных, региональных и местных программ экономического развития необходимо стимулировать участие организаций инновационной инфраструктуры в российских и зарубежных сетевых организациях, которые оказывают содействие в предоставлении услуг компаниям и научным организациям в сфере инновационной бизнес-кооперации и трансфера технологий (примерами могут служить Российская сеть трансфера технологий RTTN, Европейская сеть бизнес-инновационных центров EBN). Участие в сетевом сотрудничестве должно быть нацелено на повышение качества и содержания услуг для местных компаний и НИИ. Федеральным и региональным органам власти необходимо поддерживать инициативы по развитию сетевого взаимодействия между организациями инновационной региональной инфраструктуры (создание региональных сетей) с целью уменьшения дублирования функций, повышения качества услуг и снижения расходов бюджета на их субсидирование;
- рекомендовать и стимулировать участие российских центров коммерциализации, инновационных центров в реализации Competitiveness Innovation Program (CIP) Европейского союза в части проектов, ориентированных на развитие инновационных сетей и сетей трансфера технологий (IRC, IRE, EBN и др.);
- считать целесообразным использование в России европейского опыта реализации региональных инновационных стратегий, обеспечивающих выявление спроса на инновации среди компаний и ориентацию научного сектора и инновационной инфраструктуры на удовлетворение этого спроса. (...);
- в целях совершенствования государственного и муниципального управления по обеспечению перехода Российской Федерации на инновационный путь развития рекомендовать Комиссии при Президенте Российской Федерации по вопросам совершенствования государственного управления и правосудия, Министерству регионального развития Российской Федерации, другим заинтересованным федеральным и региональным органам власти осуществить экспертизу полномочий органов государственной власти субъектов Российской Федерации и органов местного самоуправления в части выявления проблемных вопросов, препятствующих обеспечению перехода России на режим инновационного развития, и законодательно обеспечить активизацию участия в реализации государственной научно-технической политики органов государственной власти субъектов Федерации и органов местного самоуправления, рассмотреть возможность разработки национальной программы, ориентированной на содействие российским регионам в подготовке и реализации региональных инновационных стратегий и формирование российской сети инновационных регионов;
- рекомендовать заинтересованным федеральным и региональным органам государственной власти реализовать систему мер по поддержке технопарков и процессов коммерциализации научных разработок. В частности: разработать законодательную базу для развития технопарков на федеральном уровне; предоставить налоговые льготы компаниям-резидентам технопарков, например, аналогичные льготам для резидентов ОЭЗ; упростить процедуру предоставления земельных участков для технопарков; законодательно разрешить НИИ, вузам и университетам создавать малые предприятия - start-up'ы;
- рекомендовать органам регионального и муниципального управления активно использовать инструменты международной технической и финансовой помощи, предоставляемой по линии Института Всемирного Банка, АМР США, Европейского Инструмента Соседства и Партнерства (ENPI) и других программ Европейского Союза для реализации стратегических приоритетов и планов территориального развития, поддержки инноваций;
- отметить необходимость выработки механизма интеграции документов стратегического планирования муниципального, регионального и федерального уровней;
- одобрить инициативы Комитета по пространственному развитию региона Балтийского моря (CSD/BSR) VASAB 2010 по территориальной интеграции Северо-Запада России и реализации совместных проектов в таких приоритетных сферах как развитие бизнеса, транспорта, ИКТ, управление прибрежными зонами. Отметить актуальность проекта «Окно

Восток-Запад", который позволит восполнить пробелы в оценке инновационного потенциала Северо-Запада России и расширит возможности синергии инновационных потенциалов стран Балтийского региона.

- предложить Комитету VASAB 2010 использовать Форум лидеров стратегического планирования городов и регионов России в качестве референтной группы для обсуждения Стратегии пространственного развития региона Балтийского моря.

8. Closing Conference

8.1. «Перспективы развития Северо-Западного федерального округа: вызовы, приоритеты, угрозы и ограничения»

Участники рекомендуют:

- 10) в целях максимального учёта сложившихся межсубъектовых экономических связей, обеспечения увязки общегосударственных и региональных планов и прогнозов социально-экономического развития, целесообразно предусмотреть **разработку стратегических документов долгосрочного социально-экономического развития на уровне федеральных округов**. Для преодоления ведомственной и региональной разобщённости целесообразно поручить эту работу Ассоциациям экономического взаимодействия соответствующих федеральных округов. Это позволит точнее формулировать цели регионального развития в увязке с имеющимися общими ресурсами, объективно сформировать перечень основных межрегиональных проектов, обеспечивающих достижение общих целей развития. Подобные документы могут стать основой для последующей разработки Концепции долгосрочного социально-экономического развития Российской Федерации;
- 11) для ускорения социально-экономического развития территорий требуется **активизация межрегионального взаимодействия**. Зачастую депрессивные регионы (субъекты Федерации) экономически тесно связаны с успешными регионами (транспортные подходы к инфраструктурным объектам, наличие сырьевой базы для обрабатывающих производств и т.п.). В этом случае целесообразно оказывать федеральную помощь (налоговые и иные льготы, государственные гарантии под привлекаемые кредиты, первоочередное финансирование проектов в рамках действующих ФЦП и др.) для инфраструктурного развития депрессивных территорий по поддерживаемым видам и направлениям экономической деятельности, а также для реализации проектов способствующих комплексному развитию двух и более субъектов Федерации;
- 12) необходимым условием развития и Северо-Западного федерального округа и страны в целом является **совершенствование работы транспортного комплекса**. Требуется системный подход к формированию единой стратегии развития транспортно-логистического комплекса страны в увязке с развитием отраслей экономики и внешнеэкономической ситуацией.

8.2. «Специфика стратегий приморских регионов»

Участники считают, что

- 10) Необходимо совершенствование стратегического планирования применительно к морской деятельности и приморским регионам и муниципалитетам, предусматривающее:

на федеральном уровне:

- применение интегральных подходов к планированию и управлению в морском природопользовании. Это позволит преодолеть фрагментарность, присущую отраслевому подходу, учесть взаимосвязанность видов морского природопользования, способствовать связям и межотраслевой гармонизации в морской деятельности исходя из анализа конфликтного использования ресурсов, обеспечить многоцелевую ориентацию и соответствие

деятельности природоохранным целям, участие всех заинтересованных сторон в разработке стратегий и программ развития;

- создание нормативной правовой и институциональной базы для разработки и реализации комплексных программ развития и управления прибрежными зонами, основанных на интегральных подходах, в рамках стратегий и программ социально-экономического развития приморских субъектов Федерации и программ развития прибрежных муниципальных образований. Это позволит реализовать особое единое государственное управление морскими прибрежными зонами страны (обеими их составляющими: морской и сухопутной) исходя из повсеместного успешного мирового опыта подобной деятельности и соответствующих рекомендаций организаций системы ООН и международных форумов на высшем уровне;

на региональном уровне:

- адаптацию и освоение современных управленческих технологий (методология Комплексного управления прибрежными зонами - КУПЗ) в применении к богатейшим по ресурсам и разнообразным по природным и социально-экономическим условиям прибрежным зонам страны;
- разработку и реализацию пилотных программ КУПЗ конкретных побережий страны.

Реализация этих мер позволит реализовать естественные природные конкурентные преимущества морских акваторий и прибрежных территорий в обеспечении дополнительного экономического роста, конкурентоспособности, инвестиционной привлекательности, занятости, повышения комфортности и качества жизни, охраны окружающей среды и уменьшения ущерба от природных и техногенных катастроф, а также безопасности страны

- 11) Необходимо совершенствование нормативной правовой базы, регулирующей градостроительную деятельность, в части учета специфики этой деятельности на морских акваториях, находящихся под суверенитетом и юрисдикцией Российской Федерации.
- 12) Необходимо развивать международное сотрудничество в стратегическом планировании морского природопользования, учитывая единство и экосистемный характер морских процессов, и широко использовать международный опыт в этой сфере.

FINAL NARRATIVE REPORT

17. Description

17.1. Name of beneficiary of grant contract: Ministry of Regional Development and Local Government, Latvia (Reģionālās attīstības un pašvaldību lietu ministrija).

17.2. Name and title of the Contact person: Mr Vladislavs Vesperis.

17.3. Name of partners in the Action: St. Petersburg Administration (Администрация Губернатора Санкт-Петербурга) [2], Russian Economic Developers Association (ASSET) (Ассоциация специалистов по экономическому развитию территорий) [3], Immanuel Kant State University of Russia (Российский государственный университет имени И. Канта) [4], Ministry of the Environment, Danish Forest and Nature Agency¹⁷, Denmark (Miljøministeriet, Skov- og Naturstyrelsen) [5], Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Housing, Germany (Bundesministeriums für Verkehr, Bau und Stadtentwicklung) [6], Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communication, Sweden (Näringsdepartementet) [7], Nordic Centre for Spatial Development (NORDREGIO) [8], Ministry of Regional Development, Poland (Ministerstwo Rozwoju Regionalnego) [9], Maritime Institute, Poland (Instytut Morski) [10].

17.4. Title of the Action: East-West Window (EWW).

17.5. Contract number: Grant Contract for European Community External Actions **2007/132-845**.

17.6. Start date and end date of the reporting period¹⁸: 15.06.2007 – 15.12.2008.

17.7. Target country(ies) or region(s): **North-West Russia in particular: St. Petersburg, Leningrad region and Kaliningrad region**; to some extent also Belarus and North-West Russia adjacent countries (mainly for collecting good practices and dissemination of the project results).

17.8. Final beneficiaries &/or target groups¹⁹ (if different). The target audience/recipients of the project findings are: decision-makers (ministries responsible for spatial planning and development in the BSR, including the federal government in Russia, regional authorities in

¹⁷ The name of the partner 5 was changed during the EWW project execution **from** Ministry of the Environment, Danish Forest and Nature agency **to** Ministry of the Environment, Agency for Spatial and Environmental Planning (Miljøministeriet, By- og Landskabsstyrelsen).

¹⁸ The entire implementation period of the Action

¹⁹ “Target groups” are the groups/entities who will be directly positively affected by the project at the Project Purpose level, and “final beneficiaries” are those who will benefit from the project in the long term at the level of the society or sector at large.

NW Russia, pan-Baltic organisations such as VASAB 2010). The final beneficiaries are local and regional governments in the Baltic Sea region (BSR) operators in the chosen thematic fields (e.g. businesses in WP1 and transport operators in WP2) in NW Russia and in the BSR. The divide into men and women of different project activities is provided separately.

17.9. Country (ies) in which the activities take place (if different from 1.7): Russia (St. Petersburg and Kaliningrad Oblast), Poland and Latvia.

18. Assessment of implementation of Action activities

18.1. Activities and results (for the whole reporting period including last narrative interim report)

Activity 1: Kick off of the work of Working Group no 1 on business development and innovation affecting spatial development,

1.13. First meeting of the WG1 (1 day) took place on 25 June 2007 in Riga which was according to the schedule. The meeting was planned in advance in late June so participants postponed their holidays which in this part of the BSR starts with so called Midsummer. The meeting was attended by 12 participants representing partners 1,3,4,5,6,8,9,10 and eight invited guests. The main aim was to discuss the analysis and further WG1 work in detail, to achieve clarity about division of labour between the partners, to make sure that duplication with other project is avoided (instead to aim at using results achieved by other projects) and to start the process of contracting the external experts. The following outputs were produced or achieved:

- Report how to avoid duplication with other INTERREG III B projects in the field of business development and innovation affecting spatial development had been prepared before the meeting by the project coordinator, discussed by the meeting and delivered to the Responsible (Lead) Partner.
- TORs for seven ASSET staff members, eight Kaliningrad University staff members, one Belarus expert and four external experts together with tender documentation (if necessary) have been prepared by project coordinator as result of the meeting. Tender procedures for the four external experts had been started resulting in contracting one external expert from Poland, one from Sweden, one from Latvia and one from Denmark. In addition the Belarus expert was contracted by the partner no. 8 without tender (contract below 5000 Euro).
- The main scope of analysis was proposed and discussed. Unfortunately too many question marks and uncertainties appeared during the June meeting so the additional meeting was organized in Riga in September and discussion on analysis continued till the second WG1 meeting (December 2007).
- Text for EWW section at to the VASAB website was decided, technically EWW link at VASAB website was created in September 2007.
- Project flyer was designed and edited including information on WG1 activities (300 copies were printed in October 2007).

Comments: The WG1 started the discussion on its work (i.e. necessary analysis, results to be achieved) but the topic was too broad for one day meeting in addition to many technical questions were raised. The decision was to continue the discussion when the experts contracted by tender would be available. The main problem was to what extend the achievement of the EWW goal (i.e. *to promote territorial integration of NW Russia into the BSR in the field of business development*)

required concentration on analysis concerning exclusively NW Russia and to what extent the broader BSR picture was necessary if integration should mean reciprocal relations (i.e. affecting both sides). The latter opinion prevailed and was accepted by the meeting. The WG1 considered that for producing the main output of the analytical phase (i.e. a *compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") with assessment of unexploited innovation potential in NW Russia, assessment of the potential for regional integration and with identification of spatial problems in NW Russia and BSR*) some BSR analysis as the background material should be done as well. The meeting also discussed the policy related role of the project i.e. better highlighting the EWW results on NW Russia role in the “Long Term Perspective” to be prepared by VASAB on CBSS demand. The WG1 leaders promised to ensure smooth transfer of the EWW results to the BSR strategy i.e. Long Term Perspective till 2030 (to be prepared by VASAB in 2009). The Responsible Partner declared that he would invite VASAB Secretariat to the most important meetings of the EWW to ensure smooth transfer of the project results to the “Long Term Perspective”.

- 1.14. Partnership Agreement Preparation. This action was related to all work packages and took place in June, July, August, and September 2007 and was ended in October 2007 with signing partnership agreements between Lead Partner and all other partners of the EWW project. The most difficult was signing Partnership Agreement with partners from St. Petersburg due to problems related to tax and system in Russia, conversion of EUR into rubels, banking system requirements etc. Finally two agreements, based on the results of additional working meeting (in Riga) discussions, were prepared and signed between Lead Partner and RU (ASSET) Partner and between German Partner and RU (ASSET) Partner. So at the end of the day there were 9 partnership agreements signed regulating relations between the EWW partners.
- 1.15. Quality Workshop (1 day) for Project leaders organised by INTERREG III B Secretariat and EU Delegation from Moscow in Riga on 26 September 2007 was attended by project coordinator (partner no.10), one representative of Russian partners (partner no.2) and representatives appointed by the Responsible Partner. Main guidelines from EC Delegation and INTERREG III B Secretariat on TACIS rules, payments schemes and communication experiences were presented during the seminar and later on at individual consultations. The meeting between Responsible Partner and the Russian partners was organized back to back with the workshop for discussing main technicalities of their participation in the project.

Activity 2: Analysis(WG1)

- 2.9. WG1 additional meeting (1 day) took place on 25 September 2007 in Riga to continue discussion on the scope of analysis. The meeting was attended by four WG1 members (including two external experts, project coordinator and the representative of the Russian partners) and three participants representing Responsible Partner. At the meeting in depth discussion on case studies on innovation, outsourcing and urban-rural relations in Russia took place and the detailed scope of the work of Russian partners and external experts were agreed. Also a draft outline structure of the WG1 analytical report was presented by the WG1 Coordinator and discussed in depth.
- 2.10. Data collection and interpretation started only in December 2007 after the second WG1 meeting. In this phase 34 people from all partners were involved (except partner no.7 who acted through partner no. 8). Their involvement differed. The main bulk of analytical work was done by partners no. 3, 4 and 8 and the external experts whereas the other people acted mainly as a reference group reading reports, making comments and asking for improvements. This was the task first of all of partners no. 1, 2, 5, 6, 9 and 10 representing mainly policy making side in the project and project coordination. Also VASAB Secretariat was invited by partner 1 (Responsible Partner) to participate in this process. The analysis (data collection) in principle were ended in March 2008 but some of them (requiring surveys) due to formal reasons (tenders) were completed in April 2008. Interpretation of data was

done in April 2008 for all important cases (but some analysis e.g. the benchmarking studies and urban-rural analysis continued till September 2008). In fact in April and even in May and June the fine tuning of analysis (removing mistakes noticed by the other partners) still continued. The reason was that some partners from the reference group were very demanding asking for many improvements even if they had found little inconsistencies after second or third reading of the reports. Therefore the final synthesis report (draft discussion paper) from the analytical phase was completed only in July 2008 and even slightly changed after the WG1 September 2008 meeting and as the result of the EWW final/closing Conference in October 2008.

The outputs have been following:

(i) interim:

- Data (including public surveys) and draft analytical report on “Baltic” metropolitan areas with focus on the role of Kaliningrad and St. Petersburg;
- In depth study on St. Petersburg and Kaliningrad and their developmental potentials in the BSR context (focus on innovation and outsourcing) in which: trends and present policies for innovations nested in NW Russia and outsourcing were analysed, barriers for innovations perceived by business and public administration were identified (based on surveys), and cases on transfer of innovations between NW Russia and other parts of the BSR were described;
- Case studies (reports) on Russian and Belarus small and medium sized cities – covering: Novgorod, Gatchina, Chernyakhovsk, Gusev, Sovetsk, Svetly, Berezovka, Zaslavl;
- Reports on demographic trends in North-West Russia, in St. Petersburg and in Kaliningrad and in Belarus as well;
- Reports on case studies on urban-rural relations in Russia;
- Report on INTERREG III B projects results relevant for work of the WG1 group;
- Benchmarking studies concerning situation in Poland, Germany and Latvia on the issues relevant for the WG1 recommendations .

(ii) A compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") with assessment of unexploited innovation potential in NW Russia, assessment of the potential for regional integration and with identification of spatial problems in NW Russia and BSR.

Comments:

a) All the planned outcomes were achieved. However, during the analytical phase became clear that for the NW Russia innovation is more promising path for integration within the BSR than outsourcing, therefore more efforts were done to analyse this challenge. The list of outputs was enlarged (in comparison to the planned ones) by analysis of the role of the NW Russia in the BSR context (as the result of the WG1 discussions what analysis are necessary to achieve the EWW goal). Also urban structures and functional urban areas of not only large but also some small cities were analysed. The most interesting case appeared to be Gatchina as an example of science intensive cluster in Russia located in a small city. The some other cases illustrated urban-rural relations in Russia (and Belarus).

b) While working with data it became clear that translating data into policy recommendations can not be done by each working group separately. Therefore at the meeting of the WG leaders in December it was proposed that for the starting work on recommendation a workshop for all WGs would be necessary. The Responsible Partner was asked to organize such a workshop on 31st of January 2008 instead of simple WG1 seminar (planned for that date).

c) The work was delayed by some formal constraints such as tender procedures, requirement of separate EUR accounts (very difficult for Ministries) etc.

Activity 3: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR (WG1)

- 3.1. Kick off Conference of the project (1,5 day) for broad public took place on 18-19 October 2007 (according schedule) in St. Petersburg as a part of the well known VI Forum of Strategic Planning Leaders of Cities and Regions of Russia. This allowed project to reach the planned target group. The project: its assumptions and the planned outputs were presented to the Russian decision makers - mainly city mayors and chief planners. Conference participants expressed a deep hope that EWW project would diminish knowledge gaps within the Baltic Sea Region on the character of development potential of the NW Russia, its synergies and complementarities with potentials of other countries of the region, and on methods how this potential could be efficiently connected within the BSR. It was expressed in Conference recommendations that EWW project results should be presented in 2008 at the final Conference within VII Forum of Strategic Planning Leaders of Cities and Regions of Russia. The kick off conference was attended by 259 participants mainly Russian mayors and city planners. Among them there were 57 persons outside Russia. From EWW project 20 persons participated including Latvian State Secretary representing the Responsible Partner. So EWW reached the planned target of **200** Russian decision makers and professionals involved in discussion on the project.
- 3.2. Stakeholder Seminar for WG1 (0,5 day) was organised on 23 April 2008 in Riga (instead of beginning of May as originally planned). The preliminary results of the analytical phase were presented and the first discussions on the recommendations were started. The seminars for all working groups of EWW were arranged back to back with the VASAB annual conference financed by the Latvian Ministry of Regional Development and Local Government from its own means i.e. outside the EWW budget (from the EWW budget some partners only covered their travelling to the EWW seminars). The described above arrangement resulted in very impressive participation in the seminars and allowed to reach a planned target of **100** decision makers and businessman from BSR EU countries involved in discussion of the project findings and recommendations. The conference and seminars were attended by 167 participants including 26 persons directly involved in the EWW project (although the Responsible Partner was represented by some more employees). The participants came mainly from Latvia, Lithuania, and Finland but also from Azerbaijan, Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, EU Commission, Germany, Hungary, Norway, Poland, Russia and Sweden.
- 3.3. Closing(final) Conference of the project (1 day) for broad public took place on 21st October 2008 (according schedule) in St. Petersburg. The title of the conference was “Promoting territorial integration of the North West Russia into the Baltic Sea Region”. The main organiser was ASEET together with the EWW Responsible Partner. This Conference was a part of rich spectrum of the conferences and seminars taking place under umbrella (the same premises) of the VII All-Russia Forum of Strategic Planning Leaders “Strategic Planning in Regions and Cities of Russia”. In the event 631 participants took place out of it 582 from Russia. The forum was organized by: State Duma of the Russian Federation; Ministry for Regional Development of the Russian Federation; Ministry for Economic Development of the Russian Federation; St Petersburg City Administration; Center of Strategic Research; ISCER Leontief Centre. It was opened by Mr Dmitry Kozak, Minister of Regional Development, who underlined that “Forum is becoming the public debating platform for improving the strategic planning system of social and economic development in Russian regions”. The Conference “Promoting territorial integration of the North West Russia into the Baltic Sea region” was composed of four sessions attended by large number of the participants not only from Russia but also from other Baltic Sea Region countries. Some sessions were joint ventures with other organisations, forums and bodies interested in the subjects raised by the EWW project. The names of the sessions were following:
 - “Accessibility and innovations as motors of integration of the NW Russia into the Baltic Sea Region” (presentation of the results of the WG1 and the WG2),

- “Special Features of coastal regional strategies” (presentation of the WG3 results and dialogue with all key persons in Russia dealing with ICZM and maritime spatial planning),
- “Partnership mechanisms in local economic policy implementation” (presentation of the WG1 results with regard to urban-rural partnership).

In addition to that EWW results were presented at the key session of the Forum “Prospects for Federal Okrug Development: Challenges, priorities, threats and constraints. North-West Federal Okrug” attended by key decision makers from the North-West Federal Okrug.

Comments:

The choice of the formula of the kick-off and closing conferences appeared to have very positive results on ability of the project to deliver results to the key target groups in Russia. The Conference was also attended by the Ministerial partners from the EWW project. The EWW results were mirrored in the Forums resolutions. Some interested questions were raised requiring further discussion and examination.

- 3.4. Final publication The book summing up the results of the investigations available for the stakeholders in Kaliningrad and St.Petersburg was edited in October, November and printed in December 2008 by partner no.4.

Comments:

The number of books published was smaller (100) than assumed in the application (400), although the whole budget allocated to this purpose was used. There were several reasons why the printing was more expensive than expected. Some of them were of technical reasons: i.e. the book had more coloured pictures (maps) than estimated and was thicker than planned (more than 300 pages in comparison to 150 pages planned), but the main reason was of vis mayor nature. In 2008 in Russia an unexpected inflation and economic crisis appeared which could not be taken into account at the stage of budget planning. This resulted in much higher printing costs. However, the partner no.4 is ready to print additional copies of the book if demanded. The available copies will be distributed to the most active in the EWW Russian stakeholders and to the project partners of the EWW.

Activity 4: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations and action plan (WG1)

- 4.1. Steering Group Meeting (1 day) took place on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg according to schedule. The meeting was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1,2,3,5,6,7,9,10 and seven invited guests. The Steering Group discussed the project progress. The work was lagging behind the schedule. Although the WG1 started on time it became involved in lengthy discussions about the necessary scope of analysis and detailed division of labour between working groups. The Steering Group decided therefore not to start the work on recommendations before improving synergy between the work of the working groups. This task was given to the meeting of the WGs leaders organised in Riga back to back with the WG2 (5 December 2007) and the WG1 (6-7 December 2007) meetings. The meeting also discussed details of project presentation to the kick-off conference held next day.
- 4.2. WG1 second meeting (1,5 day) took place on 6-7 December 2007 in Riga (instead of late November). The meeting was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10, two external consultants and six invited guests. The meeting concentrated on discussing analytical phase of the project (the decision was that the lagging behind analysis would make necessary to postpone by two months the next WG1 meeting i.e. till the end of analytical phase). However, the WG 1 also started examining the way of preparation of the recommendations out of the analysis conducted. For the starting work on recommendation it was agreed that a workshop for all WGs would be necessary and the

Responsible Partner was asked to organize such a workshop (synergy meeting) on 31st of January 2008 instead of a simple WG1 seminar (scheduled for beginning of February).

- 4.3. Synergy meeting no.1 (1 day) took place in Riga on 31 of January 2008 (replacing the WG1 seminar scheduled for February). It was attended by fourteen project partner members representing partners no.1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, three external experts and six invited guests. The facilitator was hired by the Responsible Partner. During the meeting the participants agreed that all three working groups were in need of a common frame. This should be given by the vision of the BSR till 2030 with full integration of the North-West Russia. The participants managed to prepare an outline of such a vision requiring further work. The meeting asked for one more working day for finishing common visionary frame which should allow preparing meaningful recommendations.
- 4.4. Steering Group Meeting 2 took place on 1 of February 2008 in Riga. It was attended by seven project partner members representing partners no. 1,3,5,6,7, 9, 10 one external expert and seven invited guests. The results of the synergy meeting were discussed i.e. synergy between the work of the working groups. It was decided to organise one more synergy meeting to continue work on the common frame for all WGs, i.e. vision of the BSR till 2030 with full integration of the North-West Russia. An agenda of the April Conference proposed by the Responsible Partner was discussed together with some technical issues. The progress in analytical phase was reviewed.
- 4.5. Synergy meeting no. 2 (1 day) took place in Liepaja on 14th of March 2008. It was attended by ten project partner members representing partners no. 1,3,5,6,9, 10 one external expert and five invited guests. The facilitator was hired by the Responsible Partner but paid from Responsible Partner own means. The final draft of the vision was discussed and shared by participants giving stable frame for analytical part and allowing proper work on recommendations.
- 4.6. WG1 fourth meeting (1 day) took place on 3-4 April 2008 in Riga. It was attended by nine project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 8, 10, two external experts and two invited guests. The meeting was convened on demand of Russian partners who started finalisation of analytical part and wanted to discuss the preliminary results among themselves. It was also important for conceptualization of the recommendations i.e. discussing what findings from analytical phase should be taken into consideration while working on recommendations.
- 4.7 WG1 fifth meeting (one day) took place on 24 April 2008 in Riga. It was attended by fifteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, four external experts and six invited guests. The WG1 before the meeting concentrated mainly on analytical work. At the fifth meeting analyses were summed up and the work on recommendations were started. However, one more meeting was requested (autumn 2008) in order to discuss the final draft of the recommendations and action programme. Due to delay in the work on urban-rural relations in Russia the relevant reports were not presented to the WG1 at this meeting. Only an overview of the progress and main findings were reported. It was decided that for synergy reasons the reports would be presented on seminar on urban-rural relations in Russia to be organised as a joint event with the SeBCo project in Kaliningrad in June 2008. This was realised and such presentation took place and was regarded as a great success by meeting participants.
- 4.8. Steering Group Meeting 3 (one day) took place on 20 May 2008 in Riga. It was attended by five project partner members representing partners no. 1, 5, 9, 10, and five invited guests. The Steering Group discussed the project progress. The results of the second synergy meeting and the April Conference were examined as well as a draft vision of the BSR till 2030 with full integration of the North-West Russia. The Steering Group decided to close analytical part and start the work on recommendations. However, the WG3 leaders asked for additional benchmark study on the results of the INTERREG projects in the field of competences of the WG3 with focus on the German experience. This was to diminish discrepancies between the WGs, since the WG1 and the WG2 already had such type of

expertises included in their work. The problems with travelling budget of Russian partners were discussed once more together with a problem of disappeared financial manager. The Steering Group also continued a discussion on political use of the EWW results i.e. incorporation of the results into the Long Term Perspective of VASAB to be produced in 2009. The output achieved:

- first draft recommendation papers (in outline format) of WG1 and WG2.

4.9. WG1 sixth meeting (one day) took place on 03 September 2008 in Jurmala. It was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, four external experts and seven invited guests. They discussed the final draft of the recommendations and action programme prepared during holiday time 2008 by ASSET, Immanuel Kant State University of Russia (Kaliningrad), Nordregio staff, and external experts. The whole work on urban-rural relations in Russia the relevant analytic reports were presented to the WG1 at this meeting as well. The WG1 discussed and improved the following documents:

- Recommendations how to improve innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Recommendations how to improve settlement policies in NW Russia (urban rural partnership) from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Action plan how to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration.

4.10. Steering Group Meeting 4 (one day) took place on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg. It was attended by 7 project partner members representing partners no. 2, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10 one external expert and 6 invited guests. The group discussed the shape of final publications of the EWW project, the use of the analytical materials and endorsed the recommendations and action proposed by the project. The main discussion was on the proper use of the EWW results for the Long Term Perspective (LTP) of VASAB elaboration of which was started few month ago (August 2008). The EWW results were placed to the different parts of the LTP outcomes. The VASAB consultant responsible for facilitating the LTP process was invited to the Steering Group meeting. It was also discussed how to use EWW outcomes for the process of preparation of the BSR EU Strategy. The partner no.5 arranged a meeting with the EU Commission on that topic. It was decided that the EWW results would be incorporated in the VASAB non-paper to be presented to the EU Commission in November/December 2008 in order to influence strategy preparation. The outputs achieved (as results of the meeting):

- Final draft of the recommendations how to improve innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Final draft of recommendations how to improve settlement policies in NW Russia (urban rural partnership) from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Final draft of the action plan how to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration,
- Final draft of recommendations on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR including concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR,
- Final action plan how to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational sea use planning and ICZM,
- Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic,
- Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application,
- Forwarding (transferring of EWW results) to important BSR processes namely: EU BSR Strategy and VASAB Long Term Perspective.

Activity 5: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 2 on accessibility

5.1. WG2 first meeting (one day) took place on 10 October 2007 in Riga It was attended by five project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 8, 10, one external expert and three

invited guests. The main aim was to discuss the scope of analysis (concrete meaning of accessibility) and the further work of the WG2 step by step, to achieve clarity about division of labour between the partners, to make sure that duplication with other project was avoided (instead to aim at using results achieved by other projects) and to start the process of contracting the external experts. The following outputs were produced or achieved:

- Report how to avoid duplication with other INTERREG III B projects in the field of accessibility was prepared by the project coordinator, discussed at the meeting and accepted by the Responsible Partner;
- TORs for four Kaliningrad University staff members, one Belarus expert and TORs for three external experts together with tender documentation (if necessary) have been prepared and approved. Procurement and contracting procedures for the one external expert was finished in September. Two other experts were also contracted (latter on);
- The main scope of analysis were proposed and discussed. The discussion on analysis continued among the partners (by e-mails) till the second WG2 meeting (December 2007);
- EWW link at the VASAB website was created (see activity 1.1);
- The content of the project flyer was loaded by short information about the WG2 activities.

Comments: The WG2 started its work behind the schedule. Due to the late project start (mid of June 2007), the first period of the project coincided with a holiday season. Therefore the real work of the WG2 (by phone, e-mails etc) started only in September 2007 i.e. three month later than planned. In addition to that, for some partners it was very inconvenient (e.g. celebrations of anniversary of establishment of the Kaliningrad University) and this postponed the start of formal work by one or two month further on i.e. till October 2007. In the meantime the preparation of the WG2 detailed analysis was started. To this end a pre meeting on 22nd of August 2007 was organised (partners 1, 7,8) to prepare tentative proposals on the substance of the work of the WG2. This meeting was paid outside the EWW budget. Although the WG2 (similarly to the WG1) came to the opinion that broader BSR picture was necessary to promote *territorial integration of NW Russia into the BSR in the field of transport and ITC*. The WG2 members also shared the WG1 concern on importance of smooth transfer of the EWW results to the BSR strategy till 2030 i.e. Long Term Perspective to be prepared by VASAB in 2009. The characteristic feature of the WG2 was a long discussion about the meaning of the notion of accessibility. As the result accessibility to energy was also considered to be an important element of the analysis.

Activity 6: Analysis(WG2)

6.1. The discussion on the scope and method of analysis (indicators, pilot studies) had been continued from October till beginning of December 2007. The manuals and guidelines were discussed many times. The main method was e-mail exchanges. As the result the manuals and blue prints were produced by partners 1 and 8 to facilitate collecting data and information:

- A blue print on screening transport policy,
- A manual for collecting data and information on accessibility.

Comments: The majority of time of the initial period was allocated to discussing the notion of accessibility. This was done in order to avoid problems when data and information collection would be started. Due to the rise of energy prices also this issue was considered as important factor for the NW Russia integration to the BSR. The second issue heavily discussed was scarcity of comparable data in Russia. Partner no 8 having a very well developed data base on transport data for the BSR was in a difficult position checking (in dialogue with partner 4) existence of similar data in Russia. This required more resources and more work load than estimated at the

beginning. But finally this allowed presenting Russia at the broader BSR picture. The phase 6.1. ended with second meeting of the WG2 (December 2007 in Riga).

6.2. Data collection and interpretation started only in December 2007 after the second WG 2 meeting. Basic data were collected by mid February 2008 but some work continued (fine tuning of reports) till May/June 2008. A draft discussion paper was ready for the Riga Stakeholder Conference in April 2008. However, it was a working document amended after each important EWW meeting, till the final/closing Conference. In this work (phase 6.1 and 6.2) seventeen people (including three external experts) were involved. Their involvement differed. The main bulk of analytical work was done by partners no. 4 and 8 and the external experts whereas the other participants acted mainly as a reference group reading reports, making comments and asking for improvements. This was done first of all by partners no. 1, 6, 7 and 10 representing mainly policy making side in the project and project coordination. Also VASAB Secretariat was invited by partner 1 (Responsible Partner) to participate in this process.

The following outputs were achieved:

(i) interim:

- Mapping of transport infrastructure policies at the federal and regional level, policies in development of the soft accessibility (to knowledge and information) and policies on clusters in NW Russia (however clusters were analysed by the WG1 in fact), also policies and situation in the field of accessibility to energy was examined;
- Identification of bottlenecks and constraints for transport (and through transport for business development) in NW Russia;
- Assessment of the policy correlation with the strategic documents at the BSR level (mainly by analysing outcomes of Strategic INTERREG III B projects pursued by VASAB, BDF, BSSSC and CPMR);
- Examining the results of other INTERREG III B projects relevant for the WG2 work;
- Feasibility assessment of connecting TEN-T with the pan-European corridors.

The planned verification of the accessibility perspective and of present (current) and forecast trade flows in NW Russia and Belarus (vis-a-vis BSR reports) was less successful. The main reason were missing data concerning predicted trade flows in NW Russia and Belarus²⁰. The accessibility perspective instead was analysed using BSR outlook to show how NW-Russia is connected with the rest of the BSR.

(ii) A compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") presenting situation, development trends and political objectives in the fields of transport and accessibility in NW RU and Belarus and their consequences for BSR cohesion and business development

Comments:

The most important planned outputs were achieved (although one output was slightly modified). In addition to that, accessibility to energy was touched as important future factor of the BSR integration that should determine in great extent the NW Russia integration into the BSR. The analysis lasted longer than expected. The main constraint was lack of regional reliable data in NW Russia. The main reason of the delay was in insufficient data availability but also to some extent larger than expected amount of available background information (e.g. results of the BSR projects) that should be digested and analysed.

Activity 7: Pilot studies (WG2)

Since the analytical phase (activity 6) was delayed also pilot projects were postponed. The aim of the activity 7 was to analyse more in depth the most promising solutions developed during the analytical

²⁰ The work on trade flows was done in co-operation with WG1 and the BSR perspective was used.

phase and prioritised during stakeholder dialogue. Therefore only in May 2008 the more concrete work on pilot studies (pre-feasibility studies) could start. The WG2 selected two (in line with the output indicators listed in the application) topics for pre-feasibility studies. The topics were following:

- i) BSR passenger railway connectivity with focus on the Eastern part of the BSR,
- j) examination of implementation of the transport part of Tallinn vision of VASAB with focus on the eastern part of the BSR.

For the pilot studies a tender procedure was used and contracts were signed in late June 2008. The results were delivered in late August 2008 and discussed by the WG2 group meeting in September. The following reports were produced:

- *Study on international rail passenger traffic development: Possibilities in the context of development of cities in the Baltic Sea Region* (Contract: 5-13/66, of 18.6.2008) elaborated by SIA “AC Konsultācijas”,
- *Evaluation of implementation of the VASAB 2010 vision in the area of mobility network and energy supply* (Contract: 5-13/74, of 23.7.2008) elaborated by SIA “AC Konsultācijas”.

The results of the studies were presented to the closing/final conference of the EWW and will serve as an input for the Long Term Spatial Development Perspective. They were also presented in advance to the WG2 members working on recommendation in order to shape the WG2 recommendations.

Comments:

An additional barrier delaying activity no.7 was obligation of tendering the contractors due to internal law of Latvia where partner no.1 (responsible for the WG2 work) is located. The WG2 decisions were taken in May 2008, but the contracts were signed only 1,5- 2 months latter coinciding once more with a holiday season. The first preliminary results of the activity no.7 were delivered in August and the final results in October/November 2008.

Activity 8: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR

The same as activity no. 3

Activity 9: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG2)

- 9.1. Steering Group Meeting (1 day) took place on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg according to schedule (for details see action 4.1).
- 9.2. WG2 second meeting (1 day) took place on 5 December 2007 in Riga (instead of late November). The meeting was attended by seven project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 7, 8, 10 and four invited guests. The meeting concentrated on discussing analytical phase of the project. The manuals and blue prints for collecting data and information were agreed. For starting work on recommendation it was discussed that the idea of Steering Group (of its first meeting in October 2007) of workshop for all WGs should be implemented and the Responsible Partner was asked to organize such a workshop (synergy meeting) in January 2008.
- 9.3. Synergy meeting no.1 (1 day) took place in Riga on 31st of January 2008 (see action 4.3. for details).
- 9.4. Steering Group Meeting 2 on 1st of February 2008 in Riga (see action 4.4. for details).
- 9.5. Synergy meeting no. 2 (1 day) took place in Liepaja on 14th of March 2008. (see action 4.5. for details).
- 9.6. Steering Group Meeting 3 (one day) took place on 20 May 2008 in Riga. (for details see action 4.8).
- 9.7. WG2 third meeting (one day) took place on 21 May 2008 in Riga according to schedule. It was attended by five project partner members representing partners no. 1, 7, 8, 10, one external expert and three invited guests. The WG2 before the third meeting concentrated

mainly on analytical work. At this meeting analyses were summed up and the work on recommendations started. It was decided that recommendations (with elements of the action programme) would be prepared for Russia and for the whole BSR with focus on better integration of NW Russia. One additional meeting was requested (autumn 2008) in order to discuss the final draft of the recommendations. The meeting also discussed the pilot actions (pre-feasibility studies) agreeing on concrete items. The outputs achieved:

- a first draft recommendations paper (in outline format),
- TOR for two most important pilot studies.

9.8. WG2 fourth meeting (one day) took place on 4th September 2008 in Jurmala. It was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, three external experts and six invited guests. They discussed the final draft of the recommendations (with elements of the action programme) prepared by Immanuel Kant State University of Russia (Kaliningrad) and Nordregio staff. The WG2 discussed and improved the following documents:

- Recommendations on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR including concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR.
- Study on international rail passenger traffic development: Possibilities in the context of development of cities in the Baltic Sea Region,
- Evaluation of implementation of the VASAB 2010 vision in the area of mobility network and energy supply,
- Overview of results of INTERREG III B projects in the field of accessibility .

9.9. Steering Group Meeting 4 (one day) took place on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg (please see action 4.10)

Activity 10: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 3 on ICZM and transnational sea use planning

10.1. WG3 preparatory meeting took place on 24 July 2007 in Kaliningrad. It was attended by nine project partner members representing partners no. 4, 10, and five invited guests. The meeting was used for preparation of the WG3 first meeting, and the pilot action in particular for presentation and discussion with the Kaliningrad partners the results of the INTERREG project BaltCoast of which recommendations should form main backbone of the work of the WG3. The preparatory meeting was organised during the holiday season due to indicated by the Kaliningrad partner necessity of postponing the WG3 first meeting till October because of the celebrations of 750th anniversary of establishment of the university (lack of experts) in early autumn 2007. So the preparatory meeting was a vehicle to start the work of the WG3 even in slightly less formal way. The main subject of discussion was the BaltCoast recommendations, TORs for experts and other guidelines necessary for elaboration of the WG3 analysis. The outputs were following:

- Decision on TORs and blue prints,
- Clarifying division of labour,
- Project flyer was discussed (and then edited) - see activity 1.1.

10.2 WG 3 first meeting (1,5 day) took place on 30-31 October 2007 in Kaliningrad i.e. with four month delay. The reason was the celebrations of 750th anniversary of establishment of the Albertina University (today Immanuel Kant State University of Russia) in Kaliningrad. The meeting was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 4, 9, 10 and to some extent also partner no.1, one external expert and fifteen invited guests mainly from Russia but also from Latvia, Germany and Finland. The main aim was to discuss the analysis and the further WG3 work in detail, to achieve clarity about division of labour between the partners, to make sure that duplication with other project was avoided (instead to aim at using results achieved by other projects) and to start the process of contracting the external experts. Instead of preparing TORs for separate experts the WG3 at pre meeting decided to make only

two TORs (one for external expert and one for the whole pilot project). For conducting analysis it was agreed that blue prints should be used. Such blue prints were prepared by partner no. 10 in advance presented at the meeting, and then improved/discussed by e-mails and approved in December 2007. The following outputs were produced or achieved:

- Report (in form of power point presentations) – presenting an overview of existing and available documentation on the chosen themes in NW Russia and at the BSR level;
- Two blue prints (for further analysis and discussions);
- Two TORs (one for external expert and one for the whole pilot project);
- One external expert was contracted by the partner no 1 covering by his expertise BSR and HELCOM perspective;
- EWW link at the VASAB website was created (see activity 1.1).

Also Kaliningrad stakeholders who attended the second part of the meeting were informed about the EWW project together with showing them the relevant BSR experience in ICZM and maritime spatial planning. They formed important part of the reference network for dialogue on project findings and recommendations. The meeting was also a starting point for executing analysis.

Activity 11 Analysis (WG 3)

11.1 The discussion on the scope and method of analysis had been continued from October till beginning of December 2007. The discussion resulted in shifting focus more from ICZM to maritime spatial planning as the most important transnational issue related to sea use in the nearest future. The blue prints (to be followed by Russian colleagues) presented by partner 10 were discussed many times. The main method was e-mail exchanges. As the result the two blue prints were agreed:

- A blue print on spatial planning legislation on the sea covering Poland,
- A blue print on potentials and conflicts on the sea covering Poland.

11.2. Gathering and compiling the WG3 information started in December 2007 after blue prints approval. Fourteen people representing partners no. 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10 were involved in the information collecting. Their involvement differed. The main bulk of analytical work was done by partners no.10 and 4 and by external expert whereas the other participants acted mainly as a reference group reading reports, making comments and asking for improvements. This was done first of all by partners no. 5,6 and 7 representing mainly policy making side in the project. The analysis in principle were ended in March. The situation of the WG3 was different than the WG1 and the WG2. The WG3 did not collect statistical information but rather qualitative information and the broad BSR background was discussed, sorted out and clarified at the first meeting by examining BaltCoast results. Therefore, the analytical work could be done in parallel with an initial phase of recommendation preparation. But also in the WG3 the completing analytical reports took more time than expected. Although first draft reports were ready in March their fine tuning continued in April and even in May and June. This was slightly learning by doing in particular for Russian experts who had little contact with maritime spatial planning in the past. The outputs were following:

- The legal systems were screened and regulations, responsibilities for offshore planning at all levels in NW Russia were identified;
- System of mapping to improve access to relevant information from NW Russia and its uploading to the pilot system made in the INTERREG III B BaltCoast project were tested (the results can be seen in the WG3 reports done by Russian colleagues);
- Actual (current) sea use in NW RU (Kaliningrad) according to the BaltCoast standards (potentials and conflicts) were described in a separate paper and conflicts and potentials were detected;

- A compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") with assessment of compatibility of the Russian regulatory framework to the legislation and practice in a pan-Baltic perspective in the field of ICZM and sea use planning was elaborated.

Comments:

The all planned outputs were achieved.

Activity 12 Pilot Action (WG 3)

Pilot action was started in October 2007 and continues till the end of August 2008. The twelve project partners staff members representing partners no. 1,4,6,7,9,10 and one external expert were involved. Partners no. 1,6,7 have acted mainly as a reference group while the main role was played by partners no. 4,9,10. The pilot action aimed at preparing a system of joint ICZM and maritime spatial planning in Gdańsk Bay between Poland and Russia. This task was discussed at the kick off meeting with various Russian stakeholders. The prevailing opinion was that due to the dispersed responsibilities in Russia in ICZM and sea space management (versus concrete central Agency in Poland responsible for sea space and regional governments responsible for ICZM activities) such goal could not be achieved in the project time span. Nowadays there is no single institution in Russia responsible for sea space management (like Maritime Offices in Germany or Poland). The WG3 came to the opinion that agreements between Polish and Russian relevant state institutions on co-operation in sea use planning and management might be too ambitious and premature as the WG3 output. Instead pilot actions were focused on the preconditions for establishment of such agreements in future, by exchange of good practices, deepening mutual understanding and preparing necessary tools and necessary institutional structures i.e. centres of excellence in both countries dealing with maritime spatial planning. It was decided that the starting point should be an agreement between Russian and Polish institutions from NGO or research domain to co-operate on promotion of integrative approach to sea space and coast in both countries. In this context a sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application was discussed. It was considered as an important tool for showing to Russian decision-makers a usefulness of maritime spatial planning. The WG3 decided to limit it to the Baltic Sea around Kaliningrad Oblast. The register was prepared by partner no. 4 and 10 in a form of GIS atlas. The following outputs were produced in the reporting period:

- The exchange of bi-lateral experience was started e.g. Polish pilot sea use plan (covering Puck Bay) elaborated in 2008 under PlanCoast INTERREG III B project was shown to the RU experts;
- The experience with the BaltCoast project of INTERREG III B was shared;
- Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application was first discussed then agreed and then produced and presented to the final/closing conference of the EWW in St. Petersburg on 21st October 2008;
- Agreement between Maritime Institute in Gdańsk and Russian partners on permanent co-operation in the future (including joint projects and policy related work) aiming at establishment of a system of joint ICZM and maritime spatial planning in Gdańsk Bay between Poland and Russia was prepared in autumn 2008. The partners of the agreement will act as an centres of excellence in their countries with regard to maritime spatial planning and ICZM.

Comments:

The pilot action had to be modified. But the actions started within EWW project will be continued after the project closure thanks to established under the EEW contacts. The aim of establishment of the system of joint ICZM and maritime spatial planning in Gdańsk Bay between Poland and Russia is still valid and will be realised in the future. What was done under EWW project was to start this process by exchange of experience, awareness rising, gathering

stakeholders and discussing with them the problem and by preparation of some necessary tools which will convince Russian decision-makers that an integrative coastal and sea space management would be important. Despite difficulties the main outputs promised in the EWW application were produced: i.e. (i) a sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application and (ii) agreements between Polish and Russian relevant institutions on co-operation in sea use planning and management.

Activity 13: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR

The same as activity no. 3

Activity 14: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG3)

- 14.1. Steering Group Meeting (1 day) took place on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg according to schedule (for details see action 4.1).
- 14.2. Synergy meeting no.1 (1 day) took place in Riga on 31st of January 2008 (see action 4.3. for details). This meeting was used by the WG3 also for development of a first outline of recommendation paper which was discussed afterwards by e-mail exchange.
- 14.3. Steering Group Meeting 2 on 1st of February 2008 in Riga (see action 4.4. for details).
- 14.4. Synergy meeting no 2 (1 day) took place in Liepaja on 14th of March 2008 (see action 4.5. for details).
- 14.5. WG3 second meeting (1,5 day) took place on 27-28 March 2008 in Kaliningrad (instead of late November 2007). It was attended by sixteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 7, 9, 10., one external expert and two invited guests. The meeting assessed the progress of the analytical work, discussed the interim reports of Russia and tried to relate the WG3 work towards the EU Integrated Maritime Policy (Blue Book). The final draft of recommendation paper was discussed and agreed. The acknowledgement of the project results at the political level was also examined. The WG3 group joined the WG1 and the WG2 wish to present its results at policy level by introducing them to the “Long Term Perspective” of VASAB. However, partner 9 was also asked to transfer the results to the EU BSR Strategy and to the EU work on integrated maritime policy. During the WG3 meeting a workshop with Russian stakeholders on off-shore planning and ICZM was organised in Kaliningrad on 27th of March 2008 as a joint venture of all projects dealing with this subject i.e. EWW, POWER and SDI-4-SEB as a part of the conference (“Integrated management, sustainable development indicators, spatial planning and monitoring of the South-Eastern Baltic coastal regions”), which took place in Kaliningrad on 26th - 30th of March 2007. Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic were elaborated by EWW project participants beforehand and proposed to stakeholders attending this conference. The recommendations were unanimously adopted by the participants including regional and local authorities from Russia. This seemed to be an important step towards introducing integrative approach towards the sea space and coastal zone in Russia.

The output achieved was following:

- Recommendation paper discussed and adopted by the Russian stakeholder (Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic).
- 14.6. Steering Group Meeting 3 (1day) took place on 20 May 2008 in Riga (for details see action 4.8).
 - 14.7. WG3 third meeting (1 day) took place on 4-5 June 2008 in Gdańsk almost according to schedule (few days later than planned originally). It was attended by fifteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 9, 10, one external expert and five invited guests. At the meeting analytical phase was summed up. The meeting was also used for examining the

experience and good practices of the Balance project in maritime spatial planning. The experts from Denmark introduce the project to the WG3 members. However, the WG3 main discussion concentrated on the 'action plan' following the recommendations adopted in March 2008. The opinions were dispersed. Some participants considered elaboration of an action plan as premature having in mind lack of legal provisions in Russia regulating sea use in an integrative way and dispersion of responsibility for sea management among many institutions. Some others proposed to focus action plan on methodological issues i.e. issues indispensable to introduce sea use planning in Russia and methodology of such planning suited for Russian conditions. After the e-mail exchange in June 2008 the partner no 9 responsible for the WG3 work decided to take the risk to prepare a draft action plan and to discuss it in September 2008 with the WG 3 members. Therefore an additional meeting was requested to be held in September 2008, to conclude the recommendation phase. The following outputs were achieved:

- The experience with Balance project of INTERREG III B was shared.

After the WG3 third meeting the partner no 9 and 10 organised (late June beginning of July 2008) consultation about the follow up of the WG3 in a form of a joint project. In the consultation the information on different ETC Programmes in the BSR were analysed and compared. The results were presented to the WG3 fourth meeting.

- 14.8. WG3 fourth meeting (one day) took place on 2nd September 2008 in Gdańsk. It was attended by thirteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 7, 9, 10 and one external expert. The meeting discussed the final draft of the action programme prepared by the staff of partners no 4 and 10 (Maritime Institute from Gdańsk and Immanuel Kant State University of Russia from Kaliningrad). Also final draft of the sea use register was presented by the partner no.4. The WG3 discussions tackled also the future use of the WG3 results. The presentations to the final/closing conference of EWW were agreed. It was also decided that the WG3 analysis should serve for broader popularization of the issue of maritime spatial planning in the Baltic Sea Region. The partner no 9. agreed to edit (by the end of 2008) from its own resources a *Compendium on Maritime Spatial Planning systems in the Baltic Sea Region countries* composed of two parts: part 1 *Survey of the national instruments and tools for the management of the sea space in the BSR countries* describing legal and institutional aspects of maritime spatial planning systems in the BSR countries and part 2 entitled *Examples of national cases of sea spatial conflicts and potentials*. Partner no.9 promised to invite to this book all other BSR countries while using the WG3 results as the core input. The WG3 also analysed different possibilities of continuation of the WG3 work. After the lively discussion it was decided to use two vehicles for further co-operation: The project BaltSeaPlan already submitted to the BSR Programme (although slightly too abstractive) and the new project to be submitted to the ENPI Programme Lithuania–Poland–Russian Federation on concrete planning work as continuation of the WG3 pilot activities. It was decided that transnational maritime planning should concentrate on Vistula/Kaliningrad lagoon and on Kursiu lagoon.

The WG3 discussed and improved the following documents during its fourth meeting:

- Action plan how to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational sea use planning and ICZM;
- Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application.

- 14.9. Steering Group Meeting 4 (one day) took place on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg (please see action 4.10)

18.2. Assessment of the results of the Action

The central objective of the Action was to promote territorial integration of NW Russia (i.e. the entire Northwest Federal District, including Kaliningrad) into the Baltic Sea region (BSR) in the identified three fields of (1) business development, (2) transport / ICT development and (3) sea use planning and Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM). The starting point was relatively impressive but

slightly idle (from the BSR perspective) developmental potential (in terms of human capital, scientific achievements etc.) of the North West Russia. The task was to develop solutions how to use the potential of the NW Russia for the benefit of the BSR economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development.

The action was successful to that extend that it managed to identify economic and spatial development needs in the NW Russia from the perspective of public authorities and businesses, requiring to be tackled by at the transnational level. This findings were benchmarked against existing good practice solutions based on experience of other BSR countries. The search was also done in order to detect economic and spatial trends, relevant for connecting territorial potentials between the NW Russia and the BSR. However, the picture coming from analysis appeared less promising than expected (see point 2.9). But even in those rather difficult circumstances the recommendations for three mentioned above fields were formulated and action plans were outlined. The main results delivered to the external audience having policy relevance are presented below:

The results achieved	The results intended	Explanation of differences
Recommendations how to improve innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration	Recommendation" paper with suggestions on policy improvements and legislative changes to improve settlement and innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration	The results achieved put less attention to legislative changes than to policy improvements. This is outcome of the survey done in order to learn from Russian businessman what are the main obstacles for them to innovate.
Recommendations how to improve settlement policies in NW Russia (urban rural partnership) from the perspective of BSR integration,		The focus of the result achieved is on urban-rural partnership as key for integrative development of settlement structure in Russia.
Action plan how to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration,	A paper with fields for further concrete actions ("action plan") to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration	Done in line with plans
Recommendations on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR including concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR,	1.Recommendation" paper with suggestions on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR 2. A paper with fields for further concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia and in BY in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR	The recommendations and action plan were merged. The reason is that Russia has very concrete plans and actions in this field for the future years so the WG2 decided to focus on long-term recommendations.
Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic	Recommendation" paper on upgrading the instruments and tools and institutional arrangements for transnational sea use planning and ICZM at the BSR level based on the completed pilot action	More ambitious recommendations were produced than expected i.e. more in line with the real situation in Russia with regard to ICZM and maritime spatial planning
Action plan how to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational sea use planning and	A paper with fields for further concrete actions ("action plan") to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational	Done in line with plans

ICZM	sea use planning and ICZM	
Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application	A sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application - based on the completed system mapping.	Done in line with plans
Agreement between maritime Institute in Gdańsk and Immanuel Kant State University of Russia on further co-operation in the field of maritime spatial planning	Agreements between Polish and Russian relevant institutions on co-operation in sea use planning and management	Done in line with plans

The most important EWW achievement is delivery of main messages resulting from the Action to the important Russian decision makers, planning professionals and scientific sector as well as to the key pan-Baltic organizations such as HELCOM or VASAB. Through VASAB also the EU BSR strategy was influenced.

18.3. The outcome on both final beneficiaries and/or target group and the situation of the target group/target region which the action addressed

The target audience/recipients of the project findings have been decision-makers (ministries responsible for spatial planning and development in the BSR, including the federal government in Russia, regional authorities in NW Russia, pan-Baltic organisations such as VASAB 2010). Thanks to the action they have received a better picture on the situation with regard to the North-West Russia integration into the Baltic Sea region (BSR). This knowledge has been already used for policy making by VASAB in production of the Long Term Spatial Development Perspective and it seems that it will be also useful for the EU Commission in elaboration of the EU BSR strategy and for HELCOM for implementation of the Baltic Sea Action Plan. In fact the Action played a tremendous role in validation of the planning methodologies and strategic documents at the pan-Baltic level based on the NW Russia perspective. The Action gave a proper insight on main drivers and obstacles of integration of the North West Russia into the BSR. The Action findings and recommendations were also delivered to the Russian decision makers and VASAB will continue its efforts to convince them that the BSR integration is beneficial for the North-West Russia. At least in the field of maritime spatial planning as the result of the Action one can see increased capacity and competence basis to take up joint transnational initiatives between the NW Russia partners and institutions from other BSR countries.

The final beneficiaries local and regional governments in the Baltic Sea region (BSR) operators in the chosen thematic fields (e.g. businesses in WP1 and transport operators in WP2) in NW Russia and in the BSR will be influenced mainly through the actions of pan-Baltic organisations mainly VASAB and its Long Term Spatial Development Perspective. This will allow for incorporation of the BSR perspective in the national/regional/local policies in the NW Russia.

18.4. Publications

The following publications were produced:

Name	Number of copies	Distribution channels
The East-West Window brochure informing about the project	300	Distributed during the project events in particular kick-off conference, stakeholder seminar, the Conference "Baltic Sea Region Programme 2007-2013: new partnership opportunities for Russian and Belarusian regions" and many other events
Атлас использования прибрежных акваторий российской части Юго-восточной Балтики (Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application – <i>edited on CD rom</i>)	200	Distributed for free during the EWW final (closing) conference, available for free from partner no.4

The book in Russian: Северо-Запад России в Регионе Балтийского моря: Проблемы и перспективы экономического взаимодействия и сотрудничества (North West Russia in the Baltic Sea region. Problems and perspectives of co-operation and mutual influence) presenting main results of the project	100	Distributed for free by partners no.4 among the project partners and participants of the EWW events. Sent to Russian relevant Ministries and main libraries.
--	-----	--

18.5. Contracts (works, supplies, services) above 5000€ awarded for the implementation of the action since the last interim report

Only one contract above 5000€ was awarded since the last interim report.

	Contract	Amount	Procedure	Winner
1	Audit Services Contract	5 131,94	“negotiated procedure without publication”	<i>SIA Rodl and Partner</i>

18.6. Continuation of the Action after ending the support from the European Community

The action will be continued after ending the EU support for the East West Window project. Durability of the project results has been ensured by the direct participation or the support of the national ministries responsible for spatial planning and development around the BSR, acting under VASAB 2010. Through their co-operation with other relevant stakeholders, the project rendered available concrete recommendations for policy-making in the chosen thematic fields in the NW Russia and at the BSR level. Through intensive dialogue with the target audience, the project influenced planners in Russia neighbouring countries by including the perspective of NW Russia. It also served for modification of pan-Baltic strategic policy papers, long-term visions and development plans on the very same account.

In particular the EWW results were used by VASAB for elaboration of the Long Term Perspective for Spatial Development of the BSR. Thanks to the EWW this will be the document with proper outlook on North-West Russia. Due to the EWW the collaboration between VASAB (ministries) and other EWW partners (research institutes) will be strengthened. The EWW results will be also used for discussing with HELCOM an idea of maritime spatial planning in the Baltic Sea Region.

Follow-up activities in effect of the project will be initiated and promoted by VASAB 2010. This includes starting up of possible new project(s) covering the whole BSR and taking into consideration the needs and perspectives of NW Russia, identified and referred to in the present project. The WG3 work will be continued in a form of the BaltSeaPlan project already approved by the BSR Programme (will start around December 2008). The WG3 partners will also plan to submit the project on elaboration of concrete maritime spatial plans for Vistula and Kursiu Lagoons in the framework of the ENPI Programme Lithuania–Poland–Russian Federation. Despite finishing the work of the WG3 the partner no.9 responsible for its leading has already declared to continue the efforts in a broader BSR set up and started elaboration of the BSR wide “Compendium on Maritime Spatial Planning systems in the Baltic Sea Region countries” using the WG3 results and experience.

18.7. Gender equality, disabilities

Where relevant, the perspective of equal opportunities was taken into account for the thematic work (especially in the fields of business and transport). Due efforts were made to secure involvement of both men and women in the composition of the project management structures, daily work and in the dialogue fora with relevant stakeholders in NW Russia and at the overall BSR level. Spatial planning forming a substance of the project from its definition cares for gender equality, prevention or exclusions of handicapped from the normal life. Although, gender equality and disabilities were not the main focus of the EWW project one can assume that the realisation of the project objectives (integration of the NW Russia into the BSR) will be beneficial in a long run also for attracting attention of Russian decision makers and Russian society to those above mentioned horizontal goals. They are placed very high at civil agenda in particular in the Nordic countries and integration means also convergence in values and way of living so it means better acceptance of these horizontal goals in Russia as well. The same has happened in Poland, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia after their accession to EU (strengthening their European integration).

18.8. Monitoring and evaluation of the activities

Monitoring of activities was done on routine basis by the project Steering Group. The group worked very effectively guiding the project and proposing the changes if necessary. The group (ministerial part) provided also an excellent piece of advice with regard to use of the EWW project results for policy making. However, one should also admit the important role of Committee on Spatial Development of the Baltic Sea Region which was among the main recipients of the project results. The advice from this body and the VASAB Secretariat which took part in majority of the EWW events (on their own money) helped a lot in proper shaping the EWW work and focusing on the policy relevant results (e.g. providing links to HELCOM, EU BSR Strategy etc.).

Also important were feedbacks received from beneficiaries during the kick-off and final (closing) conference. In the Annex 2 quotations from the Conference resolutions are attached (in Russian).

18.9. What has been learned from the Action

The main lesson from the action is that integration of the NW Russia into the Baltic Sea Region (BSR) will not be an easy process. Russia is a global player looking for global organizations and bodies as its partners. Even the regional level i.e. St. Petersburg has sufficient potential to play an important role at the global arena. This is clearly seen in the St. Petersburg government policy and strategic documents. BSR is not the main field of St. Petersburg strategic activity. Slightly different situation is with regard to Kaliningrad, but its potential is sufficient to strengthen rather cross-border than pan-Baltic integration of Russian Federation. The main integrative processes between Russia and the rest of the BSR are hardly due to market forces or conscious decisions of the Russian enterprises but rather thanks to EU financial support in form of transnational and cross-border programmes. The only field in which one can expect more or less natural co-operation between Russia and the other BSR countries is maritime spatial planning as long as it affects coastal defence, fish stock and state of the coastal nature. Russia is very active now in HELCOM where the questions of maritime spatial planning have been already raised.

Therefore strengthening integration of the North-West Russia into the BSR requires further development of the Russian medium size cities such as e.g. Kaliningrad or Pskov, their partnership with adjacent regions, and development of the maritime spatial planning institutions which in natural way will seek for the relations with their closest neighbours.

19. Partners and other Co-operation

19.1. How do you assess the relationship between the formal partners of this Action (i.e. those partners which have signed a partnership statement)? Please specify for each partner organisation

St. Petersburg Administration [2] – partner active for discussing policy relevant documents and organising meetings in St. Petersburg in the field of analysis acting through partner no.3 . Important contribution to the stakeholder dialogue. In fact this partner will be one of the main recipients of the project results.

Russian Economic Developers Association (ASSET) [3] – very demanding from formal point of view but also very experience partner in analytical work. A great bulk of the WG1 recommendations were proposed by this partner. The partner is a great interface between science and policy making in Russia in particular in St. Petersburg. Important role in dissemination activities thanks to good contacts with decision-makers in Russia at local and regional level.

Immanuel Kant State University of Russia [4] – very reliable and enthusiastic partner being a source of many data and information excellent in scientific work acquiring great experience during the EWW project how to translate analysis into policy findings, but in fact majority of recommendations of the WG2 and the WG3 were rooted in partner no. 4 thinking.

Ministry of the Environment, Danish Forest and Nature Agency, Denmark [5] – very active and experienced partner (being responsible in the past for the USUN project) leading the WG 1 work and ensuring proper presentation of EWW at the highest BSR political level.

Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Housing, Germany [6] – very active and experienced partner responsible for urban-rural investigations under the WG1, ensuring proper presentation of EWW at the highest BSR political level.

Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communication, Sweden [7] – partner ensuring link to the EU BSR strategy (use of EWW results also there), acting mainly through partner 8 but very active in the WG2 , active in the WG3 (with very high quality inputs) and contributing to policy relevant findings in the EWW.

Nordic Centre for Spatial Development (NORDREGIO) [8] – one of key drivers for analytical work, competent, flexible with a large knowledge and experience in spatial and regional development.

Ministry of Regional Development, Poland [9] – partner leading the WG3 but active in other work groups, very experienced and very flexible contributing to the work additional resources if project resources are not sufficient.

Maritime Institute, Poland [10] – key resource for maritime spatial planning and ICZM in the project supporting actively the WG3 and coordinating the whole project from content point of view in very reasonable way.

19.2. Is the partnership to continue

The partnership will continue in a form of BSR Programme and ENPI Programme projects on maritime spatial planning. The co-operation agreement between partners no 4 and 10 will serve to this end. The BaltSea Plan was approved by the BSR programme. The project will serve as a continuation and dissemination of the WG3 work and results since both partners no 4 and 10 are among its key drivers.

The EWW project results were also used within the VASAB framework. This means that new partners such as Nordregio, ASSET or Immanuel Kant State University of Russia have joined the VASAB work and their involvement will continue.

19.3. How would you assess the relationship between your organisation and State authorities in the Action countries? How has this relationship affected the Action?

Since majority of the partners are state high level institutions those relations were fine. The partners representing state authorities knew each other for many years before starting the project as the members of the VASAB co-operation (Co-operation of Ministers for spatial planning and development in the BSR countries). The new input was given by the scientific institutions. This was a great added value of the project, mutual learning how to translate analysis into policy relevant actions. The research oriented partners were quite flexible and willing to reshape analysis or repeat them if asked by policy making partners.

19.4. Where applicable, describe your relationship with any other organisations involved in implementing the Action:

- Associate(s) (if any) - no
- Sub-contractor(s) (if any). Some of the work was given to the external contractors. However an idea was that majority of work should be done by the partners themselves since the partners had sufficient qualification to execute the project and achieve its goals. Contractors were used mainly for technical issues and for bringing knowledge from INTERREG projects. Only some partners (9) and (5) used contractors more intensively (for some concrete work) due to shortages in their human resources. In principle the relation with contractors were positive with one exception (i.e. Rumanian contractor who won a tender for the EWW financial management disappeared after few month of serving the project)
- Final Beneficiaries and Target groups. Those relations were fine thanks to sue of well established and prominent conferences for presentation of the EWW. This gave the project access to the target group necessary for the project success.
- Other third parties involved. Important was a link of the project to the VASAB Secretariat and VASAB work on the Long Term Perspective. VASAB Secretariat promoted also project and its results externally on request of the Responsible Partner.

19.5. Where applicable, outline any links you have developed with other actions.

The project ambition was to develop link to other important projects in order to make use of their results (BaltCoast, PlanCoast, Balance, USUN, SeBCo – their experts were invited to the project meetings) or to make joint meetings to better reach target groups (SeBCo POWER and SDI-4-SEB). These projects represented different INTERREG strands.

19.6. If your organisation has received previous EC grants in view of strengthening the same target group, in how far has this Action been able to build upon/complement the previous one(s)? (List all previous relevant EC grants).

The Ministries involved in the project previously received a grant from INTERREG II C to prepare an Action Plan for implementation of the VASAB strategy adopted in 1994. The project was called VASAB Plus and ended in 2000. The EWW used the VASAB Plus experience but its focus was different. This time the target geographical area was the NW Russia and its integration to the BSR. The lesson learned under the VASAB Plus (where Russia had no financial resources for analysis) showed that preparation of a pan-Baltic documents with very differentiate resources might result in uneven involvement of the countries and then uneven ownership of the agreed actions or strategies. Therefore the EWW was invented to avoid such a mistake and to give Russian colleagues resources for considering their role in the BSR integration.

20. Visibility

How is the visibility of the EU contribution being ensured in the Action?

At the project start a press release was done by the Responsible Partner. Visibility was ensured by placing proper information that the EWW project was part-financed by the EU together with the EU logo and logo of INTERREG III B. This was done on printing materials, power point presentation and on the project web site. There was also some information in the Latvian radio. On demand of Russian colleagues the project was presented at the Conference “Baltic Sea Region Programme 2007-2013: new partnership opportunities for Russian and Belarusian regions” in St. Petersburg as one of the most successful INTERREG projects with Russian participation. To strengthen the project visibility a special project banner was produced and displayed on many occasions (e.g. Conference “Baltic Sea region Spatial Development Policies avenues to the Long Term Perspective” in Riga on 23 April 2007, and already mentioned conference “Baltic Sea Region Programme 2007-2013: new partnership opportunities for Russian and Belarusian regions” in St. Petersburg on 16-17 April 2008 and in many other events). The book with the project analysis and recommendations was printed in December 2008. But the most important is that the project results will be used for producing “Long Term Perspective” for the BSR which will be presented to CBSS and all important pan-Baltic organizations. Thanks to EWW NW Russia will be properly highlighted in this strategy.

The European Commission may wish to publicise the results of Actions. Do you have any objection to this report being published on Europe Aid Co-operation Office website? If so, please state your objections here.

Name of the contact person for the Action: **Vladislavs Vesperis**

Signature:Location: **Riga, Latvia**

Date report due:Date report sent:

Update of action plan

Activity	Months																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Activity 1: Kick off of the work of Working Group no 1 on business development and innovation affecting spatial development,	X	X	X	X														
Activity 2: Analysis(WG1)				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Activity 3: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR (WG1)					X						X						X	
Activity 4: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations and action plan (WG1)					X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Activity 5: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 2 on accessibility				X														
Activity 6: Analysis(WG2)					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Activity 7: Pilot studies (WG2)												X	X	X	X	X		
Activity 8: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR					X						X						X	X
Activity 9: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG2)					X	X		X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Activity 10: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 3 on ICZM and transnational sea use planning		X			X													
Activity 11 Analysis (WG 3)					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					
Activity 12 Pilot Action (WG 3)					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
Activity 13: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR					X						X						X	
Activity 14: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG3)					X			X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		

EWV events: participation of man and woman

Participants			
Event	Woman	Man	Total
Kick off meeting of the work of WG1, on 25 June 2007 in Riga	9	11	20
WG1 meeting 25 September 2007 in Riga	4	3	7
WG1 analysis (people involved)	11	23	34
Steering Group meeting on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg	7	11	18
St Petersburg kick off conference on 18-19 October 2007	112	146	259
St Petersburg Closing conference on 21 October 2008	231	400	631
WG1 second meeting on 6-7 December 2007 in Riga	9	10	19
Synergy meeting no.1 on 31 January 2008 in Riga	10	13	23
Steering Group Meeting no.2 on 1 February 2008 in Riga	4	11	15
Synergy meeting no 2 in Liepaja on 14 th of March 2008	8	8	16
WG1 fourth meeting on 3-4 April 2008 in Riga	6	7	13
Riga Stakeholders seminars (WG3 and WG1 + WG2) on 23 April 2008	83	84	167
WG1 fifth meeting on 24 April 2008 in Riga	13	12	25
Steering Group Meeting no. 3 on 20 May 2008 in Riga	4	6	10
Steering Group Meeting no. 4 on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg	3	10	13
WG1 sixth meeting on 3 rd September 2008 in Jurmala	11	11	22
WG2 first meeting on 10 October 2007 in Riga	3	6	9
WG2 analysis	6	11	17
WG2 second meeting on 5 December 2007 in Riga	4	7	11
WG2 third meeting on 21 May 2008 in Riga	2	7	9
WG2 fourth meeting on 4 th September 2008 in Jurmala	9	11	20
WG3 preparatory meeting on 24 July 2007 in Kaliningrad	4	10	14
WG 3 first meeting on 30-31 October 2007 in Kaliningrad	12	15	27
WG3 analysis	3	11	14
Pilot Action (WG 3)	3	10	13
WG3 second meeting on 27-28 March 2008 in Kaliningrad	6	13	19
WG3 third meeting on 4-5 June 2008 in Gdańsk	6	15	21
WG3 fourth meeting 2 September 2008 in Gdańsk	3	11	14

Quotations from the Conference resolutions (in Russian) in direct relations to the EAST West Window.

9. Kick Off Conference

Продвижение европейского опыта в рамках программ Европейского Инструмента Соседства и Партнерства усилит инновационный потенциал и влияние Северо-Западного региона России на процессы территориальной интеграции на внешних границах ЕС, в частности, в регионе Балтийского моря. В этих целях целесообразна активизация участия России в таких международных объединениях, как VASAB 2010, Балтийский форум развития (BDF), Программа транснационального сотрудничества региона Балтийского моря 2007-2013.

Зарубежный опыт свидетельствует о значительной роли малых и средних городов в продвижении инноваций и гармонизации территориального развития. Этот факт должен учитываться при разработке инновационных стратегий в России как на федеральном, так и на региональном уровнях. Необходимо уделять больше внимания развитию малых и средних городов, как это происходит в странах ЕС, и адаптировать европейский опыт применительно к ситуации в России (в частности, концепцию сельско-городского партнерства «ESDP Concept of Rural-Urban Partnership»). Доступ к знаниям и информации, возможность обмена идеями должны стать основой формирования территориальных моделей развития России.

/.../

Участники Форума согласились со следующим:

- необходимо особое единое государственное управление морскими прибрежными зонами страны (обеими их составляющими: морской и сухопутной) исходя из повсеместного успешного мирового опыта подобной деятельности и соответствующих рекомендаций организаций системы ООН и международных форумов на высшем уровне. Руководствуясь этим, рекомендовать: 1) создание нормативной правовой и институциональной базы для разработки и реализации комплексных программ развития и управления прибрежными зонами в рамках комплексных программ социально-экономического развития приморских субъектов Федерации и программ развития прибрежных муниципальных образований в целях активизации участия последних в освоении прибрежных и морских ресурсов; 2) адаптацию и освоение современных управленческих технологий (методология Комплексного управления прибрежными зонами (КУПЗ)) в применении к богатейшим по ресурсам и разнообразным по природным и социально-экономическим условиям прибрежным зонам страны; 3) разработку и реализацию пилотных программ КУПЗ конкретных побережий страны; 4) использование опыта сотрудничества стран Балтийского региона, в частности рекомендаций Проекта BaltCoast BSR INTERREG III B по управлению прибрежными зонами и разработке совместных стратегических проектов;
- рекомендовать использование кластерного подхода в качестве инструмента реализации стратегий развития территорий и повышения конкурентоспособности региональной и муниципальной экономики, включая выявление и диагностику потенциальных кластеров, разработку программ их развития, создание организаций по сотрудничеству. В органах власти необходимо формирование межотраслевых рабочих групп для координации развития кластеров и снятия ведомственных и отраслевых ограничений. Целесообразно более широкое использование международных программ и инструментов повышения конкурентоспособности кластеров;
- необходимо развитие региональной и муниципальной статистики, в частности для целей выработки эффективной кластерной политики и оценки результатов реализации кластерных инициатив в регионе и/или муниципалитете, формирования действенных

инструментов планирования и управления, ориентированного на результат на субфедеральных уровнях;

- при реализации федеральных, региональных и местных программ экономического развития необходимо стимулировать участие организаций инновационной инфраструктуры в российских и зарубежных сетевых организациях, которые оказывают содействие в предоставлении услуг компаниям и научным организациям в сфере инновационной бизнес-кооперации и трансфера технологий (примерами могут служить Российская сеть трансфера технологий RTTN, Европейская сеть бизнес-инновационных центров EBN). Участие в сетевом сотрудничестве должно быть нацелено на повышение качества и содержания услуг для местных компаний и НИИ. Федеральным и региональным органам власти необходимо поддерживать инициативы по развитию сетевого взаимодействия между организациями инновационной региональной инфраструктуры (создание региональных сетей) с целью уменьшения дублирования функций, повышения качества услуг и снижения расходов бюджета на их субсидирование;
- рекомендовать и стимулировать участие российских центров коммерциализации, инновационных центров в реализации Competitiveness Innovation Program (CIP) Европейского союза в части проектов, ориентированных на развитие инновационных сетей и сетей трансфера технологий (IRC, IRE, EBN и др.);
- считать целесообразным использование в России европейского опыта реализации региональных инновационных стратегий, обеспечивающих выявления спроса на инновации среди компаний и ориентацию научного сектора и инновационной инфраструктуры на удовлетворение этого спроса. (...);
- в целях совершенствования государственного и муниципального управления по обеспечению перехода Российской Федерации на инновационный путь развития рекомендовать Комиссии при Президенте Российской Федерации по вопросам совершенствования государственного управления и правосудия, Министерству регионального развития Российской Федерации, другим заинтересованным федеральным и региональным органам власти осуществить экспертизу полномочий органов государственной власти субъектов Российской Федерации и органов местного самоуправления в части выявления проблемных вопросов, препятствующих обеспечению перехода России на режим инновационного развития, и законодательно обеспечить активизацию участия в реализации государственной научно-технической политики органов государственной власти субъектов Федерации и органов местного самоуправления, рассмотреть возможность разработки национальной программы, ориентированной на содействие российским регионам в подготовке и реализации региональных инновационных стратегий и формирование российской сети инновационных регионов;
- рекомендовать заинтересованным федеральным и региональным органам государственной власти реализовать систему мер по поддержке технопарков и процессов коммерциализации научных разработок. В частности: разработать законодательную базу для развития технопарков на федеральном уровне; предоставить налоговые льготы компаниям-резидентам технопарков, например, аналогичные льготам для резидентов ОЭЗ; упростить процедуру предоставления земельных участков для технопарков; законодательно разрешить НИИ, вузам и университетам создавать малые предприятия - start-up'ы;
- рекомендовать органам регионального и муниципального управления активно использовать инструменты международной технической и финансовой помощи, предоставляемой по линии Института Всемирного Банка, АМР США, Европейского Инструмента Соседства и Партнерства (ENPI) и других программ Европейского Союза для реализации стратегических приоритетов и планов территориального развития, поддержки инноваций;
- отметить необходимость выработки механизма интеграции документов стратегического планирования муниципального, регионального и федерального уровней;
- одобрить инициативы Комитета по пространственному развитию региона Балтийского моря (CSD/BSR) VASAB 2010 по территориальной интеграции Северо-Запада России и реализации совместных проектов в таких приоритетных сферах как развитие бизнеса, транспорта, ИКТ, управление прибрежными зонами. Отметить актуальность проекта «Окно

Восток-Запад", который позволит восполнить пробелы в оценке инновационного потенциала Северо-Запада России и расширит возможности синергии инновационных потенциалов стран Балтийского региона.

