Study on providing public transport in cross-border regions – mapping of existing services and legal obstacles

Inventory of administrative and legal obstacles to cross-border public transport

Contract: 2019CE160AT093

December – 2021

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Directorate-General for Regional and Urban Policy
Directorate D – European Territorial Cooperation, Macro-regions, Interreg and Programmes Implementation I
Unit D2 – Interreg, Cross-Border Cooperation, Internal Borders

Contact: Ricardo Ferreira

E-mail: *REGIO-D2-CROSS-BORDER-COOPERATION@ec.europa.eu*
ricardo.ferreira@ec.europa.eu

European Commission
B-1049 Brussels

Study on providing public transport in cross-border regions – mapping of existing services and legal obstacles

Inventory of administrative and legal obstacles to cross-border public transport

Contract: 2019CE160AT093

Directorate-General for Regional and Urban Policy

2022

EN

Manuscript completed in December 2021

1st edition

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2022

PDF ISBN 978-92-76-46549-2 doi: 10.2776/739282 KN-01-22-009-EN-N

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

The study "Providing public transport services in cross-border regions – mapping of existing services and legal obstacles" includes a collection of obstacles to cross-border public transport service provision. In total 57 obstacles were identified. These were summarised in an 'Inventory of administrative and legal obstacles to cross-border public transport'. Obstacles result from border related particularities of cross-border public transport compared to domestic public transport. With a focus on legal and administrative obstacles of CBPT at EU Member State and EEA borders, they have been identified through document analysis and a survey.

This document presents the inventory of obstacles in form of obstacle 'fiches'. The fiches facilitate reading of the obstacles one-by-one. The inventory is also made available as an excel file, which allows to filter for modes, types of obstacles etc. and to compare obstacles along different analytical categories. The content of the fiches and the inventory is the same.

Information on legal and administrative obstacles is presented along nine main categories (some of which are further differentiated in standardised sub-categories as described in the box below):

1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle
6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle
7. Key stakeholders (suitable to initiate a solution)
8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study
9. Sources

The level of detail differs per obstacle depending on the issues at stake or the available information. Information obtained via an online survey among key players in Europe's border regions could not always be verified. Therefore, these obstacles have an "S" in the number and information on sources (part 9 of each fiche) refers to survey responses in an anonymous way. In general numbering corresponds with the number of obstacles in the inventory facilitating quick identification of the obstacles between this document and the excel file. The numbering of the obstacles is non-hierarchical but results from the data collection and document review process.

About 60% of the obstacles refer to administrative issues. About 20% of obstacles concern either EU or national legal frameworks. Finally, another 20% of CBPT obstacles have other roots. These may be a combination of different difficulties or result from other restrictions such as geographical factors or a lack of infrastructure.

Legal and administrative obstacles are due to different matters and practices and need to differentiate between different types of CBPT. They are differentiated along the following categories:

EU legal obstacles:
(I.1) the particular status of a given EU border
(I.2) the absence of EU-regulations or EU-directives on specific aspects of transport and CBPT or on other CBPT-relevant policy fields
(I.3) existing but inadequate EU legislation on specific aspects of transport and CBPT or on other CBPT-relevant policy fields
(I.4) an incoherent implementation of existing EU legislation on transport and CBPT or on other CBPT-relevant policy fields by EU-Member States

National legal obstacles:
(II.1) different national-level legal provisions in a CBPT-relevant policy field for which only a supporting EU competence does exist
(II.2) different national-level legal provisions in a CBPT-relevant policy field for which no EU competence does exist
(II.3) an asymmetric cross-border legal context for CBPT, due to different national or regional legal provisions or administrative directives on specific aspects of transport and CBPT for which no EU competence does exist

Administrative obstacles:
(III.1) non-awareness or non-willingness of national-level authorities to initiate or support solutions that could eliminate specific problems for CBPT
(III.2) an asymmetric cooperation constellation between the competent public authorities in the cross-border region, which leads to different policies on CBPT on each side or prevents that specific problems of CBPT are jointly tackled
(III.3) structural differences between transport operators delivering CBPT on each side of a border
(III.4) a lack of cross-border coordination of already existing national, regional or local public transport services
(III.5) a lacking harmonisation of fare systems existing on both sides of a border or the absence of a single cross-border fare system
(III.6) different administrative cultures (i.e. ways of delivering policies) or different working procedures / routines of transport operators on either side of the border
(III.7) other adverse practices

For the mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle the following sub-categories are differentiated:
(1.1) local / regional cross-border railway line, comprising at least one stop in two contiguous border regions in two different countries
(1.2) international railway line, also comprising stops in each of the contiguous border areas of a cross-border region
(2.1) as tram or light rail running on a line or network with dedicated tracks that are not shared with other conventional local/regional or international train services (passenger, freight)
(2.2) a "tram-train" (Karlsruhe model) running on a line or network comprising inner-city tracks and mainline railroad tracks, with the latter being also used by other conventional local/regional or international train services (passenger, freight)
(3.1) local / regional cross-border bus line, comprising at least one stop in two contiguous border regions in two different countries
(3.2) international bus line, also comprising stops in each of the contiguous border areas of a cross-border region
(4.1) river ferry service (passengers, cars) across a border river separating two contiguous border regions in two different countries
(4.3) lake ferry service (passengers, cars) across a freshwater lake separating border regions in two or more different countries
(4.3) maritime ferry service (passengers, cars, trains) across a strait / sound, with trips lasting less than 1 hour in each direction

1	Problems for a profitable operation of CBPT		
Short description	Various "systemic differences" on both sides of the AT-HU border (esp. taxes, remuneration) complicate a profitable operation of CBPT		
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices			
Type of obstacle	Other obstacle		
Comments	Simultaneous existence and complex interplay of various adverse factors mentioned under types 1, 2 and 3		
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle			
Geographical extent	Specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)		
Border	AT-HU		
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle			
Mode	Bus, Train		
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation			
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up			
Type of CBPT set-up problem	Missing cross-border transfer service between two domestic lines ending close to the common border	National, regional or local public transport authorities from both sides of the border have different functions and responsibilities, which hinders or prevents cooperation	Regional / local public transport authorities have considerably different financial capacities (budgetary resources)
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	There are different authorities responsible for public transport at the Austrian-Hungarian border (federal state in Austria vs. Central Ministry in Hungary) that also have a different territorial and service focus. From this "systems difference" also emerge barriers for operating profitable CBPT. Loss-making CBPT can be entitled to compensation from the public body who orders the public transport service. The details are well-defined by the Regulation 1370/2007 EC about PSO (Public Service Obligation) and the Regulation 1073/2009 about bus service provision. However, there is no exact indication about cross-border services and the respective member states' own complying legal framework, also not regarding the exact cross-border services concerned.		
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT			
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	Lacking economic viability		
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	The tendering and finance of services is completely different on both sides, but also the offered social discounts can vary fundamentally on either side of the border (i.e. levels of financing of certain social groups discount schemes). It is also observed that under the present tax and economic conditions the operational costs of the expected income from fares is not able to cover the cost of operation, since the latter vary at a considerable extent (EUR/km in Hungary vs. EUR/km in Austria). This makes the tariff system hard to offer competitive and simple alternatives to private car usage. The wage difference (which is the main factor for the growing cross-border commuting along the AT-HU border) applies also to the bus operator staff, primary to the bus drivers who should be ideally bilingual at least till a certain daily level. The legal need for paying at least the local wage over 3 hours of work in the other country makes the service with cheaper Hungarian staff a nearly immediate return trip which is at some cases not even published in the timetable thus they are no revenue service.		
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT			
Type of CBPT quality problem	-		
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle			
5.1 Negative direct effects			
Type of direct effect	Strongly reduced cross-border mobility by CBPT, especially in rural or sparsely populated areas	Long travel-to-work time for cross-border workers	No CBPT due to reasons of economic viability

5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region		
Type of RoE or KoE	(KoE) Traffic jams and air or noise pollution on main road axes used by cross-border commuters due to missing or sub-optimally developed CBPT	(KoE) Reduced internal accessibility of a cross-border region because local / regional CBPT are not initiated or stopped due to lacking economic viability.

6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle

6.1 Summary obstacle description	
Type	Complex source-problem-effect relationship
Comment	The obstacle originates from a complex interplay of various adverse legal and administrative factors (types 1, 2 and 3), with further complications emerging in some parts from difficult territorial and structural context conditions (esp. border in southern Burgenland)

6.2 Problem solving approach				
Type	Establishment of a new CBPT or consolidation of the existing CBPT-offer	Demand-related measures for stimulating a greater use of CBPT	Stronger coordination of neighbouring domestic fare systems for public transport	Elaboration of a joint strategy for developing and planning CBPT

7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)

Possible relevant players	National authority	Regional authority	Transport agency / association

8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study

Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 1: Problems emerging from an unprofitable operation of CBPT, missing public subsidies and other financial matters (bus, train): • Case 1, • Case 3, • Case 4, • Case 10, • Case 30, • Case 35, • Case 36, • Case S-48	
Case study references	Bus connection Szombathely (Hungary) – Oberwart (Austria)	Train connection Vienna (Austria) – Győr (Hungary)

9. Sources

Oszter, V. (2019), How to establish and operate cross-border public transport in a peripheral rural area? The example of the central and southern section of the border between Austria and Hungary

2	**Asymmetric demand patterns and difficult context conditions**			
Short description	Asymmetric demand patterns and difficult territorial context conditions are hindering the development of CBPT in sparsely populated rural border regions of Austria and Hungary.			
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices				
Type of obstacle	Other obstacle			
"other type of obstacle" or "other adverse practices"	Adverse spatial context conditions and / or complex structural factors (e.g. unbalanced pattern of cross-border commuter flows, limited demand potentials, variable service supply intensity, low profitability of service etc.) in neighbouring border regions are hindering the development of CBPT			
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle				
Geographical extent	Smaller segment of a specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)			
Border	AT-HU			
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	Southern Burgenland (AT) Vas County (HU)			
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle				
Mode	Bus, Train			
Particular features of operation	-			
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation				
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up				
Type of CBPT set-up problem	Regional / local public transport authorities have considerably different financial capacities (budgetary resources)	Other adverse consequences		
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	In the case of the peripheral border area of the Central and Southern section of the Austrian-Hungarian border, increasing daily cross-border travel is realised nearly fully by private car. Besides one regional railway crossing, only a few scheduled cross-border buses serve the sparsely populated rural border area on Austrian schooldays only with more or less stable passenger numbers which are known exactly from Origin-Destination ticketing statistics and passenger countings. Szombathely (HU) is so far away from the Austrian border that it could not become one of the service centres for Austrian border settlements. Although Kőszeg is close to the border, the size of the settlement is not so large that it would generate significant travel demand from Austria. Thus, regional public transport links between Vas County and Burgenland provide only school access at present, while improving the "general" interoperability of the border would certainly be necessary. On the Hungarian side, there is a greater service supply of timetables in terms of frequency and operating hours than in Austria.			
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT				
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	Insufficient service density at peak hours	Insufficient service density throughout the day	Insufficient service provision in weekends or during holidays	Lacking economic viability
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	This situation makes the harmonisation of timetables more difficult (securing transfer from Austrian to Hungarian buses) without adding completely new cross-border public transport connections between the closest regional micro-centres. Then the Hungarian and Austrian regional public bus services could become interoperable at the respective LAU1 centres. This is currently provided only at the railway station at Szentgotthárd on the Szombathely – Körmend – Graz railway line. But also for the Szentgotthárd rail border crossing, the modal share is still significantly lower due to the shorter cross-border operating hours and the not fully harmonised connections between ÖBB and GYSEV 13-13 pairs of daily theoretically connecting trains partly because of infrastructure restrictions of the single-track railway line.			

4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT				
Type of CBPT quality problem	-			
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle				
5.1 Negative direct effects				
Type of direct effect	Strongly reduced cross-border mobility by CBPT, especially in rural or sparsely populated areas	Long waiting / travel times	Long travel-to-work time for cross-border workers	No CBPT due to reasons of economic viability
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region				
Type of RoE or KoE	(KoE) Adverse consequences for the cross-border labour market / economy due to high travel-to-work times by CBPT (less persons seeking jobs across the border)	(KoE) Traffic jams and air or noise pollution on main road axes used by cross-border commuters due to missing or sub-optimally developed CBPT	Other secondary effects	
Background information for the negative secondary effects and / or comment on "other secondary effects"	Concerning cross-border traffic (with the exception of Szentgotthárd railway border station), the commuters are using nearly always private cars. Due to the increased traffic, Austria has limited the use of public roads leading to the border in certain sections for private cars.			
6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle				
6.1 Summary obstacle description				
Type	Complex source-problem-effect relationship			
Comment	Complex interplay of various adverse factors (see: types 1, 2 and 3) and of difficult territorial and structural context conditions.			
6.2 Problem solving approach				
Type	Pragmatic "bridging" of shared problems	Establishment of a new CBPT or consolidation of the existing CBPT-offer	Demand-related measures for stimulating a greater use of CBPT	Stronger coordination of neighbouring domestic fare systems for public transport
Description of the envisaged or already started problem-solving approach and/or comment on "other practices"	In the Interreg Central Europe CONNECT2CE project partners from Austria and Hungary including transport authorities, operator companies and the Ministry are working on a comprehensive solution for the main commuter axes. The proposed solution is to employ two new frequent cross-border bus routes integrated into the domestic services both from the financial and operational point of view. They would partly replace the existing inefficient branch line bus services by adding frequencies, particularly on the currently underserved Austrian side in Southern Burgenland. By a careful timetable harmonisation, the hub locations of Körmend and Szombathely in Hungary and Güssing and Oberwart in Austria will be able to ensure the maximum potential connectivity for the settlements served on the route with a priority on the regional centres where attractive P & R and feeder services are provided. Together with the parallel railway line in the south, the two new cross-border bus lines may contribute to a sustainable modal shift in an environmentally sensitive area.			
7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)				
Possible relevant players	National authority	Regional authority		