- предложить Комитету VASAB 2010 использовать Форум лидеров стратегического планирования городов и регионов России в качестве референтной группы для обсуждения Стратегии пространственного развития региона Балтийского моря.

10. Closing Conference

10.1. «Перспективы развития Северо-Западного федерального округа: вызовы, приоритеты, угрозы и ограничения»

Участники рекомендуют:

- 13) в целях максимального учёта сложившихся межсубъектовых экономических связей, обеспечения увязки общегосударственных и региональных планов и прогнозов социально-экономического развития, целесообразно предусмотреть **разработку стратегических документов долгосрочного социально-экономического развития на уровне федеральных округов**. Для преодоления ведомственной и региональной разобщённости целесообразно поручить эту работу Ассоциациям экономического взаимодействия соответствующих федеральных округов. Это позволит точнее формулировать цели регионального развития в увязке с имеющимися общими ресурсами, объективно сформировать перечень основных межрегиональных проектов, обеспечивающих достижение общих целей развития. Подобные документы могут стать основой для последующей разработки Концепции долгосрочного социально-экономического развития Российской Федерации;
- 14) для ускорения социально-экономического развития территорий требуется **активизация межрегионального взаимодействия**. Зачастую депрессивные регионы (субъекты Федерации) экономически тесно связаны с успешными регионами (транспортные подходы к инфраструктурным объектам, наличие сырьевой базы для обрабатывающих производств и т.п.). В этом случае целесообразно оказывать федеральную помощь (налоговые и иные льготы, государственные гарантии под привлекаемые кредиты, первоочередное финансирование проектов в рамках действующих ФЦП и др.) для инфраструктурного развития депрессивных территорий по поддерживаемым видам и направлениям экономической деятельности, а также для реализации проектов способствующих комплексному развитию двух и более субъектов Федерации;
- 15) необходимым условием развития и Северо-Западного федерального округа и страны в целом является **совершенствование работы транспортного комплекса**. Требуется системный подход к формированию единой стратегии развития транспортно-логистического комплекса страны в увязке с развитием отраслей экономики и внешнеэкономической ситуацией.

10.2. «Специфика стратегий приморских регионов»

Участники считают, что

- 13) Необходимо совершенствование стратегического планирования применительно к морской деятельности и приморским регионам и муниципалитетам, предусматривающее:

на федеральном уровне:

- применение интегральных подходов к планированию и управлению в морском природопользовании. Это позволит преодолеть фрагментарность, присущую отраслевому подходу, учесть взаимосвязанность видов морского природопользования, способствовать связям и межотраслевой гармонизации в морской деятельности исходя из анализа конфликтного использования ресурсов, обеспечить многоцелевую ориентацию и соответствие

деятельности природоохранным целям, участие всех заинтересованных сторон в разработке стратегий и программ развития;

- создание нормативной правовой и институциональной базы для разработки и реализации комплексных программ развития и управления прибрежными зонами, основанных на интегральных подходах, в рамках стратегий и программ социально-экономического развития приморских субъектов Федерации и программ развития прибрежных муниципальных образований. Это позволит реализовать особое единое государственное управление морскими прибрежными зонами страны (обеими их составляющими: морской и сухопутной) исходя из повсеместного успешного мирового опыта подобной деятельности и соответствующих рекомендаций организаций системы ООН и международных форумов на высшем уровне;

на региональном уровне:

- адаптацию и освоение современных управленческих технологий (методология Комплексного управления прибрежными зонами - КУПЗ) в применении к богатейшим по ресурсам и разнообразным по природным и социально-экономическим условиям прибрежным зонам страны;
- разработку и реализацию пилотных программ КУПЗ конкретных побережий страны.

Реализация этих мер позволит реализовать естественные природные конкурентные преимущества морских акваторий и прибрежных территорий в обеспечении дополнительного экономического роста, конкурентоспособности, инвестиционной привлекательности, занятости, повышения комфортности и качества жизни, охраны окружающей среды и уменьшения ущерба от природных и техногенных катастроф, а также безопасности страны

- 14) Необходимо совершенствование нормативной правовой базы, регулирующей градостроительную деятельность, в части учета специфики этой деятельности на морских акваториях, находящихся под суверенитетом и юрисдикцией Российской Федерации.
- 15) Необходимо развивать международное сотрудничество в стратегическом планировании морского природопользования, учитывая единство и экосистемный характер морских процессов, и широко использовать международный опыт в этой сфере.

FINAL NARRATIVE REPORT

21. Description

21.1. Name of beneficiary of grant contract: Ministry of Regional Development and Local Government, Latvia (Reģionālās attīstības un pašvaldību lietu ministrija).

21.2. Name and title of the Contact person: Mr Vladislavs Vesperis.

21.3. Name of partners in the Action: St. Petersburg Administration (Администрация Губернатора Санкт-Петербурга) [2], Russian Economic Developers Association (ASSET) (Ассоциация специалистов по экономическому развитию территорий) [3], Immanuel Kant State University of Russia (Российский государственный университет имени И. Канта) [4], Ministry of the Environment, Danish Forest and Nature Agency²¹, Denmark (Miljøministeriet, Skov- og Naturstyrelsen) [5], Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Housing, Germany (Bundesministeriums für Verkehr, Bau und Stadtentwicklung) [6], Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communication, Sweden (Näringsdepartementet) [7], Nordic Centre for Spatial Development (NORDREGIO) [8], Ministry of Regional Development, Poland (Ministerstwo Rozwoju Regionalnego) [9], Maritime Institute, Poland (Instytut Morski) [10].

21.4. Title of the Action: East-West Window (EWW).

21.5. Contract number: Grant Contract for European Community External Actions **2007/132-845**.

21.6. Start date and end date of the reporting period²²: 15.06.2007 – 15.12.2008.

21.7. Target country(ies) or region(s): **North-West Russia in particular: St. Petersburg, Leningrad region and Kaliningrad region**; to some extent also Belarus and North-West Russia adjacent countries (mainly for collecting good practices and dissemination of the project results).

21.8. Final beneficiaries &/or target groups²³ (if different). The target audience/recipients of the project findings are: decision-makers (ministries responsible for spatial planning and development in the BSR, including the federal government in Russia, regional authorities in

²¹ The name of the partner 5 was changed during the EWW project execution **from** Ministry of the Environment, Danish Forest and Nature agency **to** Ministry of the Environment, Agency for Spatial and Environmental Planning (Miljøministeriet, By- og Landskabsstyrelsen).

²² The entire implementation period of the Action

²³ “Target groups” are the groups/entities who will be directly positively affected by the project at the Project Purpose level, and “final beneficiaries” are those who will benefit from the project in the long term at the level of the society or sector at large.

NW Russia, pan-Baltic organisations such as VASAB 2010). The final beneficiaries are local and regional governments in the Baltic Sea region (BSR) operators in the chosen thematic fields (e.g. businesses in WP1 and transport operators in WP2) in NW Russia and in the BSR. The divide into men and women of different project activities is provided separately.

21.9. Country (ies) in which the activities take place (if different from 1.7): Russia (St. Petersburg and Kaliningrad Oblast), Poland and Latvia.

22. Assessment of implementation of Action activities

22.1. Activities and results (for the whole reporting period including last narrative interim report)

Activity 1: Kick off of the work of Working Group no 1 on business development and innovation affecting spatial development,

1.16. First meeting of the WG1 (1 day) took place on 25 June 2007 in Riga which was according to the schedule. The meeting was planned in advance in late June so participants postponed their holidays which in this part of the BSR starts with so called Midsummer. The meeting was attended by 12 participants representing partners 1,3,4,5,6,8,9,10 and eight invited guests. The main aim was to discuss the analysis and further WG1 work in detail, to achieve clarity about division of labour between the partners, to make sure that duplication with other project is avoided (instead to aim at using results achieved by other projects) and to start the process of contracting the external experts. The following outputs were produced or achieved:

- Report how to avoid duplication with other INTERREG III B projects in the field of business development and innovation affecting spatial development had been prepared before the meeting by the project coordinator, discussed by the meeting and delivered to the Responsible (Lead) Partner.
- TORs for seven ASSET staff members, eight Kaliningrad University staff members, one Belarus expert and four external experts together with tender documentation (if necessary) have been prepared by project coordinator as result of the meeting. Tender procedures for the four external experts had been started resulting in contracting one external expert from Poland, one from Sweden, one from Latvia and one from Denmark. In addition the Belarus expert was contracted by the partner no. 8 without tender (contract below 5000 Euro).
- The main scope of analysis was proposed and discussed. Unfortunately too many question marks and uncertainties appeared during the June meeting so the additional meeting was organized in Riga in September and discussion on analysis continued till the second WG1 meeting (December 2007).
- Text for EWW section at to the VASAB website was decided, technically EWW link at VASAB website was created in September 2007.
- Project flyer was designed and edited including information on WG1 activities (300 copies were printed in October 2007).

Comments: The WG1 started the discussion on its work (i.e. necessary analysis, results to be achieved) but the topic was too broad for one day meeting in addition to many technical questions were raised. The decision was to continue the discussion when the experts contracted by tender would be available. The main problem was to what extend the achievement of the EWW goal (i.e. *to promote territorial integration of NW Russia into the BSR in the field of business development*)

required concentration on analysis concerning exclusively NW Russia and to what extent the broader BSR picture was necessary if integration should mean reciprocal relations (i.e. affecting both sides). The latter opinion prevailed and was accepted by the meeting. The WG1 considered that for producing the main output of the analytical phase (i.e. a *compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") with assessment of unexploited innovation potential in NW Russia, assessment of the potential for regional integration and with identification of spatial problems in NW Russia and BSR*) some BSR analysis as the background material should be done as well. The meeting also discussed the policy related role of the project i.e. better highlighting the EWW results on NW Russia role in the “Long Term Perspective” to be prepared by VASAB on CBSS demand. The WG1 leaders promised to ensure smooth transfer of the EWW results to the BSR strategy i.e. Long Term Perspective till 2030 (to be prepared by VASAB in 2009). The Responsible Partner declared that he would invite VASAB Secretariat to the most important meetings of the EWW to ensure smooth transfer of the project results to the “Long Term Perspective”.

- 1.17. Partnership Agreement Preparation. This action was related to all work packages and took place in June, July, August, and September 2007 and was ended in October 2007 with signing partnership agreements between Lead Partner and all other partners of the EWW project. The most difficult was signing Partnership Agreement with partners from St. Petersburg due to problems related to tax and system in Russia, conversion of EUR into rubels, banking system requirements etc. Finally two agreements, based on the results of additional working meeting (in Riga) discussions, were prepared and signed between Lead Partner and RU (ASSET) Partner and between German Partner and RU (ASSET) Partner. So at the end of the day there were 9 partnership agreements signed regulating relations between the EWW partners.
- 1.18. Quality Workshop (1 day) for Project leaders organised by INTERREG III B Secretariat and EU Delegation from Moscow in Riga on 26 September 2007 was attended by project coordinator (partner no.10), one representative of Russian partners (partner no.2) and representatives appointed by the Responsible Partner. Main guidelines from EC Delegation and INTERREG III B Secretariat on TACIS rules, payments schemes and communication experiences were presented during the seminar and later on at individual consultations. The meeting between Responsible Partner and the Russian partners was organized back to back with the workshop for discussing main technicalities of their participation in the project.

Activity 2: Analysis(WG1)

- 2.11. WG1 additional meeting (1 day) took place on 25 September 2007 in Riga to continue discussion on the scope of analysis. The meeting was attended by four WG1 members (including two external experts, project coordinator and the representative of the Russian partners) and three participants representing Responsible Partner. At the meeting in depth discussion on case studies on innovation, outsourcing and urban-rural relations in Russia took place and the detailed scope of the work of Russian partners and external experts were agreed. Also a draft outline structure of the WG1 analytical report was presented by the WG1 Coordinator and discussed in depth.
- 2.12. Data collection and interpretation started only in December 2007 after the second WG1 meeting. In this phase 34 people from all partners were involved (except partner no.7 who acted through partner no. 8). Their involvement differed. The main bulk of analytical work was done by partners no. 3, 4 and 8 and the external experts whereas the other people acted mainly as a reference group reading reports, making comments and asking for improvements. This was the task first of all of partners no. 1, 2, 5, 6, 9 and 10 representing mainly policy making side in the project and project coordination. Also VASAB Secretariat was invited by partner 1 (Responsible Partner) to participate in this process. The analysis (data collection) in principle were ended in March 2008 but some of them (requiring surveys) due to formal reasons (tenders) were completed in April 2008. Interpretation of data was

done in April 2008 for all important cases (but some analysis e.g. the benchmarking studies and urban-rural analysis continued till September 2008). In fact in April and even in May and June the fine tuning of analysis (removing mistakes noticed by the other partners) still continued. The reason was that some partners from the reference group were very demanding asking for many improvements even if they had found little inconsistencies after second or third reading of the reports. Therefore the final synthesis report (draft discussion paper) from the analytical phase was completed only in July 2008 and even slightly changed after the WG1 September 2008 meeting and as the result of the EWW final/closing Conference in October 2008.

The outputs have been following:

(i) interim:

- Data (including public surveys) and draft analytical report on “Baltic” metropolitan areas with focus on the role of Kaliningrad and St. Petersburg;
- In depth study on St. Petersburg and Kaliningrad and their developmental potentials in the BSR context (focus on innovation and outsourcing) in which: trends and present policies for innovations nested in NW Russia and outsourcing were analysed, barriers for innovations perceived by business and public administration were identified (based on surveys), and cases on transfer of innovations between NW Russia and other parts of the BSR were described;
- Case studies (reports) on Russian and Belarus small and medium sized cities – covering: Novgorod, Gatchina, Chernyakhovsk, Gusev, Sovetsk, Svetly, Berezovka, Zaslavl;
- Reports on demographic trends in North-West Russia, in St. Petersburg and in Kaliningrad and in Belarus as well;
- Reports on case studies on urban-rural relations in Russia;
- Report on INTERREG III B projects results relevant for work of the WG1 group;
- Benchmarking studies concerning situation in Poland, Germany and Latvia on the issues relevant for the WG1 recommendations .

(ii) A compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") with assessment of unexploited innovation potential in NW Russia, assessment of the potential for regional integration and with identification of spatial problems in NW Russia and BSR.

Comments:

a) All the planned outcomes were achieved. However, during the analytical phase became clear that for the NW Russia innovation is more promising path for integration within the BSR than outsourcing, therefore more efforts were done to analyse this challenge. The list of outputs was enlarged (in comparison to the planned ones) by analysis of the role of the NW Russia in the BSR context (as the result of the WG1 discussions what analysis are necessary to achieve the EWW goal). Also urban structures and functional urban areas of not only large but also some small cities were analysed. The most interesting case appeared to be Gatchina as an example of science intensive cluster in Russia located in a small city. The some other cases illustrated urban-rural relations in Russia (and Belarus).

b) While working with data it became clear that translating data into policy recommendations can not be done by each working group separately. Therefore at the meeting of the WG leaders in December it was proposed that for the starting work on recommendation a workshop for all WGs would be necessary. The Responsible Partner was asked to organize such a workshop on 31st of January 2008 instead of simple WG1 seminar (planned for that date).

c) The work was delayed by some formal constraints such as tender procedures, requirement of separate EUR accounts (very difficult for Ministries) etc.

Activity 3: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR (WG1)

- 3.1. Kick off Conference of the project (1,5 day) for broad public took place on 18-19 October 2007 (according schedule) in St. Petersburg as a part of the well known VI Forum of Strategic Planning Leaders of Cities and Regions of Russia. This allowed project to reach the planned target group. The project: its assumptions and the planned outputs were presented to the Russian decision makers - mainly city mayors and chief planners. Conference participants expressed a deep hope that EWW project would diminish knowledge gaps within the Baltic Sea Region on the character of development potential of the NW Russia, its synergies and complementarities with potentials of other countries of the region, and on methods how this potential could be efficiently connected within the BSR. It was expressed in Conference recommendations that EWW project results should be presented in 2008 at the final Conference within VII Forum of Strategic Planning Leaders of Cities and Regions of Russia. The kick off conference was attended by 259 participants mainly Russian mayors and city planners. Among them there were 57 persons outside Russia. From EWW project 20 persons participated including Latvian State Secretary representing the Responsible Partner. So EWW reached the planned target of **200** Russian decision makers and professionals involved in discussion on the project.
- 3.2. Stakeholder Seminar for WG1 (0,5 day) was organised on 23 April 2008 in Riga (instead of beginning of May as originally planned). The preliminary results of the analytical phase were presented and the first discussions on the recommendations were started. The seminars for all working groups of EWW were arranged back to back with the VASAB annual conference financed by the Latvian Ministry of Regional Development and Local Government from its own means i.e. outside the EWW budget (from the EWW budget some partners only covered their travelling to the EWW seminars). The described above arrangement resulted in very impressive participation in the seminars and allowed to reach a planned target of **100** decision makers and businessman from BSR EU countries involved in discussion of the project findings and recommendations. The conference and seminars were attended by 167 participants including 26 persons directly involved in the EWW project (although the Responsible Partner was represented by some more employees). The participants came mainly from Latvia, Lithuania, and Finland but also from Azerbaijan, Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, EU Commission, Germany, Hungary, Norway, Poland, Russia and Sweden.
- 3.3. Closing(final) Conference of the project (1 day) for broad public took place on 21st October 2008 (according schedule) in St. Petersburg. The title of the conference was “Promoting territorial integration of the North West Russia into the Baltic Sea Region”. The main organiser was ASEET together with the EWW Responsible Partner. This Conference was a part of rich spectrum of the conferences and seminars taking place under umbrella (the same premises) of the VII All-Russia Forum of Strategic Planning Leaders “Strategic Planning in Regions and Cities of Russia”. In the event 631 participants took place out of it 582 from Russia. The forum was organized by: State Duma of the Russian Federation; Ministry for Regional Development of the Russian Federation; Ministry for Economic Development of the Russian Federation; St Petersburg City Administration; Center of Strategic Research; ISCER Leontief Centre. It was opened by Mr Dmitry Kozak, Minister of Regional Development, who underlined that “Forum is becoming the public debating platform for improving the strategic planning system of social and economic development in Russian regions”. The Conference “Promoting territorial integration of the North West Russia into the Baltic Sea region” was composed of four sessions attended by large number of the participants not only from Russia but also from other Baltic Sea Region countries. Some sessions were joint ventures with other organisations, forums and bodies interested in the subjects raised by the EWW project. The names of the sessions were following:
 - “Accessibility and innovations as motors of integration of the NW Russia into the Baltic Sea Region” (presentation of the results of the WG1 and the WG2),

- “Special Features of coastal regional strategies” (presentation of the WG3 results and dialogue with all key persons in Russia dealing with ICZM and maritime spatial planning),
- “Partnership mechanisms in local economic policy implementation” (presentation of the WG1 results with regard to urban-rural partnership).

In addition to that EWW results were presented at the key session of the Forum “Prospects for Federal Okrug Development: Challenges, priorities, threats and constraints. North-West Federal Okrug” attended by key decision makers from the North-West Federal Okrug.

Comments:

The choice of the formula of the kick-off and closing conferences appeared to have very positive results on ability of the project to deliver results to the key target groups in Russia. The Conference was also attended by the Ministerial partners from the EWW project. The EWW results were mirrored in the Forums resolutions. Some interested questions were raised requiring further discussion and examination.

- 3.4. Final publication The book summing up the results of the investigations available for the stakeholders in Kaliningrad and St.Petersburg was edited in October, November and printed in December 2008 by partner no.4.

Comments:

The number of books published was smaller (100) than assumed in the application (400), although the whole budget allocated to this purpose was used. There were several reasons why the printing was more expensive than expected. Some of them were of technical reasons: i.e. the book had more coloured pictures (maps) than estimated and was thicker than planned (more than 300 pages in comparison to 150 pages planned), but the main reason was of vis mayor nature. In 2008 in Russia an unexpected inflation and economic crisis appeared which could not be taken into account at the stage of budget planning. This resulted in much higher printing costs. However, the partner no.4 is ready to print additional copies of the book if demanded. The available copies will be distributed to the most active in the EWW Russian stakeholders and to the project partners of the EWW.

Activity 4: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations and action plan (WG1)

- 4.1. Steering Group Meeting (1 day) took place on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg according to schedule. The meeting was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1,2,3,5,6,7,9,10 and seven invited guests. The Steering Group discussed the project progress. The work was lagging behind the schedule. Although the WG1 started on time it became involved in lengthy discussions about the necessary scope of analysis and detailed division of labour between working groups. The Steering Group decided therefore not to start the work on recommendations before improving synergy between the work of the working groups. This task was given to the meeting of the WGs leaders organised in Riga back to back with the WG2 (5 December 2007) and the WG1 (6-7 December 2007) meetings. The meeting also discussed details of project presentation to the kick-off conference held next day.
- 4.2. WG1 second meeting (1,5 day) took place on 6-7 December 2007 in Riga (instead of late November). The meeting was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10, two external consultants and six invited guests. The meeting concentrated on discussing analytical phase of the project (the decision was that the lagging behind analysis would make necessary to postpone by two months the next WG1 meeting i.e. till the end of analytical phase). However, the WG 1 also started examining the way of preparation of the recommendations out of the analysis conducted. For the starting work on recommendation it was agreed that a workshop for all WGs would be necessary and the

Responsible Partner was asked to organize such a workshop (synergy meeting) on 31st of January 2008 instead of a simple WG1 seminar (scheduled for beginning of February).

- 4.3. Synergy meeting no.1 (1 day) took place in Riga on 31 of January 2008 (replacing the WG1 seminar scheduled for February). It was attended by fourteen project partner members representing partners no.1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, three external experts and six invited guests. The facilitator was hired by the Responsible Partner. During the meeting the participants agreed that all three working groups were in need of a common frame. This should be given by the vision of the BSR till 2030 with full integration of the North-West Russia. The participants managed to prepare an outline of such a vision requiring further work. The meeting asked for one more working day for finishing common visionary frame which should allow preparing meaningful recommendations.
- 4.4. Steering Group Meeting 2 took place on 1 of February 2008 in Riga. It was attended by seven project partner members representing partners no. 1,3,5,6,7, 9, 10 one external expert and seven invited guests. The results of the synergy meeting were discussed i.e. synergy between the work of the working groups. It was decided to organise one more synergy meeting to continue work on the common frame for all WGs, i.e. vision of the BSR till 2030 with full integration of the North-West Russia. An agenda of the April Conference proposed by the Responsible Partner was discussed together with some technical issues. The progress in analytical phase was reviewed.
- 4.5. Synergy meeting no. 2 (1 day) took place in Liepaja on 14th of March 2008. It was attended by ten project partner members representing partners no. 1,3,5,6,9, 10 one external expert and five invited guests. The facilitator was hired by the Responsible Partner but paid from Responsible Partner own means. The final draft of the vision was discussed and shared by participants giving stable frame for analytical part and allowing proper work on recommendations.
- 4.6. WG1 fourth meeting (1 day) took place on 3-4 April 2008 in Riga. It was attended by nine project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 8, 10, two external experts and two invited guests. The meeting was convened on demand of Russian partners who started finalisation of analytical part and wanted to discuss the preliminary results among themselves. It was also important for conceptualization of the recommendations i.e. discussing what findings from analytical phase should be taken into consideration while working on recommendations.
- 4.7 WG1 fifth meeting (one day) took place on 24 April 2008 in Riga. It was attended by fifteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, four external experts and six invited guests. The WG1 before the meeting concentrated mainly on analytical work. At the fifth meeting analyses were summed up and the work on recommendations were started. However, one more meeting was requested (autumn 2008) in order to discuss the final draft of the recommendations and action programme. Due to delay in the work on urban-rural relations in Russia the relevant reports were not presented to the WG1 at this meeting. Only an overview of the progress and main findings were reported. It was decided that for synergy reasons the reports would be presented on seminar on urban-rural relations in Russia to be organised as a joint event with the SeBCo project in Kaliningrad in June 2008. This was realised and such presentation took place and was regarded as a great success by meeting participants.
- 4.8. Steering Group Meeting 3 (one day) took place on 20 May 2008 in Riga. It was attended by five project partner members representing partners no. 1, 5, 9, 10, and five invited guests. The Steering Group discussed the project progress. The results of the second synergy meeting and the April Conference were examined as well as a draft vision of the BSR till 2030 with full integration of the North-West Russia. The Steering Group decided to close analytical part and start the work on recommendations. However, the WG3 leaders asked for additional benchmark study on the results of the INTERREG projects in the field of competences of the WG3 with focus on the German experience. This was to diminish discrepancies between the WGs, since the WG1 and the WG2 already had such type of

expertises included in their work. The problems with travelling budget of Russian partners were discussed once more together with a problem of disappeared financial manager. The Steering Group also continued a discussion on political use of the EWW results i.e. incorporation of the results into the Long Term Perspective of VASAB to be produced in 2009. The output achieved:

- first draft recommendation papers (in outline format) of WG1 and WG2.

4.9. WG1 sixth meeting (one day) took place on 03 September 2008 in Jurmala. It was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, four external experts and seven invited guests. They discussed the final draft of the recommendations and action programme prepared during holiday time 2008 by ASSET, Immanuel Kant State University of Russia (Kaliningrad), Nordregio staff, and external experts. The whole work on urban-rural relations in Russia the relevant analytic reports were presented to the WG1 at this meeting as well. The WG1 discussed and improved the following documents:

- Recommendations how to improve innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Recommendations how to improve settlement policies in NW Russia (urban rural partnership) from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Action plan how to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration.

4.10. Steering Group Meeting 4 (one day) took place on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg. It was attended by 7 project partner members representing partners no. 2, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10 one external expert and 6 invited guests. The group discussed the shape of final publications of the EWW project, the use of the analytical materials and endorsed the recommendations and action proposed by the project. The main discussion was on the proper use of the EWW results for the Long Term Perspective (LTP) of VASAB elaboration of which was started few month ago (August 2008). The EWW results were placed to the different parts of the LTP outcomes. The VASAB consultant responsible for facilitating the LTP process was invited to the Steering Group meeting. It was also discussed how to use EWW outcomes for the process of preparation of the BSR EU Strategy. The partner no.5 arranged a meeting with the EU Commission on that topic. It was decided that the EWW results would be incorporated in the VASAB non-paper to be presented to the EU Commission in November/December 2008 in order to influence strategy preparation. The outputs achieved (as results of the meeting):

- Final draft of the recommendations how to improve innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Final draft of recommendations how to improve settlement policies in NW Russia (urban rural partnership) from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Final draft of the action plan how to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration,
- Final draft of recommendations on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR including concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR,
- Final action plan how to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational sea use planning and ICZM,
- Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic,
- Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application,
- Forwarding (transferring of EWW results) to important BSR processes namely: EU BSR Strategy and VASAB Long Term Perspective.

Activity 5: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 2 on accessibility

5.1. WG2 first meeting (one day) took place on 10 October 2007 in Riga It was attended by five project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 8, 10, one external expert and three

invited guests. The main aim was to discuss the scope of analysis (concrete meaning of accessibility) and the further work of the WG2 step by step, to achieve clarity about division of labour between the partners, to make sure that duplication with other project was avoided (instead to aim at using results achieved by other projects) and to start the process of contracting the external experts. The following outputs were produced or achieved:

- Report how to avoid duplication with other INTERREG III B projects in the field of accessibility was prepared by the project coordinator, discussed at the meeting and accepted by the Responsible Partner;
- TORs for four Kaliningrad University staff members, one Belarus expert and TORs for three external experts together with tender documentation (if necessary) have been prepared and approved. Procurement and contracting procedures for the one external expert was finished in September. Two other experts were also contracted (latter on);
- The main scope of analysis were proposed and discussed. The discussion on analysis continued among the partners (by e-mails) till the second WG2 meeting (December 2007);
- EWW link at the VASAB website was created (see activity 1.1);
- The content of the project flyer was loaded by short information about the WG2 activities.

Comments: The WG2 started its work behind the schedule. Due to the late project start (mid of June 2007), the first period of the project coincided with a holiday season. Therefore the real work of the WG2 (by phone, e-mails etc) started only in September 2007 i.e. three month later than planned. In addition to that, for some partners it was very inconvenient (e.g. celebrations of anniversary of establishment of the Kaliningrad University) and this postponed the start of formal work by one or two month further on i.e. till October 2007. In the meantime the preparation of the WG2 detailed analysis was started. To this end a pre meeting on 22nd of August 2007 was organised (partners 1, 7,8) to prepare tentative proposals on the substance of the work of the WG2. This meeting was paid outside the EWW budget. Although the WG2 (similarly to the WG1) came to the opinion that broader BSR picture was necessary to promote *territorial integration of NW Russia into the BSR in the field of transport and ITC*. The WG2 members also shared the WG1 concern on importance of smooth transfer of the EWW results to the BSR strategy till 2030 i.e. Long Term Perspective to be prepared by VASAB in 2009. The characteristic feature of the WG2 was a long discussion about the meaning of the notion of accessibility. As the result accessibility to energy was also considered to be an important element of the analysis.

Activity 6: Analysis(WG2)

6.1. The discussion on the scope and method of analysis (indicators, pilot studies) had been continued from October till beginning of December 2007. The manuals and guidelines were discussed many times. The main method was e-mail exchanges. As the result the manuals and blue prints were produced by partners 1 and 8 to facilitate collecting data and information:

- A blue print on screening transport policy,
- A manual for collecting data and information on accessibility.

Comments: The majority of time of the initial period was allocated to discussing the notion of accessibility. This was done in order to avoid problems when data and information collection would be started. Due to the rise of energy prices also this issue was considered as important factor for the NW Russia integration to the BSR. The second issue heavily discussed was scarcity of comparable data in Russia. Partner no 8 having a very well developed data base on transport data for the BSR was in a difficult position checking (in dialogue with partner 4) existence of similar data in Russia. This required more resources and more work load than estimated at the

beginning. But finally this allowed presenting Russia at the broader BSR picture. The phase 6.1. ended with second meeting of the WG2 (December 2007 in Riga).

6.2. Data collection and interpretation started only in December 2007 after the second WG 2 meeting. Basic data were collected by mid February 2008 but some work continued (fine tuning of reports) till May/June 2008. A draft discussion paper was ready for the Riga Stakeholder Conference in April 2008. However, it was a working document amended after each important EWW meeting, till the final/closing Conference. In this work (phase 6.1 and 6.2) seventeen people (including three external experts) were involved. Their involvement differed. The main bulk of analytical work was done by partners no. 4 and 8 and the external experts whereas the other participants acted mainly as a reference group reading reports, making comments and asking for improvements. This was done first of all by partners no. 1, 6, 7 and 10 representing mainly policy making side in the project and project coordination. Also VASAB Secretariat was invited by partner 1 (Responsible Partner) to participate in this process.

The following outputs were achieved:

(i) interim:

- Mapping of transport infrastructure policies at the federal and regional level, policies in development of the soft accessibility (to knowledge and information) and policies on clusters in NW Russia (however clusters were analysed by the WG1 in fact), also policies and situation in the field of accessibility to energy was examined;
- Identification of bottlenecks and constraints for transport (and through transport for business development) in NW Russia;
- Assessment of the policy correlation with the strategic documents at the BSR level (mainly by analysing outcomes of Strategic INTERREG III B projects pursued by VASAB, BDF, BSSSC and CPMR);
- Examining the results of other INTERREG III B projects relevant for the WG2 work;
- Feasibility assessment of connecting TEN-T with the pan-European corridors.

The planned verification of the accessibility perspective and of present (current) and forecast trade flows in NW Russia and Belarus (vis-a-vis BSR reports) was less successful. The main reason were missing data concerning predicted trade flows in NW Russia and Belarus²⁴. The accessibility perspective instead was analysed using BSR outlook to show how NW-Russia is connected with the rest of the BSR.

(ii) A compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") presenting situation, development trends and political objectives in the fields of transport and accessibility in NW RU and Belarus and their consequences for BSR cohesion and business development

Comments:

The most important planned outputs were achieved (although one output was slightly modified). In addition to that, accessibility to energy was touched as important future factor of the BSR integration that should determine in great extent the NW Russia integration into the BSR. The analysis lasted longer than expected. The main constraint was lack of regional reliable data in NW Russia. The main reason of the delay was in insufficient data availability but also to some extent larger than expected amount of available background information (e.g. results of the BSR projects) that should be digested and analysed.

Activity 7: Pilot studies (WG2)

Since the analytical phase (activity 6) was delayed also pilot projects were postponed. The aim of the activity 7 was to analyse more in depth the most promising solutions developed during the analytical

²⁴ The work on trade flows was done in co-operation with WG1 and the BSR perspective was used.

phase and prioritised during stakeholder dialogue. Therefore only in May 2008 the more concrete work on pilot studies (pre-feasibility studies) could start. The WG2 selected two (in line with the output indicators listed in the application) topics for pre-feasibility studies. The topics were following:

- k) BSR passenger railway connectivity with focus on the Eastern part of the BSR,
- l) examination of implementation of the transport part of Tallinn vision of VASAB with focus on the eastern part of the BSR.

For the pilot studies a tender procedure was used and contracts were signed in late June 2008. The results were delivered in late August 2008 and discussed by the WG2 group meeting in September. The following reports were produced:

- *Study on international rail passenger traffic development: Possibilities in the context of development of cities in the Baltic Sea Region* (Contract: 5-13/66, of 18.6.2008) elaborated by SIA “AC Konsultācijas”,
- *Evaluation of implementation of the VASAB 2010 vision in the area of mobility network and energy supply* (Contract: 5-13/74, of 23.7.2008) elaborated by SIA “AC Konsultācijas”.

The results of the studies were presented to the closing/final conference of the EWW and will serve as an input for the Long Term Spatial Development Perspective. They were also presented in advance to the WG2 members working on recommendation in order to shape the WG2 recommendations.

Comments:

An additional barrier delaying activity no.7 was obligation of tendering the contractors due to internal law of Latvia where partner no.1 (responsible for the WG2 work) is located. The WG2 decisions were taken in May 2008, but the contracts were signed only 1,5- 2 months latter coinciding once more with a holiday season. The first preliminary results of the activity no.7 were delivered in August and the final results in October/November 2008.

Activity 8: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR

The same as activity no. 3

Activity 9: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG2)

- 9.1. Steering Group Meeting (1 day) took place on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg according to schedule (for details see action 4.1).
- 9.2. WG2 second meeting (1 day) took place on 5 December 2007 in Riga (instead of late November). The meeting was attended by seven project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 7, 8, 10 and four invited guests. The meeting concentrated on discussing analytical phase of the project. The manuals and blue prints for collecting data and information were agreed. For starting work on recommendation it was discussed that the idea of Steering Group (of its first meeting in October 2007) of workshop for all WGs should be implemented and the Responsible Partner was asked to organize such a workshop (synergy meeting) in January 2008.
- 9.3. Synergy meeting no.1 (1 day) took place in Riga on 31st of January 2008 (see action 4.3. for details).
- 9.4. Steering Group Meeting 2 on 1st of February 2008 in Riga (see action 4.4. for details).
- 9.5. Synergy meeting no. 2 (1 day) took place in Liepaja on 14th of March 2008. (see action 4.5. for details).
- 9.6. Steering Group Meeting 3 (one day) took place on 20 May 2008 in Riga. (for details see action 4.8).
- 9.7. WG2 third meeting (one day) took place on 21 May 2008 in Riga according to schedule. It was attended by five project partner members representing partners no. 1, 7, 8, 10, one external expert and three invited guests. The WG2 before the third meeting concentrated

mainly on analytical work. At this meeting analyses were summed up and the work on recommendations started. It was decided that recommendations (with elements of the action programme) would be prepared for Russia and for the whole BSR with focus on better integration of NW Russia. One additional meeting was requested (autumn 2008) in order to discuss the final draft of the recommendations. The meeting also discussed the pilot actions (pre-feasibility studies) agreeing on concrete items. The outputs achieved:

- a first draft recommendations paper (in outline format),
- TOR for two most important pilot studies.

9.8. WG2 fourth meeting (one day) took place on 4th September 2008 in Jurmala. It was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, three external experts and six invited guests. They discussed the final draft of the recommendations (with elements of the action programme) prepared by Immanuel Kant State University of Russia (Kaliningrad) and Nordregio staff. The WG2 discussed and improved the following documents:

- Recommendations on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR including concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR.
- Study on international rail passenger traffic development: Possibilities in the context of development of cities in the Baltic Sea Region,
- Evaluation of implementation of the VASAB 2010 vision in the area of mobility network and energy supply,
- Overview of results of INTERREG III B projects in the field of accessibility .

9.9. Steering Group Meeting 4 (one day) took place on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg (please see action 4.10)

Activity 10: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 3 on ICZM and transnational sea use planning

10.1. WG3 preparatory meeting took place on 24 July 2007 in Kaliningrad. It was attended by nine project partner members representing partners no. 4, 10, and five invited guests. The meeting was used for preparation of the WG3 first meeting, and the pilot action in particular for presentation and discussion with the Kaliningrad partners the results of the INTERREG project BaltCoast of which recommendations should form main backbone of the work of the WG3. The preparatory meeting was organised during the holiday season due to indicated by the Kaliningrad partner necessity of postponing the WG3 first meeting till October because of the celebrations of 750th anniversary of establishment of the university (lack of experts) in early autumn 2007. So the preparatory meeting was a vehicle to start the work of the WG3 even in slightly less formal way. The main subject of discussion was the BaltCoast recommendations, TORs for experts and other guidelines necessary for elaboration of the WG3 analysis. The outputs were following:

- Decision on TORs and blue prints,
- Clarifying division of labour,
- Project flyer was discussed (and then edited) - see activity 1.1.

10.2 WG 3 first meeting (1,5 day) took place on 30-31 October 2007 in Kaliningrad i.e. with four month delay. The reason was the celebrations of 750th anniversary of establishment of the Albertina University (today Immanuel Kant State University of Russia) in Kaliningrad. The meeting was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 4, 9, 10 and to some extent also partner no.1, one external expert and fifteen invited guests mainly from Russia but also from Latvia, Germany and Finland. The main aim was to discuss the analysis and the further WG3 work in detail, to achieve clarity about division of labour between the partners, to make sure that duplication with other project was avoided (instead to aim at using results achieved by other projects) and to start the process of contracting the external experts. Instead of preparing TORs for separate experts the WG3 at pre meeting decided to make only

two TORs (one for external expert and one for the whole pilot project). For conducting analysis it was agreed that blue prints should be used. Such blue prints were prepared by partner no. 10 in advance presented at the meeting, and then improved/discussed by e-mails and approved in December 2007. The following outputs were produced or achieved:

- Report (in form of power point presentations) – presenting an overview of existing and available documentation on the chosen themes in NW Russia and at the BSR level;
- Two blue prints (for further analysis and discussions);
- Two TORs (one for external expert and one for the whole pilot project);
- One external expert was contracted by the partner no 1 covering by his expertise BSR and HELCOM perspective;
- EWW link at the VASAB website was created (see activity 1.1).

Also Kaliningrad stakeholders who attended the second part of the meeting were informed about the EWW project together with showing them the relevant BSR experience in ICZM and maritime spatial planning. They formed important part of the reference network for dialogue on project findings and recommendations. The meeting was also a starting point for executing analysis.

Activity 11 Analysis (WG 3)

11.1 The discussion on the scope and method of analysis had been continued from October till beginning of December 2007. The discussion resulted in shifting focus more from ICZM to maritime spatial planning as the most important transnational issue related to sea use in the nearest future. The blue prints (to be followed by Russian colleagues) presented by partner 10 were discussed many times. The main method was e-mail exchanges. As the result the two blue prints were agreed:

- A blue print on spatial planning legislation on the sea covering Poland,
- A blue print on potentials and conflicts on the sea covering Poland.

11.2. Gathering and compiling the WG3 information started in December 2007 after blue prints approval. Fourteen people representing partners no. 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10 were involved in the information collecting. Their involvement differed. The main bulk of analytical work was done by partners no.10 and 4 and by external expert whereas the other participants acted mainly as a reference group reading reports, making comments and asking for improvements. This was done first of all by partners no. 5,6 and 7 representing mainly policy making side in the project. The analysis in principle were ended in March. The situation of the WG3 was different than the WG1 and the WG2. The WG3 did not collect statistical information but rather qualitative information and the broad BSR background was discussed, sorted out and clarified at the first meeting by examining BaltCoast results. Therefore, the analytical work could be done in parallel with an initial phase of recommendation preparation. But also in the WG3 the completing analytical reports took more time than expected. Although first draft reports were ready in March their fine tuning continued in April and even in May and June. This was slightly learning by doing in particular for Russian experts who had little contact with maritime spatial planning in the past. The outputs were following:

- The legal systems were screened and regulations, responsibilities for offshore planning at all levels in NW Russia were identified;
- System of mapping to improve access to relevant information from NW Russia and its uploading to the pilot system made in the INTERREG III B BaltCoast project were tested (the results can be seen in the WG3 reports done by Russian colleagues);
- Actual (current) sea use in NW RU (Kaliningrad) according to the BaltCoast standards (potentials and conflicts) were described in a separate paper and conflicts and potentials were detected;

- A compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") with assessment of compatibility of the Russian regulatory framework to the legislation and practice in a pan-Baltic perspective in the field of ICZM and sea use planning was elaborated.

Comments:

The all planned outputs were achieved.

Activity 12 Pilot Action (WG 3)

Pilot action was started in October 2007 and continues till the end of August 2008. The twelve project partners staff members representing partners no. 1,4,6,7,9,10 and one external expert were involved. Partners no. 1,6,7 have acted mainly as a reference group while the main role was played by partners no. 4,9,10. The pilot action aimed at preparing a system of joint ICZM and maritime spatial planning in Gdańsk Bay between Poland and Russia. This task was discussed at the kick off meeting with various Russian stakeholders. The prevailing opinion was that due to the dispersed responsibilities in Russia in ICZM and sea space management (versus concrete central Agency in Poland responsible for sea space and regional governments responsible for ICZM activities) such goal could not be achieved in the project time span. Nowadays there is no single institution in Russia responsible for sea space management (like Maritime Offices in Germany or Poland). The WG3 came to the opinion that agreements between Polish and Russian relevant state institutions on co-operation in sea use planning and management might be too ambitious and premature as the WG3 output. Instead pilot actions were focused on the preconditions for establishment of such agreements in future, by exchange of good practices, deepening mutual understanding and preparing necessary tools and necessary institutional structures i.e. centres of excellence in both countries dealing with maritime spatial planning. It was decided that the starting point should be an agreement between Russian and Polish institutions from NGO or research domain to co-operate on promotion of integrative approach to sea space and coast in both countries. In this context a sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application was discussed. It was considered as an important tool for showing to Russian decision-makers a usefulness of maritime spatial planning. The WG3 decided to limit it to the Baltic Sea around Kaliningrad Oblast. The register was prepared by partner no. 4 and 10 in a form of GIS atlas. The following outputs were produced in the reporting period:

- The exchange of bi-lateral experience was started e.g. Polish pilot sea use plan (covering Puck Bay) elaborated in 2008 under PlanCoast INTERREG III B project was shown to the RU experts;
- The experience with the BaltCoast project of INTERREG III B was shared;
- Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application was first discussed then agreed and then produced and presented to the final/closing conference of the EWW in St. Petersburg on 21st October 2008;
- Agreement between Maritime Institute in Gdańsk and Russian partners on permanent co-operation in the future (including joint projects and policy related work) aiming at establishment of a system of joint ICZM and maritime spatial planning in Gdańsk Bay between Poland and Russia was prepared in autumn 2008. The partners of the agreement will act as an centres of excellence in their countries with regard to maritime spatial planning and ICZM.

Comments:

The pilot action had to be modified. But the actions started within EWW project will be continued after the project closure thanks to established under the EEW contacts. The aim of establishment of the system of joint ICZM and maritime spatial planning in Gdańsk Bay between Poland and Russia is still valid and will be realised in the future. What was done under EWW project was to start this process by exchange of experience, awareness rising, gathering

stakeholders and discussing with them the problem and by preparation of some necessary tools which will convince Russian decision-makers that an integrative coastal and sea space management would be important. Despite difficulties the main outputs promised in the EWW application were produced: i.e. (i) a sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application and (ii) agreements between Polish and Russian relevant institutions on co-operation in sea use planning and management.

Activity 13: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR

The same as activity no. 3

Activity 14: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG3)

- 14.1. Steering Group Meeting (1 day) took place on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg according to schedule (for details see action 4.1).
- 14.2. Synergy meeting no.1 (1 day) took place in Riga on 31st of January 2008 (see action 4.3. for details). This meeting was used by the WG3 also for development of a first outline of recommendation paper which was discussed afterwards by e-mail exchange.
- 14.3. Steering Group Meeting 2 on 1st of February 2008 in Riga (see action 4.4. for details).
- 14.4. Synergy meeting no 2 (1 day) took place in Liepaja on 14th of March 2008 (see action 4.5. for details).
- 14.5. WG3 second meeting (1,5 day) took place on 27-28 March 2008 in Kaliningrad (instead of late November 2007). It was attended by sixteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 7, 9, 10., one external expert and two invited guests. The meeting assessed the progress of the analytical work, discussed the interim reports of Russia and tried to relate the WG3 work towards the EU Integrated Maritime Policy (Blue Book). The final draft of recommendation paper was discussed and agreed. The acknowledgement of the project results at the political level was also examined. The WG3 group joined the WG1 and the WG2 wish to present its results at policy level by introducing them to the “Long Term Perspective” of VASAB. However, partner 9 was also asked to transfer the results to the EU BSR Strategy and to the EU work on integrated maritime policy. During the WG3 meeting a workshop with Russian stakeholders on off-shore planning and ICZM was organised in Kaliningrad on 27th of March 2008 as a joint venture of all projects dealing with this subject i.e. EWW, POWER and SDI-4-SEB as a part of the conference (“Integrated management, sustainable development indicators, spatial planning and monitoring of the South-Eastern Baltic coastal regions”), which took place in Kaliningrad on 26th - 30th of March 2007. Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic were elaborated by EWW project participants beforehand and proposed to stakeholders attending this conference. The recommendations were unanimously adopted by the participants including regional and local authorities from Russia. This seemed to be an important step towards introducing integrative approach towards the sea space and coastal zone in Russia.

The output achieved was following:

- Recommendation paper discussed and adopted by the Russian stakeholder (Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic).
- 14.6. Steering Group Meeting 3 (1day) took place on 20 May 2008 in Riga (for details see action 4.8).
 - 14.7. WG3 third meeting (1 day) took place on 4-5 June 2008 in Gdańsk almost according to schedule (few days later than planned originally). It was attended by fifteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 9, 10, one external expert and five invited guests. At the meeting analytical phase was summed up. The meeting was also used for examining the

experience and good practices of the Balance project in maritime spatial planning. The experts from Denmark introduce the project to the WG3 members. However, the WG3 main discussion concentrated on the 'action plan' following the recommendations adopted in March 2008. The opinions were dispersed. Some participants considered elaboration of an action plan as premature having in mind lack of legal provisions in Russia regulating sea use in an integrative way and dispersion of responsibility for sea management among many institutions. Some others proposed to focus action plan on methodological issues i.e. issues indispensable to introduce sea use planning in Russia and methodology of such planning suited for Russian conditions. After the e-mail exchange in June 2008 the partner no 9 responsible for the WG3 work decided to take the risk to prepare a draft action plan and to discuss it in September 2008 with the WG 3 members. Therefore an additional meeting was requested to be held in September 2008, to conclude the recommendation phase. The following outputs were achieved:

- The experience with Balance project of INTERREG III B was shared.

After the WG3 third meeting the partner no 9 and 10 organised (late June beginning of July 2008) consultation about the follow up of the WG3 in a form of a joint project. In the consultation the information on different ETC Programmes in the BSR were analysed and compared. The results were presented to the WG3 fourth meeting.

- 14.8. WG3 fourth meeting (one day) took place on 2nd September 2008 in Gdańsk. It was attended by thirteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 7, 9, 10 and one external expert. The meeting discussed the final draft of the action programme prepared by the staff of partners no 4 and 10 (Maritime Institute from Gdańsk and Immanuel Kant State University of Russia from Kaliningrad). Also final draft of the sea use register was presented by the partner no.4. The WG3 discussions tackled also the future use of the WG3 results. The presentations to the final/closing conference of EWW were agreed. It was also decided that the WG3 analysis should serve for broader popularization of the issue of maritime spatial planning in the Baltic Sea Region. The partner no 9. agreed to edit (by the end of 2008) from its own resources a *Compendium on Maritime Spatial Planning systems in the Baltic Sea Region countries* composed of two parts: part 1 *Survey of the national instruments and tools for the management of the sea space in the BSR countries* describing legal and institutional aspects of maritime spatial planning systems in the BSR countries and part 2 entitled *Examples of national cases of sea spatial conflicts and potentials*. Partner no.9 promised to invite to this book all other BSR countries while using the WG3 results as the core input. The WG3 also analysed different possibilities of continuation of the WG3 work. After the lively discussion it was decided to use two vehicles for further co-operation: The project BaltSeaPlan already submitted to the BSR Programme (although slightly too abstractive) and the new project to be submitted to the ENPI Programme Lithuania–Poland–Russian Federation on concrete planning work as continuation of the WG3 pilot activities. It was decided that transnational maritime planning should concentrate on Vistula/Kaliningrad lagoon and on Kursiu lagoon.

The WG3 discussed and improved the following documents during its fourth meeting:

- Action plan how to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational sea use planning and ICZM;
- Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application.

- 14.9. Steering Group Meeting 4 (one day) took place on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg (please see action 4.10)

22.2. Assessment of the results of the Action

The central objective of the Action was to promote territorial integration of NW Russia (i.e. the entire Northwest Federal District, including Kaliningrad) into the Baltic Sea region (BSR) in the identified three fields of (1) business development, (2) transport / ICT development and (3) sea use planning and Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM). The starting point was relatively impressive but

slightly idle (from the BSR perspective) developmental potential (in terms of human capital, scientific achievements etc.) of the North West Russia. The task was to develop solutions how to use the potential of the NW Russia for the benefit of the BSR economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development.

The action was successful to that extend that it managed to identify economic and spatial development needs in the NW Russia from the perspective of public authorities and businesses, requiring to be tackled by at the transnational level. This findings were benchmarked against existing good practice solutions based on experience of other BSR countries. The search was also done in order to detect economic and spatial trends, relevant for connecting territorial potentials between the NW Russia and the BSR. However, the picture coming from analysis appeared less promising than expected (see point 2.9). But even in those rather difficult circumstances the recommendations for three mentioned above fields were formulated and action plans were outlined. The main results delivered to the external audience having policy relevance are presented below:

The results achieved	The results intended	Explanation of differences
Recommendations how to improve innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration	Recommendation" paper with suggestions on policy improvements and legislative changes to improve settlement and innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration	The results achieved put less attention to legislative changes than to policy improvements. This is outcome of the survey done in order to learn from Russian businessman what are the main obstacles for them to innovate.
Recommendations how to improve settlement policies in NW Russia (urban rural partnership) from the perspective of BSR integration,		The focus of the result achieved is on urban-rural partnership as key for integrative development of settlement structure in Russia.
Action plan how to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration,	A paper with fields for further concrete actions ("action plan") to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration	Done in line with plans
Recommendations on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR including concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR,	1.Recommendation" paper with suggestions on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR 2. A paper with fields for further concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia and in BY in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR	The recommendations and action plan were merged. The reason is that Russia has very concrete plans and actions in this field for the future years so the WG2 decided to focus on long-term recommendations.
Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic	Recommendation" paper on upgrading the instruments and tools and institutional arrangements for transnational sea use planning and ICZM at the BSR level based on the completed pilot action	More ambitious recommendations were produced than expected i.e. more in line with the real situation in Russia with regard to ICZM and maritime spatial planning
Action plan how to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational sea use planning and	A paper with fields for further concrete actions ("action plan") to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational	Done in line with plans

ICZM	sea use planning and ICZM	
Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application	A sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application - based on the completed system mapping.	Done in line with plans
Agreement between maritime Institute in Gdańsk and Immanuel Kant State University of Russia on further co-operation in the field of maritime spatial planning	Agreements between Polish and Russian relevant institutions on co-operation in sea use planning and management	Done in line with plans

The most important EWW achievement is delivery of main messages resulting from the Action to the important Russian decision makers, planning professionals and scientific sector as well as to the key pan-Baltic organizations such as HELCOM or VASAB. Through VASAB also the EU BSR strategy was influenced.

22.3. The outcome on both final beneficiaries and/or target group and the situation of the target group/target region which the action addressed

The target audience/recipients of the project findings have been decision-makers (ministries responsible for spatial planning and development in the BSR, including the federal government in Russia, regional authorities in NW Russia, pan-Baltic organisations such as VASAB 2010). Thanks to the action they have received a better picture on the situation with regard to the North-West Russia integration into the Baltic Sea region (BSR). This knowledge has been already used for policy making by VASAB in production of the Long Term Spatial Development Perspective and it seems that it will be also useful for the EU Commission in elaboration of the EU BSR strategy and for HELCOM for implementation of the Baltic Sea Action Plan. In fact the Action played a tremendous role in validation of the planning methodologies and strategic documents at the pan-Baltic level based on the NW Russia perspective. The Action gave a proper insight on main drivers and obstacles of integration of the North West Russia into the BSR. The Action findings and recommendations were also delivered to the Russian decision makers and VASAB will continue its efforts to convince them that the BSR integration is beneficial for the North-West Russia. At least in the field of maritime spatial planning as the result of the Action one can see increased capacity and competence basis to take up joint transnational initiatives between the NW Russia partners and institutions from other BSR countries.

The final beneficiaries local and regional governments in the Baltic Sea region (BSR) operators in the chosen thematic fields (e.g. businesses in WP1 and transport operators in WP2) in NW Russia and in the BSR will be influenced mainly through the actions of pan-Baltic organisations mainly VASAB and its Long Term Spatial Development Perspective. This will allow for incorporation of the BSR perspective in the national/regional/local policies in the NW Russia.

22.4. Publications

The following publications were produced:

Name	Number of copies	Distribution channels
The East-West Window brochure informing about the project	300	Distributed during the project events in particular kick-off conference, stakeholder seminar, the Conference "Baltic Sea Region Programme 2007-2013: new partnership opportunities for Russian and Belarusian regions" and many other events
Атлас использования прибрежных акваторий российской части Юго-восточной Балтики (Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application – <i>edited on CD rom</i>)	200	Distributed for free during the EWW final (closing) conference, available for free from partner no.4

The book in Russian: Северо-Запад России в Регионе Балтийского Моря: Проблемы и перспективы экономического взаимодействия и сотрудничества (North West Russia in the Baltic Sea region. Problems and perspectives of co-operation and mutual influence) presenting main results of the project	100	Distributed for free by partners no.4 among the project partners and participants of the EWW events. Sent to Russian relevant Ministries and main libraries.
--	-----	--

22.5. Contracts (works, supplies, services) above 5000€ awarded for the implementation of the action since the last interim report

Only one contract above 5000€ was awarded since the last interim report.

	Contract	Amount	Procedure	Winner
1	Audit Services Contract	5 131,94	“negotiated procedure without publication”	<i>SIA Rodl and Partner</i>

22.6. Continuation of the Action after ending the support from the European Community

The action will be continued after ending the EU support for the East West Window project. Durability of the project results has been ensured by the direct participation or the support of the national ministries responsible for spatial planning and development around the BSR, acting under VASAB 2010. Through their co-operation with other relevant stakeholders, the project rendered available concrete recommendations for policy-making in the chosen thematic fields in the NW Russia and at the BSR level. Through intensive dialogue with the target audience, the project influenced planners in Russia neighbouring countries by including the perspective of NW Russia. It also served for modification of pan-Baltic strategic policy papers, long-term visions and development plans on the very same account.

In particular the EWW results were used by VASAB for elaboration of the Long Term Perspective for Spatial Development of the BSR. Thanks to the EWW this will be the document with proper outlook on North-West Russia. Due to the EWW the collaboration between VASAB (ministries) and other EWW partners (research institutes) will be strengthened. The EWW results will be also used for discussing with HELCOM an idea of maritime spatial planning in the Baltic Sea Region.

Follow-up activities in effect of the project will be initiated and promoted by VASAB 2010. This includes starting up of possible new project(s) covering the whole BSR and taking into consideration the needs and perspectives of NW Russia, identified and referred to in the present project. The WG3 work will be continued in a form of the BaltSeaPlan project already approved by the BSR Programme (will start around December 2008). The WG3 partners will also plan to submit the project on elaboration of concrete maritime spatial plans for Vistula and Kursiu Lagoons in the framework of the ENPI Programme Lithuania–Poland–Russian Federation. Despite finishing the work of the WG3 the partner no.9 responsible for its leading has already declared to continue the efforts in a broader BSR set up and started elaboration of the BSR wide “Compendium on Maritime Spatial Planning systems in the Baltic Sea Region countries” using the WG3 results and experience.

22.7. Gender equality, disabilities

Where relevant, the perspective of equal opportunities was taken into account for the thematic work (especially in the fields of business and transport). Due efforts were made to secure involvement of both men and women in the composition of the project management structures, daily work and in the dialogue fora with relevant stakeholders in NW Russia and at the overall BSR level. Spatial planning forming a substance of the project from its definition cares for gender equality, prevention or exclusions of handicapped from the normal life. Although, gender equality and disabilities were not the main focus of the EWW project one can assume that the realisation of the project objectives (integration of the NW Russia into the BSR) will be beneficial in a long run also for attracting attention of Russian decision makers and Russian society to those above mentioned horizontal goals. They are placed very high at civil agenda in particular in the Nordic countries and integration means also convergence in values and way of living so it means better acceptance of these horizontal goals in Russia as well. The same has happened in Poland, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia after their accession to EU (strengthening their European integration).

22.8. Monitoring and evaluation of the activities

Monitoring of activities was done on routine basis by the project Steering Group. The group worked very effectively guiding the project and proposing the changes if necessary. The group (ministerial part) provided also an excellent piece of advice with regard to use of the EWW project results for policy making. However, one should also admit the important role of Committee on Spatial Development of the Baltic Sea Region which was among the main recipients of the project results. The advice from this body and the VASAB Secretariat which took part in majority of the EWW events (on their own money) helped a lot in proper shaping the EWW work and focusing on the policy relevant results (e.g. providing links to HELCOM, EU BSR Strategy etc.).

Also important were feedbacks received from beneficiaries during the kick-off and final (closing) conference. In the Annex 2 quotations from the Conference resolutions are attached (in Russian).

22.9. What has been learned from the Action

The main lesson from the action is that integration of the NW Russia into the Baltic Sea Region (BSR) will not be an easy process. Russia is a global player looking for global organizations and bodies as its partners. Even the regional level i.e. St. Petersburg has sufficient potential to play an important role at the global arena. This is clearly seen in the St. Petersburg government policy and strategic documents. BSR is not the main field of St. Petersburg strategic activity. Slightly different situation is with regard to Kaliningrad, but its potential is sufficient to strengthen rather cross-border than pan-Baltic integration of Russian Federation. The main integrative processes between Russia and the rest of the BSR are hardly due to market forces or conscious decisions of the Russian enterprises but rather thanks to EU financial support in form of transnational and cross-border programmes. The only field in which one can expect more or less natural co-operation between Russia and the other BSR countries is maritime spatial planning as long as it affects coastal defence, fish stock and state of the coastal nature. Russia is very active now in HELCOM where the questions of maritime spatial planning have been already raised.

Therefore strengthening integration of the North-West Russia into the BSR requires further development of the Russian medium size cities such as e.g. Kaliningrad or Pskov, their partnership with adjacent regions, and development of the maritime spatial planning institutions which in natural way will seek for the relations with their closest neighbours.

23. Partners and other Co-operation

23.1. How do you assess the relationship between the formal partners of this Action (i.e. those partners which have signed a partnership statement)? Please specify for each partner organisation

St. Petersburg Administration [2] – partner active for discussing policy relevant documents and organising meetings in St. Petersburg in the field of analysis acting through partner no.3 . Important contribution to the stakeholder dialogue. In fact this partner will be one of the main recipients of the project results.

Russian Economic Developers Association (ASSET) [3] – very demanding from formal point of view but also very experience partner in analytical work. A great bulk of the WG1 recommendations were proposed by this partner. The partner is a great interface between science and policy making in Russia in particular in St. Petersburg. Important role in dissemination activities thanks to good contacts with decision-makers in Russia at local and regional level.

Immanuel Kant State University of Russia [4] – very reliable and enthusiastic partner being a source of many data and information excellent in scientific work acquiring great experience during the EWW project how to translate analysis into policy findings, but in fact majority of recommendations of the WG2 and the WG3 were rooted in partner no. 4 thinking.

Ministry of the Environment, Danish Forest and Nature Agency, Denmark [5] – very active and experienced partner (being responsible in the past for the USUN project) leading the WG 1 work and ensuring proper presentation of EWW at the highest BSR political level.

Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Housing, Germany [6] – very active and experienced partner responsible for urban-rural investigations under the WG1, ensuring proper presentation of EWW at the highest BSR political level.

Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communication, Sweden [7] – partner ensuring link to the EU BSR strategy (use of EWW results also there), acting mainly through partner 8 but very active in the WG2 , active in the WG3 (with very high quality inputs) and contributing to policy relevant findings in the EWW.

Nordic Centre for Spatial Development (NORDREGIO) [8] – one of key drivers for analytical work, competent, flexible with a large knowledge and experience in spatial and regional development.

Ministry of Regional Development, Poland [9] – partner leading the WG3 but active in other work groups, very experienced and very flexible contributing to the work additional resources if project resources are not sufficient.

Maritime Institute, Poland [10] – key resource for maritime spatial planning and ICZM in the project supporting actively the WG3 and coordinating the whole project from content point of view in very reasonable way.

23.2. Is the partnership to continue

The partnership will continue in a form of BSR Programme and ENPI Programme projects on maritime spatial planning. The co-operation agreement between partners no 4 and 10 will serve to this end. The BaltSea Plan was approved by the BSR programme. The project will serve as a continuation and dissemination of the WG3 work and results since both partners no 4 and 10 are among its key drivers.

The EWW project results were also used within the VASAB framework. This means that new partners such as Nordregio, ASSET or Immanuel Kant State University of Russia have joined the VASAB work and their involvement will continue.

23.3. How would you assess the relationship between your organisation and State authorities in the Action countries? How has this relationship affected the Action?

Since majority of the partners are state high level institutions those relations were fine. The partners representing state authorities knew each other for many years before starting the project as the members of the VASAB co-operation (Co-operation of Ministers for spatial planning and development in the BSR countries). The new input was given by the scientific institutions. This was a great added value of the project, mutual learning how to translate analysis into policy relevant actions. The research oriented partners were quite flexible and willing to reshape analysis or repeat them if asked by policy making partners.

23.4. Where applicable, describe your relationship with any other organisations involved in implementing the Action:

- Associate(s) (if any) - no
- Sub-contractor(s) (if any). Some of the work was given to the external contractors. However an idea was that majority of work should be done by the partners themselves since the partners had sufficient qualification to execute the project and achieve its goals. Contractors were used mainly for technical issues and for bringing knowledge from INTERREG projects. Only some partners (9) and (5) used contractors more intensively (for some concrete work) due to shortages in their human resources. In principle the relation with contractors were positive with one exception (i.e. Rumanian contractor who won a tender for the EWW financial management disappeared after few month of serving the project)
- Final Beneficiaries and Target groups. Those relations were fine thanks to sue of well established and prominent conferences for presentation of the EWW. This gave the project access to the target group necessary for the project success.
- Other third parties involved. Important was a link of the project to the VASAB Secretariat and VASAB work on the Long Term Perspective. VASAB Secretariat promoted also project and its results externally on request of the Responsible Partner.

23.5. Where applicable, outline any links you have developed with other actions.

The project ambition was to develop link to other important projects in order to make use of their results (BaltCoast, PlanCoast, Balance, USUN, SeBCo – their experts were invited to the project meetings) or to make joint meetings to better reach target groups (SeBCo POWER and SDI-4-SEB). These projects represented different INTERREG strands.

23.6. If your organisation has received previous EC grants in view of strengthening the same target group, in how far has this Action been able to build upon/complement the previous one(s)? (List all previous relevant EC grants).

The Ministries involved in the project previously received a grant from INTERREG II C to prepare an Action Plan for implementation of the VASAB strategy adopted in 1994. The project was called VASAB Plus and ended in 2000. The EWW used the VASAB Plus experience but its focus was different. This time the target geographical area was the NW Russia and its integration to the BSR. The lesson learned under the VASAB Plus (where Russia had no financial resources for analysis) showed that preparation of a pan-Baltic documents with very differentiate resources might result in uneven involvement of the countries and then uneven ownership of the agreed actions or strategies. Therefore the EWW was invented to avoid such a mistake and to give Russian colleagues resources for considering their role in the BSR integration.

24. Visibility

How is the visibility of the EU contribution being ensured in the Action?

At the project start a press release was done by the Responsible Partner. Visibility was ensured by placing proper information that the EWW project was part-financed by the EU together with the EU logo and logo of INTERREG III B. This was done on printing materials, power point presentation and on the project web site. There was also some information in the Latvian radio. On demand of Russian colleagues the project was presented at the Conference “Baltic Sea Region Programme 2007-2013: new partnership opportunities for Russian and Belarusian regions” in St. Petersburg as one of the most successful INTERREG projects with Russian participation. To strengthen the project visibility a special project banner was produced and displayed on many occasions (e.g. Conference “Baltic Sea region Spatial Development Policies avenues to the Long Term Perspective” in Riga on 23 April 2007, and already mentioned conference “Baltic Sea Region Programme 2007-2013: new partnership opportunities for Russian and Belarusian regions” in St. Petersburg on 16-17 April 2008 and in many other events). The book with the project analysis and recommendations was printed in December 2008. But the most important is that the project results will be used for producing “Long Term Perspective” for the BSR which will be presented to CBSS and all important pan-Baltic organizations. Thanks to EWW NW Russia will be properly highlighted in this strategy.

The European Commission may wish to publicise the results of Actions. Do you have any objection to this report being published on Europe Aid Co-operation Office website? If so, please state your objections here.

Name of the contact person for the Action: **Vladislavs Vesperis**

Signature:Location: **Riga, Latvia**

Date report due:Date report sent:

Update of action plan

Activity	Months																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Activity 1: Kick off of the work of Working Group no 1 on business development and innovation affecting spatial development,	X	X	X	X														
Activity 2: Analysis(WG1)				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Activity 3: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR (WG1)					X						X						X	
Activity 4: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations and action plan (WG1)					X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Activity 5: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 2 on accessibility				X														
Activity 6: Analysis(WG2)					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Activity 7: Pilot studies (WG2)												X	X	X	X	X		
Activity 8: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR					X						X						X	X
Activity 9: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG2)					X	X		X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Activity 10: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 3 on ICZM and transnational sea use planning		X			X													
Activity 11 Analysis (WG 3)					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					
Activity 12 Pilot Action (WG 3)					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
Activity 13: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR					X						X						X	
Activity 14: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG3)					X			X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		

EWV events: participation of man and woman

Participants			
Event	Woman	Man	Total
Kick off meeting of the work of WG1, on 25 June 2007 in Riga	9	11	20
WG1 meeting 25 September 2007 in Riga	4	3	7
WG1 analysis (people involved)	11	23	34
Steering Group meeting on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg	7	11	18
St Petersburg kick off conference on 18-19 October 2007	112	146	259
St Petersburg Closing conference on 21 October 2008	231	400	631
WG1 second meeting on 6-7 December 2007 in Riga	9	10	19
Synergy meeting no.1 on 31 January 2008 in Riga	10	13	23
Steering Group Meeting no.2 on 1 February 2008 in Riga	4	11	15
Synergy meeting no 2 in Liepaja on 14 th of March 2008	8	8	16
WG1 fourth meeting on 3-4 April 2008 in Riga	6	7	13
Riga Stakeholders seminars (WG3 and WG1 + WG2) on 23 April 2008	83	84	167
WG1 fifth meeting on 24 April 2008 in Riga	13	12	25
Steering Group Meeting no. 3 on 20 May 2008 in Riga	4	6	10
Steering Group Meeting no. 4 on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg	3	10	13
WG1 sixth meeting on 3 rd September 2008 in Jurmala	11	11	22
WG2 first meeting on 10 October 2007 in Riga	3	6	9
WG2 analysis	6	11	17
WG2 second meeting on 5 December 2007 in Riga	4	7	11
WG2 third meeting on 21 May 2008 in Riga	2	7	9
WG2 fourth meeting on 4 th September 2008 in Jurmala	9	11	20
WG3 preparatory meeting on 24 July 2007 in Kaliningrad	4	10	14
WG 3 first meeting on 30-31 October 2007 in Kaliningrad	12	15	27
WG3 analysis	3	11	14
Pilot Action (WG 3)	3	10	13
WG3 second meeting on 27-28 March 2008 in Kaliningrad	6	13	19
WG3 third meeting on 4-5 June 2008 in Gdańsk	6	15	21
WG3 fourth meeting 2 September 2008 in Gdańsk	3	11	14

Quotations from the Conference resolutions (in Russian) in direct relations to the EAST West Window.

11. Kick Off Conference

Продвижение европейского опыта в рамках программ Европейского Инструмента Соседства и Партнерства усилит инновационный потенциал и влияние Северо-Западного региона России на процессы территориальной интеграции на внешних границах ЕС, в частности, в регионе Балтийского моря. В этих целях целесообразна активизация участия России в таких международных объединениях, как VASAB 2010, Балтийский форум развития (BDF), Программа транснационального сотрудничества региона Балтийского моря 2007-2013.

Зарубежный опыт свидетельствует о значительной роли малых и средних городов в продвижении инноваций и гармонизации территориального развития. Этот факт должен учитываться при разработке инновационных стратегий в России как на федеральном, так и на региональном уровнях. Необходимо уделять больше внимания развитию малых и средних городов, как это происходит в странах ЕС, и адаптировать европейский опыт применительно к ситуации в России (в частности, концепцию сельско-городского партнерства «ESDP Concept of Rural-Urban Partnership»). Доступ к знаниям и информации, возможность обмена идеями должны стать основой формирования территориальных моделей развития России.

/.../

Участники Форума согласились со следующим:

- необходимо особое единое государственное управление морскими прибрежными зонами страны (обеими их составляющими: морской и сухопутной) исходя из повсеместного успешного мирового опыта подобной деятельности и соответствующих рекомендаций организаций системы ООН и международных форумов на высшем уровне. Руководствуясь этим, рекомендовать: 1) создание нормативной правовой и институциональной базы для разработки и реализации комплексных программ развития и управления прибрежными зонами в рамках комплексных программ социально-экономического развития приморских субъектов Федерации и программ развития прибрежных муниципальных образований в целях активизации участия последних в освоении прибрежных и морских ресурсов; 2) адаптацию и освоение современных управленческих технологий (методология Комплексного управления прибрежными зонами (КУПЗ)) в применении к богатейшим по ресурсам и разнообразным по природным и социально-экономическим условиям прибрежным зонам страны; 3) разработку и реализацию пилотных программ КУПЗ конкретных побережий страны; 4) использование опыта сотрудничества стран Балтийского региона, в частности рекомендаций Проекта BaltCoast BSR INTERREG III B по управлению прибрежными зонами и разработке совместных стратегических проектов;
- рекомендовать использование кластерного подхода в качестве инструмента реализации стратегий развития территорий и повышения конкурентоспособности региональной и муниципальной экономики, включая выявление и диагностику потенциальных кластеров, разработку программ их развития, создание организаций по сотрудничеству. В органах власти необходимо формирование межотраслевых рабочих групп для координации развития кластеров и снятия ведомственных и отраслевых ограничений. Целесообразно более широкое использование международных программ и инструментов повышения конкурентоспособности кластеров;
- необходимо развитие региональной и муниципальной статистики, в частности для целей выработки эффективной кластерной политики и оценки результатов реализации кластерных инициатив в регионе и/или муниципалитете, формирования действенных

инструментов планирования и управления, ориентированного на результат на субфедеральных уровнях;

- при реализации федеральных, региональных и местных программ экономического развития необходимо стимулировать участие организаций инновационной инфраструктуры в российских и зарубежных сетевых организациях, которые оказывают содействие в предоставлении услуг компаниям и научным организациям в сфере инновационной бизнес-кооперации и трансфера технологий (примерами могут служить Российская сеть трансфера технологий RTTN, Европейская сеть бизнес-инновационных центров EBN). Участие в сетевом сотрудничестве должно быть нацелено на повышение качества и содержания услуг для местных компаний и НИИ. Федеральным и региональным органам власти необходимо поддерживать инициативы по развитию сетевого взаимодействия между организациями инновационной региональной инфраструктуры (создание региональных сетей) с целью уменьшения дублирования функций, повышения качества услуг и снижения расходов бюджета на их субсидирование;
- рекомендовать и стимулировать участие российских центров коммерциализации, инновационных центров в реализации Competitiveness Innovation Program (CIP) Европейского союза в части проектов, ориентированных на развитие инновационных сетей и сетей трансфера технологий (IRC, IRE, EBN и др.);
- считать целесообразным использование в России европейского опыта реализации региональных инновационных стратегий, обеспечивающих выявление спроса на инновации среди компаний и ориентацию научного сектора и инновационной инфраструктуры на удовлетворение этого спроса. (...);
- в целях совершенствования государственного и муниципального управления по обеспечению перехода Российской Федерации на инновационный путь развития рекомендовать Комиссии при Президенте Российской Федерации по вопросам совершенствования государственного управления и правосудия, Министерству регионального развития Российской Федерации, другим заинтересованным федеральным и региональным органам власти осуществить экспертизу полномочий органов государственной власти субъектов Российской Федерации и органов местного самоуправления в части выявления проблемных вопросов, препятствующих обеспечению перехода России на режим инновационного развития, и законодательно обеспечить активизацию участия в реализации государственной научно-технической политики органов государственной власти субъектов Федерации и органов местного самоуправления, рассмотреть возможность разработки национальной программы, ориентированной на содействие российским регионам в подготовке и реализации региональных инновационных стратегий и формирование российской сети инновационных регионов;
- рекомендовать заинтересованным федеральным и региональным органам государственной власти реализовать систему мер по поддержке технопарков и процессов коммерциализации научных разработок. В частности: разработать законодательную базу для развития технопарков на федеральном уровне; предоставить налоговые льготы компаниям-резидентам технопарков, например, аналогичные льготам для резидентов ОЭЗ; упростить процедуру предоставления земельных участков для технопарков; законодательно разрешить НИИ, вузам и университетам создавать малые предприятия - start-up'ы;
- рекомендовать органам регионального и муниципального управления активно использовать инструменты международной технической и финансовой помощи, предоставляемой по линии Института Всемирного Банка, АМР США, Европейского Инструмента Соседства и Партнерства (ENPI) и других программ Европейского Союза для реализации стратегических приоритетов и планов территориального развития, поддержки инноваций;
- отметить необходимость выработки механизма интеграции документов стратегического планирования муниципального, регионального и федерального уровней;
- одобрить инициативы Комитета по пространственному развитию региона Балтийского моря (CSD/BSR) VASAB 2010 по территориальной интеграции Северо-Запада России и реализации совместных проектов в таких приоритетных сферах как развитие бизнеса, транспорта, ИКТ, управление прибрежными зонами. Отметить актуальность проекта «Окно

Восток-Запад", который позволит восполнить пробелы в оценке инновационного потенциала Северо-Запада России и расширит возможности синергии инновационных потенциалов стран Балтийского региона.

- предложить Комитету VASAB 2010 использовать Форум лидеров стратегического планирования городов и регионов России в качестве референтной группы для обсуждения Стратегии пространственного развития региона Балтийского моря.

12. Closing Conference

12.1. «Перспективы развития Северо-Западного федерального округа: вызовы, приоритеты, угрозы и ограничения»

Участники рекомендуют:

- 16) в целях максимального учёта сложившихся межсубъектовых экономических связей, обеспечения увязки общегосударственных и региональных планов и прогнозов социально-экономического развития, целесообразно предусмотреть **разработку стратегических документов долгосрочного социально-экономического развития на уровне федеральных округов**. Для преодоления ведомственной и региональной разобщённости целесообразно поручить эту работу Ассоциациям экономического взаимодействия соответствующих федеральных округов. Это позволит точнее формулировать цели регионального развития в увязке с имеющимися общими ресурсами, объективно сформировать перечень основных межрегиональных проектов, обеспечивающих достижение общих целей развития. Подобные документы могут стать основой для последующей разработки Концепции долгосрочного социально-экономического развития Российской Федерации;
- 17) для ускорения социально-экономического развития территорий требуется **активизация межрегионального взаимодействия**. Зачастую депрессивные регионы (субъекты Федерации) экономически тесно связаны с успешными регионами (транспортные подходы к инфраструктурным объектам, наличие сырьевой базы для обрабатывающих производств и т.п.). В этом случае целесообразно оказывать федеральную помощь (налоговые и иные льготы, государственные гарантии под привлекаемые кредиты, первоочередное финансирование проектов в рамках действующих ФЦП и др.) для инфраструктурного развития депрессивных территорий по поддерживаемым видам и направлениям экономической деятельности, а также для реализации проектов способствующих комплексному развитию двух и более субъектов Федерации;
- 18) необходимым условием развития и Северо-Западного федерального округа и страны в целом является **совершенствование работы транспортного комплекса**. Требуется системный подход к формированию единой стратегии развития транспортно-логистического комплекса страны в увязке с развитием отраслей экономики и внешнеэкономической ситуацией.

12.2. «Специфика стратегий приморских регионов»

Участники считают, что

- 16) Необходимо совершенствование стратегического планирования применительно к морской деятельности и приморским регионам и муниципалитетам, предусматривающее:

на федеральном уровне:

- применение интегральных подходов к планированию и управлению в морском природопользовании. Это позволит преодолеть фрагментарность, присущую отраслевому подходу, учесть взаимосвязанность видов морского природопользования, способствовать связям и межотраслевой гармонизации в морской деятельности исходя из анализа конфликтного использования ресурсов, обеспечить многоцелевую ориентацию и соответствие

деятельности природоохранным целям, участие всех заинтересованных сторон в разработке стратегий и программ развития;

- создание нормативной правовой и институциональной базы для разработки и реализации комплексных программ развития и управления прибрежными зонами, основанных на интегральных подходах, в рамках стратегий и программ социально-экономического развития приморских субъектов Федерации и программ развития прибрежных муниципальных образований. Это позволит реализовать особое единое государственное управление морскими прибрежными зонами страны (обеими их составляющими: морской и сухопутной) исходя из повсеместного успешного мирового опыта подобной деятельности и соответствующих рекомендаций организаций системы ООН и международных форумов на высшем уровне;

на региональном уровне:

- адаптацию и освоение современных управленческих технологий (методология Комплексного управления прибрежными зонами - КУПЗ) в применении к богатейшим по ресурсам и разнообразным по природным и социально-экономическим условиям прибрежным зонам страны;
- разработку и реализацию пилотных программ КУПЗ конкретных побережий страны.

Реализация этих мер позволит реализовать естественные природные конкурентные преимущества морских акваторий и прибрежных территорий в обеспечении дополнительного экономического роста, конкурентоспособности, инвестиционной привлекательности, занятости, повышения комфортности и качества жизни, охраны окружающей среды и уменьшения ущерба от природных и техногенных катастроф, а также безопасности страны

- 17) Необходимо совершенствование нормативной правовой базы, регулирующей градостроительную деятельность, в части учета специфики этой деятельности на морских акваториях, находящихся под суверенитетом и юрисдикцией Российской Федерации.
- 18) Необходимо развивать международное сотрудничество в стратегическом планировании морского природопользования, учитывая единство и экосистемный характер морских процессов, и широко использовать международный опыт в этой сфере.

FINAL NARRATIVE REPORT

25. Description

25.1. Name of beneficiary of grant contract: Ministry of Regional Development and Local Government, Latvia (Reģionālās attīstības un pašvaldību lietu ministrija).

25.2. Name and title of the Contact person: Mr Vladislavs Vesperis.

25.3. Name of partners in the Action: St. Petersburg Administration (Администрация Губернатора Санкт-Петербурга) [2], Russian Economic Developers Association (ASSET) (Ассоциация специалистов по экономическому развитию территорий) [3], Immanuel Kant State University of Russia (Российский государственный университет имени И. Канта) [4], Ministry of the Environment, Danish Forest and Nature Agency²⁵, Denmark (Miljøministeriet, Skov- og Naturstyrelsen) [5], Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Housing, Germany (Bundesministeriums für Verkehr, Bau und Stadtentwicklung) [6], Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communication, Sweden (Näringsdepartementet) [7], Nordic Centre for Spatial Development (NORDREGIO) [8], Ministry of Regional Development, Poland (Ministerstwo Rozwoju Regionalnego) [9], Maritime Institute, Poland (Instytut Morski) [10].

25.4. Title of the Action: East-West Window (EWW).

25.5. Contract number: Grant Contract for European Community External Actions **2007/132-845**.

25.6. Start date and end date of the reporting period²⁶: 15.06.2007 – 15.12.2008.

25.7. Target country(ies) or region(s): **North-West Russia in particular: St. Petersburg, Leningrad region and Kaliningrad region**; to some extent also Belarus and North-West Russia adjacent countries (mainly for collecting good practices and dissemination of the project results).

25.8. Final beneficiaries &/or target groups²⁷ (if different). The target audience/recipients of the project findings are: decision-makers (ministries responsible for spatial planning and

²⁵ The name of the partner 5 was changed during the EWW project execution **from** Ministry of the Environment, Danish Forest and Nature agency **to** Ministry of the Environment, Agency for Spatial and Environmental Planning (Miljøministeriet, By- og Landskabsstyrelsen).

²⁶ The entire implementation period of the Action

²⁷ “Target groups” are the groups/entities who will be directly positively affected by the project at the Project Purpose level, and “final beneficiaries” are those who will benefit from the project in the long term at the level of the society or sector at large.

development in the BSR, including the federal government in Russia, regional authorities in NW Russia, pan-Baltic organisations such as VASAB 2010). The final beneficiaries are local and regional governments in the Baltic Sea region (BSR) operators in the chosen thematic fields (e.g. businesses in WP1 and transport operators in WP2) in NW Russia and in the BSR. The divide into men and women of different project activities is provided separately.

25.9. Country (ies) in which the activities take place (if different from 1.7): Russia (St. Petersburg and Kaliningrad Oblast), Poland and Latvia.

26. Assessment of implementation of Action activities

26.1. Activities and results (for the whole reporting period including last narrative interim report)

Activity 1: Kick off of the work of Working Group no 1 on business development and innovation affecting spatial development,

1.19. First meeting of the WG1 (1 day) took place on 25 June 2007 in Riga which was according to the schedule. The meeting was planned in advance in late June so participants postponed their holidays which in this part of the BSR starts with so called Midsummer. The meeting was attended by 12 participants representing partners 1,3,4,5,6,8,9,10 and eight invited guests. The main aim was to discuss the analysis and further WG1 work in detail, to achieve clarity about division of labour between the partners, to make sure that duplication with other project is avoided (instead to aim at using results achieved by other projects) and to start the process of contracting the external experts. The following outputs were produced or achieved:

- Report how to avoid duplication with other INTERREG III B projects in the field of business development and innovation affecting spatial development had been prepared before the meeting by the project coordinator, discussed by the meeting and delivered to the Responsible (Lead) Partner.
- TORs for seven ASSET staff members, eight Kaliningrad University staff members, one Belarus expert and four external experts together with tender documentation (if necessary) have been prepared by project coordinator as result of the meeting. Tender procedures for the four external experts had been started resulting in contracting one external expert from Poland, one from Sweden, one from Latvia and one from Denmark. In addition the Belarus expert was contracted by the partner no. 8 without tender (contract below 5000 Euro).
- The main scope of analysis was proposed and discussed. Unfortunately too many question marks and uncertainties appeared during the June meeting so the additional meeting was organized in Riga in September and discussion on analysis continued till the second WG1 meeting (December 2007).
- Text for EWW section at to the VASAB website was decided, technically EWW link at VASAB website was created in September 2007.
- Project flyer was designed and edited including information on WG1 activities (300 copies were printed in October 2007).

Comments: The WG1 started the discussion on its work (i.e. necessary analysis, results to be achieved) but the topic was too broad for one day meeting in addition to many technical questions were raised. The decision was to continue the discussion when the experts contracted by tender would be available. The main problem was to what extend the achievement of the EWW goal (i.e.

to promote territorial integration of NW Russia into the BSR in the field of business development) required concentration on analysis concerning exclusively NW Russia and to what extent the broader BSR picture was necessary if integration should mean reciprocal relations (i.e. affecting both sides). The latter opinion prevailed and was accepted by the meeting. The WG1 considered that for producing the main output of the analytical phase (i.e. a *compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") with assessment of unexploited innovation potential in NW Russia, assessment of the potential for regional integration and with identification of spatial problems in NW Russia and BSR*) some BSR analysis as the background material should be done as well. The meeting also discussed the policy related role of the project i.e. better highlighting the EWW results on NW Russia role in the “Long Term Perspective” to be prepared by VASAB on CBSS demand. The WG1 leaders promised to ensure smooth transfer of the EWW results to the BSR strategy i.e. Long Term Perspective till 2030 (to be prepared by VASAB in 2009). The Responsible Partner declared that he would invite VASAB Secretariat to the most important meetings of the EWW to ensure smooth transfer of the project results to the “Long Term Perspective”.

- 1.20. Partnership Agreement Preparation. This action was related to all work packages and took place in June, July, August, and September 2007 and was ended in October 2007 with signing partnership agreements between Lead Partner and all other partners of the EWW project. The most difficult was signing Partnership Agreement with partners from St. Petersburg due to problems related to tax and system in Russia, conversion of EUR into rubels, banking system requirements etc. Finally two agreements, based on the results of additional working meeting (in Riga) discussions, were prepared and signed between Lead Partner and RU (ASSET) Partner and between German Partner and RU (ASSET) Partner. So at the end of the day there were 9 partnership agreements signed regulating relations between the EWW partners.
- 1.21. Quality Workshop (1 day) for Project leaders organised by INTERREG III B Secretariat and EU Delegation from Moscow in Riga on 26 September 2007 was attended by project coordinator (partner no.10), one representative of Russian partners (partner no.2) and representatives appointed by the Responsible Partner. Main guidelines from EC Delegation and INTERREG III B Secretariat on TACIS rules, payments schemes and communication experiences were presented during the seminar and later on at individual consultations. The meeting between Responsible Partner and the Russian partners was organized back to back with the workshop for discussing main technicalities of their participation in the project.

Activity 2: Analysis(WG1)

- 2.13. WG1 additional meeting (1 day) took place on 25 September 2007 in Riga to continue discussion on the scope of analysis. The meeting was attended by four WG1 members (including two external experts, project coordinator and the representative of the Russian partners) and three participants representing Responsible Partner. At the meeting in depth discussion on case studies on innovation, outsourcing and urban-rural relations in Russia took place and the detailed scope of the work of Russian partners and external experts were agreed. Also a draft outline structure of the WG1 analytical report was presented by the WG1 Coordinator and discussed in depth.
- 2.14. Data collection and interpretation started only in December 2007 after the second WG1 meeting. In this phase 34 people from all partners were involved (except partner no.7 who acted through partner no. 8). Their involvement differed. The main bulk of analytical work was done by partners no. 3, 4 and 8 and the external experts whereas the other people acted mainly as a reference group reading reports, making comments and asking for improvements. This was the task first of all of partners no. 1, 2, 5, 6, 9 and 10 representing mainly policy making side in the project and project coordination. Also VASAB Secretariat was invited by partner 1 (Responsible Partner) to participate in this process. The analysis (data collection) in principle were ended in March 2008 but some of them (requiring surveys)

due to formal reasons (tenders) were completed in April 2008. Interpretation of data was done in April 2008 for all important cases (but some analysis e.g. the benchmarking studies and urban-rural analysis continued till September 2008). In fact in April and even in May and June the fine tuning of analysis (removing mistakes noticed by the other partners) still continued. The reason was that some partners from the reference group were very demanding asking for many improvements even if they had found little inconsistencies after second or third reading of the reports. Therefore the final synthesis report (draft discussion paper) from the analytical phase was completed only in July 2008 and even slightly changed after the WG1 September 2008 meeting and as the result of the EWW final/closing Conference in October 2008.

The outputs have been following:

(i) interim:

- Data (including public surveys) and draft analytical report on “Baltic” metropolitan areas with focus on the role of Kaliningrad and St. Petersburg;
- In depth study on St. Petersburg and Kaliningrad and their developmental potentials in the BSR context (focus on innovation and outsourcing) in which: trends and present policies for innovations nested in NW Russia and outsourcing were analysed, barriers for innovations perceived by business and public administration were identified (based on surveys), and cases on transfer of innovations between NW Russia and other parts of the BSR were described;
- Case studies (reports) on Russian and Belarus small and medium sized cities – covering: Novgorod, Gatchina, Chernyakhovsk, Gusev, Sovetsk, Svetly, Berezovka, Zaslavl;
- Reports on demographic trends in North-West Russia, in St. Petersburg and in Kaliningrad and in Belarus as well;
- Reports on case studies on urban-rural relations in Russia;
- Report on INTERREG III B projects results relevant for work of the WG1 group;
- Benchmarking studies concerning situation in Poland, Germany and Latvia on the issues relevant for the WG1 recommendations .

(ii) A compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") with assessment of unexploited innovation potential in NW Russia, assessment of the potential for regional integration and with identification of spatial problems in NW Russia and BSR.

Comments:

a) All the planned outcomes were achieved. However, during the analytical phase became clear that for the NW Russia innovation is more promising path for integration within the BSR than outsourcing, therefore more efforts were done to analyse this challenge. The list of outputs was enlarged (in comparison to the planned ones) by analysis of the role of the NW Russia in the BSR context (as the result of the WG1 discussions what analysis are necessary to achieve the EWW goal). Also urban structures and functional urban areas of not only large but also some small cities were analysed. The most interesting case appeared to be Gatchina as an example of science intensive cluster in Russia located in a small city. The some other cases illustrated urban-rural relations in Russia (and Belarus).

b) While working with data it became clear that translating data into policy recommendations can not be done by each working group separately. Therefore at the meeting of the WG leaders in December it was proposed that for the starting work on recommendation a workshop for all WGs would be necessary. The Responsible Partner was asked to organize such a workshop on 31st of January 2008 instead of simple WG1 seminar (planned for that date).

c) The work was delayed by some formal constraints such as tender procedures, requirement of separate EUR accounts (very difficult for Ministries) etc.

Activity 3: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR (WG1)

- 3.1. Kick off Conference of the project (1,5 day) for broad public took place on 18-19 October 2007 (according schedule) in St. Petersburg as a part of the well known VI Forum of Strategic Planning Leaders of Cities and Regions of Russia. This allowed project to reach the planned target group. The project: its assumptions and the planned outputs were presented to the Russian decision makers - mainly city mayors and chief planners. Conference participants expressed a deep hope that EWW project would diminish knowledge gaps within the Baltic Sea Region on the character of development potential of the NW Russia, its synergies and complementarities with potentials of other countries of the region, and on methods how this potential could be efficiently connected within the BSR. It was expressed in Conference recommendations that EWW project results should be presented in 2008 at the final Conference within VII Forum of Strategic Planning Leaders of Cities and Regions of Russia. The kick off conference was attended by 259 participants mainly Russian mayors and city planners. Among them there were 57 persons outside Russia. From EWW project 20 persons participated including Latvian State Secretary representing the Responsible Partner. So EWW reached the planned target of **200** Russian decision makers and professionals involved in discussion on the project.
- 3.2. Stakeholder Seminar for WG1 (0,5 day) was organised on 23 April 2008 in Riga (instead of beginning of May as originally planned). The preliminary results of the analytical phase were presented and the first discussions on the recommendations were started. The seminars for all working groups of EWW were arranged back to back with the VASAB annual conference financed by the Latvian Ministry of Regional Development and Local Government from its own means i.e. outside the EWW budget (from the EWW budget some partners only covered their travelling to the EWW seminars). The described above arrangement resulted in very impressive participation in the seminars and allowed to reach a planned target of **100** decision makers and businessman from BSR EU countries involved in discussion of the project findings and recommendations. The conference and seminars were attended by 167 participants including 26 persons directly involved in the EWW project (although the Responsible Partner was represented by some more employees). The participants came mainly from Latvia, Lithuania, and Finland but also from Azerbaijan, Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, EU Commission, Germany, Hungary, Norway, Poland, Russia and Sweden.
- 3.3. Closing(final) Conference of the project (1 day) for broad public took place on 21st October 2008 (according schedule) in St. Petersburg. The title of the conference was “Promoting territorial integration of the North West Russia into the Baltic Sea Region”. The main organiser was ASEET together with the EWW Responsible Partner. This Conference was a part of rich spectrum of the conferences and seminars taking place under umbrella (the same premises) of the VII All-Russia Forum of Strategic Planning Leaders “Strategic Planning in Regions and Cities of Russia”. In the event 631 participants took place out of it 582 from Russia. The forum was organized by: State Duma of the Russian Federation; Ministry for Regional Development of the Russian Federation; Ministry for Economic Development of the Russian Federation; St Petersburg City Administration; Center of Strategic Research; ISCER Leontief Centre. It was opened by Mr Dmitry Kozak, Minister of Regional Development, who underlined that “Forum is becoming the public debating platform for improving the strategic planning system of social and economic development in Russian regions”. The Conference “Promoting territorial integration of the North West Russia into the Baltic Sea region” was composed of four sessions attended by large number of the participants not only from Russia but also from other Baltic Sea Region countries. Some sessions were joint ventures with other organisations, forums and bodies interested in the subjects raised by the EWW project. The names of the sessions were following:

- “Accessibility and innovations as motors of integration of the NW Russia into the Baltic Sea Region” (presentation of the results of the WG1 and the WG2),
- “Special Features of coastal regional strategies” (presentation of the WG3 results and dialogue with all key persons in Russia dealing with ICZM and maritime spatial planning),
- “Partnership mechanisms in local economic policy implementation” (presentation of the WG1 results with regard to urban-rural partnership).

In addition to that EWW results were presented at the key session of the Forum “Prospects for Federal Okrug Development: Challenges, priorities, threats and constraints. North-West Federal Okrug” attended by key decision makers from the North-West Federal Okrug.

Comments:

The choice of the formula of the kick-off and closing conferences appeared to have very positive results on ability of the project to deliver results to the key target groups in Russia. The Conference was also attended by the Ministerial partners from the EWW project. The EWW results were mirrored in the Forums resolutions. Some interested questions were raised requiring further discussion and examination.

- 3.4. Final publication The book summing up the results of the investigations available for the stakeholders in Kaliningrad and St.Petersburg was edited in October, November and printed in December 2008 by partner no.4.

Comments:

The number of books published was smaller (100) than assumed in the application (400), although the whole budget allocated to this purpose was used. There were several reasons why the printing was more expensive than expected. Some of them were of technical reasons: i.e. the book had more coloured pictures (maps) than estimated and was thicker than planned (more than 300 pages in comparison to 150 pages planned), but the main reason was of vis mayor nature. In 2008 in Russia an unexpected inflation and economic crisis appeared which could not be taken into account at the stage of budget planning. This resulted in much higher printing costs. However, the partner no.4 is ready to print additional copies of the book if demanded. The available copies will be distributed to the most active in the EWW Russian stakeholders and to the project partners of the EWW.

Activity 4: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations and action plan (WG1)

- 4.1. Steering Group Meeting (1 day) took place on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg according to schedule. The meeting was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1,2,3,5,6,7,9,10 and seven invited guests. The Steering Group discussed the project progress. The work was lagging behind the schedule. Although the WG1 started on time it became involved in lengthy discussions about the necessary scope of analysis and detailed division of labour between working groups. The Steering Group decided therefore not to start the work on recommendations before improving synergy between the work of the working groups. This task was given to the meeting of the WGs leaders organised in Riga back to back with the WG2 (5 December 2007) and the WG1 (6-7 December 2007) meetings. The meeting also discussed details of project presentation to the kick-off conference held next day.
- 4.2. WG1 second meeting (1,5 day) took place on 6-7 December 2007 in Riga (instead of late November). The meeting was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10, two external consultants and six invited guests. The meeting concentrated on discussing analytical phase of the project (the decision was that the lagging behind analysis would make necessary to postpone by two months the next WG1 meeting i.e. till the end of analytical phase). However, the WG 1 also started examining the way of preparation of the recommendations out of the analysis conducted. For the starting work on

recommendation it was agreed that a workshop for all WGs would be necessary and the Responsible Partner was asked to organize such a workshop (synergy meeting) on 31st of January 2008 instead of a simple WG1 seminar (scheduled for beginning of February).

- 4.3. Synergy meeting no.1 (1 day) took place in Riga on 31 of January 2008 (replacing the WG1 seminar scheduled for February). It was attended by fourteen project partner members representing partners no.1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, three external experts and six invited guests. The facilitator was hired by the Responsible Partner. During the meeting the participants agreed that all three working groups were in need of a common frame. This should be given by the vision of the BSR till 2030 with full integration of the North-West Russia. The participants managed to prepare an outline of such a vision requiring further work. The meeting asked for one more working day for finishing common visionary frame which should allow preparing meaningful recommendations.
- 4.4. Steering Group Meeting 2 took place on 1 of February 2008 in Riga. It was attended by seven project partner members representing partners no. 1,3,5,6,7, 9, 10 one external expert and seven invited guests. The results of the synergy meeting were discussed i.e. synergy between the work of the working groups. It was decided to organise one more synergy meeting to continue work on the common frame for all WGs, i.e. vision of the BSR till 2030 with full integration of the North-West Russia. An agenda of the April Conference proposed by the Responsible Partner was discussed together with some technical issues. The progress in analytical phase was reviewed.
- 4.5. Synergy meeting no. 2 (1 day) took place in Liepaja on 14th of March 2008. It was attended by ten project partner members representing partners no. 1,3,5,6,9, 10 one external expert and five invited guests. The facilitator was hired by the Responsible Partner but paid from Responsible Partner own means. The final draft of the vision was discussed and shared by participants giving stable frame for analytical part and allowing proper work on recommendations.
- 4.6. WG1 fourth meeting (1 day) took place on 3-4 April 2008 in Riga. It was attended by nine project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 8, 10, two external experts and two invited guests. The meeting was convened on demand of Russian partners who started finalisation of analytical part and wanted to discuss the preliminary results among themselves. It was also important for conceptualization of the recommendations i.e. discussing what findings from analytical phase should be taken into consideration while working on recommendations.
- 4.7 WG1 fifth meeting (one day) took place on 24 April 2008 in Riga. It was attended by fifteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, four external experts and six invited guests. The WG1 before the meeting concentrated mainly on analytical work. At the fifth meeting analyses were summed up and the work on recommendations were started. However, one more meeting was requested (autumn 2008) in order to discuss the final draft of the recommendations and action programme. Due to delay in the work on urban-rural relations in Russia the relevant reports were not presented to the WG1 at this meeting. Only an overview of the progress and main findings were reported. It was decided that for synergy reasons the reports would be presented on seminar on urban-rural relations in Russia to be organised as a joint event with the SeBCo project in Kaliningrad in June 2008. This was realised and such presentation took place and was regarded as a great success by meeting participants.
- 4.8. Steering Group Meeting 3 (one day) took place on 20 May 2008 in Riga. It was attended by five project partner members representing partners no. 1, 5, 9, 10, and five invited guests. The Steering Group discussed the project progress. The results of the second synergy meeting and the April Conference were examined as well as a draft vision of the BSR till 2030 with full integration of the North-West Russia. The Steering Group decided to close analytical part and start the work on recommendations. However, the WG3 leaders asked for additional benchmark study on the results of the INTERREG projects in the field of competences of the WG3 with focus on the German experience. This was to diminish

discrepancies between the WGs, since the WG1 and the WG2 already had such type of expertises included in their work. The problems with travelling budget of Russian partners were discussed once more together with a problem of disappeared financial manager. The Steering Group also continued a discussion on political use of the EWW results i.e. incorporation of the results into the Long Term Perspective of VASAB to be produced in 2009. The output achieved:

- first draft recommendation papers (in outline format) of WG1 and WG2.

4.9. WG1 sixth meeting (one day) took place on 03 September 2008 in Jurmala. It was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, four external experts and seven invited guests. They discussed the final draft of the recommendations and action programme prepared during holiday time 2008 by ASSET, Immanuel Kant State University of Russia (Kaliningrad), Nordregio staff, and external experts. The whole work on urban-rural relations in Russia the relevant analytic reports were presented to the WG1 at this meeting as well. The WG1 discussed and improved the following documents:

- Recommendations how to improve innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Recommendations how to improve settlement policies in NW Russia (urban rural partnership) from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Action plan how to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration.

4.10. Steering Group Meeting 4 (one day) took place on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg. It was attended by 7 project partner members representing partners no. 2, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10 one external expert and 6 invited guests. The group discussed the shape of final publications of the EWW project, the use of the analytical materials and endorsed the recommendations and action proposed by the project. The main discussion was on the proper use of the EWW results for the Long Term Perspective (LTP) of VASAB elaboration of which was started few month ago (August 2008). The EWW results were placed to the different parts of the LTP outcomes. The VASAB consultant responsible for facilitating the LTP process was invited to the Steering Group meeting. It was also discussed how to use EWW outcomes for the process of preparation of the BSR EU Strategy. The partner no.5 arranged a meeting with the EU Commission on that topic. It was decided that the EWW results would be incorporated in the VASAB non-paper to be presented to the EU Commission in November/December 2008 in order to influence strategy preparation. The outputs achieved (as results of the meeting):

- Final draft of the recommendations how to improve innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Final draft of recommendations how to improve settlement policies in NW Russia (urban rural partnership) from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Final draft of the action plan how to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration,
- Final draft of recommendations on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR including concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR,
- Final action plan how to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational sea use planning and ICZM,
- Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic,
- Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application,
- Forwarding (transferring of EWW results) to important BSR processes namely: EU BSR Strategy and VASAB Long Term Perspective.

Activity 5: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 2 on accessibility

5.1. WG2 first meeting (one day) took place on 10 October 2007 in Riga. It was attended by five project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 8, 10, one external expert and three invited guests. The main aim was to discuss the scope of analysis (concrete meaning of accessibility) and the further work of the WG2 step by step, to achieve clarity about division of labour between the partners, to make sure that duplication with other project was avoided (instead to aim at using results achieved by other projects) and to start the process of contracting the external experts. The following outputs were produced or achieved:

- Report how to avoid duplication with other INTERREG III B projects in the field of accessibility was prepared by the project coordinator, discussed at the meeting and accepted by the Responsible Partner;
- TORs for four Kaliningrad University staff members, one Belarus expert and TORs for three external experts together with tender documentation (if necessary) have been prepared and approved. Procurement and contracting procedures for the one external expert was finished in September. Two other experts were also contracted (latter on);
- The main scope of analysis were proposed and discussed. The discussion on analysis continued among the partners (by e-mails) till the second WG2 meeting (December 2007);
- EWW link at the VASAB website was created (see activity 1.1);
- The content of the project flyer was loaded by short information about the WG2 activities.

Comments: The WG2 started its work behind the schedule. Due to the late project start (mid of June 2007), the first period of the project coincided with a holiday season. Therefore the real work of the WG2 (by phone, e-mails etc) started only in September 2007 i.e. three month later than planned. In addition to that, for some partners it was very inconvenient (e.g. celebrations of anniversary of establishment of the Kaliningrad University) and this postponed the start of formal work by one or two month further on i.e. till October 2007. In the meantime the preparation of the WG2 detailed analysis was started. To this end a pre meeting on 22nd of August 2007 was organised (partners 1, 7,8) to prepare tentative proposals on the substance of the work of the WG2. This meeting was paid outside the EWW budget. Although the WG2 (similarly to the WG1) came to the opinion that broader BSR picture was necessary to promote *territorial integration of NW Russia into the BSR in the field of transport and ITC*. The WG2 members also shared the WG1 concern on importance of smooth transfer of the EWW results to the BSR strategy till 2030 i.e. Long Term Perspective to be prepared by VASAB in 2009. The characteristic feature of the WG2 was a long discussion about the meaning of the notion of accessibility. As the result accessibility to energy was also considered to be an important element of the analysis.

Activity 6: Analysis(WG2)

6.1. The discussion on the scope and method of analysis (indicators, pilot studies) had been continued from October till beginning of December 2007. The manuals and guidelines were discussed many times. The main method was e-mail exchanges. As the result the manuals and blue prints were produced by partners 1 and 8 to facilitate collecting data and information:

- A blue print on screening transport policy,
- A manual for collecting data and information on accessibility.

Comments: The majority of time of the initial period was allocated to discussing the notion of accessibility. This was done in order to avoid problems when data and information collection would be started. Due to the rise of energy prices also this issue was considered as important factor for the NW Russia integration to the BSR. The second issue heavily discussed was scarcity of comparable data in Russia. Partner no 8 having a very well developed data base on transport data for the BSR was in a difficult position checking (in dialogue with partner 4) existence of

similar data in Russia. This required more resources and more work load than estimated at the beginning. But finally this allowed presenting Russia at the broader BSR picture. The phase 6.1. ended with second meeting of the WG2 (December 2007 in Riga).

6.2. Data collection and interpretation started only in December 2007 after the second WG 2 meeting. Basic data were collected by mid February 2008 but some work continued (fine tuning of reports) till May/June 2008. A draft discussion paper was ready for the Riga Stakeholder Conference in April 2008. However, it was a working document amended after each important EWW meeting, till the final/closing Conference. In this work (phase 6.1 and 6.2) seventeen people (including three external experts) were involved. Their involvement differed. The main bulk of analytical work was done by partners no. 4 and 8 and the external experts whereas the other participants acted mainly as a reference group reading reports, making comments and asking for improvements. This was done first of all by partners no. 1, 6, 7 and 10 representing mainly policy making side in the project and project coordination. Also VASAB Secretariat was invited by partner 1 (Responsible Partner) to participate in this process.

The following outputs were achieved:

(i) interim:

- Mapping of transport infrastructure policies at the federal and regional level, policies in development of the soft accessibility (to knowledge and information) and policies on clusters in NW Russia (however clusters were analysed by the WG1 in fact), also policies and situation in the field of accessibility to energy was examined;
- Identification of bottlenecks and constraints for transport (and through transport for business development) in NW Russia;
- Assessment of the policy correlation with the strategic documents at the BSR level (mainly by analysing outcomes of Strategic INTERREG III B projects pursued by VASAB, BDF, BSSSC and CPMR);
- Examining the results of other INTERREG III B projects relevant for the WG2 work;
- Feasibility assessment of connecting TEN-T with the pan-European corridors.

The planned verification of the accessibility perspective and of present (current) and forecast trade flows in NW Russia and Belarus (vis-a-vis BSR reports) was less successful. The main reason were missing data concerning predicted trade flows in NW Russia and Belarus²⁸. The accessibility perspective instead was analysed using BSR outlook to show how NW-Russia is connected with the rest of the BSR.

(ii) A compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") presenting situation, development trends and political objectives in the fields of transport and accessibility in NW RU and Belarus and their consequences for BSR cohesion and business development

Comments:

The most important planned outputs were achieved (although one output was slightly modified). In addition to that, accessibility to energy was touched as important future factor of the BSR integration that should determine in great extent the NW Russia integration into the BSR. The analysis lasted longer than expected. The main constraint was lack of regional reliable data in NW Russia. The main reason of the delay was in insufficient data availability but also to some extent larger than expected amount of available background information (e.g. results of the BSR projects) that should be digested and analysed.

Activity 7: Pilot studies (WG2)

²⁸ The work on trade flows was done in co-operation with WG1 and the BSR perspective was used.

Since the analytical phase (activity 6) was delayed also pilot projects were postponed. The aim of the activity 7 was to analyse more in depth the most promising solutions developed during the analytical phase and prioritised during stakeholder dialogue. Therefore only in May 2008 the more concrete work on pilot studies (pre-feasibility studies) could start. The WG2 selected two (in line with the output indicators listed in the application) topics for pre-feasibility studies. The topics were following:

- m) BSR passenger railway connectivity with focus on the Eastern part of the BSR,
- n) examination of implementation of the transport part of Tallinn vision of VASAB with focus on the eastern part of the BSR.

For the pilot studies a tender procedure was used and contracts were signed in late June 2008. The results were delivered in late August 2008 and discussed by the WG2 group meeting in September. The following reports were produced:

- *Study on international rail passenger traffic development: Possibilities in the context of development of cities in the Baltic Sea Region* (Contract: 5-13/66, of 18.6.2008) elaborated by SIA “AC Konsultācijas”,
- *Evaluation of implementation of the VASAB 2010 vision in the area of mobility network and energy supply* (Contract: 5-13/74, of 23.7.2008) elaborated by SIA “AC Konsultācijas”.

The results of the studies were presented to the closing/final conference of the EWW and will serve as an input for the Long Term Spatial Development Perspective. They were also presented in advance to the WG2 members working on recommendation in order to shape the WG2 recommendations.

Comments:

An additional barrier delaying activity no.7 was obligation of tendering the contractors due to internal law of Latvia where partner no.1 (responsible for the WG2 work) is located. The WG2 decisions were taken in May 2008, but the contracts were signed only 1,5- 2 months latter coinciding once more with a holiday season. The first preliminary results of the activity no.7 were delivered in August and the final results in October/November 2008.

Activity 8: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR

The same as activity no. 3

Activity 9: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG2)

- 9.1. Steering Group Meeting (1 day) took place on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg according to schedule (for details see action 4.1).
- 9.2. WG2 second meeting (1 day) took place on 5 December 2007 in Riga (instead of late November). The meeting was attended by seven project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 7, 8, 10 and four invited guests. The meeting concentrated on discussing analytical phase of the project. The manuals and blue prints for collecting data and information were agreed. For starting work on recommendation it was discussed that the idea of Steering Group (of its first meeting in October 2007) of workshop for all WGs should be implemented and the Responsible Partner was asked to organize such a workshop (synergy meeting) in January 2008.
- 9.3. Synergy meeting no.1 (1 day) took place in Riga on 31st of January 2008 (see action 4.3. for details).
- 9.4. Steering Group Meeting 2 on 1st of February 2008 in Riga (see action 4.4. for details).
- 9.5. Synergy meeting no. 2 (1 day) took place in Liepaja on 14th of March 2008. (see action 4.5. for details).
- 9.6. Steering Group Meeting 3 (one day) took place on 20 May 2008 in Riga. (for details see action 4.8).

- 9.7. WG2 third meeting (one day) took place on 21 May 2008 in Riga according to schedule. It was attended by five project partner members representing partners no. 1, 7, 8, 10, one external expert and three invited guests. The WG2 before the third meeting concentrated mainly on analytical work. At this meeting analyses were summed up and the work on recommendations started. It was decided that recommendations (with elements of the action programme) would be prepared for Russia and for the whole BSR with focus on better integration of NW Russia. One additional meeting was requested (autumn 2008) in order to discuss the final draft of the recommendations. The meeting also discussed the pilot actions (pre-feasibility studies) agreeing on concrete items. The outputs achieved:
- a first draft recommendations paper (in outline format),
 - TOR for two most important pilot studies.
- 9.8. WG2 fourth meeting (one day) took place on 4th September 2008 in Jurmala. It was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, three external experts and six invited guests. They discussed the final draft of the recommendations (with elements of the action programme) prepared by Immanuel Kant State University of Russia (Kaliningrad) and Nordregio staff. The WG2 discussed and improved the following documents:
- Recommendations on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR including concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR.
 - Study on international rail passenger traffic development: Possibilities in the context of development of cities in the Baltic Sea Region,
 - Evaluation of implementation of the VASAB 2010 vision in the area of mobility network and energy supply,
 - Overview of results of INTERREG III B projects in the field of accessibility .
- 9.9. Steering Group Meeting 4 (one day) took place on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg (please see action 4.10)

Activity 10: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 3 on ICZM and transnational sea use planning

- 10.1. WG3 preparatory meeting took place on 24 July 2007 in Kaliningrad. It was attended by nine project partner members representing partners no. 4, 10, and five invited guests. The meeting was used for preparation of the WG3 first meeting, and the pilot action in particular for presentation and discussion with the Kaliningrad partners the results of the INTERREG project BaltCoast of which recommendations should form main backbone of the work of the WG3. The preparatory meeting was organised during the holiday season due to indicated by the Kaliningrad partner necessity of postponing the WG3 first meeting till October because of the celebrations of 750th anniversary of establishment of the university (lack of experts) in early autumn 2007. So the preparatory meeting was a vehicle to start the work of the WG3 even in slightly less formal way. The main subject of discussion was the BaltCoast recommendations, TORs for experts and other guidelines necessary for elaboration of the WG3 analysis. The outputs were following:
- Decision on TORs and blue prints,
 - Clarifying division of labour,
 - Project flyer was discussed (and then edited) - see activity 1.1.
- 10.2 WG 3 first meeting (1,5 day) took place on 30-31 October 2007 in Kaliningrad i.e. with four month delay. The reason was the celebrations of 750th anniversary of establishment of the Albertina University (today Immanuel Kant State University of Russia) in Kaliningrad. The meeting was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 4, 9, 10 and to some extent also partner no.1, one external expert and fifteen invited guests mainly from Russia but also from Latvia, Germany and Finland. The main aim was to discuss the analysis and the further WG3 work in detail, to achieve clarity about division of labour between the

partners, to make sure that duplication with other project was avoided (instead to aim at using results achieved by other projects) and to start the process of contracting the external experts. Instead of preparing TORs for separate experts the WG3 at pre meeting decided to make only two TORs (one for external expert and one for the whole pilot project). For conducting analysis it was agreed that blue prints should be used. Such blue prints were prepared by partner no. 10 in advance presented at the meeting, and then improved/discussed by e-mails and approved in December 2007. The following outputs were produced or achieved:

- Report (in form of power point presentations) – presenting an overview of existing and available documentation on the chosen themes in NW Russia and at the BSR level;
- Two blue prints (for further analysis and discussions);
- Two TORs (one for external expert and one for the whole pilot project);
- One external expert was contracted by the partner no 1 covering by his expertise BSR and HELCOM perspective;
- EWW link at the VASAB website was created (see activity 1.1).

Also Kaliningrad stakeholders who attended the second part of the meeting were informed about the EWW project together with showing them the relevant BSR experience in ICZM and maritime spatial planning. They formed important part of the reference network for dialogue on project findings and recommendations. The meeting was also a starting point for executing analysis.

Activity 11 Analysis (WG 3)

11.1 The discussion on the scope and method of analysis had been continued from October till beginning of December 2007. The discussion resulted in shifting focus more from ICZM to maritime spatial planning as the most important transnational issue related to sea use in the nearest future. The blue prints (to be followed by Russian colleagues) presented by partner 10 were discussed many times. The main method was e-mail exchanges. As the result the two blue prints were agreed:

- A blue print on spatial planning legislation on the sea covering Poland,
- A blue print on potentials and conflicts on the sea covering Poland.

11.2. Gathering and compiling the WG3 information started in December 2007 after blue prints approval. Fourteen people representing partners no. 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10 were involved in the information collecting. Their involvement differed. The main bulk of analytical work was done by partners no.10 and 4 and by external expert whereas the other participants acted mainly as a reference group reading reports, making comments and asking for improvements. This was done first of all by partners no. 5,6 and 7 representing mainly policy making side in the project. The analysis in principle were ended in March. The situation of the WG3 was different than the WG1 and the WG2. The WG3 did not collect statistical information but rather qualitative information and the broad BSR background was discussed, sorted out and clarified at the first meeting by examining BaltCoast results. Therefore, the analytical work could be done in parallel with an initial phase of recommendation preparation. But also in the WG3 the completing analytical reports took more time than expected. Although first draft reports were ready in March their fine tuning continued in April and even in May and June. This was slightly learning by doing in particular for Russian experts who had little contact with maritime spatial planning in the past. The outputs were following:

- The legal systems were screened and regulations, responsibilities for offshore planning at all levels in NW Russia were identified;
- System of mapping to improve access to relevant information from NW Russia and its uploading to the pilot system made in the INTERREG III B BaltCoast project were tested (the results can be seen in the WG3 reports done by Russian colleagues);

- Actual (current) sea use in NW RU (Kaliningrad) according to the BaltCoast standards (potentials and conflicts) were described in a separate paper and conflicts and potentials were detected;
- A compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") with assessment of compatibility of the Russian regulatory framework to the legislation and practice in a pan-Baltic perspective in the field of ICZM and sea use planning was elaborated.

Comments:

The all planned outputs were achieved.

Activity 12 Pilot Action (WG 3)

Pilot action was started in October 2007 and continues till the end of August 2008. The twelve project partners staff members representing partners no. 1,4,6,7,9,10 and one external expert were involved. Partners no. 1,6,7 have acted mainly as a reference group while the main role was played by partners no. 4,9,10. The pilot action aimed at preparing a system of joint ICZM and maritime spatial planning in Gdańsk Bay between Poland and Russia. This task was discussed at the kick off meeting with various Russian stakeholders. The prevailing opinion was that due to the dispersed responsibilities in Russia in ICZM and sea space management (versus concrete central Agency in Poland responsible for sea space and regional governments responsible for ICZM activities) such goal could not be achieved in the project time span. Nowadays there is no single institution in Russia responsible for sea space management (like Maritime Offices in Germany or Poland). The WG3 came to the opinion that agreements between Polish and Russian relevant state institutions on co-operation in sea use planning and management might be too ambitious and premature as the WG3 output. Instead pilot actions were focused on the preconditions for establishment of such agreements in future, by exchange of good practices, deepening mutual understanding and preparing necessary tools and necessary institutional structures i.e. centres of excellence in both countries dealing with maritime spatial planning. It was decided that the starting point should be an agreement between Russian and Polish institutions from NGO or research domain to co-operate on promotion of integrative approach to sea space and coast in both countries. In this context a sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application was discussed. It was considered as an important tool for showing to Russian decision-makers a usefulness of maritime spatial planning. The WG3 decided to limit it to the Baltic Sea around Kaliningrad Oblast. The register was prepared by partner no. 4 and 10 in a form of GIS atlas. The following outputs were produced in the reporting period:

- The exchange of bi-lateral experience was started e.g. Polish pilot sea use plan (covering Puck Bay) elaborated in 2008 under PlanCoast INTERREG III B project was shown to the RU experts;
- The experience with the BaltCoast project of INTERREG III B was shared;
- Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application was first discussed then agreed and then produced and presented to the final/closing conference of the EWW in St. Petersburg on 21st October 2008;
- Agreement between Maritime Institute in Gdańsk and Russian partners on permanent co-operation in the future (including joint projects and policy related work) aiming at establishment of a system of joint ICZM and maritime spatial planning in Gdańsk Bay between Poland and Russia was prepared in autumn 2008. The partners of the agreement will act as centres of excellence in their countries with regard to maritime spatial planning and ICZM.

Comments:

The pilot action had to be modified. But the actions started within EWW project will be continued after the project closure thanks to established under the EEW contacts. The aim of

establishment of the system of joint ICZM and maritime spatial planning in Gdańsk Bay between Poland and Russia is still valid and will be realised in the future. What was done under EWW project was to start this process by exchange of experience, awareness rising, gathering stakeholders and discussing with them the problem and by preparation of some necessary tools which will convince Russian decision-makers that an integrative coastal and sea space management would be important. Despite difficulties the main outputs promised in the EWW application were produced: i.e. (i) a sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application and (ii) agreements between Polish and Russian relevant institutions on co-operation in sea use planning and management.

Activity 13: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR

The same as activity no. 3

Activity 14: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG3)

- 14.1. Steering Group Meeting (1 day) took place on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg according to schedule (for details see action 4.1).
- 14.2. Synergy meeting no.1 (1 day) took place in Riga on 31st of January 2008 (see action 4.3. for details). This meeting was used by the WG3 also for development of a first outline of recommendation paper which was discussed afterwards by e-mail exchange.
- 14.3. Steering Group Meeting 2 on 1st of February 2008 in Riga (see action 4.4. for details).
- 14.4. Synergy meeting no 2 (1 day) took place in Liepaja on 14th of March 2008 (see action 4.5. for details).
- 14.5. WG3 second meeting (1,5 day) took place on 27-28 March 2008 in Kaliningrad (instead of late November 2007). It was attended by sixteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 7, 9, 10., one external expert and two invited guests. The meeting assessed the progress of the analytical work, discussed the interim reports of Russia and tried to relate the WG3 work towards the EU Integrated Maritime Policy (Blue Book). The final draft of recommendation paper was discussed and agreed. The acknowledgement of the project results at the political level was also examined. The WG3 group joined the WG1 and the WG2 wish to present its results at policy level by introducing them to the "Long Term Perspective" of VASAB. However, partner 9 was also asked to transfer the results to the EU BSR Strategy and to the EU work on integrated maritime policy. During the WG3 meeting a workshop with Russian stakeholders on off-shore planning and ICZM was organised in Kaliningrad on 27th of March 2008 as a joint venture of all projects dealing with this subject i.e. EWW, POWER and SDI-4-SEB as a part of the conference ("Integrated management, sustainable development indicators, spatial planning and monitoring of the South-Eastern Baltic coastal regions"), which took place in Kaliningrad on 26th - 30th of March 2007. Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic were elaborated by EWW project participants beforehand and proposed to stakeholders attending this conference. The recommendations were unanimously adopted by the participants including regional and local authorities from Russia. This seemed to be an important step towards introducing integrative approach towards the sea space and coastal zone in Russia.

The output achieved was following:

- Recommendation paper discussed and adopted by the Russian stakeholder (Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic).
- 14.6. Steering Group Meeting 3 (1day) took place on 20 May 2008 in Riga (for details see action 4.8).

14.7. WG3 third meeting (1 day) took place on 4-5 June 2008 in Gdańsk almost according to schedule (few days later than planned originally). It was attended by fifteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 9, 10, one external expert and five invited guests. At the meeting analytical phase was summed up. The meeting was also used for examining the experience and good practices of the Balance project in maritime spatial planning. The experts from Denmark introduce the project to the WG3 members. However, the WG3 main discussion concentrated on the 'action plan' following the recommendations adopted in March 2008. The opinions were dispersed. Some participants considered elaboration of an action plan as premature having in mind lack of legal provisions in Russia regulating sea use in an integrative way and dispersion of responsibility for sea management among many institutions. Some others proposed to focus action plan on methodological issues i.e. issues indispensable to introduce sea use planning in Russia and methodology of such planning suited for Russian conditions. After the e-mail exchange in June 2008 the partner no 9 responsible for the WG3 work decided to take the risk to prepare a draft action plan and to discuss it in September 2008 with the WG 3 members. Therefore an additional meeting was requested to be held in September 2008, to conclude the recommendation phase. The following outputs were achieved:

- The experience with Balance project of INTERREG III B was shared.

After the WG3 third meeting the partner no 9 and 10 organised (late June beginning of July 2008) consultation about the follow up of the WG3 in a form of a joint project. In the consultation the information on different ETC Programmes in the BSR were analysed and compared. The results were presented to the WG3 fourth meeting.

14.8. WG3 fourth meeting (one day) took place on 2nd September 2008 in Gdańsk. It was attended by thirteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 7, 9, 10 and one external expert. The meeting discussed the final draft of the action programme prepared by the staff of partners no 4 and 10 (Maritime Institute from Gdańsk and Immanuel Kant State University of Russia from Kaliningrad). Also final draft of the sea use register was presented by the partner no.4. The WG3 discussions tackled also the future use of the WG3 results. The presentations to the final/closing conference of EWW were agreed. It was also decided that the WG3 analysis should serve for broader popularization of the issue of maritime spatial planning in the Baltic Sea Region. The partner no 9. agreed to edit (by the end of 2008) from its own resources a *Compendium on Maritime Spatial Planning systems in the Baltic Sea Region countries* composed of two parts: part 1 *Survey of the national instruments and tools for the management of the sea space in the BSR countries* describing legal and institutional aspects of maritime spatial planning systems in the BSR countries and part 2 entitled *Examples of national cases of sea spatial conflicts and potentials*. Partner no.9 promised to invite to this book all other BSR countries while using the WG3 results as the core input. The WG3 also analysed different possibilities of continuation of the WG3 work. After the lively discussion it was decided to use two vehicles for further co-operation: The project BaltSeaPlan already submitted to the BSR Programme (although slightly too abstractive) and the new project to be submitted to the ENPI Programme Lithuania–Poland–Russian Federation on concrete planning work as continuation of the WG3 pilot activities. It was decided that transnational maritime planning should concentrate on Vistula/Kalinigrad lagoon and on Kursiu lagoon.

The WG3 discussed and improved the following documents during its fourth meeting:

- Action plan how to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational sea use planning and ICZM;
- Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application.

14.9. Steering Group Meeting 4 (one day) took place on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg (please see action 4.10)

26.2. Assessment of the results of the Action

The central objective of the Action was to promote territorial integration of NW Russia (i.e. the entire Northwest Federal District, including Kaliningrad) into the Baltic Sea region (BSR) in the identified three fields of (1) business development, (2) transport / ICT development and (3) sea use planning and Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM). The starting point was relatively impressive but slightly idle (from the BSR perspective) developmental potential (in terms of human capital, scientific achievements etc.) of the North West Russia. The task was to develop solutions how to use the potential of the NW Russia for the benefit of the BSR economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development.

The action was successful to that extend that it managed to identify economic and spatial development needs in the NW Russia from the perspective of public authorities and businesses, requiring to be tackled by at the transnational level. This findings were benchmarked against existing good practice solutions based on experience of other BSR countries. The search was also done in order to detect economic and spatial trends, relevant for connecting territorial potentials between the NW Russia and the BSR. However, the picture coming from analysis appeared less promising than expected (see point 2.9). But even in those rather difficult circumstances the recommendations for three mentioned above fields were formulated and action plans were outlined. The main results delivered to the external audience having policy relevance are presented below:

The results achieved	The results intended	Explanation of differences
Recommendations how to improve innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration	Recommendation" paper with suggestions on policy improvements and legislative changes to improve settlement and innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration	The results achieved put less attention to legislative changes than to policy improvements. This is outcome of the survey done in order to learn from Russian businessman what are the main obstacles for them to innovate.
Recommendations how to improve settlement policies in NW Russia (urban rural partnership) from the perspective of BSR integration,		The focus of the result achieved is on urban-rural partnership as key for integrative development of settlement structure in Russia.
Action plan how to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration,	A paper with fields for further concrete actions ("action plan") to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration	Done in line with plans
Recommendations on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR including concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR,	1.Recommendation" paper with suggestions on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR 2. A paper with fields for further concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia and in BY in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR	The recommendations and action plan were merged. The reason is that Russia has very concrete plans and actions in this field for the future years so the WG2 decided to focus on long-term recommendations.
Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic	Recommendation" paper on upgrading the instruments and tools and institutional arrangements for transnational sea use planning and ICZM at the BSR level based on the completed pilot action	More ambitious recommendations were produced than expected i.e. more in line with the real situation in Russia with regard to ICZM and maritime spatial planning

Action plan how to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational sea use planning and ICZM	A paper with fields for further concrete actions ("action plan") to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational sea use planning and ICZM	Done in line with plans
Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application	A sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application - based on the completed system mapping.	Done in line with plans
Agreement between maritime Institute in Gdańsk and Immanuel Kant State University of Russia on further co-operation in the field of maritime spatial planning	Agreements between Polish and Russian relevant institutions on co-operation in sea use planning and management	Done in line with plans

The most important EWW achievement is delivery of main messages resulting from the Action to the important Russian decision makers, planning professionals and scientific sector as well as to the key pan-Baltic organizations such as HELCOM or VASAB. Through VASAB also the EU BSR strategy was influenced.

26.3. The outcome on both final beneficiaries and/or target group and the situation of the target group/target region which the action addressed

The target audience/recipients of the project findings have been decision-makers (ministries responsible for spatial planning and development in the BSR, including the federal government in Russia, regional authorities in NW Russia, pan-Baltic organisations such as VASAB 2010). Thanks to the action they have received a better picture on the situation with regard to the North-West Russia integration into the Baltic Sea region (BSR). This knowledge has been already used for policy making by VASAB in production of the Long Term Spatial Development Perspective and it seems that it will be also useful for the EU Commission in elaboration of the EU BSR strategy and for HELCOM for implementation of the Baltic Sea Action Plan. In fact the Action played a tremendous role in validation of the planning methodologies and strategic documents at the pan-Baltic level based on the NW Russia perspective. The Action gave a proper insight on main drivers and obstacles of integration of the North West Russia into the BSR. The Action findings and recommendations were also delivered to the Russian decision makers and VASAB will continue its efforts to convince them that the BSR integration is beneficial for the North-West Russia. At least in the field of maritime spatial planning as the result of the Action one can see increased capacity and competence basis to take up joint transnational initiatives between the NW Russia partners and institutions from other BSR countries.

The final beneficiaries local and regional governments in the Baltic Sea region (BSR) operators in the chosen thematic fields (e.g. businesses in WP1 and transport operators in WP2) in NW Russia and in the BSR will be influenced mainly through the actions of pan-Baltic organisations mainly VASAB and its Long Term Spatial Development Perspective. This will allow for incorporation of the BSR perspective in the national/regional/local policies in the NW Russia.

26.4. Publications

The following publications were produced:

Name	Number of copies	Distribution channels
The East-West Window brochure informing about the project	300	Distributed during the project events in particular kick-off conference, stakeholder seminar, the Conference "Baltic Sea Region Programme 2007-2013: new partnership opportunities for Russian and Belarusian regions" and many other events

Атлас использования прибрежных акваторий российской части Юго-восточной Балтики (Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application – <i>edited on CD rom</i>)	200	Distributed for free during the EWW final (closing) conference, available for free from partner no.4
The book in Russian: Северо-Запад России в Регионе Балтийского Моря: Проблемы и перспективы экономического взаимодействия и сотрудничества (North West Russia in the Baltic Sea region. Problems and perspectives of co-operation and mutual influence) presenting main results of the project	100	Distributed for free by partners no.4 among the project partners and participants of the EWW events. Sent to Russian relevant Ministries and main libraries.

26.5. Contracts (works, supplies, services) above 5000€ awarded for the implementation of the action since the last interim report

Only one contract above 5000€ was awarded since the last interim report.

	Contract	Amount	Procedure	Winner
1	Audit Services Contract	5 131,94	“negotiated procedure without publication”	<i>SIA Rodl and Partner</i>

26.6. Continuation of the Action after ending the support from the European Community

The action will be continued after ending the EU support for the East West Window project. Durability of the project results has been ensured by the direct participation or the support of the national ministries responsible for spatial planning and development around the BSR, acting under VASAB 2010. Through their co-operation with other relevant stakeholders, the project rendered available concrete recommendations for policy-making in the chosen thematic fields in the NW Russia and at the BSR level. Through intensive dialogue with the target audience, the project influenced planners in Russia neighbouring countries by including the perspective of NW Russia. It also served for modification of pan-Baltic strategic policy papers, long-term visions and development plans on the very same account.

In particular the EWW results were used by VASAB for elaboration of the Long Term Perspective for Spatial Development of the BSR. Thanks to the EWW this will be the document with proper outlook on North-West Russia. Due to the EWW the collaboration between VASAB (ministries) and other EWW partners (research institutes) will be strengthened. The EWW results will be also used for discussing with HELCOM an idea of maritime spatial planning in the Baltic Sea Region.

Follow-up activities in effect of the project will be initiated and promoted by VASAB 2010. This includes starting up of possible new project(s) covering the whole BSR and taking into consideration the needs and perspectives of NW Russia, identified and referred to in the present project. The WG3 work will be continued in a form of the BaltSeaPlan project already approved by the BSR Programme (will start around December 2008). The WG3 partners will also plan to submit the project on elaboration of concrete maritime spatial plans for Vistula and Kursiu Lagoons in the framework of the ENPI Programme Lithuania–Poland–Russian Federation. Despite finishing the work of the WG3 the partner no.9 responsible for its leading has already declared to continue the efforts in a broader BSR set up and started elaboration of the BSR wide

“Compendium on Maritime Spatial Planning systems in the Baltic Sea Region countries” using the WG3 results and experience.

26.7. Gender equality, disabilities

Where relevant, the perspective of equal opportunities was taken into account for the thematic work (especially in the fields of business and transport). Due efforts were made to secure involvement of both men and women in the composition of the project management structures, daily work and in the dialogue fora with relevant stakeholders in NW Russia and at the overall BSR level. Spatial planning forming a substance of the project from its definition cares for gender equality, prevention or exclusions of handicapped from the normal life. Although, gender equality and disables were not the main focus of the EWW project one can assume that the realisation of the project objectives (integration of the NW Russia into the BSR) will be beneficial in a long run also for attracting attention of Russian decision makers and Russian society to those above mentioned horizontal goals. They are placed very high at civil agenda in particular in the Nordic countries and integration means also convergence in values and way of living so it means better acceptance of these horizontal goals in Russia as well. The same has happened in Poland, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia after their accession to EU (strengthening their European integration).

26.8. Monitoring and evaluation of the activities

Monitoring of activities was done on routine basis by the project Steering Group. The group worked very effectively guiding the project and proposing the changes if necessary. The group (ministerial part) provided also an excellent piece of advice with regard to use of the EWW project results for policy making. However, one should also admit the important role of Committee on Spatial Development of the Baltic Sea Region which was among the main recipients of the project results. The advice from this body and the VASAB Secretariat which took part in majority of the EWW events (on their own money) helped a lot in proper shaping the EWW work and focusing on the policy relevant results (e.g. providing links to HELCOM, EU BSR Strategy etc.).

Also important were feedbacks received from beneficiaries during the kick-off and final (closing) conference. In the Annex 2 quotations from the Conference resolutions are attached (in Russian).

26.9. What has been learned from the Action

The main lesson from the action is that integration of the NW Russia into the Baltic Sea Region (BSR) will not be an easy process. Russia is a global player looking for global organizations and bodies as its partners. Even the regional level i.e. St. Petersburg has sufficient potential to play an important role at the global arena. This is clearly seen in the St. Petersburg government policy and strategic documents. BSR is not the main field of St. Petersburg strategic activity. Slightly different situation is with regard to Kaliningrad, but its potential is sufficient to strengthen rather cross-border than pan-Baltic integration of Russian Federation. The main integrative processes between Russia and the rest of the BSR are hardly due to market forces or conscious decisions of the Russian enterprises but rather thanks to EU financial support in form of transnational and cross-border programmes. The only field in which one can expect more or less natural co-operation between Russia and the other BSR countries is maritime spatial planning as long as it affects coastal defence, fish stock and state of the coastal nature. Russia is very active now in HELCOM where the questions of maritime spatial planning have been already raised.

Therefore strengthening integration of the North-West Russia into the BSR requires further development of the Russian medium size cities such as e.g. Kaliningrad or Pskov, their partnership with adjacent regions, and development of the maritime spatial planning institutions which in natural way will seek for the relations with their closest neighbours.

27. Partners and other Co-operation

27.1. How do you assess the relationship between the formal partners of this Action (i.e. those partners which have signed a partnership statement)? Please specify for each partner organisation

St. Petersburg Administration [2] – partner active for discussing policy relevant documents and organising meetings in St. Petersburg in the field of analysis acting through partner no.3 . Important contribution to the stakeholder dialogue. In fact this partner will be one of the main recipients of the project results.

Russian Economic Developers Association (ASSET) [3] – very demanding from formal point of view but also very experience partner in analytical work. A great bulk of the WG1 recommendations were proposed by this partner. The partner is a great interface between science and policy making in Russia in particular in St. Petersburg. Important role in dissemination activities thanks to good contacts with decision-makers in Russia at local and regional level.

Immanuel Kant State University of Russia [4] – very reliable and enthusiastic partner being a source of many data and information excellent in scientific work acquiring great experience during the EWW project how to translate analysis into policy findings, but in fact majority of recommendations of the WG2 and the WG3 were rooted in partner no. 4 thinking.

Ministry of the Environment, Danish Forest and Nature Agency, Denmark [5] – very active and experienced partner (being responsible in the past for the USUN project) leading the WG 1 work and ensuring proper presentation of EWW at the highest BSR political level.

Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Housing, Germany [6] – very active and experienced partner responsible for urban-rural investigations under the WG1, ensuring proper presentation of EWW at the highest BSR political level.

Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communication, Sweden [7] – partner ensuring link to the EU BSR strategy (use of EWW results also there), acting mainly through partner 8 but very active in the WG2 , active in the WG3 (with very high quality inputs) and contributing to policy relevant findings in the EWW.

Nordic Centre for Spatial Development (NORDREGIO) [8] – one of key drivers for analytical work, competent, flexible with a large knowledge and experience in spatial and regional development.

Ministry of Regional Development, Poland [9] – partner leading the WG3 but active in other work groups, very experienced and very flexible contributing to the work additional resources if project resources are not sufficient.

Maritime Institute, Poland [10] – key resource for maritime spatial planning and ICZM in the project supporting actively the WG3 and coordinating the whole project from content point of view in very reasonable way.

27.2. Is the partnership to continue

The partnership will continue in a form of BSR Programme and ENPI Programme projects on maritime spatial planning. The co-operation agreement between partners no 4 and 10 will serve

to this end. The BaltSea Plan was approved by the BSR programme. The project will serve as a continuation and dissemination of the WG3 work and results since both partners no 4 and 10 are among its key drivers.

The EWW project results were also used within the VASAB framework. This means that new partners such as Nordregio, ASSET or Immanuel Kant State University of Russia have joined the VASAB work and their involvement will continue.

27.3. How would you assess the relationship between your organisation and State authorities in the Action countries? How has this relationship affected the Action?

Since majority of the partners are state high level institutions those relations were fine. The partners representing state authorities knew each other for many years before starting the project as the members of the VASAB co-operation (Co-operation of Ministers for spatial planning and development in the BSR countries). The new input was given by the scientific institutions. This was a great added value of the project, mutual learning how to translate analysis into policy relevant actions. The research oriented partners were quite flexible and willing to reshape analysis or repeat them if asked by policy making partners.

27.4. Where applicable, describe your relationship with any other organisations involved in implementing the Action:

- Associate(s) (if any) - no
- Sub-contractor(s) (if any). Some of the work was given to the external contractors. However an idea was that majority of work should be done by the partners themselves since the partners had sufficient qualification to execute the project and achieve its goals. Contractors were used mainly for technical issues and for bringing knowledge from INTERREG projects. Only some partners (9) and (5) used contractors more intensively (for some concrete work) due to shortages in their human resources. In principle the relation with contractors were positive with one exception (i.e. Rumanian contractor who won a tender for the EWW financial management disappeared after few month of serving the project)
- Final Beneficiaries and Target groups. Those relations were fine thanks to sue of well established and prominent conferences for presentation of the EWW. This gave the project access to the target group necessary for the project success.
- Other third parties involved. Important was a link of the project to the VASAB Secretariat and VASAB work on the Long Term Perspective. VASAB Secretariat promoted also project and its results externally on request of the Responsible Partner.

27.5. Where applicable, outline any links you have developed with other actions.

The project ambition was to develop link to other important projects in order to make use of their results (BaltCoast, PlanCoast, Balance, USUN, SeBCo – their experts were invited to the project meetings) or to make joint meetings to better reach target groups (SeBCo POWER and SDI-4-SEB). These projects represented different INTERREG strands.

27.6. If your organisation has received previous EC grants in view of strengthening the same target group, in how far has this Action been able to build upon/complement the previous one(s)? (List all previous relevant EC grants).

The Ministries involved in the project previously received a grant from INTERREG II C to prepare an Action Plan for implementation of the VASAB strategy adopted in 1994. The project was called VASAB Plus and ended in 2000. The EWW used the VASAB Plus experience but its focus was different. This time the target geographical area was the NW Russia and its integration to the BSR. The lesson learned under the VASAB Plus (where Russia had no financial resources for analysis) showed that preparation of a pan-Baltic documents with very differentiate resources

might result in uneven involvement of the countries and then uneven ownership of the agreed actions or strategies. Therefore the EWW was invented to avoid such a mistake and to give Russian colleagues resources for considering their role in the BSR integration.

28. Visibility

How is the visibility of the EU contribution being ensured in the Action?

At the project start a press release was done by the Responsible Partner. Visibility was ensured by placing proper information that the EWW project was part-financed by the EU together with the EU logo and logo of INTERREG III B. This was done on printing materials, power point presentation and on the project web site. There was also some information in the Latvian radio. On demand of Russian colleagues the project was presented at the Conference “Baltic Sea Region Programme 2007-2013: new partnership opportunities for Russian and Belarusian regions” in St. Petersburg as one of the most successful INTERREG projects with Russian participation. To strengthen the project visibility a special project banner was produced and displayed on many occasions (e.g. Conference “Baltic Sea region Spatial Development Policies avenues to the Long Term Perspective” in Riga on 23 April 2007, and already mentioned conference “Baltic Sea Region Programme 2007-2013: new partnership opportunities for Russian and Belarusian regions” in St. Petersburg on 16-17 April 2008 and in many other events). The book with the project analysis and recommendations was printed in December 2008. But the most important is that the project results will be used for producing “Long Term Perspective” for the BSR which will be presented to CBSS and all important pan-Baltic organizations. Thanks to EWW NW Russia will be properly highlighted in this strategy.

The European Commission may wish to publicise the results of Actions. Do you have any objection to this report being published on Europe Aid Co-operation Office website? If so, please state your objections here.

Name of the contact person for the Action: **Vladislavs Vesperis**

Signature:Location: **Riga, Latvia**

Date report due:Date report sent:

Update of action plan

Activity	Months																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Activity 1: Kick off of the work of Working Group no 1 on business development and innovation affecting spatial development,	X	X	X	X														
Activity 2: Analysis(WG1)				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Activity 3: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR (WG1)					X						X						X	
Activity 4: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations and action plan (WG1)					X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Activity 5: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 2 on accessibility				X														
Activity 6: Analysis(WG2)					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Activity 7: Pilot studies (WG2)												X	X	X	X	X		
Activity 8: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR					X						X						X	X
Activity 9: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG2)					X	X		X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Activity 10: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 3 on ICZM and transnational sea use planning		X			X													
Activity 11 Analysis (WG 3)					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					
Activity 12 Pilot Action (WG 3)					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
Activity 13: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR					X						X						X	
Activity 14: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG3)					X			X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		

EWV events: participation of man and woman

Participants			
Event	Woman	Man	Total
Kick off meeting of the work of WG1, on 25 June 2007 in Riga	9	11	20
WG1 meeting 25 September 2007 in Riga	4	3	7
WG1 analysis (people involved)	11	23	34
Steering Group meeting on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg	7	11	18
St Petersburg kick off conference on 18-19 October 2007	112	146	259
St Petersburg Closing conference on 21 October 2008	231	400	631
WG1 second meeting on 6-7 December 2007 in Riga	9	10	19
Synergy meeting no.1 on 31 January 2008 in Riga	10	13	23
Steering Group Meeting no.2 on 1 February 2008 in Riga	4	11	15
Synergy meeting no 2 in Liepaja on 14 th of March 2008	8	8	16
WG1 fourth meeting on 3-4 April 2008 in Riga	6	7	13
Riga Stakeholders seminars (WG3 and WG1 + WG2) on 23 April 2008	83	84	167
WG1 fifth meeting on 24 April 2008 in Riga	13	12	25
Steering Group Meeting no. 3 on 20 May 2008 in Riga	4	6	10
Steering Group Meeting no. 4 on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg	3	10	13
WG1 sixth meeting on 3 rd September 2008 in Jurmala	11	11	22
WG2 first meeting on 10 October 2007 in Riga	3	6	9
WG2 analysis	6	11	17
WG2 second meeting on 5 December 2007 in Riga	4	7	11
WG2 third meeting on 21 May 2008 in Riga	2	7	9
WG2 fourth meeting on 4 th September 2008 in Jurmala	9	11	20
WG3 preparatory meeting on 24 July 2007 in Kaliningrad	4	10	14
WG 3 first meeting on 30-31 October 2007 in Kaliningrad	12	15	27
WG3 analysis	3	11	14
Pilot Action (WG 3)	3	10	13
WG3 second meeting on 27-28 March 2008 in Kaliningrad	6	13	19
WG3 third meeting on 4-5 June 2008 in Gdańsk	6	15	21
WG3 fourth meeting 2 September 2008 in Gdańsk	3	11	14

Quotations from the Conference resolutions (in Russian) in direct relations to the EAST West Window.

13. Kick Off Conference

Продвижение европейского опыта в рамках программ Европейского Инструмента Соседства и Партнерства усилит инновационный потенциал и влияние Северо-Западного региона России на процессы территориальной интеграции на внешних границах ЕС, в частности, в регионе Балтийского моря. В этих целях целесообразна активизация участия России в таких международных объединениях, как VASAB 2010, Балтийский форум развития (BDF), Программа транснационального сотрудничества региона Балтийского моря 2007-2013.

Зарубежный опыт свидетельствует о значительной роли малых и средних городов в продвижении инноваций и гармонизации территориального развития. Этот факт должен учитываться при разработке инновационных стратегий в России как на федеральном, так и на региональном уровнях. Необходимо уделять больше внимания развитию малых и средних городов, как это происходит в странах ЕС, и адаптировать европейский опыт применительно к ситуации в России (в частности, концепцию сельско-городского партнерства «ESDP Concept of Rural-Urban Partnership»). Доступ к знаниям и информации, возможность обмена идеями должны стать основой формирования территориальных моделей развития России.

/.../

Участники Форума согласились со следующим:

- необходимо особое единое государственное управление морскими прибрежными зонами страны (обеими их составляющими: морской и сухопутной) исходя из повсеместного успешного мирового опыта подобной деятельности и соответствующих рекомендаций организаций системы ООН и международных форумов на высшем уровне. Руководствуясь этим, рекомендовать: 1) создание нормативной правовой и институциональной базы для разработки и реализации комплексных программ развития и управления прибрежными зонами в рамках комплексных программ социально-экономического развития приморских субъектов Федерации и программ развития прибрежных муниципальных образований в целях активизации участия последних в освоении прибрежных и морских ресурсов; 2) адаптацию и освоение современных управленческих технологий (методология Комплексного управления прибрежными зонами (КУПЗ)) в применении к богатейшим по ресурсам и разнообразным по природным и социально-экономическим условиям прибрежным зонам страны; 3) разработку и реализацию пилотных программ КУПЗ конкретных побережий страны; 4) использование опыта сотрудничества стран Балтийского региона, в частности рекомендаций Проекта BaltCoast BSR INTERREG III B по управлению прибрежными зонами и разработке совместных стратегических проектов;
- рекомендовать использование кластерного подхода в качестве инструмента реализации стратегий развития территорий и повышения конкурентоспособности региональной и муниципальной экономики, включая выявление и диагностику потенциальных кластеров, разработку программ их развития, создание организаций по сотрудничеству. В органах власти необходимо формирование межотраслевых рабочих групп для координации развития кластеров и снятия ведомственных и отраслевых ограничений. Целесообразно более широкое использование международных программ и инструментов повышения конкурентоспособности кластеров;
- необходимо развитие региональной и муниципальной статистики, в частности для целей выработки эффективной кластерной политики и оценки результатов реализации кластерных инициатив в регионе и/или муниципалитете, формирования действенных

инструментов планирования и управления, ориентированного на результат на субфедеральных уровнях;

- при реализации федеральных, региональных и местных программ экономического развития необходимо стимулировать участие организаций инновационной инфраструктуры в российских и зарубежных сетевых организациях, которые оказывают содействие в предоставлении услуг компаниям и научным организациям в сфере инновационной бизнес-кооперации и трансфера технологий (примерами могут служить Российская сеть трансфера технологий RTTN, Европейская сеть бизнес-инновационных центров EBN). Участие в сетевом сотрудничестве должно быть нацелено на повышение качества и содержания услуг для местных компаний и НИИ. Федеральным и региональным органам власти необходимо поддерживать инициативы по развитию сетевого взаимодействия между организациями инновационной региональной инфраструктуры (создание региональных сетей) с целью уменьшения дублирования функций, повышения качества услуг и снижения расходов бюджета на их субсидирование;
- рекомендовать и стимулировать участие российских центров коммерциализации, инновационных центров в реализации Competitiveness Innovation Program (CIP) Европейского союза в части проектов, ориентированных на развитие инновационных сетей и сетей трансфера технологий (IRC, IRE, EBN и др.);
- считать целесообразным использование в России европейского опыта реализации региональных инновационных стратегий, обеспечивающих выявление спроса на инновации среди компаний и ориентацию научного сектора и инновационной инфраструктуры на удовлетворение этого спроса. (...);
- в целях совершенствования государственного и муниципального управления по обеспечению перехода Российской Федерации на инновационный путь развития рекомендовать Комиссии при Президенте Российской Федерации по вопросам совершенствования государственного управления и правосудия, Министерству регионального развития Российской Федерации, другим заинтересованным федеральным и региональным органам власти осуществить экспертизу полномочий органов государственной власти субъектов Российской Федерации и органов местного самоуправления в части выявления проблемных вопросов, препятствующих обеспечению перехода России на режим инновационного развития, и законодательно обеспечить активизацию участия в реализации государственной научно-технической политики органов государственной власти субъектов Федерации и органов местного самоуправления, рассмотреть возможность разработки национальной программы, ориентированной на содействие российским регионам в подготовке и реализации региональных инновационных стратегий и формирование российской сети инновационных регионов;
- рекомендовать заинтересованным федеральным и региональным органам государственной власти реализовать систему мер по поддержке технопарков и процессов коммерциализации научных разработок. В частности: разработать законодательную базу для развития технопарков на федеральном уровне; предоставить налоговые льготы компаниям-резидентам технопарков, например, аналогичные льготам для резидентов ОЭЗ; упростить процедуру предоставления земельных участков для технопарков; законодательно разрешить НИИ, вузам и университетам создавать малые предприятия - start-up'ы;
- рекомендовать органам регионального и муниципального управления активно использовать инструменты международной технической и финансовой помощи, предоставляемой по линии Института Всемирного Банка, АМР США, Европейского Инструмента Соседства и Партнерства (ENPI) и других программ Европейского Союза для реализации стратегических приоритетов и планов территориального развития, поддержки инноваций;
- отметить необходимость выработки механизма интеграции документов стратегического планирования муниципального, регионального и федерального уровней;
- одобрить инициативы Комитета по пространственному развитию региона Балтийского моря (CSD/BSR) VASAB 2010 по территориальной интеграции Северо-Запада России и реализации совместных проектов в таких приоритетных сферах как развитие бизнеса, транспорта, ИКТ, управление прибрежными зонами. Отметить актуальность проекта «Окно

Восток-Запад", который позволит восполнить пробелы в оценке инновационного потенциала Северо-Запада России и расширит возможности синергии инновационных потенциалов стран Балтийского региона.