8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study		
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 2: Problems emerging from difficult territorial context conditions and / or missing demand potentials: • Case 2, • Case 5, • Case 9, • Case 17, • Case 24	
Case study references	Bus connection Szombathely (Hungary) – Oberwart (Austria)	Train connection Vienna (Austria) – Győr (Hungary)
9. Sources		
Oszter, V. (2019), How to establish and operate cross-border public transport in a peripheral rural area? The example of the central and southern section of the border between Austria and Hungary		

3	**No public subsidies in Slovenia for cross-border bus services.**	
Short description	Regional cross-border public bus services cannot be subsidized under Slovenian law, which complicates the set-up of CBPT at all national borders of SI.	
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices		
Type of obstacle	EU legal obstacle	
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(I.4) an incoherent implementation of existing EU legislation on transport and CBPT or on other CBPT-relevant policy fields by EU-Member States	
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle		
Geographical extent	Multiple borders	
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	All national borders of Slovenia (SI-IT, SI-AT, SI-HR, SI-HU)	
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle		
Mode	Bus	
Particular features of operation	(3.1) local / regional cross-border bus line, comprising at least one stop in two contiguous border regions in two different countries	
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation		
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up		
Type of CBPT set-up problem	Other adverse consequences	
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	In Slovenia, bus public passenger transport is regulated at the national level by the Road Transport Act. The state shall ensure the public passenger transport as a public service and awards concessions to the most favourable transport providers on the basis of a public tender. An exception is urban public transport, which is regulated by the cities. International bus lines are regulated according to European legislation. There is no special regulation for local (regional) cross-border lines. Moreover, there is no legal basis for the cross-border lines to be co-financed by the state or by local communities. According to the Slovenian Road Transport Act, transport providers have exclusive rights to transport passengers in their areas. Due to the exclusive rights of transport operators who provide public service in Slovenia, it is not allowed to any other operators to transport passengers between two bus stops in Slovenia.	
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT		
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	Lacking economic viability	
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT		
Type of CBPT quality problem	-	
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle		
5.1 Negative direct effects		
Type of direct effect	Transport operators bear additional cost for running CBPT	No CBPT due to reasons of economic viability
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region		
Type of RoE or KoE	(KoE) Reduced internal accessibility of a cross-border region because local / regional CBPT are not initiated or stopped due to lacking economic viability.	
6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle		
6.1 Summary obstacle description		
Type	Straightforward source-problem-effect relationship	
Comment	-	
6.2 Problem solving approach		
Type	National-level legislative action with regard to transport and CBPT	

Description of the envisaged or already started problem-solving approach and/or comment on "other practices"	There were several discussions between Slovenian TRANS-BORDERS partners and competent Slovenian authority (Ministry of Infrastructure) to include the local cross-border bus services in national public service (in a similar way as rail services). Changes of the road transport act have been proposed. SOLUTION To subsidize cross-border public bus transport, changes in Slovenian legislation are needed. Relevant changes of Road Transport Act have been prepared at the Ministry of infrastructure. The procedure could not start before the election of the new Slovenian government in 2018, but also the parliament procedure could be long.
7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)	
Possible relevant players	National authority
8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study	
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 1: Problems emerging from an unprofitable operation of CBPT, missing public subsidies and other financial matters (bus, train): • Case 1, • Case 3, • Case 4, • Case 10, • Case 30, • Case 35, • Case 36, • Case S-48
Case study references	Bus connection Gorizia (Italy) – Nova Gorica (Slovenia)
9. Sources	
TRANS-BORDERS (2018), Regional action plan for improving cross-border public transport Carinthia – Koroška, based on regional analysis.	

4	**No public subsidies for regional cross-border public bus services**	
Short description	Regional cross-border public bus services cannot be subsidized under Slovenian law, which complicates the set-up of CBPT between Austria and Slovenia.	
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices		
Type of obstacle	EU legal obstacle	
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(I.4) an incoherent implementation of existing EU legislation on transport and CBPT or on other CBPT-relevant policy fields by EU-Member States	
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle		
Geographical extent	Specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)	
Border	AT-SI	
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	Carinthia (AT) Koroška region (SI)	
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle		
Mode	Bus	
Particular features of operation	(3.1) local / regional cross-border bus line, comprising at least one stop in two contiguous border regions in two different countries	
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation		
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up		
Type of CBPT set-up problem	Missing cross-border transfer service between two domestic lines ending close to the common border	
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	By combining Štrekna and the Mislinja Valley Cycling Route in Koroška region with the River Lavant Cycling Route (Lavantradweg) in Carinthia, a 70 km long cross-border cycling route could be established. However, a transfer of cyclist should be supported by a cross-border bus service. The starting and ending point of the bus line could be Mislinja in Slovenia and Lavamünd (or St. Paul) in Austria. Lavamünd in Austria has no public transport service with a bus during weekends, with the exception of the tourism-oriented Lavantaller Radlerbus operating only in summer months. The bus line Lavamünd – Dravograd - Velenje should be de iure split into 2 lines (de facto could be operated by the same bus): • Velenje – Dravograd: This line should be included in the Slovenian national public service. It should be operated by one of the Slovenian bus operators with a concession (company Nomago in Koroška region). This bus could take national and international passengers, Slovenian integrated tickets should be accepted. This bus line could accept subsidies according to Slovenian national rules (max. 0,56 EUR per km). • Dravograd – Lavamünd (or St. Paul): This line should be registered by an Austrian operator as international line. The Slovenian operator should be a subcontractor and it should (possibly) accept Kärntner Linien tickets on the Austrian side (also "Freifahrt" for students could be enabled).	
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT		
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	-	
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT		
Type of CBPT quality problem	Absence of a cross-border direct service	
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle		
5.1 Negative direct effects		
Type of direct effect	Strongly reduced cross-border mobility by CBPT, especially in rural or sparsely populated areas	No CBPT due to reasons of economic viability

5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region		
Type of RoE or KoE	(KoE) Reduced internal accessibility of a cross-border region because local / regional CBPT are not initiated or stopped due to lacking economic viability.	Other secondary effects
Background information for the negative secondary effects and / or comment on "other secondary effects"	The cross-border area between Carinthia (AT) and Koroška region (SI) is an attractive tourism destination. The cross-border area offers a considerable amount of cycling infrastructure and develops tourism and recreational products. In Slovenia, the Regional Development Agency for Koroška region puts significant efforts in developing the Drava River Cycling Route and the provision of transfer for cyclists along the cycling route is one of the emphases in addition to infrastructure and tourism product development. Should improvements not take place, then this could also cause negative knock-on effects for tourism development in the cross-border area. Furthermore, the new passenger train station in St. Paul (Lavant River Valley, AT) of the Koralm High-Speed Railway that is still under construction (expected completion in 2025) will most likely generate new demands for daily mobility not present today. St. Paul will serve as a regional passenger hub for accessing the high-speed rail connection within the cross-border region and probably raise the need for establishing a cross-border bus connection from Dravograd (SI) to Lavamünd (AT) and further onwards to St. Paul.	

6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle				
6.1 Summary obstacle description				
Type	Straightforward source-problem-effect relationship			
Comment	To achieve a solution an agreement should be made between Slovenian and Austrian bus operators and between Slovenian and Carinthian competent authorities and bus operators. Furthermore, other legal restrictions should be eliminated and a practical test run shouldbe realised.			
6.2 Problem solving approach				
Type	National-level legislative action with regard to transport and CBPT	Pragmatic "bridging" of shared problems	Establishment of a new CBPT or consolidation of the existing CBPT-offer	Demand-related measures for stimulating a greater use of CBPT
Description of the envisaged or already started problem-solving approach and/or comment on "other practices"	Within the TRANS-BORDERS project, a pilot implementation of the upgraded cross-border bus service was realized in 2019. Also a financing and pricing model was developed. The new cross-border bus line was designed in cooperation by the Office of the Carinthian Government and the Carinthia Transport Association as well as the Regional Development Agency for the Koroška region. The new offer is at the same time sustainable in the sense of future generations and strengthens cycling tourism. During the winter period 2019, an evaluation report was prepared. Small modifications (minor modification of route, pricing simplification) should be addressed in the pilot run in season 2020 along with short-term (2021) and long-term (after 2022) financing model development. The start of the pilot run 2020 was planned for the 1st May with operation on weekends and public holidays in Slovenia and Austria. Due to the effects of the Corona crisis, however, the start is postponed until the measures expire. We hope that the daily operation of the bike busses is possible from July onwards as planned. With the end of the test operation in September 2020 contract negotiations are conducted for the time afterwards (summer season 2021). A long-term solution for subsidizing cross-border public bus lines requires changes in the Slovenian Road Transport Act (i.e. possibility for subsidizing non-profitable cross-border public bus lines; passenger transportation within Slovenia).			

7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)		
Possible relevant players	National authority	Transport agency / association

8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study	
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 1: Problems emerging from an unprofitable operation of CBPT, missing public subsidies and other financial matters (bus, train): • Case 1, • Case 3, • Case 4, • Case 10, • Case 30, • Case 35, • Case 36, • Case S-48

Case study references	Train connection Maribor (Slovenia) – Bleiburg (Austria)

9. Sources

TRANS-BORDERS (2018), Regional action plan for improving cross-border public transport Carinthia – Koroška, based on regional analysis.

TRANS-BORDERS (2019), Newsletter Volume 5, November 2019

TRANS-BORDERS (2020), Newsletter Volume 6, May 2020

5	**Under-developed rail passenger transport offer**	
Short description	Significant spatial and time gaps in the existing cross-border rail passenger transport offer between Carinthia (AT) and Koroška region (SI).	
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices		
Type of obstacle	Administrative obstacle	
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(III.4) a lack of cross-border coordination of already existing national, regional or local public transport services	
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle		
Geographical extent	Specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)	
Border	AT-SI	
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	Carinthia (AT) Koroška region (SI)	
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle		
Mode	Train	
Particular features of operation	(1.1) local / regional cross-border railway line, comprising at least one stop in two contiguous border regions in two different countries	
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation		
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up		
Type of CBPT set-up problem	-	
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT		
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	Insufficient service density throughout the day	Insufficient service provision in weekends or during holidays
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	There are still significant spatial and time gaps in the existing cross-border public transport offer between Carinthia (AT) and Koroška region (SI). At present, cross-border rail passenger transport between Koroška region and Carinthia is limited to the train connection Maribor-Prevalje-Bleiburg-Klagenfurt. Just few years ago there were even discussions to abandon cross-border railway line between Maribor-Prevalje (Sl) and Bleiburg (AT). Today this is history.Important changes will occur with the expected completion of the Koralm Railway (Koralmbahn) in 2025, which is a 127 km-long double-track and electrified high-speed railway that is under construction on the Austrian side. The high-speed railway line will connect the Austrian cities of Graz (Styria) and Klagenfurt (Carinthia) and reduce travel time between both cities to 45 minutes. A new passenger train station is foreseen in St. Paul in the Lavant River Valley (AT), to which the border-close Austrian municipality of Bleiburg is directly connected by a northern rail branch. This will also add importance to the cross-border "Koroška proga" railway line between Bleiburg and Maribor in Slovenia. Current data on demand and commuting patterns indicate that considerable efforts should focus on further upgrading existing cross-border possibilities provided by the railway line corridor between Maribor and Bleiburg.	
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT		
Type of CBPT quality problem	Inadequate or lacking passenger information	Different ticket formats or ticket validation methods
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	To fully develop the potential of cross-border possibilities provided by the railway line corridor between Maribor and Bleiburg, also promotion, marketing, and common ticketing would be needed. There are already discussions to expand weekend connections after 2020. Up to eleven trains are discussed between Bleiburg and Dravograd (Sl) after 2020 supported with up to the date train carriages, especially concerning the comfort of the passengers.	

5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle					
5.1 Negative direct effects					
Type of direct effect	Strongly reduced cross-border mobility by CBPT, especially in rural or sparsely populated areas				
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region					
Type of RoE or KoE	(ReE) Poor rail track conditions or missing road traffic management infrastructures reduce operating speed of CBPT (rail, bus)				
6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle					
6.1 Summary obstacle description					
Type	Straightforward source-problem-effect relationship				
Comment					
6.2 Problem solving approach					
Type	Pragmatic "bridging" of shared problems	Establishment of a new CBPT or consolidation of the existing CBPT-offer	Demand-related measures for stimulating a greater use of CBPT	Stronger coordination of neighbouring domestic fare systems for public transport	Other practice
Description of the envisaged or already started problem-solving approach and/or comment on "other practices"	Within the TRANS-BORDERS project, a pilot implementation of the upgraded cross-border train service was realized in 2018 / 2019. A binding legal agreement between Slovenian Railways – Passenger Service, Slovenian Infrastructure Agency and RRA Koroška was concluded in 2019. The pilot implementation also included promotion and marketing. One of the first results was the launching of the summer Saturday train between Maribor and Bleiburg. During the first test service in 2018, 746 passengers and 202 bicycles were transferred. These numbers were increased during the test service in summer 2019 (811 passengers, 431 bicycles). The results confirm the intention to adapt the train to the needs of cross-border cycling tourists. A modified test run was planned for the coming summer season. Due to the Corona crisis, however, public transport between Austria and Slovenia is restricted. Services in Carinthia were reduced and in Slovenia even cancelled. The railway line will start operating as soon as these measures expire. The project partners are currently aiming for a launch in July 2020, because then is the high season for cycling. After the pilot operation, in September 2020, a final evaluation of the summer train season will be carried out.				
7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)					
Possible relevant players	National authority	Transport agency / association			
8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study					
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 2: Problems emerging from difficult territorial context conditions and / or missing demand potentials: • Case 2, • Case 5, • Case 9, • Case 17, • Case 24				
Case study references	Train connection Maribor (Slovenia) – Bleiburg (Austria)				
9. Sources					
TRANS-BORDERS (2018), Regional action plan for improving cross-border public transport Carinthia – Koroška, based on regional analysis. TRANS-BORDERS (2020), Newsletter Volume 6, May 2020					