- предложить Комитету VASAB 2010 использовать Форум лидеров стратегического планирования городов и регионов России в качестве референтной группы для обсуждения Стратегии пространственного развития региона Балтийского моря.

14. Closing Conference

14.1. «Перспективы развития Северо-Западного федерального округа: вызовы, приоритеты, угрозы и ограничения»

Участники рекомендуют:

- 19) в целях максимального учёта сложившихся межсубъектовых экономических связей, обеспечения увязки общегосударственных и региональных планов и прогнозов социально-экономического развития, целесообразно предусмотреть **разработку стратегических документов долгосрочного социально-экономического развития на уровне федеральных округов**. Для преодоления ведомственной и региональной разобщённости целесообразно поручить эту работу Ассоциациям экономического взаимодействия соответствующих федеральных округов. Это позволит точнее формулировать цели регионального развития в увязке с имеющимися общими ресурсами, объективно сформировать перечень основных межрегиональных проектов, обеспечивающих достижение общих целей развития. Подобные документы могут стать основой для последующей разработки Концепции долгосрочного социально-экономического развития Российской Федерации;
- 20) для ускорения социально-экономического развития территорий требуется **активизация межрегионального взаимодействия**. Зачастую депрессивные регионы (субъекты Федерации) экономически тесно связаны с успешными регионами (транспортные подходы к инфраструктурным объектам, наличие сырьевой базы для обрабатывающих производств и т.п.). В этом случае целесообразно оказывать федеральную помощь (налоговые и иные льготы, государственные гарантии под привлекаемые кредиты, первоочередное финансирование проектов в рамках действующих ФЦП и др.) для инфраструктурного развития депрессивных территорий по поддерживаемым видам и направлениям экономической деятельности, а также для реализации проектов способствующих комплексному развитию двух и более субъектов Федерации;
- 21) необходимым условием развития и Северо-Западного федерального округа и страны в целом является **совершенствование работы транспортного комплекса**. Требуется системный подход к формированию единой стратегии развития транспортно-логистического комплекса страны в увязке с развитием отраслей экономики и внешнеэкономической ситуацией.

14.2. «Специфика стратегий приморских регионов»

Участники считают, что

- 19) Необходимо совершенствование стратегического планирования применительно к морской деятельности и приморским регионам и муниципалитетам, предусматривающее:

на федеральном уровне:

- применение интегральных подходов к планированию и управлению в морском природопользовании. Это позволит преодолеть фрагментарность, присущую отраслевому подходу, учесть взаимосвязанность видов морского природопользования, способствовать связям и межотраслевой гармонизации в морской деятельности исходя из анализа конфликтного использования ресурсов, обеспечить многоцелевую ориентацию и соответствие

деятельности природоохранным целям, участие всех заинтересованных сторон в разработке стратегий и программ развития;

- создание нормативной правовой и институциональной базы для разработки и реализации комплексных программ развития и управления прибрежными зонами, основанных на интегральных подходах, в рамках стратегий и программ социально-экономического развития приморских субъектов Федерации и программ развития прибрежных муниципальных образований. Это позволит реализовать особое единое государственное управление морскими прибрежными зонами страны (обеими их составляющими: морской и сухопутной) исходя из повсеместного успешного мирового опыта подобной деятельности и соответствующих рекомендаций организаций системы ООН и международных форумов на высшем уровне;

на региональном уровне:

- адаптацию и освоение современных управленческих технологий (методология Комплексного управления прибрежными зонами - КУПЗ) в применении к богатейшим по ресурсам и разнообразным по природным и социально-экономическим условиям прибрежным зонам страны;
- разработку и реализацию пилотных программ КУПЗ конкретных побережий страны.

Реализация этих мер позволит реализовать естественные природные конкурентные преимущества морских акваторий и прибрежных территорий в обеспечении дополнительного экономического роста, конкурентоспособности, инвестиционной привлекательности, занятости, повышения комфортности и качества жизни, охраны окружающей среды и уменьшения ущерба от природных и техногенных катастроф, а также безопасности страны

- 20) Необходимо совершенствование нормативной правовой базы, регулирующей градостроительную деятельность, в части учета специфики этой деятельности на морских акваториях, находящихся под суверенитетом и юрисдикцией Российской Федерации.
- 21) Необходимо развивать международное сотрудничество в стратегическом планировании морского природопользования, учитывая единство и экосистемный характер морских процессов, и широко использовать международный опыт в этой сфере.

FINAL NARRATIVE REPORT

29. Description

29.1. Name of beneficiary of grant contract: Ministry of Regional Development and Local Government, Latvia (Reģionālās attīstības un pašvaldību lietu ministrija).

29.2. Name and title of the Contact person: Mr Vladislavs Vesperis.

29.3. Name of partners in the Action: St. Petersburg Administration (Администрация Губернатора Санкт-Петербурга) [2], Russian Economic Developers Association (ASSET) (Ассоциация специалистов по экономическому развитию территорий) [3], Immanuel Kant State University of Russia (Российский государственный университет имени И. Канта) [4], Ministry of the Environment, Danish Forest and Nature Agency²⁹, Denmark (Miljøministeriet, Skov- og Naturstyrelsen) [5], Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Housing, Germany (Bundesministeriums für Verkehr, Bau und Stadtentwicklung) [6], Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communication, Sweden (Näringsdepartementet) [7], Nordic Centre for Spatial Development (NORDREGIO) [8], Ministry of Regional Development, Poland (Ministerstwo Rozwoju Regionalnego) [9], Maritime Institute, Poland (Instytut Morski) [10].

29.4. Title of the Action: East-West Window (EWW).

29.5. Contract number: Grant Contract for European Community External Actions **2007/132-845**.

29.6. Start date and end date of the reporting period³⁰: 15.06.2007 – 15.12.2008.

29.7. Target country(ies) or region(s): **North-West Russia in particular: St. Petersburg, Leningrad region and Kaliningrad region**; to some extent also Belarus and North-West Russia adjacent countries (mainly for collecting good practices and dissemination of the project results).

29.8. Final beneficiaries &/or target groups³¹ (if different). The target audience/recipients of the project findings are: decision-makers (ministries responsible for spatial planning and development in the BSR, including the federal government in Russia, regional authorities in

²⁹ The name of the partner 5 was changed during the EWW project execution **from** Ministry of the Environment, Danish Forest and Nature agency **to** Ministry of the Environment, Agency for Spatial and Environmental Planning (Miljøministeriet, By- og Landskabsstyrelsen).

³⁰ The entire implementation period of the Action

³¹ “Target groups” are the groups/entities who will be directly positively affected by the project at the Project Purpose level, and “final beneficiaries” are those who will benefit from the project in the long term at the level of the society or sector at large.

NW Russia, pan-Baltic organisations such as VASAB 2010). The final beneficiaries are local and regional governments in the Baltic Sea region (BSR) operators in the chosen thematic fields (e.g. businesses in WP1 and transport operators in WP2) in NW Russia and in the BSR. The divide into men and women of different project activities is provided separately.

29.9. Country (ies) in which the activities take place (if different from 1.7): Russia (St. Petersburg and Kaliningrad Oblast), Poland and Latvia.

30. Assessment of implementation of Action activities

30.1. Activities and results (for the whole reporting period including last narrative interim report)

Activity 1: Kick off of the work of Working Group no 1 on business development and innovation affecting spatial development,

1.22. First meeting of the WG1 (1 day) took place on 25 June 2007 in Riga which was according to the schedule. The meeting was planned in advance in late June so participants postponed their holidays which in this part of the BSR starts with so called Midsummer. The meeting was attended by 12 participants representing partners 1,3,4,5,6,8,9,10 and eight invited guests. The main aim was to discuss the analysis and further WG1 work in detail, to achieve clarity about division of labour between the partners, to make sure that duplication with other project is avoided (instead to aim at using results achieved by other projects) and to start the process of contracting the external experts. The following outputs were produced or achieved:

- Report how to avoid duplication with other INTERREG III B projects in the field of business development and innovation affecting spatial development had been prepared before the meeting by the project coordinator, discussed by the meeting and delivered to the Responsible (Lead) Partner.
- TORs for seven ASSET staff members, eight Kaliningrad University staff members, one Belarus expert and four external experts together with tender documentation (if necessary) have been prepared by project coordinator as result of the meeting. Tender procedures for the four external experts had been started resulting in contracting one external expert from Poland, one from Sweden, one from Latvia and one from Denmark. In addition the Belarus expert was contracted by the partner no. 8 without tender (contract below 5000 Euro).
- The main scope of analysis was proposed and discussed. Unfortunately too many question marks and uncertainties appeared during the June meeting so the additional meeting was organized in Riga in September and discussion on analysis continued till the second WG1 meeting (December 2007).
- Text for EWW section at to the VASAB website was decided, technically EWW link at VASAB website was created in September 2007.
- Project flyer was designed and edited including information on WG1 activities (300 copies were printed in October 2007).

Comments: The WG1 started the discussion on its work (i.e. necessary analysis, results to be achieved) but the topic was too broad for one day meeting in addition to many technical questions were raised. The decision was to continue the discussion when the experts contracted by tender would be available. The main problem was to what extend the achievement of the EWW goal (i.e. *to promote territorial integration of NW Russia into the BSR in the field of business development*)

required concentration on analysis concerning exclusively NW Russia and to what extent the broader BSR picture was necessary if integration should mean reciprocal relations (i.e. affecting both sides). The latter opinion prevailed and was accepted by the meeting. The WG1 considered that for producing the main output of the analytical phase (i.e. a *compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") with assessment of unexploited innovation potential in NW Russia, assessment of the potential for regional integration and with identification of spatial problems in NW Russia and BSR*) some BSR analysis as the background material should be done as well. The meeting also discussed the policy related role of the project i.e. better highlighting the EWW results on NW Russia role in the “Long Term Perspective” to be prepared by VASAB on CBSS demand. The WG1 leaders promised to ensure smooth transfer of the EWW results to the BSR strategy i.e. Long Term Perspective till 2030 (to be prepared by VASAB in 2009). The Responsible Partner declared that he would invite VASAB Secretariat to the most important meetings of the EWW to ensure smooth transfer of the project results to the “Long Term Perspective”.

- 1.23. Partnership Agreement Preparation. This action was related to all work packages and took place in June, July, August, and September 2007 and was ended in October 2007 with signing partnership agreements between Lead Partner and all other partners of the EWW project. The most difficult was signing Partnership Agreement with partners from St. Petersburg due to problems related to tax and system in Russia, conversion of EUR into rubels, banking system requirements etc. Finally two agreements, based on the results of additional working meeting (in Riga) discussions, were prepared and signed between Lead Partner and RU (ASSET) Partner and between German Partner and RU (ASSET) Partner. So at the end of the day there were 9 partnership agreements signed regulating relations between the EWW partners.
- 1.24. Quality Workshop (1 day) for Project leaders organised by INTERREG III B Secretariat and EU Delegation from Moscow in Riga on 26 September 2007 was attended by project coordinator (partner no.10), one representative of Russian partners (partner no.2) and representatives appointed by the Responsible Partner. Main guidelines from EC Delegation and INTERREG III B Secretariat on TACIS rules, payments schemes and communication experiences were presented during the seminar and later on at individual consultations. The meeting between Responsible Partner and the Russian partners was organized back to back with the workshop for discussing main technicalities of their participation in the project.

Activity 2: Analysis(WG1)

- 2.15. WG1 additional meeting (1 day) took place on 25 September 2007 in Riga to continue discussion on the scope of analysis. The meeting was attended by four WG1 members (including two external experts, project coordinator and the representative of the Russian partners) and three participants representing Responsible Partner. At the meeting in depth discussion on case studies on innovation, outsourcing and urban-rural relations in Russia took place and the detailed scope of the work of Russian partners and external experts were agreed. Also a draft outline structure of the WG1 analytical report was presented by the WG1 Coordinator and discussed in depth.
- 2.16. Data collection and interpretation started only in December 2007 after the second WG1 meeting. In this phase 34 people from all partners were involved (except partner no.7 who acted through partner no. 8). Their involvement differed. The main bulk of analytical work was done by partners no. 3, 4 and 8 and the external experts whereas the other people acted mainly as a reference group reading reports, making comments and asking for improvements. This was the task first of all of partners no. 1, 2, 5, 6, 9 and 10 representing mainly policy making side in the project and project coordination. Also VASAB Secretariat was invited by partner 1 (Responsible Partner) to participate in this process. The analysis (data collection) in principle were ended in March 2008 but some of them (requiring surveys) due to formal reasons (tenders) were completed in April 2008. Interpretation of data was

done in April 2008 for all important cases (but some analysis e.g. the benchmarking studies and urban-rural analysis continued till September 2008). In fact in April and even in May and June the fine tuning of analysis (removing mistakes noticed by the other partners) still continued. The reason was that some partners from the reference group were very demanding asking for many improvements even if they had found little inconsistencies after second or third reading of the reports. Therefore the final synthesis report (draft discussion paper) from the analytical phase was completed only in July 2008 and even slightly changed after the WG1 September 2008 meeting and as the result of the EWW final/closing Conference in October 2008.

The outputs have been following:

(i) interim:

- Data (including public surveys) and draft analytical report on “Baltic” metropolitan areas with focus on the role of Kaliningrad and St. Petersburg;
- In depth study on St. Petersburg and Kaliningrad and their developmental potentials in the BSR context (focus on innovation and outsourcing) in which: trends and present policies for innovations nested in NW Russia and outsourcing were analysed, barriers for innovations perceived by business and public administration were identified (based on surveys), and cases on transfer of innovations between NW Russia and other parts of the BSR were described;
- Case studies (reports) on Russian and Belarus small and medium sized cities – covering: Novgorod, Gatchina, Chernyakhovsk, Gusev, Sovetsk, Svetly, Berezovka, Zaslavl;
- Reports on demographic trends in North-West Russia, in St. Petersburg and in Kaliningrad and in Belarus as well;
- Reports on case studies on urban-rural relations in Russia;
- Report on INTERREG III B projects results relevant for work of the WG1 group;
- Benchmarking studies concerning situation in Poland, Germany and Latvia on the issues relevant for the WG1 recommendations .

(ii) A compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") with assessment of unexploited innovation potential in NW Russia, assessment of the potential for regional integration and with identification of spatial problems in NW Russia and BSR.

Comments:

a) All the planned outcomes were achieved. However, during the analytical phase became clear that for the NW Russia innovation is more promising path for integration within the BSR than outsourcing, therefore more efforts were done to analyse this challenge. The list of outputs was enlarged (in comparison to the planned ones) by analysis of the role of the NW Russia in the BSR context (as the result of the WG1 discussions what analysis are necessary to achieve the EWW goal). Also urban structures and functional urban areas of not only large but also some small cities were analysed. The most interesting case appeared to be Gatchina as an example of science intensive cluster in Russia located in a small city. The some other cases illustrated urban-rural relations in Russia (and Belarus).

b) While working with data it became clear that translating data into policy recommendations can not be done by each working group separately. Therefore at the meeting of the WG leaders in December it was proposed that for the starting work on recommendation a workshop for all WGs would be necessary. The Responsible Partner was asked to organize such a workshop on 31st of January 2008 instead of simple WG1 seminar (planned for that date).

c) The work was delayed by some formal constraints such as tender procedures, requirement of separate EUR accounts (very difficult for Ministries) etc.

Activity 3: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR (WG1)

- 3.1. Kick off Conference of the project (1,5 day) for broad public took place on 18-19 October 2007 (according schedule) in St. Petersburg as a part of the well known VI Forum of Strategic Planning Leaders of Cities and Regions of Russia. This allowed project to reach the planned target group. The project: its assumptions and the planned outputs were presented to the Russian decision makers - mainly city mayors and chief planners. Conference participants expressed a deep hope that EWW project would diminish knowledge gaps within the Baltic Sea Region on the character of development potential of the NW Russia, its synergies and complementarities with potentials of other countries of the region, and on methods how this potential could be efficiently connected within the BSR. It was expressed in Conference recommendations that EWW project results should be presented in 2008 at the final Conference within VII Forum of Strategic Planning Leaders of Cities and Regions of Russia. The kick off conference was attended by 259 participants mainly Russian mayors and city planners. Among them there were 57 persons outside Russia. From EWW project 20 persons participated including Latvian State Secretary representing the Responsible Partner. So EWW reached the planned target of **200** Russian decision makers and professionals involved in discussion on the project.
- 3.2. Stakeholder Seminar for WG1 (0,5 day) was organised on 23 April 2008 in Riga (instead of beginning of May as originally planned). The preliminary results of the analytical phase were presented and the first discussions on the recommendations were started. The seminars for all working groups of EWW were arranged back to back with the VASAB annual conference financed by the Latvian Ministry of Regional Development and Local Government from its own means i.e. outside the EWW budget (from the EWW budget some partners only covered their travelling to the EWW seminars). The described above arrangement resulted in very impressive participation in the seminars and allowed to reach a planned target of **100** decision makers and businessman from BSR EU countries involved in discussion of the project findings and recommendations. The conference and seminars were attended by 167 participants including 26 persons directly involved in the EWW project (although the Responsible Partner was represented by some more employees). The participants came mainly from Latvia, Lithuania, and Finland but also from Azerbaijan, Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, EU Commission, Germany, Hungary, Norway, Poland, Russia and Sweden.
- 3.3. Closing(final) Conference of the project (1 day) for broad public took place on 21st October 2008 (according schedule) in St. Petersburg. The title of the conference was “Promoting territorial integration of the North West Russia into the Baltic Sea Region”. The main organiser was ASEET together with the EWW Responsible Partner. This Conference was a part of rich spectrum of the conferences and seminars taking place under umbrella (the same premises) of the VII All-Russia Forum of Strategic Planning Leaders “Strategic Planning in Regions and Cities of Russia”. In the event 631 participants took place out of it 582 from Russia. The forum was organized by: State Duma of the Russian Federation; Ministry for Regional Development of the Russian Federation; Ministry for Economic Development of the Russian Federation; St Petersburg City Administration; Center of Strategic Research; ISCER Leontief Centre. It was opened by Mr Dmitry Kozak, Minister of Regional Development, who underlined that “Forum is becoming the public debating platform for improving the strategic planning system of social and economic development in Russian regions”. The Conference “Promoting territorial integration of the North West Russia into the Baltic Sea region” was composed of four sessions attended by large number of the participants not only from Russia but also from other Baltic Sea Region countries. Some sessions were joint ventures with other organisations, forums and bodies interested in the subjects raised by the EWW project. The names of the sessions were following:
 - “Accessibility and innovations as motors of integration of the NW Russia into the Baltic Sea Region” (presentation of the results of the WG1 and the WG2),

- “Special Features of coastal regional strategies” (presentation of the WG3 results and dialogue with all key persons in Russia dealing with ICZM and maritime spatial planning),
- “Partnership mechanisms in local economic policy implementation” (presentation of the WG1 results with regard to urban-rural partnership).

In addition to that EWW results were presented at the key session of the Forum “Prospects for Federal Okrug Development: Challenges, priorities, threats and constraints. North-West Federal Okrug” attended by key decision makers from the North-West Federal Okrug.

Comments:

The choice of the formula of the kick-off and closing conferences appeared to have very positive results on ability of the project to deliver results to the key target groups in Russia. The Conference was also attended by the Ministerial partners from the EWW project. The EWW results were mirrored in the Forums resolutions. Some interested questions were raised requiring further discussion and examination.

- 3.4. Final publication The book summing up the results of the investigations available for the stakeholders in Kaliningrad and St.Petersburg was edited in October, November and printed in December 2008 by partner no.4.

Comments:

The number of books published was smaller (100) than assumed in the application (400), although the whole budget allocated to this purpose was used. There were several reasons why the printing was more expensive than expected. Some of them were of technical reasons: i.e. the book had more coloured pictures (maps) than estimated and was thicker than planned (more than 300 pages in comparison to 150 pages planned), but the main reason was of vis mayor nature. In 2008 in Russia an unexpected inflation and economic crisis appeared which could not be taken into account at the stage of budget planning. This resulted in much higher printing costs. However, the partner no.4 is ready to print additional copies of the book if demanded. The available copies will be distributed to the most active in the EWW Russian stakeholders and to the project partners of the EWW.

Activity 4: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations and action plan (WG1)

- 4.1. Steering Group Meeting (1 day) took place on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg according to schedule. The meeting was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1,2,3,5,6,7,9,10 and seven invited guests. The Steering Group discussed the project progress. The work was lagging behind the schedule. Although the WG1 started on time it became involved in lengthy discussions about the necessary scope of analysis and detailed division of labour between working groups. The Steering Group decided therefore not to start the work on recommendations before improving synergy between the work of the working groups. This task was given to the meeting of the WGs leaders organised in Riga back to back with the WG2 (5 December 2007) and the WG1 (6-7 December 2007) meetings. The meeting also discussed details of project presentation to the kick-off conference held next day.
- 4.2. WG1 second meeting (1,5 day) took place on 6-7 December 2007 in Riga (instead of late November). The meeting was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10, two external consultants and six invited guests. The meeting concentrated on discussing analytical phase of the project (the decision was that the lagging behind analysis would make necessary to postpone by two months the next WG1 meeting i.e. till the end of analytical phase). However, the WG 1 also started examining the way of preparation of the recommendations out of the analysis conducted. For the starting work on recommendation it was agreed that a workshop for all WGs would be necessary and the

Responsible Partner was asked to organize such a workshop (synergy meeting) on 31st of January 2008 instead of a simple WG1 seminar (scheduled for beginning of February).

- 4.3. Synergy meeting no.1 (1 day) took place in Riga on 31 of January 2008 (replacing the WG1 seminar scheduled for February). It was attended by fourteen project partner members representing partners no.1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, three external experts and six invited guests. The facilitator was hired by the Responsible Partner. During the meeting the participants agreed that all three working groups were in need of a common frame. This should be given by the vision of the BSR till 2030 with full integration of the North-West Russia. The participants managed to prepare an outline of such a vision requiring further work. The meeting asked for one more working day for finishing common visionary frame which should allow preparing meaningful recommendations.
- 4.4. Steering Group Meeting 2 took place on 1 of February 2008 in Riga. It was attended by seven project partner members representing partners no. 1,3,5,6,7, 9, 10 one external expert and seven invited guests. The results of the synergy meeting were discussed i.e. synergy between the work of the working groups. It was decided to organise one more synergy meeting to continue work on the common frame for all WGs, i.e. vision of the BSR till 2030 with full integration of the North-West Russia. An agenda of the April Conference proposed by the Responsible Partner was discussed together with some technical issues. The progress in analytical phase was reviewed.
- 4.5. Synergy meeting no. 2 (1 day) took place in Liepaja on 14th of March 2008. It was attended by ten project partner members representing partners no. 1,3,5,6,9, 10 one external expert and five invited guests. The facilitator was hired by the Responsible Partner but paid from Responsible Partner own means. The final draft of the vision was discussed and shared by participants giving stable frame for analytical part and allowing proper work on recommendations.
- 4.6. WG1 fourth meeting (1 day) took place on 3-4 April 2008 in Riga. It was attended by nine project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 8, 10, two external experts and two invited guests. The meeting was convened on demand of Russian partners who started finalisation of analytical part and wanted to discuss the preliminary results among themselves. It was also important for conceptualization of the recommendations i.e. discussing what findings from analytical phase should be taken into consideration while working on recommendations.
- 4.7 WG1 fifth meeting (one day) took place on 24 April 2008 in Riga. It was attended by fifteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, four external experts and six invited guests. The WG1 before the meeting concentrated mainly on analytical work. At the fifth meeting analyses were summed up and the work on recommendations were started. However, one more meeting was requested (autumn 2008) in order to discuss the final draft of the recommendations and action programme. Due to delay in the work on urban-rural relations in Russia the relevant reports were not presented to the WG1 at this meeting. Only an overview of the progress and main findings were reported. It was decided that for synergy reasons the reports would be presented on seminar on urban-rural relations in Russia to be organised as a joint event with the SeBCo project in Kaliningrad in June 2008. This was realised and such presentation took place and was regarded as a great success by meeting participants.
- 4.8. Steering Group Meeting 3 (one day) took place on 20 May 2008 in Riga. It was attended by five project partner members representing partners no. 1, 5, 9, 10, and five invited guests. The Steering Group discussed the project progress. The results of the second synergy meeting and the April Conference were examined as well as a draft vision of the BSR till 2030 with full integration of the North-West Russia. The Steering Group decided to close analytical part and start the work on recommendations. However, the WG3 leaders asked for additional benchmark study on the results of the INTERREG projects in the field of competences of the WG3 with focus on the German experience. This was to diminish discrepancies between the WGs, since the WG1 and the WG2 already had such type of

expertises included in their work. The problems with travelling budget of Russian partners were discussed once more together with a problem of disappeared financial manager. The Steering Group also continued a discussion on political use of the EWW results i.e. incorporation of the results into the Long Term Perspective of VASAB to be produced in 2009. The output achieved:

- first draft recommendation papers (in outline format) of WG1 and WG2.

4.9. WG1 sixth meeting (one day) took place on 03 September 2008 in Jurmala. It was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, four external experts and seven invited guests. They discussed the final draft of the recommendations and action programme prepared during holiday time 2008 by ASSET, Immanuel Kant State University of Russia (Kaliningrad), Nordregio staff, and external experts. The whole work on urban-rural relations in Russia the relevant analytic reports were presented to the WG1 at this meeting as well. The WG1 discussed and improved the following documents:

- Recommendations how to improve innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Recommendations how to improve settlement policies in NW Russia (urban rural partnership) from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Action plan how to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration.

4.10. Steering Group Meeting 4 (one day) took place on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg. It was attended by 7 project partner members representing partners no. 2, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10 one external expert and 6 invited guests. The group discussed the shape of final publications of the EWW project, the use of the analytical materials and endorsed the recommendations and action proposed by the project. The main discussion was on the proper use of the EWW results for the Long Term Perspective (LTP) of VASAB elaboration of which was started few month ago (August 2008). The EWW results were placed to the different parts of the LTP outcomes. The VASAB consultant responsible for facilitating the LTP process was invited to the Steering Group meeting. It was also discussed how to use EWW outcomes for the process of preparation of the BSR EU Strategy. The partner no.5 arranged a meeting with the EU Commission on that topic. It was decided that the EWW results would be incorporated in the VASAB non-paper to be presented to the EU Commission in November/December 2008 in order to influence strategy preparation. The outputs achieved (as results of the meeting):

- Final draft of the recommendations how to improve innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Final draft of recommendations how to improve settlement policies in NW Russia (urban rural partnership) from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Final draft of the action plan how to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration,
- Final draft of recommendations on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR including concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR,
- Final action plan how to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational sea use planning and ICZM,
- Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic,
- Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application,
- Forwarding (transferring of EWW results) to important BSR processes namely: EU BSR Strategy and VASAB Long Term Perspective.

Activity 5: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 2 on accessibility

5.1. WG2 first meeting (one day) took place on 10 October 2007 in Riga It was attended by five project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 8, 10, one external expert and three

invited guests. The main aim was to discuss the scope of analysis (concrete meaning of accessibility) and the further work of the WG2 step by step, to achieve clarity about division of labour between the partners, to make sure that duplication with other project was avoided (instead to aim at using results achieved by other projects) and to start the process of contracting the external experts. The following outputs were produced or achieved:

- Report how to avoid duplication with other INTERREG III B projects in the field of accessibility was prepared by the project coordinator, discussed at the meeting and accepted by the Responsible Partner;
- TORs for four Kaliningrad University staff members, one Belarus expert and TORs for three external experts together with tender documentation (if necessary) have been prepared and approved. Procurement and contracting procedures for the one external expert was finished in September. Two other experts were also contracted (latter on);
- The main scope of analysis were proposed and discussed. The discussion on analysis continued among the partners (by e-mails) till the second WG2 meeting (December 2007);
- EWW link at the VASAB website was created (see activity 1.1);
- The content of the project flyer was loaded by short information about the WG2 activities.

Comments: The WG2 started its work behind the schedule. Due to the late project start (mid of June 2007), the first period of the project coincided with a holiday season. Therefore the real work of the WG2 (by phone, e-mails etc) started only in September 2007 i.e. three month later than planned. In addition to that, for some partners it was very inconvenient (e.g. celebrations of anniversary of establishment of the Kaliningrad University) and this postponed the start of formal work by one or two month further on i.e. till October 2007. In the meantime the preparation of the WG2 detailed analysis was started. To this end a pre meeting on 22nd of August 2007 was organised (partners 1, 7,8) to prepare tentative proposals on the substance of the work of the WG2. This meeting was paid outside the EWW budget. Although the WG2 (similarly to the WG1) came to the opinion that broader BSR picture was necessary to promote *territorial integration of NW Russia into the BSR in the field of transport and ITC*. The WG2 members also shared the WG1 concern on importance of smooth transfer of the EWW results to the BSR strategy till 2030 i.e. Long Term Perspective to be prepared by VASAB in 2009. The characteristic feature of the WG2 was a long discussion about the meaning of the notion of accessibility. As the result accessibility to energy was also considered to be an important element of the analysis.

Activity 6: Analysis(WG2)

6.1. The discussion on the scope and method of analysis (indicators, pilot studies) had been continued from October till beginning of December 2007. The manuals and guidelines were discussed many times. The main method was e-mail exchanges. As the result the manuals and blue prints were produced by partners 1 and 8 to facilitate collecting data and information:

- A blue print on screening transport policy,
- A manual for collecting data and information on accessibility.

Comments: The majority of time of the initial period was allocated to discussing the notion of accessibility. This was done in order to avoid problems when data and information collection would be started. Due to the rise of energy prices also this issue was considered as important factor for the NW Russia integration to the BSR. The second issue heavily discussed was scarcity of comparable data in Russia. Partner no 8 having a very well developed data base on transport data for the BSR was in a difficult position checking (in dialogue with partner 4) existence of similar data in Russia. This required more resources and more work load than estimated at the

beginning. But finally this allowed presenting Russia at the broader BSR picture. The phase 6.1. ended with second meeting of the WG2 (December 2007 in Riga).

6.2. Data collection and interpretation started only in December 2007 after the second WG 2 meeting. Basic data were collected by mid February 2008 but some work continued (fine tuning of reports) till May/June 2008. A draft discussion paper was ready for the Riga Stakeholder Conference in April 2008. However, it was a working document amended after each important EWW meeting, till the final/closing Conference. In this work (phase 6.1 and 6.2) seventeen people (including three external experts) were involved. Their involvement differed. The main bulk of analytical work was done by partners no. 4 and 8 and the external experts whereas the other participants acted mainly as a reference group reading reports, making comments and asking for improvements. This was done first of all by partners no. 1, 6, 7 and 10 representing mainly policy making side in the project and project coordination. Also VASAB Secretariat was invited by partner 1 (Responsible Partner) to participate in this process.

The following outputs were achieved:

(i) interim:

- Mapping of transport infrastructure policies at the federal and regional level, policies in development of the soft accessibility (to knowledge and information) and policies on clusters in NW Russia (however clusters were analysed by the WG1 in fact), also policies and situation in the field of accessibility to energy was examined;
- Identification of bottlenecks and constraints for transport (and through transport for business development) in NW Russia;
- Assessment of the policy correlation with the strategic documents at the BSR level (mainly by analysing outcomes of Strategic INTERREG III B projects pursued by VASAB, BDF, BSSSC and CPMR);
- Examining the results of other INTERREG III B projects relevant for the WG2 work;
- Feasibility assessment of connecting TEN-T with the pan-European corridors.

The planned verification of the accessibility perspective and of present (current) and forecast trade flows in NW Russia and Belarus (vis-a-vis BSR reports) was less successful. The main reason were missing data concerning predicted trade flows in NW Russia and Belarus³². The accessibility perspective instead was analysed using BSR outlook to show how NW-Russia is connected with the rest of the BSR.

(ii) A compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") presenting situation, development trends and political objectives in the fields of transport and accessibility in NW RU and Belarus and their consequences for BSR cohesion and business development

Comments:

The most important planned outputs were achieved (although one output was slightly modified). In addition to that, accessibility to energy was touched as important future factor of the BSR integration that should determine in great extent the NW Russia integration into the BSR. The analysis lasted longer than expected. The main constraint was lack of regional reliable data in NW Russia. The main reason of the delay was in insufficient data availability but also to some extent larger than expected amount of available background information (e.g. results of the BSR projects) that should be digested and analysed.

Activity 7: Pilot studies (WG2)

Since the analytical phase (activity 6) was delayed also pilot projects were postponed. The aim of the activity 7 was to analyse more in depth the most promising solutions developed during the analytical

³² The work on trade flows was done in co-operation with WG1 and the BSR perspective was used.

phase and prioritised during stakeholder dialogue. Therefore only in May 2008 the more concrete work on pilot studies (pre-feasibility studies) could start. The WG2 selected two (in line with the output indicators listed in the application) topics for pre-feasibility studies. The topics were following:

- o) BSR passenger railway connectivity with focus on the Eastern part of the BSR,
- p) examination of implementation of the transport part of Tallinn vision of VASAB with focus on the eastern part of the BSR.

For the pilot studies a tender procedure was used and contracts were signed in late June 2008. The results were delivered in late August 2008 and discussed by the WG2 group meeting in September. The following reports were produced:

- *Study on international rail passenger traffic development: Possibilities in the context of development of cities in the Baltic Sea Region* (Contract: 5-13/66, of 18.6.2008) elaborated by SIA “AC Konsultācijas”,
- *Evaluation of implementation of the VASAB 2010 vision in the area of mobility network and energy supply* (Contract: 5-13/74, of 23.7.2008) elaborated by SIA “AC Konsultācijas”.

The results of the studies were presented to the closing/final conference of the EWW and will serve as an input for the Long Term Spatial Development Perspective. They were also presented in advance to the WG2 members working on recommendation in order to shape the WG2 recommendations.

Comments:

An additional barrier delaying activity no.7 was obligation of tendering the contractors due to internal law of Latvia where partner no.1 (responsible for the WG2 work) is located. The WG2 decisions were taken in May 2008, but the contracts were signed only 1,5- 2 months latter coinciding once more with a holiday season. The first preliminary results of the activity no.7 were delivered in August and the final results in October/November 2008.

Activity 8: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR

The same as activity no. 3

Activity 9: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG2)

- 9.1. Steering Group Meeting (1 day) took place on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg according to schedule (for details see action 4.1).
- 9.2. WG2 second meeting (1 day) took place on 5 December 2007 in Riga (instead of late November). The meeting was attended by seven project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 7, 8, 10 and four invited guests. The meeting concentrated on discussing analytical phase of the project. The manuals and blue prints for collecting data and information were agreed. For starting work on recommendation it was discussed that the idea of Steering Group (of its first meeting in October 2007) of workshop for all WGs should be implemented and the Responsible Partner was asked to organize such a workshop (synergy meeting) in January 2008.
- 9.3. Synergy meeting no.1 (1 day) took place in Riga on 31st of January 2008 (see action 4.3. for details).
- 9.4. Steering Group Meeting 2 on 1st of February 2008 in Riga (see action 4.4. for details).
- 9.5. Synergy meeting no. 2 (1 day) took place in Liepaja on 14th of March 2008. (see action 4.5. for details).
- 9.6. Steering Group Meeting 3 (one day) took place on 20 May 2008 in Riga. (for details see action 4.8).
- 9.7. WG2 third meeting (one day) took place on 21 May 2008 in Riga according to schedule. It was attended by five project partner members representing partners no. 1, 7, 8, 10, one external expert and three invited guests. The WG2 before the third meeting concentrated

mainly on analytical work. At this meeting analyses were summed up and the work on recommendations started. It was decided that recommendations (with elements of the action programme) would be prepared for Russia and for the whole BSR with focus on better integration of NW Russia. One additional meeting was requested (autumn 2008) in order to discuss the final draft of the recommendations. The meeting also discussed the pilot actions (pre-feasibility studies) agreeing on concrete items. The outputs achieved:

- a first draft recommendations paper (in outline format),
- TOR for two most important pilot studies.

9.8. WG2 fourth meeting (one day) took place on 4th September 2008 in Jurmala. It was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, three external experts and six invited guests. They discussed the final draft of the recommendations (with elements of the action programme) prepared by Immanuel Kant State University of Russia (Kaliningrad) and Nordregio staff. The WG2 discussed and improved the following documents:

- Recommendations on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR including concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR.
- Study on international rail passenger traffic development: Possibilities in the context of development of cities in the Baltic Sea Region,
- Evaluation of implementation of the VASAB 2010 vision in the area of mobility network and energy supply,
- Overview of results of INTERREG III B projects in the field of accessibility .

9.9. Steering Group Meeting 4 (one day) took place on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg (please see action 4.10)

Activity 10: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 3 on ICZM and transnational sea use planning

10.1. WG3 preparatory meeting took place on 24 July 2007 in Kaliningrad. It was attended by nine project partner members representing partners no. 4, 10, and five invited guests. The meeting was used for preparation of the WG3 first meeting, and the pilot action in particular for presentation and discussion with the Kaliningrad partners the results of the INTERREG project BaltCoast of which recommendations should form main backbone of the work of the WG3. The preparatory meeting was organised during the holiday season due to indicated by the Kaliningrad partner necessity of postponing the WG3 first meeting till October because of the celebrations of 750th anniversary of establishment of the university (lack of experts) in early autumn 2007. So the preparatory meeting was a vehicle to start the work of the WG3 even in slightly less formal way. The main subject of discussion was the BaltCoast recommendations, TORs for experts and other guidelines necessary for elaboration of the WG3 analysis. The outputs were following:

- Decision on TORs and blue prints,
- Clarifying division of labour,
- Project flyer was discussed (and then edited) - see activity 1.1.

10.2 WG 3 first meeting (1,5 day) took place on 30-31 October 2007 in Kaliningrad i.e. with four month delay. The reason was the celebrations of 750th anniversary of establishment of the Albertina University (today Immanuel Kant State University of Russia) in Kaliningrad. The meeting was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 4, 9, 10 and to some extent also partner no.1, one external expert and fifteen invited guests mainly from Russia but also from Latvia, Germany and Finland. The main aim was to discuss the analysis and the further WG3 work in detail, to achieve clarity about division of labour between the partners, to make sure that duplication with other project was avoided (instead to aim at using results achieved by other projects) and to start the process of contracting the external experts. Instead of preparing TORs for separate experts the WG3 at pre meeting decided to make only

two TORs (one for external expert and one for the whole pilot project). For conducting analysis it was agreed that blue prints should be used. Such blue prints were prepared by partner no. 10 in advance presented at the meeting, and then improved/discussed by e-mails and approved in December 2007. The following outputs were produced or achieved:

- Report (in form of power point presentations) – presenting an overview of existing and available documentation on the chosen themes in NW Russia and at the BSR level;
- Two blue prints (for further analysis and discussions);
- Two TORs (one for external expert and one for the whole pilot project);
- One external expert was contracted by the partner no 1 covering by his expertise BSR and HELCOM perspective;
- EWW link at the VASAB website was created (see activity 1.1).

Also Kaliningrad stakeholders who attended the second part of the meeting were informed about the EWW project together with showing them the relevant BSR experience in ICZM and maritime spatial planning. They formed important part of the reference network for dialogue on project findings and recommendations. The meeting was also a starting point for executing analysis.

Activity 11 Analysis (WG 3)

11.1 The discussion on the scope and method of analysis had been continued from October till beginning of December 2007. The discussion resulted in shifting focus more from ICZM to maritime spatial planning as the most important transnational issue related to sea use in the nearest future. The blue prints (to be followed by Russian colleagues) presented by partner 10 were discussed many times. The main method was e-mail exchanges. As the result the two blue prints were agreed:

- A blue print on spatial planning legislation on the sea covering Poland,
- A blue print on potentials and conflicts on the sea covering Poland.

11.2. Gathering and compiling the WG3 information started in December 2007 after blue prints approval. Fourteen people representing partners no. 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10 were involved in the information collecting. Their involvement differed. The main bulk of analytical work was done by partners no.10 and 4 and by external expert whereas the other participants acted mainly as a reference group reading reports, making comments and asking for improvements. This was done first of all by partners no. 5,6 and 7 representing mainly policy making side in the project. The analysis in principle were ended in March. The situation of the WG3 was different than the WG1 and the WG2. The WG3 did not collect statistical information but rather qualitative information and the broad BSR background was discussed, sorted out and clarified at the first meeting by examining BaltCoast results. Therefore, the analytical work could be done in parallel with an initial phase of recommendation preparation. But also in the WG3 the completing analytical reports took more time than expected. Although first draft reports were ready in March their fine tuning continued in April and even in May and June. This was slightly learning by doing in particular for Russian experts who had little contact with maritime spatial planning in the past. The outputs were following:

- The legal systems were screened and regulations, responsibilities for offshore planning at all levels in NW Russia were identified;
- System of mapping to improve access to relevant information from NW Russia and its uploading to the pilot system made in the INTERREG III B BaltCoast project were tested (the results can be seen in the WG3 reports done by Russian colleagues);
- Actual (current) sea use in NW RU (Kaliningrad) according to the BaltCoast standards (potentials and conflicts) were described in a separate paper and conflicts and potentials were detected;

- A compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") with assessment of compatibility of the Russian regulatory framework to the legislation and practice in a pan-Baltic perspective in the field of ICZM and sea use planning was elaborated.

Comments:

The all planned outputs were achieved.

Activity 12 Pilot Action (WG 3)

Pilot action was started in October 2007 and continues till the end of August 2008. The twelve project partners staff members representing partners no. 1,4,6,7,9,10 and one external expert were involved. Partners no. 1,6,7 have acted mainly as a reference group while the main role was played by partners no. 4,9,10. The pilot action aimed at preparing a system of joint ICZM and maritime spatial planning in Gdańsk Bay between Poland and Russia. This task was discussed at the kick off meeting with various Russian stakeholders. The prevailing opinion was that due to the dispersed responsibilities in Russia in ICZM and sea space management (versus concrete central Agency in Poland responsible for sea space and regional governments responsible for ICZM activities) such goal could not be achieved in the project time span. Nowadays there is no single institution in Russia responsible for sea space management (like Maritime Offices in Germany or Poland). The WG3 came to the opinion that agreements between Polish and Russian relevant state institutions on co-operation in sea use planning and management might be too ambitious and premature as the WG3 output. Instead pilot actions were focused on the preconditions for establishment of such agreements in future, by exchange of good practices, deepening mutual understanding and preparing necessary tools and necessary institutional structures i.e. centres of excellence in both countries dealing with maritime spatial planning. It was decided that the starting point should be an agreement between Russian and Polish institutions from NGO or research domain to co-operate on promotion of integrative approach to sea space and coast in both countries. In this context a sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application was discussed. It was considered as an important tool for showing to Russian decision-makers a usefulness of maritime spatial planning. The WG3 decided to limit it to the Baltic Sea around Kaliningrad Oblast. The register was prepared by partner no. 4 and 10 in a form of GIS atlas. The following outputs were produced in the reporting period:

- The exchange of bi-lateral experience was started e.g. Polish pilot sea use plan (covering Puck Bay) elaborated in 2008 under PlanCoast INTERREG III B project was shown to the RU experts;
- The experience with the BaltCoast project of INTERREG III B was shared;
- Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application was first discussed then agreed and then produced and presented to the final/closing conference of the EWW in St. Petersburg on 21st October 2008;
- Agreement between Maritime Institute in Gdańsk and Russian partners on permanent co-operation in the future (including joint projects and policy related work) aiming at establishment of a system of joint ICZM and maritime spatial planning in Gdańsk Bay between Poland and Russia was prepared in autumn 2008. The partners of the agreement will act as an centres of excellence in their countries with regard to maritime spatial planning and ICZM.

Comments:

The pilot action had to be modified. But the actions started within EWW project will be continued after the project closure thanks to established under the EEW contacts. The aim of establishment of the system of joint ICZM and maritime spatial planning in Gdańsk Bay between Poland and Russia is still valid and will be realised in the future. What was done under EWW project was to start this process by exchange of experience, awareness rising, gathering

stakeholders and discussing with them the problem and by preparation of some necessary tools which will convince Russian decision-makers that an integrative coastal and sea space management would be important. Despite difficulties the main outputs promised in the EWW application were produced: i.e. (i) a sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application and (ii) agreements between Polish and Russian relevant institutions on co-operation in sea use planning and management.

Activity 13: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR

The same as activity no. 3

Activity 14: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG3)

- 14.1. Steering Group Meeting (1 day) took place on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg according to schedule (for details see action 4.1).
- 14.2. Synergy meeting no.1 (1 day) took place in Riga on 31st of January 2008 (see action 4.3. for details). This meeting was used by the WG3 also for development of a first outline of recommendation paper which was discussed afterwards by e-mail exchange.
- 14.3. Steering Group Meeting 2 on 1st of February 2008 in Riga (see action 4.4. for details).
- 14.4. Synergy meeting no 2 (1 day) took place in Liepaja on 14th of March 2008 (see action 4.5. for details).
- 14.5. WG3 second meeting (1,5 day) took place on 27-28 March 2008 in Kaliningrad (instead of late November 2007). It was attended by sixteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 7, 9, 10., one external expert and two invited guests. The meeting assessed the progress of the analytical work, discussed the interim reports of Russia and tried to relate the WG3 work towards the EU Integrated Maritime Policy (Blue Book). The final draft of recommendation paper was discussed and agreed. The acknowledgement of the project results at the political level was also examined. The WG3 group joined the WG1 and the WG2 wish to present its results at policy level by introducing them to the “Long Term Perspective” of VASAB. However, partner 9 was also asked to transfer the results to the EU BSR Strategy and to the EU work on integrated maritime policy. During the WG3 meeting a workshop with Russian stakeholders on off-shore planning and ICZM was organised in Kaliningrad on 27th of March 2008 as a joint venture of all projects dealing with this subject i.e. EWW, POWER and SDI-4-SEB as a part of the conference (“Integrated management, sustainable development indicators, spatial planning and monitoring of the South-Eastern Baltic coastal regions”), which took place in Kaliningrad on 26th - 30th of March 2007. Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic were elaborated by EWW project participants beforehand and proposed to stakeholders attending this conference. The recommendations were unanimously adopted by the participants including regional and local authorities from Russia. This seemed to be an important step towards introducing integrative approach towards the sea space and coastal zone in Russia.

The output achieved was following:

- Recommendation paper discussed and adopted by the Russian stakeholder (Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic).
- 14.6. Steering Group Meeting 3 (1day) took place on 20 May 2008 in Riga (for details see action 4.8).
 - 14.7. WG3 third meeting (1 day) took place on 4-5 June 2008 in Gdańsk almost according to schedule (few days later than planned originally). It was attended by fifteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 9, 10, one external expert and five invited guests. At the meeting analytical phase was summed up. The meeting was also used for examining the

experience and good practices of the Balance project in maritime spatial planning. The experts from Denmark introduce the project to the WG3 members. However, the WG3 main discussion concentrated on the 'action plan' following the recommendations adopted in March 2008. The opinions were dispersed. Some participants considered elaboration of an action plan as premature having in mind lack of legal provisions in Russia regulating sea use in an integrative way and dispersion of responsibility for sea management among many institutions. Some others proposed to focus action plan on methodological issues i.e. issues indispensable to introduce sea use planning in Russia and methodology of such planning suited for Russian conditions. After the e-mail exchange in June 2008 the partner no 9 responsible for the WG3 work decided to take the risk to prepare a draft action plan and to discuss it in September 2008 with the WG 3 members. Therefore an additional meeting was requested to be held in September 2008, to conclude the recommendation phase. The following outputs were achieved:

- The experience with Balance project of INTERREG III B was shared.

After the WG3 third meeting the partner no 9 and 10 organised (late June beginning of July 2008) consultation about the follow up of the WG3 in a form of a joint project. In the consultation the information on different ETC Programmes in the BSR were analysed and compared. The results were presented to the WG3 fourth meeting.

- 14.8. WG3 fourth meeting (one day) took place on 2nd September 2008 in Gdańsk. It was attended by thirteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 7, 9, 10 and one external expert. The meeting discussed the final draft of the action programme prepared by the staff of partners no 4 and 10 (Maritime Institute from Gdańsk and Immanuel Kant State University of Russia from Kaliningrad). Also final draft of the sea use register was presented by the partner no.4. The WG3 discussions tackled also the future use of the WG3 results. The presentations to the final/closing conference of EWW were agreed. It was also decided that the WG3 analysis should serve for broader popularization of the issue of maritime spatial planning in the Baltic Sea Region. The partner no 9. agreed to edit (by the end of 2008) from its own resources a *Compendium on Maritime Spatial Planning systems in the Baltic Sea Region countries* composed of two parts: part 1 *Survey of the national instruments and tools for the management of the sea space in the BSR countries* describing legal and institutional aspects of maritime spatial planning systems in the BSR countries and part 2 entitled *Examples of national cases of sea spatial conflicts and potentials*. Partner no.9 promised to invite to this book all other BSR countries while using the WG3 results as the core input. The WG3 also analysed different possibilities of continuation of the WG3 work. After the lively discussion it was decided to use two vehicles for further co-operation: The project BaltSeaPlan already submitted to the BSR Programme (although slightly too abstractive) and the new project to be submitted to the ENPI Programme Lithuania–Poland–Russian Federation on concrete planning work as continuation of the WG3 pilot activities. It was decided that transnational maritime planning should concentrate on Vistula/Kaliningrad lagoon and on Kursiu lagoon.

The WG3 discussed and improved the following documents during its fourth meeting:

- Action plan how to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational sea use planning and ICZM;
- Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application.

- 14.9. Steering Group Meeting 4 (one day) took place on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg (please see action 4.10)

30.2. Assessment of the results of the Action

The central objective of the Action was to promote territorial integration of NW Russia (i.e. the entire Northwest Federal District, including Kaliningrad) into the Baltic Sea region (BSR) in the identified three fields of (1) business development, (2) transport / ICT development and (3) sea use planning and Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM). The starting point was relatively impressive but

slightly idle (from the BSR perspective) developmental potential (in terms of human capital, scientific achievements etc.) of the North West Russia. The task was to develop solutions how to use the potential of the NW Russia for the benefit of the BSR economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development.

The action was successful to that extend that it managed to identify economic and spatial development needs in the NW Russia from the perspective of public authorities and businesses, requiring to be tackled by at the transnational level. This findings were benchmarked against existing good practice solutions based on experience of other BSR countries. The search was also done in order to detect economic and spatial trends, relevant for connecting territorial potentials between the NW Russia and the BSR. However, the picture coming from analysis appeared less promising than expected (see point 2.9). But even in those rather difficult circumstances the recommendations for three mentioned above fields were formulated and action plans were outlined. The main results delivered to the external audience having policy relevance are presented below:

The results achieved	The results intended	Explanation of differences
Recommendations how to improve innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration	Recommendation" paper with suggestions on policy improvements and legislative changes to improve settlement and innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration	The results achieved put less attention to legislative changes than to policy improvements. This is outcome of the survey done in order to learn from Russian businessman what are the main obstacles for them to innovate.
Recommendations how to improve settlement policies in NW Russia (urban rural partnership) from the perspective of BSR integration,		The focus of the result achieved is on urban-rural partnership as key for integrative development of settlement structure in Russia.
Action plan how to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration,	A paper with fields for further concrete actions ("action plan") to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration	Done in line with plans
Recommendations on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR including concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR,	1.Recommendation" paper with suggestions on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR 2. A paper with fields for further concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia and in BY in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR	The recommendations and action plan were merged. The reason is that Russia has very concrete plans and actions in this field for the future years so the WG2 decided to focus on long-term recommendations.
Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic	Recommendation" paper on upgrading the instruments and tools and institutional arrangements for transnational sea use planning and ICZM at the BSR level based on the completed pilot action	More ambitious recommendations were produced than expected i.e. more in line with the real situation in Russia with regard to ICZM and maritime spatial planning
Action plan how to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational sea use planning and	A paper with fields for further concrete actions ("action plan") to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational	Done in line with plans

ICZM	sea use planning and ICZM	
Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application	A sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application - based on the completed system mapping.	Done in line with plans
Agreement between maritime Institute in Gdańsk and Immanuel Kant State University of Russia on further co-operation in the field of maritime spatial planning	Agreements between Polish and Russian relevant institutions on co-operation in sea use planning and management	Done in line with plans

The most important EWW achievement is delivery of main messages resulting from the Action to the important Russian decision makers, planning professionals and scientific sector as well as to the key pan-Baltic organizations such as HELCOM or VASAB. Through VASAB also the EU BSR strategy was influenced.

30.3. The outcome on both final beneficiaries and/or target group and the situation of the target group/target region which the action addressed

The target audience/recipients of the project findings have been decision-makers (ministries responsible for spatial planning and development in the BSR, including the federal government in Russia, regional authorities in NW Russia, pan-Baltic organisations such as VASAB 2010). Thanks to the action they have received a better picture on the situation with regard to the North-West Russia integration into the Baltic Sea region (BSR). This knowledge has been already used for policy making by VASAB in production of the Long Term Spatial Development Perspective and it seems that it will be also useful for the EU Commission in elaboration of the EU BSR strategy and for HELCOM for implementation of the Baltic Sea Action Plan. In fact the Action played a tremendous role in validation of the planning methodologies and strategic documents at the pan-Baltic level based on the NW Russia perspective. The Action gave a proper insight on main drivers and obstacles of integration of the North West Russia into the BSR. The Action findings and recommendations were also delivered to the Russian decision makers and VASAB will continue its efforts to convince them that the BSR integration is beneficial for the North-West Russia. At least in the field of maritime spatial planning as the result of the Action one can see increased capacity and competence basis to take up joint transnational initiatives between the NW Russia partners and institutions from other BSR countries.

The final beneficiaries local and regional governments in the Baltic Sea region (BSR) operators in the chosen thematic fields (e.g. businesses in WP1 and transport operators in WP2) in NW Russia and in the BSR will be influenced mainly through the actions of pan-Baltic organisations mainly VASAB and its Long Term Spatial Development Perspective. This will allow for incorporation of the BSR perspective in the national/regional/local policies in the NW Russia.

30.4. Publications

The following publications were produced:

Name	Number of copies	Distribution channels
The East-West Window brochure informing about the project	300	Distributed during the project events in particular kick-off conference, stakeholder seminar, the Conference "Baltic Sea Region Programme 2007-2013: new partnership opportunities for Russian and Belarusian regions" and many other events
Атлас использования прибрежных акваторий российской части Юго-восточной Балтики (Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application – <i>edited on CD rom</i>)	200	Distributed for free during the EWW final (closing) conference, available for free from partner no.4

The book in Russian: Северо-Запад России в Регионе Балтийского моря: Проблемы и перспективы экономического взаимодействия и сотрудничества (North West Russia in the Baltic Sea region. Problems and perspectives of co-operation and mutual influence) presenting main results of the project	100	Distributed for free by partners no.4 among the project partners and participants of the EWW events. Sent to Russian relevant Ministries and main libraries.
--	-----	--

30.5. Contracts (works, supplies, services) above 5000€ awarded for the implementation of the action since the last interim report

Only one contract above 5000€ was awarded since the last interim report.

	Contract	Amount	Procedure	Winner
1	Audit Services Contract	5 131,94	“negotiated procedure without publication”	<i>SIA Rodl and Partner</i>

30.6. Continuation of the Action after ending the support from the European Community

The action will be continued after ending the EU support for the East West Window project. Durability of the project results has been ensured by the direct participation or the support of the national ministries responsible for spatial planning and development around the BSR, acting under VASAB 2010. Through their co-operation with other relevant stakeholders, the project rendered available concrete recommendations for policy-making in the chosen thematic fields in the NW Russia and at the BSR level. Through intensive dialogue with the target audience, the project influenced planners in Russia neighbouring countries by including the perspective of NW Russia. It also served for modification of pan-Baltic strategic policy papers, long-term visions and development plans on the very same account.

In particular the EWW results were used by VASAB for elaboration of the Long Term Perspective for Spatial Development of the BSR. Thanks to the EWW this will be the document with proper outlook on North-West Russia. Due to the EWW the collaboration between VASAB (ministries) and other EWW partners (research institutes) will be strengthened. The EWW results will be also used for discussing with HELCOM an idea of maritime spatial planning in the Baltic Sea Region.

Follow-up activities in effect of the project will be initiated and promoted by VASAB 2010. This includes starting up of possible new project(s) covering the whole BSR and taking into consideration the needs and perspectives of NW Russia, identified and referred to in the present project. The WG3 work will be continued in a form of the BaltSeaPlan project already approved by the BSR Programme (will start around December 2008). The WG3 partners will also plan to submit the project on elaboration of concrete maritime spatial plans for Vistula and Kursiu Lagoons in the framework of the ENPI Programme Lithuania–Poland–Russian Federation. Despite finishing the work of the WG3 the partner no.9 responsible for its leading has already declared to continue the efforts in a broader BSR set up and started elaboration of the BSR wide “Compendium on Maritime Spatial Planning systems in the Baltic Sea Region countries” using the WG3 results and experience.

30.7. Gender equality, disabilities

Where relevant, the perspective of equal opportunities was taken into account for the thematic work (especially in the fields of business and transport). Due efforts were made to secure involvement of both men and women in the composition of the project management structures, daily work and in the dialogue fora with relevant stakeholders in NW Russia and at the overall BSR level. Spatial planning forming a substance of the project from its definition cares for gender equality, prevention or exclusions of handicapped from the normal life. Although, gender equality and disabilities were not the main focus of the EWW project one can assume that the realisation of the project objectives (integration of the NW Russia into the BSR) will be beneficial in a long run also for attracting attention of Russian decision makers and Russian society to those above mentioned horizontal goals. They are placed very high at civil agenda in particular in the Nordic countries and integration means also convergence in values and way of living so it means better acceptance of these horizontal goals in Russia as well. The same has happened in Poland, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia after their accession to EU (strengthening their European integration).

30.8. Monitoring and evaluation of the activities

Monitoring of activities was done on routine basis by the project Steering Group. The group worked very effectively guiding the project and proposing the changes if necessary. The group (ministerial part) provided also an excellent piece of advice with regard to use of the EWW project results for policy making. However, one should also admit the important role of Committee on Spatial Development of the Baltic Sea Region which was among the main recipients of the project results. The advice from this body and the VASAB Secretariat which took part in majority of the EWW events (on their own money) helped a lot in proper shaping the EWW work and focusing on the policy relevant results (e.g. providing links to HELCOM, EU BSR Strategy etc.).

Also important were feedbacks received from beneficiaries during the kick-off and final (closing) conference. In the Annex 2 quotations from the Conference resolutions are attached (in Russian).

30.9. What has been learned from the Action

The main lesson from the action is that integration of the NW Russia into the Baltic Sea Region (BSR) will not be an easy process. Russia is a global player looking for global organizations and bodies as its partners. Even the regional level i.e. St. Petersburg has sufficient potential to play an important role at the global arena. This is clearly seen in the St. Petersburg government policy and strategic documents. BSR is not the main field of St. Petersburg strategic activity. Slightly different situation is with regard to Kaliningrad, but its potential is sufficient to strengthen rather cross-border than pan-Baltic integration of Russian Federation. The main integrative processes between Russia and the rest of the BSR are hardly due to market forces or conscious decisions of the Russian enterprises but rather thanks to EU financial support in form of transnational and cross-border programmes. The only field in which one can expect more or less natural co-operation between Russia and the other BSR countries is maritime spatial planning as long as it affects coastal defence, fish stock and state of the coastal nature. Russia is very active now in HELCOM where the questions of maritime spatial planning have been already raised.

Therefore strengthening integration of the North-West Russia into the BSR requires further development of the Russian medium size cities such as e.g. Kaliningrad or Pskov, their partnership with adjacent regions, and development of the maritime spatial planning institutions which in natural way will seek for the relations with their closest neighbours.

31. Partners and other Co-operation

31.1. How do you assess the relationship between the formal partners of this Action (i.e. those partners which have signed a partnership statement)? Please specify for each partner organisation

St. Petersburg Administration [2] – partner active for discussing policy relevant documents and organising meetings in St. Petersburg in the field of analysis acting through partner no.3 . Important contribution to the stakeholder dialogue. In fact this partner will be one of the main recipients of the project results.

Russian Economic Developers Association (ASSET) [3] – very demanding from formal point of view but also very experience partner in analytical work. A great bulk of the WG1 recommendations were proposed by this partner. The partner is a great interface between science and policy making in Russia in particular in St. Petersburg. Important role in dissemination activities thanks to good contacts with decision-makers in Russia at local and regional level.

Immanuel Kant State University of Russia [4] – very reliable and enthusiastic partner being a source of many data and information excellent in scientific work acquiring great experience during the EWW project how to translate analysis into policy findings, but in fact majority of recommendations of the WG2 and the WG3 were rooted in partner no. 4 thinking.

Ministry of the Environment, Danish Forest and Nature Agency, Denmark [5] – very active and experienced partner (being responsible in the past for the USUN project) leading the WG 1 work and ensuring proper presentation of EWW at the highest BSR political level.

Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Housing, Germany [6] – very active and experienced partner responsible for urban-rural investigations under the WG1, ensuring proper presentation of EWW at the highest BSR political level.

Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communication, Sweden [7] – partner ensuring link to the EU BSR strategy (use of EWW results also there), acting mainly through partner 8 but very active in the WG2 , active in the WG3 (with very high quality inputs) and contributing to policy relevant findings in the EWW.

Nordic Centre for Spatial Development (NORDREGIO) [8] – one of key drivers for analytical work, competent, flexible with a large knowledge and experience in spatial and regional development.

Ministry of Regional Development, Poland [9] – partner leading the WG3 but active in other work groups, very experienced and very flexible contributing to the work additional resources if project resources are not sufficient.

Maritime Institute, Poland [10] – key resource for maritime spatial planning and ICZM in the project supporting actively the WG3 and coordinating the whole project from content point of view in very reasonable way.

31.2. Is the partnership to continue

The partnership will continue in a form of BSR Programme and ENPI Programme projects on maritime spatial planning. The co-operation agreement between partners no 4 and 10 will serve to this end. The BaltSea Plan was approved by the BSR programme. The project will serve as a continuation and dissemination of the WG3 work and results since both partners no 4 and 10 are among its key drivers.

The EWW project results were also used within the VASAB framework. This means that new partners such as Nordregio, ASSET or Immanuel Kant State University of Russia have joined the VASAB work and their involvement will continue.

31.3. How would you assess the relationship between your organisation and State authorities in the Action countries? How has this relationship affected the Action?

Since majority of the partners are state high level institutions those relations were fine. The partners representing state authorities knew each other for many years before starting the project as the members of the VASAB co-operation (Co-operation of Ministers for spatial planning and development in the BSR countries). The new input was given by the scientific institutions. This was a great added value of the project, mutual learning how to translate analysis into policy relevant actions. The research oriented partners were quite flexible and willing to reshape analysis or repeat them if asked by policy making partners.

31.4. Where applicable, describe your relationship with any other organisations involved in implementing the Action:

- Associate(s) (if any) - no
- Sub-contractor(s) (if any). Some of the work was given to the external contractors. However an idea was that majority of work should be done by the partners themselves since the partners had sufficient qualification to execute the project and achieve its goals. Contractors were used mainly for technical issues and for bringing knowledge from INTERREG projects. Only some partners (9) and (5) used contractors more intensively (for some concrete work) due to shortages in their human resources. In principle the relation with contractors were positive with one exception (i.e. Rumanian contractor who won a tender for the EWW financial management disappeared after few month of serving the project)
- Final Beneficiaries and Target groups. Those relations were fine thanks to sue of well established and prominent conferences for presentation of the EWW. This gave the project access to the target group necessary for the project success.
- Other third parties involved. Important was a link of the project to the VASAB Secretariat and VASAB work on the Long Term Perspective. VASAB Secretariat promoted also project and its results externally on request of the Responsible Partner.

31.5. Where applicable, outline any links you have developed with other actions.

The project ambition was to develop link to other important projects in order to make use of their results (BaltCoast, PlanCoast, Balance, USUN, SeBCo – their experts were invited to the project meetings) or to make joint meetings to better reach target groups (SeBCo POWER and SDI-4-SEB). These projects represented different INTERREG strands.

31.6. If your organisation has received previous EC grants in view of strengthening the same target group, in how far has this Action been able to build upon/complement the previous one(s)? (List all previous relevant EC grants).

The Ministries involved in the project previously received a grant from INTERREG II C to prepare an Action Plan for implementation of the VASAB strategy adopted in 1994. The project was called VASAB Plus and ended in 2000. The EWW used the VASAB Plus experience but its focus was different. This time the target geographical area was the NW Russia and its integration to the BSR. The lesson learned under the VASAB Plus (where Russia had no financial resources for analysis) showed that preparation of a pan-Baltic documents with very differentiate resources might result in uneven involvement of the countries and then uneven ownership of the agreed actions or strategies. Therefore the EWW was invented to avoid such a mistake and to give Russian colleagues resources for considering their role in the BSR integration.

32. Visibility

How is the visibility of the EU contribution being ensured in the Action?

At the project start a press release was done by the Responsible Partner. Visibility was ensured by placing proper information that the EWW project was part-financed by the EU together with the EU logo and logo of INTERREG III B. This was done on printing materials, power point presentation and on the project web site. There was also some information in the Latvian radio. On demand of Russian colleagues the project was presented at the Conference “Baltic Sea Region Programme 2007-2013: new partnership opportunities for Russian and Belarusian regions” in St. Petersburg as one of the most successful INTERREG projects with Russian participation. To strengthen the project visibility a special project banner was produced and displayed on many occasions (e.g. Conference “Baltic Sea region Spatial Development Policies avenues to the Long Term Perspective” in Riga on 23 April 2007, and already mentioned conference “Baltic Sea Region Programme 2007-2013: new partnership opportunities for Russian and Belarusian regions” in St. Petersburg on 16-17 April 2008 and in many other events). The book with the project analysis and recommendations was printed in December 2008. But the most important is that the project results will be used for producing “Long Term Perspective” for the BSR which will be presented to CBSS and all important pan-Baltic organizations. Thanks to EWW NW Russia will be properly highlighted in this strategy.

The European Commission may wish to publicise the results of Actions. Do you have any objection to this report being published on Europe Aid Co-operation Office website? If so, please state your objections here.

Name of the contact person for the Action: **Vladislavs Vesperis**

Signature:Location: **Riga, Latvia**

Date report due:Date report sent:

Update of action plan

Activity	Months																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Activity 1: Kick off of the work of Working Group no 1 on business development and innovation affecting spatial development,	X	X	X	X														
Activity 2: Analysis(WG1)				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Activity 3: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR (WG1)					X						X						X	
Activity 4: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations and action plan (WG1)					X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Activity 5: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 2 on accessibility				X														
Activity 6: Analysis(WG2)					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Activity 7: Pilot studies (WG2)												X	X	X	X	X		
Activity 8: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR					X						X						X	X
Activity 9: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG2)					X	X		X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Activity 10: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 3 on ICZM and transnational sea use planning		X			X													
Activity 11 Analysis (WG 3)					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					
Activity 12 Pilot Action (WG 3)					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
Activity 13: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR					X						X						X	
Activity 14: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG3)					X			X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		

EWV events: participation of man and woman

Participants			
Event	Woman	Man	Total
Kick off meeting of the work of WG1, on 25 June 2007 in Riga	9	11	20
WG1 meeting 25 September 2007 in Riga	4	3	7
WG1 analysis (people involved)	11	23	34
Steering Group meeting on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg	7	11	18
St Petersburg kick off conference on 18-19 October 2007	112	146	259
St Petersburg Closing conference on 21 October 2008	231	400	631
WG1 second meeting on 6-7 December 2007 in Riga	9	10	19
Synergy meeting no.1 on 31 January 2008 in Riga	10	13	23
Steering Group Meeting no.2 on 1 February 2008 in Riga	4	11	15
Synergy meeting no 2 in Liepaja on 14 th of March 2008	8	8	16
WG1 fourth meeting on 3-4 April 2008 in Riga	6	7	13
Riga Stakeholders seminars (WG3 and WG1 + WG2) on 23 April 2008	83	84	167
WG1 fifth meeting on 24 April 2008 in Riga	13	12	25
Steering Group Meeting no. 3 on 20 May 2008 in Riga	4	6	10
Steering Group Meeting no. 4 on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg	3	10	13
WG1 sixth meeting on 3 rd September 2008 in Jurmala	11	11	22
WG2 first meeting on 10 October 2007 in Riga	3	6	9
WG2 analysis	6	11	17
WG2 second meeting on 5 December 2007 in Riga	4	7	11
WG2 third meeting on 21 May 2008 in Riga	2	7	9
WG2 fourth meeting on 4 th September 2008 in Jurmala	9	11	20
WG3 preparatory meeting on 24 July 2007 in Kaliningrad	4	10	14
WG 3 first meeting on 30-31 October 2007 in Kaliningrad	12	15	27
WG3 analysis	3	11	14
Pilot Action (WG 3)	3	10	13
WG3 second meeting on 27-28 March 2008 in Kaliningrad	6	13	19
WG3 third meeting on 4-5 June 2008 in Gdańsk	6	15	21
WG3 fourth meeting 2 September 2008 in Gdańsk	3	11	14

Quotations from the Conference resolutions (in Russian) in direct relations to the EAST West Window.

15. Kick Off Conference

Продвижение европейского опыта в рамках программ Европейского Инструмента Соседства и Партнерства усилит инновационный потенциал и влияние Северо-Западного региона России на процессы территориальной интеграции на внешних границах ЕС, в частности, в регионе Балтийского моря. В этих целях целесообразна активизация участия России в таких международных объединениях, как VASAB 2010, Балтийский форум развития (BDF), Программа транснационального сотрудничества региона Балтийского моря 2007-2013.

Зарубежный опыт свидетельствует о значительной роли малых и средних городов в продвижении инноваций и гармонизации территориального развития. Этот факт должен учитываться при разработке инновационных стратегий в России как на федеральном, так и на региональном уровнях. Необходимо уделять больше внимания развитию малых и средних городов, как это происходит в странах ЕС, и адаптировать европейский опыт применительно к ситуации в России (в частности, концепцию сельско-городского партнерства «ESDP Concept of Rural-Urban Partnership»). Доступ к знаниям и информации, возможность обмена идеями должны стать основой формирования территориальных моделей развития России.

/.../

Участники Форума согласились со следующим:

- необходимо особое единое государственное управление морскими прибрежными зонами страны (обеими их составляющими: морской и сухопутной) исходя из повсеместного успешного мирового опыта подобной деятельности и соответствующих рекомендаций организаций системы ООН и международных форумов на высшем уровне. Руководствуясь этим, рекомендовать: 1) создание нормативной правовой и институциональной базы для разработки и реализации комплексных программ развития и управления прибрежными зонами в рамках комплексных программ социально-экономического развития приморских субъектов Федерации и программ развития прибрежных муниципальных образований в целях активизации участия последних в освоении прибрежных и морских ресурсов; 2) адаптацию и освоение современных управленческих технологий (методология Комплексного управления прибрежными зонами (КУПЗ)) в применении к богатейшим по ресурсам и разнообразным по природным и социально-экономическим условиям прибрежным зонам страны; 3) разработку и реализацию пилотных программ КУПЗ конкретных побережий страны; 4) использование опыта сотрудничества стран Балтийского региона, в частности рекомендаций Проекта BaltCoast BSR INTERREG III B по управлению прибрежными зонами и разработке совместных стратегических проектов;
- рекомендовать использование кластерного подхода в качестве инструмента реализации стратегий развития территорий и повышения конкурентоспособности региональной и муниципальной экономики, включая выявление и диагностику потенциальных кластеров, разработку программ их развития, создание организаций по сотрудничеству. В органах власти необходимо формирование межотраслевых рабочих групп для координации развития кластеров и снятия ведомственных и отраслевых ограничений. Целесообразно более широкое использование международных программ и инструментов повышения конкурентоспособности кластеров;
- необходимо развитие региональной и муниципальной статистики, в частности для целей выработки эффективной кластерной политики и оценки результатов реализации кластерных инициатив в регионе и/или муниципалитете, формирования действенных

инструментов планирования и управления, ориентированного на результат на субфедеральных уровнях;

- при реализации федеральных, региональных и местных программ экономического развития необходимо стимулировать участие организаций инновационной инфраструктуры в российских и зарубежных сетевых организациях, которые оказывают содействие в предоставлении услуг компаниям и научным организациям в сфере инновационной бизнес-кооперации и трансфера технологий (примерами могут служить Российская сеть трансфера технологий RTTN, Европейская сеть бизнес-инновационных центров EBN). Участие в сетевом сотрудничестве должно быть нацелено на повышение качества и содержания услуг для местных компаний и НИИ. Федеральным и региональным органам власти необходимо поддерживать инициативы по развитию сетевого взаимодействия между организациями инновационной региональной инфраструктуры (создание региональных сетей) с целью уменьшения дублирования функций, повышения качества услуг и снижения расходов бюджета на их субсидирование;
- рекомендовать и стимулировать участие российских центров коммерциализации, инновационных центров в реализации Competitiveness Innovation Program (CIP) Европейского союза в части проектов, ориентированных на развитие инновационных сетей и сетей трансфера технологий (IRC, IRE, EBN и др.);
- считать целесообразным использование в России европейского опыта реализации региональных инновационных стратегий, обеспечивающих выявление спроса на инновации среди компаний и ориентацию научного сектора и инновационной инфраструктуры на удовлетворение этого спроса. (...);
- в целях совершенствования государственного и муниципального управления по обеспечению перехода Российской Федерации на инновационный путь развития рекомендовать Комиссии при Президенте Российской Федерации по вопросам совершенствования государственного управления и правосудия, Министерству регионального развития Российской Федерации, другим заинтересованным федеральным и региональным органам власти осуществить экспертизу полномочий органов государственной власти субъектов Российской Федерации и органов местного самоуправления в части выявления проблемных вопросов, препятствующих обеспечению перехода России на режим инновационного развития, и законодательно обеспечить активизацию участия в реализации государственной научно-технической политики органов государственной власти субъектов Федерации и органов местного самоуправления, рассмотреть возможность разработки национальной программы, ориентированной на содействие российским регионам в подготовке и реализации региональных инновационных стратегий и формирование российской сети инновационных регионов;
- рекомендовать заинтересованным федеральным и региональным органам государственной власти реализовать систему мер по поддержке технопарков и процессов коммерциализации научных разработок. В частности: разработать законодательную базу для развития технопарков на федеральном уровне; предоставить налоговые льготы компаниям-резидентам технопарков, например, аналогичные льготам для резидентов ОЭЗ; упростить процедуру предоставления земельных участков для технопарков; законодательно разрешить НИИ, вузам и университетам создавать малые предприятия - start-up'ы;
- рекомендовать органам регионального и муниципального управления активно использовать инструменты международной технической и финансовой помощи, предоставляемой по линии Института Всемирного Банка, АМР США, Европейского Инструмента Соседства и Партнерства (ENPI) и других программ Европейского Союза для реализации стратегических приоритетов и планов территориального развития, поддержки инноваций;
- отметить необходимость выработки механизма интеграции документов стратегического планирования муниципального, регионального и федерального уровней;
- одобрить инициативы Комитета по пространственному развитию региона Балтийского моря (CSD/BSR) VASAB 2010 по территориальной интеграции Северо-Запада России и реализации совместных проектов в таких приоритетных сферах как развитие бизнеса, транспорта, ИКТ, управление прибрежными зонами. Отметить актуальность проекта «Окно

Восток-Запад", который позволит восполнить пробелы в оценке инновационного потенциала Северо-Запада России и расширит возможности синергии инновационных потенциалов стран Балтийского региона.

- предложить Комитету VASAB 2010 использовать Форум лидеров стратегического планирования городов и регионов России в качестве референтной группы для обсуждения Стратегии пространственного развития региона Балтийского моря.

16. Closing Conference

16.1. «Перспективы развития Северо-Западного федерального округа: вызовы, приоритеты, угрозы и ограничения»

Участники рекомендуют:

- 22) в целях максимального учёта сложившихся межсубъектовых экономических связей, обеспечения увязки общегосударственных и региональных планов и прогнозов социально-экономического развития, целесообразно предусмотреть **разработку стратегических документов долгосрочного социально-экономического развития на уровне федеральных округов**. Для преодоления ведомственной и региональной разобщённости целесообразно поручить эту работу Ассоциациям экономического взаимодействия соответствующих федеральных округов. Это позволит точнее формулировать цели регионального развития в увязке с имеющимися общими ресурсами, объективно сформировать перечень основных межрегиональных проектов, обеспечивающих достижение общих целей развития. Подобные документы могут стать основой для последующей разработки Концепции долгосрочного социально-экономического развития Российской Федерации;
- 23) для ускорения социально-экономического развития территорий требуется **активизация межрегионального взаимодействия**. Зачастую депрессивные регионы (субъекты Федерации) экономически тесно связаны с успешными регионами (транспортные подходы к инфраструктурным объектам, наличие сырьевой базы для обрабатывающих производств и т.п.). В этом случае целесообразно оказывать федеральную помощь (налоговые и иные льготы, государственные гарантии под привлекаемые кредиты, первоочередное финансирование проектов в рамках действующих ФЦП и др.) для инфраструктурного развития депрессивных территорий по поддерживаемым видам и направлениям экономической деятельности, а также для реализации проектов способствующих комплексному развитию двух и более субъектов Федерации;
- 24) необходимым условием развития и Северо-Западного федерального округа и страны в целом является **совершенствование работы транспортного комплекса**. Требуется системный подход к формированию единой стратегии развития транспортно-логистического комплекса страны в увязке с развитием отраслей экономики и внешнеэкономической ситуацией.

16.2. «Специфика стратегий приморских регионов»

Участники считают, что

- 22) Необходимо совершенствование стратегического планирования применительно к морской деятельности и приморским регионам и муниципалитетам, предусматривающее:

на федеральном уровне:

- применение интегральных подходов к планированию и управлению в морском природопользовании. Это позволит преодолеть фрагментарность, присущую отраслевому подходу, учесть взаимосвязанность видов морского природопользования, способствовать связям и межотраслевой гармонизации в морской деятельности исходя из анализа конфликтного использования ресурсов, обеспечить многоцелевую ориентацию и соответствие

деятельности природоохранным целям, участие всех заинтересованных сторон в разработке стратегий и программ развития;

- создание нормативной правовой и институциональной базы для разработки и реализации комплексных программ развития и управления прибрежными зонами, основанных на интегральных подходах, в рамках стратегий и программ социально-экономического развития приморских субъектов Федерации и программ развития прибрежных муниципальных образований. Это позволит реализовать особое единое государственное управление морскими прибрежными зонами страны (обеими их составляющими: морской и сухопутной) исходя из повсеместного успешного мирового опыта подобной деятельности и соответствующих рекомендаций организаций системы ООН и международных форумов на высшем уровне;

на региональном уровне:

- адаптацию и освоение современных управленческих технологий (методология Комплексного управления прибрежными зонами - КУПЗ) в применении к богатейшим по ресурсам и разнообразным по природным и социально-экономическим условиям прибрежным зонам страны;
- разработку и реализацию пилотных программ КУПЗ конкретных побережий страны.

Реализация этих мер позволит реализовать естественные природные конкурентные преимущества морских акваторий и прибрежных территорий в обеспечении дополнительного экономического роста, конкурентоспособности, инвестиционной привлекательности, занятости, повышения комфортности и качества жизни, охраны окружающей среды и уменьшения ущерба от природных и техногенных катастроф, а также безопасности страны

- 23) Необходимо совершенствование нормативной правовой базы, регулирующей градостроительную деятельность, в части учета специфики этой деятельности на морских акваториях, находящихся под суверенитетом и юрисдикцией Российской Федерации.
- 24) Необходимо развивать международное сотрудничество в стратегическом планировании морского природопользования, учитывая единство и экосистемный характер морских процессов, и широко использовать международный опыт в этой сфере.

FINAL NARRATIVE REPORT

33. Description

33.1. Name of beneficiary of grant contract: Ministry of Regional Development and Local Government, Latvia (Reģionālās attīstības un pašvaldību lietu ministrija).

33.2. Name and title of the Contact person: Mr Vladislavs Vesperis.

33.3. Name of partners in the Action: St. Petersburg Administration (Администрация Губернатора Санкт-Петербурга) [2], Russian Economic Developers Association (ASSET) (Ассоциация специалистов по экономическому развитию территорий) [3], Immanuel Kant State University of Russia (Российский государственный университет имени И. Канта) [4], Ministry of the Environment, Danish Forest and Nature Agency³³, Denmark (Miljøministeriet, Skov- og Naturstyrelsen) [5], Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Housing, Germany (Bundesministeriums für Verkehr, Bau und Stadtentwicklung) [6], Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communication, Sweden (Näringsdepartementet) [7], Nordic Centre for Spatial Development (NORDREGIO) [8], Ministry of Regional Development, Poland (Ministerstwo Rozwoju Regionalnego) [9], Maritime Institute, Poland (Instytut Morski) [10].

33.4. Title of the Action: East-West Window (EWW).

33.5. Contract number: Grant Contract for European Community External Actions **2007/132-845**.

33.6. Start date and end date of the reporting period³⁴: 15.06.2007 – 15.12.2008.

33.7. Target country(ies) or region(s): **North-West Russia in particular: St. Petersburg, Leningrad region and Kaliningrad region**; to some extent also Belarus and North-West Russia adjacent countries (mainly for collecting good practices and dissemination of the project results).

33.8. Final beneficiaries &/or target groups³⁵ (if different). The target audience/recipients of the project findings are: decision-makers (ministries responsible for spatial planning and development in the BSR, including the federal government in Russia, regional authorities in

³³ The name of the partner 5 was changed during the EWW project execution **from** Ministry of the Environment, Danish Forest and Nature agency **to** Ministry of the Environment, Agency for Spatial and Environmental Planning (Miljøministeriet, By- og Landskabsstyrelsen).

³⁴ The entire implementation period of the Action

³⁵ “Target groups” are the groups/entities who will be directly positively affected by the project at the Project Purpose level, and “final beneficiaries” are those who will benefit from the project in the long term at the level of the society or sector at large.

NW Russia, pan-Baltic organisations such as VASAB 2010). The final beneficiaries are local and regional governments in the Baltic Sea region (BSR) operators in the chosen thematic fields (e.g. businesses in WP1 and transport operators in WP2) in NW Russia and in the BSR. The divide into men and women of different project activities is provided separately.

33.9. Country (ies) in which the activities take place (if different from 1.7): Russia (St. Petersburg and Kaliningrad Oblast), Poland and Latvia.

34. Assessment of implementation of Action activities

34.1. Activities and results (for the whole reporting period including last narrative interim report)

Activity 1: Kick off of the work of Working Group no 1 on business development and innovation affecting spatial development,

1.25. First meeting of the WG1 (1 day) took place on 25 June 2007 in Riga which was according to the schedule. The meeting was planned in advance in late June so participants postponed their holidays which in this part of the BSR starts with so called Midsummer. The meeting was attended by 12 participants representing partners 1,3,4,5,6,8,9,10 and eight invited guests. The main aim was to discuss the analysis and further WG1 work in detail, to achieve clarity about division of labour between the partners, to make sure that duplication with other project is avoided (instead to aim at using results achieved by other projects) and to start the process of contracting the external experts. The following outputs were produced or achieved:

- Report how to avoid duplication with other INTERREG III B projects in the field of business development and innovation affecting spatial development had been prepared before the meeting by the project coordinator, discussed by the meeting and delivered to the Responsible (Lead) Partner.
- TORs for seven ASSET staff members, eight Kaliningrad University staff members, one Belarus expert and four external experts together with tender documentation (if necessary) have been prepared by project coordinator as result of the meeting. Tender procedures for the four external experts had been started resulting in contracting one external expert from Poland, one from Sweden, one from Latvia and one from Denmark. In addition the Belarus expert was contracted by the partner no. 8 without tender (contract below 5000 Euro).
- The main scope of analysis was proposed and discussed. Unfortunately too many question marks and uncertainties appeared during the June meeting so the additional meeting was organized in Riga in September and discussion on analysis continued till the second WG1 meeting (December 2007).
- Text for EWW section at to the VASAB website was decided, technically EWW link at VASAB website was created in September 2007.
- Project flyer was designed and edited including information on WG1 activities (300 copies were printed in October 2007).

Comments: The WG1 started the discussion on its work (i.e. necessary analysis, results to be achieved) but the topic was too broad for one day meeting in addition to many technical questions were raised. The decision was to continue the discussion when the experts contracted by tender would be available. The main problem was to what extend the achievement of the EWW goal (i.e. *to promote territorial integration of NW Russia into the BSR in the field of business development*)

required concentration on analysis concerning exclusively NW Russia and to what extent the broader BSR picture was necessary if integration should mean reciprocal relations (i.e. affecting both sides). The latter opinion prevailed and was accepted by the meeting. The WG1 considered that for producing the main output of the analytical phase (i.e. a *compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") with assessment of unexploited innovation potential in NW Russia, assessment of the potential for regional integration and with identification of spatial problems in NW Russia and BSR*) some BSR analysis as the background material should be done as well. The meeting also discussed the policy related role of the project i.e. better highlighting the EWW results on NW Russia role in the “Long Term Perspective” to be prepared by VASAB on CBSS demand. The WG1 leaders promised to ensure smooth transfer of the EWW results to the BSR strategy i.e. Long Term Perspective till 2030 (to be prepared by VASAB in 2009). The Responsible Partner declared that he would invite VASAB Secretariat to the most important meetings of the EWW to ensure smooth transfer of the project results to the “Long Term Perspective”.

- 1.26. Partnership Agreement Preparation. This action was related to all work packages and took place in June, July, August, and September 2007 and was ended in October 2007 with signing partnership agreements between Lead Partner and all other partners of the EWW project. The most difficult was signing Partnership Agreement with partners from St. Petersburg due to problems related to tax and system in Russia, conversion of EUR into rubels, banking system requirements etc. Finally two agreements, based on the results of additional working meeting (in Riga) discussions, were prepared and signed between Lead Partner and RU (ASSET) Partner and between German Partner and RU (ASSET) Partner. So at the end of the day there were 9 partnership agreements signed regulating relations between the EWW partners.
- 1.27. Quality Workshop (1 day) for Project leaders organised by INTERREG III B Secretariat and EU Delegation from Moscow in Riga on 26 September 2007 was attended by project coordinator (partner no.10), one representative of Russian partners (partner no.2) and representatives appointed by the Responsible Partner. Main guidelines from EC Delegation and INTERREG III B Secretariat on TACIS rules, payments schemes and communication experiences were presented during the seminar and later on at individual consultations. The meeting between Responsible Partner and the Russian partners was organized back to back with the workshop for discussing main technicalities of their participation in the project.

Activity 2: Analysis(WG1)

- 2.17. WG1 additional meeting (1 day) took place on 25 September 2007 in Riga to continue discussion on the scope of analysis. The meeting was attended by four WG1 members (including two external experts, project coordinator and the representative of the Russian partners) and three participants representing Responsible Partner. At the meeting in depth discussion on case studies on innovation, outsourcing and urban-rural relations in Russia took place and the detailed scope of the work of Russian partners and external experts were agreed. Also a draft outline structure of the WG1 analytical report was presented by the WG1 Coordinator and discussed in depth.
- 2.18. Data collection and interpretation started only in December 2007 after the second WG1 meeting. In this phase 34 people from all partners were involved (except partner no.7 who acted through partner no. 8). Their involvement differed. The main bulk of analytical work was done by partners no. 3, 4 and 8 and the external experts whereas the other people acted mainly as a reference group reading reports, making comments and asking for improvements. This was the task first of all of partners no. 1, 2, 5, 6, 9 and 10 representing mainly policy making side in the project and project coordination. Also VASAB Secretariat was invited by partner 1 (Responsible Partner) to participate in this process. The analysis (data collection) in principle were ended in March 2008 but some of them (requiring surveys) due to formal reasons (tenders) were completed in April 2008. Interpretation of data was

done in April 2008 for all important cases (but some analysis e.g. the benchmarking studies and urban-rural analysis continued till September 2008). In fact in April and even in May and June the fine tuning of analysis (removing mistakes noticed by the other partners) still continued. The reason was that some partners from the reference group were very demanding asking for many improvements even if they had found little inconsistencies after second or third reading of the reports. Therefore the final synthesis report (draft discussion paper) from the analytical phase was completed only in July 2008 and even slightly changed after the WG1 September 2008 meeting and as the result of the EWW final/closing Conference in October 2008.

The outputs have been following:

(i) interim:

- Data (including public surveys) and draft analytical report on “Baltic” metropolitan areas with focus on the role of Kaliningrad and St. Petersburg;
- In depth study on St. Petersburg and Kaliningrad and their developmental potentials in the BSR context (focus on innovation and outsourcing) in which: trends and present policies for innovations nested in NW Russia and outsourcing were analysed, barriers for innovations perceived by business and public administration were identified (based on surveys), and cases on transfer of innovations between NW Russia and other parts of the BSR were described;
- Case studies (reports) on Russian and Belarus small and medium sized cities – covering: Novgorod, Gatchina, Chernyakhovsk, Gusev, Sovetsk, Svetly, Berezovka, Zaslavl;
- Reports on demographic trends in North-West Russia, in St. Petersburg and in Kaliningrad and in Belarus as well;
- Reports on case studies on urban-rural relations in Russia;
- Report on INTERREG III B projects results relevant for work of the WG1 group;
- Benchmarking studies concerning situation in Poland, Germany and Latvia on the issues relevant for the WG1 recommendations .

(ii) A compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") with assessment of unexploited innovation potential in NW Russia, assessment of the potential for regional integration and with identification of spatial problems in NW Russia and BSR.

Comments:

a) All the planned outcomes were achieved. However, during the analytical phase became clear that for the NW Russia innovation is more promising path for integration within the BSR than outsourcing, therefore more efforts were done to analyse this challenge. The list of outputs was enlarged (in comparison to the planned ones) by analysis of the role of the NW Russia in the BSR context (as the result of the WG1 discussions what analysis are necessary to achieve the EWW goal). Also urban structures and functional urban areas of not only large but also some small cities were analysed. The most interesting case appeared to be Gatchina as an example of science intensive cluster in Russia located in a small city. The some other cases illustrated urban-rural relations in Russia (and Belarus).

b) While working with data it became clear that translating data into policy recommendations can not be done by each working group separately. Therefore at the meeting of the WG leaders in December it was proposed that for the starting work on recommendation a workshop for all WGs would be necessary. The Responsible Partner was asked to organize such a workshop on 31st of January 2008 instead of simple WG1 seminar (planned for that date).

c) The work was delayed by some formal constraints such as tender procedures, requirement of separate EUR accounts (very difficult for Ministries) etc.

Activity 3: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR (WG1)

- 3.1. Kick off Conference of the project (1,5 day) for broad public took place on 18-19 October 2007 (according schedule) in St. Petersburg as a part of the well known VI Forum of Strategic Planning Leaders of Cities and Regions of Russia. This allowed project to reach the planned target group. The project: its assumptions and the planned outputs were presented to the Russian decision makers - mainly city mayors and chief planners. Conference participants expressed a deep hope that EWW project would diminish knowledge gaps within the Baltic Sea Region on the character of development potential of the NW Russia, its synergies and complementarities with potentials of other countries of the region, and on methods how this potential could be efficiently connected within the BSR. It was expressed in Conference recommendations that EWW project results should be presented in 2008 at the final Conference within VII Forum of Strategic Planning Leaders of Cities and Regions of Russia. The kick off conference was attended by 259 participants mainly Russian mayors and city planners. Among them there were 57 persons outside Russia. From EWW project 20 persons participated including Latvian State Secretary representing the Responsible Partner. So EWW reached the planned target of **200** Russian decision makers and professionals involved in discussion on the project.
- 3.2. Stakeholder Seminar for WG1 (0,5 day) was organised on 23 April 2008 in Riga (instead of beginning of May as originally planned). The preliminary results of the analytical phase were presented and the first discussions on the recommendations were started. The seminars for all working groups of EWW were arranged back to back with the VASAB annual conference financed by the Latvian Ministry of Regional Development and Local Government from its own means i.e. outside the EWW budget (from the EWW budget some partners only covered their travelling to the EWW seminars). The described above arrangement resulted in very impressive participation in the seminars and allowed to reach a planned target of **100** decision makers and businessman from BSR EU countries involved in discussion of the project findings and recommendations. The conference and seminars were attended by 167 participants including 26 persons directly involved in the EWW project (although the Responsible Partner was represented by some more employees). The participants came mainly from Latvia, Lithuania, and Finland but also from Azerbaijan, Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, EU Commission, Germany, Hungary, Norway, Poland, Russia and Sweden.
- 3.3. Closing(final) Conference of the project (1 day) for broad public took place on 21st October 2008 (according schedule) in St. Petersburg. The title of the conference was “Promoting territorial integration of the North West Russia into the Baltic Sea Region”. The main organiser was ASEET together with the EWW Responsible Partner. This Conference was a part of rich spectrum of the conferences and seminars taking place under umbrella (the same premises) of the VII All-Russia Forum of Strategic Planning Leaders “Strategic Planning in Regions and Cities of Russia”. In the event 631 participants took place out of it 582 from Russia. The forum was organized by: State Duma of the Russian Federation; Ministry for Regional Development of the Russian Federation; Ministry for Economic Development of the Russian Federation; St Petersburg City Administration; Center of Strategic Research; ISCER Leontief Centre. It was opened by Mr Dmitry Kozak, Minister of Regional Development, who underlined that “Forum is becoming the public debating platform for improving the strategic planning system of social and economic development in Russian regions”. The Conference “Promoting territorial integration of the North West Russia into the Baltic Sea region” was composed of four sessions attended by large number of the participants not only from Russia but also from other Baltic Sea Region countries. Some sessions were joint ventures with other organisations, forums and bodies interested in the subjects raised by the EWW project. The names of the sessions were following:
 - “Accessibility and innovations as motors of integration of the NW Russia into the Baltic Sea Region” (presentation of the results of the WG1 and the WG2),

- “Special Features of coastal regional strategies” (presentation of the WG3 results and dialogue with all key persons in Russia dealing with ICZM and maritime spatial planning),
- “Partnership mechanisms in local economic policy implementation” (presentation of the WG1 results with regard to urban-rural partnership).

In addition to that EWW results were presented at the key session of the Forum “Prospects for Federal Okrug Development: Challenges, priorities, threats and constraints. North-West Federal Okrug” attended by key decision makers from the North-West Federal Okrug.

Comments:

The choice of the formula of the kick-off and closing conferences appeared to have very positive results on ability of the project to deliver results to the key target groups in Russia. The Conference was also attended by the Ministerial partners from the EWW project. The EWW results were mirrored in the Forums resolutions. Some interested questions were raised requiring further discussion and examination.

- 3.4. Final publication The book summing up the results of the investigations available for the stakeholders in Kaliningrad and St.Petersburg was edited in October, November and printed in December 2008 by partner no.4.

Comments:

The number of books published was smaller (100) than assumed in the application (400), although the whole budget allocated to this purpose was used. There were several reasons why the printing was more expensive than expected. Some of them were of technical reasons: i.e. the book had more coloured pictures (maps) than estimated and was thicker than planned (more than 300 pages in comparison to 150 pages planned), but the main reason was of vis mayor nature. In 2008 in Russia an unexpected inflation and economic crisis appeared which could not be taken into account at the stage of budget planning. This resulted in much higher printing costs. However, the partner no.4 is ready to print additional copies of the book if demanded. The available copies will be distributed to the most active in the EWW Russian stakeholders and to the project partners of the EWW.

Activity 4: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations and action plan (WG1)

- 4.1. Steering Group Meeting (1 day) took place on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg according to schedule. The meeting was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1,2,3,5,6,7,9,10 and seven invited guests. The Steering Group discussed the project progress. The work was lagging behind the schedule. Although the WG1 started on time it became involved in lengthy discussions about the necessary scope of analysis and detailed division of labour between working groups. The Steering Group decided therefore not to start the work on recommendations before improving synergy between the work of the working groups. This task was given to the meeting of the WGs leaders organised in Riga back to back with the WG2 (5 December 2007) and the WG1 (6-7 December 2007) meetings. The meeting also discussed details of project presentation to the kick-off conference held next day.
- 4.2. WG1 second meeting (1,5 day) took place on 6-7 December 2007 in Riga (instead of late November). The meeting was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10, two external consultants and six invited guests. The meeting concentrated on discussing analytical phase of the project (the decision was that the lagging behind analysis would make necessary to postpone by two months the next WG1 meeting i.e. till the end of analytical phase). However, the WG 1 also started examining the way of preparation of the recommendations out of the analysis conducted. For the starting work on recommendation it was agreed that a workshop for all WGs would be necessary and the

Responsible Partner was asked to organize such a workshop (synergy meeting) on 31st of January 2008 instead of a simple WG1 seminar (scheduled for beginning of February).

- 4.3. Synergy meeting no.1 (1 day) took place in Riga on 31 of January 2008 (replacing the WG1 seminar scheduled for February). It was attended by fourteen project partner members representing partners no.1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, three external experts and six invited guests. The facilitator was hired by the Responsible Partner. During the meeting the participants agreed that all three working groups were in need of a common frame. This should be given by the vision of the BSR till 2030 with full integration of the North-West Russia. The participants managed to prepare an outline of such a vision requiring further work. The meeting asked for one more working day for finishing common visionary frame which should allow preparing meaningful recommendations.
- 4.4. Steering Group Meeting 2 took place on 1 of February 2008 in Riga. It was attended by seven project partner members representing partners no. 1,3,5,6,7, 9, 10 one external expert and seven invited guests. The results of the synergy meeting were discussed i.e. synergy between the work of the working groups. It was decided to organise one more synergy meeting to continue work on the common frame for all WGs, i.e. vision of the BSR till 2030 with full integration of the North-West Russia. An agenda of the April Conference proposed by the Responsible Partner was discussed together with some technical issues. The progress in analytical phase was reviewed.
- 4.5. Synergy meeting no. 2 (1 day) took place in Liepaja on 14th of March 2008. It was attended by ten project partner members representing partners no. 1,3,5,6,9, 10 one external expert and five invited guests. The facilitator was hired by the Responsible Partner but paid from Responsible Partner own means. The final draft of the vision was discussed and shared by participants giving stable frame for analytical part and allowing proper work on recommendations.
- 4.6. WG1 fourth meeting (1 day) took place on 3-4 April 2008 in Riga. It was attended by nine project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 8, 10, two external experts and two invited guests. The meeting was convened on demand of Russian partners who started finalisation of analytical part and wanted to discuss the preliminary results among themselves. It was also important for conceptualization of the recommendations i.e. discussing what findings from analytical phase should be taken into consideration while working on recommendations.
- 4.7 WG1 fifth meeting (one day) took place on 24 April 2008 in Riga. It was attended by fifteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, four external experts and six invited guests. The WG1 before the meeting concentrated mainly on analytical work. At the fifth meeting analyses were summed up and the work on recommendations were started. However, one more meeting was requested (autumn 2008) in order to discuss the final draft of the recommendations and action programme. Due to delay in the work on urban-rural relations in Russia the relevant reports were not presented to the WG1 at this meeting. Only an overview of the progress and main findings were reported. It was decided that for synergy reasons the reports would be presented on seminar on urban-rural relations in Russia to be organised as a joint event with the SeBCo project in Kaliningrad in June 2008. This was realised and such presentation took place and was regarded as a great success by meeting participants.
- 4.8. Steering Group Meeting 3 (one day) took place on 20 May 2008 in Riga. It was attended by five project partner members representing partners no. 1, 5, 9, 10, and five invited guests. The Steering Group discussed the project progress. The results of the second synergy meeting and the April Conference were examined as well as a draft vision of the BSR till 2030 with full integration of the North-West Russia. The Steering Group decided to close analytical part and start the work on recommendations. However, the WG3 leaders asked for additional benchmark study on the results of the INTERREG projects in the field of competences of the WG3 with focus on the German experience. This was to diminish discrepancies between the WGs, since the WG1 and the WG2 already had such type of

expertises included in their work. The problems with travelling budget of Russian partners were discussed once more together with a problem of disappeared financial manager. The Steering Group also continued a discussion on political use of the EWW results i.e. incorporation of the results into the Long Term Perspective of VASAB to be produced in 2009. The output achieved:

- first draft recommendation papers (in outline format) of WG1 and WG2.

4.9. WG1 sixth meeting (one day) took place on 03 September 2008 in Jurmala. It was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, four external experts and seven invited guests. They discussed the final draft of the recommendations and action programme prepared during holiday time 2008 by ASSET, Immanuel Kant State University of Russia (Kaliningrad), Nordregio staff, and external experts. The whole work on urban-rural relations in Russia the relevant analytic reports were presented to the WG1 at this meeting as well. The WG1 discussed and improved the following documents:

- Recommendations how to improve innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Recommendations how to improve settlement policies in NW Russia (urban rural partnership) from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Action plan how to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration.

4.10. Steering Group Meeting 4 (one day) took place on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg. It was attended by 7 project partner members representing partners no. 2, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10 one external expert and 6 invited guests. The group discussed the shape of final publications of the EWW project, the use of the analytical materials and endorsed the recommendations and action proposed by the project. The main discussion was on the proper use of the EWW results for the Long Term Perspective (LTP) of VASAB elaboration of which was started few month ago (August 2008). The EWW results were placed to the different parts of the LTP outcomes. The VASAB consultant responsible for facilitating the LTP process was invited to the Steering Group meeting. It was also discussed how to use EWW outcomes for the process of preparation of the BSR EU Strategy. The partner no.5 arranged a meeting with the EU Commission on that topic. It was decided that the EWW results would be incorporated in the VASAB non-paper to be presented to the EU Commission in November/December 2008 in order to influence strategy preparation. The outputs achieved (as results of the meeting):

- Final draft of the recommendations how to improve innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Final draft of recommendations how to improve settlement policies in NW Russia (urban rural partnership) from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Final draft of the action plan how to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration,
- Final draft of recommendations on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR including concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR,
- Final action plan how to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational sea use planning and ICZM,
- Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic,
- Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application,
- Forwarding (transferring of EWW results) to important BSR processes namely: EU BSR Strategy and VASAB Long Term Perspective.

Activity 5: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 2 on accessibility

5.1. WG2 first meeting (one day) took place on 10 October 2007 in Riga It was attended by five project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 8, 10, one external expert and three

invited guests. The main aim was to discuss the scope of analysis (concrete meaning of accessibility) and the further work of the WG2 step by step, to achieve clarity about division of labour between the partners, to make sure that duplication with other project was avoided (instead to aim at using results achieved by other projects) and to start the process of contracting the external experts. The following outputs were produced or achieved:

- Report how to avoid duplication with other INTERREG III B projects in the field of accessibility was prepared by the project coordinator, discussed at the meeting and accepted by the Responsible Partner;
- TORs for four Kaliningrad University staff members, one Belarus expert and TORs for three external experts together with tender documentation (if necessary) have been prepared and approved. Procurement and contracting procedures for the one external expert was finished in September. Two other experts were also contracted (latter on);
- The main scope of analysis were proposed and discussed. The discussion on analysis continued among the partners (by e-mails) till the second WG2 meeting (December 2007);
- EWW link at the VASAB website was created (see activity 1.1);
- The content of the project flyer was loaded by short information about the WG2 activities.

Comments: The WG2 started its work behind the schedule. Due to the late project start (mid of June 2007), the first period of the project coincided with a holiday season. Therefore the real work of the WG2 (by phone, e-mails etc) started only in September 2007 i.e. three month later than planned. In addition to that, for some partners it was very inconvenient (e.g. celebrations of anniversary of establishment of the Kaliningrad University) and this postponed the start of formal work by one or two month further on i.e. till October 2007. In the meantime the preparation of the WG2 detailed analysis was started. To this end a pre meeting on 22nd of August 2007 was organised (partners 1, 7,8) to prepare tentative proposals on the substance of the work of the WG2. This meeting was paid outside the EWW budget. Although the WG2 (similarly to the WG1) came to the opinion that broader BSR picture was necessary to promote *territorial integration of NW Russia into the BSR in the field of transport and ITC*. The WG2 members also shared the WG1 concern on importance of smooth transfer of the EWW results to the BSR strategy till 2030 i.e. Long Term Perspective to be prepared by VASAB in 2009. The characteristic feature of the WG2 was a long discussion about the meaning of the notion of accessibility. As the result accessibility to energy was also considered to be an important element of the analysis.

Activity 6: Analysis(WG2)

6.1. The discussion on the scope and method of analysis (indicators, pilot studies) had been continued from October till beginning of December 2007. The manuals and guidelines were discussed many times. The main method was e-mail exchanges. As the result the manuals and blue prints were produced by partners 1 and 8 to facilitate collecting data and information:

- A blue print on screening transport policy,
- A manual for collecting data and information on accessibility.

Comments: The majority of time of the initial period was allocated to discussing the notion of accessibility. This was done in order to avoid problems when data and information collection would be started. Due to the rise of energy prices also this issue was considered as important factor for the NW Russia integration to the BSR. The second issue heavily discussed was scarcity of comparable data in Russia. Partner no 8 having a very well developed data base on transport data for the BSR was in a difficult position checking (in dialogue with partner 4) existence of similar data in Russia. This required more resources and more work load than estimated at the

beginning. But finally this allowed presenting Russia at the broader BSR picture. The phase 6.1. ended with second meeting of the WG2 (December 2007 in Riga).

6.2. Data collection and interpretation started only in December 2007 after the second WG 2 meeting. Basic data were collected by mid February 2008 but some work continued (fine tuning of reports) till May/June 2008. A draft discussion paper was ready for the Riga Stakeholder Conference in April 2008. However, it was a working document amended after each important EWW meeting, till the final/closing Conference. In this work (phase 6.1 and 6.2) seventeen people (including three external experts) were involved. Their involvement differed. The main bulk of analytical work was done by partners no. 4 and 8 and the external experts whereas the other participants acted mainly as a reference group reading reports, making comments and asking for improvements. This was done first of all by partners no. 1, 6, 7 and 10 representing mainly policy making side in the project and project coordination. Also VASAB Secretariat was invited by partner 1 (Responsible Partner) to participate in this process.

The following outputs were achieved:

(i) interim:

- Mapping of transport infrastructure policies at the federal and regional level, policies in development of the soft accessibility (to knowledge and information) and policies on clusters in NW Russia (however clusters were analysed by the WG1 in fact), also policies and situation in the field of accessibility to energy was examined;
- Identification of bottlenecks and constraints for transport (and through transport for business development) in NW Russia;
- Assessment of the policy correlation with the strategic documents at the BSR level (mainly by analysing outcomes of Strategic INTERREG III B projects pursued by VASAB, BDF, BSSSC and CPMR);
- Examining the results of other INTERREG III B projects relevant for the WG2 work;
- Feasibility assessment of connecting TEN-T with the pan-European corridors.

The planned verification of the accessibility perspective and of present (current) and forecast trade flows in NW Russia and Belarus (vis-a-vis BSR reports) was less successful. The main reason were missing data concerning predicted trade flows in NW Russia and Belarus³⁶. The accessibility perspective instead was analysed using BSR outlook to show how NW-Russia is connected with the rest of the BSR.

(ii) A compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") presenting situation, development trends and political objectives in the fields of transport and accessibility in NW RU and Belarus and their consequences for BSR cohesion and business development

Comments:

The most important planned outputs were achieved (although one output was slightly modified). In addition to that, accessibility to energy was touched as important future factor of the BSR integration that should determine in great extent the NW Russia integration into the BSR. The analysis lasted longer than expected. The main constraint was lack of regional reliable data in NW Russia. The main reason of the delay was in insufficient data availability but also to some extent larger than expected amount of available background information (e.g. results of the BSR projects) that should be digested and analysed.

Activity 7: Pilot studies (WG2)

Since the analytical phase (activity 6) was delayed also pilot projects were postponed. The aim of the activity 7 was to analyse more in depth the most promising solutions developed during the analytical

³⁶ The work on trade flows was done in co-operation with WG1 and the BSR perspective was used.

phase and prioritised during stakeholder dialogue. Therefore only in May 2008 the more concrete work on pilot studies (pre-feasibility studies) could start. The WG2 selected two (in line with the output indicators listed in the application) topics for pre-feasibility studies. The topics were following:

- q) BSR passenger railway connectivity with focus on the Eastern part of the BSR,
- r) examination of implementation of the transport part of Tallinn vision of VASAB with focus on the eastern part of the BSR.

For the pilot studies a tender procedure was used and contracts were signed in late June 2008. The results were delivered in late August 2008 and discussed by the WG2 group meeting in September. The following reports were produced:

- *Study on international rail passenger traffic development: Possibilities in the context of development of cities in the Baltic Sea Region* (Contract: 5-13/66, of 18.6.2008) elaborated by SIA “AC Konsultācijas”,
- *Evaluation of implementation of the VASAB 2010 vision in the area of mobility network and energy supply* (Contract: 5-13/74, of 23.7.2008) elaborated by SIA “AC Konsultācijas”.

The results of the studies were presented to the closing/final conference of the EWW and will serve as an input for the Long Term Spatial Development Perspective. They were also presented in advance to the WG2 members working on recommendation in order to shape the WG2 recommendations.

Comments:

An additional barrier delaying activity no.7 was obligation of tendering the contractors due to internal law of Latvia where partner no.1 (responsible for the WG2 work) is located. The WG2 decisions were taken in May 2008, but the contracts were signed only 1,5- 2 months latter coinciding once more with a holiday season. The first preliminary results of the activity no.7 were delivered in August and the final results in October/November 2008.

Activity 8: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR

The same as activity no. 3

Activity 9: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG2)

- 9.1. Steering Group Meeting (1 day) took place on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg according to schedule (for details see action 4.1).
- 9.2. WG2 second meeting (1 day) took place on 5 December 2007 in Riga (instead of late November). The meeting was attended by seven project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 7, 8, 10 and four invited guests. The meeting concentrated on discussing analytical phase of the project. The manuals and blue prints for collecting data and information were agreed. For starting work on recommendation it was discussed that the idea of Steering Group (of its first meeting in October 2007) of workshop for all WGs should be implemented and the Responsible Partner was asked to organize such a workshop (synergy meeting) in January 2008.
- 9.3. Synergy meeting no.1 (1 day) took place in Riga on 31st of January 2008 (see action 4.3. for details).
- 9.4. Steering Group Meeting 2 on 1st of February 2008 in Riga (see action 4.4. for details).
- 9.5. Synergy meeting no. 2 (1 day) took place in Liepaja on 14th of March 2008. (see action 4.5. for details).
- 9.6. Steering Group Meeting 3 (one day) took place on 20 May 2008 in Riga. (for details see action 4.8).
- 9.7. WG2 third meeting (one day) took place on 21 May 2008 in Riga according to schedule. It was attended by five project partner members representing partners no. 1, 7, 8, 10, one external expert and three invited guests. The WG2 before the third meeting concentrated

mainly on analytical work. At this meeting analyses were summed up and the work on recommendations started. It was decided that recommendations (with elements of the action programme) would be prepared for Russia and for the whole BSR with focus on better integration of NW Russia. One additional meeting was requested (autumn 2008) in order to discuss the final draft of the recommendations. The meeting also discussed the pilot actions (pre-feasibility studies) agreeing on concrete items. The outputs achieved:

- a first draft recommendations paper (in outline format),
- TOR for two most important pilot studies.

9.8. WG2 fourth meeting (one day) took place on 4th September 2008 in Jurmala. It was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, three external experts and six invited guests. They discussed the final draft of the recommendations (with elements of the action programme) prepared by Immanuel Kant State University of Russia (Kaliningrad) and Nordregio staff. The WG2 discussed and improved the following documents:

- Recommendations on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR including concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR.
- Study on international rail passenger traffic development: Possibilities in the context of development of cities in the Baltic Sea Region,
- Evaluation of implementation of the VASAB 2010 vision in the area of mobility network and energy supply,
- Overview of results of INTERREG III B projects in the field of accessibility .

9.9. Steering Group Meeting 4 (one day) took place on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg (please see action 4.10)

Activity 10: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 3 on ICZM and transnational sea use planning

10.1. WG3 preparatory meeting took place on 24 July 2007 in Kaliningrad. It was attended by nine project partner members representing partners no. 4, 10, and five invited guests. The meeting was used for preparation of the WG3 first meeting, and the pilot action in particular for presentation and discussion with the Kaliningrad partners the results of the INTERREG project BaltCoast of which recommendations should form main backbone of the work of the WG3. The preparatory meeting was organised during the holiday season due to indicated by the Kaliningrad partner necessity of postponing the WG3 first meeting till October because of the celebrations of 750th anniversary of establishment of the university (lack of experts) in early autumn 2007. So the preparatory meeting was a vehicle to start the work of the WG3 even in slightly less formal way. The main subject of discussion was the BaltCoast recommendations, TORs for experts and other guidelines necessary for elaboration of the WG3 analysis. The outputs were following:

- Decision on TORs and blue prints,
- Clarifying division of labour,
- Project flyer was discussed (and then edited) - see activity 1.1.

10.2 WG 3 first meeting (1,5 day) took place on 30-31 October 2007 in Kaliningrad i.e. with four month delay. The reason was the celebrations of 750th anniversary of establishment of the Albertina University (today Immanuel Kant State University of Russia) in Kaliningrad. The meeting was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 4, 9, 10 and to some extent also partner no.1, one external expert and fifteen invited guests mainly from Russia but also from Latvia, Germany and Finland. The main aim was to discuss the analysis and the further WG3 work in detail, to achieve clarity about division of labour between the partners, to make sure that duplication with other project was avoided (instead to aim at using results achieved by other projects) and to start the process of contracting the external experts. Instead of preparing TORs for separate experts the WG3 at pre meeting decided to make only

two TORs (one for external expert and one for the whole pilot project). For conducting analysis it was agreed that blue prints should be used. Such blue prints were prepared by partner no. 10 in advance presented at the meeting, and then improved/discussed by e-mails and approved in December 2007. The following outputs were produced or achieved:

- Report (in form of power point presentations) – presenting an overview of existing and available documentation on the chosen themes in NW Russia and at the BSR level;
- Two blue prints (for further analysis and discussions);
- Two TORs (one for external expert and one for the whole pilot project);
- One external expert was contracted by the partner no 1 covering by his expertise BSR and HELCOM perspective;
- EWW link at the VASAB website was created (see activity 1.1).

Also Kaliningrad stakeholders who attended the second part of the meeting were informed about the EWW project together with showing them the relevant BSR experience in ICZM and maritime spatial planning. They formed important part of the reference network for dialogue on project findings and recommendations. The meeting was also a starting point for executing analysis.

Activity 11 Analysis (WG 3)

11.1 The discussion on the scope and method of analysis had been continued from October till beginning of December 2007. The discussion resulted in shifting focus more from ICZM to maritime spatial planning as the most important transnational issue related to sea use in the nearest future. The blue prints (to be followed by Russian colleagues) presented by partner 10 were discussed many times. The main method was e-mail exchanges. As the result the two blue prints were agreed:

- A blue print on spatial planning legislation on the sea covering Poland,
- A blue print on potentials and conflicts on the sea covering Poland.

11.2. Gathering and compiling the WG3 information started in December 2007 after blue prints approval. Fourteen people representing partners no. 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10 were involved in the information collecting. Their involvement differed. The main bulk of analytical work was done by partners no.10 and 4 and by external expert whereas the other participants acted mainly as a reference group reading reports, making comments and asking for improvements. This was done first of all by partners no. 5,6 and 7 representing mainly policy making side in the project. The analysis in principle were ended in March. The situation of the WG3 was different than the WG1 and the WG2. The WG3 did not collect statistical information but rather qualitative information and the broad BSR background was discussed, sorted out and clarified at the first meeting by examining BaltCoast results. Therefore, the analytical work could be done in parallel with an initial phase of recommendation preparation. But also in the WG3 the completing analytical reports took more time than expected. Although first draft reports were ready in March their fine tuning continued in April and even in May and June. This was slightly learning by doing in particular for Russian experts who had little contact with maritime spatial planning in the past. The outputs were following:

- The legal systems were screened and regulations, responsibilities for offshore planning at all levels in NW Russia were identified;
- System of mapping to improve access to relevant information from NW Russia and its uploading to the pilot system made in the INTERREG III B BaltCoast project were tested (the results can be seen in the WG3 reports done by Russian colleagues);
- Actual (current) sea use in NW RU (Kaliningrad) according to the BaltCoast standards (potentials and conflicts) were described in a separate paper and conflicts and potentials were detected;

- A compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") with assessment of compatibility of the Russian regulatory framework to the legislation and practice in a pan-Baltic perspective in the field of ICZM and sea use planning was elaborated.

Comments:

The all planned outputs were achieved.

Activity 12 Pilot Action (WG 3)

Pilot action was started in October 2007 and continues till the end of August 2008. The twelve project partners staff members representing partners no. 1,4,6,7,9,10 and one external expert were involved. Partners no. 1,6,7 have acted mainly as a reference group while the main role was played by partners no. 4,9,10. The pilot action aimed at preparing a system of joint ICZM and maritime spatial planning in Gdańsk Bay between Poland and Russia. This task was discussed at the kick off meeting with various Russian stakeholders. The prevailing opinion was that due to the dispersed responsibilities in Russia in ICZM and sea space management (versus concrete central Agency in Poland responsible for sea space and regional governments responsible for ICZM activities) such goal could not be achieved in the project time span. Nowadays there is no single institution in Russia responsible for sea space management (like Maritime Offices in Germany or Poland). The WG3 came to the opinion that agreements between Polish and Russian relevant state institutions on co-operation in sea use planning and management might be too ambitious and premature as the WG3 output. Instead pilot actions were focused on the preconditions for establishment of such agreements in future, by exchange of good practices, deepening mutual understanding and preparing necessary tools and necessary institutional structures i.e. centres of excellence in both countries dealing with maritime spatial planning. It was decided that the starting point should be an agreement between Russian and Polish institutions from NGO or research domain to co-operate on promotion of integrative approach to sea space and coast in both countries. In this context a sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application was discussed. It was considered as an important tool for showing to Russian decision-makers a usefulness of maritime spatial planning. The WG3 decided to limit it to the Baltic Sea around Kaliningrad Oblast. The register was prepared by partner no. 4 and 10 in a form of GIS atlas. The following outputs were produced in the reporting period:

- The exchange of bi-lateral experience was started e.g. Polish pilot sea use plan (covering Puck Bay) elaborated in 2008 under PlanCoast INTERREG III B project was shown to the RU experts;
- The experience with the BaltCoast project of INTERREG III B was shared;
- Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application was first discussed then agreed and then produced and presented to the final/closing conference of the EWW in St. Petersburg on 21st October 2008;
- Agreement between Maritime Institute in Gdańsk and Russian partners on permanent co-operation in the future (including joint projects and policy related work) aiming at establishment of a system of joint ICZM and maritime spatial planning in Gdańsk Bay between Poland and Russia was prepared in autumn 2008. The partners of the agreement will act as an centres of excellence in their countries with regard to maritime spatial planning and ICZM.

Comments:

The pilot action had to be modified. But the actions started within EWW project will be continued after the project closure thanks to established under the EEW contacts. The aim of establishment of the system of joint ICZM and maritime spatial planning in Gdańsk Bay between Poland and Russia is still valid and will be realised in the future. What was done under EWW project was to start this process by exchange of experience, awareness rising, gathering

stakeholders and discussing with them the problem and by preparation of some necessary tools which will convince Russian decision-makers that an integrative coastal and sea space management would be important. Despite difficulties the main outputs promised in the EWW application were produced: i.e. (i) a sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application and (ii) agreements between Polish and Russian relevant institutions on co-operation in sea use planning and management.

Activity 13: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR

The same as activity no. 3

Activity 14: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG3)

- 14.1. Steering Group Meeting (1 day) took place on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg according to schedule (for details see action 4.1).
- 14.2. Synergy meeting no.1 (1 day) took place in Riga on 31st of January 2008 (see action 4.3. for details). This meeting was used by the WG3 also for development of a first outline of recommendation paper which was discussed afterwards by e-mail exchange.
- 14.3. Steering Group Meeting 2 on 1st of February 2008 in Riga (see action 4.4. for details).
- 14.4. Synergy meeting no 2 (1 day) took place in Liepaja on 14th of March 2008 (see action 4.5. for details).
- 14.5. WG3 second meeting (1,5 day) took place on 27-28 March 2008 in Kaliningrad (instead of late November 2007). It was attended by sixteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 7, 9, 10., one external expert and two invited guests. The meeting assessed the progress of the analytical work, discussed the interim reports of Russia and tried to relate the WG3 work towards the EU Integrated Maritime Policy (Blue Book). The final draft of recommendation paper was discussed and agreed. The acknowledgement of the project results at the political level was also examined. The WG3 group joined the WG1 and the WG2 wish to present its results at policy level by introducing them to the “Long Term Perspective” of VASAB. However, partner 9 was also asked to transfer the results to the EU BSR Strategy and to the EU work on integrated maritime policy. During the WG3 meeting a workshop with Russian stakeholders on off-shore planning and ICZM was organised in Kaliningrad on 27th of March 2008 as a joint venture of all projects dealing with this subject i.e. EWW, POWER and SDI-4-SEB as a part of the conference (“Integrated management, sustainable development indicators, spatial planning and monitoring of the South-Eastern Baltic coastal regions”), which took place in Kaliningrad on 26th - 30th of March 2007. Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic were elaborated by EWW project participants beforehand and proposed to stakeholders attending this conference. The recommendations were unanimously adopted by the participants including regional and local authorities from Russia. This seemed to be an important step towards introducing integrative approach towards the sea space and coastal zone in Russia.

The output achieved was following:

- Recommendation paper discussed and adopted by the Russian stakeholder (Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic).
- 14.6. Steering Group Meeting 3 (1day) took place on 20 May 2008 in Riga (for details see action 4.8).
 - 14.7. WG3 third meeting (1 day) took place on 4-5 June 2008 in Gdańsk almost according to schedule (few days later than planned originally). It was attended by fifteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 9, 10, one external expert and five invited guests. At the meeting analytical phase was summed up. The meeting was also used for examining the

experience and good practices of the Balance project in maritime spatial planning. The experts from Denmark introduce the project to the WG3 members. However, the WG3 main discussion concentrated on the 'action plan' following the recommendations adopted in March 2008. The opinions were dispersed. Some participants considered elaboration of an action plan as premature having in mind lack of legal provisions in Russia regulating sea use in an integrative way and dispersion of responsibility for sea management among many institutions. Some others proposed to focus action plan on methodological issues i.e. issues indispensable to introduce sea use planning in Russia and methodology of such planning suited for Russian conditions. After the e-mail exchange in June 2008 the partner no 9 responsible for the WG3 work decided to take the risk to prepare a draft action plan and to discuss it in September 2008 with the WG 3 members. Therefore an additional meeting was requested to be held in September 2008, to conclude the recommendation phase. The following outputs were achieved:

- The experience with Balance project of INTERREG III B was shared.

After the WG3 third meeting the partner no 9 and 10 organised (late June beginning of July 2008) consultation about the follow up of the WG3 in a form of a joint project. In the consultation the information on different ETC Programmes in the BSR were analysed and compared. The results were presented to the WG3 fourth meeting.

- 14.8. WG3 fourth meeting (one day) took place on 2nd September 2008 in Gdańsk. It was attended by thirteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 7, 9, 10 and one external expert. The meeting discussed the final draft of the action programme prepared by the staff of partners no 4 and 10 (Maritime Institute from Gdańsk and Immanuel Kant State University of Russia from Kaliningrad). Also final draft of the sea use register was presented by the partner no.4. The WG3 discussions tackled also the future use of the WG3 results. The presentations to the final/closing conference of EWW were agreed. It was also decided that the WG3 analysis should serve for broader popularization of the issue of maritime spatial planning in the Baltic Sea Region. The partner no 9. agreed to edit (by the end of 2008) from its own resources a *Compendium on Maritime Spatial Planning systems in the Baltic Sea Region countries* composed of two parts: part 1 *Survey of the national instruments and tools for the management of the sea space in the BSR countries* describing legal and institutional aspects of maritime spatial planning systems in the BSR countries and part 2 entitled *Examples of national cases of sea spatial conflicts and potentials*. Partner no.9 promised to invite to this book all other BSR countries while using the WG3 results as the core input. The WG3 also analysed different possibilities of continuation of the WG3 work. After the lively discussion it was decided to use two vehicles for further co-operation: The project BaltSeaPlan already submitted to the BSR Programme (although slightly too abstractive) and the new project to be submitted to the ENPI Programme Lithuania–Poland–Russian Federation on concrete planning work as continuation of the WG3 pilot activities. It was decided that transnational maritime planning should concentrate on Vistula/Kaliningrad lagoon and on Kursiu lagoon.

The WG3 discussed and improved the following documents during its fourth meeting:

- Action plan how to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational sea use planning and ICZM;
- Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application.

- 14.9. Steering Group Meeting 4 (one day) took place on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg (please see action 4.10)

34.2. Assessment of the results of the Action

The central objective of the Action was to promote territorial integration of NW Russia (i.e. the entire Northwest Federal District, including Kaliningrad) into the Baltic Sea region (BSR) in the identified three fields of (1) business development, (2) transport / ICT development and (3) sea use planning and Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM). The starting point was relatively impressive but

slightly idle (from the BSR perspective) developmental potential (in terms of human capital, scientific achievements etc.) of the North West Russia. The task was to develop solutions how to use the potential of the NW Russia for the benefit of the BSR economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development.

The action was successful to that extend that it managed to identify economic and spatial development needs in the NW Russia from the perspective of public authorities and businesses, requiring to be tackled by at the transnational level. This findings were benchmarked against existing good practice solutions based on experience of other BSR countries. The search was also done in order to detect economic and spatial trends, relevant for connecting territorial potentials between the NW Russia and the BSR. However, the picture coming from analysis appeared less promising than expected (see point 2.9). But even in those rather difficult circumstances the recommendations for three mentioned above fields were formulated and action plans were outlined. The main results delivered to the external audience having policy relevance are presented below:

The results achieved	The results intended	Explanation of differences
Recommendations how to improve innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration	Recommendation" paper with suggestions on policy improvements and legislative changes to improve settlement and innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration	The results achieved put less attention to legislative changes than to policy improvements. This is outcome of the survey done in order to learn from Russian businessman what are the main obstacles for them to innovate.
Recommendations how to improve settlement policies in NW Russia (urban rural partnership) from the perspective of BSR integration,		The focus of the result achieved is on urban-rural partnership as key for integrative development of settlement structure in Russia.
Action plan how to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration,	A paper with fields for further concrete actions ("action plan") to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration	Done in line with plans
Recommendations on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR including concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR,	1.Recommendation" paper with suggestions on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR 2. A paper with fields for further concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia and in BY in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR	The recommendations and action plan were merged. The reason is that Russia has very concrete plans and actions in this field for the future years so the WG2 decided to focus on long-term recommendations.
Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic	Recommendation" paper on upgrading the instruments and tools and institutional arrangements for transnational sea use planning and ICZM at the BSR level based on the completed pilot action	More ambitious recommendations were produced than expected i.e. more in line with the real situation in Russia with regard to ICZM and maritime spatial planning
Action plan how to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational sea use planning and	A paper with fields for further concrete actions ("action plan") to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational	Done in line with plans

ICZM	sea use planning and ICZM	
Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application	A sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application - based on the completed system mapping.	Done in line with plans
Agreement between maritime Institute in Gdańsk and Immanuel Kant State University of Russia on further co-operation in the field of maritime spatial planning	Agreements between Polish and Russian relevant institutions on co-operation in sea use planning and management	Done in line with plans

The most important EWW achievement is delivery of main messages resulting from the Action to the important Russian decision makers, planning professionals and scientific sector as well as to the key pan-Baltic organizations such as HELCOM or VASAB. Through VASAB also the EU BSR strategy was influenced.

34.3. The outcome on both final beneficiaries and/or target group and the situation of the target group/target region which the action addressed

The target audience/recipients of the project findings have been decision-makers (ministries responsible for spatial planning and development in the BSR, including the federal government in Russia, regional authorities in NW Russia, pan-Baltic organisations such as VASAB 2010). Thanks to the action they have received a better picture on the situation with regard to the North-West Russia integration into the Baltic Sea region (BSR). This knowledge has been already used for policy making by VASAB in production of the Long Term Spatial Development Perspective and it seems that it will be also useful for the EU Commission in elaboration of the EU BSR strategy and for HELCOM for implementation of the Baltic Sea Action Plan. In fact the Action played a tremendous role in validation of the planning methodologies and strategic documents at the pan-Baltic level based on the NW Russia perspective. The Action gave a proper insight on main drivers and obstacles of integration of the North West Russia into the BSR. The Action findings and recommendations were also delivered to the Russian decision makers and VASAB will continue its efforts to convince them that the BSR integration is beneficial for the North-West Russia. At least in the field of maritime spatial planning as the result of the Action one can see increased capacity and competence basis to take up joint transnational initiatives between the NW Russia partners and institutions from other BSR countries.

The final beneficiaries local and regional governments in the Baltic Sea region (BSR) operators in the chosen thematic fields (e.g. businesses in WP1 and transport operators in WP2) in NW Russia and in the BSR will be influenced mainly through the actions of pan-Baltic organisations mainly VASAB and its Long Term Spatial Development Perspective. This will allow for incorporation of the BSR perspective in the national/regional/local policies in the NW Russia.

34.4. Publications

The following publications were produced:

Name	Number of copies	Distribution channels
The East-West Window brochure informing about the project	300	Distributed during the project events in particular kick-off conference, stakeholder seminar, the Conference "Baltic Sea Region Programme 2007-2013: new partnership opportunities for Russian and Belarusian regions" and many other events
Атлас использования прибрежных акваторий российской части Юго-восточной Балтики (Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application – <i>edited on CD rom</i>)	200	Distributed for free during the EWW final (closing) conference, available for free from partner no.4

The book in Russian: Северо-Запад России в Регионе Балтийского моря: Проблемы и перспективы экономического взаимодействия и сотрудничества (North West Russia in the Baltic Sea region. Problems and perspectives of co-operation and mutual influence) presenting main results of the project	100	Distributed for free by partners no.4 among the project partners and participants of the EWW events. Sent to Russian relevant Ministries and main libraries.
--	-----	--

34.5. Contracts (works, supplies, services) above 5000€ awarded for the implementation of the action since the last interim report

Only one contract above 5000€ was awarded since the last interim report.

	Contract	Amount	Procedure	Winner
1	Audit Services Contract	5 131,94	“negotiated procedure without publication”	<i>SIA Rodl and Partner</i>

34.6. Continuation of the Action after ending the support from the European Community

The action will be continued after ending the EU support for the East West Window project. Durability of the project results has been ensured by the direct participation or the support of the national ministries responsible for spatial planning and development around the BSR, acting under VASAB 2010. Through their co-operation with other relevant stakeholders, the project rendered available concrete recommendations for policy-making in the chosen thematic fields in the NW Russia and at the BSR level. Through intensive dialogue with the target audience, the project influenced planners in Russia neighbouring countries by including the perspective of NW Russia. It also served for modification of pan-Baltic strategic policy papers, long-term visions and development plans on the very same account.

In particular the EWW results were used by VASAB for elaboration of the Long Term Perspective for Spatial Development of the BSR. Thanks to the EWW this will be the document with proper outlook on North-West Russia. Due to the EWW the collaboration between VASAB (ministries) and other EWW partners (research institutes) will be strengthened. The EWW results will be also used for discussing with HELCOM an idea of maritime spatial planning in the Baltic Sea Region.

Follow-up activities in effect of the project will be initiated and promoted by VASAB 2010. This includes starting up of possible new project(s) covering the whole BSR and taking into consideration the needs and perspectives of NW Russia, identified and referred to in the present project. The WG3 work will be continued in a form of the BaltSeaPlan project already approved by the BSR Programme (will start around December 2008). The WG3 partners will also plan to submit the project on elaboration of concrete maritime spatial plans for Vistula and Kursiu Lagoons in the framework of the ENPI Programme Lithuania–Poland–Russian Federation. Despite finishing the work of the WG3 the partner no.9 responsible for its leading has already declared to continue the efforts in a broader BSR set up and started elaboration of the BSR wide “Compendium on Maritime Spatial Planning systems in the Baltic Sea Region countries” using the WG3 results and experience.

34.7. Gender equality, disabilities

Where relevant, the perspective of equal opportunities was taken into account for the thematic work (especially in the fields of business and transport). Due efforts were made to secure involvement of both men and women in the composition of the project management structures, daily work and in the dialogue fora with relevant stakeholders in NW Russia and at the overall BSR level. Spatial planning forming a substance of the project from its definition cares for gender equality, prevention or exclusions of handicapped from the normal life. Although, gender equality and disabilities were not the main focus of the EWW project one can assume that the realisation of the project objectives (integration of the NW Russia into the BSR) will be beneficial in a long run also for attracting attention of Russian decision makers and Russian society to those above mentioned horizontal goals. They are placed very high at civil agenda in particular in the Nordic countries and integration means also convergence in values and way of living so it means better acceptance of these horizontal goals in Russia as well. The same has happened in Poland, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia after their accession to EU (strengthening their European integration).

34.8. Monitoring and evaluation of the activities

Monitoring of activities was done on routine basis by the project Steering Group. The group worked very effectively guiding the project and proposing the changes if necessary. The group (ministerial part) provided also an excellent piece of advice with regard to use of the EWW project results for policy making. However, one should also admit the important role of Committee on Spatial Development of the Baltic Sea Region which was among the main recipients of the project results. The advice from this body and the VASAB Secretariat which took part in majority of the EWW events (on their own money) helped a lot in proper shaping the EWW work and focusing on the policy relevant results (e.g. providing links to HELCOM, EU BSR Strategy etc.).

Also important were feedbacks received from beneficiaries during the kick-off and final (closing) conference. In the Annex 2 quotations from the Conference resolutions are attached (in Russian).

34.9. What has been learned from the Action

The main lesson from the action is that integration of the NW Russia into the Baltic Sea Region (BSR) will not be an easy process. Russia is a global player looking for global organizations and bodies as its partners. Even the regional level i.e. St. Petersburg has sufficient potential to play an important role at the global arena. This is clearly seen in the St. Petersburg government policy and strategic documents. BSR is not the main field of St. Petersburg strategic activity. Slightly different situation is with regard to Kaliningrad, but its potential is sufficient to strengthen rather cross-border than pan-Baltic integration of Russian Federation. The main integrative processes between Russia and the rest of the BSR are hardly due to market forces or conscious decisions of the Russian enterprises but rather thanks to EU financial support in form of transnational and cross-border programmes. The only field in which one can expect more or less natural co-operation between Russia and the other BSR countries is maritime spatial planning as long as it affects coastal defence, fish stock and state of the coastal nature. Russia is very active now in HELCOM where the questions of maritime spatial planning have been already raised.

Therefore strengthening integration of the North-West Russia into the BSR requires further development of the Russian medium size cities such as e.g. Kaliningrad or Pskov, their partnership with adjacent regions, and development of the maritime spatial planning institutions which in natural way will seek for the relations with their closest neighbours.

35. Partners and other Co-operation

35.1. How do you assess the relationship between the formal partners of this Action (i.e. those partners which have signed a partnership statement)? Please specify for each partner organisation

St. Petersburg Administration [2] – partner active for discussing policy relevant documents and organising meetings in St. Petersburg in the field of analysis acting through partner no.3 . Important contribution to the stakeholder dialogue. In fact this partner will be one of the main recipients of the project results.

Russian Economic Developers Association (ASSET) [3] – very demanding from formal point of view but also very experience partner in analytical work. A great bulk of the WG1 recommendations were proposed by this partner. The partner is a great interface between science and policy making in Russia in particular in St. Petersburg. Important role in dissemination activities thanks to good contacts with decision-makers in Russia at local and regional level.

Immanuel Kant State University of Russia [4] – very reliable and enthusiastic partner being a source of many data and information excellent in scientific work acquiring great experience during the EWW project how to translate analysis into policy findings, but in fact majority of recommendations of the WG2 and the WG3 were rooted in partner no. 4 thinking.

Ministry of the Environment, Danish Forest and Nature Agency, Denmark [5] – very active and experienced partner (being responsible in the past for the USUN project) leading the WG 1 work and ensuring proper presentation of EWW at the highest BSR political level.

Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Housing, Germany [6] – very active and experienced partner responsible for urban-rural investigations under the WG1, ensuring proper presentation of EWW at the highest BSR political level.

Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communication, Sweden [7] – partner ensuring link to the EU BSR strategy (use of EWW results also there), acting mainly through partner 8 but very active in the WG2 , active in the WG3 (with very high quality inputs) and contributing to policy relevant findings in the EWW.

Nordic Centre for Spatial Development (NORDREGIO) [8] – one of key drivers for analytical work, competent, flexible with a large knowledge and experience in spatial and regional development.

Ministry of Regional Development, Poland [9] – partner leading the WG3 but active in other work groups, very experienced and very flexible contributing to the work additional resources if project resources are not sufficient.

Maritime Institute, Poland [10] – key resource for maritime spatial planning and ICZM in the project supporting actively the WG3 and coordinating the whole project from content point of view in very reasonable way.

35.2. Is the partnership to continue

The partnership will continue in a form of BSR Programme and ENPI Programme projects on maritime spatial planning. The co-operation agreement between partners no 4 and 10 will serve to this end. The BaltSea Plan was approved by the BSR programme. The project will serve as a continuation and dissemination of the WG3 work and results since both partners no 4 and 10 are among its key drivers.

The EWW project results were also used within the VASAB framework. This means that new partners such as Nordregio, ASSET or Immanuel Kant State University of Russia have joined the VASAB work and their involvement will continue.

35.3. How would you assess the relationship between your organisation and State authorities in the Action countries? How has this relationship affected the Action?

Since majority of the partners are state high level institutions those relations were fine. The partners representing state authorities knew each other for many years before starting the project as the members of the VASAB co-operation (Co-operation of Ministers for spatial planning and development in the BSR countries). The new input was given by the scientific institutions. This was a great added value of the project, mutual learning how to translate analysis into policy relevant actions. The research oriented partners were quite flexible and willing to reshape analysis or repeat them if asked by policy making partners.

35.4. Where applicable, describe your relationship with any other organisations involved in implementing the Action:

- Associate(s) (if any) - no
- Sub-contractor(s) (if any). Some of the work was given to the external contractors. However an idea was that majority of work should be done by the partners themselves since the partners had sufficient qualification to execute the project and achieve its goals. Contractors were used mainly for technical issues and for bringing knowledge from INTERREG projects. Only some partners (9) and (5) used contractors more intensively (for some concrete work) due to shortages in their human resources. In principle the relation with contractors were positive with one exception (i.e. Rumanian contractor who won a tender for the EWW financial management disappeared after few month of serving the project)
- Final Beneficiaries and Target groups. Those relations were fine thanks to sue of well established and prominent conferences for presentation of the EWW. This gave the project access to the target group necessary for the project success.
- Other third parties involved. Important was a link of the project to the VASAB Secretariat and VASAB work on the Long Term Perspective. VASAB Secretariat promoted also project and its results externally on request of the Responsible Partner.

35.5. Where applicable, outline any links you have developed with other actions.

The project ambition was to develop link to other important projects in order to make use of their results (BaltCoast, PlanCoast, Balance, USUN, SeBCo – their experts were invited to the project meetings) or to make joint meetings to better reach target groups (SeBCo POWER and SDI-4-SEB). These projects represented different INTERREG strands.

35.6. If your organisation has received previous EC grants in view of strengthening the same target group, in how far has this Action been able to build upon/complement the previous one(s)? (List all previous relevant EC grants).

The Ministries involved in the project previously received a grant from INTERREG II C to prepare an Action Plan for implementation of the VASAB strategy adopted in 1994. The project was called VASAB Plus and ended in 2000. The EWW used the VASAB Plus experience but its focus was different. This time the target geographical area was the NW Russia and its integration to the BSR. The lesson learned under the VASAB Plus (where Russia had no financial resources for analysis) showed that preparation of a pan-Baltic documents with very differentiate resources might result in uneven involvement of the countries and then uneven ownership of the agreed actions or strategies. Therefore the EWW was invented to avoid such a mistake and to give Russian colleagues resources for considering their role in the BSR integration.

36. Visibility

How is the visibility of the EU contribution being ensured in the Action?

At the project start a press release was done by the Responsible Partner. Visibility was ensured by placing proper information that the EWW project was part-financed by the EU together with the EU logo and logo of INTERREG III B. This was done on printing materials, power point presentation and on the project web site. There was also some information in the Latvian radio. On demand of Russian colleagues the project was presented at the Conference “Baltic Sea Region Programme 2007-2013: new partnership opportunities for Russian and Belarusian regions” in St. Petersburg as one of the most successful INTERREG projects with Russian participation. To strengthen the project visibility a special project banner was produced and displayed on many occasions (e.g. Conference “Baltic Sea region Spatial Development Policies avenues to the Long Term Perspective” in Riga on 23 April 2007, and already mentioned conference “Baltic Sea Region Programme 2007-2013: new partnership opportunities for Russian and Belarusian regions” in St. Petersburg on 16-17 April 2008 and in many other events). The book with the project analysis and recommendations was printed in December 2008. But the most important is that the project results will be used for producing “Long Term Perspective” for the BSR which will be presented to CBSS and all important pan-Baltic organizations. Thanks to EWW NW Russia will be properly highlighted in this strategy.

The European Commission may wish to publicise the results of Actions. Do you have any objection to this report being published on Europe Aid Co-operation Office website? If so, please state your objections here.

Name of the contact person for the Action: **Vladislavs Vesperis**

Signature:Location: **Riga, Latvia**

Date report due:Date report sent:

Update of action plan

Activity	Months																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Activity 1: Kick off of the work of Working Group no 1 on business development and innovation affecting spatial development,	X	X	X	X														
Activity 2: Analysis(WG1)				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Activity 3: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR (WG1)					X						X						X	
Activity 4: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations and action plan (WG1)					X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Activity 5: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 2 on accessibility				X														
Activity 6: Analysis(WG2)					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Activity 7: Pilot studies (WG2)												X	X	X	X	X		
Activity 8: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR					X						X						X	X
Activity 9: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG2)					X	X		X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Activity 10: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 3 on ICZM and transnational sea use planning		X			X													
Activity 11 Analysis (WG 3)					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					
Activity 12 Pilot Action (WG 3)					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
Activity 13: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR					X						X						X	
Activity 14: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG3)					X			X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		

EWV events: participation of man and woman

Participants			
Event	Woman	Man	Total
Kick off meeting of the work of WG1, on 25 June 2007 in Riga	9	11	20
WG1 meeting 25 September 2007 in Riga	4	3	7
WG1 analysis (people involved)	11	23	34
Steering Group meeting on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg	7	11	18
St Petersburg kick off conference on 18-19 October 2007	112	146	259
St Petersburg Closing conference on 21 October 2008	231	400	631
WG1 second meeting on 6-7 December 2007 in Riga	9	10	19
Synergy meeting no.1 on 31 January 2008 in Riga	10	13	23
Steering Group Meeting no.2 on 1 February 2008 in Riga	4	11	15
Synergy meeting no 2 in Liepaja on 14 th of March 2008	8	8	16
WG1 fourth meeting on 3-4 April 2008 in Riga	6	7	13
Riga Stakeholders seminars (WG3 and WG1 + WG2) on 23 April 2008	83	84	167
WG1 fifth meeting on 24 April 2008 in Riga	13	12	25
Steering Group Meeting no. 3 on 20 May 2008 in Riga	4	6	10
Steering Group Meeting no. 4 on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg	3	10	13
WG1 sixth meeting on 3 rd September 2008 in Jurmala	11	11	22
WG2 first meeting on 10 October 2007 in Riga	3	6	9
WG2 analysis	6	11	17
WG2 second meeting on 5 December 2007 in Riga	4	7	11
WG2 third meeting on 21 May 2008 in Riga	2	7	9
WG2 fourth meeting on 4 th September 2008 in Jurmala	9	11	20
WG3 preparatory meeting on 24 July 2007 in Kaliningrad	4	10	14
WG 3 first meeting on 30-31 October 2007 in Kaliningrad	12	15	27
WG3 analysis	3	11	14
Pilot Action (WG 3)	3	10	13
WG3 second meeting on 27-28 March 2008 in Kaliningrad	6	13	19
WG3 third meeting on 4-5 June 2008 in Gdańsk	6	15	21
WG3 fourth meeting 2 September 2008 in Gdańsk	3	11	14

Quotations from the Conference resolutions (in Russian) in direct relations to the EAST West Window.

17. Kick Off Conference

Продвижение европейского опыта в рамках программ Европейского Инструмента Соседства и Партнерства усилит инновационный потенциал и влияние Северо-Западного региона России на процессы территориальной интеграции на внешних границах ЕС, в частности, в регионе Балтийского моря. В этих целях целесообразна активизация участия России в таких международных объединениях, как VASAB 2010, Балтийский форум развития (BDF), Программа транснационального сотрудничества региона Балтийского моря 2007-2013.

Зарубежный опыт свидетельствует о значительной роли малых и средних городов в продвижении инноваций и гармонизации территориального развития. Этот факт должен учитываться при разработке инновационных стратегий в России как на федеральном, так и на региональном уровнях. Необходимо уделять больше внимания развитию малых и средних городов, как это происходит в странах ЕС, и адаптировать европейский опыт применительно к ситуации в России (в частности, концепцию сельско-городского партнерства «ESDP Concept of Rural-Urban Partnership»). Доступ к знаниям и информации, возможность обмена идеями должны стать основой формирования территориальных моделей развития России.

/.../

Участники Форума согласились со следующим:

- необходимо особое единое государственное управление морскими прибрежными зонами страны (обеими их составляющими: морской и сухопутной) исходя из повсеместного успешного мирового опыта подобной деятельности и соответствующих рекомендаций организаций системы ООН и международных форумов на высшем уровне. Руководствуясь этим, рекомендовать: 1) создание нормативной правовой и институциональной базы для разработки и реализации комплексных программ развития и управления прибрежными зонами в рамках комплексных программ социально-экономического развития приморских субъектов Федерации и программ развития прибрежных муниципальных образований в целях активизации участия последних в освоении прибрежных и морских ресурсов; 2) адаптацию и освоение современных управленческих технологий (методология Комплексного управления прибрежными зонами (КУПЗ)) в применении к богатейшим по ресурсам и разнообразным по природным и социально-экономическим условиям прибрежным зонам страны; 3) разработку и реализацию пилотных программ КУПЗ конкретных побережий страны; 4) использование опыта сотрудничества стран Балтийского региона, в частности рекомендаций Проекта BaltCoast BSR INTERREG III B по управлению прибрежными зонами и разработке совместных стратегических проектов;
- рекомендовать использование кластерного подхода в качестве инструмента реализации стратегий развития территорий и повышения конкурентоспособности региональной и муниципальной экономики, включая выявление и диагностику потенциальных кластеров, разработку программ их развития, создание организаций по сотрудничеству. В органах власти необходимо формирование межотраслевых рабочих групп для координации развития кластеров и снятия ведомственных и отраслевых ограничений. Целесообразно более широкое использование международных программ и инструментов повышения конкурентоспособности кластеров;
- необходимо развитие региональной и муниципальной статистики, в частности для целей выработки эффективной кластерной политики и оценки результатов реализации кластерных инициатив в регионе и/или муниципалитете, формирования действенных

инструментов планирования и управления, ориентированного на результат на субфедеральных уровнях;

- при реализации федеральных, региональных и местных программ экономического развития необходимо стимулировать участие организаций инновационной инфраструктуры в российских и зарубежных сетевых организациях, которые оказывают содействие в предоставлении услуг компаниям и научным организациям в сфере инновационной бизнес-кооперации и трансфера технологий (примерами могут служить Российская сеть трансфера технологий RTTN, Европейская сеть бизнес-инновационных центров EBN). Участие в сетевом сотрудничестве должно быть нацелено на повышение качества и содержания услуг для местных компаний и НИИ. Федеральным и региональным органам власти необходимо поддерживать инициативы по развитию сетевого взаимодействия между организациями инновационной региональной инфраструктуры (создание региональных сетей) с целью уменьшения дублирования функций, повышения качества услуг и снижения расходов бюджета на их субсидирование;
- рекомендовать и стимулировать участие российских центров коммерциализации, инновационных центров в реализации Competitiveness Innovation Program (CIP) Европейского союза в части проектов, ориентированных на развитие инновационных сетей и сетей трансфера технологий (IRC, IRE, EBN и др.);
- считать целесообразным использование в России европейского опыта реализации региональных инновационных стратегий, обеспечивающих выявление спроса на инновации среди компаний и ориентацию научного сектора и инновационной инфраструктуры на удовлетворение этого спроса. (...);
- в целях совершенствования государственного и муниципального управления по обеспечению перехода Российской Федерации на инновационный путь развития рекомендовать Комиссии при Президенте Российской Федерации по вопросам совершенствования государственного управления и правосудия, Министерству регионального развития Российской Федерации, другим заинтересованным федеральным и региональным органам власти осуществить экспертизу полномочий органов государственной власти субъектов Российской Федерации и органов местного самоуправления в части выявления проблемных вопросов, препятствующих обеспечению перехода России на режим инновационного развития, и законодательно обеспечить активизацию участия в реализации государственной научно-технической политики органов государственной власти субъектов Федерации и органов местного самоуправления, рассмотреть возможность разработки национальной программы, ориентированной на содействие российским регионам в подготовке и реализации региональных инновационных стратегий и формирование российской сети инновационных регионов;
- рекомендовать заинтересованным федеральным и региональным органам государственной власти реализовать систему мер по поддержке технопарков и процессов коммерциализации научных разработок. В частности: разработать законодательную базу для развития технопарков на федеральном уровне; предоставить налоговые льготы компаниям-резидентам технопарков, например, аналогичные льготам для резидентов ОЭЗ; упростить процедуру предоставления земельных участков для технопарков; законодательно разрешить НИИ, вузам и университетам создавать малые предприятия - start-up'ы;
- рекомендовать органам регионального и муниципального управления активно использовать инструменты международной технической и финансовой помощи, предоставляемой по линии Института Всемирного Банка, АМР США, Европейского Инструмента Соседства и Партнерства (ENPI) и других программ Европейского Союза для реализации стратегических приоритетов и планов территориального развития, поддержки инноваций;
- отметить необходимость выработки механизма интеграции документов стратегического планирования муниципального, регионального и федерального уровней;
- одобрить инициативы Комитета по пространственному развитию региона Балтийского моря (CSD/BSR) VASAB 2010 по территориальной интеграции Северо-Запада России и реализации совместных проектов в таких приоритетных сферах как развитие бизнеса, транспорта, ИКТ, управление прибрежными зонами. Отметить актуальность проекта «Окно

Восток-Запад", который позволит восполнить пробелы в оценке инновационного потенциала Северо-Запада России и расширит возможности синергии инновационных потенциалов стран Балтийского региона.

- предложить Комитету VASAB 2010 использовать Форум лидеров стратегического планирования городов и регионов России в качестве референтной группы для обсуждения Стратегии пространственного развития региона Балтийского моря.

18. Closing Conference

18.1. «Перспективы развития Северо-Западного федерального округа: вызовы, приоритеты, угрозы и ограничения»

Участники рекомендуют:

- 25) в целях максимального учёта сложившихся межсубъектовых экономических связей, обеспечения увязки общегосударственных и региональных планов и прогнозов социально-экономического развития, целесообразно предусмотреть **разработку стратегических документов долгосрочного социально-экономического развития на уровне федеральных округов**. Для преодоления ведомственной и региональной разобщённости целесообразно поручить эту работу Ассоциациям экономического взаимодействия соответствующих федеральных округов. Это позволит точнее формулировать цели регионального развития в увязке с имеющимися общими ресурсами, объективно сформировать перечень основных межрегиональных проектов, обеспечивающих достижение общих целей развития. Подобные документы могут стать основой для последующей разработки Концепции долгосрочного социально-экономического развития Российской Федерации;
- 26) для ускорения социально-экономического развития территорий требуется **активизация межрегионального взаимодействия**. Зачастую депрессивные регионы (субъекты Федерации) экономически тесно связаны с успешными регионами (транспортные подходы к инфраструктурным объектам, наличие сырьевой базы для обрабатывающих производств и т.п.). В этом случае целесообразно оказывать федеральную помощь (налоговые и иные льготы, государственные гарантии под привлекаемые кредиты, первоочередное финансирование проектов в рамках действующих ФЦП и др.) для инфраструктурного развития депрессивных территорий по поддерживаемым видам и направлениям экономической деятельности, а также для реализации проектов способствующих комплексному развитию двух и более субъектов Федерации;
- 27) необходимым условием развития и Северо-Западного федерального округа и страны в целом является **совершенствование работы транспортного комплекса**. Требуется системный подход к формированию единой стратегии развития транспортно-логистического комплекса страны в увязке с развитием отраслей экономики и внешнеэкономической ситуацией.