6	**Lack of cross-border data and absence joint planning**	
Short description	Lack of jointly exploitable cross-border data on public transport services (train and bus) and absence of a coherent planning for cross-border public transport services at the Franco-Belgian border.	
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices		
Type of obstacle	Administrative obstacle	
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(III.4) a lack of cross-border coordination of already existing national, regional or local public transport services	
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle		
Geographical extent	Specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)	
Border	BE-FR	
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	Région Hauts-de-France (FR) Regions of Flanders and Wallonia (BE)	
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle		
Mode	Bus, Train	
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation		
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up		
Type of CBPT set-up problem	Missing cross-border transfer service between two domestic lines ending close to the common border	Missing statistical information on demand or supply potentials for CBPT
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	At the entire Franco-Belgian border between the regions Hauts-de-France, Flanders and Wallonia, the CBPT offer is sub-optimal. This is caused by a decline in cross-border rail links, the presence of bus networks that most often stop at the border (i.e. few or no cross-border bus lines) and by differences in the operation of regional public transport systems that exist on either side of the common border. A specific obstacle that currently hinders the joint development of cross-border public transport is a lack of adequate information / data on the use of and demand for cross-border public transport services. This also prevents the elaboration of a cross-border mobility scheme between Hauts-de-France and Belgium, which identifies the current supply as well as shortages and bottlenecks.	
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT		
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	-	
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT		
Type of CBPT quality problem	-	
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle		
5.1 Negative direct effects		
Type of direct effect	Strongly reduced cross-border mobility by CBPT, especially in rural or sparsely populated areas	No cross-border strategy for integrating domestic public transport services or elaborating new CBPT

Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	The obstacle also hinders a detailed analysis of (existing) cross-border public transport at the entire Hauts-de-France / Belgium border, both for the major cross-border axes (esp. the coastal axis "Calais-Dunkerque-De Panne-Oostende-Brugge -Gent", the Hainaut axes "Valenciennes-Mons" and "Maubeuge-Mons" and the axes of the Lille / Kortrijk / Tournai triangle) and for the more "local" connections in rural areas including soft mobility modes. Public actors from both sides of the border are lacking fine and shared knowledge of public transport user data, but also of policies and actors on both sides of the border. The main challenges are the access to open data and the establishment of new user data from connected devices (telephone, GPS, etc.) or major railway operators (SNCB and SNCF) and from other public transport companies.
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region	
Type of RoE or KoE	(KoE) Traffic jams and air or noise pollution on main road axes used by cross-border commuters due to missing or sub-optimally developed CBPT
Background information for the negative secondary effects and / or comment on "other secondary effects"	At the entire Franco-Belgian border between the regions Hauts-de-France, Flanders and Wallonia, regular cross-border movements of persons are primarily home-to-work trips. They take place mainly from France to Belgium but since 2009 also increasingly in the opposite direction. Other travel motives are cross-border trips for tourism / leisure, training and medico-social services. However, individual car use still appears to be the predominant mobility solution for realising cross-border trips.

6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle

6.1 Summary obstacle description	
Type	Straightforward source-problem-effect relationship
Comment	

6.2 Problem solving approach					
Type	Pragmatic "bridging" of shared problems	Establishment of a new CBPT or consolidation of the existing CBPT-offer	Elaboration of a joint strategy for developing and planning CBPT	Up-building of a joint knowledge base on CBPT	More intense and structured cross-border collaboration between key actors
Description of the envisaged or already started problem-solving approach and/or comment on "other practices"	Possible information sources for closing the data gap on public transport can be • user data linked to ticketing systems (e.g. MOBIB card), which indicates stops and ascents and descents; • data from road traffic operating centres; • data from censuses (e.g. on home-to-work trips); • data from company travel plans (i.e. companies with more than 100 employees) and transport compensation payments; • household travel surveys. Short and medium-term solutions could be a joint observation of the collective public transport demand, involving • the setting up and sharing of common databases (e.g. via an Open Data site), • the organisation of regular meetings of the competent services for establishing greater coherence, • the realisation of precise measurements on a few cross-border axes; • the strengthened use of common frames of reference for surveys; • the proposal to major operators (telephone companies, SNCB, SNCF) for integrating their data at the level of a "neutral" body; the establishment of a cross-border observatory with a mobility component.				

7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)

Possible relevant players	Regional authority	Local authority

8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study

Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	-
Case study references	Train connection Lille (France) – Tournai (Belgium)

9. Sources

Agence de développement et d'urbanisme de Lille Métropole (2017), Séminaire technique, planification transfrontalière, pp. 18, 19

7	**Inadequate pricing and passenger information**	
Short description	Inadequate pricing of short distance rail trips and suboptimal passenger information are hindering cross-border public transport at the Franco-Belgian border.	
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices		
Type of obstacle	Administrative obstacle	
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(III.5) a lacking harmonisation of fare systems existing on both sides of a border or the absence of a single cross-border fare system	
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle		
Geographical extent	Smaller segment of a specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)	
Border	BE-FR	
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	Région Hauts-de-France (FR) Regions of Flanders and Wallonia (BE) EGTC "West-Vlaanderen / Flandre – Dunkerque – Côte d'Opale" and EGTC "Eurométropole Lille-Kortrijk-Tournai"	
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle		
Mode	Train	
Particular features of operation	(1.1) local / regional cross-border railway line, comprising at least one stop in two contiguous border regions in two different countries	
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation		
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up		
Type of CBPT set-up problem	-	
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT		
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	-	
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT		
Type of CBPT quality problem	Inadequate or lacking passenger information	Strong differences in fare levels for local transport services
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	Specific obstacles hindering the development of cross-border public transport are inadequate pricing policies (i.e. ticketing systems that differ on modes and fares, load breaks, etc.) and sub-optimal user information about cross-border public transport services. Especially within the cross-border territories covered by the EGTC "West-Vlaanderen / Flandre – Dunkerque – Côte d'Opale" and the EGTC "Eurométropole Lille-Kortrijk-Tournai", it is necessary to abandon the international pricing system for local cross-border rail trips that penalises inhabitants from both sides of the border.	
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle		
5.1 Negative direct effects		
Type of direct effect	Passengers bear high ticket cost	
Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	The international pricing system for local cross-border rail trips is penalising inhabitants from both sides of the border.	
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region		
Type of RoE or KoE	(KoE) Traffic jams and air or noise pollution on main road axes used by cross-border commuters due to missing or sub-optimally developed CBPT	

Background information for the negative secondary effects and / or comment on "other secondary effects"	At the entire Franco-Belgian border between the regions Hauts-de-France, Flanders and Wallonia, regular cross-border movements of persons are primarily home-to-work trips. They take place mainly from France to Belgium but since 2009 also increasingly in the opposite direction. Other travel motives are cross-border trips for tourism / leisure, training and medico-social services. However, individual car use still appears to be the predominant mobility solution for realising cross-border trips.				
6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle					
6.1 Summary obstacle description					
Type	Straightforward source-problem-effect relationship				
Comment	The obstacle can be addressed by an improved ticketing and information policy for cross-border public transport. This can build on what already exists and optimise it in a way that it makes border effects "pass". The approach should be project-based but long-term oriented, which requires "audacity and patience" as well as permanence and regularity.				
6.2 Problem solving approach					
Type	Pragmatic "bridging" of shared problems	Establishment of a new CBPT or consolidation of the existing CBPT-offer	Stronger coordination of neighbouring domestic fare systems for public transport	Elaboration of a joint strategy for developing and planning CBPT	More intense and structured cross-border collaboration between key actors
Description of the envisaged or already started problem-solving approach and/or comment on "other practices"	SHORT AND MEDIUM-TERM SOLUTIONS: One of the first steps should be to work on a few concrete projects addressing the issues of pricing / ticketing and information. Activities should focus on • expanding the regional information centres with elements from each side of the common border • working on the compatibility of the bilingual ticketing tools MOBIB and PASS PASS ; • better coordination transport operators (rail and urban TC) to facilitate passenger information (pricing, connections) and communication; • managing the coherence of the offers as well as the costs; • promoting work and exchanges between communities in the framework of cross-border cooperation. Further activities should introduce a cross-border ticketing systems and develop an international mobility platform (e.g. a cross-border mobility centre) that uses digital tools for disseminating information to passengers, for proposing a range of travel offers and for circulating information on supply and demand for all types of transport (including car-sharing).				
7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)					
Possible relevant players	Regional authority	Local authority			
8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study					
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 3: Problems emerging from inadequate ticket pricing, lacking tariff integration (incl. non-recognition of free public transport for severely disabled persons) or sub-optimal passenger information: • Case 7, • Case 13, • Case 21, • Case 22, • Case 23, • Case 29, • Case 32, • Case 40, • Case 41, • Case 42, • Case 43, • Case 44				
Case study references	Train connection Lille (France) – Tournai (Belgium)				
9. Sources					
Agence de développement et d'urbanisme de Lille Métropole (2017), Séminaire technique, planification transfrontalière, pp. 18, 19					

8	**Diversity of public transport actors**
Short description	High diversity of cross-border public transport actors within the Eurométropole Lille-Kortrijk-Tournai hinders the set-up of CBPT.
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices	
Type of obstacle	Administrative obstacle
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(III.2) an asymmetric cooperation constellation between the competent public authorities in the cross-border region, which leads to different policies on CBPT on each side or prevents that specific problems of CBPT are jointly tackled
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle	
Geographical extent	Smaller segment of a specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)
Border	BE-FR
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	Eurométropole Lille-Kortrijk-Tournai
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle	
Mode	Bus, Train
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation	
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up	
Type of CBPT set-up problem	National, regional or local public transport authorities from both sides of the border have different functions and responsibilities, which hinders or prevents cooperation
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	Within the EGTC "Eurométropole Lille-Kortrijk-Tournai" (ELKT), the success of CBPT depends to a large extent on the mutual coordination of the plans and actions of each of the actors involved: This requires a good understanding of the territorial systems and the actors in the cross-border network. The main challenge for organising CBPT within the ELKT is to coordinate actions and strategies of actors involved in cross-border governance, while the level of government and the territorial scale of decision-makers differ significantly on each side. National railway companies are responsible for cross-border train services, but in France these services have to be contracted with the French railway system at regional level, whereas no such regional intervention exists in Belgium. Similarly, decisions concerning cross-border bus lines are taken on the French side at local level within the Lille Metropolitan Urban Community (Communauté Urbaine Lille Métropole), whereas in Belgium bus lines are managed by the regions and the province of West Flanders. The Belgian intermunicipal associations state that they have a strong interest in the issue of cross-border transit, but at present they have no competence in this area and have no means of influencing and controlling the service providers.
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT	
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	-
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT	
Type of CBPT quality problem	Absence of a cross-border direct service
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	Within the EGTC "Eurométropole Lille-Kortrijk-Tournai" (ELKT), the organisation of cross-border public transport does not function as a genuine cross-border system, but mostly as an articulation of regional and national transport systems which are connected to each other by lines reaching to the border, thus enabling the junction between these different systems.

5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle					
5.1 Negative direct effects					
Type of direct effect	No cross-border strategy for integrating domestic public transport services or elaborating new CBPT	Other direct effects			
Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	This incongruity in public transport governance creates complications for the coordination of CBPT. The challenge is not so much the difficulty of communicating between the different scales, but to convince the actors to consider mobility within the cross-border space. A second challenge is to motivate transport companies to develop cross-border lines and services, whereas economically speaking the returns on investment are generally limited. The analysis of the networks of actors shows, firstly, that the Lille-based metropolitan government (Communauté Urbaine Lille Métropole) appears to be the leading actor in cross-border governance and, secondly, that not all the competent actors in the field of public transport are central in the network. Conversely, some actors with no competence in this area appear as key actors of governance. This has more recently become of stronger relevant on the French side, since the competence for organising interurban transport has been transferred from the Departments to the Regions. Today, the Départments remain responsible for roads and mainly seek - in consultation with the border territories - to optimise the organisation of road infrastructure and to strengthen mobility of by other means within the framework of their competences (e.g. car-sharing areas, soft modes, financial aid, etc.), particularly in rural areas and as part of territorial solidarity. The results show that there is not necessarily a correlation between the centrality of an actor in the network and its competences in the field of public transport.				
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region					
Type of RoE or KoE	-				
6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle					
6.1 Summary obstacle description					
Type	Complex source-problem-effect relationship				
Comment	The obstacle is difficult to address, since national / regional / local structures responsible for delivering public transport on both sides of the border cannot be changed.				
6.2 Problem solving approach					
Type	Interstate agreements in the field of CBPT	Pragmatic "bridging" of shared problems	Establishment of joint structures for managing CBPT (e.g. EGTC)	Establishment of a new CBPT or consolidation of the existing CBPT-offer	More intense and structured cross-border collaboration between key actors
Description of the envisaged or already started problem-solving approach and/or comment on "other practices"	A process of structuring CBPT governance is under way within the Eurométropole Lille-Kortrijk-Tournai, but it does not yet appear to be efficient as regards the implementation of a common strategy in the field of public transport. Admittedly there is a joint desire to organise this cross-border metropolitan territory, but cross-border interactions and particularly public transport use remain modest given the demographic size of this cooperation area.				
7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)					
Possible relevant players	Regional authority	Local authority			
8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study					
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 4: Problems emerging from a diversity of public transport governance systems, different policy concepts, lack of cooperation between key actors (national or regional public authorities, transport providers etc.) and complex administrative procedures or adverse political behaviour: • Case 8, • Case 14, • Case 15, • Case 16, • Case 26, • Case 31, • Case 33, • Case 37,				

	• Case 38, • Case 45, • Case S-50, • Case S-54, • Case S-55, • Case S-56
Case study references	Train connection Lille (France) – Tournai (Belgium)

9. Sources

Durand (2013), pp. 15-23, 31-33

Département du Nord (2017), Déclinaison opérationnelle de la délibération cadre concernant la stratégie de coopération transfrontalière

9	**Scarce and / or scattered demand potentials.**	
Short description	Scarce and / or scattered demand potentials are hindering the development of CBPT at the border between France and West Flanders.	
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices		
Type of obstacle	Other obstacle	
"other type of obstacle" or "other adverse practices"	Adverse spatial context conditions and / or complex structural factors (e.g. unbalanced pattern of cross-border commuter flows, limited demand potentials, variable service supply intensity, low profitability of service etc.) in neighbouring border regions are hindering the development of CBPT	
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle		
Geographical extent	Smaller segment of a specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)	
Border	BE-FR	
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	Département Nord (FR) Province of West Flanders (BE)	
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle		
Mode	Bus	
Particular features of operation	(3.1) local / regional cross-border bus line, comprising at least one stop in two contiguous border regions in two different countries	
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation		
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up		
Type of CBPT set-up problem	-	
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT		
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	Lacking economic viability	Other adverse consequences
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	On the French-Flemish border, commercial success of cross-border lines is not at all guaranteed. Public transport by rail and bus is mainly intended to transport a large number of people to the same destination at the same time. Typical examples are "home-to-work trips" and "home-school trips". However, the latter form of traffic does hardly exist across the French-Flemish border. While there are many thousands of French workers who cross the border every day, they live in widely dispersed locations (also in the countryside) and often have irregular working hours. Public transport is not able to respond to this situation, not even in the domestic context. Therefore, most (cross-border) commuters are reaching their place of work by car. But also for cross-border traffic originating from other purposes, it is just as difficult for public transport to provide a viable solution. Cross-border shopping undeniably exists on the French-Flemish border, often taking place in a family context with a car boot full of goods on the way back. Shoppers then prefer to resign themselves to queuing at the approach to shopping centres. Finally, it is generally observed that there is less trade between two cities separated by the same distance if there is a border between the two. This is called the border effect.	
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT		
Type of CBPT quality problem	Absence of a cross-border direct service	
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	The scattered demand potential and different needs / habitudes of potential users is also the main reason why today there are a dozen bus lines on both sides of the French-Flemish border that go as far as the border but do not cross it.	