18.2. «Специфика стратегий приморских регионов»

Участники считают, что

- 25) Необходимо совершенствование стратегического планирования применительно к морской деятельности и приморским регионам и муниципалитетам, предусматривающее:

на федеральном уровне:

- применение интегральных подходов к планированию и управлению в морском природопользовании. Это позволит преодолеть фрагментарность, присущую отраслевому подходу, учесть взаимосвязанность видов морского природопользования, способствовать связям и межотраслевой гармонизации в морской деятельности исходя из анализа конфликтного использования ресурсов, обеспечить многоцелевую ориентацию и соответствие

деятельности природоохранным целям, участие всех заинтересованных сторон в разработке стратегий и программ развития;

- создание нормативной правовой и институциональной базы для разработки и реализации комплексных программ развития и управления прибрежными зонами, основанных на интегральных подходах, в рамках стратегий и программ социально-экономического развития приморских субъектов Федерации и программ развития прибрежных муниципальных образований. Это позволит реализовать особое единое государственное управление морскими прибрежными зонами страны (обеими их составляющими: морской и сухопутной) исходя из повсеместного успешного мирового опыта подобной деятельности и соответствующих рекомендаций организаций системы ООН и международных форумов на высшем уровне;

на региональном уровне:

- адаптацию и освоение современных управленческих технологий (методология Комплексного управления прибрежными зонами - КУПЗ) в применении к богатейшим по ресурсам и разнообразным по природным и социально-экономическим условиям прибрежным зонам страны;
- разработку и реализацию пилотных программ КУПЗ конкретных побережий страны.

Реализация этих мер позволит реализовать естественные природные конкурентные преимущества морских акваторий и прибрежных территорий в обеспечении дополнительного экономического роста, конкурентоспособности, инвестиционной привлекательности, занятости, повышения комфортности и качества жизни, охраны окружающей среды и уменьшения ущерба от природных и техногенных катастроф, а также безопасности страны

- 26) Необходимо совершенствование нормативной правовой базы, регулирующей градостроительную деятельность, в части учета специфики этой деятельности на морских акваториях, находящихся под суверенитетом и юрисдикцией Российской Федерации.
- 27) Необходимо развивать международное сотрудничество в стратегическом планировании морского природопользования, учитывая единство и экосистемный характер морских процессов, и широко использовать международный опыт в этой сфере.

FINAL NARRATIVE REPORT

37. Description

37.1. Name of beneficiary of grant contract: Ministry of Regional Development and Local Government, Latvia (Reģionālās attīstības un pašvaldību lietu ministrija).

37.2. Name and title of the Contact person: Mr Vladislavs Vesperis.

37.3. Name of partners in the Action: St. Petersburg Administration (Администрация Губернатора Санкт-Петербурга) [2], Russian Economic Developers Association (ASSET) (Ассоциация специалистов по экономическому развитию территорий) [3], Immanuel Kant State University of Russia (Российский государственный университет имени И. Канта) [4], Ministry of the Environment, Danish Forest and Nature Agency³⁷, Denmark (Miljøministeriet, Skov- og Naturstyrelsen) [5], Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Housing, Germany (Bundesministeriums für Verkehr, Bau und Stadtentwicklung) [6], Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communication, Sweden (Näringsdepartementet) [7], Nordic Centre for Spatial Development (NORDREGIO) [8], Ministry of Regional Development, Poland (Ministerstwo Rozwoju Regionalnego) [9], Maritime Institute, Poland (Instytut Morski) [10].

37.4. Title of the Action: East-West Window (EWW).

37.5. Contract number: Grant Contract for European Community External Actions **2007/132-845**.

37.6. Start date and end date of the reporting period³⁸: 15.06.2007 – 15.12.2008.

37.7. Target country(ies) or region(s): **North-West Russia in particular: St. Petersburg, Leningrad region and Kaliningrad region**; to some extent also Belarus and North-West Russia adjacent countries (mainly for collecting good practices and dissemination of the project results).

37.8. Final beneficiaries &/or target groups³⁹ (if different). The target audience/recipients of the project findings are: decision-makers (ministries responsible for spatial planning and

³⁷ The name of the partner 5 was changed during the EWW project execution **from** Ministry of the Environment, Danish Forest and Nature agency **to** Ministry of the Environment, Agency for Spatial and Environmental Planning (Miljøministeriet, By- og Landskabsstyrelsen).

³⁸ The entire implementation period of the Action

³⁹ “Target groups” are the groups/entities who will be directly positively affected by the project at the Project Purpose level, and “final beneficiaries” are those who will benefit from the project in the long term at the level of the society or sector at large.

development in the BSR, including the federal government in Russia, regional authorities in NW Russia, pan-Baltic organisations such as VASAB 2010). The final beneficiaries are local and regional governments in the Baltic Sea region (BSR) operators in the chosen thematic fields (e.g. businesses in WP1 and transport operators in WP2) in NW Russia and in the BSR. The divide into men and women of different project activities is provided separately.

37.9. Country (ies) in which the activities take place (if different from 1.7): Russia (St. Petersburg and Kaliningrad Oblast), Poland and Latvia.

38. Assessment of implementation of Action activities

38.1. Activities and results (for the whole reporting period including last narrative interim report)

Activity 1: Kick off of the work of Working Group no 1 on business development and innovation affecting spatial development,

1.28. First meeting of the WG1 (1 day) took place on 25 June 2007 in Riga which was according to the schedule. The meeting was planned in advance in late June so participants postponed their holidays which in this part of the BSR starts with so called Midsummer. The meeting was attended by 12 participants representing partners 1,3,4,5,6,8,9,10 and eight invited guests. The main aim was to discuss the analysis and further WG1 work in detail, to achieve clarity about division of labour between the partners, to make sure that duplication with other project is avoided (instead to aim at using results achieved by other projects) and to start the process of contracting the external experts. The following outputs were produced or achieved:

- Report how to avoid duplication with other INTERREG III B projects in the field of business development and innovation affecting spatial development had been prepared before the meeting by the project coordinator, discussed by the meeting and delivered to the Responsible (Lead) Partner.
- TORs for seven ASSET staff members, eight Kaliningrad University staff members, one Belarus expert and four external experts together with tender documentation (if necessary) have been prepared by project coordinator as result of the meeting. Tender procedures for the four external experts had been started resulting in contracting one external expert from Poland, one from Sweden, one from Latvia and one from Denmark. In addition the Belarus expert was contracted by the partner no. 8 without tender (contract below 5000 Euro).
- The main scope of analysis was proposed and discussed. Unfortunately too many question marks and uncertainties appeared during the June meeting so the additional meeting was organized in Riga in September and discussion on analysis continued till the second WG1 meeting (December 2007).
- Text for EWW section at to the VASAB website was decided, technically EWW link at VASAB website was created in September 2007.
- Project flyer was designed and edited including information on WG1 activities (300 copies were printed in October 2007).

Comments: The WG1 started the discussion on its work (i.e. necessary analysis, results to be achieved) but the topic was too broad for one day meeting in addition to many technical questions were raised. The decision was to continue the discussion when the experts contracted by tender would be available. The main problem was to what extend the achievement of the EWW goal (i.e.

to promote territorial integration of NW Russia into the BSR in the field of business development) required concentration on analysis concerning exclusively NW Russia and to what extent the broader BSR picture was necessary if integration should mean reciprocal relations (i.e. affecting both sides). The latter opinion prevailed and was accepted by the meeting. The WG1 considered that for producing the main output of the analytical phase (i.e. a *compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") with assessment of unexploited innovation potential in NW Russia, assessment of the potential for regional integration and with identification of spatial problems in NW Russia and BSR*) some BSR analysis as the background material should be done as well. The meeting also discussed the policy related role of the project i.e. better highlighting the EWW results on NW Russia role in the “Long Term Perspective” to be prepared by VASAB on CBSS demand. The WG1 leaders promised to ensure smooth transfer of the EWW results to the BSR strategy i.e. Long Term Perspective till 2030 (to be prepared by VASAB in 2009). The Responsible Partner declared that he would invite VASAB Secretariat to the most important meetings of the EWW to ensure smooth transfer of the project results to the “Long Term Perspective”.

- 1.29. Partnership Agreement Preparation. This action was related to all work packages and took place in June, July, August, and September 2007 and was ended in October 2007 with signing partnership agreements between Lead Partner and all other partners of the EWW project. The most difficult was signing Partnership Agreement with partners from St. Petersburg due to problems related to tax and system in Russia, conversion of EUR into rubels, banking system requirements etc. Finally two agreements, based on the results of additional working meeting (in Riga) discussions, were prepared and signed between Lead Partner and RU (ASSET) Partner and between German Partner and RU (ASSET) Partner. So at the end of the day there were 9 partnership agreements signed regulating relations between the EWW partners.
- 1.30. Quality Workshop (1 day) for Project leaders organised by INTERREG III B Secretariat and EU Delegation from Moscow in Riga on 26 September 2007 was attended by project coordinator (partner no.10), one representative of Russian partners (partner no.2) and representatives appointed by the Responsible Partner. Main guidelines from EC Delegation and INTERREG III B Secretariat on TACIS rules, payments schemes and communication experiences were presented during the seminar and later on at individual consultations. The meeting between Responsible Partner and the Russian partners was organized back to back with the workshop for discussing main technicalities of their participation in the project.

Activity 2: Analysis(WG1)

- 2.19. WG1 additional meeting (1 day) took place on 25 September 2007 in Riga to continue discussion on the scope of analysis. The meeting was attended by four WG1 members (including two external experts, project coordinator and the representative of the Russian partners) and three participants representing Responsible Partner. At the meeting in depth discussion on case studies on innovation, outsourcing and urban-rural relations in Russia took place and the detailed scope of the work of Russian partners and external experts were agreed. Also a draft outline structure of the WG1 analytical report was presented by the WG1 Coordinator and discussed in depth.
- 2.20. Data collection and interpretation started only in December 2007 after the second WG1 meeting. In this phase 34 people from all partners were involved (except partner no.7 who acted through partner no. 8). Their involvement differed. The main bulk of analytical work was done by partners no. 3, 4 and 8 and the external experts whereas the other people acted mainly as a reference group reading reports, making comments and asking for improvements. This was the task first of all of partners no. 1, 2, 5, 6, 9 and 10 representing mainly policy making side in the project and project coordination. Also VASAB Secretariat was invited by partner 1 (Responsible Partner) to participate in this process. The analysis (data collection) in principle were ended in March 2008 but some of them (requiring surveys)

due to formal reasons (tenders) were completed in April 2008. Interpretation of data was done in April 2008 for all important cases (but some analysis e.g. the benchmarking studies and urban-rural analysis continued till September 2008). In fact in April and even in May and June the fine tuning of analysis (removing mistakes noticed by the other partners) still continued. The reason was that some partners from the reference group were very demanding asking for many improvements even if they had found little inconsistencies after second or third reading of the reports. Therefore the final synthesis report (draft discussion paper) from the analytical phase was completed only in July 2008 and even slightly changed after the WG1 September 2008 meeting and as the result of the EWW final/closing Conference in October 2008.

The outputs have been following:

(i) interim:

- Data (including public surveys) and draft analytical report on “Baltic” metropolitan areas with focus on the role of Kaliningrad and St. Petersburg;
- In depth study on St. Petersburg and Kaliningrad and their developmental potentials in the BSR context (focus on innovation and outsourcing) in which: trends and present policies for innovations nested in NW Russia and outsourcing were analysed, barriers for innovations perceived by business and public administration were identified (based on surveys), and cases on transfer of innovations between NW Russia and other parts of the BSR were described;
- Case studies (reports) on Russian and Belarus small and medium sized cities – covering: Novgorod, Gatchina, Chernyakhovsk, Gusev, Sovetsk, Svetly, Berezovka, Zaslavl;
- Reports on demographic trends in North-West Russia, in St. Petersburg and in Kaliningrad and in Belarus as well;
- Reports on case studies on urban-rural relations in Russia;
- Report on INTERREG III B projects results relevant for work of the WG1 group;
- Benchmarking studies concerning situation in Poland, Germany and Latvia on the issues relevant for the WG1 recommendations .

(ii) A compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") with assessment of unexploited innovation potential in NW Russia, assessment of the potential for regional integration and with identification of spatial problems in NW Russia and BSR.

Comments:

a) All the planned outcomes were achieved. However, during the analytical phase became clear that for the NW Russia innovation is more promising path for integration within the BSR than outsourcing, therefore more efforts were done to analyse this challenge. The list of outputs was enlarged (in comparison to the planned ones) by analysis of the role of the NW Russia in the BSR context (as the result of the WG1 discussions what analysis are necessary to achieve the EWW goal). Also urban structures and functional urban areas of not only large but also some small cities were analysed. The most interesting case appeared to be Gatchina as an example of science intensive cluster in Russia located in a small city. The some other cases illustrated urban-rural relations in Russia (and Belarus).

b) While working with data it became clear that translating data into policy recommendations can not be done by each working group separately. Therefore at the meeting of the WG leaders in December it was proposed that for the starting work on recommendation a workshop for all WGs would be necessary. The Responsible Partner was asked to organize such a workshop on 31st of January 2008 instead of simple WG1 seminar (planned for that date).

c) The work was delayed by some formal constraints such as tender procedures, requirement of separate EUR accounts (very difficult for Ministries) etc.

Activity 3: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR (WG1)

- 3.1. Kick off Conference of the project (1,5 day) for broad public took place on 18-19 October 2007 (according schedule) in St. Petersburg as a part of the well known VI Forum of Strategic Planning Leaders of Cities and Regions of Russia. This allowed project to reach the planned target group. The project: its assumptions and the planned outputs were presented to the Russian decision makers - mainly city mayors and chief planners. Conference participants expressed a deep hope that EWW project would diminish knowledge gaps within the Baltic Sea Region on the character of development potential of the NW Russia, its synergies and complementarities with potentials of other countries of the region, and on methods how this potential could be efficiently connected within the BSR. It was expressed in Conference recommendations that EWW project results should be presented in 2008 at the final Conference within VII Forum of Strategic Planning Leaders of Cities and Regions of Russia. The kick off conference was attended by 259 participants mainly Russian mayors and city planners. Among them there were 57 persons outside Russia. From EWW project 20 persons participated including Latvian State Secretary representing the Responsible Partner. So EWW reached the planned target of **200** Russian decision makers and professionals involved in discussion on the project.
- 3.2. Stakeholder Seminar for WG1 (0,5 day) was organised on 23 April 2008 in Riga (instead of beginning of May as originally planned). The preliminary results of the analytical phase were presented and the first discussions on the recommendations were started. The seminars for all working groups of EWW were arranged back to back with the VASAB annual conference financed by the Latvian Ministry of Regional Development and Local Government from its own means i.e. outside the EWW budget (from the EWW budget some partners only covered their travelling to the EWW seminars). The described above arrangement resulted in very impressive participation in the seminars and allowed to reach a planned target of **100** decision makers and businessman from BSR EU countries involved in discussion of the project findings and recommendations. The conference and seminars were attended by 167 participants including 26 persons directly involved in the EWW project (although the Responsible Partner was represented by some more employees). The participants came mainly from Latvia, Lithuania, and Finland but also from Azerbaijan, Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, EU Commission, Germany, Hungary, Norway, Poland, Russia and Sweden.
- 3.3. Closing(final) Conference of the project (1 day) for broad public took place on 21st October 2008 (according schedule) in St. Petersburg. The title of the conference was “Promoting territorial integration of the North West Russia into the Baltic Sea Region”. The main organiser was ASEET together with the EWW Responsible Partner. This Conference was a part of rich spectrum of the conferences and seminars taking place under umbrella (the same premises) of the VII All-Russia Forum of Strategic Planning Leaders “Strategic Planning in Regions and Cities of Russia”. In the event 631 participants took place out of it 582 from Russia. The forum was organized by: State Duma of the Russian Federation; Ministry for Regional Development of the Russian Federation; Ministry for Economic Development of the Russian Federation; St Petersburg City Administration; Center of Strategic Research; ISCER Leontief Centre. It was opened by Mr Dmitry Kozak, Minister of Regional Development, who underlined that “Forum is becoming the public debating platform for improving the strategic planning system of social and economic development in Russian regions”. The Conference “Promoting territorial integration of the North West Russia into the Baltic Sea region” was composed of four sessions attended by large number of the participants not only from Russia but also from other Baltic Sea Region countries. Some sessions were joint ventures with other organisations, forums and bodies interested in the subjects raised by the EWW project. The names of the sessions were following:

- “Accessibility and innovations as motors of integration of the NW Russia into the Baltic Sea Region” (presentation of the results of the WG1 and the WG2),
- “Special Features of coastal regional strategies” (presentation of the WG3 results and dialogue with all key persons in Russia dealing with ICZM and maritime spatial planning),
- “Partnership mechanisms in local economic policy implementation” (presentation of the WG1 results with regard to urban-rural partnership).

In addition to that EWW results were presented at the key session of the Forum “Prospects for Federal Okrug Development: Challenges, priorities, threats and constraints. North-West Federal Okrug” attended by key decision makers from the North-West Federal Okrug.

Comments:

The choice of the formula of the kick-off and closing conferences appeared to have very positive results on ability of the project to deliver results to the key target groups in Russia. The Conference was also attended by the Ministerial partners from the EWW project. The EWW results were mirrored in the Forums resolutions. Some interested questions were raised requiring further discussion and examination.

- 3.4. Final publication The book summing up the results of the investigations available for the stakeholders in Kaliningrad and St.Petersburg was edited in October, November and printed in December 2008 by partner no.4.

Comments:

The number of books published was smaller (100) than assumed in the application (400), although the whole budget allocated to this purpose was used. There were several reasons why the printing was more expensive than expected. Some of them were of technical reasons: i.e. the book had more coloured pictures (maps) than estimated and was thicker than planned (more than 300 pages in comparison to 150 pages planned), but the main reason was of vis mayor nature. In 2008 in Russia an unexpected inflation and economic crisis appeared which could not be taken into account at the stage of budget planning. This resulted in much higher printing costs. However, the partner no.4 is ready to print additional copies of the book if demanded. The available copies will be distributed to the most active in the EWW Russian stakeholders and to the project partners of the EWW.

Activity 4: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations and action plan (WG1)

- 4.1. Steering Group Meeting (1 day) took place on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg according to schedule. The meeting was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1,2,3,5,6,7,9,10 and seven invited guests. The Steering Group discussed the project progress. The work was lagging behind the schedule. Although the WG1 started on time it became involved in lengthy discussions about the necessary scope of analysis and detailed division of labour between working groups. The Steering Group decided therefore not to start the work on recommendations before improving synergy between the work of the working groups. This task was given to the meeting of the WGs leaders organised in Riga back to back with the WG2 (5 December 2007) and the WG1 (6-7 December 2007) meetings. The meeting also discussed details of project presentation to the kick-off conference held next day.
- 4.2. WG1 second meeting (1,5 day) took place on 6-7 December 2007 in Riga (instead of late November). The meeting was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10, two external consultants and six invited guests. The meeting concentrated on discussing analytical phase of the project (the decision was that the lagging behind analysis would make necessary to postpone by two months the next WG1 meeting i.e. till the end of analytical phase). However, the WG 1 also started examining the way of preparation of the recommendations out of the analysis conducted. For the starting work on

recommendation it was agreed that a workshop for all WGs would be necessary and the Responsible Partner was asked to organize such a workshop (synergy meeting) on 31st of January 2008 instead of a simple WG1 seminar (scheduled for beginning of February).

- 4.3. Synergy meeting no.1 (1 day) took place in Riga on 31 of January 2008 (replacing the WG1 seminar scheduled for February). It was attended by fourteen project partner members representing partners no.1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, three external experts and six invited guests. The facilitator was hired by the Responsible Partner. During the meeting the participants agreed that all three working groups were in need of a common frame. This should be given by the vision of the BSR till 2030 with full integration of the North-West Russia. The participants managed to prepare an outline of such a vision requiring further work. The meeting asked for one more working day for finishing common visionary frame which should allow preparing meaningful recommendations.
- 4.4. Steering Group Meeting 2 took place on 1 of February 2008 in Riga. It was attended by seven project partner members representing partners no. 1,3,5,6,7, 9, 10 one external expert and seven invited guests. The results of the synergy meeting were discussed i.e. synergy between the work of the working groups. It was decided to organise one more synergy meeting to continue work on the common frame for all WGs, i.e. vision of the BSR till 2030 with full integration of the North-West Russia. An agenda of the April Conference proposed by the Responsible Partner was discussed together with some technical issues. The progress in analytical phase was reviewed.
- 4.5. Synergy meeting no. 2 (1 day) took place in Liepaja on 14th of March 2008. It was attended by ten project partner members representing partners no. 1,3,5,6,9, 10 one external expert and five invited guests. The facilitator was hired by the Responsible Partner but paid from Responsible Partner own means. The final draft of the vision was discussed and shared by participants giving stable frame for analytical part and allowing proper work on recommendations.
- 4.6. WG1 fourth meeting (1 day) took place on 3-4 April 2008 in Riga. It was attended by nine project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 8, 10, two external experts and two invited guests. The meeting was convened on demand of Russian partners who started finalisation of analytical part and wanted to discuss the preliminary results among themselves. It was also important for conceptualization of the recommendations i.e. discussing what findings from analytical phase should be taken into consideration while working on recommendations.
- 4.7 WG1 fifth meeting (one day) took place on 24 April 2008 in Riga. It was attended by fifteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, four external experts and six invited guests. The WG1 before the meeting concentrated mainly on analytical work. At the fifth meeting analyses were summed up and the work on recommendations were started. However, one more meeting was requested (autumn 2008) in order to discuss the final draft of the recommendations and action programme. Due to delay in the work on urban-rural relations in Russia the relevant reports were not presented to the WG1 at this meeting. Only an overview of the progress and main findings were reported. It was decided that for synergy reasons the reports would be presented on seminar on urban-rural relations in Russia to be organised as a joint event with the SeBCo project in Kaliningrad in June 2008. This was realised and such presentation took place and was regarded as a great success by meeting participants.
- 4.8. Steering Group Meeting 3 (one day) took place on 20 May 2008 in Riga. It was attended by five project partner members representing partners no. 1, 5, 9, 10, and five invited guests. The Steering Group discussed the project progress. The results of the second synergy meeting and the April Conference were examined as well as a draft vision of the BSR till 2030 with full integration of the North-West Russia. The Steering Group decided to close analytical part and start the work on recommendations. However, the WG3 leaders asked for additional benchmark study on the results of the INTERREG projects in the field of competences of the WG3 with focus on the German experience. This was to diminish

discrepancies between the WGs, since the WG1 and the WG2 already had such type of expertises included in their work. The problems with travelling budget of Russian partners were discussed once more together with a problem of disappeared financial manager. The Steering Group also continued a discussion on political use of the EWW results i.e. incorporation of the results into the Long Term Perspective of VASAB to be produced in 2009. The output achieved:

- first draft recommendation papers (in outline format) of WG1 and WG2.

4.9. WG1 sixth meeting (one day) took place on 03 September 2008 in Jurmala. It was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, four external experts and seven invited guests. They discussed the final draft of the recommendations and action programme prepared during holiday time 2008 by ASSET, Immanuel Kant State University of Russia (Kaliningrad), Nordregio staff, and external experts. The whole work on urban-rural relations in Russia the relevant analytic reports were presented to the WG1 at this meeting as well. The WG1 discussed and improved the following documents:

- Recommendations how to improve innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Recommendations how to improve settlement policies in NW Russia (urban rural partnership) from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Action plan how to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration.

4.10. Steering Group Meeting 4 (one day) took place on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg. It was attended by 7 project partner members representing partners no. 2, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10 one external expert and 6 invited guests. The group discussed the shape of final publications of the EWW project, the use of the analytical materials and endorsed the recommendations and action proposed by the project. The main discussion was on the proper use of the EWW results for the Long Term Perspective (LTP) of VASAB elaboration of which was started few month ago (August 2008). The EWW results were placed to the different parts of the LTP outcomes. The VASAB consultant responsible for facilitating the LTP process was invited to the Steering Group meeting. It was also discussed how to use EWW outcomes for the process of preparation of the BSR EU Strategy. The partner no.5 arranged a meeting with the EU Commission on that topic. It was decided that the EWW results would be incorporated in the VASAB non-paper to be presented to the EU Commission in November/December 2008 in order to influence strategy preparation. The outputs achieved (as results of the meeting):

- Final draft of the recommendations how to improve innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Final draft of recommendations how to improve settlement policies in NW Russia (urban rural partnership) from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Final draft of the action plan how to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration,
- Final draft of recommendations on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR including concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR,
- Final action plan how to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational sea use planning and ICZM,
- Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic,
- Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application,
- Forwarding (transferring of EWW results) to important BSR processes namely: EU BSR Strategy and VASAB Long Term Perspective.

Activity 5: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 2 on accessibility

5.1. WG2 first meeting (one day) took place on 10 October 2007 in Riga. It was attended by five project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 8, 10, one external expert and three invited guests. The main aim was to discuss the scope of analysis (concrete meaning of accessibility) and the further work of the WG2 step by step, to achieve clarity about division of labour between the partners, to make sure that duplication with other project was avoided (instead to aim at using results achieved by other projects) and to start the process of contracting the external experts. The following outputs were produced or achieved:

- Report how to avoid duplication with other INTERREG III B projects in the field of accessibility was prepared by the project coordinator, discussed at the meeting and accepted by the Responsible Partner;
- TORs for four Kaliningrad University staff members, one Belarus expert and TORs for three external experts together with tender documentation (if necessary) have been prepared and approved. Procurement and contracting procedures for the one external expert was finished in September. Two other experts were also contracted (latter on);
- The main scope of analysis were proposed and discussed. The discussion on analysis continued among the partners (by e-mails) till the second WG2 meeting (December 2007);
- EWW link at the VASAB website was created (see activity 1.1);
- The content of the project flyer was loaded by short information about the WG2 activities.

Comments: The WG2 started its work behind the schedule. Due to the late project start (mid of June 2007), the first period of the project coincided with a holiday season. Therefore the real work of the WG2 (by phone, e-mails etc) started only in September 2007 i.e. three month later than planned. In addition to that, for some partners it was very inconvenient (e.g. celebrations of anniversary of establishment of the Kaliningrad University) and this postponed the start of formal work by one or two month further on i.e. till October 2007. In the meantime the preparation of the WG2 detailed analysis was started. To this end a pre meeting on 22nd of August 2007 was organised (partners 1, 7,8) to prepare tentative proposals on the substance of the work of the WG2. This meeting was paid outside the EWW budget. Although the WG2 (similarly to the WG1) came to the opinion that broader BSR picture was necessary to promote *territorial integration of NW Russia into the BSR in the field of transport and ITC*. The WG2 members also shared the WG1 concern on importance of smooth transfer of the EWW results to the BSR strategy till 2030 i.e. Long Term Perspective to be prepared by VASAB in 2009. The characteristic feature of the WG2 was a long discussion about the meaning of the notion of accessibility. As the result accessibility to energy was also considered to be an important element of the analysis.

Activity 6: Analysis(WG2)

6.1. The discussion on the scope and method of analysis (indicators, pilot studies) had been continued from October till beginning of December 2007. The manuals and guidelines were discussed many times. The main method was e-mail exchanges. As the result the manuals and blue prints were produced by partners 1 and 8 to facilitate collecting data and information:

- A blue print on screening transport policy,
- A manual for collecting data and information on accessibility.

Comments: The majority of time of the initial period was allocated to discussing the notion of accessibility. This was done in order to avoid problems when data and information collection would be started. Due to the rise of energy prices also this issue was considered as important factor for the NW Russia integration to the BSR. The second issue heavily discussed was scarcity of comparable data in Russia. Partner no 8 having a very well developed data base on transport data for the BSR was in a difficult position checking (in dialogue with partner 4) existence of

similar data in Russia. This required more resources and more work load than estimated at the beginning. But finally this allowed presenting Russia at the broader BSR picture. The phase 6.1. ended with second meeting of the WG2 (December 2007 in Riga).

6.2. Data collection and interpretation started only in December 2007 after the second WG 2 meeting. Basic data were collected by mid February 2008 but some work continued (fine tuning of reports) till May/June 2008. A draft discussion paper was ready for the Riga Stakeholder Conference in April 2008. However, it was a working document amended after each important EWW meeting, till the final/closing Conference. In this work (phase 6.1 and 6.2) seventeen people (including three external experts) were involved. Their involvement differed. The main bulk of analytical work was done by partners no. 4 and 8 and the external experts whereas the other participants acted mainly as a reference group reading reports, making comments and asking for improvements. This was done first of all by partners no. 1, 6, 7 and 10 representing mainly policy making side in the project and project coordination. Also VASAB Secretariat was invited by partner 1 (Responsible Partner) to participate in this process.

The following outputs were achieved:

(i) interim:

- Mapping of transport infrastructure policies at the federal and regional level, policies in development of the soft accessibility (to knowledge and information) and policies on clusters in NW Russia (however clusters were analysed by the WG1 in fact), also policies and situation in the field of accessibility to energy was examined;
- Identification of bottlenecks and constraints for transport (and through transport for business development) in NW Russia;
- Assessment of the policy correlation with the strategic documents at the BSR level (mainly by analysing outcomes of Strategic INTERREG III B projects pursued by VASAB, BDF, BSSSC and CPMR);
- Examining the results of other INTERREG III B projects relevant for the WG2 work;
- Feasibility assessment of connecting TEN-T with the pan-European corridors.

The planned verification of the accessibility perspective and of present (current) and forecast trade flows in NW Russia and Belarus (vis-a-vis BSR reports) was less successful. The main reason were missing data concerning predicted trade flows in NW Russia and Belarus⁴⁰. The accessibility perspective instead was analysed using BSR outlook to show how NW-Russia is connected with the rest of the BSR.

(ii) A compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") presenting situation, development trends and political objectives in the fields of transport and accessibility in NW RU and Belarus and their consequences for BSR cohesion and business development

Comments:

The most important planned outputs were achieved (although one output was slightly modified). In addition to that, accessibility to energy was touched as important future factor of the BSR integration that should determine in great extent the NW Russia integration into the BSR. The analysis lasted longer than expected. The main constraint was lack of regional reliable data in NW Russia. The main reason of the delay was in insufficient data availability but also to some extent larger than expected amount of available background information (e.g. results of the BSR projects) that should be digested and analysed.

Activity 7: Pilot studies (WG2)

⁴⁰ The work on trade flows was done in co-operation with WG1 and the BSR perspective was used.

Since the analytical phase (activity 6) was delayed also pilot projects were postponed. The aim of the activity 7 was to analyse more in depth the most promising solutions developed during the analytical phase and prioritised during stakeholder dialogue. Therefore only in May 2008 the more concrete work on pilot studies (pre-feasibility studies) could start. The WG2 selected two (in line with the output indicators listed in the application) topics for pre-feasibility studies. The topics were following:

- s) BSR passenger railway connectivity with focus on the Eastern part of the BSR,
- t) examination of implementation of the transport part of Tallinn vision of VASAB with focus on the eastern part of the BSR.

For the pilot studies a tender procedure was used and contracts were signed in late June 2008. The results were delivered in late August 2008 and discussed by the WG2 group meeting in September. The following reports were produced:

- *Study on international rail passenger traffic development: Possibilities in the context of development of cities in the Baltic Sea Region* (Contract: 5-13/66, of 18.6.2008) elaborated by SIA "AC Konsultācijas",
- *Evaluation of implementation of the VASAB 2010 vision in the area of mobility network and energy supply* (Contract: 5-13/74, of 23.7.2008) elaborated by SIA "AC Konsultācijas".

The results of the studies were presented to the closing/final conference of the EWW and will serve as an input for the Long Term Spatial Development Perspective. They were also presented in advance to the WG2 members working on recommendation in order to shape the WG2 recommendations.

Comments:

An additional barrier delaying activity no.7 was obligation of tendering the contractors due to internal law of Latvia where partner no.1 (responsible for the WG2 work) is located. The WG2 decisions were taken in May 2008, but the contracts were signed only 1,5- 2 months latter coinciding once more with a holiday season. The first preliminary results of the activity no.7 were delivered in August and the final results in October/November 2008.

Activity 8: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR

The same as activity no. 3

Activity 9: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG2)

- 9.1. Steering Group Meeting (1 day) took place on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg according to schedule (for details see action 4.1).
- 9.2. WG2 second meeting (1 day) took place on 5 December 2007 in Riga (instead of late November). The meeting was attended by seven project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 7, 8, 10 and four invited guests. The meeting concentrated on discussing analytical phase of the project. The manuals and blue prints for collecting data and information were agreed. For starting work on recommendation it was discussed that the idea of Steering Group (of its first meeting in October 2007) of workshop for all WGs should be implemented and the Responsible Partner was asked to organize such a workshop (synergy meeting) in January 2008.
- 9.3. Synergy meeting no.1 (1 day) took place in Riga on 31st of January 2008 (see action 4.3. for details).
- 9.4. Steering Group Meeting 2 on 1st of February 2008 in Riga (see action 4.4. for details).
- 9.5. Synergy meeting no. 2 (1 day) took place in Liepaja on 14th of March 2008. (see action 4.5. for details).
- 9.6. Steering Group Meeting 3 (one day) took place on 20 May 2008 in Riga. (for details see action 4.8).

- 9.7. WG2 third meeting (one day) took place on 21 May 2008 in Riga according to schedule. It was attended by five project partner members representing partners no. 1, 7, 8, 10, one external expert and three invited guests. The WG2 before the third meeting concentrated mainly on analytical work. At this meeting analyses were summed up and the work on recommendations started. It was decided that recommendations (with elements of the action programme) would be prepared for Russia and for the whole BSR with focus on better integration of NW Russia. One additional meeting was requested (autumn 2008) in order to discuss the final draft of the recommendations. The meeting also discussed the pilot actions (pre-feasibility studies) agreeing on concrete items. The outputs achieved:
- a first draft recommendations paper (in outline format),
 - TOR for two most important pilot studies.
- 9.8. WG2 fourth meeting (one day) took place on 4th September 2008 in Jurmala. It was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, three external experts and six invited guests. They discussed the final draft of the recommendations (with elements of the action programme) prepared by Immanuel Kant State University of Russia (Kaliningrad) and Nordregio staff. The WG2 discussed and improved the following documents:
- Recommendations on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR including concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR.
 - Study on international rail passenger traffic development: Possibilities in the context of development of cities in the Baltic Sea Region,
 - Evaluation of implementation of the VASAB 2010 vision in the area of mobility network and energy supply,
 - Overview of results of INTERREG III B projects in the field of accessibility .
- 9.9. Steering Group Meeting 4 (one day) took place on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg (please see action 4.10)

Activity 10: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 3 on ICZM and transnational sea use planning

- 10.1. WG3 preparatory meeting took place on 24 July 2007 in Kaliningrad. It was attended by nine project partner members representing partners no. 4, 10, and five invited guests. The meeting was used for preparation of the WG3 first meeting, and the pilot action in particular for presentation and discussion with the Kaliningrad partners the results of the INTERREG project BaltCoast of which recommendations should form main backbone of the work of the WG3. The preparatory meeting was organised during the holiday season due to indicated by the Kaliningrad partner necessity of postponing the WG3 first meeting till October because of the celebrations of 750th anniversary of establishment of the university (lack of experts) in early autumn 2007. So the preparatory meeting was a vehicle to start the work of the WG3 even in slightly less formal way. The main subject of discussion was the BaltCoast recommendations, TORs for experts and other guidelines necessary for elaboration of the WG3 analysis. The outputs were following:
- Decision on TORs and blue prints,
 - Clarifying division of labour,
 - Project flyer was discussed (and then edited) - see activity 1.1.
- 10.2 WG 3 first meeting (1,5 day) took place on 30-31 October 2007 in Kaliningrad i.e. with four month delay. The reason was the celebrations of 750th anniversary of establishment of the Albertina University (today Immanuel Kant State University of Russia) in Kaliningrad. The meeting was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 4, 9, 10 and to some extent also partner no.1, one external expert and fifteen invited guests mainly from Russia but also from Latvia, Germany and Finland. The main aim was to discuss the analysis and the further WG3 work in detail, to achieve clarity about division of labour between the

partners, to make sure that duplication with other project was avoided (instead to aim at using results achieved by other projects) and to start the process of contracting the external experts. Instead of preparing TORs for separate experts the WG3 at pre meeting decided to make only two TORs (one for external expert and one for the whole pilot project). For conducting analysis it was agreed that blue prints should be used. Such blue prints were prepared by partner no. 10 in advance presented at the meeting, and then improved/discussed by e-mails and approved in December 2007. The following outputs were produced or achieved:

- Report (in form of power point presentations) – presenting an overview of existing and available documentation on the chosen themes in NW Russia and at the BSR level;
- Two blue prints (for further analysis and discussions);
- Two TORs (one for external expert and one for the whole pilot project);
- One external expert was contracted by the partner no 1 covering by his expertise BSR and HELCOM perspective;
- EWW link at the VASAB website was created (see activity 1.1).

Also Kaliningrad stakeholders who attended the second part of the meeting were informed about the EWW project together with showing them the relevant BSR experience in ICZM and maritime spatial planning. They formed important part of the reference network for dialogue on project findings and recommendations. The meeting was also a starting point for executing analysis.

Activity 11 Analysis (WG 3)

11.1 The discussion on the scope and method of analysis had been continued from October till beginning of December 2007. The discussion resulted in shifting focus more from ICZM to maritime spatial planning as the most important transnational issue related to sea use in the nearest future. The blue prints (to be followed by Russian colleagues) presented by partner 10 were discussed many times. The main method was e-mail exchanges. As the result the two blue prints were agreed:

- A blue print on spatial planning legislation on the sea covering Poland,
- A blue print on potentials and conflicts on the sea covering Poland.

11.2. Gathering and compiling the WG3 information started in December 2007 after blue prints approval. Fourteen people representing partners no. 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10 were involved in the information collecting. Their involvement differed. The main bulk of analytical work was done by partners no.10 and 4 and by external expert whereas the other participants acted mainly as a reference group reading reports, making comments and asking for improvements. This was done first of all by partners no. 5,6 and 7 representing mainly policy making side in the project. The analysis in principle were ended in March. The situation of the WG3 was different than the WG1 and the WG2. The WG3 did not collect statistical information but rather qualitative information and the broad BSR background was discussed, sorted out and clarified at the first meeting by examining BaltCoast results. Therefore, the analytical work could be done in parallel with an initial phase of recommendation preparation. But also in the WG3 the completing analytical reports took more time than expected. Although first draft reports were ready in March their fine tuning continued in April and even in May and June. This was slightly learning by doing in particular for Russian experts who had little contact with maritime spatial planning in the past. The outputs were following:

- The legal systems were screened and regulations, responsibilities for offshore planning at all levels in NW Russia were identified;
- System of mapping to improve access to relevant information from NW Russia and its uploading to the pilot system made in the INTERREG III B BaltCoast project were tested (the results can be seen in the WG3 reports done by Russian colleagues);

- Actual (current) sea use in NW RU (Kaliningrad) according to the BaltCoast standards (potentials and conflicts) were described in a separate paper and conflicts and potentials were detected;
- A compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") with assessment of compatibility of the Russian regulatory framework to the legislation and practice in a pan-Baltic perspective in the field of ICZM and sea use planning was elaborated.

Comments:

The all planned outputs were achieved.

Activity 12 Pilot Action (WG 3)

Pilot action was started in October 2007 and continues till the end of August 2008. The twelve project partners staff members representing partners no. 1,4,6,7,9,10 and one external expert were involved. Partners no. 1,6,7 have acted mainly as a reference group while the main role was played by partners no. 4,9,10. The pilot action aimed at preparing a system of joint ICZM and maritime spatial planning in Gdańsk Bay between Poland and Russia. This task was discussed at the kick off meeting with various Russian stakeholders. The prevailing opinion was that due to the dispersed responsibilities in Russia in ICZM and sea space management (versus concrete central Agency in Poland responsible for sea space and regional governments responsible for ICZM activities) such goal could not be achieved in the project time span. Nowadays there is no single institution in Russia responsible for sea space management (like Maritime Offices in Germany or Poland). The WG3 came to the opinion that agreements between Polish and Russian relevant state institutions on co-operation in sea use planning and management might be too ambitious and premature as the WG3 output. Instead pilot actions were focused on the preconditions for establishment of such agreements in future, by exchange of good practices, deepening mutual understanding and preparing necessary tools and necessary institutional structures i.e. centres of excellence in both countries dealing with maritime spatial planning. It was decided that the starting point should be an agreement between Russian and Polish institutions from NGO or research domain to co-operate on promotion of integrative approach to sea space and coast in both countries. In this context a sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application was discussed. It was considered as an important tool for showing to Russian decision-makers a usefulness of maritime spatial planning. The WG3 decided to limit it to the Baltic Sea around Kaliningrad Oblast. The register was prepared by partner no. 4 and 10 in a form of GIS atlas. The following outputs were produced in the reporting period:

- The exchange of bi-lateral experience was started e.g. Polish pilot sea use plan (covering Puck Bay) elaborated in 2008 under PlanCoast INTERREG III B project was shown to the RU experts;
- The experience with the BaltCoast project of INTERREG III B was shared;
- Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application was first discussed then agreed and then produced and presented to the final/closing conference of the EWW in St. Petersburg on 21st October 2008;
- Agreement between Maritime Institute in Gdańsk and Russian partners on permanent co-operation in the future (including joint projects and policy related work) aiming at establishment of a system of joint ICZM and maritime spatial planning in Gdańsk Bay between Poland and Russia was prepared in autumn 2008. The partners of the agreement will act as centres of excellence in their countries with regard to maritime spatial planning and ICZM.

Comments:

The pilot action had to be modified. But the actions started within EWW project will be continued after the project closure thanks to established under the EEW contacts. The aim of

establishment of the system of joint ICZM and maritime spatial planning in Gdańsk Bay between Poland and Russia is still valid and will be realised in the future. What was done under EWW project was to start this process by exchange of experience, awareness rising, gathering stakeholders and discussing with them the problem and by preparation of some necessary tools which will convince Russian decision-makers that an integrative coastal and sea space management would be important. Despite difficulties the main outputs promised in the EWW application were produced: i.e. (i) a sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application and (ii) agreements between Polish and Russian relevant institutions on co-operation in sea use planning and management.

Activity 13: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR

The same as activity no. 3

Activity 14: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG3)

- 14.1. Steering Group Meeting (1 day) took place on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg according to schedule (for details see action 4.1).
- 14.2. Synergy meeting no.1 (1 day) took place in Riga on 31st of January 2008 (see action 4.3. for details). This meeting was used by the WG3 also for development of a first outline of recommendation paper which was discussed afterwards by e-mail exchange.
- 14.3. Steering Group Meeting 2 on 1st of February 2008 in Riga (see action 4.4. for details).
- 14.4. Synergy meeting no 2 (1 day) took place in Liepaja on 14th of March 2008 (see action 4.5. for details).
- 14.5. WG3 second meeting (1,5 day) took place on 27-28 March 2008 in Kaliningrad (instead of late November 2007). It was attended by sixteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 7, 9, 10., one external expert and two invited guests. The meeting assessed the progress of the analytical work, discussed the interim reports of Russia and tried to relate the WG3 work towards the EU Integrated Maritime Policy (Blue Book). The final draft of recommendation paper was discussed and agreed. The acknowledgement of the project results at the political level was also examined. The WG3 group joined the WG1 and the WG2 wish to present its results at policy level by introducing them to the "Long Term Perspective" of VASAB. However, partner 9 was also asked to transfer the results to the EU BSR Strategy and to the EU work on integrated maritime policy. During the WG3 meeting a workshop with Russian stakeholders on off-shore planning and ICZM was organised in Kaliningrad on 27th of March 2008 as a joint venture of all projects dealing with this subject i.e. EWW, POWER and SDI-4-SEB as a part of the conference ("Integrated management, sustainable development indicators, spatial planning and monitoring of the South-Eastern Baltic coastal regions"), which took place in Kaliningrad on 26th - 30th of March 2007. Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic were elaborated by EWW project participants beforehand and proposed to stakeholders attending this conference. The recommendations were unanimously adopted by the participants including regional and local authorities from Russia. This seemed to be an important step towards introducing integrative approach towards the sea space and coastal zone in Russia.

The output achieved was following:

- Recommendation paper discussed and adopted by the Russian stakeholder (Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic).
- 14.6. Steering Group Meeting 3 (1day) took place on 20 May 2008 in Riga (for details see action 4.8).

14.7. WG3 third meeting (1 day) took place on 4-5 June 2008 in Gdańsk almost according to schedule (few days later than planned originally). It was attended by fifteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 9, 10, one external expert and five invited guests. At the meeting analytical phase was summed up. The meeting was also used for examining the experience and good practices of the Balance project in maritime spatial planning. The experts from Denmark introduce the project to the WG3 members. However, the WG3 main discussion concentrated on the 'action plan' following the recommendations adopted in March 2008. The opinions were dispersed. Some participants considered elaboration of an action plan as premature having in mind lack of legal provisions in Russia regulating sea use in an integrative way and dispersion of responsibility for sea management among many institutions. Some others proposed to focus action plan on methodological issues i.e. issues indispensable to introduce sea use planning in Russia and methodology of such planning suited for Russian conditions. After the e-mail exchange in June 2008 the partner no 9 responsible for the WG3 work decided to take the risk to prepare a draft action plan and to discuss it in September 2008 with the WG 3 members. Therefore an additional meeting was requested to be held in September 2008, to conclude the recommendation phase. The following outputs were achieved:

- The experience with Balance project of INTERREG III B was shared.

After the WG3 third meeting the partner no 9 and 10 organised (late June beginning of July 2008) consultation about the follow up of the WG3 in a form of a joint project. In the consultation the information on different ETC Programmes in the BSR were analysed and compared. The results were presented to the WG3 fourth meeting.

14.8. WG3 fourth meeting (one day) took place on 2nd September 2008 in Gdańsk. It was attended by thirteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 7, 9, 10 and one external expert. The meeting discussed the final draft of the action programme prepared by the staff of partners no 4 and 10 (Maritime Institute from Gdańsk and Immanuel Kant State University of Russia from Kaliningrad). Also final draft of the sea use register was presented by the partner no.4. The WG3 discussions tackled also the future use of the WG3 results. The presentations to the final/closing conference of EWW were agreed. It was also decided that the WG3 analysis should serve for broader popularization of the issue of maritime spatial planning in the Baltic Sea Region. The partner no 9. agreed to edit (by the end of 2008) from its own resources a *Compendium on Maritime Spatial Planning systems in the Baltic Sea Region countries* composed of two parts: part 1 *Survey of the national instruments and tools for the management of the sea space in the BSR countries* describing legal and institutional aspects of maritime spatial planning systems in the BSR countries and part 2 entitled *Examples of national cases of sea spatial conflicts and potentials*. Partner no.9 promised to invite to this book all other BSR countries while using the WG3 results as the core input. The WG3 also analysed different possibilities of continuation of the WG3 work. After the lively discussion it was decided to use two vehicles for further co-operation: The project BaltSeaPlan already submitted to the BSR Programme (although slightly too abstractive) and the new project to be submitted to the ENPI Programme Lithuania–Poland–Russian Federation on concrete planning work as continuation of the WG3 pilot activities. It was decided that transnational maritime planning should concentrate on Vistula/Kalinigrad lagoon and on Kursiu lagoon.

The WG3 discussed and improved the following documents during its fourth meeting:

- Action plan how to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational sea use planning and ICZM;
- Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application.

14.9. Steering Group Meeting 4 (one day) took place on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg (please see action 4.10)

38.2. Assessment of the results of the Action

The central objective of the Action was to promote territorial integration of NW Russia (i.e. the entire Northwest Federal District, including Kaliningrad) into the Baltic Sea region (BSR) in the identified three fields of (1) business development, (2) transport / ICT development and (3) sea use planning and Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM). The starting point was relatively impressive but slightly idle (from the BSR perspective) developmental potential (in terms of human capital, scientific achievements etc.) of the North West Russia. The task was to develop solutions how to use the potential of the NW Russia for the benefit of the BSR economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development.

The action was successful to that extend that it managed to identify economic and spatial development needs in the NW Russia from the perspective of public authorities and businesses, requiring to be tackled by at the transnational level. This findings were benchmarked against existing good practice solutions based on experience of other BSR countries. The search was also done in order to detect economic and spatial trends, relevant for connecting territorial potentials between the NW Russia and the BSR. However, the picture coming from analysis appeared less promising than expected (see point 2.9). But even in those rather difficult circumstances the recommendations for three mentioned above fields were formulated and action plans were outlined. The main results delivered to the external audience having policy relevance are presented below:

The results achieved	The results intended	Explanation of differences
Recommendations how to improve innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration	Recommendation" paper with suggestions on policy improvements and legislative changes to improve settlement and innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration	The results achieved put less attention to legislative changes than to policy improvements. This is outcome of the survey done in order to learn from Russian businessman what are the main obstacles for them to innovate.
Recommendations how to improve settlement policies in NW Russia (urban rural partnership) from the perspective of BSR integration,		The focus of the result achieved is on urban-rural partnership as key for integrative development of settlement structure in Russia.
Action plan how to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration,	A paper with fields for further concrete actions ("action plan") to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration	Done in line with plans
Recommendations on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR including concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR,	1.Recommendation" paper with suggestions on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR 2. A paper with fields for further concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia and in BY in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR	The recommendations and action plan were merged. The reason is that Russia has very concrete plans and actions in this field for the future years so the WG2 decided to focus on long-term recommendations.
Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic	Recommendation" paper on upgrading the instruments and tools and institutional arrangements for transnational sea use planning and ICZM at the BSR level based on the completed pilot action	More ambitious recommendations were produced than expected i.e. more in line with the real situation in Russia with regard to ICZM and maritime spatial planning

Action plan how to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational sea use planning and ICZM	A paper with fields for further concrete actions ("action plan") to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational sea use planning and ICZM	Done in line with plans
Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application	A sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application - based on the completed system mapping.	Done in line with plans
Agreement between maritime Institute in Gdańsk and Immanuel Kant State University of Russia on further co-operation in the field of maritime spatial planning	Agreements between Polish and Russian relevant institutions on co-operation in sea use planning and management	Done in line with plans

The most important EWW achievement is delivery of main messages resulting from the Action to the important Russian decision makers, planning professionals and scientific sector as well as to the key pan-Baltic organizations such as HELCOM or VASAB. Through VASAB also the EU BSR strategy was influenced.

38.3. The outcome on both final beneficiaries and/or target group and the situation of the target group/target region which the action addressed

The target audience/recipients of the project findings have been decision-makers (ministries responsible for spatial planning and development in the BSR, including the federal government in Russia, regional authorities in NW Russia, pan-Baltic organisations such as VASAB 2010). Thanks to the action they have received a better picture on the situation with regard to the North-West Russia integration into the Baltic Sea region (BSR). This knowledge has been already used for policy making by VASAB in production of the Long Term Spatial Development Perspective and it seems that it will be also useful for the EU Commission in elaboration of the EU BSR strategy and for HELCOM for implementation of the Baltic Sea Action Plan. In fact the Action played a tremendous role in validation of the planning methodologies and strategic documents at the pan-Baltic level based on the NW Russia perspective. The Action gave a proper insight on main drivers and obstacles of integration of the North West Russia into the BSR. The Action findings and recommendations were also delivered to the Russian decision makers and VASAB will continue its efforts to convince them that the BSR integration is beneficial for the North-West Russia. At least in the field of maritime spatial planning as the result of the Action one can see increased capacity and competence basis to take up joint transnational initiatives between the NW Russia partners and institutions from other BSR countries.

The final beneficiaries local and regional governments in the Baltic Sea region (BSR) operators in the chosen thematic fields (e.g. businesses in WP1 and transport operators in WP2) in NW Russia and in the BSR will be influenced mainly through the actions of pan-Baltic organisations mainly VASAB and its Long Term Spatial Development Perspective. This will allow for incorporation of the BSR perspective in the national/regional/local policies in the NW Russia.

38.4. Publications

The following publications were produced:

Name	Number of copies	Distribution channels
The East-West Window brochure informing about the project	300	Distributed during the project events in particular kick-off conference, stakeholder seminar, the Conference "Baltic Sea Region Programme 2007-2013: new partnership opportunities for Russian and Belarusian regions" and many other events

Атлас использования прибрежных акваторий российской части Юго-восточной Балтики (Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application – <i>edited on CD rom</i>)	200	Distributed for free during the EWW final (closing) conference, available for free from partner no.4
The book in Russian: Северо-Запад России в Регионе Балтийского Моря: Проблемы и перспективы экономического взаимодействия и сотрудничества (North West Russia in the Baltic Sea region. Problems and perspectives of co-operation and mutual influence) presenting main results of the project	100	Distributed for free by partners no.4 among the project partners and participants of the EWW events. Sent to Russian relevant Ministries and main libraries.

38.5. Contracts (works, supplies, services) above 5000€ awarded for the implementation of the action since the last interim report

Only one contract above 5000€ was awarded since the last interim report.

	Contract	Amount	Procedure	Winner
1	Audit Services Contract	5 131,94	“negotiated procedure without publication”	<i>SIA Rodl and Partner</i>

38.6. Continuation of the Action after ending the support from the European Community

The action will be continued after ending the EU support for the East West Window project. Durability of the project results has been ensured by the direct participation or the support of the national ministries responsible for spatial planning and development around the BSR, acting under VASAB 2010. Through their co-operation with other relevant stakeholders, the project rendered available concrete recommendations for policy-making in the chosen thematic fields in the NW Russia and at the BSR level. Through intensive dialogue with the target audience, the project influenced planners in Russia neighbouring countries by including the perspective of NW Russia. It also served for modification of pan-Baltic strategic policy papers, long-term visions and development plans on the very same account.

In particular the EWW results were used by VASAB for elaboration of the Long Term Perspective for Spatial Development of the BSR. Thanks to the EWW this will be the document with proper outlook on North-West Russia. Due to the EWW the collaboration between VASAB (ministries) and other EWW partners (research institutes) will be strengthened. The EWW results will be also used for discussing with HELCOM an idea of maritime spatial planning in the Baltic Sea Region.

Follow-up activities in effect of the project will be initiated and promoted by VASAB 2010. This includes starting up of possible new project(s) covering the whole BSR and taking into consideration the needs and perspectives of NW Russia, identified and referred to in the present project. The WG3 work will be continued in a form of the BaltSeaPlan project already approved by the BSR Programme (will start around December 2008). The WG3 partners will also plan to submit the project on elaboration of concrete maritime spatial plans for Vistula and Kursiu Lagoons in the framework of the ENPI Programme Lithuania–Poland–Russian Federation. Despite finishing the work of the WG3 the partner no.9 responsible for its leading has already declared to continue the efforts in a broader BSR set up and started elaboration of the BSR wide

“Compendium on Maritime Spatial Planning systems in the Baltic Sea Region countries” using the WG3 results and experience.

38.7. Gender equality, disabilities

Where relevant, the perspective of equal opportunities was taken into account for the thematic work (especially in the fields of business and transport). Due efforts were made to secure involvement of both men and women in the composition of the project management structures, daily work and in the dialogue fora with relevant stakeholders in NW Russia and at the overall BSR level. Spatial planning forming a substance of the project from its definition cares for gender equality, prevention or exclusions of handicapped from the normal life. Although, gender equality and disables were not the main focus of the EWW project one can assume that the realisation of the project objectives (integration of the NW Russia into the BSR) will be beneficial in a long run also for attracting attention of Russian decision makers and Russian society to those above mentioned horizontal goals. They are placed very high at civil agenda in particular in the Nordic countries and integration means also convergence in values and way of living so it means better acceptance of these horizontal goals in Russia as well. The same has happened in Poland, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia after their accession to EU (strengthening their European integration).

38.8. Monitoring and evaluation of the activities

Monitoring of activities was done on routine basis by the project Steering Group. The group worked very effectively guiding the project and proposing the changes if necessary. The group (ministerial part) provided also an excellent piece of advice with regard to use of the EWW project results for policy making. However, one should also admit the important role of Committee on Spatial Development of the Baltic Sea Region which was among the main recipients of the project results. The advice from this body and the VASAB Secretariat which took part in majority of the EWW events (on their own money) helped a lot in proper shaping the EWW work and focusing on the policy relevant results (e.g. providing links to HELCOM, EU BSR Strategy etc.).

Also important were feedbacks received from beneficiaries during the kick-off and final (closing) conference. In the Annex 2 quotations from the Conference resolutions are attached (in Russian).

38.9. What has been learned from the Action

The main lesson from the action is that integration of the NW Russia into the Baltic Sea Region (BSR) will not be an easy process. Russia is a global player looking for global organizations and bodies as its partners. Even the regional level i.e. St. Petersburg has sufficient potential to play an important role at the global arena. This is clearly seen in the St. Petersburg government policy and strategic documents. BSR is not the main field of St. Petersburg strategic activity. Slightly different situation is with regard to Kaliningrad, but its potential is sufficient to strengthen rather cross-border than pan-Baltic integration of Russian Federation. The main integrative processes between Russia and the rest of the BSR are hardly due to market forces or conscious decisions of the Russian enterprises but rather thanks to EU financial support in form of transnational and cross-border programmes. The only field in which one can expect more or less natural co-operation between Russia and the other BSR countries is maritime spatial planning as long as it affects coastal defence, fish stock and state of the coastal nature. Russia is very active now in HELCOM where the questions of maritime spatial planning have been already raised.

Therefore strengthening integration of the North-West Russia into the BSR requires further development of the Russian medium size cities such as e.g. Kaliningrad or Pskov, their partnership with adjacent regions, and development of the maritime spatial planning institutions which in natural way will seek for the relations with their closest neighbours.

39. Partners and other Co-operation

39.1. How do you assess the relationship between the formal partners of this Action (i.e. those partners which have signed a partnership statement)? Please specify for each partner organisation

St. Petersburg Administration [2] – partner active for discussing policy relevant documents and organising meetings in St. Petersburg in the field of analysis acting through partner no.3 . Important contribution to the stakeholder dialogue. In fact this partner will be one of the main recipients of the project results.

Russian Economic Developers Association (ASSET) [3] – very demanding from formal point of view but also very experience partner in analytical work. A great bulk of the WG1 recommendations were proposed by this partner. The partner is a great interface between science and policy making in Russia in particular in St. Petersburg. Important role in dissemination activities thanks to good contacts with decision-makers in Russia at local and regional level.

Immanuel Kant State University of Russia [4] – very reliable and enthusiastic partner being a source of many data and information excellent in scientific work acquiring great experience during the EWW project how to translate analysis into policy findings, but in fact majority of recommendations of the WG2 and the WG3 were rooted in partner no. 4 thinking.

Ministry of the Environment, Danish Forest and Nature Agency, Denmark [5] – very active and experienced partner (being responsible in the past for the USUN project) leading the WG 1 work and ensuring proper presentation of EWW at the highest BSR political level.

Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Housing, Germany [6] – very active and experienced partner responsible for urban-rural investigations under the WG1, ensuring proper presentation of EWW at the highest BSR political level.

Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communication, Sweden [7] – partner ensuring link to the EU BSR strategy (use of EWW results also there), acting mainly through partner 8 but very active in the WG2 , active in the WG3 (with very high quality inputs) and contributing to policy relevant findings in the EWW.

Nordic Centre for Spatial Development (NORDREGIO) [8] – one of key drivers for analytical work, competent, flexible with a large knowledge and experience in spatial and regional development.

Ministry of Regional Development, Poland [9] – partner leading the WG3 but active in other work groups, very experienced and very flexible contributing to the work additional resources if project resources are not sufficient.

Maritime Institute, Poland [10] – key resource for maritime spatial planning and ICZM in the project supporting actively the WG3 and coordinating the whole project from content point of view in very reasonable way.

39.2. Is the partnership to continue

The partnership will continue in a form of BSR Programme and ENPI Programme projects on maritime spatial planning. The co-operation agreement between partners no 4 and 10 will serve

to this end. The BaltSea Plan was approved by the BSR programme. The project will serve as a continuation and dissemination of the WG3 work and results since both partners no 4 and 10 are among its key drivers.

The EWW project results were also used within the VASAB framework. This means that new partners such as Nordregio, ASSET or Immanuel Kant State University of Russia have joined the VASAB work and their involvement will continue.

39.3. How would you assess the relationship between your organisation and State authorities in the Action countries? How has this relationship affected the Action?

Since majority of the partners are state high level institutions those relations were fine. The partners representing state authorities knew each other for many years before starting the project as the members of the VASAB co-operation (Co-operation of Ministers for spatial planning and development in the BSR countries). The new input was given by the scientific institutions. This was a great added value of the project, mutual learning how to translate analysis into policy relevant actions. The research oriented partners were quite flexible and willing to reshape analysis or repeat them if asked by policy making partners.

39.4. Where applicable, describe your relationship with any other organisations involved in implementing the Action:

- Associate(s) (if any) - no
- Sub-contractor(s) (if any). Some of the work was given to the external contractors. However an idea was that majority of work should be done by the partners themselves since the partners had sufficient qualification to execute the project and achieve its goals. Contractors were used mainly for technical issues and for bringing knowledge from INTERREG projects. Only some partners (9) and (5) used contractors more intensively (for some concrete work) due to shortages in their human resources. In principle the relation with contractors were positive with one exception (i.e. Rumanian contractor who won a tender for the EWW financial management disappeared after few month of serving the project)
- Final Beneficiaries and Target groups. Those relations were fine thanks to sue of well established and prominent conferences for presentation of the EWW. This gave the project access to the target group necessary for the project success.
- Other third parties involved. Important was a link of the project to the VASAB Secretariat and VASAB work on the Long Term Perspective. VASAB Secretariat promoted also project and its results externally on request of the Responsible Partner.

39.5. Where applicable, outline any links you have developed with other actions.

The project ambition was to develop link to other important projects in order to make use of their results (BaltCoast, PlanCoast, Balance, USUN, SeBCo – their experts were invited to the project meetings) or to make joint meetings to better reach target groups (SeBCo POWER and SDI-4-SEB). These projects represented different INTERREG strands.

39.6. If your organisation has received previous EC grants in view of strengthening the same target group, in how far has this Action been able to build upon/complement the previous one(s)? (List all previous relevant EC grants).

The Ministries involved in the project previously received a grant from INTERREG II C to prepare an Action Plan for implementation of the VASAB strategy adopted in 1994. The project was called VASAB Plus and ended in 2000. The EWW used the VASAB Plus experience but its focus was different. This time the target geographical area was the NW Russia and its integration to the BSR. The lesson learned under the VASAB Plus (where Russia had no financial resources for analysis) showed that preparation of a pan-Baltic documents with very differentiate resources

might result in uneven involvement of the countries and then uneven ownership of the agreed actions or strategies. Therefore the EWW was invented to avoid such a mistake and to give Russian colleagues resources for considering their role in the BSR integration.

40. Visibility

How is the visibility of the EU contribution being ensured in the Action?

At the project start a press release was done by the Responsible Partner. Visibility was ensured by placing proper information that the EWW project was part-financed by the EU together with the EU logo and logo of INTERREG III B. This was done on printing materials, power point presentation and on the project web site. There was also some information in the Latvian radio. On demand of Russian colleagues the project was presented at the Conference “Baltic Sea Region Programme 2007-2013: new partnership opportunities for Russian and Belarusian regions” in St. Petersburg as one of the most successful INTERREG projects with Russian participation. To strengthen the project visibility a special project banner was produced and displayed on many occasions (e.g. Conference “Baltic Sea region Spatial Development Policies avenues to the Long Term Perspective” in Riga on 23 April 2007, and already mentioned conference “Baltic Sea Region Programme 2007-2013: new partnership opportunities for Russian and Belarusian regions” in St. Petersburg on 16-17 April 2008 and in many other events). The book with the project analysis and recommendations was printed in December 2008. But the most important is that the project results will be used for producing “Long Term Perspective” for the BSR which will be presented to CBSS and all important pan-Baltic organizations. Thanks to EWW NW Russia will be properly highlighted in this strategy.

The European Commission may wish to publicise the results of Actions. Do you have any objection to this report being published on Europe Aid Co-operation Office website? If so, please state your objections here.

Name of the contact person for the Action: **Vladislavs Vesperis**

Signature:Location: **Riga, Latvia**

Date report due:Date report sent:

Update of action plan

Activity	Months																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Activity 1: Kick off of the work of Working Group no 1 on business development and innovation affecting spatial development,	X	X	X	X														
Activity 2: Analysis(WG1)				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Activity 3: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR (WG1)					X						X						X	
Activity 4: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations and action plan (WG1)					X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Activity 5: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 2 on accessibility				X														
Activity 6: Analysis(WG2)					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Activity 7: Pilot studies (WG2)												X	X	X	X	X		
Activity 8: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR					X						X						X	X
Activity 9: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG2)					X	X		X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Activity 10: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 3 on ICZM and transnational sea use planning		X			X													
Activity 11 Analysis (WG 3)					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					
Activity 12 Pilot Action (WG 3)					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
Activity 13: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR					X						X						X	
Activity 14: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG3)					X			X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		

EWV events: participation of man and woman

Participants			
Event	Woman	Man	Total
Kick off meeting of the work of WG1, on 25 June 2007 in Riga	9	11	20
WG1 meeting 25 September 2007 in Riga	4	3	7
WG1 analysis (people involved)	11	23	34
Steering Group meeting on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg	7	11	18
St Petersburg kick off conference on 18-19 October 2007	112	146	259
St Petersburg Closing conference on 21 October 2008	231	400	631
WG1 second meeting on 6-7 December 2007 in Riga	9	10	19
Synergy meeting no.1 on 31 January 2008 in Riga	10	13	23
Steering Group Meeting no.2 on 1 February 2008 in Riga	4	11	15
Synergy meeting no 2 in Liepaja on 14 th of March 2008	8	8	16
WG1 fourth meeting on 3-4 April 2008 in Riga	6	7	13
Riga Stakeholders seminars (WG3 and WG1 + WG2) on 23 April 2008	83	84	167
WG1 fifth meeting on 24 April 2008 in Riga	13	12	25
Steering Group Meeting no. 3 on 20 May 2008 in Riga	4	6	10
Steering Group Meeting no. 4 on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg	3	10	13
WG1 sixth meeting on 3 rd September 2008 in Jurmala	11	11	22
WG2 first meeting on 10 October 2007 in Riga	3	6	9
WG2 analysis	6	11	17
WG2 second meeting on 5 December 2007 in Riga	4	7	11
WG2 third meeting on 21 May 2008 in Riga	2	7	9
WG2 fourth meeting on 4 th September 2008 in Jurmala	9	11	20
WG3 preparatory meeting on 24 July 2007 in Kaliningrad	4	10	14
WG 3 first meeting on 30-31 October 2007 in Kaliningrad	12	15	27
WG3 analysis	3	11	14
Pilot Action (WG 3)	3	10	13
WG3 second meeting on 27-28 March 2008 in Kaliningrad	6	13	19
WG3 third meeting on 4-5 June 2008 in Gdańsk	6	15	21
WG3 fourth meeting 2 September 2008 in Gdańsk	3	11	14

Quotations from the Conference resolutions (in Russian) in direct relations to the EAST West Window.

19. Kick Off Conference

Продвижение европейского опыта в рамках программ Европейского Инструмента Соседства и Партнерства усилит инновационный потенциал и влияние Северо-Западного региона России на процессы территориальной интеграции на внешних границах ЕС, в частности, в регионе Балтийского моря. В этих целях целесообразна активизация участия России в таких международных объединениях, как VASAB 2010, Балтийский форум развития (BDF), Программа транснационального сотрудничества региона Балтийского моря 2007-2013.

Зарубежный опыт свидетельствует о значительной роли малых и средних городов в продвижении инноваций и гармонизации территориального развития. Этот факт должен учитываться при разработке инновационных стратегий в России как на федеральном, так и на региональном уровнях. Необходимо уделять больше внимания развитию малых и средних городов, как это происходит в странах ЕС, и адаптировать европейский опыт применительно к ситуации в России (в частности, концепцию сельско-городского партнерства «ESDP Concept of Rural-Urban Partnership»). Доступ к знаниям и информации, возможность обмена идеями должны стать основой формирования территориальных моделей развития России.

/.../

Участники Форума согласились со следующим:

- необходимо особое единое государственное управление морскими прибрежными зонами страны (обеими их составляющими: морской и сухопутной) исходя из повсеместного успешного мирового опыта подобной деятельности и соответствующих рекомендаций организаций системы ООН и международных форумов на высшем уровне. Руководствуясь этим, рекомендовать: 1) создание нормативной правовой и институциональной базы для разработки и реализации комплексных программ развития и управления прибрежными зонами в рамках комплексных программ социально-экономического развития приморских субъектов Федерации и программ развития прибрежных муниципальных образований в целях активизации участия последних в освоении прибрежных и морских ресурсов; 2) адаптацию и освоение современных управленческих технологий (методология Комплексного управления прибрежными зонами (КУПЗ)) в применении к богатейшим по ресурсам и разнообразным по природным и социально-экономическим условиям прибрежным зонам страны; 3) разработку и реализацию пилотных программ КУПЗ конкретных побережий страны; 4) использование опыта сотрудничества стран Балтийского региона, в частности рекомендаций Проекта BaltCoast BSR INTERREG III B по управлению прибрежными зонами и разработке совместных стратегических проектов;
- рекомендовать использование кластерного подхода в качестве инструмента реализации стратегий развития территорий и повышения конкурентоспособности региональной и муниципальной экономики, включая выявление и диагностику потенциальных кластеров, разработку программ их развития, создание организаций по сотрудничеству. В органах власти необходимо формирование межотраслевых рабочих групп для координации развития кластеров и снятия ведомственных и отраслевых ограничений. Целесообразно более широкое использование международных программ и инструментов повышения конкурентоспособности кластеров;
- необходимо развитие региональной и муниципальной статистики, в частности для целей выработки эффективной кластерной политики и оценки результатов реализации кластерных инициатив в регионе и/или муниципалитете, формирования действенных

инструментов планирования и управления, ориентированного на результат на субфедеральных уровнях;

- при реализации федеральных, региональных и местных программ экономического развития необходимо стимулировать участие организаций инновационной инфраструктуры в российских и зарубежных сетевых организациях, которые оказывают содействие в предоставлении услуг компаниям и научным организациям в сфере инновационной бизнес-кооперации и трансфера технологий (примерами могут служить Российская сеть трансфера технологий RTTN, Европейская сеть бизнес-инновационных центров EBN). Участие в сетевом сотрудничестве должно быть нацелено на повышение качества и содержания услуг для местных компаний и НИИ. Федеральным и региональным органам власти необходимо поддерживать инициативы по развитию сетевого взаимодействия между организациями инновационной региональной инфраструктуры (создание региональных сетей) с целью уменьшения дублирования функций, повышения качества услуг и снижения расходов бюджета на их субсидирование;
- рекомендовать и стимулировать участие российских центров коммерциализации, инновационных центров в реализации Competitiveness Innovation Program (CIP) Европейского союза в части проектов, ориентированных на развитие инновационных сетей и сетей трансфера технологий (IRC, IRE, EBN и др.);
- считать целесообразным использование в России европейского опыта реализации региональных инновационных стратегий, обеспечивающих выявление спроса на инновации среди компаний и ориентацию научного сектора и инновационной инфраструктуры на удовлетворение этого спроса. (...);
- в целях совершенствования государственного и муниципального управления по обеспечению перехода Российской Федерации на инновационный путь развития рекомендовать Комиссии при Президенте Российской Федерации по вопросам совершенствования государственного управления и правосудия, Министерству регионального развития Российской Федерации, другим заинтересованным федеральным и региональным органам власти осуществить экспертизу полномочий органов государственной власти субъектов Российской Федерации и органов местного самоуправления в части выявления проблемных вопросов, препятствующих обеспечению перехода России на режим инновационного развития, и законодательно обеспечить активизацию участия в реализации государственной научно-технической политики органов государственной власти субъектов Федерации и органов местного самоуправления, рассмотреть возможность разработки национальной программы, ориентированной на содействие российским регионам в подготовке и реализации региональных инновационных стратегий и формирование российской сети инновационных регионов;
- рекомендовать заинтересованным федеральным и региональным органам государственной власти реализовать систему мер по поддержке технопарков и процессов коммерциализации научных разработок. В частности: разработать законодательную базу для развития технопарков на федеральном уровне; предоставить налоговые льготы компаниям-резидентам технопарков, например, аналогичные льготам для резидентов ОЭЗ; упростить процедуру предоставления земельных участков для технопарков; законодательно разрешить НИИ, вузам и университетам создавать малые предприятия - start-up'ы;
- рекомендовать органам регионального и муниципального управления активно использовать инструменты международной технической и финансовой помощи, предоставляемой по линии Института Всемирного Банка, АМР США, Европейского Инструмента Соседства и Партнерства (ENPI) и других программ Европейского Союза для реализации стратегических приоритетов и планов территориального развития, поддержки инноваций;
- отметить необходимость выработки механизма интеграции документов стратегического планирования муниципального, регионального и федерального уровней;
- одобрить инициативы Комитета по пространственному развитию региона Балтийского моря (CSD/BSR) VASAB 2010 по территориальной интеграции Северо-Запада России и реализации совместных проектов в таких приоритетных сферах как развитие бизнеса, транспорта, ИКТ, управление прибрежными зонами. Отметить актуальность проекта «Окно

Восток-Запад", который позволит восполнить пробелы в оценке инновационного потенциала Северо-Запада России и расширит возможности синергии инновационных потенциалов стран Балтийского региона.

- предложить Комитету VASAB 2010 использовать Форум лидеров стратегического планирования городов и регионов России в качестве референтной группы для обсуждения Стратегии пространственного развития региона Балтийского моря.

20. Closing Conference

20.1. «Перспективы развития Северо-Западного федерального округа: вызовы, приоритеты, угрозы и ограничения»

Участники рекомендуют:

- 28) в целях максимального учёта сложившихся межсубъектовых экономических связей, обеспечения увязки общегосударственных и региональных планов и прогнозов социально-экономического развития, целесообразно предусмотреть **разработку стратегических документов долгосрочного социально-экономического развития на уровне федеральных округов**. Для преодоления ведомственной и региональной разобщённости целесообразно поручить эту работу Ассоциациям экономического взаимодействия соответствующих федеральных округов. Это позволит точнее формулировать цели регионального развития в увязке с имеющимися общими ресурсами, объективно сформировать перечень основных межрегиональных проектов, обеспечивающих достижение общих целей развития. Подобные документы могут стать основой для последующей разработки Концепции долгосрочного социально-экономического развития Российской Федерации;
- 29) для ускорения социально-экономического развития территорий требуется **активизация межрегионального взаимодействия**. Зачастую депрессивные регионы (субъекты Федерации) экономически тесно связаны с успешными регионами (транспортные подходы к инфраструктурным объектам, наличие сырьевой базы для обрабатывающих производств и т.п.). В этом случае целесообразно оказывать федеральную помощь (налоговые и иные льготы, государственные гарантии под привлекаемые кредиты, первоочередное финансирование проектов в рамках действующих ФЦП и др.) для инфраструктурного развития депрессивных территорий по поддерживаемым видам и направлениям экономической деятельности, а также для реализации проектов способствующих комплексному развитию двух и более субъектов Федерации;
- 30) необходимым условием развития и Северо-Западного федерального округа и страны в целом является **совершенствование работы транспортного комплекса**. Требуется системный подход к формированию единой стратегии развития транспортно-логистического комплекса страны в увязке с развитием отраслей экономики и внешнеэкономической ситуацией.

20.2. «Специфика стратегий приморских регионов»

Участники считают, что

- 28) Необходимо совершенствование стратегического планирования применительно к морской деятельности и приморским регионам и муниципалитетам, предусматривающее:

на федеральном уровне:

- применение интегральных подходов к планированию и управлению в морском природопользовании. Это позволит преодолеть фрагментарность, присущую отраслевому подходу, учесть взаимосвязанность видов морского природопользования, способствовать связям и межотраслевой гармонизации в морской деятельности исходя из анализа конфликтного использования ресурсов, обеспечить многоцелевую ориентацию и соответствие

деятельности природоохранным целям, участие всех заинтересованных сторон в разработке стратегий и программ развития;

- создание нормативной правовой и институциональной базы для разработки и реализации комплексных программ развития и управления прибрежными зонами, основанных на интегральных подходах, в рамках стратегий и программ социально-экономического развития приморских субъектов Федерации и программ развития прибрежных муниципальных образований. Это позволит реализовать особое единое государственное управление морскими прибрежными зонами страны (обеими их составляющими: морской и сухопутной) исходя из повсеместного успешного мирового опыта подобной деятельности и соответствующих рекомендаций организаций системы ООН и международных форумов на высшем уровне;

на региональном уровне:

- адаптацию и освоение современных управленческих технологий (методология Комплексного управления прибрежными зонами - КУПЗ) в применении к богатейшим по ресурсам и разнообразным по природным и социально-экономическим условиям прибрежным зонам страны;
- разработку и реализацию пилотных программ КУПЗ конкретных побережий страны.