5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle				
5.1 Negative direct effects				
Type of direct effect	No CBPT due to reasons of economic viability			
Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	The scattered demand potential and different needs / habitudes of potential users on both sides of the border is also a problem for the economic viability of cross-border bus services.			
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region				
Type of RoE or KoE	(KoE) Traffic jams and air or noise pollution on main road axes used by cross-border commuters due to missing or sub-optimally developed CBPT			
6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle				
6.1 Summary obstacle description				
Type	Straightforward source-problem-effect relationship			
Comment	The main root cause for the obstacle can hardly be eliminated, but a pilot-based "testing" of the economic viability of new cross-border bus lines to various destinations could represent a partial solution.			
6.2 Problem solving approach				
Type	Pragmatic "bridging" of shared problems	Demand-related measures for stimulating a greater use of CBPT	Stronger coordination of neighbouring domestic fare systems for public transport	More intense and structured cross-border collaboration between key actors
Description of the envisaged or already started problem-solving approach and/or comment on "other practices"	The Flemish Minister for Mobility, Lydia Peeters, has earmarked about 800,000 euros for mobility experiments in the Westhoek transport region at the end of 2019. The lion's share of this amount is earmarked for the extension, on an experimental basis for one year, of the Ypres-Le Bizet (Ploegsteert) bus line to Armentières station and at the same time for the creation of a line linking Poperinghe to Hazebrouck. At present, the Westhoek transport region is in the process of establishing contacts with its French neighbours in order to be able to launch these experimental lines. The stakes are high for the Westhoek, because if these attempts are not successful, cross-border public transport risks being forgotten for many years to come. Above all, the Ypres-Armentières line should succeed. The additional journey from the current terminus, literally a stone's throw from the border, to Armentières station with (numerous) connections to Dunkirk, Calais and above all Lille, is barely three kilometres. The Poperinghe-Hazebrouck link seems riskier, given the longer journey on French territory, which is moreover in a more rural region			
7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)				
Possible relevant players	Regional authority	Local authority		
8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study				
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 2: Problems emerging from difficult territorial context conditions and / or missing demand potentials: • Case 2, • Case 5, • Case 9, • Case 17, • Case 24			
Case study references	-			
9. Sources				
Les-plats-pays (2020), La frontière franco-belge, terminus de ce bus. Author : Christophe Boval, (traduit par Michel Perquy)				

10	**Survival of a CBPT line is under threat.**	
Short description	Survival of the only bus line crossing the border between West Flanders and France is under threat.	
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices		
Type of obstacle	Administrative obstacle	
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(III.4) a lack of cross-border coordination of already existing national, regional or local public transport services	
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle		
Geographical extent	Smaller segment of a specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)	
Border	BE-FR	
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	Département Nord (FR) Province of West Flanders (BE) Dunkirk (FR) Adinkerque / La Panne (BE)	
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle		
Mode	Bus	
Particular features of operation	(3.1) local / regional cross-border bus line, comprising at least one stop in two contiguous border regions in two different countries	
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation		
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up		
Type of CBPT set-up problem	-	
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT		
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	Lacking economic viability	Other adverse consequences
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	The bus from Dunkirk in France that crosses the border and continues to Adinkerque (La Panne) station in Flanders is not a bi-national connection between two cities on either side of the border. It is simply the cross-border extension of a French line, more specifically line 20 of the Dunkirk urban public transport company (DK'BUS). The many stops along the way, the diversion to Bray-les-Dunes and Zuydcoote Hôpital Maritime and the mandatory changeover to one of the Chrono C1 or C2 lines for Dunkirk all mean that the journey from Adinkerque to Dunkirk, a distance of barely 20 km, takes well over an hour. But transport is free for the traveller since DK'BUS introduced free public transport on its entire network two years ago. It was clear that Dunkirk would sooner or later request a financial contribution from the Belgians for the extension of line 20 to Adinkerque station. Just as it was foreseeable that there would be a certain wait-and-see attitude on this side of the border. The Metropolitan Council of Dunkirk sent a short letter to the Flemish Region's company for urban and rural public transport (i.e. De Lijn), the municipality of De Panne and the amusement park Plopsaland. However, all three parties have their own reasons for not feeling concerned: De Lijn has nothing to do with French bus lines, the city itself does not organise public transport and, like other companies in Belgium, Plopsaland does not contribute directly to public transport, unlike companies in France where a 'transport payment' is deducted from the wage bill.	
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT		
Type of CBPT quality problem	Other adverse consequences	

Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	In addition, the bus line from Dunkirk has not always been welcomed with great fanfare in La Panne. A few years ago, the stops at Moeder Lambik and Plopsaland were abolished because of nuisance. To get to Plopsaland by the Dunkirk bus or to continue your journey with the Tram du Littoral, one has to stay on the bus to the terminus at the station and then return.
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle	
5.1 Negative direct effects	
Type of direct effect	No CBPT due to reasons of economic viability
Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	Flemish actors would with no doubt have continued for some time in not responding to Dunkirk, had there not been the Covid-19 crisis and the sudden closure of national borders. As a result, the route of line 20 was shortened to the French municipality Bray-les-Dunes close to the border. The reopening of the border proved to be the ideal opportunity for DK'BUS to put some pressure by limiting the route of line 20 to the border. Although the French-Belgian border was indeed reopened on 15 June 2020 after the containment due to Covid-19, line 20 of the Dunkirk transport company DK'BUS did not resume the journey to the station at La Panne in Flanders. Thus, the existence of the only bus line crossing the border between Flanders and France was under threat, with buses simply turning around at the border. In the end, it didn't come to an ending of operations yet. Under the pressure of the outraged reactions in the (social) media, the mayor of La Panne and his colleague, the mayor of Dunkirk, worked out a provisional solution, leading to the resumption of this journey in the course of July.
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region	
Type of RoE or KoE	-
6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle	
6.1 Summary obstacle description	
Type	Straightforward source-problem-effect relationship
Comment	The threat to the cross-border bus route posed by the financial issues can in principle be mitigated by setting up a joint and permanent financing solution.
6.2 Problem solving approach	

Type	Pragmatic "bridging" of shared problems	Establishment of a new CBPT or consolidation of the existing CBPT-offer	Demand-related measures for stimulating a greater use of CBPT	Stronger coordination of neighbouring domestic fare systems for public transport	More intense and structured cross-border collaboration between key actors
Description of the envisaged or already started problem-solving approach and/or comment on "other practices"	On the Flemish side, the promise was made to look for a way to assume a fair share of the operating costs of this line. In theory, the new Flemish mobility decree provides for the newly created transport regions (in this case the Westhoek transport region) to take local mobility initiatives independently of De Lijn, at least on condition that all municipalities in the region agree. The question also remains as to whether it is possible to pay money to a foreign transport company in this way. Finally, in Flemish tailor-made public transport there is no provision for free public transport for the user, so there is a risk of setting a precedent. In order to circumvent all these aspects, there are already dreams here and there of a Flemish contribution to the organisation of a 'real' Dunkirk-La Panne cross-border interurban line, as a complement to the DK'BUS suburban line. In this option, the traveller who wants to travel quickly from one city to another would pay for a ticket for a fast bus journey that could even take the motorway. This would be a way of reviving the old Adinkerque-Dunkirk railway line in a way. This sounds very nice in theory, but is this scenario realistic?				

7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)			
Possible relevant players	Regional authority	Local authority	corss-border entity

8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study	
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 1: Problems emerging from an unprofitable operation of CBPT, missing public subsidies and other financial matters (bus, train): • Case 1, • Case 3,

	• Case 4, • Case 10, • Case 30, • Case 35, • Case 36, • Case S-48
Case study references	-

9. Sources

Les-plats-pays (2020), La frontière franco-belge, terminus de ce bus. Author : Christophe Boval, (traduit par Michel Perquy)

11	**High efforts for operating and introducing CBPT**	
Short description	At the border between West-Flanders and the Netherlands, substantial efforts are neded for upholding the only cross-border bus line and for introducing new lines	
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices		
Type of obstacle	Administrative obstacle	
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(III.3) structural differences between transport operators delivering CBPT on each side of a border	
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle		
Geographical extent	Smaller segment of a specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)	
Border	BE-NL	
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	Province of West Flanders (BE) Province of Zeeland (NL)	
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle		
Mode	Bus	
Particular features of operation	(3.1) local / regional cross-border bus line, comprising at least one stop in two contiguous border regions in two different countries	
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation		
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up		
Type of CBPT set-up problem	Missing statistical information on demand or supply potentials for CBPT	Other adverse consequences
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	In West Flanders, the Flemish Region's company for urban and rural public transport (De Lijn) is reluctant to establish cross-border lines, especially in the context of the budget cuts imposed on the transport company in recent years. The first difficulty arises even before starting a line, especially in the planning phase. In the domestic context of a single country, an estimate of the potential of a line is made using as much statistical data and the Flemish traffic model as possible. Of course, there are also data and models beyond the borders, but they are not entirely comparable.	
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT		
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	Other adverse consequences	
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	In West Flanders, the Flemish Region's company for urban and rural public transport (De Lijn) runs a single fully-fledged cross-border bus line between Bruges and Breskens in Zeeland, thus crossing the border into the Netherlands. The line connects Bruges station to the landing stage of the pedestrian and cycle ferry crossing the Western Scheldt to Vlissingen, via the tourist attraction of Sluis and the regional hospital of Oostburg, both in the Netherlands. In Westkapelle there is a bus connection to AZ Zeno Hospital and Knokke. The commercial success of this line is sufficiently interesting that De Lijn wishes to maintain it in cooperation with the Dutch co-operator Connexxion. But just maintaining the existing line is a daily struggle. Not because of major differences of opinion or divergent strategic visions, but because of the small, concrete, daily issues that have to be resolved. These include • exact routing and scheduling with clear agreements on nodes and guaranteed connections, • agreements on pricing and revenue sharing, • information exchange and radio links with the dispatching centre of the other operator, • on-board composting equipment (collaborative research on system interoperability or clear agreements on the presence and responsibilities of equipment), • communication and marketing, • information and announcements in vehicles and at stops, • the influence of traffic lights on each other's territories, • social security, passenger control, etc.	

4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT			
Type of CBPT quality problem	-		
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle			
5.1 Negative direct effects			
Type of direct effect	Other direct effects		
Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	In the context of a single country, the complex matters related to the ongoing organisation/operation of bus lines are things that are almost self-evident or for which there are procedures. But for a cross-border line, all these aspects are the subject of separate discussions and agreements. This tailor-made work is increasingly at odds with the efforts to rationalise and standardise processes which public transport companies are forced to apply for reasons of efficiency.		
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region			
Type of RoE or KoE	-		
6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle			
6.1 Summary obstacle description			
Type	Complex source-problem-effect relationship		
Comment	Some of the problems can in principle be solved by more intense cooperation (i.e. data availability on public transport demand), while others are an inherent necessity of CBPT (i.e. effort linked to line operation) or belong to the political dimension (i.e. budgetary cuts for public transport)..		
6.2 Problem solving approach			
Type	Pragmatic "bridging" of shared problems	Up-building of a joint knowledge base on CBPT	More intense and structured cross-border collaboration between key actors
7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)			
Possible relevant players	Regional authority	Local authority	Service provider
8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study			
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	-		
Case study references	-		
9. Sources			
Les-plats-pays (2020), La frontière franco-belge, terminus de ce bus. Author : Christophe Boval, (traduit par Michel Perquy)			

12	**Not yet optimal CBPT.**
Short description	Not yet optimal cross-border public transport services (bus, rail) at the entire German-Dutch border.
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices	
Type of obstacle	Other obstacle
"other type of obstacle" or "other adverse practices"	Simultaneous existence and complex interplay of various adverse factors mentioned under types 1, 2 and 3, also coupled to persisting shortcomings in the railway infrastructure
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle	
Geographical extent	Specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)
Border	DE-NL
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	North Rhine-Westphalia, Niedersachsen (DE) Provinces of Limburg, Gelderland, Overijssel, Groningen, Drenthe (NL)
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle	
Mode	Bus, Train
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation	
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up	
Type of CBPT set-up problem	-

4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT					
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	Insufficient service density at peak hours	Insufficient service density throughout the day	Insufficient service provision in weekends or during holidays	Restrictions for commercial lines (e.g. ban on cabotage)	Lacking economic viability
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	In the last 15 years, many improvements have been achieved in CBPT by rail and bus along the German-Dutch border (see: mobil.NRW 2020). However, further improvements are needed. An expansion and standardisation of rail networks is needed in the Dutch-German border area. Moreover, there are still many obstacles and peculiarities that hinder the development of efficient and attractive cross-border public transport by bus. They emerge from a combination of three factors: (1) The economic need to subsidise public transport on sections of cross-border bus lines (from both sides to the border) must be recognised by national legislation and by the concerned public transport authorities on both sides of the border. (2) The possibility of linking internal transport lines to cross-border community lines should be implemented wherever possible. (3) Still existing service prohibitions for line sections "on the other side of the border" should be dismantled in the future. Finally, diversified tariff systems and different payment systems make it difficult to use public transport. A standardisation / harmonisation of local public transport is recommended in order to facilitate commuting of cross-border workers, on the one hand, and to introduce low-threshold offers for excursions and trips to the neighbouring countries, on the other hand.				

4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT				
Type of CBPT quality problem	Absence of a cross-border direct service	Inadequate or lacking passenger information	Different ticket formats or ticket validation methods	Limited distribution channels for cross-border tickets
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	Shortcomings in the field of CBPT were revealed by a recent public dialogue-process organised on the principle of Open Government (NRW.Dialog.Benelux). Participants highlighted that timetable information must be harmonised and uniform ticket systems created (cross-border tickets). Further simplification would thus contribute to stimulate the use of public transport. Cross-border mobility is also relevant in rural border areas. Many of the participants			

	would like to see a simple, transparent and affordable ticket system so that they can travel easily to the neighbouring country, even in old age. They were often afraid of not being able to find their way around the mass of information at the ticket counter. For 'digital natives' this is less of a problem, but for people who do not have access to digital media or are not familiar with them, this is a hurdle for maintaining contacts to their neighbours. Other concrete proposals were to close a few metres of railway track in Enschede with a partnership project to make the public transport connection more attractive again for both sides and to send a signal that projects in this manageable framework are not only feasible but can have a big impact.

5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle

5.1 Negative direct effects

Type of direct effect	Other direct effects
Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	A large number of shortcomings in the field of CBPT were revealed by a recent public dialogue-process organised on the principle of Open Government (NRW.Dialog.Benelux). The current set-up of cross-border public transport is complicated and therefore requires improvements. Participants highlighted that public transport connections to the neighbouring country are still inadequate in some places and that low-cost cross-border mobility by public transport needs to be facilitated.

5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region

Type of RoE or KoE	(ReE) Poor rail track conditions or missing road traffic management infrastructures reduce operating speed of CBPT (rail, bus)	(ReE) Lacking or poorly developed support infrastructure at local access points or transition interfaces (train stations, bus stops) reduce the use of CBPT	(KoE) Adverse consequences for the cross-border labour market / economy due to high travel-to-work times by CBPT (less persons seeking jobs across the border)	(KoE) Traffic jams and air or noise pollution on main road axes used by cross-border commuters due to missing or sub-optimally developed CBPT
Background information for the negative secondary effects and / or comment on "other secondary effects"	At the German-Dutch border, still too many citizens living close to the border use their cars for travelling to the neighbouring country (e.g. for work, shopping or leisure). Therefore, a stronger simplification would contribute to increase the use of CBPT.			

6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle

6.1 Summary obstacle description

Type	Straightforward source-problem-effect relationship
Comment	On an individual basis, the regionally or locally existing problems can be addressed and solved by appropriate solutions.

6.2 Problem solving approach

Type	Pragmatic "bridging" of shared problems	Establishment of a new CBPT or consolidation of the existing CBPT-offer	Demand-related measures for stimulating a greater use of CBPT	Stronger coordination of neighbouring domestic fare systems for public transport	Elaboration of a joint strategy for developing and planning CBPT	Up-building of a joint knowledge base on CBPT	More intense and structured cross-border collaboration between key actors
Description of the envisaged or already started problem-solving approach and/or comment on "other practices"	In 2019, North Rhine-Westphalia (NRW) and five Dutch provinces (Gelderland, Limburg, Noord-Brabant, Overijssel and Zuid-Holland) reaffirmed and concretised their cooperation in the field of mobility and public transport with a joint working agenda. The agenda includes: • A further expansion of regional cross-border rail passenger transport, e.g. on the routes RE 8 Koblenz-Cologne-Mönchengladbach (extension to Venlo), RB 18 Aachen-Heerlen-Maastricht (extension to Liège), RB 51 Dortmund-Enschede (increased frequency) and RB 64 Münster-Enschede (electrification and extension to Zwolle). • A further improvement of cross-border intercity rail passenger transport, e.g. on the connections Eindhoven-Venlo-Düsseldorf-Hamm (with ambitions to continue to The Hague/Rotterdam), IC Amsterdam/Schiphol-Eindhoven-Heerlen (extension to						

	Aachen -Cologne), ICE Amsterdam-Arnheim-Düsseldorf-Cologne-Frankfurt and IC Amsterdam-Hengelo-Osnabrück-Berlin (improvement of connections). • A realisation and extension of cross-border bus services, e.g. between Aalten - Bocholt and Nijmegen-Kleve. • Expansion of activities in the field of cross-border e-ticketing and cross-border tariffs. Citizens consultations reveal that additional initiatives should be launched to increase CBPT use, for example by means of target group-specific offers. A standardisation of ticket prices and additional discounts (esp. for pupils, students and pensioners) should make the use of CBPT more attractive. In addition, further opportunities can emerge from a stronger use of the advantages of digitalisation (e.g. electronically rechargeable and usable tickets as well as the use of mobile phone apps). In rural border areas, better cross-border mobility should be guided by the following objective: Borderless travel with 1 ticket/1 price and easy ticket purchase at counters with staff for information. This should be implemented with 1 button on the ticket machine and 1 ticket for all trains between NRW and the Netherlands. In addition, there should be an app for 1 ticket (in the Euregio) and possibilities for parking bicycles and cars at the station.

7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)		
Possible relevant players	Regional authority	corss-border entity

8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study	
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 5: Problems emerging from a sub-optimal development of CBPT (bus, rail): • Case 12, • Case 19, • Case 34, • Case S-49, • Case S-51
Case study references	

9. Sources

mobil.nrw (2020) , Grenzüberschreitender ÖPNV, Veröffentlicht am 06.11.2020

Staatskanzlei des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen (2019),
NRW.Dialog.Benelux. Dokumentation der Dialogveranstaltung in Münster am 31.08.2019

Staatskanzlei des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen (2019),
NRW.Dialog.Benelux. Dokumentation der Dialogveranstaltung in Paderborn am 28.09.2019

Staatskanzlei des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen (2019),
Abschluss-dokumentation zur Dialogreihe NRW.Dialog.Benelux im Rahmen des Beneluxjahr.NRW 2019

Eisenbahnjournal Zughalt.de (2020),

13	**Not yet optimal ticketing for CBPT**
Short description	Not yet optimal situation in the field of ticketing (esp. e-Ticketing) for CBPT in the Euregio Maas Rhein.
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices	
Type of obstacle	Administrative obstacle
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(III.5) a lacking harmonisation of fare systems existing on both sides of a border or the absence of a single cross-border fare system
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle	
Geographical extent	Multiple borders
Border	
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	Bilateral border segments within the Euregio Maas-Rhein (DE-NL, DE-BE, NL-BE)
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle	
Mode	Bus, Train
Particular features of operation	
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation	
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up	
Type of CBPT set-up problem	-
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT	
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	-
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT	
Type of CBPT quality problem	Different ticket formats or ticket validation methods
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	Within the Euregio Meuse-Rhine (EMR), very good CBPT already exist due to an intensive cooperation of all relevant partners. Despite significant improvements achieved over the past decades, there are still barriers hindering passenger transport across borders. An important barrier is the not yet optimal situation in the field of ticketing. More than 100 different tickets are offered by the transport companies operating in the Euregio, with only a few of them being valid for cross-border journeys. Furthermore, there are different standards for e-Ticketing which also constitutes a major challenge. Within the border triangle, the introduction of three different national e-Ticketing standards has not made life easier for cross-border travellers. In the Netherlands they need to have an OV-chipkaart, in Germany a VDV-card and in Belgium a MOBIB card. Consequently, there is a risk of developing isolated electronic ticketing systems for public transport that exist next to each other but collide at the national borders. The main challenge is to enable border-crossing interoperability between nationally divergent standards.
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle	
5.1 Negative direct effects	
Type of direct effect	Other direct effects
Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	Other shortcomings in the field of CBPT were revealed by a recent public dialogue-process organised on the principle of Open Government (NRW.Dialog.Benelux), which also concern the EMR. Participants criticised in particular the often complicated or non-transparent set-up of current CBPT. The current shortcomings in the field of ticketing do not prevent CBPT, but they considerably hinder passengers to travel worry-free and seamless across national borders. These quality demands can only be met if current weaknesses are eliminated.
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region	
Type of RoE or KoE	(KoE) Traffic jams and air or noise pollution on main road axes used by cross-border commuters due to missing or sub-optimally developed CBPT

Background information for the negative secondary effects and / or comment on "other secondary effects"	The often complicated or non-transparent set-up of CBPT in the Euregio also has a negative impact on the climate. Too many citizens living close to the trilateral border still use their cars for travelling to the neighbouring countries, wherefore a stronger simplification would contribute to increase the use of public transport.

6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle

6.1 Summary obstacle description

Type	Straightforward source-problem-effect relationship
Comment	On an individual basis, the regionally or locally existing problems can be addressed and solved by appropriate solutions.

6.2 Problem solving approach

Type	Pragmatic "bridging" of shared problems	Stronger coordination of neighbouring domestic fare systems for public transport	Elaboration of a joint strategy for developing and planning CBPT	Up-building of a joint knowledge base on CBPT	More intense and structured cross-border collaboration between key actors
Description of the envisaged or already started problem-solving approach and/or comment on "other practices"	With the support of the European Union, partners in from the Euregio have carried out a Horizon 2020 project with the Open Ticketing Institute (OTI) and VDV e-Ticket Service to explore strategies to make travelling easier for cross-border travellers. These include readers that can read several cards, smart cards or mobile phones that can contain the data of several cards, and a single account. The project "European Travellers Club" (ETC) is addressing this challenge in the EMR by developing a token-based technology for the interoperable use of different e-ticket standards in cross-border public transport without changing existing national standards. The solution is flexible in terms of user medium (chip card, smartphone, ticket to print etc.) and has potential for integrating multimodal offerings (e.g. car sharing). The new cross-border project, called "Easy Connect", builds on and further develops the successfully tested cross-border ID ticketing technology from the completed European Travellers Club (ETC) project.				

7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)

Possible relevant players	Regional authority	corss-border entity

8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study

Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 3: Problems emerging from inadequate ticket pricing, lacking tariff integration (incl. non-recognition of free public transport for severely disabled persons) or sub-optimal passenger information: • Case 7, • Case 13, • Case 21, • Case 22, • Case 23, • Case 29, • Case 32, • Case 40, • Case 41, • Case 42, • Case 43, • Case 44
Case study references	Bus connection Maastricht (Netherlands) – Aachen (Germany)

9. Sources

Elsmann / Warnecke (2017),
Cross-border public transport - Best practice examples and future challenges in the Euregio Meuse-Rhine. Maastricht, 1st June 2017
Staatskanzlei des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen (2019), NRW.Dialog.Benelux. Dokumentation der Dialogveranstaltung in Aachen am 29.06.2019
Euregio Maas Rhein (2021), Mobilität und Infrastruktur
ETC - European Travellers Club (no date mentioned), For interoperable Public Transport in Europe. Horizon 2020 Project, funded under grant agreement No. 636126.
Intelligent Transport (2020), Developing cross-border ticketing in public transport networks
Intelligent Transport (2020), A matter of necessity: cross-border public transport in the Euregio,

14	**Missing bilateral agreement hinders local CBPT**
Short description	Requirement for bilateral agreement on further liberalisation of passenger services hinders local CBPT at the Spanish - Portuguese border
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices	
Type of obstacle	EU legal obstacle
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(I.4) an incoherent implementation of existing EU legislation on transport and CBPT or on other CBPT-relevant policy fields by EU-Member States
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle	
Geographical extent	Smaller segment of a specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)
Border	ES-PT
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	EGTC River Minho
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle	
Mode	Bus
Particular features of operation	(3.1) local / regional cross-border bus line, comprising at least one stop in two contiguous border regions in two different countries
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation	
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up	
Type of CBPT set-up problem	Other adverse consequences
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	On the northern part of the border between Portugal and Spain, actors from the River Minho EGTC highlighted that an establishment of cross-border bus lines on the territory of the River Minho EGTC is hindered by provisions in the Regulation (EC) 1073/2009. The EU legal obstacle for a cross-border extension of bus lines exists only, if bus lines will include the performance of urban cabotage services. In that case, Regulation (EC) 1073/2009 forbids cabotage operations in urban centres or conurbations, or transport needs between it and the surrounding areas (Article 15(c)), unless a bilateral or multilateral agreement on further liberalisation of the service is concluded between the Member States in accordance with article 25 of that regulation (i.e. Article 25 provides for Member States "to conclude agreements on the further liberalisation of international passenger services, in particular as regards the authorisation system and the simplification or abolition of control documents, especially in border regions").
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT	
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	-
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT	
Type of CBPT quality problem	-
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle	
5.1 Negative direct effects	
Type of direct effect	Other direct effects
Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	The local / regional administrative bodies on both sides have to cope with difficulties linked to an assimilation of cross-border transport with international transport. This is a result of insufficient and inadequate European and national legal provisions to establish a specific regime for local cross-border passenger transport. The case shows that the role of national authorities is determinant and therefore crucial when it comes to cross-border public transport projects. This constraint applies almost regardless of the scope or scale of the cross-border initiative, even for the establishment of an urban bus line. It also demonstrates the lack of proportionality between the initiative at stake (i.e. transport at local / regional level) and the applicable legal tools (i.e. national or international legal provisions).
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region	
Type of RoE or KoE	-