Реализация этих мер позволит реализовать естественные природные конкурентные преимущества морских акваторий и прибрежных территорий в обеспечении дополнительного экономического роста, конкурентоспособности, инвестиционной привлекательности, занятости, повышения комфортности и качества жизни, охраны окружающей среды и уменьшения ущерба от природных и техногенных катастроф, а также безопасности страны

- 29) Необходимо совершенствование нормативной правовой базы, регулирующей градостроительную деятельность, в части учета специфики этой деятельности на морских акваториях, находящихся под суверенитетом и юрисдикцией Российской Федерации.
- 30) Необходимо развивать международное сотрудничество в стратегическом планировании морского природопользования, учитывая единство и экосистемный характер морских процессов, и широко использовать международный опыт в этой сфере.

FINAL NARRATIVE REPORT

41. Description

41.1. Name of beneficiary of grant contract: Ministry of Regional Development and Local Government, Latvia (Reģionālās attīstības un pašvaldību lietu ministrija).

41.2. Name and title of the Contact person: Mr Vladislavs Vesperis.

41.3. Name of partners in the Action: St. Petersburg Administration (Администрация Губернатора Санкт-Петербурга) [2], Russian Economic Developers Association (ASSET) (Ассоциация специалистов по экономическому развитию территорий) [3], Immanuel Kant State University of Russia (Российский государственный университет имени И. Канта) [4], Ministry of the Environment, Danish Forest and Nature Agency⁴¹, Denmark (Miljøministeriet, Skov- og Naturstyrelsen) [5], Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Housing, Germany (Bundesministeriums für Verkehr, Bau und Stadtentwicklung) [6], Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communication, Sweden (Näringsdepartementet) [7], Nordic Centre for Spatial Development (NORDREGIO) [8], Ministry of Regional Development, Poland (Ministerstwo Rozwoju Regionalnego) [9], Maritime Institute, Poland (Instytut Morski) [10].

41.4. Title of the Action: East-West Window (EWW).

41.5. Contract number: Grant Contract for European Community External Actions **2007/132-845**.

41.6. Start date and end date of the reporting period⁴²: 15.06.2007 – 15.12.2008.

41.7. Target country(ies) or region(s): **North-West Russia in particular: St. Petersburg, Leningrad region and Kaliningrad region**; to some extent also Belarus and North-West Russia adjacent countries (mainly for collecting good practices and dissemination of the project results).

41.8. Final beneficiaries &/or target groups⁴³ (if different). The target audience/recipients of the project findings are: decision-makers (ministries responsible for spatial planning and development in the BSR, including the federal government in Russia, regional authorities in

⁴¹ The name of the partner 5 was changed during the EWW project execution **from** Ministry of the Environment, Danish Forest and Nature agency **to** Ministry of the Environment, Agency for Spatial and Environmental Planning (Miljøministeriet, By- og Landskabsstyrelsen).

⁴² The entire implementation period of the Action

⁴³ “Target groups” are the groups/entities who will be directly positively affected by the project at the Project Purpose level, and “final beneficiaries” are those who will benefit from the project in the long term at the level of the society or sector at large.

NW Russia, pan-Baltic organisations such as VASAB 2010). The final beneficiaries are local and regional governments in the Baltic Sea region (BSR) operators in the chosen thematic fields (e.g. businesses in WP1 and transport operators in WP2) in NW Russia and in the BSR. The divide into men and women of different project activities is provided separately.

41.9. Country (ies) in which the activities take place (if different from 1.7): Russia (St. Petersburg and Kaliningrad Oblast), Poland and Latvia.

42. Assessment of implementation of Action activities

42.1. Activities and results (for the whole reporting period including last narrative interim report)

Activity 1: Kick off of the work of Working Group no 1 on business development and innovation affecting spatial development,

1.31. First meeting of the WG1 (1 day) took place on 25 June 2007 in Riga which was according to the schedule. The meeting was planned in advance in late June so participants postponed their holidays which in this part of the BSR starts with so called Midsummer. The meeting was attended by 12 participants representing partners 1,3,4,5,6,8,9,10 and eight invited guests. The main aim was to discuss the analysis and further WG1 work in detail, to achieve clarity about division of labour between the partners, to make sure that duplication with other project is avoided (instead to aim at using results achieved by other projects) and to start the process of contracting the external experts. The following outputs were produced or achieved:

- Report how to avoid duplication with other INTERREG III B projects in the field of business development and innovation affecting spatial development had been prepared before the meeting by the project coordinator, discussed by the meeting and delivered to the Responsible (Lead) Partner.
- TORs for seven ASSET staff members, eight Kaliningrad University staff members, one Belarus expert and four external experts together with tender documentation (if necessary) have been prepared by project coordinator as result of the meeting. Tender procedures for the four external experts had been started resulting in contracting one external expert from Poland, one from Sweden, one from Latvia and one from Denmark. In addition the Belarus expert was contracted by the partner no. 8 without tender (contract below 5000 Euro).
- The main scope of analysis was proposed and discussed. Unfortunately too many question marks and uncertainties appeared during the June meeting so the additional meeting was organized in Riga in September and discussion on analysis continued till the second WG1 meeting (December 2007).
- Text for EWW section at to the VASAB website was decided, technically EWW link at VASAB website was created in September 2007.
- Project flyer was designed and edited including information on WG1 activities (300 copies were printed in October 2007).

Comments: The WG1 started the discussion on its work (i.e. necessary analysis, results to be achieved) but the topic was too broad for one day meeting in addition to many technical questions were raised. The decision was to continue the discussion when the experts contracted by tender would be available. The main problem was to what extend the achievement of the EWW goal (i.e. *to promote territorial integration of NW Russia into the BSR in the field of business development*)

required concentration on analysis concerning exclusively NW Russia and to what extent the broader BSR picture was necessary if integration should mean reciprocal relations (i.e. affecting both sides). The latter opinion prevailed and was accepted by the meeting. The WG1 considered that for producing the main output of the analytical phase (i.e. a *compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") with assessment of unexploited innovation potential in NW Russia, assessment of the potential for regional integration and with identification of spatial problems in NW Russia and BSR*) some BSR analysis as the background material should be done as well. The meeting also discussed the policy related role of the project i.e. better highlighting the EWW results on NW Russia role in the “Long Term Perspective” to be prepared by VASAB on CBSS demand. The WG1 leaders promised to ensure smooth transfer of the EWW results to the BSR strategy i.e. Long Term Perspective till 2030 (to be prepared by VASAB in 2009). The Responsible Partner declared that he would invite VASAB Secretariat to the most important meetings of the EWW to ensure smooth transfer of the project results to the “Long Term Perspective”.

- 1.32. Partnership Agreement Preparation. This action was related to all work packages and took place in June, July, August, and September 2007 and was ended in October 2007 with signing partnership agreements between Lead Partner and all other partners of the EWW project. The most difficult was signing Partnership Agreement with partners from St. Petersburg due to problems related to tax and system in Russia, conversion of EUR into rubels, banking system requirements etc. Finally two agreements, based on the results of additional working meeting (in Riga) discussions, were prepared and signed between Lead Partner and RU (ASSET) Partner and between German Partner and RU (ASSET) Partner. So at the end of the day there were 9 partnership agreements signed regulating relations between the EWW partners.
- 1.33. Quality Workshop (1 day) for Project leaders organised by INTERREG III B Secretariat and EU Delegation from Moscow in Riga on 26 September 2007 was attended by project coordinator (partner no.10), one representative of Russian partners (partner no.2) and representatives appointed by the Responsible Partner. Main guidelines from EC Delegation and INTERREG III B Secretariat on TACIS rules, payments schemes and communication experiences were presented during the seminar and later on at individual consultations. The meeting between Responsible Partner and the Russian partners was organized back to back with the workshop for discussing main technicalities of their participation in the project.

Activity 2: Analysis(WG1)

- 2.21. WG1 additional meeting (1 day) took place on 25 September 2007 in Riga to continue discussion on the scope of analysis. The meeting was attended by four WG1 members (including two external experts, project coordinator and the representative of the Russian partners) and three participants representing Responsible Partner. At the meeting in depth discussion on case studies on innovation, outsourcing and urban-rural relations in Russia took place and the detailed scope of the work of Russian partners and external experts were agreed. Also a draft outline structure of the WG1 analytical report was presented by the WG1 Coordinator and discussed in depth.
- 2.22. Data collection and interpretation started only in December 2007 after the second WG1 meeting. In this phase 34 people from all partners were involved (except partner no.7 who acted through partner no. 8). Their involvement differed. The main bulk of analytical work was done by partners no. 3, 4 and 8 and the external experts whereas the other people acted mainly as a reference group reading reports, making comments and asking for improvements. This was the task first of all of partners no. 1, 2, 5, 6, 9 and 10 representing mainly policy making side in the project and project coordination. Also VASAB Secretariat was invited by partner 1 (Responsible Partner) to participate in this process. The analysis (data collection) in principle were ended in March 2008 but some of them (requiring surveys) due to formal reasons (tenders) were completed in April 2008. Interpretation of data was

done in April 2008 for all important cases (but some analysis e.g. the benchmarking studies and urban-rural analysis continued till September 2008). In fact in April and even in May and June the fine tuning of analysis (removing mistakes noticed by the other partners) still continued. The reason was that some partners from the reference group were very demanding asking for many improvements even if they had found little inconsistencies after second or third reading of the reports. Therefore the final synthesis report (draft discussion paper) from the analytical phase was completed only in July 2008 and even slightly changed after the WG1 September 2008 meeting and as the result of the EWW final/closing Conference in October 2008.

The outputs have been following:

(i) interim:

- Data (including public surveys) and draft analytical report on “Baltic” metropolitan areas with focus on the role of Kaliningrad and St. Petersburg;
- In depth study on St. Petersburg and Kaliningrad and their developmental potentials in the BSR context (focus on innovation and outsourcing) in which: trends and present policies for innovations nested in NW Russia and outsourcing were analysed, barriers for innovations perceived by business and public administration were identified (based on surveys), and cases on transfer of innovations between NW Russia and other parts of the BSR were described;
- Case studies (reports) on Russian and Belarus small and medium sized cities – covering: Novgorod, Gatchina, Chernyakhovsk, Gusev, Sovetsk, Svetly, Berezovka, Zaslavl;
- Reports on demographic trends in North-West Russia, in St. Petersburg and in Kaliningrad and in Belarus as well;
- Reports on case studies on urban-rural relations in Russia;
- Report on INTERREG III B projects results relevant for work of the WG1 group;
- Benchmarking studies concerning situation in Poland, Germany and Latvia on the issues relevant for the WG1 recommendations .

(ii) A compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") with assessment of unexploited innovation potential in NW Russia, assessment of the potential for regional integration and with identification of spatial problems in NW Russia and BSR.

Comments:

a) All the planned outcomes were achieved. However, during the analytical phase became clear that for the NW Russia innovation is more promising path for integration within the BSR than outsourcing, therefore more efforts were done to analyse this challenge. The list of outputs was enlarged (in comparison to the planned ones) by analysis of the role of the NW Russia in the BSR context (as the result of the WG1 discussions what analysis are necessary to achieve the EWW goal). Also urban structures and functional urban areas of not only large but also some small cities were analysed. The most interesting case appeared to be Gatchina as an example of science intensive cluster in Russia located in a small city. The some other cases illustrated urban-rural relations in Russia (and Belarus).

b) While working with data it became clear that translating data into policy recommendations can not be done by each working group separately. Therefore at the meeting of the WG leaders in December it was proposed that for the starting work on recommendation a workshop for all WGs would be necessary. The Responsible Partner was asked to organize such a workshop on 31st of January 2008 instead of simple WG1 seminar (planned for that date).

c) The work was delayed by some formal constraints such as tender procedures, requirement of separate EUR accounts (very difficult for Ministries) etc.

Activity 3: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR (WG1)

- 3.1. Kick off Conference of the project (1,5 day) for broad public took place on 18-19 October 2007 (according schedule) in St. Petersburg as a part of the well known VI Forum of Strategic Planning Leaders of Cities and Regions of Russia. This allowed project to reach the planned target group. The project: its assumptions and the planned outputs were presented to the Russian decision makers - mainly city mayors and chief planners. Conference participants expressed a deep hope that EWW project would diminish knowledge gaps within the Baltic Sea Region on the character of development potential of the NW Russia, its synergies and complementarities with potentials of other countries of the region, and on methods how this potential could be efficiently connected within the BSR. It was expressed in Conference recommendations that EWW project results should be presented in 2008 at the final Conference within VII Forum of Strategic Planning Leaders of Cities and Regions of Russia. The kick off conference was attended by 259 participants mainly Russian mayors and city planners. Among them there were 57 persons outside Russia. From EWW project 20 persons participated including Latvian State Secretary representing the Responsible Partner. So EWW reached the planned target of **200** Russian decision makers and professionals involved in discussion on the project.
- 3.2. Stakeholder Seminar for WG1 (0,5 day) was organised on 23 April 2008 in Riga (instead of beginning of May as originally planned). The preliminary results of the analytical phase were presented and the first discussions on the recommendations were started. The seminars for all working groups of EWW were arranged back to back with the VASAB annual conference financed by the Latvian Ministry of Regional Development and Local Government from its own means i.e. outside the EWW budget (from the EWW budget some partners only covered their travelling to the EWW seminars). The described above arrangement resulted in very impressive participation in the seminars and allowed to reach a planned target of **100** decision makers and businessman from BSR EU countries involved in discussion of the project findings and recommendations. The conference and seminars were attended by 167 participants including 26 persons directly involved in the EWW project (although the Responsible Partner was represented by some more employees). The participants came mainly from Latvia, Lithuania, and Finland but also from Azerbaijan, Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, EU Commission, Germany, Hungary, Norway, Poland, Russia and Sweden.
- 3.3. Closing(final) Conference of the project (1 day) for broad public took place on 21st October 2008 (according schedule) in St. Petersburg. The title of the conference was “Promoting territorial integration of the North West Russia into the Baltic Sea Region”. The main organiser was ASEET together with the EWW Responsible Partner. This Conference was a part of rich spectrum of the conferences and seminars taking place under umbrella (the same premises) of the VII All-Russia Forum of Strategic Planning Leaders “Strategic Planning in Regions and Cities of Russia”. In the event 631 participants took place out of it 582 from Russia. The forum was organized by: State Duma of the Russian Federation; Ministry for Regional Development of the Russian Federation; Ministry for Economic Development of the Russian Federation; St Petersburg City Administration; Center of Strategic Research; IS CER Leontief Centre. It was opened by Mr Dmitry Kozak, Minister of Regional Development, who underlined that “Forum is becoming the public debating platform for improving the strategic planning system of social and economic development in Russian regions”. The Conference “Promoting territorial integration of the North West Russia into the Baltic Sea region” was composed of four sessions attended by large number of the participants not only from Russia but also from other Baltic Sea Region countries. Some sessions were joint ventures with other organisations, forums and bodies interested in the subjects raised by the EWW project. The names of the sessions were following:
 - “Accessibility and innovations as motors of integration of the NW Russia into the Baltic Sea Region” (presentation of the results of the WG1 and the WG2),

- “Special Features of coastal regional strategies” (presentation of the WG3 results and dialogue with all key persons in Russia dealing with ICZM and maritime spatial planning),
- “Partnership mechanisms in local economic policy implementation” (presentation of the WG1 results with regard to urban-rural partnership).

In addition to that EWW results were presented at the key session of the Forum “Prospects for Federal Okrug Development: Challenges, priorities, threats and constraints. North-West Federal Okrug” attended by key decision makers from the North-West Federal Okrug.

Comments:

The choice of the formula of the kick-off and closing conferences appeared to have very positive results on ability of the project to deliver results to the key target groups in Russia. The Conference was also attended by the Ministerial partners from the EWW project. The EWW results were mirrored in the Forums resolutions. Some interested questions were raised requiring further discussion and examination.

- 3.4. Final publication The book summing up the results of the investigations available for the stakeholders in Kaliningrad and St.Petersburg was edited in October, November and printed in December 2008 by partner no.4.

Comments:

The number of books published was smaller (100) than assumed in the application (400), although the whole budget allocated to this purpose was used. There were several reasons why the printing was more expensive than expected. Some of them were of technical reasons: i.e. the book had more coloured pictures (maps) than estimated and was thicker than planned (more than 300 pages in comparison to 150 pages planned), but the main reason was of vis mayor nature. In 2008 in Russia an unexpected inflation and economic crisis appeared which could not be taken into account at the stage of budget planning. This resulted in much higher printing costs. However, the partner no.4 is ready to print additional copies of the book if demanded. The available copies will be distributed to the most active in the EWW Russian stakeholders and to the project partners of the EWW.

Activity 4: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations and action plan (WG1)

- 4.1. Steering Group Meeting (1 day) took place on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg according to schedule. The meeting was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1,2,3,5,6,7,9,10 and seven invited guests. The Steering Group discussed the project progress. The work was lagging behind the schedule. Although the WG1 started on time it became involved in lengthy discussions about the necessary scope of analysis and detailed division of labour between working groups. The Steering Group decided therefore not to start the work on recommendations before improving synergy between the work of the working groups. This task was given to the meeting of the WGs leaders organised in Riga back to back with the WG2 (5 December 2007) and the WG1 (6-7 December 2007) meetings. The meeting also discussed details of project presentation to the kick-off conference held next day.
- 4.2. WG1 second meeting (1,5 day) took place on 6-7 December 2007 in Riga (instead of late November). The meeting was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10, two external consultants and six invited guests. The meeting concentrated on discussing analytical phase of the project (the decision was that the lagging behind analysis would make necessary to postpone by two months the next WG1 meeting i.e. till the end of analytical phase). However, the WG 1 also started examining the way of preparation of the recommendations out of the analysis conducted. For the starting work on recommendation it was agreed that a workshop for all WGs would be necessary and the

Responsible Partner was asked to organize such a workshop (synergy meeting) on 31st of January 2008 instead of a simple WG1 seminar (scheduled for beginning of February).

- 4.3. Synergy meeting no.1 (1 day) took place in Riga on 31 of January 2008 (replacing the WG1 seminar scheduled for February). It was attended by fourteen project partner members representing partners no.1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, three external experts and six invited guests. The facilitator was hired by the Responsible Partner. During the meeting the participants agreed that all three working groups were in need of a common frame. This should be given by the vision of the BSR till 2030 with full integration of the North-West Russia. The participants managed to prepare an outline of such a vision requiring further work. The meeting asked for one more working day for finishing common visionary frame which should allow preparing meaningful recommendations.
- 4.4. Steering Group Meeting 2 took place on 1 of February 2008 in Riga. It was attended by seven project partner members representing partners no. 1,3,5,6,7, 9, 10 one external expert and seven invited guests. The results of the synergy meeting were discussed i.e. synergy between the work of the working groups. It was decided to organise one more synergy meeting to continue work on the common frame for all WGs, i.e. vision of the BSR till 2030 with full integration of the North-West Russia. An agenda of the April Conference proposed by the Responsible Partner was discussed together with some technical issues. The progress in analytical phase was reviewed.
- 4.5. Synergy meeting no. 2 (1 day) took place in Liepaja on 14th of March 2008. It was attended by ten project partner members representing partners no. 1,3,5,6,9, 10 one external expert and five invited guests. The facilitator was hired by the Responsible Partner but paid from Responsible Partner own means. The final draft of the vision was discussed and shared by participants giving stable frame for analytical part and allowing proper work on recommendations.
- 4.6. WG1 fourth meeting (1 day) took place on 3-4 April 2008 in Riga. It was attended by nine project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 8, 10, two external experts and two invited guests. The meeting was convened on demand of Russian partners who started finalisation of analytical part and wanted to discuss the preliminary results among themselves. It was also important for conceptualization of the recommendations i.e. discussing what findings from analytical phase should be taken into consideration while working on recommendations.
- 4.7 WG1 fifth meeting (one day) took place on 24 April 2008 in Riga. It was attended by fifteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, four external experts and six invited guests. The WG1 before the meeting concentrated mainly on analytical work. At the fifth meeting analyses were summed up and the work on recommendations were started. However, one more meeting was requested (autumn 2008) in order to discuss the final draft of the recommendations and action programme. Due to delay in the work on urban-rural relations in Russia the relevant reports were not presented to the WG1 at this meeting. Only an overview of the progress and main findings were reported. It was decided that for synergy reasons the reports would be presented on seminar on urban-rural relations in Russia to be organised as a joint event with the SeBCo project in Kaliningrad in June 2008. This was realised and such presentation took place and was regarded as a great success by meeting participants.
- 4.8. Steering Group Meeting 3 (one day) took place on 20 May 2008 in Riga. It was attended by five project partner members representing partners no. 1, 5, 9, 10, and five invited guests. The Steering Group discussed the project progress. The results of the second synergy meeting and the April Conference were examined as well as a draft vision of the BSR till 2030 with full integration of the North-West Russia. The Steering Group decided to close analytical part and start the work on recommendations. However, the WG3 leaders asked for additional benchmark study on the results of the INTERREG projects in the field of competences of the WG3 with focus on the German experience. This was to diminish discrepancies between the WGs, since the WG1 and the WG2 already had such type of

expertises included in their work. The problems with travelling budget of Russian partners were discussed once more together with a problem of disappeared financial manager. The Steering Group also continued a discussion on political use of the EWW results i.e. incorporation of the results into the Long Term Perspective of VASAB to be produced in 2009. The output achieved:

- first draft recommendation papers (in outline format) of WG1 and WG2.

4.9. WG1 sixth meeting (one day) took place on 03 September 2008 in Jurmala. It was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, four external experts and seven invited guests. They discussed the final draft of the recommendations and action programme prepared during holiday time 2008 by ASSET, Immanuel Kant State University of Russia (Kaliningrad), Nordregio staff, and external experts. The whole work on urban-rural relations in Russia the relevant analytic reports were presented to the WG1 at this meeting as well. The WG1 discussed and improved the following documents:

- Recommendations how to improve innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Recommendations how to improve settlement policies in NW Russia (urban rural partnership) from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Action plan how to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration.

4.10. Steering Group Meeting 4 (one day) took place on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg. It was attended by 7 project partner members representing partners no. 2, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10 one external expert and 6 invited guests. The group discussed the shape of final publications of the EWW project, the use of the analytical materials and endorsed the recommendations and action proposed by the project. The main discussion was on the proper use of the EWW results for the Long Term Perspective (LTP) of VASAB elaboration of which was started few month ago (August 2008). The EWW results were placed to the different parts of the LTP outcomes. The VASAB consultant responsible for facilitating the LTP process was invited to the Steering Group meeting. It was also discussed how to use EWW outcomes for the process of preparation of the BSR EU Strategy. The partner no.5 arranged a meeting with the EU Commission on that topic. It was decided that the EWW results would be incorporated in the VASAB non-paper to be presented to the EU Commission in November/December 2008 in order to influence strategy preparation. The outputs achieved (as results of the meeting):

- Final draft of the recommendations how to improve innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Final draft of recommendations how to improve settlement policies in NW Russia (urban rural partnership) from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Final draft of the action plan how to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration,
- Final draft of recommendations on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR including concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR,
- Final action plan how to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational sea use planning and ICZM,
- Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic,
- Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application,
- Forwarding (transferring of EWW results) to important BSR processes namely: EU BSR Strategy and VASAB Long Term Perspective.

Activity 5: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 2 on accessibility

5.1. WG2 first meeting (one day) took place on 10 October 2007 in Riga It was attended by five project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 8, 10, one external expert and three

invited guests. The main aim was to discuss the scope of analysis (concrete meaning of accessibility) and the further work of the WG2 step by step, to achieve clarity about division of labour between the partners, to make sure that duplication with other project was avoided (instead to aim at using results achieved by other projects) and to start the process of contracting the external experts. The following outputs were produced or achieved:

- Report how to avoid duplication with other INTERREG III B projects in the field of accessibility was prepared by the project coordinator, discussed at the meeting and accepted by the Responsible Partner;
- TORs for four Kaliningrad University staff members, one Belarus expert and TORs for three external experts together with tender documentation (if necessary) have been prepared and approved. Procurement and contracting procedures for the one external expert was finished in September. Two other experts were also contracted (latter on);
- The main scope of analysis were proposed and discussed. The discussion on analysis continued among the partners (by e-mails) till the second WG2 meeting (December 2007);
- EWW link at the VASAB website was created (see activity 1.1);
- The content of the project flyer was loaded by short information about the WG2 activities.

Comments: The WG2 started its work behind the schedule. Due to the late project start (mid of June 2007), the first period of the project coincided with a holiday season. Therefore the real work of the WG2 (by phone, e-mails etc) started only in September 2007 i.e. three month later than planned. In addition to that, for some partners it was very inconvenient (e.g. celebrations of anniversary of establishment of the Kaliningrad University) and this postponed the start of formal work by one or two month further on i.e. till October 2007. In the meantime the preparation of the WG2 detailed analysis was started. To this end a pre meeting on 22nd of August 2007 was organised (partners 1, 7,8) to prepare tentative proposals on the substance of the work of the WG2. This meeting was paid outside the EWW budget. Although the WG2 (similarly to the WG1) came to the opinion that broader BSR picture was necessary to promote *territorial integration of NW Russia into the BSR in the field of transport and ITC*. The WG2 members also shared the WG1 concern on importance of smooth transfer of the EWW results to the BSR strategy till 2030 i.e. Long Term Perspective to be prepared by VASAB in 2009. The characteristic feature of the WG2 was a long discussion about the meaning of the notion of accessibility. As the result accessibility to energy was also considered to be an important element of the analysis.

Activity 6: Analysis(WG2)

6.1. The discussion on the scope and method of analysis (indicators, pilot studies) had been continued from October till beginning of December 2007. The manuals and guidelines were discussed many times. The main method was e-mail exchanges. As the result the manuals and blue prints were produced by partners 1 and 8 to facilitate collecting data and information:

- A blue print on screening transport policy,
- A manual for collecting data and information on accessibility.

Comments: The majority of time of the initial period was allocated to discussing the notion of accessibility. This was done in order to avoid problems when data and information collection would be started. Due to the rise of energy prices also this issue was considered as important factor for the NW Russia integration to the BSR. The second issue heavily discussed was scarcity of comparable data in Russia. Partner no 8 having a very well developed data base on transport data for the BSR was in a difficult position checking (in dialogue with partner 4) existence of similar data in Russia. This required more resources and more work load than estimated at the

beginning. But finally this allowed presenting Russia at the broader BSR picture. The phase 6.1. ended with second meeting of the WG2 (December 2007 in Riga).

6.2. Data collection and interpretation started only in December 2007 after the second WG 2 meeting. Basic data were collected by mid February 2008 but some work continued (fine tuning of reports) till May/June 2008. A draft discussion paper was ready for the Riga Stakeholder Conference in April 2008. However, it was a working document amended after each important EWW meeting, till the final/closing Conference. In this work (phase 6.1 and 6.2) seventeen people (including three external experts) were involved. Their involvement differed. The main bulk of analytical work was done by partners no. 4 and 8 and the external experts whereas the other participants acted mainly as a reference group reading reports, making comments and asking for improvements. This was done first of all by partners no. 1, 6, 7 and 10 representing mainly policy making side in the project and project coordination. Also VASAB Secretariat was invited by partner 1 (Responsible Partner) to participate in this process.

The following outputs were achieved:

(i) interim:

- Mapping of transport infrastructure policies at the federal and regional level, policies in development of the soft accessibility (to knowledge and information) and policies on clusters in NW Russia (however clusters were analysed by the WG1 in fact), also policies and situation in the field of accessibility to energy was examined;
- Identification of bottlenecks and constraints for transport (and through transport for business development) in NW Russia;
- Assessment of the policy correlation with the strategic documents at the BSR level (mainly by analysing outcomes of Strategic INTERREG III B projects pursued by VASAB, BDF, BSSSC and CPMR);
- Examining the results of other INTERREG III B projects relevant for the WG2 work;
- Feasibility assessment of connecting TEN-T with the pan-European corridors.

The planned verification of the accessibility perspective and of present (current) and forecast trade flows in NW Russia and Belarus (vis-a-vis BSR reports) was less successful. The main reason were missing data concerning predicted trade flows in NW Russia and Belarus⁴⁴. The accessibility perspective instead was analysed using BSR outlook to show how NW-Russia is connected with the rest of the BSR.

(ii) A compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") presenting situation, development trends and political objectives in the fields of transport and accessibility in NW RU and Belarus and their consequences for BSR cohesion and business development

Comments:

The most important planned outputs were achieved (although one output was slightly modified). In addition to that, accessibility to energy was touched as important future factor of the BSR integration that should determine in great extent the NW Russia integration into the BSR. The analysis lasted longer than expected. The main constraint was lack of regional reliable data in NW Russia. The main reason of the delay was in insufficient data availability but also to some extent larger than expected amount of available background information (e.g. results of the BSR projects) that should be digested and analysed.

Activity 7: Pilot studies (WG2)

Since the analytical phase (activity 6) was delayed also pilot projects were postponed. The aim of the activity 7 was to analyse more in depth the most promising solutions developed during the analytical

⁴⁴ The work on trade flows was done in co-operation with WG1 and the BSR perspective was used.

phase and prioritised during stakeholder dialogue. Therefore only in May 2008 the more concrete work on pilot studies (pre-feasibility studies) could start. The WG2 selected two (in line with the output indicators listed in the application) topics for pre-feasibility studies. The topics were following:

- u) BSR passenger railway connectivity with focus on the Eastern part of the BSR,
- v) examination of implementation of the transport part of Tallinn vision of VASAB with focus on the eastern part of the BSR.

For the pilot studies a tender procedure was used and contracts were signed in late June 2008. The results were delivered in late August 2008 and discussed by the WG2 group meeting in September. The following reports were produced:

- *Study on international rail passenger traffic development: Possibilities in the context of development of cities in the Baltic Sea Region* (Contract: 5-13/66, of 18.6.2008) elaborated by SIA “AC Konsultācijas”,
- *Evaluation of implementation of the VASAB 2010 vision in the area of mobility network and energy supply* (Contract: 5-13/74, of 23.7.2008) elaborated by SIA “AC Konsultācijas”.

The results of the studies were presented to the closing/final conference of the EWW and will serve as an input for the Long Term Spatial Development Perspective. They were also presented in advance to the WG2 members working on recommendation in order to shape the WG2 recommendations.

Comments:

An additional barrier delaying activity no.7 was obligation of tendering the contractors due to internal law of Latvia where partner no.1 (responsible for the WG2 work) is located. The WG2 decisions were taken in May 2008, but the contracts were signed only 1,5- 2 months latter coinciding once more with a holiday season. The first preliminary results of the activity no.7 were delivered in August and the final results in October/November 2008.

Activity 8: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR

The same as activity no. 3

Activity 9: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG2)

- 9.1. Steering Group Meeting (1 day) took place on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg according to schedule (for details see action 4.1).
- 9.2. WG2 second meeting (1 day) took place on 5 December 2007 in Riga (instead of late November). The meeting was attended by seven project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 7, 8, 10 and four invited guests. The meeting concentrated on discussing analytical phase of the project. The manuals and blue prints for collecting data and information were agreed. For starting work on recommendation it was discussed that the idea of Steering Group (of its first meeting in October 2007) of workshop for all WGs should be implemented and the Responsible Partner was asked to organize such a workshop (synergy meeting) in January 2008.
- 9.3. Synergy meeting no.1 (1 day) took place in Riga on 31st of January 2008 (see action 4.3. for details).
- 9.4. Steering Group Meeting 2 on 1st of February 2008 in Riga (see action 4.4. for details).
- 9.5. Synergy meeting no. 2 (1 day) took place in Liepaja on 14th of March 2008. (see action 4.5. for details).
- 9.6. Steering Group Meeting 3 (one day) took place on 20 May 2008 in Riga. (for details see action 4.8).
- 9.7. WG2 third meeting (one day) took place on 21 May 2008 in Riga according to schedule. It was attended by five project partner members representing partners no. 1, 7, 8, 10, one external expert and three invited guests. The WG2 before the third meeting concentrated

mainly on analytical work. At this meeting analyses were summed up and the work on recommendations started. It was decided that recommendations (with elements of the action programme) would be prepared for Russia and for the whole BSR with focus on better integration of NW Russia. One additional meeting was requested (autumn 2008) in order to discuss the final draft of the recommendations. The meeting also discussed the pilot actions (pre-feasibility studies) agreeing on concrete items. The outputs achieved:

- a first draft recommendations paper (in outline format),
- TOR for two most important pilot studies.

9.8. WG2 fourth meeting (one day) took place on 4th September 2008 in Jurmala. It was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, three external experts and six invited guests. They discussed the final draft of the recommendations (with elements of the action programme) prepared by Immanuel Kant State University of Russia (Kaliningrad) and Nordregio staff. The WG2 discussed and improved the following documents:

- Recommendations on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR including concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR.
- Study on international rail passenger traffic development: Possibilities in the context of development of cities in the Baltic Sea Region,
- Evaluation of implementation of the VASAB 2010 vision in the area of mobility network and energy supply,
- Overview of results of INTERREG III B projects in the field of accessibility .

9.9. Steering Group Meeting 4 (one day) took place on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg (please see action 4.10)

Activity 10: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 3 on ICZM and transnational sea use planning

10.1. WG3 preparatory meeting took place on 24 July 2007 in Kaliningrad. It was attended by nine project partner members representing partners no. 4, 10, and five invited guests. The meeting was used for preparation of the WG3 first meeting, and the pilot action in particular for presentation and discussion with the Kaliningrad partners the results of the INTERREG project BaltCoast of which recommendations should form main backbone of the work of the WG3. The preparatory meeting was organised during the holiday season due to indicated by the Kaliningrad partner necessity of postponing the WG3 first meeting till October because of the celebrations of 750th anniversary of establishment of the university (lack of experts) in early autumn 2007. So the preparatory meeting was a vehicle to start the work of the WG3 even in slightly less formal way. The main subject of discussion was the BaltCoast recommendations, TORs for experts and other guidelines necessary for elaboration of the WG3 analysis. The outputs were following:

- Decision on TORs and blue prints,
- Clarifying division of labour,
- Project flyer was discussed (and then edited) - see activity 1.1.

10.2 WG 3 first meeting (1,5 day) took place on 30-31 October 2007 in Kaliningrad i.e. with four month delay. The reason was the celebrations of 750th anniversary of establishment of the Albertina University (today Immanuel Kant State University of Russia) in Kaliningrad. The meeting was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 4, 9, 10 and to some extent also partner no.1, one external expert and fifteen invited guests mainly from Russia but also from Latvia, Germany and Finland. The main aim was to discuss the analysis and the further WG3 work in detail, to achieve clarity about division of labour between the partners, to make sure that duplication with other project was avoided (instead to aim at using results achieved by other projects) and to start the process of contracting the external experts. Instead of preparing TORs for separate experts the WG3 at pre meeting decided to make only

two TORs (one for external expert and one for the whole pilot project). For conducting analysis it was agreed that blue prints should be used. Such blue prints were prepared by partner no. 10 in advance presented at the meeting, and then improved/discussed by e-mails and approved in December 2007. The following outputs were produced or achieved:

- Report (in form of power point presentations) – presenting an overview of existing and available documentation on the chosen themes in NW Russia and at the BSR level;
- Two blue prints (for further analysis and discussions);
- Two TORs (one for external expert and one for the whole pilot project);
- One external expert was contracted by the partner no 1 covering by his expertise BSR and HELCOM perspective;
- EWW link at the VASAB website was created (see activity 1.1).

Also Kaliningrad stakeholders who attended the second part of the meeting were informed about the EWW project together with showing them the relevant BSR experience in ICZM and maritime spatial planning. They formed important part of the reference network for dialogue on project findings and recommendations. The meeting was also a starting point for executing analysis.

Activity 11 Analysis (WG 3)

11.1 The discussion on the scope and method of analysis had been continued from October till beginning of December 2007. The discussion resulted in shifting focus more from ICZM to maritime spatial planning as the most important transnational issue related to sea use in the nearest future. The blue prints (to be followed by Russian colleagues) presented by partner 10 were discussed many times. The main method was e-mail exchanges. As the result the two blue prints were agreed:

- A blue print on spatial planning legislation on the sea covering Poland,
- A blue print on potentials and conflicts on the sea covering Poland.

11.2. Gathering and compiling the WG3 information started in December 2007 after blue prints approval. Fourteen people representing partners no. 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10 were involved in the information collecting. Their involvement differed. The main bulk of analytical work was done by partners no.10 and 4 and by external expert whereas the other participants acted mainly as a reference group reading reports, making comments and asking for improvements. This was done first of all by partners no. 5,6 and 7 representing mainly policy making side in the project. The analysis in principle were ended in March. The situation of the WG3 was different than the WG1 and the WG2. The WG3 did not collect statistical information but rather qualitative information and the broad BSR background was discussed, sorted out and clarified at the first meeting by examining BaltCoast results. Therefore, the analytical work could be done in parallel with an initial phase of recommendation preparation. But also in the WG3 the completing analytical reports took more time than expected. Although first draft reports were ready in March their fine tuning continued in April and even in May and June. This was slightly learning by doing in particular for Russian experts who had little contact with maritime spatial planning in the past. The outputs were following:

- The legal systems were screened and regulations, responsibilities for offshore planning at all levels in NW Russia were identified;
- System of mapping to improve access to relevant information from NW Russia and its uploading to the pilot system made in the INTERREG III B BaltCoast project were tested (the results can be seen in the WG3 reports done by Russian colleagues);
- Actual (current) sea use in NW RU (Kaliningrad) according to the BaltCoast standards (potentials and conflicts) were described in a separate paper and conflicts and potentials were detected;

- A compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") with assessment of compatibility of the Russian regulatory framework to the legislation and practice in a pan-Baltic perspective in the field of ICZM and sea use planning was elaborated.

Comments:

The all planned outputs were achieved.

Activity 12 Pilot Action (WG 3)

Pilot action was started in October 2007 and continues till the end of August 2008. The twelve project partners staff members representing partners no. 1,4,6,7,9,10 and one external expert were involved. Partners no. 1,6,7 have acted mainly as a reference group while the main role was played by partners no. 4,9,10. The pilot action aimed at preparing a system of joint ICZM and maritime spatial planning in Gdańsk Bay between Poland and Russia. This task was discussed at the kick off meeting with various Russian stakeholders. The prevailing opinion was that due to the dispersed responsibilities in Russia in ICZM and sea space management (versus concrete central Agency in Poland responsible for sea space and regional governments responsible for ICZM activities) such goal could not be achieved in the project time span. Nowadays there is no single institution in Russia responsible for sea space management (like Maritime Offices in Germany or Poland). The WG3 came to the opinion that agreements between Polish and Russian relevant state institutions on co-operation in sea use planning and management might be too ambitious and premature as the WG3 output. Instead pilot actions were focused on the preconditions for establishment of such agreements in future, by exchange of good practices, deepening mutual understanding and preparing necessary tools and necessary institutional structures i.e. centres of excellence in both countries dealing with maritime spatial planning. It was decided that the starting point should be an agreement between Russian and Polish institutions from NGO or research domain to co-operate on promotion of integrative approach to sea space and coast in both countries. In this context a sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application was discussed. It was considered as an important tool for showing to Russian decision-makers a usefulness of maritime spatial planning. The WG3 decided to limit it to the Baltic Sea around Kaliningrad Oblast. The register was prepared by partner no. 4 and 10 in a form of GIS atlas. The following outputs were produced in the reporting period:

- The exchange of bi-lateral experience was started e.g. Polish pilot sea use plan (covering Puck Bay) elaborated in 2008 under PlanCoast INTERREG III B project was shown to the RU experts;
- The experience with the BaltCoast project of INTERREG III B was shared;
- Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application was first discussed then agreed and then produced and presented to the final/closing conference of the EWW in St. Petersburg on 21st October 2008;
- Agreement between Maritime Institute in Gdańsk and Russian partners on permanent co-operation in the future (including joint projects and policy related work) aiming at establishment of a system of joint ICZM and maritime spatial planning in Gdańsk Bay between Poland and Russia was prepared in autumn 2008. The partners of the agreement will act as an centres of excellence in their countries with regard to maritime spatial planning and ICZM.

Comments:

The pilot action had to be modified. But the actions started within EWW project will be continued after the project closure thanks to established under the EEW contacts. The aim of establishment of the system of joint ICZM and maritime spatial planning in Gdańsk Bay between Poland and Russia is still valid and will be realised in the future. What was done under EWW project was to start this process by exchange of experience, awareness rising, gathering

stakeholders and discussing with them the problem and by preparation of some necessary tools which will convince Russian decision-makers that an integrative coastal and sea space management would be important. Despite difficulties the main outputs promised in the EWW application were produced: i.e. (i) a sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application and (ii) agreements between Polish and Russian relevant institutions on co-operation in sea use planning and management.

Activity 13: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR

The same as activity no. 3

Activity 14: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG3)

- 14.1. Steering Group Meeting (1 day) took place on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg according to schedule (for details see action 4.1).
- 14.2. Synergy meeting no.1 (1 day) took place in Riga on 31st of January 2008 (see action 4.3. for details). This meeting was used by the WG3 also for development of a first outline of recommendation paper which was discussed afterwards by e-mail exchange.
- 14.3. Steering Group Meeting 2 on 1st of February 2008 in Riga (see action 4.4. for details).
- 14.4. Synergy meeting no 2 (1 day) took place in Liepaja on 14th of March 2008 (see action 4.5. for details).
- 14.5. WG3 second meeting (1,5 day) took place on 27-28 March 2008 in Kaliningrad (instead of late November 2007). It was attended by sixteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 7, 9, 10., one external expert and two invited guests. The meeting assessed the progress of the analytical work, discussed the interim reports of Russia and tried to relate the WG3 work towards the EU Integrated Maritime Policy (Blue Book). The final draft of recommendation paper was discussed and agreed. The acknowledgement of the project results at the political level was also examined. The WG3 group joined the WG1 and the WG2 wish to present its results at policy level by introducing them to the “Long Term Perspective” of VASAB. However, partner 9 was also asked to transfer the results to the EU BSR Strategy and to the EU work on integrated maritime policy. During the WG3 meeting a workshop with Russian stakeholders on off-shore planning and ICZM was organised in Kaliningrad on 27th of March 2008 as a joint venture of all projects dealing with this subject i.e. EWW, POWER and SDI-4-SEB as a part of the conference (“Integrated management, sustainable development indicators, spatial planning and monitoring of the South-Eastern Baltic coastal regions”), which took place in Kaliningrad on 26th - 30th of March 2007. Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic were elaborated by EWW project participants beforehand and proposed to stakeholders attending this conference. The recommendations were unanimously adopted by the participants including regional and local authorities from Russia. This seemed to be an important step towards introducing integrative approach towards the sea space and coastal zone in Russia.

The output achieved was following:

- Recommendation paper discussed and adopted by the Russian stakeholder (Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic).
- 14.6. Steering Group Meeting 3 (1day) took place on 20 May 2008 in Riga (for details see action 4.8).
 - 14.7. WG3 third meeting (1 day) took place on 4-5 June 2008 in Gdańsk almost according to schedule (few days later than planned originally). It was attended by fifteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 9, 10, one external expert and five invited guests. At the meeting analytical phase was summed up. The meeting was also used for examining the

experience and good practices of the Balance project in maritime spatial planning. The experts from Denmark introduce the project to the WG3 members. However, the WG3 main discussion concentrated on the 'action plan' following the recommendations adopted in March 2008. The opinions were dispersed. Some participants considered elaboration of an action plan as premature having in mind lack of legal provisions in Russia regulating sea use in an integrative way and dispersion of responsibility for sea management among many institutions. Some others proposed to focus action plan on methodological issues i.e. issues indispensable to introduce sea use planning in Russia and methodology of such planning suited for Russian conditions. After the e-mail exchange in June 2008 the partner no 9 responsible for the WG3 work decided to take the risk to prepare a draft action plan and to discuss it in September 2008 with the WG 3 members. Therefore an additional meeting was requested to be held in September 2008, to conclude the recommendation phase. The following outputs were achieved:

- The experience with Balance project of INTERREG III B was shared.

After the WG3 third meeting the partner no 9 and 10 organised (late June beginning of July 2008) consultation about the follow up of the WG3 in a form of a joint project. In the consultation the information on different ETC Programmes in the BSR were analysed and compared. The results were presented to the WG3 fourth meeting.

- 14.8. WG3 fourth meeting (one day) took place on 2nd September 2008 in Gdańsk. It was attended by thirteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 7, 9, 10 and one external expert. The meeting discussed the final draft of the action programme prepared by the staff of partners no 4 and 10 (Maritime Institute from Gdańsk and Immanuel Kant State University of Russia from Kaliningrad). Also final draft of the sea use register was presented by the partner no.4. The WG3 discussions tackled also the future use of the WG3 results. The presentations to the final/closing conference of EWW were agreed. It was also decided that the WG3 analysis should serve for broader popularization of the issue of maritime spatial planning in the Baltic Sea Region. The partner no 9. agreed to edit (by the end of 2008) from its own resources a *Compendium on Maritime Spatial Planning systems in the Baltic Sea Region countries* composed of two parts: part 1 *Survey of the national instruments and tools for the management of the sea space in the BSR countries* describing legal and institutional aspects of maritime spatial planning systems in the BSR countries and part 2 entitled *Examples of national cases of sea spatial conflicts and potentials*. Partner no.9 promised to invite to this book all other BSR countries while using the WG3 results as the core input. The WG3 also analysed different possibilities of continuation of the WG3 work. After the lively discussion it was decided to use two vehicles for further co-operation: The project BaltSeaPlan already submitted to the BSR Programme (although slightly too abstractive) and the new project to be submitted to the ENPI Programme Lithuania–Poland–Russian Federation on concrete planning work as continuation of the WG3 pilot activities. It was decided that transnational maritime planning should concentrate on Vistula/Kaliningrad lagoon and on Kursiu lagoon.

The WG3 discussed and improved the following documents during its fourth meeting:

- Action plan how to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational sea use planning and ICZM;
- Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application.

- 14.9. Steering Group Meeting 4 (one day) took place on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg (please see action 4.10)

42.2. Assessment of the results of the Action

The central objective of the Action was to promote territorial integration of NW Russia (i.e. the entire Northwest Federal District, including Kaliningrad) into the Baltic Sea region (BSR) in the identified three fields of (1) business development, (2) transport / ICT development and (3) sea use planning and Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM). The starting point was relatively impressive but

slightly idle (from the BSR perspective) developmental potential (in terms of human capital, scientific achievements etc.) of the North West Russia. The task was to develop solutions how to use the potential of the NW Russia for the benefit of the BSR economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development.

The action was successful to that extend that it managed to identify economic and spatial development needs in the NW Russia from the perspective of public authorities and businesses, requiring to be tackled by at the transnational level. This findings were benchmarked against existing good practice solutions based on experience of other BSR countries. The search was also done in order to detect economic and spatial trends, relevant for connecting territorial potentials between the NW Russia and the BSR. However, the picture coming from analysis appeared less promising than expected (see point 2.9). But even in those rather difficult circumstances the recommendations for three mentioned above fields were formulated and action plans were outlined. The main results delivered to the external audience having policy relevance are presented below:

The results achieved	The results intended	Explanation of differences
Recommendations how to improve innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration	Recommendation" paper with suggestions on policy improvements and legislative changes to improve settlement and innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration	The results achieved put less attention to legislative changes than to policy improvements. This is outcome of the survey done in order to learn from Russian businessman what are the main obstacles for them to innovate.
Recommendations how to improve settlement policies in NW Russia (urban rural partnership) from the perspective of BSR integration,		The focus of the result achieved is on urban-rural partnership as key for integrative development of settlement structure in Russia.
Action plan how to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration,	A paper with fields for further concrete actions ("action plan") to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration	Done in line with plans
Recommendations on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR including concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR,	1.Recommendation" paper with suggestions on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR 2. A paper with fields for further concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia and in BY in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR	The recommendations and action plan were merged. The reason is that Russia has very concrete plans and actions in this field for the future years so the WG2 decided to focus on long-term recommendations.
Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic	Recommendation" paper on upgrading the instruments and tools and institutional arrangements for transnational sea use planning and ICZM at the BSR level based on the completed pilot action	More ambitious recommendations were produced than expected i.e. more in line with the real situation in Russia with regard to ICZM and maritime spatial planning
Action plan how to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational sea use planning and	A paper with fields for further concrete actions ("action plan") to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational	Done in line with plans

ICZM	sea use planning and ICZM	
Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application	A sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application - based on the completed system mapping.	Done in line with plans
Agreement between maritime Institute in Gdańsk and Immanuel Kant State University of Russia on further co-operation in the field of maritime spatial planning	Agreements between Polish and Russian relevant institutions on co-operation in sea use planning and management	Done in line with plans

The most important EWW achievement is delivery of main messages resulting from the Action to the important Russian decision makers, planning professionals and scientific sector as well as to the key pan-Baltic organizations such as HELCOM or VASAB. Through VASAB also the EU BSR strategy was influenced.

42.3. The outcome on both final beneficiaries and/or target group and the situation of the target group/target region which the action addressed

The target audience/recipients of the project findings have been decision-makers (ministries responsible for spatial planning and development in the BSR, including the federal government in Russia, regional authorities in NW Russia, pan-Baltic organisations such as VASAB 2010). Thanks to the action they have received a better picture on the situation with regard to the North-West Russia integration into the Baltic Sea region (BSR). This knowledge has been already used for policy making by VASAB in production of the Long Term Spatial Development Perspective and it seems that it will be also useful for the EU Commission in elaboration of the EU BSR strategy and for HELCOM for implementation of the Baltic Sea Action Plan. In fact the Action played a tremendous role in validation of the planning methodologies and strategic documents at the pan-Baltic level based on the NW Russia perspective. The Action gave a proper insight on main drivers and obstacles of integration of the North West Russia into the BSR. The Action findings and recommendations were also delivered to the Russian decision makers and VASAB will continue its efforts to convince them that the BSR integration is beneficial for the North-West Russia. At least in the field of maritime spatial planning as the result of the Action one can see increased capacity and competence basis to take up joint transnational initiatives between the NW Russia partners and institutions from other BSR countries.

The final beneficiaries local and regional governments in the Baltic Sea region (BSR) operators in the chosen thematic fields (e.g. businesses in WP1 and transport operators in WP2) in NW Russia and in the BSR will be influenced mainly through the actions of pan-Baltic organisations mainly VASAB and its Long Term Spatial Development Perspective. This will allow for incorporation of the BSR perspective in the national/regional/local policies in the NW Russia.

42.4. Publications

The following publications were produced:

Name	Number of copies	Distribution channels
The East-West Window brochure informing about the project	300	Distributed during the project events in particular kick-off conference, stakeholder seminar, the Conference "Baltic Sea Region Programme 2007-2013: new partnership opportunities for Russian and Belarusian regions" and many other events
Атлас использования прибрежных акваторий российской части Юго-восточной Балтики (Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application – <i>edited on CD rom</i>)	200	Distributed for free during the EWW final (closing) conference, available for free from partner no.4

The book in Russian: Северо-Запад России в Регионе Балтийского Моря: Проблемы и перспективы экономического взаимодействия и сотрудничества (North West Russia in the Baltic Sea region. Problems and perspectives of co-operation and mutual influence) presenting main results of the project	100	Distributed for free by partners no.4 among the project partners and participants of the EWW events. Sent to Russian relevant Ministries and main libraries.
--	-----	--

42.5. Contracts (works, supplies, services) above 5000€ awarded for the implementation of the action since the last interim report

Only one contract above 5000€ was awarded since the last interim report.

	Contract	Amount	Procedure	Winner
1	Audit Services Contract	5 131,94	“negotiated procedure without publication”	<i>SIA Rodl and Partner</i>

42.6. Continuation of the Action after ending the support from the European Community

The action will be continued after ending the EU support for the East West Window project. Durability of the project results has been ensured by the direct participation or the support of the national ministries responsible for spatial planning and development around the BSR, acting under VASAB 2010. Through their co-operation with other relevant stakeholders, the project rendered available concrete recommendations for policy-making in the chosen thematic fields in the NW Russia and at the BSR level. Through intensive dialogue with the target audience, the project influenced planners in Russia neighbouring countries by including the perspective of NW Russia. It also served for modification of pan-Baltic strategic policy papers, long-term visions and development plans on the very same account.

In particular the EWW results were used by VASAB for elaboration of the Long Term Perspective for Spatial Development of the BSR. Thanks to the EWW this will be the document with proper outlook on North-West Russia. Due to the EWW the collaboration between VASAB (ministries) and other EWW partners (research institutes) will be strengthened. The EWW results will be also used for discussing with HELCOM an idea of maritime spatial planning in the Baltic Sea Region.

Follow-up activities in effect of the project will be initiated and promoted by VASAB 2010. This includes starting up of possible new project(s) covering the whole BSR and taking into consideration the needs and perspectives of NW Russia, identified and referred to in the present project. The WG3 work will be continued in a form of the BaltSeaPlan project already approved by the BSR Programme (will start around December 2008). The WG3 partners will also plan to submit the project on elaboration of concrete maritime spatial plans for Vistula and Kursiu Lagoons in the framework of the ENPI Programme Lithuania–Poland–Russian Federation. Despite finishing the work of the WG3 the partner no.9 responsible for its leading has already declared to continue the efforts in a broader BSR set up and started elaboration of the BSR wide “Compendium on Maritime Spatial Planning systems in the Baltic Sea Region countries” using the WG3 results and experience.

42.7. Gender equality, disabilities

Where relevant, the perspective of equal opportunities was taken into account for the thematic work (especially in the fields of business and transport). Due efforts were made to secure involvement of both men and women in the composition of the project management structures, daily work and in the dialogue fora with relevant stakeholders in NW Russia and at the overall BSR level. Spatial planning forming a substance of the project from its definition cares for gender equality, prevention or exclusions of handicapped from the normal life. Although, gender equality and disabilities were not the main focus of the EWW project one can assume that the realisation of the project objectives (integration of the NW Russia into the BSR) will be beneficial in a long run also for attracting attention of Russian decision makers and Russian society to those above mentioned horizontal goals. They are placed very high at civil agenda in particular in the Nordic countries and integration means also convergence in values and way of living so it means better acceptance of these horizontal goals in Russia as well. The same has happened in Poland, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia after their accession to EU (strengthening their European integration).

42.8. Monitoring and evaluation of the activities

Monitoring of activities was done on routine basis by the project Steering Group. The group worked very effectively guiding the project and proposing the changes if necessary. The group (ministerial part) provided also an excellent piece of advice with regard to use of the EWW project results for policy making. However, one should also admit the important role of Committee on Spatial Development of the Baltic Sea Region which was among the main recipients of the project results. The advice from this body and the VASAB Secretariat which took part in majority of the EWW events (on their own money) helped a lot in proper shaping the EWW work and focusing on the policy relevant results (e.g. providing links to HELCOM, EU BSR Strategy etc.).

Also important were feedbacks received from beneficiaries during the kick-off and final (closing) conference. In the Annex 2 quotations from the Conference resolutions are attached (in Russian).

42.9. What has been learned from the Action

The main lesson from the action is that integration of the NW Russia into the Baltic Sea Region (BSR) will not be an easy process. Russia is a global player looking for global organizations and bodies as its partners. Even the regional level i.e. St. Petersburg has sufficient potential to play an important role at the global arena. This is clearly seen in the St. Petersburg government policy and strategic documents. BSR is not the main field of St. Petersburg strategic activity. Slightly different situation is with regard to Kaliningrad, but its potential is sufficient to strengthen rather cross-border than pan-Baltic integration of Russian Federation. The main integrative processes between Russia and the rest of the BSR are hardly due to market forces or conscious decisions of the Russian enterprises but rather thanks to EU financial support in form of transnational and cross-border programmes. The only field in which one can expect more or less natural co-operation between Russia and the other BSR countries is maritime spatial planning as long as it affects coastal defence, fish stock and state of the coastal nature. Russia is very active now in HELCOM where the questions of maritime spatial planning have been already raised.

Therefore strengthening integration of the North-West Russia into the BSR requires further development of the Russian medium size cities such as e.g. Kaliningrad or Pskov, their partnership with adjacent regions, and development of the maritime spatial planning institutions which in natural way will seek for the relations with their closest neighbours.

43. Partners and other Co-operation

43.1. How do you assess the relationship between the formal partners of this Action (i.e. those partners which have signed a partnership statement)? Please specify for each partner organisation

St. Petersburg Administration [2] – partner active for discussing policy relevant documents and organising meetings in St. Petersburg in the field of analysis acting through partner no.3 . Important contribution to the stakeholder dialogue. In fact this partner will be one of the main recipients of the project results.

Russian Economic Developers Association (ASSET) [3] – very demanding from formal point of view but also very experience partner in analytical work. A great bulk of the WG1 recommendations were proposed by this partner. The partner is a great interface between science and policy making in Russia in particular in St. Petersburg. Important role in dissemination activities thanks to good contacts with decision-makers in Russia at local and regional level.

Immanuel Kant State University of Russia [4] – very reliable and enthusiastic partner being a source of many data and information excellent in scientific work acquiring great experience during the EWW project how to translate analysis into policy findings, but in fact majority of recommendations of the WG2 and the WG3 were rooted in partner no. 4 thinking.

Ministry of the Environment, Danish Forest and Nature Agency, Denmark [5] – very active and experienced partner (being responsible in the past for the USUN project) leading the WG 1 work and ensuring proper presentation of EWW at the highest BSR political level.

Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Housing, Germany [6] – very active and experienced partner responsible for urban-rural investigations under the WG1, ensuring proper presentation of EWW at the highest BSR political level.

Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communication, Sweden [7] – partner ensuring link to the EU BSR strategy (use of EWW results also there), acting mainly through partner 8 but very active in the WG2 , active in the WG3 (with very high quality inputs) and contributing to policy relevant findings in the EWW.

Nordic Centre for Spatial Development (NORDREGIO) [8] – one of key drivers for analytical work, competent, flexible with a large knowledge and experience in spatial and regional development.

Ministry of Regional Development, Poland [9] – partner leading the WG3 but active in other work groups, very experienced and very flexible contributing to the work additional resources if project resources are not sufficient.

Maritime Institute, Poland [10] – key resource for maritime spatial planning and ICZM in the project supporting actively the WG3 and coordinating the whole project from content point of view in very reasonable way.

43.2. Is the partnership to continue

The partnership will continue in a form of BSR Programme and ENPI Programme projects on maritime spatial planning. The co-operation agreement between partners no 4 and 10 will serve to this end. The BaltSea Plan was approved by the BSR programme. The project will serve as a continuation and dissemination of the WG3 work and results since both partners no 4 and 10 are among its key drivers.

The EWW project results were also used within the VASAB framework. This means that new partners such as Nordregio, ASSET or Immanuel Kant State University of Russia have joined the VASAB work and their involvement will continue.

43.3. How would you assess the relationship between your organisation and State authorities in the Action countries? How has this relationship affected the Action?

Since majority of the partners are state high level institutions those relations were fine. The partners representing state authorities knew each other for many years before starting the project as the members of the VASAB co-operation (Co-operation of Ministers for spatial planning and development in the BSR countries). The new input was given by the scientific institutions. This was a great added value of the project, mutual learning how to translate analysis into policy relevant actions. The research oriented partners were quite flexible and willing to reshape analysis or repeat them if asked by policy making partners.

43.4. Where applicable, describe your relationship with any other organisations involved in implementing the Action:

- Associate(s) (if any) - no
- Sub-contractor(s) (if any). Some of the work was given to the external contractors. However an idea was that majority of work should be done by the partners themselves since the partners had sufficient qualification to execute the project and achieve its goals. Contractors were used mainly for technical issues and for bringing knowledge from INTERREG projects. Only some partners (9) and (5) used contractors more intensively (for some concrete work) due to shortages in their human resources. In principle the relation with contractors were positive with one exception (i.e. Rumanian contractor who won a tender for the EWW financial management disappeared after few month of serving the project)
- Final Beneficiaries and Target groups. Those relations were fine thanks to sue of well established and prominent conferences for presentation of the EWW. This gave the project access to the target group necessary for the project success.
- Other third parties involved. Important was a link of the project to the VASAB Secretariat and VASAB work on the Long Term Perspective. VASAB Secretariat promoted also project and its results externally on request of the Responsible Partner.

43.5. Where applicable, outline any links you have developed with other actions.

The project ambition was to develop link to other important projects in order to make use of their results (BaltCoast, PlanCoast, Balance, USUN, SeBCo – their experts were invited to the project meetings) or to make joint meetings to better reach target groups (SeBCo POWER and SDI-4-SEB). These projects represented different INTERREG strands.

43.6. If your organisation has received previous EC grants in view of strengthening the same target group, in how far has this Action been able to build upon/complement the previous one(s)? (List all previous relevant EC grants).

The Ministries involved in the project previously received a grant from INTERREG II C to prepare an Action Plan for implementation of the VASAB strategy adopted in 1994. The project was called VASAB Plus and ended in 2000. The EWW used the VASAB Plus experience but its focus was different. This time the target geographical area was the NW Russia and its integration to the BSR. The lesson learned under the VASAB Plus (where Russia had no financial resources for analysis) showed that preparation of a pan-Baltic documents with very differentiate resources might result in uneven involvement of the countries and then uneven ownership of the agreed actions or strategies. Therefore the EWW was invented to avoid such a mistake and to give Russian colleagues resources for considering their role in the BSR integration.

44. Visibility

How is the visibility of the EU contribution being ensured in the Action?

At the project start a press release was done by the Responsible Partner. Visibility was ensured by placing proper information that the EWW project was part-financed by the EU together with the EU logo and logo of INTERREG III B. This was done on printing materials, power point presentation and on the project web site. There was also some information in the Latvian radio. On demand of Russian colleagues the project was presented at the Conference “Baltic Sea Region Programme 2007-2013: new partnership opportunities for Russian and Belarusian regions” in St. Petersburg as one of the most successful INTERREG projects with Russian participation. To strengthen the project visibility a special project banner was produced and displayed on many occasions (e.g. Conference “Baltic Sea region Spatial Development Policies avenues to the Long Term Perspective” in Riga on 23 April 2007, and already mentioned conference “Baltic Sea Region Programme 2007-2013: new partnership opportunities for Russian and Belarusian regions” in St. Petersburg on 16-17 April 2008 and in many other events). The book with the project analysis and recommendations was printed in December 2008. But the most important is that the project results will be used for producing “Long Term Perspective” for the BSR which will be presented to CBSS and all important pan-Baltic organizations. Thanks to EWW NW Russia will be properly highlighted in this strategy.

The European Commission may wish to publicise the results of Actions. Do you have any objection to this report being published on Europe Aid Co-operation Office website? If so, please state your objections here.

Name of the contact person for the Action: **Vladislavs Vesperis**

Signature:Location: **Riga, Latvia**

Date report due:Date report sent:

Update of action plan

Activity	Months																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Activity 1: Kick off of the work of Working Group no 1 on business development and innovation affecting spatial development,	X	X	X	X														
Activity 2: Analysis(WG1)				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Activity 3: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR (WG1)					X						X						X	
Activity 4: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations and action plan (WG1)					X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Activity 5: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 2 on accessibility				X														
Activity 6: Analysis(WG2)					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Activity 7: Pilot studies (WG2)												X	X	X	X	X		
Activity 8: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR					X						X						X	X
Activity 9: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG2)					X	X		X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Activity 10: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 3 on ICZM and transnational sea use planning		X			X													
Activity 11 Analysis (WG 3)					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					
Activity 12 Pilot Action (WG 3)					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
Activity 13: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR					X						X						X	
Activity 14: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG3)					X			X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		

EWV events: participation of man and woman

Participants			
Event	Woman	Man	Total
Kick off meeting of the work of WG1, on 25 June 2007 in Riga	9	11	20
WG1 meeting 25 September 2007 in Riga	4	3	7
WG1 analysis (people involved)	11	23	34
Steering Group meeting on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg	7	11	18
St Petersburg kick off conference on 18-19 October 2007	112	146	259
St Petersburg Closing conference on 21 October 2008	231	400	631
WG1 second meeting on 6-7 December 2007 in Riga	9	10	19
Synergy meeting no.1 on 31 January 2008 in Riga	10	13	23
Steering Group Meeting no.2 on 1 February 2008 in Riga	4	11	15
Synergy meeting no 2 in Liepaja on 14 th of March 2008	8	8	16
WG1 fourth meeting on 3-4 April 2008 in Riga	6	7	13
Riga Stakeholders seminars (WG3 and WG1 + WG2) on 23 April 2008	83	84	167
WG1 fifth meeting on 24 April 2008 in Riga	13	12	25
Steering Group Meeting no. 3 on 20 May 2008 in Riga	4	6	10
Steering Group Meeting no. 4 on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg	3	10	13
WG1 sixth meeting on 3 rd September 2008 in Jurmala	11	11	22
WG2 first meeting on 10 October 2007 in Riga	3	6	9
WG2 analysis	6	11	17
WG2 second meeting on 5 December 2007 in Riga	4	7	11
WG2 third meeting on 21 May 2008 in Riga	2	7	9
WG2 fourth meeting on 4 th September 2008 in Jurmala	9	11	20
WG3 preparatory meeting on 24 July 2007 in Kaliningrad	4	10	14
WG 3 first meeting on 30-31 October 2007 in Kaliningrad	12	15	27
WG3 analysis	3	11	14
Pilot Action (WG 3)	3	10	13
WG3 second meeting on 27-28 March 2008 in Kaliningrad	6	13	19
WG3 third meeting on 4-5 June 2008 in Gdańsk	6	15	21
WG3 fourth meeting 2 September 2008 in Gdańsk	3	11	14

Quotations from the Conference resolutions (in Russian) in direct relations to the EAST West Window.

21. Kick Off Conference

Продвижение европейского опыта в рамках программ Европейского Инструмента Соседства и Партнерства усилит инновационный потенциал и влияние Северо-Западного региона России на процессы территориальной интеграции на внешних границах ЕС, в частности, в регионе Балтийского моря. В этих целях целесообразна активизация участия России в таких международных объединениях, как VASAB 2010, Балтийский форум развития (BDF), Программа транснационального сотрудничества региона Балтийского моря 2007-2013.

Зарубежный опыт свидетельствует о значительной роли малых и средних городов в продвижении инноваций и гармонизации территориального развития. Этот факт должен учитываться при разработке инновационных стратегий в России как на федеральном, так и на региональном уровнях. Необходимо уделять больше внимания развитию малых и средних городов, как это происходит в странах ЕС, и адаптировать европейский опыт применительно к ситуации в России (в частности, концепцию сельско-городского партнерства «ESDP Concept of Rural-Urban Partnership»). Доступ к знаниям и информации, возможность обмена идеями должны стать основой формирования территориальных моделей развития России.

/.../

Участники Форума согласились со следующим:

- необходимо особое единое государственное управление морскими прибрежными зонами страны (обеими их составляющими: морской и сухопутной) исходя из повсеместного успешного мирового опыта подобной деятельности и соответствующих рекомендаций организаций системы ООН и международных форумов на высшем уровне. Руководствуясь этим, рекомендовать: 1) создание нормативной правовой и институциональной базы для разработки и реализации комплексных программ развития и управления прибрежными зонами в рамках комплексных программ социально-экономического развития приморских субъектов Федерации и программ развития прибрежных муниципальных образований в целях активизации участия последних в освоении прибрежных и морских ресурсов; 2) адаптацию и освоение современных управленческих технологий (методология Комплексного управления прибрежными зонами (КУПЗ)) в применении к богатейшим по ресурсам и разнообразным по природным и социально-экономическим условиям прибрежным зонам страны; 3) разработку и реализацию пилотных программ КУПЗ конкретных побережий страны; 4) использование опыта сотрудничества стран Балтийского региона, в частности рекомендаций Проекта BaltCoast BSR INTERREG III B по управлению прибрежными зонами и разработке совместных стратегических проектов;
- рекомендовать использование кластерного подхода в качестве инструмента реализации стратегий развития территорий и повышения конкурентоспособности региональной и муниципальной экономики, включая выявление и диагностику потенциальных кластеров, разработку программ их развития, создание организаций по сотрудничеству. В органах власти необходимо формирование межотраслевых рабочих групп для координации развития кластеров и снятия ведомственных и отраслевых ограничений. Целесообразно более широкое использование международных программ и инструментов повышения конкурентоспособности кластеров;
- необходимо развитие региональной и муниципальной статистики, в частности для целей выработки эффективной кластерной политики и оценки результатов реализации кластерных инициатив в регионе и/или муниципалитете, формирования действенных

инструментов планирования и управления, ориентированного на результат на субфедеральных уровнях;

- при реализации федеральных, региональных и местных программ экономического развития необходимо стимулировать участие организаций инновационной инфраструктуры в российских и зарубежных сетевых организациях, которые оказывают содействие в предоставлении услуг компаниям и научным организациям в сфере инновационной бизнес-кооперации и трансфера технологий (примерами могут служить Российская сеть трансфера технологий RTTN, Европейская сеть бизнес-инновационных центров EBN). Участие в сетевом сотрудничестве должно быть нацелено на повышение качества и содержания услуг для местных компаний и НИИ. Федеральным и региональным органам власти необходимо поддерживать инициативы по развитию сетевого взаимодействия между организациями инновационной региональной инфраструктуры (создание региональных сетей) с целью уменьшения дублирования функций, повышения качества услуг и снижения расходов бюджета на их субсидирование;
- рекомендовать и стимулировать участие российских центров коммерциализации, инновационных центров в реализации Competitiveness Innovation Program (CIP) Европейского союза в части проектов, ориентированных на развитие инновационных сетей и сетей трансфера технологий (IRC, IRE, EBN и др.);
- считать целесообразным использование в России европейского опыта реализации региональных инновационных стратегий, обеспечивающих выявление спроса на инновации среди компаний и ориентацию научного сектора и инновационной инфраструктуры на удовлетворение этого спроса. (...);
- в целях совершенствования государственного и муниципального управления по обеспечению перехода Российской Федерации на инновационный путь развития рекомендовать Комиссии при Президенте Российской Федерации по вопросам совершенствования государственного управления и правосудия, Министерству регионального развития Российской Федерации, другим заинтересованным федеральным и региональным органам власти осуществить экспертизу полномочий органов государственной власти субъектов Российской Федерации и органов местного самоуправления в части выявления проблемных вопросов, препятствующих обеспечению перехода России на режим инновационного развития, и законодательно обеспечить активизацию участия в реализации государственной научно-технической политики органов государственной власти субъектов Федерации и органов местного самоуправления, рассмотреть возможность разработки национальной программы, ориентированной на содействие российским регионам в подготовке и реализации региональных инновационных стратегий и формирование российской сети инновационных регионов;
- рекомендовать заинтересованным федеральным и региональным органам государственной власти реализовать систему мер по поддержке технопарков и процессов коммерциализации научных разработок. В частности: разработать законодательную базу для развития технопарков на федеральном уровне; предоставить налоговые льготы компаниям-резидентам технопарков, например, аналогичные льготам для резидентов ОЭЗ; упростить процедуру предоставления земельных участков для технопарков; законодательно разрешить НИИ, вузам и университетам создавать малые предприятия - start-up'ы;
- рекомендовать органам регионального и муниципального управления активно использовать инструменты международной технической и финансовой помощи, предоставляемой по линии Института Всемирного Банка, АМР США, Европейского Инструмента Соседства и Партнерства (ENPI) и других программ Европейского Союза для реализации стратегических приоритетов и планов территориального развития, поддержки инноваций;
- отметить необходимость выработки механизма интеграции документов стратегического планирования муниципального, регионального и федерального уровней;
- одобрить инициативы Комитета по пространственному развитию региона Балтийского моря (CSD/BSR) VASAB 2010 по территориальной интеграции Северо-Запада России и реализации совместных проектов в таких приоритетных сферах как развитие бизнеса, транспорта, ИКТ, управление прибрежными зонами. Отметить актуальность проекта «Окно

Восток-Запад", который позволит восполнить пробелы в оценке инновационного потенциала Северо-Запада России и расширит возможности синергии инновационных потенциалов стран Балтийского региона.

- предложить Комитету VASAB 2010 использовать Форум лидеров стратегического планирования городов и регионов России в качестве референтной группы для обсуждения Стратегии пространственного развития региона Балтийского моря.

22. Closing Conference

22.1. «Перспективы развития Северо-Западного федерального округа: вызовы, приоритеты, угрозы и ограничения»

Участники рекомендуют:

- 31) в целях максимального учёта сложившихся межсубъектовых экономических связей, обеспечения увязки общегосударственных и региональных планов и прогнозов социально-экономического развития, целесообразно предусмотреть **разработку стратегических документов долгосрочного социально-экономического развития на уровне федеральных округов**. Для преодоления ведомственной и региональной разобщённости целесообразно поручить эту работу Ассоциациям экономического взаимодействия соответствующих федеральных округов. Это позволит точнее формулировать цели регионального развития в увязке с имеющимися общими ресурсами, объективно сформировать перечень основных межрегиональных проектов, обеспечивающих достижение общих целей развития. Подобные документы могут стать основой для последующей разработки Концепции долгосрочного социально-экономического развития Российской Федерации;
- 32) для ускорения социально-экономического развития территорий требуется **активизация межрегионального взаимодействия**. Зачастую депрессивные регионы (субъекты Федерации) экономически тесно связаны с успешными регионами (транспортные подходы к инфраструктурным объектам, наличие сырьевой базы для обрабатывающих производств и т.п.). В этом случае целесообразно оказывать федеральную помощь (налоговые и иные льготы, государственные гарантии под привлекаемые кредиты, первоочередное финансирование проектов в рамках действующих ФЦП и др.) для инфраструктурного развития депрессивных территорий по поддерживаемым видам и направлениям экономической деятельности, а также для реализации проектов способствующих комплексному развитию двух и более субъектов Федерации;
- 33) необходимым условием развития и Северо-Западного федерального округа и страны в целом является **совершенствование работы транспортного комплекса**. Требуется системный подход к формированию единой стратегии развития транспортно-логистического комплекса страны в увязке с развитием отраслей экономики и внешнеэкономической ситуацией.

22.2. «Специфика стратегий приморских регионов»

Участники считают, что

- 31) Необходимо совершенствование стратегического планирования применительно к морской деятельности и приморским регионам и муниципалитетам, предусматривающее:

на федеральном уровне:

- применение интегральных подходов к планированию и управлению в морском природопользовании. Это позволит преодолеть фрагментарность, присущую отраслевому подходу, учесть взаимосвязанность видов морского природопользования, способствовать связям и межотраслевой гармонизации в морской деятельности исходя из анализа конфликтного использования ресурсов, обеспечить многоцелевую ориентацию и соответствие

деятельности природоохранным целям, участие всех заинтересованных сторон в разработке стратегий и программ развития;

- создание нормативной правовой и институциональной базы для разработки и реализации комплексных программ развития и управления прибрежными зонами, основанных на интегральных подходах, в рамках стратегий и программ социально-экономического развития приморских субъектов Федерации и программ развития прибрежных муниципальных образований. Это позволит реализовать особое единое государственное управление морскими прибрежными зонами страны (обеими их составляющими: морской и сухопутной) исходя из повсеместного успешного мирового опыта подобной деятельности и соответствующих рекомендаций организаций системы ООН и международных форумов на высшем уровне;

на региональном уровне:

- адаптацию и освоение современных управленческих технологий (методология Комплексного управления прибрежными зонами - КУПЗ) в применении к богатейшим по ресурсам и разнообразным по природным и социально-экономическим условиям прибрежным зонам страны;
- разработку и реализацию пилотных программ КУПЗ конкретных побережий страны.

Реализация этих мер позволит реализовать естественные природные конкурентные преимущества морских акваторий и прибрежных территорий в обеспечении дополнительного экономического роста, конкурентоспособности, инвестиционной привлекательности, занятости, повышения комфортности и качества жизни, охраны окружающей среды и уменьшения ущерба от природных и техногенных катастроф, а также безопасности страны

- 32) Необходимо совершенствование нормативной правовой базы, регулирующей градостроительную деятельность, в части учета специфики этой деятельности на морских акваториях, находящихся под суверенитетом и юрисдикцией Российской Федерации.
- 33) Необходимо развивать международное сотрудничество в стратегическом планировании морского природопользования, учитывая единство и экосистемный характер морских процессов, и широко использовать международный опыт в этой сфере.

FINAL NARRATIVE REPORT

45. Description

45.1. Name of beneficiary of grant contract: Ministry of Regional Development and Local Government, Latvia (Reģionālās attīstības un pašvaldību lietu ministrija).

45.2. Name and title of the Contact person: Mr Vladislavs Vesperis.

45.3. Name of partners in the Action: St. Petersburg Administration (Администрация Губернатора Санкт-Петербурга) [2], Russian Economic Developers Association (ASSET) (Ассоциация специалистов по экономическому развитию территорий) [3], Immanuel Kant State University of Russia (Российский государственный университет имени И. Канта) [4], Ministry of the Environment, Danish Forest and Nature Agency⁴⁵, Denmark (Miljøministeriet, Skov- og Naturstyrelsen) [5], Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Housing, Germany (Bundesministeriums für Verkehr, Bau und Stadtentwicklung) [6], Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communication, Sweden (Näringsdepartementet) [7], Nordic Centre for Spatial Development (NORDREGIO) [8], Ministry of Regional Development, Poland (Ministerstwo Rozwoju Regionalnego) [9], Maritime Institute, Poland (Instytut Morski) [10].

45.4. Title of the Action: East-West Window (EWW).

45.5. Contract number: Grant Contract for European Community External Actions **2007/132-845**.

45.6. Start date and end date of the reporting period⁴⁶: 15.06.2007 – 15.12.2008.

45.7. Target country(ies) or region(s): **North-West Russia in particular: St. Petersburg, Leningrad region and Kaliningrad region**; to some extent also Belarus and North-West Russia adjacent countries (mainly for collecting good practices and dissemination of the project results).

45.8. Final beneficiaries &/or target groups⁴⁷ (if different). The target audience/recipients of the project findings are: decision-makers (ministries responsible for spatial planning and development in the BSR, including the federal government in Russia, regional authorities in

⁴⁵ The name of the partner 5 was changed during the EWW project execution **from** Ministry of the Environment, Danish Forest and Nature agency **to** Ministry of the Environment, Agency for Spatial and Environmental Planning (Miljøministeriet, By- og Landskabsstyrelsen).

⁴⁶ The entire implementation period of the Action

⁴⁷ “Target groups” are the groups/entities who will be directly positively affected by the project at the Project Purpose level, and “final beneficiaries” are those who will benefit from the project in the long term at the level of the society or sector at large.

NW Russia, pan-Baltic organisations such as VASAB 2010). The final beneficiaries are local and regional governments in the Baltic Sea region (BSR) operators in the chosen thematic fields (e.g. businesses in WP1 and transport operators in WP2) in NW Russia and in the BSR. The divide into men and women of different project activities is provided separately.

45.9. Country (ies) in which the activities take place (if different from 1.7): Russia (St. Petersburg and Kaliningrad Oblast), Poland and Latvia.

46. Assessment of implementation of Action activities

46.1. Activities and results (for the whole reporting period including last narrative interim report)

Activity 1: Kick off of the work of Working Group no 1 on business development and innovation affecting spatial development,

1.34. First meeting of the WG1 (1 day) took place on 25 June 2007 in Riga which was according to the schedule. The meeting was planned in advance in late June so participants postponed their holidays which in this part of the BSR starts with so called Midsummer. The meeting was attended by 12 participants representing partners 1,3,4,5,6,8,9,10 and eight invited guests. The main aim was to discuss the analysis and further WG1 work in detail, to achieve clarity about division of labour between the partners, to make sure that duplication with other project is avoided (instead to aim at using results achieved by other projects) and to start the process of contracting the external experts. The following outputs were produced or achieved:

- Report how to avoid duplication with other INTERREG III B projects in the field of business development and innovation affecting spatial development had been prepared before the meeting by the project coordinator, discussed by the meeting and delivered to the Responsible (Lead) Partner.
- TORs for seven ASSET staff members, eight Kaliningrad University staff members, one Belarus expert and four external experts together with tender documentation (if necessary) have been prepared by project coordinator as result of the meeting. Tender procedures for the four external experts had been started resulting in contracting one external expert from Poland, one from Sweden, one from Latvia and one from Denmark. In addition the Belarus expert was contracted by the partner no. 8 without tender (contract below 5000 Euro).
- The main scope of analysis was proposed and discussed. Unfortunately too many question marks and uncertainties appeared during the June meeting so the additional meeting was organized in Riga in September and discussion on analysis continued till the second WG1 meeting (December 2007).
- Text for EWW section at to the VASAB website was decided, technically EWW link at VASAB website was created in September 2007.
- Project flyer was designed and edited including information on WG1 activities (300 copies were printed in October 2007).

Comments: The WG1 started the discussion on its work (i.e. necessary analysis, results to be achieved) but the topic was too broad for one day meeting in addition to many technical questions were raised. The decision was to continue the discussion when the experts contracted by tender would be available. The main problem was to what extend the achievement of the EWW goal (i.e. *to promote territorial integration of NW Russia into the BSR in the field of business development*)

required concentration on analysis concerning exclusively NW Russia and to what extent the broader BSR picture was necessary if integration should mean reciprocal relations (i.e. affecting both sides). The latter opinion prevailed and was accepted by the meeting. The WG1 considered that for producing the main output of the analytical phase (i.e. a *compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") with assessment of unexploited innovation potential in NW Russia, assessment of the potential for regional integration and with identification of spatial problems in NW Russia and BSR*) some BSR analysis as the background material should be done as well. The meeting also discussed the policy related role of the project i.e. better highlighting the EWW results on NW Russia role in the “Long Term Perspective” to be prepared by VASAB on CBSS demand. The WG1 leaders promised to ensure smooth transfer of the EWW results to the BSR strategy i.e. Long Term Perspective till 2030 (to be prepared by VASAB in 2009). The Responsible Partner declared that he would invite VASAB Secretariat to the most important meetings of the EWW to ensure smooth transfer of the project results to the “Long Term Perspective”.

- 1.35. Partnership Agreement Preparation. This action was related to all work packages and took place in June, July, August, and September 2007 and was ended in October 2007 with signing partnership agreements between Lead Partner and all other partners of the EWW project. The most difficult was signing Partnership Agreement with partners from St. Petersburg due to problems related to tax and system in Russia, conversion of EUR into rubels, banking system requirements etc. Finally two agreements, based on the results of additional working meeting (in Riga) discussions, were prepared and signed between Lead Partner and RU (ASSET) Partner and between German Partner and RU (ASSET) Partner. So at the end of the day there were 9 partnership agreements signed regulating relations between the EWW partners.
- 1.36. Quality Workshop (1 day) for Project leaders organised by INTERREG III B Secretariat and EU Delegation from Moscow in Riga on 26 September 2007 was attended by project coordinator (partner no.10), one representative of Russian partners (partner no.2) and representatives appointed by the Responsible Partner. Main guidelines from EC Delegation and INTERREG III B Secretariat on TACIS rules, payments schemes and communication experiences were presented during the seminar and later on at individual consultations. The meeting between Responsible Partner and the Russian partners was organized back to back with the workshop for discussing main technicalities of their participation in the project.

Activity 2: Analysis(WG1)

- 2.23. WG1 additional meeting (1 day) took place on 25 September 2007 in Riga to continue discussion on the scope of analysis. The meeting was attended by four WG1 members (including two external experts, project coordinator and the representative of the Russian partners) and three participants representing Responsible Partner. At the meeting in depth discussion on case studies on innovation, outsourcing and urban-rural relations in Russia took place and the detailed scope of the work of Russian partners and external experts were agreed. Also a draft outline structure of the WG1 analytical report was presented by the WG1 Coordinator and discussed in depth.
- 2.24. Data collection and interpretation started only in December 2007 after the second WG1 meeting. In this phase 34 people from all partners were involved (except partner no.7 who acted through partner no. 8). Their involvement differed. The main bulk of analytical work was done by partners no. 3, 4 and 8 and the external experts whereas the other people acted mainly as a reference group reading reports, making comments and asking for improvements. This was the task first of all of partners no. 1, 2, 5, 6, 9 and 10 representing mainly policy making side in the project and project coordination. Also VASAB Secretariat was invited by partner 1 (Responsible Partner) to participate in this process. The analysis (data collection) in principle were ended in March 2008 but some of them (requiring surveys) due to formal reasons (tenders) were completed in April 2008. Interpretation of data was

done in April 2008 for all important cases (but some analysis e.g. the benchmarking studies and urban-rural analysis continued till September 2008). In fact in April and even in May and June the fine tuning of analysis (removing mistakes noticed by the other partners) still continued. The reason was that some partners from the reference group were very demanding asking for many improvements even if they had found little inconsistencies after second or third reading of the reports. Therefore the final synthesis report (draft discussion paper) from the analytical phase was completed only in July 2008 and even slightly changed after the WG1 September 2008 meeting and as the result of the EWW final/closing Conference in October 2008.

The outputs have been following:

(i) interim:

- Data (including public surveys) and draft analytical report on “Baltic” metropolitan areas with focus on the role of Kaliningrad and St. Petersburg;
- In depth study on St. Petersburg and Kaliningrad and their developmental potentials in the BSR context (focus on innovation and outsourcing) in which: trends and present policies for innovations nested in NW Russia and outsourcing were analysed, barriers for innovations perceived by business and public administration were identified (based on surveys), and cases on transfer of innovations between NW Russia and other parts of the BSR were described;
- Case studies (reports) on Russian and Belarus small and medium sized cities – covering: Novgorod, Gatchina, Chernyakhovsk, Gusev, Sovetsk, Svetly, Berezovka, Zaslavl;
- Reports on demographic trends in North-West Russia, in St. Petersburg and in Kaliningrad and in Belarus as well;
- Reports on case studies on urban-rural relations in Russia;
- Report on INTERREG III B projects results relevant for work of the WG1 group;
- Benchmarking studies concerning situation in Poland, Germany and Latvia on the issues relevant for the WG1 recommendations .

(ii) A compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") with assessment of unexploited innovation potential in NW Russia, assessment of the potential for regional integration and with identification of spatial problems in NW Russia and BSR.

Comments:

a) All the planned outcomes were achieved. However, during the analytical phase became clear that for the NW Russia innovation is more promising path for integration within the BSR than outsourcing, therefore more efforts were done to analyse this challenge. The list of outputs was enlarged (in comparison to the planned ones) by analysis of the role of the NW Russia in the BSR context (as the result of the WG1 discussions what analysis are necessary to achieve the EWW goal). Also urban structures and functional urban areas of not only large but also some small cities were analysed. The most interesting case appeared to be Gatchina as an example of science intensive cluster in Russia located in a small city. The some other cases illustrated urban-rural relations in Russia (and Belarus).

b) While working with data it became clear that translating data into policy recommendations can not be done by each working group separately. Therefore at the meeting of the WG leaders in December it was proposed that for the starting work on recommendation a workshop for all WGs would be necessary. The Responsible Partner was asked to organize such a workshop on 31st of January 2008 instead of simple WG1 seminar (planned for that date).

c) The work was delayed by some formal constraints such as tender procedures, requirement of separate EUR accounts (very difficult for Ministries) etc.

Activity 3: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR (WG1)

- 3.1. Kick off Conference of the project (1,5 day) for broad public took place on 18-19 October 2007 (according schedule) in St. Petersburg as a part of the well known VI Forum of Strategic Planning Leaders of Cities and Regions of Russia. This allowed project to reach the planned target group. The project: its assumptions and the planned outputs were presented to the Russian decision makers - mainly city mayors and chief planners. Conference participants expressed a deep hope that EWW project would diminish knowledge gaps within the Baltic Sea Region on the character of development potential of the NW Russia, its synergies and complementarities with potentials of other countries of the region, and on methods how this potential could be efficiently connected within the BSR. It was expressed in Conference recommendations that EWW project results should be presented in 2008 at the final Conference within VII Forum of Strategic Planning Leaders of Cities and Regions of Russia. The kick off conference was attended by 259 participants mainly Russian mayors and city planners. Among them there were 57 persons outside Russia. From EWW project 20 persons participated including Latvian State Secretary representing the Responsible Partner. So EWW reached the planned target of **200** Russian decision makers and professionals involved in discussion on the project.
- 3.2. Stakeholder Seminar for WG1 (0,5 day) was organised on 23 April 2008 in Riga (instead of beginning of May as originally planned). The preliminary results of the analytical phase were presented and the first discussions on the recommendations were started. The seminars for all working groups of EWW were arranged back to back with the VASAB annual conference financed by the Latvian Ministry of Regional Development and Local Government from its own means i.e. outside the EWW budget (from the EWW budget some partners only covered their travelling to the EWW seminars). The described above arrangement resulted in very impressive participation in the seminars and allowed to reach a planned target of **100** decision makers and businessman from BSR EU countries involved in discussion of the project findings and recommendations. The conference and seminars were attended by 167 participants including 26 persons directly involved in the EWW project (although the Responsible Partner was represented by some more employees). The participants came mainly from Latvia, Lithuania, and Finland but also from Azerbaijan, Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, EU Commission, Germany, Hungary, Norway, Poland, Russia and Sweden.
- 3.3. Closing(final) Conference of the project (1 day) for broad public took place on 21st October 2008 (according schedule) in St. Petersburg. The title of the conference was “Promoting territorial integration of the North West Russia into the Baltic Sea Region”. The main organiser was ASEET together with the EWW Responsible Partner. This Conference was a part of rich spectrum of the conferences and seminars taking place under umbrella (the same premises) of the VII All-Russia Forum of Strategic Planning Leaders “Strategic Planning in Regions and Cities of Russia”. In the event 631 participants took place out of it 582 from Russia. The forum was organized by: State Duma of the Russian Federation; Ministry for Regional Development of the Russian Federation; Ministry for Economic Development of the Russian Federation; St Petersburg City Administration; Center of Strategic Research; IS CER Leontief Centre. It was opened by Mr Dmitry Kozak, Minister of Regional Development, who underlined that “Forum is becoming the public debating platform for improving the strategic planning system of social and economic development in Russian regions”. The Conference “Promoting territorial integration of the North West Russia into the Baltic Sea region” was composed of four sessions attended by large number of the participants not only from Russia but also from other Baltic Sea Region countries. Some sessions were joint ventures with other organisations, forums and bodies interested in the subjects raised by the EWW project. The names of the sessions were following:
 - “Accessibility and innovations as motors of integration of the NW Russia into the Baltic Sea Region” (presentation of the results of the WG1 and the WG2),

- “Special Features of coastal regional strategies” (presentation of the WG3 results and dialogue with all key persons in Russia dealing with ICZM and maritime spatial planning),
- “Partnership mechanisms in local economic policy implementation” (presentation of the WG1 results with regard to urban-rural partnership).

In addition to that EWW results were presented at the key session of the Forum “Prospects for Federal Okrug Development: Challenges, priorities, threats and constraints. North-West Federal Okrug” attended by key decision makers from the North-West Federal Okrug.

Comments:

The choice of the formula of the kick-off and closing conferences appeared to have very positive results on ability of the project to deliver results to the key target groups in Russia. The Conference was also attended by the Ministerial partners from the EWW project. The EWW results were mirrored in the Forums resolutions. Some interested questions were raised requiring further discussion and examination.

- 3.4. Final publication The book summing up the results of the investigations available for the stakeholders in Kaliningrad and St.Petersburg was edited in October, November and printed in December 2008 by partner no.4.

Comments:

The number of books published was smaller (100) than assumed in the application (400), although the whole budget allocated to this purpose was used. There were several reasons why the printing was more expensive than expected. Some of them were of technical reasons: i.e. the book had more coloured pictures (maps) than estimated and was thicker than planned (more than 300 pages in comparison to 150 pages planned), but the main reason was of vis mayor nature. In 2008 in Russia an unexpected inflation and economic crisis appeared which could not be taken into account at the stage of budget planning. This resulted in much higher printing costs. However, the partner no.4 is ready to print additional copies of the book if demanded. The available copies will be distributed to the most active in the EWW Russian stakeholders and to the project partners of the EWW.

Activity 4: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations and action plan (WG1)

- 4.1. Steering Group Meeting (1 day) took place on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg according to schedule. The meeting was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1,2,3,5,6,7,9,10 and seven invited guests. The Steering Group discussed the project progress. The work was lagging behind the schedule. Although the WG1 started on time it became involved in lengthy discussions about the necessary scope of analysis and detailed division of labour between working groups. The Steering Group decided therefore not to start the work on recommendations before improving synergy between the work of the working groups. This task was given to the meeting of the WGs leaders organised in Riga back to back with the WG2 (5 December 2007) and the WG1 (6-7 December 2007) meetings. The meeting also discussed details of project presentation to the kick-off conference held next day.
- 4.2. WG1 second meeting (1,5 day) took place on 6-7 December 2007 in Riga (instead of late November). The meeting was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10, two external consultants and six invited guests. The meeting concentrated on discussing analytical phase of the project (the decision was that the lagging behind analysis would make necessary to postpone by two months the next WG1 meeting i.e. till the end of analytical phase). However, the WG 1 also started examining the way of preparation of the recommendations out of the analysis conducted. For the starting work on recommendation it was agreed that a workshop for all WGs would be necessary and the

Responsible Partner was asked to organize such a workshop (synergy meeting) on 31st of January 2008 instead of a simple WG1 seminar (scheduled for beginning of February).

- 4.3. Synergy meeting no.1 (1 day) took place in Riga on 31 of January 2008 (replacing the WG1 seminar scheduled for February). It was attended by fourteen project partner members representing partners no.1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, three external experts and six invited guests. The facilitator was hired by the Responsible Partner. During the meeting the participants agreed that all three working groups were in need of a common frame. This should be given by the vision of the BSR till 2030 with full integration of the North-West Russia. The participants managed to prepare an outline of such a vision requiring further work. The meeting asked for one more working day for finishing common visionary frame which should allow preparing meaningful recommendations.
- 4.4. Steering Group Meeting 2 took place on 1 of February 2008 in Riga. It was attended by seven project partner members representing partners no. 1,3,5,6,7, 9, 10 one external expert and seven invited guests. The results of the synergy meeting were discussed i.e. synergy between the work of the working groups. It was decided to organise one more synergy meeting to continue work on the common frame for all WGs, i.e. vision of the BSR till 2030 with full integration of the North-West Russia. An agenda of the April Conference proposed by the Responsible Partner was discussed together with some technical issues. The progress in analytical phase was reviewed.
- 4.5. Synergy meeting no. 2 (1 day) took place in Liepaja on 14th of March 2008. It was attended by ten project partner members representing partners no. 1,3,5,6,9, 10 one external expert and five invited guests. The facilitator was hired by the Responsible Partner but paid from Responsible Partner own means. The final draft of the vision was discussed and shared by participants giving stable frame for analytical part and allowing proper work on recommendations.
- 4.6. WG1 fourth meeting (1 day) took place on 3-4 April 2008 in Riga. It was attended by nine project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 8, 10, two external experts and two invited guests. The meeting was convened on demand of Russian partners who started finalisation of analytical part and wanted to discuss the preliminary results among themselves. It was also important for conceptualization of the recommendations i.e. discussing what findings from analytical phase should be taken into consideration while working on recommendations.
- 4.7 WG1 fifth meeting (one day) took place on 24 April 2008 in Riga. It was attended by fifteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, four external experts and six invited guests. The WG1 before the meeting concentrated mainly on analytical work. At the fifth meeting analyses were summed up and the work on recommendations were started. However, one more meeting was requested (autumn 2008) in order to discuss the final draft of the recommendations and action programme. Due to delay in the work on urban-rural relations in Russia the relevant reports were not presented to the WG1 at this meeting. Only an overview of the progress and main findings were reported. It was decided that for synergy reasons the reports would be presented on seminar on urban-rural relations in Russia to be organised as a joint event with the SeBCo project in Kaliningrad in June 2008. This was realised and such presentation took place and was regarded as a great success by meeting participants.
- 4.8. Steering Group Meeting 3 (one day) took place on 20 May 2008 in Riga. It was attended by five project partner members representing partners no. 1, 5, 9, 10, and five invited guests. The Steering Group discussed the project progress. The results of the second synergy meeting and the April Conference were examined as well as a draft vision of the BSR till 2030 with full integration of the North-West Russia. The Steering Group decided to close analytical part and start the work on recommendations. However, the WG3 leaders asked for additional benchmark study on the results of the INTERREG projects in the field of competences of the WG3 with focus on the German experience. This was to diminish discrepancies between the WGs, since the WG1 and the WG2 already had such type of

expertises included in their work. The problems with travelling budget of Russian partners were discussed once more together with a problem of disappeared financial manager. The Steering Group also continued a discussion on political use of the EWW results i.e. incorporation of the results into the Long Term Perspective of VASAB to be produced in 2009. The output achieved:

- first draft recommendation papers (in outline format) of WG1 and WG2.

4.9. WG1 sixth meeting (one day) took place on 03 September 2008 in Jurmala. It was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, four external experts and seven invited guests. They discussed the final draft of the recommendations and action programme prepared during holiday time 2008 by ASSET, Immanuel Kant State University of Russia (Kaliningrad), Nordregio staff, and external experts. The whole work on urban-rural relations in Russia the relevant analytic reports were presented to the WG1 at this meeting as well. The WG1 discussed and improved the following documents:

- Recommendations how to improve innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Recommendations how to improve settlement policies in NW Russia (urban rural partnership) from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Action plan how to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration.

4.10. Steering Group Meeting 4 (one day) took place on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg. It was attended by 7 project partner members representing partners no. 2, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10 one external expert and 6 invited guests. The group discussed the shape of final publications of the EWW project, the use of the analytical materials and endorsed the recommendations and action proposed by the project. The main discussion was on the proper use of the EWW results for the Long Term Perspective (LTP) of VASAB elaboration of which was started few month ago (August 2008). The EWW results were placed to the different parts of the LTP outcomes. The VASAB consultant responsible for facilitating the LTP process was invited to the Steering Group meeting. It was also discussed how to use EWW outcomes for the process of preparation of the BSR EU Strategy. The partner no.5 arranged a meeting with the EU Commission on that topic. It was decided that the EWW results would be incorporated in the VASAB non-paper to be presented to the EU Commission in November/December 2008 in order to influence strategy preparation. The outputs achieved (as results of the meeting):

- Final draft of the recommendations how to improve innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Final draft of recommendations how to improve settlement policies in NW Russia (urban rural partnership) from the perspective of BSR integration,
- Final draft of the action plan how to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration,
- Final draft of recommendations on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR including concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR,
- Final action plan how to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational sea use planning and ICZM,
- Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic,
- Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application,
- Forwarding (transferring of EWW results) to important BSR processes namely: EU BSR Strategy and VASAB Long Term Perspective.

Activity 5: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 2 on accessibility

5.1. WG2 first meeting (one day) took place on 10 October 2007 in Riga It was attended by five project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 8, 10, one external expert and three

invited guests. The main aim was to discuss the scope of analysis (concrete meaning of accessibility) and the further work of the WG2 step by step, to achieve clarity about division of labour between the partners, to make sure that duplication with other project was avoided (instead to aim at using results achieved by other projects) and to start the process of contracting the external experts. The following outputs were produced or achieved:

- Report how to avoid duplication with other INTERREG III B projects in the field of accessibility was prepared by the project coordinator, discussed at the meeting and accepted by the Responsible Partner;
- TORs for four Kaliningrad University staff members, one Belarus expert and TORs for three external experts together with tender documentation (if necessary) have been prepared and approved. Procurement and contracting procedures for the one external expert was finished in September. Two other experts were also contracted (latter on);
- The main scope of analysis were proposed and discussed. The discussion on analysis continued among the partners (by e-mails) till the second WG2 meeting (December 2007);
- EWW link at the VASAB website was created (see activity 1.1);
- The content of the project flyer was loaded by short information about the WG2 activities.

Comments: The WG2 started its work behind the schedule. Due to the late project start (mid of June 2007), the first period of the project coincided with a holiday season. Therefore the real work of the WG2 (by phone, e-mails etc) started only in September 2007 i.e. three month later than planned. In addition to that, for some partners it was very inconvenient (e.g. celebrations of anniversary of establishment of the Kaliningrad University) and this postponed the start of formal work by one or two month further on i.e. till October 2007. In the meantime the preparation of the WG2 detailed analysis was started. To this end a pre meeting on 22nd of August 2007 was organised (partners 1, 7,8) to prepare tentative proposals on the substance of the work of the WG2. This meeting was paid outside the EWW budget. Although the WG2 (similarly to the WG1) came to the opinion that broader BSR picture was necessary to promote *territorial integration of NW Russia into the BSR in the field of transport and ITC*. The WG2 members also shared the WG1 concern on importance of smooth transfer of the EWW results to the BSR strategy till 2030 i.e. Long Term Perspective to be prepared by VASAB in 2009. The characteristic feature of the WG2 was a long discussion about the meaning of the notion of accessibility. As the result accessibility to energy was also considered to be an important element of the analysis.

Activity 6: Analysis(WG2)

6.1. The discussion on the scope and method of analysis (indicators, pilot studies) had been continued from October till beginning of December 2007. The manuals and guidelines were discussed many times. The main method was e-mail exchanges. As the result the manuals and blue prints were produced by partners 1 and 8 to facilitate collecting data and information:

- A blue print on screening transport policy,
- A manual for collecting data and information on accessibility.

Comments: The majority of time of the initial period was allocated to discussing the notion of accessibility. This was done in order to avoid problems when data and information collection would be started. Due to the rise of energy prices also this issue was considered as important factor for the NW Russia integration to the BSR. The second issue heavily discussed was scarcity of comparable data in Russia. Partner no 8 having a very well developed data base on transport data for the BSR was in a difficult position checking (in dialogue with partner 4) existence of similar data in Russia. This required more resources and more work load than estimated at the

beginning. But finally this allowed presenting Russia at the broader BSR picture. The phase 6.1. ended with second meeting of the WG2 (December 2007 in Riga).

6.2. Data collection and interpretation started only in December 2007 after the second WG 2 meeting. Basic data were collected by mid February 2008 but some work continued (fine tuning of reports) till May/June 2008. A draft discussion paper was ready for the Riga Stakeholder Conference in April 2008. However, it was a working document amended after each important EWW meeting, till the final/closing Conference. In this work (phase 6.1 and 6.2) seventeen people (including three external experts) were involved. Their involvement differed. The main bulk of analytical work was done by partners no. 4 and 8 and the external experts whereas the other participants acted mainly as a reference group reading reports, making comments and asking for improvements. This was done first of all by partners no. 1, 6, 7 and 10 representing mainly policy making side in the project and project coordination. Also VASAB Secretariat was invited by partner 1 (Responsible Partner) to participate in this process.

The following outputs were achieved:

(i) interim:

- Mapping of transport infrastructure policies at the federal and regional level, policies in development of the soft accessibility (to knowledge and information) and policies on clusters in NW Russia (however clusters were analysed by the WG1 in fact), also policies and situation in the field of accessibility to energy was examined;
- Identification of bottlenecks and constraints for transport (and through transport for business development) in NW Russia;
- Assessment of the policy correlation with the strategic documents at the BSR level (mainly by analysing outcomes of Strategic INTERREG III B projects pursued by VASAB, BDF, BSSSC and CPMR);
- Examining the results of other INTERREG III B projects relevant for the WG2 work;
- Feasibility assessment of connecting TEN-T with the pan-European corridors.

The planned verification of the accessibility perspective and of present (current) and forecast trade flows in NW Russia and Belarus (vis-a-vis BSR reports) was less successful. The main reason were missing data concerning predicted trade flows in NW Russia and Belarus⁴⁸. The accessibility perspective instead was analysed using BSR outlook to show how NW-Russia is connected with the rest of the BSR.

(ii) A compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") presenting situation, development trends and political objectives in the fields of transport and accessibility in NW RU and Belarus and their consequences for BSR cohesion and business development

Comments:

The most important planned outputs were achieved (although one output was slightly modified). In addition to that, accessibility to energy was touched as important future factor of the BSR integration that should determine in great extent the NW Russia integration into the BSR. The analysis lasted longer than expected. The main constraint was lack of regional reliable data in NW Russia. The main reason of the delay was in insufficient data availability but also to some extent larger than expected amount of available background information (e.g. results of the BSR projects) that should be digested and analysed.

Activity 7: Pilot studies (WG2)

Since the analytical phase (activity 6) was delayed also pilot projects were postponed. The aim of the activity 7 was to analyse more in depth the most promising solutions developed during the analytical

⁴⁸ The work on trade flows was done in co-operation with WG1 and the BSR perspective was used.

phase and prioritised during stakeholder dialogue. Therefore only in May 2008 the more concrete work on pilot studies (pre-feasibility studies) could start. The WG2 selected two (in line with the output indicators listed in the application) topics for pre-feasibility studies. The topics were following:

- w) BSR passenger railway connectivity with focus on the Eastern part of the BSR,
- x) examination of implementation of the transport part of Tallinn vision of VASAB with focus on the eastern part of the BSR.

For the pilot studies a tender procedure was used and contracts were signed in late June 2008. The results were delivered in late August 2008 and discussed by the WG2 group meeting in September. The following reports were produced:

- *Study on international rail passenger traffic development: Possibilities in the context of development of cities in the Baltic Sea Region* (Contract: 5-13/66, of 18.6.2008) elaborated by SIA “AC Konsultācijas”,
- *Evaluation of implementation of the VASAB 2010 vision in the area of mobility network and energy supply* (Contract: 5-13/74, of 23.7.2008) elaborated by SIA “AC Konsultācijas”.

The results of the studies were presented to the closing/final conference of the EWW and will serve as an input for the Long Term Spatial Development Perspective. They were also presented in advance to the WG2 members working on recommendation in order to shape the WG2 recommendations.

Comments:

An additional barrier delaying activity no.7 was obligation of tendering the contractors due to internal law of Latvia where partner no.1 (responsible for the WG2 work) is located. The WG2 decisions were taken in May 2008, but the contracts were signed only 1,5- 2 months latter coinciding once more with a holiday season. The first preliminary results of the activity no.7 were delivered in August and the final results in October/November 2008.

Activity 8: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR

The same as activity no. 3

Activity 9: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG2)

- 9.1. Steering Group Meeting (1 day) took place on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg according to schedule (for details see action 4.1).
- 9.2. WG2 second meeting (1 day) took place on 5 December 2007 in Riga (instead of late November). The meeting was attended by seven project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 7, 8, 10 and four invited guests. The meeting concentrated on discussing analytical phase of the project. The manuals and blue prints for collecting data and information were agreed. For starting work on recommendation it was discussed that the idea of Steering Group (of its first meeting in October 2007) of workshop for all WGs should be implemented and the Responsible Partner was asked to organize such a workshop (synergy meeting) in January 2008.
- 9.3. Synergy meeting no.1 (1 day) took place in Riga on 31st of January 2008 (see action 4.3. for details).
- 9.4. Steering Group Meeting 2 on 1st of February 2008 in Riga (see action 4.4. for details).
- 9.5. Synergy meeting no. 2 (1 day) took place in Liepaja on 14th of March 2008. (see action 4.5. for details).
- 9.6. Steering Group Meeting 3 (one day) took place on 20 May 2008 in Riga. (for details see action 4.8).
- 9.7. WG2 third meeting (one day) took place on 21 May 2008 in Riga according to schedule. It was attended by five project partner members representing partners no. 1, 7, 8, 10, one external expert and three invited guests. The WG2 before the third meeting concentrated

mainly on analytical work. At this meeting analyses were summed up and the work on recommendations started. It was decided that recommendations (with elements of the action programme) would be prepared for Russia and for the whole BSR with focus on better integration of NW Russia. One additional meeting was requested (autumn 2008) in order to discuss the final draft of the recommendations. The meeting also discussed the pilot actions (pre-feasibility studies) agreeing on concrete items. The outputs achieved:

- a first draft recommendations paper (in outline format),
- TOR for two most important pilot studies.

9.8. WG2 fourth meeting (one day) took place on 4th September 2008 in Jurmala. It was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, three external experts and six invited guests. They discussed the final draft of the recommendations (with elements of the action programme) prepared by Immanuel Kant State University of Russia (Kaliningrad) and Nordregio staff. The WG2 discussed and improved the following documents:

- Recommendations on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR including concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR.
- Study on international rail passenger traffic development: Possibilities in the context of development of cities in the Baltic Sea Region,
- Evaluation of implementation of the VASAB 2010 vision in the area of mobility network and energy supply,
- Overview of results of INTERREG III B projects in the field of accessibility .

9.9. Steering Group Meeting 4 (one day) took place on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg (please see action 4.10)

Activity 10: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 3 on ICZM and transnational sea use planning

10.1. WG3 preparatory meeting took place on 24 July 2007 in Kaliningrad. It was attended by nine project partner members representing partners no. 4, 10, and five invited guests. The meeting was used for preparation of the WG3 first meeting, and the pilot action in particular for presentation and discussion with the Kaliningrad partners the results of the INTERREG project BaltCoast of which recommendations should form main backbone of the work of the WG3. The preparatory meeting was organised during the holiday season due to indicated by the Kaliningrad partner necessity of postponing the WG3 first meeting till October because of the celebrations of 750th anniversary of establishment of the university (lack of experts) in early autumn 2007. So the preparatory meeting was a vehicle to start the work of the WG3 even in slightly less formal way. The main subject of discussion was the BaltCoast recommendations, TORs for experts and other guidelines necessary for elaboration of the WG3 analysis. The outputs were following:

- Decision on TORs and blue prints,
- Clarifying division of labour,
- Project flyer was discussed (and then edited) - see activity 1.1.

10.2 WG 3 first meeting (1,5 day) took place on 30-31 October 2007 in Kaliningrad i.e. with four month delay. The reason was the celebrations of 750th anniversary of establishment of the Albertina University (today Immanuel Kant State University of Russia) in Kaliningrad. The meeting was attended by eleven project partner members representing partners no. 4, 9, 10 and to some extent also partner no.1, one external expert and fifteen invited guests mainly from Russia but also from Latvia, Germany and Finland. The main aim was to discuss the analysis and the further WG3 work in detail, to achieve clarity about division of labour between the partners, to make sure that duplication with other project was avoided (instead to aim at using results achieved by other projects) and to start the process of contracting the external experts. Instead of preparing TORs for separate experts the WG3 at pre meeting decided to make only

two TORs (one for external expert and one for the whole pilot project). For conducting analysis it was agreed that blue prints should be used. Such blue prints were prepared by partner no. 10 in advance presented at the meeting, and then improved/discussed by e-mails and approved in December 2007. The following outputs were produced or achieved:

- Report (in form of power point presentations) – presenting an overview of existing and available documentation on the chosen themes in NW Russia and at the BSR level;
- Two blue prints (for further analysis and discussions);
- Two TORs (one for external expert and one for the whole pilot project);
- One external expert was contracted by the partner no 1 covering by his expertise BSR and HELCOM perspective;
- EWW link at the VASAB website was created (see activity 1.1).

Also Kaliningrad stakeholders who attended the second part of the meeting were informed about the EWW project together with showing them the relevant BSR experience in ICZM and maritime spatial planning. They formed important part of the reference network for dialogue on project findings and recommendations. The meeting was also a starting point for executing analysis.

Activity 11 Analysis (WG 3)

11.1 The discussion on the scope and method of analysis had been continued from October till beginning of December 2007. The discussion resulted in shifting focus more from ICZM to maritime spatial planning as the most important transnational issue related to sea use in the nearest future. The blue prints (to be followed by Russian colleagues) presented by partner 10 were discussed many times. The main method was e-mail exchanges. As the result the two blue prints were agreed:

- A blue print on spatial planning legislation on the sea covering Poland,
- A blue print on potentials and conflicts on the sea covering Poland.

11.2. Gathering and compiling the WG3 information started in December 2007 after blue prints approval. Fourteen people representing partners no. 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10 were involved in the information collecting. Their involvement differed. The main bulk of analytical work was done by partners no.10 and 4 and by external expert whereas the other participants acted mainly as a reference group reading reports, making comments and asking for improvements. This was done first of all by partners no. 5,6 and 7 representing mainly policy making side in the project. The analysis in principle were ended in March. The situation of the WG3 was different than the WG1 and the WG2. The WG3 did not collect statistical information but rather qualitative information and the broad BSR background was discussed, sorted out and clarified at the first meeting by examining BaltCoast results. Therefore, the analytical work could be done in parallel with an initial phase of recommendation preparation. But also in the WG3 the completing analytical reports took more time than expected. Although first draft reports were ready in March their fine tuning continued in April and even in May and June. This was slightly learning by doing in particular for Russian experts who had little contact with maritime spatial planning in the past. The outputs were following:

- The legal systems were screened and regulations, responsibilities for offshore planning at all levels in NW Russia were identified;
- System of mapping to improve access to relevant information from NW Russia and its uploading to the pilot system made in the INTERREG III B BaltCoast project were tested (the results can be seen in the WG3 reports done by Russian colleagues);
- Actual (current) sea use in NW RU (Kaliningrad) according to the BaltCoast standards (potentials and conflicts) were described in a separate paper and conflicts and potentials were detected;

- A compiled draft discussion paper ("overview") with assessment of compatibility of the Russian regulatory framework to the legislation and practice in a pan-Baltic perspective in the field of ICZM and sea use planning was elaborated.

Comments:

The all planned outputs were achieved.

Activity 12 Pilot Action (WG 3)

Pilot action was started in October 2007 and continues till the end of August 2008. The twelve project partners staff members representing partners no. 1,4,6,7,9,10 and one external expert were involved. Partners no. 1,6,7 have acted mainly as a reference group while the main role was played by partners no. 4,9,10. The pilot action aimed at preparing a system of joint ICZM and maritime spatial planning in Gdańsk Bay between Poland and Russia. This task was discussed at the kick off meeting with various Russian stakeholders. The prevailing opinion was that due to the dispersed responsibilities in Russia in ICZM and sea space management (versus concrete central Agency in Poland responsible for sea space and regional governments responsible for ICZM activities) such goal could not be achieved in the project time span. Nowadays there is no single institution in Russia responsible for sea space management (like Maritime Offices in Germany or Poland). The WG3 came to the opinion that agreements between Polish and Russian relevant state institutions on co-operation in sea use planning and management might be too ambitious and premature as the WG3 output. Instead pilot actions were focused on the preconditions for establishment of such agreements in future, by exchange of good practices, deepening mutual understanding and preparing necessary tools and necessary institutional structures i.e. centres of excellence in both countries dealing with maritime spatial planning. It was decided that the starting point should be an agreement between Russian and Polish institutions from NGO or research domain to co-operate on promotion of integrative approach to sea space and coast in both countries. In this context a sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application was discussed. It was considered as an important tool for showing to Russian decision-makers a usefulness of maritime spatial planning. The WG3 decided to limit it to the Baltic Sea around Kaliningrad Oblast. The register was prepared by partner no. 4 and 10 in a form of GIS atlas. The following outputs were produced in the reporting period:

- The exchange of bi-lateral experience was started e.g. Polish pilot sea use plan (covering Puck Bay) elaborated in 2008 under PlanCoast INTERREG III B project was shown to the RU experts;
- The experience with the BaltCoast project of INTERREG III B was shared;
- Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application was first discussed then agreed and then produced and presented to the final/closing conference of the EWW in St. Petersburg on 21st October 2008;
- Agreement between Maritime Institute in Gdańsk and Russian partners on permanent co-operation in the future (including joint projects and policy related work) aiming at establishment of a system of joint ICZM and maritime spatial planning in Gdańsk Bay between Poland and Russia was prepared in autumn 2008. The partners of the agreement will act as an centres of excellence in their countries with regard to maritime spatial planning and ICZM.

Comments:

The pilot action had to be modified. But the actions started within EWW project will be continued after the project closure thanks to established under the EEW contacts. The aim of establishment of the system of joint ICZM and maritime spatial planning in Gdańsk Bay between Poland and Russia is still valid and will be realised in the future. What was done under EWW project was to start this process by exchange of experience, awareness rising, gathering

stakeholders and discussing with them the problem and by preparation of some necessary tools which will convince Russian decision-makers that an integrative coastal and sea space management would be important. Despite difficulties the main outputs promised in the EWW application were produced: i.e. (i) a sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application and (ii) agreements between Polish and Russian relevant institutions on co-operation in sea use planning and management.

Activity 13: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR

The same as activity no. 3

Activity 14: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG3)

- 14.1. Steering Group Meeting (1 day) took place on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg according to schedule (for details see action 4.1).
- 14.2. Synergy meeting no.1 (1 day) took place in Riga on 31st of January 2008 (see action 4.3. for details). This meeting was used by the WG3 also for development of a first outline of recommendation paper which was discussed afterwards by e-mail exchange.
- 14.3. Steering Group Meeting 2 on 1st of February 2008 in Riga (see action 4.4. for details).
- 14.4. Synergy meeting no 2 (1 day) took place in Liepaja on 14th of March 2008 (see action 4.5. for details).
- 14.5. WG3 second meeting (1,5 day) took place on 27-28 March 2008 in Kaliningrad (instead of late November 2007). It was attended by sixteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 7, 9, 10., one external expert and two invited guests. The meeting assessed the progress of the analytical work, discussed the interim reports of Russia and tried to relate the WG3 work towards the EU Integrated Maritime Policy (Blue Book). The final draft of recommendation paper was discussed and agreed. The acknowledgement of the project results at the political level was also examined. The WG3 group joined the WG1 and the WG2 wish to present its results at policy level by introducing them to the “Long Term Perspective” of VASAB. However, partner 9 was also asked to transfer the results to the EU BSR Strategy and to the EU work on integrated maritime policy. During the WG3 meeting a workshop with Russian stakeholders on off-shore planning and ICZM was organised in Kaliningrad on 27th of March 2008 as a joint venture of all projects dealing with this subject i.e. EWW, POWER and SDI-4-SEB as a part of the conference (“Integrated management, sustainable development indicators, spatial planning and monitoring of the South-Eastern Baltic coastal regions”), which took place in Kaliningrad on 26th - 30th of March 2007. Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic were elaborated by EWW project participants beforehand and proposed to stakeholders attending this conference. The recommendations were unanimously adopted by the participants including regional and local authorities from Russia. This seemed to be an important step towards introducing integrative approach towards the sea space and coastal zone in Russia.

The output achieved was following:

- Recommendation paper discussed and adopted by the Russian stakeholder (Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic).
- 14.6. Steering Group Meeting 3 (1day) took place on 20 May 2008 in Riga (for details see action 4.8).
 - 14.7. WG3 third meeting (1 day) took place on 4-5 June 2008 in Gdańsk almost according to schedule (few days later than planned originally). It was attended by fifteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 9, 10, one external expert and five invited guests. At the meeting analytical phase was summed up. The meeting was also used for examining the

experience and good practices of the Balance project in maritime spatial planning. The experts from Denmark introduce the project to the WG3 members. However, the WG3 main discussion concentrated on the 'action plan' following the recommendations adopted in March 2008. The opinions were dispersed. Some participants considered elaboration of an action plan as premature having in mind lack of legal provisions in Russia regulating sea use in an integrative way and dispersion of responsibility for sea management among many institutions. Some others proposed to focus action plan on methodological issues i.e. issues indispensable to introduce sea use planning in Russia and methodology of such planning suited for Russian conditions. After the e-mail exchange in June 2008 the partner no 9 responsible for the WG3 work decided to take the risk to prepare a draft action plan and to discuss it in September 2008 with the WG 3 members. Therefore an additional meeting was requested to be held in September 2008, to conclude the recommendation phase. The following outputs were achieved:

- The experience with Balance project of INTERREG III B was shared.

After the WG3 third meeting the partner no 9 and 10 organised (late June beginning of July 2008) consultation about the follow up of the WG3 in a form of a joint project. In the consultation the information on different ETC Programmes in the BSR were analysed and compared. The results were presented to the WG3 fourth meeting.

- 14.8. WG3 fourth meeting (one day) took place on 2nd September 2008 in Gdańsk. It was attended by thirteen project partner members representing partners no. 1, 4, 7, 9, 10 and one external expert. The meeting discussed the final draft of the action programme prepared by the staff of partners no 4 and 10 (Maritime Institute from Gdańsk and Immanuel Kant State University of Russia from Kaliningrad). Also final draft of the sea use register was presented by the partner no.4. The WG3 discussions tackled also the future use of the WG3 results. The presentations to the final/closing conference of EWW were agreed. It was also decided that the WG3 analysis should serve for broader popularization of the issue of maritime spatial planning in the Baltic Sea Region. The partner no 9. agreed to edit (by the end of 2008) from its own resources a *Compendium on Maritime Spatial Planning systems in the Baltic Sea Region countries* composed of two parts: part 1 *Survey of the national instruments and tools for the management of the sea space in the BSR countries* describing legal and institutional aspects of maritime spatial planning systems in the BSR countries and part 2 entitled *Examples of national cases of sea spatial conflicts and potentials*. Partner no.9 promised to invite to this book all other BSR countries while using the WG3 results as the core input. The WG3 also analysed different possibilities of continuation of the WG3 work. After the lively discussion it was decided to use two vehicles for further co-operation: The project BaltSeaPlan already submitted to the BSR Programme (although slightly too abstractive) and the new project to be submitted to the ENPI Programme Lithuania–Poland–Russian Federation on concrete planning work as continuation of the WG3 pilot activities. It was decided that transnational maritime planning should concentrate on Vistula/Kaliningrad lagoon and on Kursiu lagoon.

The WG3 discussed and improved the following documents during its fourth meeting:

- Action plan how to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational sea use planning and ICZM;
- Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application.

- 14.9. Steering Group Meeting 4 (one day) took place on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg (please see action 4.10)

46.2. Assessment of the results of the Action

The central objective of the Action was to promote territorial integration of NW Russia (i.e. the entire Northwest Federal District, including Kaliningrad) into the Baltic Sea region (BSR) in the identified three fields of (1) business development, (2) transport / ICT development and (3) sea use planning and Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM). The starting point was relatively impressive but

slightly idle (from the BSR perspective) developmental potential (in terms of human capital, scientific achievements etc.) of the North West Russia. The task was to develop solutions how to use the potential of the NW Russia for the benefit of the BSR economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development.

The action was successful to that extend that it managed to identify economic and spatial development needs in the NW Russia from the perspective of public authorities and businesses, requiring to be tackled by at the transnational level. This findings were benchmarked against existing good practice solutions based on experience of other BSR countries. The search was also done in order to detect economic and spatial trends, relevant for connecting territorial potentials between the NW Russia and the BSR. However, the picture coming from analysis appeared less promising than expected (see point 2.9). But even in those rather difficult circumstances the recommendations for three mentioned above fields were formulated and action plans were outlined. The main results delivered to the external audience having policy relevance are presented below:

The results achieved	The results intended	Explanation of differences
Recommendations how to improve innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration	Recommendation" paper with suggestions on policy improvements and legislative changes to improve settlement and innovation policies in NW Russia from the perspective of BSR integration	The results achieved put less attention to legislative changes than to policy improvements. This is outcome of the survey done in order to learn from Russian businessman what are the main obstacles for them to innovate.
Recommendations how to improve settlement policies in NW Russia (urban rural partnership) from the perspective of BSR integration,		The focus of the result achieved is on urban-rural partnership as key for integrative development of settlement structure in Russia.
Action plan how to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration,	A paper with fields for further concrete actions ("action plan") to improve position of the NW Russia in the BSR integration	Done in line with plans
Recommendations on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR including concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR,	1.Recommendation" paper with suggestions on improvements in transport and ICT policies in NW Russia from the viewpoint of economic and territorial integration of the BSR 2. A paper with fields for further concrete actions ("action plan") to be taken in NW Russia and in BY in order to boost economic competitiveness, territorial cohesion and sustainable development of the BSR	The recommendations and action plan were merged. The reason is that Russia has very concrete plans and actions in this field for the future years so the WG2 decided to focus on long-term recommendations.
Recommendations on integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning in the South East Baltic	Recommendation" paper on upgrading the instruments and tools and institutional arrangements for transnational sea use planning and ICZM at the BSR level based on the completed pilot action	More ambitious recommendations were produced than expected i.e. more in line with the real situation in Russia with regard to ICZM and maritime spatial planning
Action plan how to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational sea use planning and	A paper with fields for further concrete actions ("action plan") to integrate NW RU into BSR countries co-operation in/(BSR system of) the transnational	Done in line with plans

ICZM	sea use planning and ICZM	
Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application	A sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application - based on the completed system mapping.	Done in line with plans
Agreement between maritime Institute in Gdańsk and Immanuel Kant State University of Russia on further co-operation in the field of maritime spatial planning	Agreements between Polish and Russian relevant institutions on co-operation in sea use planning and management	Done in line with plans

The most important EWW achievement is delivery of main messages resulting from the Action to the important Russian decision makers, planning professionals and scientific sector as well as to the key pan-Baltic organizations such as HELCOM or VASAB. Through VASAB also the EU BSR strategy was influenced.

46.3. The outcome on both final beneficiaries and/or target group and the situation of the target group/target region which the action addressed

The target audience/recipients of the project findings have been decision-makers (ministries responsible for spatial planning and development in the BSR, including the federal government in Russia, regional authorities in NW Russia, pan-Baltic organisations such as VASAB 2010). Thanks to the action they have received a better picture on the situation with regard to the North-West Russia integration into the Baltic Sea region (BSR). This knowledge has been already used for policy making by VASAB in production of the Long Term Spatial Development Perspective and it seems that it will be also useful for the EU Commission in elaboration of the EU BSR strategy and for HELCOM for implementation of the Baltic Sea Action Plan. In fact the Action played a tremendous role in validation of the planning methodologies and strategic documents at the pan-Baltic level based on the NW Russia perspective. The Action gave a proper insight on main drivers and obstacles of integration of the North West Russia into the BSR. The Action findings and recommendations were also delivered to the Russian decision makers and VASAB will continue its efforts to convince them that the BSR integration is beneficial for the North-West Russia. At least in the field of maritime spatial planning as the result of the Action one can see increased capacity and competence basis to take up joint transnational initiatives between the NW Russia partners and institutions from other BSR countries.

The final beneficiaries local and regional governments in the Baltic Sea region (BSR) operators in the chosen thematic fields (e.g. businesses in WP1 and transport operators in WP2) in NW Russia and in the BSR will be influenced mainly through the actions of pan-Baltic organisations mainly VASAB and its Long Term Spatial Development Perspective. This will allow for incorporation of the BSR perspective in the national/regional/local policies in the NW Russia.

46.4. Publications

The following publications were produced:

Name	Number of copies	Distribution channels
The East-West Window brochure informing about the project	300	Distributed during the project events in particular kick-off conference, stakeholder seminar, the Conference "Baltic Sea Region Programme 2007-2013: new partnership opportunities for Russian and Belarusian regions" and many other events
Атлас использования прибрежных акваторий российской части Юго-восточной Балтики (Sea use register in Russia with relevant maps/GIS application – <i>edited on CD rom</i>)	200	Distributed for free during the EWW final (closing) conference, available for free from partner no.4

The book in Russian: Северо-Запад России в Регионе Балтийского моря: Проблемы и перспективы экономического взаимодействия и сотрудничества (North West Russia in the Baltic Sea region. Problems and perspectives of co-operation and mutual influence) presenting main results of the project	100	Distributed for free by partners no.4 among the project partners and participants of the EWW events. Sent to Russian relevant Ministries and main libraries.
--	-----	--

46.5. Contracts (works, supplies, services) above 5000€ awarded for the implementation of the action since the last interim report

Only one contract above 5000€ was awarded since the last interim report.

	Contract	Amount	Procedure	Winner
1	Audit Services Contract	5 131,94	“negotiated procedure without publication”	<i>SIA Rodl and Partner</i>

46.6. Continuation of the Action after ending the support from the European Community

The action will be continued after ending the EU support for the East West Window project. Durability of the project results has been ensured by the direct participation or the support of the national ministries responsible for spatial planning and development around the BSR, acting under VASAB 2010. Through their co-operation with other relevant stakeholders, the project rendered available concrete recommendations for policy-making in the chosen thematic fields in the NW Russia and at the BSR level. Through intensive dialogue with the target audience, the project influenced planners in Russia neighbouring countries by including the perspective of NW Russia. It also served for modification of pan-Baltic strategic policy papers, long-term visions and development plans on the very same account.

In particular the EWW results were used by VASAB for elaboration of the Long Term Perspective for Spatial Development of the BSR. Thanks to the EWW this will be the document with proper outlook on North-West Russia. Due to the EWW the collaboration between VASAB (ministries) and other EWW partners (research institutes) will be strengthened. The EWW results will be also used for discussing with HELCOM an idea of maritime spatial planning in the Baltic Sea Region.

Follow-up activities in effect of the project will be initiated and promoted by VASAB 2010. This includes starting up of possible new project(s) covering the whole BSR and taking into consideration the needs and perspectives of NW Russia, identified and referred to in the present project. The WG3 work will be continued in a form of the BaltSeaPlan project already approved by the BSR Programme (will start around December 2008). The WG3 partners will also plan to submit the project on elaboration of concrete maritime spatial plans for Vistula and Kursiu Lagoons in the framework of the ENPI Programme Lithuania–Poland–Russian Federation. Despite finishing the work of the WG3 the partner no.9 responsible for its leading has already declared to continue the efforts in a broader BSR set up and started elaboration of the BSR wide “Compendium on Maritime Spatial Planning systems in the Baltic Sea Region countries” using the WG3 results and experience.

46.7. Gender equality, disabilities

Where relevant, the perspective of equal opportunities was taken into account for the thematic work (especially in the fields of business and transport). Due efforts were made to secure involvement of both men and women in the composition of the project management structures, daily work and in the dialogue fora with relevant stakeholders in NW Russia and at the overall BSR level. Spatial planning forming a substance of the project from its definition cares for gender equality, prevention or exclusions of handicapped from the normal life. Although, gender equality and disabilities were not the main focus of the EWW project one can assume that the realisation of the project objectives (integration of the NW Russia into the BSR) will be beneficial in a long run also for attracting attention of Russian decision makers and Russian society to those above mentioned horizontal goals. They are placed very high at civil agenda in particular in the Nordic countries and integration means also convergence in values and way of living so it means better acceptance of these horizontal goals in Russia as well. The same has happened in Poland, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia after their accession to EU (strengthening their European integration).

46.8. Monitoring and evaluation of the activities

Monitoring of activities was done on routine basis by the project Steering Group. The group worked very effectively guiding the project and proposing the changes if necessary. The group (ministerial part) provided also an excellent piece of advice with regard to use of the EWW project results for policy making. However, one should also admit the important role of Committee on Spatial Development of the Baltic Sea Region which was among the main recipients of the project results. The advice from this body and the VASAB Secretariat which took part in majority of the EWW events (on their own money) helped a lot in proper shaping the EWW work and focusing on the policy relevant results (e.g. providing links to HELCOM, EU BSR Strategy etc.).

Also important were feedbacks received from beneficiaries during the kick-off and final (closing) conference. In the Annex 2 quotations from the Conference resolutions are attached (in Russian).

46.9. What has been learned from the Action

The main lesson from the action is that integration of the NW Russia into the Baltic Sea Region (BSR) will not be an easy process. Russia is a global player looking for global organizations and bodies as its partners. Even the regional level i.e. St. Petersburg has sufficient potential to play an important role at the global arena. This is clearly seen in the St. Petersburg government policy and strategic documents. BSR is not the main field of St. Petersburg strategic activity. Slightly different situation is with regard to Kaliningrad, but its potential is sufficient to strengthen rather cross-border than pan-Baltic integration of Russian Federation. The main integrative processes between Russia and the rest of the BSR are hardly due to market forces or conscious decisions of the Russian enterprises but rather thanks to EU financial support in form of transnational and cross-border programmes. The only field in which one can expect more or less natural co-operation between Russia and the other BSR countries is maritime spatial planning as long as it affects coastal defence, fish stock and state of the coastal nature. Russia is very active now in HELCOM where the questions of maritime spatial planning have been already raised.

Therefore strengthening integration of the North-West Russia into the BSR requires further development of the Russian medium size cities such as e.g. Kaliningrad or Pskov, their partnership with adjacent regions, and development of the maritime spatial planning institutions which in natural way will seek for the relations with their closest neighbours.

47. Partners and other Co-operation

47.1. How do you assess the relationship between the formal partners of this Action (i.e. those partners which have signed a partnership statement)? Please specify for each partner organisation

St. Petersburg Administration [2] – partner active for discussing policy relevant documents and organising meetings in St. Petersburg in the field of analysis acting through partner no.3 . Important contribution to the stakeholder dialogue. In fact this partner will be one of the main recipients of the project results.

Russian Economic Developers Association (ASSET) [3] – very demanding from formal point of view but also very experience partner in analytical work. A great bulk of the WG1 recommendations were proposed by this partner. The partner is a great interface between science and policy making in Russia in particular in St. Petersburg. Important role in dissemination activities thanks to good contacts with decision-makers in Russia at local and regional level.

Immanuel Kant State University of Russia [4] – very reliable and enthusiastic partner being a source of many data and information excellent in scientific work acquiring great experience during the EWW project how to translate analysis into policy findings, but in fact majority of recommendations of the WG2 and the WG3 were rooted in partner no. 4 thinking.

Ministry of the Environment, Danish Forest and Nature Agency, Denmark [5] – very active and experienced partner (being responsible in the past for the USUN project) leading the WG 1 work and ensuring proper presentation of EWW at the highest BSR political level.

Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Housing, Germany [6] – very active and experienced partner responsible for urban-rural investigations under the WG1, ensuring proper presentation of EWW at the highest BSR political level.

Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communication, Sweden [7] – partner ensuring link to the EU BSR strategy (use of EWW results also there), acting mainly through partner 8 but very active in the WG2 , active in the WG3 (with very high quality inputs) and contributing to policy relevant findings in the EWW.

Nordic Centre for Spatial Development (NORDREGIO) [8] – one of key drivers for analytical work, competent, flexible with a large knowledge and experience in spatial and regional development.

Ministry of Regional Development, Poland [9] – partner leading the WG3 but active in other work groups, very experienced and very flexible contributing to the work additional resources if project resources are not sufficient.

Maritime Institute, Poland [10] – key resource for maritime spatial planning and ICZM in the project supporting actively the WG3 and coordinating the whole project from content point of view in very reasonable way.

47.2. Is the partnership to continue

The partnership will continue in a form of BSR Programme and ENPI Programme projects on maritime spatial planning. The co-operation agreement between partners no 4 and 10 will serve to this end. The BaltSea Plan was approved by the BSR programme. The project will serve as a continuation and dissemination of the WG3 work and results since both partners no 4 and 10 are among its key drivers.

The EWW project results were also used within the VASAB framework. This means that new partners such as Nordregio, ASSET or Immanuel Kant State University of Russia have joined the VASAB work and their involvement will continue.

47.3. How would you assess the relationship between your organisation and State authorities in the Action countries? How has this relationship affected the Action?

Since majority of the partners are state high level institutions those relations were fine. The partners representing state authorities knew each other for many years before starting the project as the members of the VASAB co-operation (Co-operation of Ministers for spatial planning and development in the BSR countries). The new input was given by the scientific institutions. This was a great added value of the project, mutual learning how to translate analysis into policy relevant actions. The research oriented partners were quite flexible and willing to reshape analysis or repeat them if asked by policy making partners.

47.4. Where applicable, describe your relationship with any other organisations involved in implementing the Action:

- Associate(s) (if any) - no
- Sub-contractor(s) (if any). Some of the work was given to the external contractors. However an idea was that majority of work should be done by the partners themselves since the partners had sufficient qualification to execute the project and achieve its goals. Contractors were used mainly for technical issues and for bringing knowledge from INTERREG projects. Only some partners (9) and (5) used contractors more intensively (for some concrete work) due to shortages in their human resources. In principle the relation with contractors were positive with one exception (i.e. Rumanian contractor who won a tender for the EWW financial management disappeared after few month of serving the project)
- Final Beneficiaries and Target groups. Those relations were fine thanks to sue of well established and prominent conferences for presentation of the EWW. This gave the project access to the target group necessary for the project success.
- Other third parties involved. Important was a link of the project to the VASAB Secretariat and VASAB work on the Long Term Perspective. VASAB Secretariat promoted also project and its results externally on request of the Responsible Partner.

47.5. Where applicable, outline any links you have developed with other actions.

The project ambition was to develop link to other important projects in order to make use of their results (BaltCoast, PlanCoast, Balance, USUN, SeBCo – their experts were invited to the project meetings) or to make joint meetings to better reach target groups (SeBCo POWER and SDI-4-SEB). These projects represented different INTERREG strands.

47.6. If your organisation has received previous EC grants in view of strengthening the same target group, in how far has this Action been able to build upon/complement the previous one(s)? (List all previous relevant EC grants).

The Ministries involved in the project previously received a grant from INTERREG II C to prepare an Action Plan for implementation of the VASAB strategy adopted in 1994. The project was called VASAB Plus and ended in 2000. The EWW used the VASAB Plus experience but its focus was different. This time the target geographical area was the NW Russia and its integration to the BSR. The lesson learned under the VASAB Plus (where Russia had no financial resources for analysis) showed that preparation of a pan-Baltic documents with very differentiate resources might result in uneven involvement of the countries and then uneven ownership of the agreed actions or strategies. Therefore the EWW was invented to avoid such a mistake and to give Russian colleagues resources for considering their role in the BSR integration.

48. Visibility

How is the visibility of the EU contribution being ensured in the Action?

At the project start a press release was done by the Responsible Partner. Visibility was ensured by placing proper information that the EWW project was part-financed by the EU together with the EU logo and logo of INTERREG III B. This was done on printing materials, power point presentation and on the project web site. There was also some information in the Latvian radio. On demand of Russian colleagues the project was presented at the Conference “Baltic Sea Region Programme 2007-2013: new partnership opportunities for Russian and Belarusian regions” in St. Petersburg as one of the most successful INTERREG projects with Russian participation. To strengthen the project visibility a special project banner was produced and displayed on many occasions (e.g. Conference “Baltic Sea region Spatial Development Policies avenues to the Long Term Perspective” in Riga on 23 April 2007, and already mentioned conference “Baltic Sea Region Programme 2007-2013: new partnership opportunities for Russian and Belarusian regions” in St. Petersburg on 16-17 April 2008 and in many other events). The book with the project analysis and recommendations was printed in December 2008. But the most important is that the project results will be used for producing “Long Term Perspective” for the BSR which will be presented to CBSS and all important pan-Baltic organizations. Thanks to EWW NW Russia will be properly highlighted in this strategy.

The European Commission may wish to publicise the results of Actions. Do you have any objection to this report being published on Europe Aid Co-operation Office website? If so, please state your objections here.

Name of the contact person for the Action: **Vladislavs Vesperis**

Signature:Location: **Riga, Latvia**

Date report due:Date report sent:

Update of action plan

Activity	Months																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Activity 1: Kick off of the work of Working Group no 1 on business development and innovation affecting spatial development,	X	X	X	X														
Activity 2: Analysis(WG1)				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Activity 3: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR (WG1)					X						X						X	
Activity 4: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations and action plan (WG1)					X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Activity 5: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 2 on accessibility				X														
Activity 6: Analysis(WG2)					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Activity 7: Pilot studies (WG2)												X	X	X	X	X		
Activity 8: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR					X						X						X	X
Activity 9: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG2)					X	X		X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Activity 10: Kick off of the work of the Working Group no 3 on ICZM and transnational sea use planning		X			X													
Activity 11 Analysis (WG 3)					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					
Activity 12 Pilot Action (WG 3)					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
Activity 13: Dialogue with stakeholders in RU and in BSR					X						X						X	
Activity 14: Preparation and acknowledgement of the recommendations (WG3)					X			X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		

EWV events: participation of man and woman

Participants			
Event	Woman	Man	Total
Kick off meeting of the work of WG1, on 25 June 2007 in Riga	9	11	20
WG1 meeting 25 September 2007 in Riga	4	3	7
WG1 analysis (people involved)	11	23	34
Steering Group meeting on 17 October 2007 in St. Petersburg	7	11	18
St Petersburg kick off conference on 18-19 October 2007	112	146	259
St Petersburg Closing conference on 21 October 2008	231	400	631
WG1 second meeting on 6-7 December 2007 in Riga	9	10	19
Synergy meeting no.1 on 31 January 2008 in Riga	10	13	23
Steering Group Meeting no.2 on 1 February 2008 in Riga	4	11	15
Synergy meeting no 2 in Liepaja on 14 th of March 2008	8	8	16
WG1 fourth meeting on 3-4 April 2008 in Riga	6	7	13
Riga Stakeholders seminars (WG3 and WG1 + WG2) on 23 April 2008	83	84	167
WG1 fifth meeting on 24 April 2008 in Riga	13	12	25
Steering Group Meeting no. 3 on 20 May 2008 in Riga	4	6	10
Steering Group Meeting no. 4 on 20 October 2008 in St. Petersburg	3	10	13
WG1 sixth meeting on 3 rd September 2008 in Jurmala	11	11	22
WG2 first meeting on 10 October 2007 in Riga	3	6	9
WG2 analysis	6	11	17
WG2 second meeting on 5 December 2007 in Riga	4	7	11
WG2 third meeting on 21 May 2008 in Riga	2	7	9
WG2 fourth meeting on 4 th September 2008 in Jurmala	9	11	20
WG3 preparatory meeting on 24 July 2007 in Kaliningrad	4	10	14
WG 3 first meeting on 30-31 October 2007 in Kaliningrad	12	15	27
WG3 analysis	3	11	14
Pilot Action (WG 3)	3	10	13
WG3 second meeting on 27-28 March 2008 in Kaliningrad	6	13	19
WG3 third meeting on 4-5 June 2008 in Gdańsk	6	15	21
WG3 fourth meeting 2 September 2008 in Gdańsk	3	11	14

Quotations from the Conference resolutions (in Russian) in direct relations to the EAST West Window.

23. Kick Off Conference

Продвижение европейского опыта в рамках программ Европейского Инструмента Соседства и Партнерства усилит инновационный потенциал и влияние Северо-Западного региона России на процессы территориальной интеграции на внешних границах ЕС, в частности, в регионе Балтийского моря. В этих целях целесообразна активизация участия России в таких международных объединениях, как VASAB 2010, Балтийский форум развития (BDF), Программа транснационального сотрудничества региона Балтийского моря 2007-2013.

Зарубежный опыт свидетельствует о значительной роли малых и средних городов в продвижении инноваций и гармонизации территориального развития. Этот факт должен учитываться при разработке инновационных стратегий в России как на федеральном, так и на региональном уровнях. Необходимо уделять больше внимания развитию малых и средних городов, как это происходит в странах ЕС, и адаптировать европейский опыт применительно к ситуации в России (в частности, концепцию сельско-городского партнерства «ESDP Concept of Rural-Urban Partnership»). Доступ к знаниям и информации, возможность обмена идеями должны стать основой формирования территориальных моделей развития России.

/.../

Участники Форума согласились со следующим:

- необходимо особое единое государственное управление морскими прибрежными зонами страны (обеими их составляющими: морской и сухопутной) исходя из повсеместного успешного мирового опыта подобной деятельности и соответствующих рекомендаций организаций системы ООН и международных форумов на высшем уровне. Руководствуясь этим, рекомендовать: 1) создание нормативной правовой и институциональной базы для разработки и реализации комплексных программ развития и управления прибрежными зонами в рамках комплексных программ социально-экономического развития приморских субъектов Федерации и программ развития прибрежных муниципальных образований в целях активизации участия последних в освоении прибрежных и морских ресурсов; 2) адаптацию и освоение современных управленческих технологий (методология Комплексного управления прибрежными зонами (КУПЗ)) в применении к богатейшим по ресурсам и разнообразным по природным и социально-экономическим условиям прибрежным зонам страны; 3) разработку и реализацию пилотных программ КУПЗ конкретных побережий страны; 4) использование опыта сотрудничества стран Балтийского региона, в частности рекомендаций Проекта BaltCoast BSR INTERREG III B по управлению прибрежными зонами и разработке совместных стратегических проектов;
- рекомендовать использование кластерного подхода в качестве инструмента реализации стратегий развития территорий и повышения конкурентоспособности региональной и муниципальной экономики, включая выявление и диагностику потенциальных кластеров, разработку программ их развития, создание организаций по сотрудничеству. В органах власти необходимо формирование межотраслевых рабочих групп для координации развития кластеров и снятия ведомственных и отраслевых ограничений. Целесообразно более широкое использование международных программ и инструментов повышения конкурентоспособности кластеров;
- необходимо развитие региональной и муниципальной статистики, в частности для целей выработки эффективной кластерной политики и оценки результатов реализации кластерных инициатив в регионе и/или муниципалитете, формирования действенных

инструментов планирования и управления, ориентированного на результат на субфедеральных уровнях;

- при реализации федеральных, региональных и местных программ экономического развития необходимо стимулировать участие организаций инновационной инфраструктуры в российских и зарубежных сетевых организациях, которые оказывают содействие в предоставлении услуг компаниям и научным организациям в сфере инновационной бизнес-кооперации и трансфера технологий (примерами могут служить Российская сеть трансфера технологий RTTN, Европейская сеть бизнес-инновационных центров EBN). Участие в сетевом сотрудничестве должно быть нацелено на повышение качества и содержания услуг для местных компаний и НИИ. Федеральным и региональным органам власти необходимо поддерживать инициативы по развитию сетевого взаимодействия между организациями инновационной региональной инфраструктуры (создание региональных сетей) с целью уменьшения дублирования функций, повышения качества услуг и снижения расходов бюджета на их субсидирование;
- рекомендовать и стимулировать участие российских центров коммерциализации, инновационных центров в реализации Competitiveness Innovation Program (CIP) Европейского союза в части проектов, ориентированных на развитие инновационных сетей и сетей трансфера технологий (IRC, IRE, EBN и др.);
- считать целесообразным использование в России европейского опыта реализации региональных инновационных стратегий, обеспечивающих выявление спроса на инновации среди компаний и ориентацию научного сектора и инновационной инфраструктуры на удовлетворение этого спроса. (...);
- в целях совершенствования государственного и муниципального управления по обеспечению перехода Российской Федерации на инновационный путь развития рекомендовать Комиссии при Президенте Российской Федерации по вопросам совершенствования государственного управления и правосудия, Министерству регионального развития Российской Федерации, другим заинтересованным федеральным и региональным органам власти осуществить экспертизу полномочий органов государственной власти субъектов Российской Федерации и органов местного самоуправления в части выявления проблемных вопросов, препятствующих обеспечению перехода России на режим инновационного развития, и законодательно обеспечить активизацию участия в реализации государственной научно-технической политики органов государственной власти субъектов Федерации и органов местного самоуправления, рассмотреть возможность разработки национальной программы, ориентированной на содействие российским регионам в подготовке и реализации региональных инновационных стратегий и формирование российской сети инновационных регионов;
- рекомендовать заинтересованным федеральным и региональным органам государственной власти реализовать систему мер по поддержке технопарков и процессов коммерциализации научных разработок. В частности: разработать законодательную базу для развития технопарков на федеральном уровне; предоставить налоговые льготы компаниям-резидентам технопарков, например, аналогичные льготам для резидентов ОЭЗ; упростить процедуру предоставления земельных участков для технопарков; законодательно разрешить НИИ, вузам и университетам создавать малые предприятия - start-up'ы;
- рекомендовать органам регионального и муниципального управления активно использовать инструменты международной технической и финансовой помощи, предоставляемой по линии Института Всемирного Банка, АМР США, Европейского Инструмента Соседства и Партнерства (ENPI) и других программ Европейского Союза для реализации стратегических приоритетов и планов территориального развития, поддержки инноваций;
- отметить необходимость выработки механизма интеграции документов стратегического планирования муниципального, регионального и федерального уровней;
- одобрить инициативы Комитета по пространственному развитию региона Балтийского моря (CSD/BSR) VASAB 2010 по территориальной интеграции Северо-Запада России и реализации совместных проектов в таких приоритетных сферах как развитие бизнеса, транспорта, ИКТ, управление прибрежными зонами. Отметить актуальность проекта «Окно

Восток-Запад", который позволит восполнить пробелы в оценке инновационного потенциала Северо-Запада России и расширит возможности синергии инновационных потенциалов стран Балтийского региона.

- предложить Комитету VASAB 2010 использовать Форум лидеров стратегического планирования городов и регионов России в качестве референтной группы для обсуждения Стратегии пространственного развития региона Балтийского моря.

24. Closing Conference

24.1. «Перспективы развития Северо-Западного федерального округа: вызовы, приоритеты, угрозы и ограничения»

Участники рекомендуют:

- 34) в целях максимального учёта сложившихся межсубъектовых экономических связей, обеспечения увязки общегосударственных и региональных планов и прогнозов социально-экономического развития, целесообразно предусмотреть **разработку стратегических документов долгосрочного социально-экономического развития на уровне федеральных округов**. Для преодоления ведомственной и региональной разобщённости целесообразно поручить эту работу Ассоциациям экономического взаимодействия соответствующих федеральных округов. Это позволит точнее формулировать цели регионального развития в увязке с имеющимися общими ресурсами, объективно сформировать перечень основных межрегиональных проектов, обеспечивающих достижение общих целей развития. Подобные документы могут стать основой для последующей разработки Концепции долгосрочного социально-экономического развития Российской Федерации;
- 35) для ускорения социально-экономического развития территорий требуется **активизация межрегионального взаимодействия**. Зачастую депрессивные регионы (субъекты Федерации) экономически тесно связаны с успешными регионами (транспортные подходы к инфраструктурным объектам, наличие сырьевой базы для обрабатывающих производств и т.п.). В этом случае целесообразно оказывать федеральную помощь (налоговые и иные льготы, государственные гарантии под привлекаемые кредиты, первоочередное финансирование проектов в рамках действующих ФЦП и др.) для инфраструктурного развития депрессивных территорий по поддерживаемым видам и направлениям экономической деятельности, а также для реализации проектов способствующих комплексному развитию двух и более субъектов Федерации;
- 36) необходимым условием развития и Северо-Западного федерального округа и страны в целом является **совершенствование работы транспортного комплекса**. Требуется системный подход к формированию единой стратегии развития транспортно-логистического комплекса страны в увязке с развитием отраслей экономики и внешнеэкономической ситуацией.

24.2. «Специфика стратегий приморских регионов»

Участники считают, что

- 34) Необходимо совершенствование стратегического планирования применительно к морской деятельности и приморским регионам и муниципалитетам, предусматривающее:

на федеральном уровне:

- применение интегральных подходов к планированию и управлению в морском природопользовании. Это позволит преодолеть фрагментарность, присущую отраслевому подходу, учесть взаимосвязанность видов морского природопользования, способствовать связям и межотраслевой гармонизации в морской деятельности исходя из анализа конфликтного использования ресурсов, обеспечить многоцелевую ориентацию и соответствие

деятельности природоохранным целям, участие всех заинтересованных сторон в разработке стратегий и программ развития;

- создание нормативной правовой и институциональной базы для разработки и реализации комплексных программ развития и управления прибрежными зонами, основанных на интегральных подходах, в рамках стратегий и программ социально-экономического развития приморских субъектов Федерации и программ развития прибрежных муниципальных образований. Это позволит реализовать особое единое государственное управление морскими прибрежными зонами страны (обеими их составляющими: морской и сухопутной) исходя из повсеместного успешного мирового опыта подобной деятельности и соответствующих рекомендаций организаций системы ООН и международных форумов на высшем уровне;

на региональном уровне:

- адаптацию и освоение современных управленческих технологий (методология Комплексного управления прибрежными зонами - КУПЗ) в применении к богатейшим по ресурсам и разнообразным по природным и социально-экономическим условиям прибрежным зонам страны;
- разработку и реализацию пилотных программ КУПЗ конкретных побережий страны.

Реализация этих мер позволит реализовать естественные природные конкурентные преимущества морских акваторий и прибрежных территорий в обеспечении дополнительного экономического роста, конкурентоспособности, инвестиционной привлекательности, занятости, повышения комфортности и качества жизни, охраны окружающей среды и уменьшения ущерба от природных и техногенных катастроф, а также безопасности страны

- 35) Необходимо совершенствование нормативной правовой базы, регулирующей градостроительную деятельность, в части учета специфики этой деятельности на морских акваториях, находящихся под суверенитетом и юрисдикцией Российской Федерации.
- 36) Необходимо развивать международное сотрудничество в стратегическом планировании морского природопользования, учитывая единство и экосистемный характер морских процессов, и широко использовать международный опыт в этой сфере.