6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle				
6.1 Summary obstacle description				
Type	Complex source-problem-effect relationship			
Comment	The very substantial coordination effort with its multilevel-approach is highly complex and represents an overly strong burden for local / regional authorities.			
6.2 Problem solving approach				
Type	EU-level legislative action with regard to transport and CBPT	Interstate agreements in the field of CBPT	More intense and structured cross-border collaboration between key actors	Other practice
Description of the envisaged or already started problem-solving approach and/or comment on "other practices"	For solving the obstacle, the B-Solutions initiative has developed a detailed roadmap for necessary legal and administrative actions to be undertaken: • definition, coordination and legal formalisation of a project for the cross-border extension of regular transport services across the border, and agreement on cross-border cooperation between the competent transport authorities to be concluded by the local authorities and validated at the national level; • adaptation of the cross-border initiative to international passenger transport regulations in accordance with Regulation 1073/2009, Law 16/1987 in Spain and Decree Law 3/2001 in Portugal; • amendment of the public contracts relating to the transport lines affected by the plan in order to enable the cross-border extension of transport routes. The signing of a cross-border cooperation agreement has to take place between the competent transport authorities. The agreement would allow the attribution of authorisations for the provision of regular international transport services to transport operators by the competent State entities. It would also allow the amendment of any public contracts relating to the transport lines affected by the extension. This would integrate three different legal frameworks on the legal status and procurement of public passenger transport services: the cross-border cooperation framework between territorial entities of Spain and Portugal, the "community" (regional) and national (Spanish and Portuguese) legislative framework, and both European and national legislations. Finally, in the case of cabotage operations referred to in Regulation 1073/2009, it must be noted that a proposal COM (2017) 647 to amend Regulation 1073/2009 has been presented to solve identified problems such as hampering the development of intercity bus services in the Member States. The proposal removes the requirement for cabotage operations to be carried out independently from the international services (Amendment 70).			
7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)				
Possible relevant players	Regional authority	Local authority	corss-border entity	
8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study				
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 4: Problems emerging from a diversity of public transport governance systems, different policy concepts, lack of cooperation between key actors (national or regional public authorities, transport providers etc.) and complex administrative procedures or adverse political behaviour: • Case 8, • Case 14, • Case 15, • Case 16, • Case 26, • Case 31, • Case 33, • Case 37, • Case 38, • Case 45, • Case S-50, • Case S-54, • Case S-55, • Case S-56			
Case study references	Bus connection Verín (Spain) Chaves (Portugal)			

9. Sources
AEBR/EU (2020a), b-solutions: Solving Border Obstacles - A Compendium of 43 Cases, pp. 32-36. AEBR/EU (2020b), ANNEX b-solutions: Solving Border Obstacles - A Compendium of 43 Cases, pp.74-76.

15	**Complex administrative procedures hinder CBPT**	
Short description	Complex administrative procedures hinder cross-border public transport at the Spanish - Portuguese border.	
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices		
Type of obstacle	Administrative obstacle	
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(III.2) an asymmetric cooperation constellation between the competent public authorities in the cross-border region, which leads to different policies on CBPT on each side or prevents that specific problems of CBPT are jointly tackled	
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle		
Geographical extent	Smaller segment of a specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)	
Border	ES-PT	
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	EGTC River Minho	
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle		
Mode	Bus	
Particular features of operation	(3.1) local / regional cross-border bus line, comprising at least one stop in two contiguous border regions in two different countries	
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation		
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up		
Type of CBPT set-up problem	National, regional or local public transport authorities from both sides of the border have different functions and responsibilities, which hinders or prevents cooperation	Other adverse consequences
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	On the northern part of the border between Portugal and Spain, actors from the River Minho EGTC highlighted the difficulty (or virtual impossibility) of setting up bus lines covering the cross-border territory because of complex administrative procedures. Additional difficulties encountered by the River Minho EGTC in the planning phase of cross-border bus lines are linked to the complexity of the legal framework to be applied. This cross-border intervention requires the coordination of legal procedures set out at local, regional, and national level, in Spain and in Portugal. The main hindrance lies in the variety of actors with a remit for the management of public transports on both sides of the border, which results in an asymmetry of competences and consequent lack of coordination at the administrative level. In Portugal the management of public transport is delegated to municipalities or to inter-municipal communities (CIM), while in Spain the autonomous regions have exclusive competence for the development of transport provision in their territories. At present, there are no joint mechanisms or practices to support cross-border cooperation or coordination in relation to the planning and/or provision of regular passenger services at cross-border level.	
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT		
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	-	
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT		
Type of CBPT quality problem	-	
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle		
5.1 Negative direct effects		
Type of direct effect	Other direct effects	

Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	High administrative burden and cooperation efforts needed for setting up CBPT.
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region	
Type of RoE or KoE	-

6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle					
6.1 Summary obstacle description					
Type	Complex source-problem-effect relationship				
Comment	The extension of certain regular passenger transport services beyond the border may become operational by disentangling the complexity that arises from the concurrence of administrative procedures.				
6.2 Problem solving approach					
Type	Interstate agreements in the field of CBPT	Tools provided for by the "European cross-border mechanism" (ECBM)	Pragmatic "bridging" of shared problems	Up-building of a joint knowledge base on CBPT	More intense and structured cross-border collaboration between key actors
Description of the envisaged or already started problem-solving approach and/or comment on "other practices"	The River Minho EGTC will promote technical meetings between the Galician and Alto Minho transport authorities to identify the cross-border public transport lines that will be included in the terms of their concession plan. The EGTC will also encourage the drafting of a new agreement in accordance with the provisions of the Treaty of Valencia on cross-border cooperation between the territorial entities of Spain and Portugal (2003). This Treaty sets legal indications on how to articulate the development of institutionalised cooperation actions between the territorial actors of the two Countries.				

7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)				
Possible relevant players	National authority	Regional authority	Local authority	corss-border entity

8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study	
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 4: Problems emerging from a diversity of public transport governance systems, different policy concepts, lack of cooperation between key actors (national or regional public authorities, transport providers etc.) and complex administrative procedures or adverse political behaviour: • Case 8, • Case 14, • Case 15, • Case 16, • Case 26, • Case 31, • Case 33, • Case 37, • Case 38, • Case 45, • Case S-50, • Case S-54, • Case S-55, • Case S-56
Case study references	Bus connection Verín (Spain) Chaves (Portugal)

9. Sources

AEBR/EU (2020a), b-solutions: Solving Border Obstacles - A Compendium of 43 Cases, pp. 32-36.

AEBR/EU (2020b), ANNEX b-solutions: Solving Border Obstacles - A Compendium of 43 Cases, pp.74-76.

16	**Complex administrative procedures hinder CBPT**	
Short description	Complex administrative procedures hinder cross-border public transport between the municipalities of Chaves and Verínat at the Spanish - Portuguese border.	
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices		
Type of obstacle	Administrative obstacle	
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(III.2) an asymmetric cooperation constellation between the competent public authorities in the cross-border region, which leads to different policies on CBPT on each side or prevents that specific problems of CBPT are jointly tackled	
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle		
Geographical extent	Smaller segment of a specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)	
Border	ES-PT	
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	Municipalities of Chaves and Verín	
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle		
Mode	Bus	
Particular features of operation	(3.1) local / regional cross-border bus line, comprising at least one stop in two contiguous border regions in two different countries	
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation		
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up		
Type of CBPT set-up problem	National, regional or local public transport authorities from both sides of the border have different functions and responsibilities, which hinders or prevents cooperation	Other adverse consequences
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	On the northern part of the border between Portugal and Spain, the Eurocity Chaves-Verín includes two medium-sized border municipalities. In the last ten years, the Eurocity had the aim of delivering a regular passenger transport service with the view of improving cross-border mobility. The complex coordination effort required to start the implementation of a bus service between the cities of Chaves and Verín has prevented its realisation so far. Several obstacles were identified in this case, of which the administrative obstacles are the most important ones. They are the asymmetry in the areas of competence of local promoters, the absence of coordination across the border and the lack of clarity on an applicable legal framework for cross-border cooperation in public transport. The promoters of the cross-border public transport project, namely the municipalities of Verín and Chaves, and the Chaves-Verín Eurocity EGTC, do not currently hold competence or a remit for public passenger transport provision within the cross-border area. To permit the provision of the passenger transport service, the endorsement of the competent state authority is required (Instituto da Mobilidade e dos Transportes in Portugal and the Dirección General de Transporte Terrestre in Spain). The absence of a concept of cross-border transport in the national law of both countries also hinders the readiness of a solution. Another legal impediment for launching a regular public service with cabotage lies in Article 15 of Regulation (EC) No 1073/2009, which excludes cabotage (i.e. "exception of transport services meeting the needs of an urban centre or conurbation, or transport needs between it and the surrounding areas"). The exception envisaged in Article 25 of the Regulation to allow for the cabotage of international transport services in border regions also represents a disproportionate effort from local / regional public authorities and heavy administrative procedures. Article 25 provides for Member States "to conclude agreements on the further liberalisation of international passenger services, in particular as regards the authorisation system and the simplification or abolition of control documents, especially in border regions". As a consequence, all these requirements have an strong inhibiting effect on the establishment of the CBPT service. Finally, also insufficient knowledge within the local administration of the legal framework for cross-border cooperation and the management of public transport services further increased the difficulties for implementing the joint initiative.	

4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT				
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	-			
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT				
Type of CBPT quality problem	-			
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle				
5.1 Negative direct effects				
Type of direct effect	Other direct effects			
Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	The case shows that the role of national authorities is determinant and therefore crucial when it comes to cross-border public transport projects. This constraint applies almost regardless of the scope or scale of the cross-border initiative, even for the establishment of an urban bus line. It also demonstrates the lack of proportionality between the initiative at stake (i.e. transport at local level) and the applicable legal tools (i.e. national or international legal provisions).			
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region				
Type of RoE or KoE	-			
6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle				
6.1 Summary obstacle description				
Type	Complex source-problem-effect relationship			
Comment	The very substantial coordination effort with its multilevel-approach is highly complex and represents an overly strong burden for local authorities.			
6.2 Problem solving approach				
Type	Interstate agreements in the field of CBPT	More intense and structured cross-border collaboration between key actors		
Description of the envisaged or already started problem-solving approach and/or comment on "other practices"	For solving the obstacle, the B-Solutions initiative has developed a detailed roadmap for necessary actions to be undertaken. The solution proposes the creation of a regular public transport service between Chaves and Verín without cabotage and foresees two phases: Phase 1. Definition, agreement and legal formalisation of the cross-border project by the relevant transport authorities. In particular, the key is the definition of the technical arrangements for the extension and/or connection and coordination between public services, on the economic cost (investment and/or operation), and on the coordination of the procedural arrangements for implementation. A cross-border cooperation agreement should be drawn up in accordance with already existing provisions, in this case the Treaty of Valencia between the Portuguese Republic and the Kingdom of Spain on cross-border cooperation of territorial entities and authorities (3 October 2002). Ultimately, this should be communicated for control to the national competent authorities of both states and finally be validated. Phase 2: Adaptation of the project to international passenger transport regulations. The cross-border project must be brought into line with international road transport regulations for bus travel. To this end, the transport companies operating the line(s) affected by the cross-border project, on both Portuguese and Spanish sides, must apply to the competent state entities (Dirección General de Transporte Terrestre del Ministerio de Fomento in Spain and Instituto da Mobilidade e dos Transportes (IMT, I.P.) in Portugal), for the mandatory authorisation provided for in Regulation 1073/2009.			
7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)				
Possible relevant players	National authority	Regional authority	Local authority	corss-border entity
8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study				
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 4: Problems emerging from a diversity of public transport governance systems, different policy concepts, lack of cooperation between key actors (national or regional public authorities, transport providers etc.) and complex administrative procedures or adverse political behaviour: • Case 8, • Case 14, • Case 15, • Case 16, • Case 26, • Case 31, • Case 33,			

	• Case 37, • Case 38, • Case 45, • Case S-50, • Case S-54, • Case S-55, • Case S-56
Case study references	Bus connection Verín (Spain) Chaves (Portugal)

9. Sources

AEBR/EU (2020a), b-solutions: Solving Border Obstacles - A Compendium of 43 Cases, pp. 32-36.

AEBR/EU (2020b), ANNEX b-solutions: Solving Border Obstacles - A Compendium of 43 Cases, pp.92-94.

17	**Lacking demand potentials for CBPT**
Short description	Scarce and / or scattered demand potentials are hindering the development of CBPT between mountain border areas in France and Switzerland.
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices	
Type of obstacle	Other obstacle
"other type of obstacle" or "other adverse practices"	Adverse spatial context conditions and / or complex structural factors (e.g. unbalanced pattern of cross-border commuter flows, limited demand potentials, variable service supply intensity, low profitability of service etc.) in neighbouring border regions are hindering the development of CBPT
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle	
Geographical extent	Smaller segment of a specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)
Border	FR-CH
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	Département Jura (FR) Canton de Vaud (CH)
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle	
Mode	Bus
Particular features of operation	(3.1) local / regional cross-border bus line, comprising at least one stop in two contiguous border regions in two different countries
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation	
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up	
Type of CBPT set-up problem	Other adverse consequences
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	COMPETING OPTIONS FOR ADRESSING THE NEEDS OF COMMUTERS: In the Joux Valley (Vallée de Joux, CH), there is no cross-border public transport line to reach the valley upstream of Lake of Joux. A new bus line would open up the Vallée de Joux and also significantly reducing the journey time to Nyon and Geneva or vice versa. Thus, consideration could be given to the establishment of a cross-border public transport line, linking the two Vaud train stations of La Cure and Le Brassus via the French villages of Les Rousses and Bois d'Amont. In 2010, the French-Swiss TransJurassian Conference (CTJ - Conférence TransJurassienne franco-suisse) conducted a study on cross-border travel, called "Schéma de cohérence des mobilités transfrontalières de l'Arc Jurassien". The main challenge of this study was to understand the movements of cross-border workers located near the border and to develop a targeted response for them. For the Vallée de Joux sector, the Scheme has notably identified an interest in two public bus transport lines: • a bus line from Morbier (FR), serving Morez, Les Rousses and folding down to La Cure at the Swiss border to the Nyon - St-Cergue - La Cure train, • a bus line from Morbier over Morez to Les Rousses folding down at Le Brassus station. These lines would specifically target French commuters travelling to the Nyon region and the Valley. However, the interest in terms of services for the population living in the Swiss Canton of Vaud is limited. Today, two common transport solutions exist in this valley for cross-border commuter flows: company shuttles and car-sharing. (1) Companies of the Vallée de Joux now finance more than 7 daily shuttles to transport the employees of the main companies to their place of work at the required times. A project is currently being developed to complete this offer by providing parking spaces in La Cure and organising additional shuttles. These bus connections provide an appropriate response to transport needs. (2) At the same time, a scheme has been set up to promote car-sharing in the Jura Arc. This is a proportionate solution in a context where the origins and destinations of home-work movements are widely dispersed and working hours are not always harmonised. This cross-border initiative has a good return rate from companies and employees, particularly in the Vallée de Joux. Today, 15 companies in the valley have joined the programme, representing 4,830 employees. More than 500 employees are registered in the scheme and the overall car-sharing rate in these companies is 28%. Since the launch of the scheme, the practice has more than doubled in this sector.

4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT				
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	-			
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT				
Type of CBPT quality problem	-			
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle				
5.1 Negative direct effects				
Type of direct effect	Other direct effects			
Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	LACK OF INTEREST DUE TO EXISTING ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS: The proposed line "La Cure - Les Rousses - Bois d'Amont - Le Brassus" would in theory have the advantage of combining the needs of commuters travelling to the Nyon region and of the communes of the Vallée de Joux, as well as exchanges between the Nyon and Vallée de Joux basins. In practice, however, with about 30 minutes of one-way travel time between La Cure and Le Brassus and hourly rates on the two rail links Vallorbe - Le Pont - Le Brassus and Nyon - St-Cergue - La Cure, it is not possible to meet all demands with a reasonable number of vehicles. Indeed, a minimum of two vehicles is required to operate a link with an hourly rate; this link would not be able to offer connections on both train lines. While the link on the Vallorbe - Le Pont - Le Brassus line is preferred, the interest of the population of Vaud, in terms of service, is again limited in this case. In terms of potential, in 2017 the municipalities of Les Rousses and Bois d'Amont had around 800 cross-border workers heading for Le Chenit, L'Abbaye or Le Lieu. This figure rises to around 1,400 if the Communes of Morez and Morbier in France are included. The value of a public transport line compared to the company shuttles already in place or planned, directly aimed at the employees of watchmaking companies, and therefore based as closely as possible on their needs, should be analysed.			
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region				
Type of RoE or KoE	(KoE) Traffic jams and air or noise pollution on main road axes used by cross-border commuters due to missing or sub-optimally developed CBPT			
Background information for the negative secondary effects and / or comment on "other secondary effects"	In the Joux Valley (Vallée de Joux), the planned development of watchmaking factories in the village of Le Brassus (CH) should create several hundred jobs (a very positive element for the economic health of the region), but are likely to have a significant impact on cross-border traffic. At present, the initiatives taken by the regional economic and institutional players to reduce cross-border traffic, particularly with regard to car-sharing, are unfortunately producing only limited results.			
6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle				
6.1 Summary obstacle description				
Type	Straightforward source-problem-effect relationship			
Comment	The obstacle can be addressed by practically examining / testing service options that are complementary (in comparison to the existing services for commuters) and in the interest of both sides.			
6.2 Problem solving approach				
Type	Pragmatic "bridging" of shared problems	Establishment of a new CBPT or consolidation of the existing CBPT-offer	Demand-related measures for stimulating a greater use of CBPT	More intense and structured cross-border collaboration between key actors
7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)				
Possible relevant players	Regional authority	Local authority		
8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study				
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 2: Problems emerging from difficult territorial context conditions and / or missing demand potentials: • Case 2, • Case 5, • Case 9, • Case 17, • Case 24			
Case study references	-			

9. Sources
Canton de Vaud (2020), Réponse du Conseil d'Etat à la simple question Sébastien Cala – Trafic routier transfrontalier : pourquoi ne pas prendre le bus. JANVIER 2020 19_QUE_057

18	**Railway infrastructure modernisation neglects small cross-border connections.**		
Short description	National-level railway infrastructure modernisation policies (esp. tracks and technical installations) neglect small-scale cross-border linkages in the peripheral border regions at the German-Polish-Czech border.		
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices			
Type of obstacle	Administrative obstacle		
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(III.1) non-awareness or non-willingness of national-level authorities to initiate or support solutions that could eliminate specific problems for CBPT		
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle			
Geographical extent	Multiple borders		
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	Free State of Saxony (DE) Liberecký kraj (CZ) Province of Lower Silesia (PL) Bilateral borders in the Euroregion Neiße (DE-PL, DE-CZ, CZ-PL)		
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle			
Mode	Train		
Particular features of operation	(1.2) international railway line, also comprising stops in each of the contiguous border areas of a cross-border region		
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation			
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up			
Type of CBPT set-up problem	Missing cross-border transfer service between two domestic lines ending close to the common border	Lacking interoperability of national railway systems requires specific rail rolling stock able to operate on both sides of the border	Different technical standards and safety provisions for transport vehicles (bus, train)
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	In the border triangle of Germany, Poland and the Czech Republic , the demand for cross-border railway connections and connection to the Trans European Transport Network with the junction Görlitz-Zgorzelec has great importance for the entire region. Especially the north-south axis from Berlin via Cottbus, Görlitz, Zittau and Liberec to Prague as well as the connection from Dresden via Görlitz to Wróclaw (Breslau) are essential for a sustainable development of the Euroregion. In the peripheral areas of the border triangle, cross-border rail connections exist but they are not ideal yet. On the Czech side, trains end in the last town before the Polish border, but rail tracks continue in principle (i.e. in the past, a long-distance connection from Berlin to Vienna had used this section). On the Polish side, since 1991, the track is only used by freight trains due to its condition up to Zgorzelec.		
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT			
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	-		
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT			
Type of CBPT quality problem	Other adverse consequences		
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	Within the Euroregion Neiße, existing rail passenger transport services are disadvantaged by the fact that national railway infrastructure companies pursue the development of infrastructure for their own national territory, not regarding links with neighbouring countries. Moreover, also obstacles emerging from different legal frameworks and requirements for rolling stock make cross-border transport services so difficult to plan and maintain. Current solutions are usually complicated and exclude small scale rail connections.		

5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle			
5.1 Negative direct effects			
Type of direct effect	Strongly reduced cross-border mobility by CBPT, especially in rural or sparsely populated areas	Long waiting / travel times	Other direct effects
Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	DEVELOPMENT NEEDS (GENERAL): In the Province of Lower Silesia, the most urgent tasks include the improvement of (i) technical conditions of local railway lines leading to border crossings and (ii) the accessibility of the border area which will affect its tourist and economic attractiveness. These actions will help prepare a transport offer that is beneficial for passengers and tailored to their needs both in terms of quantity (the number of connections) and quality (competitive travel time, favourable schedules). The Liberec – Szklarska Poręba railway connection, which is an example of cooperation between Liberec region and Lower Silesia, requires intensive work and consultations about its organization and financing. Current problems, such as instable amount, require arrangements as to the future organizational model of connections. In the Liberec Region, the most important need is to persuade representatives of SŽDC and the Czech Ministry of Transport on both political and expert level of crucial the underestimation if Czech-internal rail infrastructures connecting Liberecký kraj with the Centre of Czech Republic.		
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region			
Type of RoE or KoE	(ReE) Poor rail track conditions or missing road traffic management infrastructures reduce operating speed of CBPT (rail, bus)	(KoE) Reduced internal accessibility of a cross-border region because local / regional CBPT are not initiated or stopped due to lacking economic viability.	Other secondary effects
Background information for the negative secondary effects and / or comment on "other secondary effects"	DEVELOPMENT NEEDS (LINES): (1) Liberec – Zgorzelec/Görlitz: There is still a missing attractive connection of the TEN-T node Zgorzelec/Görlitz with Liberec. A prolongation of the rail track Liberec - Černousy / Zawidów to Zgorzelec would offer the link for regional passenger from Frýdlant region or Zawidów and Sulików to Zgorzelec / Görlitz and further to Wróclaw, Dresden or Berlin and on the Polish side this would result in a smoother connection to Liberec and further on to Praha. Quick rail connection Liberec – Dresden is hanging on the reconstruction of the peage passage from Hrádek nad Nisou to Zittau via Porajów. (2) Wrocław – Jelenia Góra – (Krakonosze / Krkonoše) - Liberec: Because of geographical conditions (Lower Silesia is separated from the Liberec Region by the Karkonosze Mountain range) and historical routes (especially railways), the connection of both regions cannot be called attractive. Despite relatively short linear distance between Jelenia Góra and Liberec, current rail transport is highly uncompetitive (it is more a tourist attraction). Both regions are motivated to start up a traffic route advantageously connecting the Liberec Region and Lower Silesia (with junction points in Prague and Wrocław). (3) Jelenia Góra - Zgorzelec/Görlitz: Another problem that also requires decisive actions is the revitalization of the remaining railway infrastructure leading to the main transport corridor E-30 that connects to the transport hubs in Wrocław and Dresden. Technical condition of rail infrastructure and the standard of passenger facilities leave much to be desired. The rail connection between Jelenia Góra and Zgorzelec, for example, is constantly deteriorating. Technical conditions makes it difficult to prepare an attractive transport service offer, both quantitative (in terms of the number of connections) and qualitative (travel time, schedules). In order for the border area to develop, it is important to return former railway lines into operation, especially those leading to towns and cities interesting from a tourist's point of view (e.g. the lines between Gryfów Śląski and Świeradów-Zdrój and between Jelenia Góra, Karpacz and Kowary). Their renovation would serve not only an efficient and economic tourist transport but also provide people employed in the tourism sector in these towns with additional means of communication.		

6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle								
6.1 Summary obstacle description								
Type	Complex source-problem-effect relationship							
Comment	Transport systems in cross-border area of Germany, Poland and the Czech Republic are very complex and the introduction of new services require trilateral solutions. Existing cross-border structures (Euroregion Neiße) do not necessarily cover these needs, because various actors and stakeholders need to be involved and convinced on each side of the border.							
6.2 Problem solving approach								
Type	Interstate agreements in the field of CBPT	Pragmatic "bridging" of shared problems	Establishment of joint structures for managing CBPT (e.g. EGTC)	Establishment of a new CBPT or consolidation of the existing CBPT-offer	Demand-related measures for stimulating a greater use of CBPT	Stronger coordination of neighbouring domestic fare systems for public transport	Elaboration of a joint strategy for developing and planning CBPT	More intense and structured cross-border collaboration between key actors
Description of the envisaged or already started problem-solving approach and/or comment on "other practices"	To highlight these shortcomings, the transnational project TRANS-BORDERS organised a conference (on 12 February 2019) that brought together representatives of ministries, district administrations, cities and railway companies from the three countries. A memorandum is to be drafted by summer 2019 and handed over to the national administrations. Further to pin-pointing development needs especially on the Polish and Czech sides, the partners also explored how cross-border governance in the field of public transport should be improved. EGTCs are indeed an appropriate institutional solution. However, the establishment of an EGTC is a long term process, which was demonstrated by TRANS-BORDERS. The project examined the possibility of extending the Czech-Polish EGTC "NOVUM" to neighbouring border areas regions in Germany and the Czech Republic. It appeared, however, that this would be too wide and the focus would not be concentrated appropriately. So the project created a specific concept for an EGTC in the border triangle Germany, Poland and the Czech Republic, based on existing structures. This initiative will be followed up after the end of the project.							

7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)				
Possible relevant players	National authority	Regional authority	Local authority	corss-border entity

8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study			
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 6: Problems emerging from inadequate railway infrastructure or lacking interoperability of rail-rolling stock: • Case 18, • Case 20, • Case 27, • Case S-46, • Case S-53		
Case study references	Rail connection Lichkov (Czechia) – Gorzanow (Poland)	Rail connection Johanngeorgenstadt (Germany) – Karlovy Dary Dolni Nadrazi (Czechia)	Rail connection Berlin (Germany) – Kostrzyn (Poland)

9. Sources
TRANS-BORDERS (2018), Regional action plan for improving cross-border passenger rail transport Liberec Region - Lower Silesia (Final 11 / 2018) TRANS-BORDERS (2019), Newsletter Volume 4, May 2019 TRANS-BORDERS (2019), Newsletter Volume 5, November 2019 TRANS-BORDERS (2020), Newsletter Volume 7, November 2020

19	**Multiple factors hinder the set-up of CBPT.**
Short description	Time-consuming clarification of complex legal, administrative and operational aspects is hindering the establishment of a cross-border bus-line in the border triangle between Germany, Poland and the Czech Republic.
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices	
Type of obstacle	Other obstacle
"other type of obstacle" or "other adverse practices"	Simultaneous existence and complex interplay of various adverse factors mentioned under types 1, 2 and 3
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle	
Geographical extent	Multiple borders
Border	
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	Free State of Saxony (DE) Liberecký kraj (CZ) Province of Lower Silesia (PL) Bilateral borders in the Euroregion Neiße (DE-PL, DE-CZ, CZ-PL)
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle	
Mode	Bus
Particular features of operation	(3.1) local / regional cross-border bus line, comprising at least one stop in two contiguous border regions in two different countries
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation	
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up	

Type of CBPT set-up problem	Missing cross-border transfer service between two domestic lines ending close to the common border	Regional / local public transport authorities have considerably different financial capacities (budgetary resources)	Other adverse consequences
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	In the Euroregion Neiße covering the border triangle of Germany, Poland and the Czech Republic, there is currently no cross-border bus connection between the border towns of Zittau (DE) and Bogatynia (PL) and also no bus connection between Zittau and the Liberec region in the Czech Republic. Zittau and Bogatynia are only 15 kilometres distant from each other and the situation today shows typical obstacles of cross-border passenger services. To travel from Bogatynia to Zittau there is only one bus service between Bogatynia and the last village before the German border (Porajów) under operation. Then a walk of 300 meters across the border is necessary to reach the city bus to Zittau. With the aim of strengthening connections in the border triangle, the transnational project TRANS-BORDERS aimed at conceiving and preparing an extended new bus line between Zittau, Bogatynia and the Czech town of Frýdlant v Čechách. This new cross-border axis should connect Bogatynia with the next relevant rail nodes in Zittau and Frýdlant.		

4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT	
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	Restrictions for commercial lines (e.g. ban on cabotage)
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	HERE SET-UP PHASE: The ban on cabotage: Cabotage is the commercial carriage of goods or passengers with a place of loading or unloading in a State, the so-called host Member State, by an operator who has neither a registered office nor a place of business in that State. Since the new bus line Zittau – Bogatynia – Frýdlant will cross two national borders, a solution must be found for the ban on cabotage. The ban can be circumvented by a joint cross-border award for bus transport services. This would give the bus operator the necessary national licences to provide the transport services. Financing is provided in the form of subsidies as a public transport service. This would make it possible to integrate cross-border services into national networks and avoid double journeys.

4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT	
Type of CBPT quality problem	Other adverse consequences
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	HERE SET-UP PHASE: The joint tariff model and financing has to address two challenges. Due to the different currencies in the countries and, in particular, the significant differences in income levels, fares are calculated differently and vary widely. Ultimately, this means that passengers from the economically stronger country (Germany) buy their tickets cheaper abroad, but the (in this case German) transport companies have less revenue as a result. In terms of revenue distribution, these interrelationships are a crucial issue that needs to be resolved. The question of revenue distribution should be clarified by cooperation between transport associations on the organisation of a common tariff system. The system should be able (1) to map all traffic independently of the responsible customer and know where which operating programs have been ordered and financed; (2) to allocate revenue from fares to the route sections driven and transport companies and thus territories (relation-related revenue distribution), calculate taxes correctly and, if necessary, make commercial corrections; (3) to take into account the different price structures of the transport companies and allocate them correctly on a territorial basis. Only this way it can be guaranteed for each sub-region (territory) and thus each service orderer that it receives the revenues to which it is entitled and can correctly account for the traffic.
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle	
5.1 Negative direct effects	
Type of direct effect	Other direct effects
Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	In the planning stage of the new cross-border bus service, a high administrative effort is necessary for clarifying a number of complex legal, administrative and operational aspects.
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region	
Type of RoE or KoE	-
6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle	
6.1 Summary obstacle description	
Type	Complex source-problem-effect relationship
Comment	For preparing an extended new bus line between Zittau, Bogatynia and the Czech town of Frýdlant v Čechách, a number of complex legal, administrative and operational aspects must be clarified in advance.

6.2 Problem solving approach					
Type	Pragmatic "bridging" of shared problems	Establishment of a new CBPT or consolidation of the existing CBPT-offer	Stronger coordination of neighbouring domestic fare systems for public transport	Elaboration of a joint strategy for developing and planning CBPT	More intense and structured cross-border collaboration between key actors
Description of the envisaged or already started problem-solving approach and/or comment on "other practices"	The TRANS-BORDERS project investigated and planned a bus line from Zittau via Bogatynia to the Czech town of Frýdlant v Čechách with a connection to the Polish health resort Świeradów Zdrój on weekends. In the planning, this corridor was divided into two bus lines: line 831a between Zittau and Bogatynia (daily running) and line 691 (on the whole corridor for leisure traffic). It was necessary to consider the integration into existing timetable grids, in particular the junction at Zittau station and relevant connections in Frýdlant v Čechách. In the first step, a timetable concept was drawn up and coordinated with the actors involved (transport associations, municipalities, operators, etc.) concerning replicability and interchanges. During an internal meeting on 21st January 2020, the possibility was discussed how to meet the request of the Liberec region transport association (KORID LK) for a continuous				

	excursion line between Zittau and Świeradów Zdrój, which only operates on weekends. In the medium term, KORID would like to achieve that the line 831a is extended to Frýdlant v Čechách. This would create a second regional axis between important places in the border area between Germany and the Czech Republic in addition to the railway line between Zittau and Liberec. A kick off meeting took place in May 2019, followed by further planning meetings between German and Polish partners. The start of the bus line was planned for spring 2020. The original plan was to start line 831a on 1st May 2020 and line 691 on 6th June 2020. The signing of a financing agreement drawn up by the district of Görlitz and the city of Bogatynia was scheduled for April. However, due to the Corona crisis, these appointments were postponed. In Poland, bus traffic is almost completely at a standstill and the borders are closed. Due to the current situation, a new start date is still to be agreed.

7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)

Possible relevant players	National authority	Regional authority	Local authority	Transport agency / association	corss-border entity

8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study

Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 5: Problems emerging from a sub-optimal development of CBPT (bus, rail): • Case 12, • Case 19, • Case 34, • Case S-49, • Case S-51
Case study references	Bus connection Zittau (Germany) – Bogatynia (Poland)

9. Sources

TRANS-BORDERS (2018), Regional action plan for improving cross-border public transport Saxony - Liberec Region (Final
11 / 2018)

TRANS-BORDERS (2019), Newsletter Volume 4, May 2019

TRANS-BORDERS (2019), Newsletter Volume 5, November 2019

TRANS-BORDERS (2020), Newsletter Volume 6, May 2020

20	**Multiple factors hinder the improvement of CBPT**		
Short description	The improvement of a cross-border train connection in the border triangle between Germany, Poland and the Czech Republic (Zittau - Liberec) has to tackle complex legal, administrative and operational aspects.		
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices			
Type of obstacle	Other obstacle		
"other type of obstacle" or "other adverse practices"	Simultaneous existence and complex interplay of various adverse factors mentioned under types 1, 2 and 3		
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle			
Geographical extent	Multiple borders		
Border			
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	Free State of Saxony (DE) Liberecký kraj (CZ) Province of Lower Silesia (PL) Bilateral borders in the Euroregion Neiße (DE-PL, DE-CZ, CZ-PL)		
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle			
Mode	Train		
Particular features of operation	(1.1) local / regional cross-border railway line, comprising at least one stop in two contiguous border regions in two different countries		
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation			
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up			
Type of CBPT set-up problem	-		
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT			
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	-		
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT			
Type of CBPT quality problem	Strong differences in fare levels for local transport services	Non-availability of modern rail rolling stock that can operate on both sides	Other adverse consequences
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	(1) Governance of CBPT: In the East Saxony region (especially Zittau in the district of Görlitz) on the German side and in the Liberec region on the Czech side, different transport associations coordinate public passenger transport: the Zweckverband Oberlausitz-Niederschlesien (ZVON) in Eastern Saxony and KORID LK in the Liberec region. In the Czech Republic, regional trains and buses are ordered by the district administration of Liberec (Kraj), but transport across Kraj borders must be economically self-sustained. This makes it difficult to introduce cross-border connections. (2) Infrastructure: The railway line between Zittau and Liberec is single-track and not electrified. In rail traffic, particularly on the section between Zittau and Hrádek nad Nisou, attractive travel times cannot be achieved due to the infrastructural conditions and the associated low speeds. In order to optimise the cross-border connection towards Liberec and to link the "0"-node Zittau with the "30"-node Liberec, the dilapidated section between Zittau and Hrádek nad Nisou has to be rehabilitated. The measures include the upgrading of the superstructure, bridges, culverts and dams. The aim is to increase the speed to at least 80 km/h. One challenge is to involve all relevant railway infrastructure operators in the project. The question of financing also remains unresolved. A special feature of the section between Zittau and Hrádek nad Nisou is that the section behind Zittau crosses Polish territory for almost three kilometres without stopping until Czech territory is reached. This section belongs to the Polish infrastructure company PKP PLK, which is also responsible for the operation, maintenance and repairs. Trilateral discussions with all parties involved are needed to clarify the financing		

	issues related to the line rehabilitation Zittau – Hrádek nad Nisou (3) Train operations: The future redesign of traffic and the establishment of the "0"-node in Zittau will result in changes to the general conditions. The "0"-node means that trains arrive shortly before the hour from any direction and depart shortly after the hour in any direction. Of particular importance is a good transition option with short transfer times in Zittau from Görlitz in the direction of Liberec. In Liberec, a "30"-node is planned. In addition to upgrading the route section from Zittau to Hrádek nad Nisou for shortening travel times, good transition possibilities and short transfer times must therefore be created at the "0"-node Zittau from all directions. Coordinated connections between the "0"-node Zittau and the "30"-node in Liberec are of great importance for the attractiveness of the connection. (4) Rolling stock: The purchase of new railway vehicles is unlikely in the coming years, due to the currently existing transport contract. Nevertheless, an eye should be kept on the future development of the rail vehicle market and develop coordinated concepts at an early stage. Early planning of rolling stock is necessary to enable joint cross-border allocation after the expiry of the transport contracts. Changes at the EU-level will facilitate the technical approval process of rail rolling stock in the future. From June 2019 vehicle approval for all EU countries will be the responsibility of the European Union Agency for Railways. The agency will process the approval documents submitted by the vehicle manufacturer and then issue an approval ("placing into the market"). A final inspection by the operator ensures that the vehicle is ready for use on the relevant routes ("placing into service"). The Federal Railway Authority (EBA) in Germany and Drážní úřad in the Czech Republic will continue to be involved in the approval procedure, but only by providing qualified personnel. (5) Tariff model and financing: Due to the different currencies in the countries and, in particular, the significant differences in income levels, fares are calculated differently and vary widely. Ultimately, this means that passengers from the economically stronger country (Germany) buy their tickets cheaper abroad, but the (in this case German) transport companies have less revenue as a result. In terms of revenue distribution, these interrelationships are a crucial issue that needs to be resolved.
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle	
5.1 Negative direct effects	
Type of direct effect	Strongly reduced cross-border mobility by CBPT, especially in rural or sparsely populated areas Other direct effects
Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	In the Euroregion Neiße covering the border triangle of Germany, Poland and the Czech Republic, the cross-border railway line between Zittau and Liberec is poorly developed and not attractive for passenger transport. In order to improve cross-border rail passenger transport, a high administrative effort is necessary for clarifying a number of complex legal, administrative and operational aspects.
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region	
Type of RoE or KoE	-
6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle	
6.1 Summary obstacle description	
Type	Complex source-problem-effect relationship
Comment	For improving the situation of rail passenger transport between the German und Czech parts of the Euregio, however, a number of complex legal, administrative and operational aspects must be clarified in advance.
6.2 Problem solving approach	

Type	Pragmatic "bridging" of shared problems	Establishment of joint structures for managing CBPT (e.g. EGTC)	Establishment of a new CBPT or consolidation of the existing CBPT-offer	Demand-related measures for stimulating a greater use of CBPT	Stronger coordination of neighbouring domestic fare systems for public transport	More intense and structured cross-border collaboration between key actors

Description of the envisaged or already started problem-solving approach and/or comment on "other practices"	Solution elaborated under the project TRANS-BORDERS: A possible strengthening of cross-border traffic between Germany and the Czech Republic can be implemented by measures requiring a short-term (1-3 years) or medium-term (4-10 years) timeframe: • Improvement of the rail section Zittau - Hrádek nad Nisou (short-term) • Strengthening of the rail section Zittau - Görlitz (short-term) • Adaptation of platforms at stations and creation of better accessibility (medium-term). • Improving operation through coordinated connections/links between 0-node Zittau and 30-node Liberec (short-term). • Improving cooperation between transport undertakings and transport associations on tariff model and financing (short-term). • Development of revenue distribution models prior to the introduction of cross-border lines (medium-term). • Establishment of an EGTC DE-CZ-PL for organisation, marketing and communication (medium-term). • Joint invitation to tender for international transport services (medium-term).

7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)

Possible relevant players	National authority	Regional authority	Local authority	corss-border entity

8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study

Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 6: Problems emerging from inadequate railway infrastructure or lacking interoperability of rail-rolling stock: • Case 18, • Case 20, • Case 27, • Case S-46, • Case S-53		
Case study references	Rail connection Lichkov (Czechia) – Gorzanow (Poland)	Rail connection Johanngeorgenstadt (Germany) – Karlovy Dary Dolni Nadrazi (Czechia)	Rail connection Berlin (Germany) – Kostrzyn (Poland)

9. Sources

TRANS-BORDERS (2018), Regional action plan for improving cross-border public transport Saxony - Liberec Region (Final
11 / 2018)

21	**Multiple factors hinder cross-border tariff integration**	
Short description	Different national and regional legislations on public transport as well as complex questions relating to financing and organisation are complicating the set-up of a joint transport association with integrated tariffs for the EuRegio Salzburg Berchtesgadener Land Traunstein.	
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices		
Type of obstacle	National legal obstacle	
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(II.3) an asymmetric cross-border legal context for CBPT, due to different national or regional legal provisions or administrative directives on specific aspects of transport and CBPT for which no EU competence does exist	
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle		
Geographical extent	Smaller segment of a specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)	
Border	AT-DE	
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	Freistaat Bayern (DE) Land Salzburg (AT) EuRegio Salzburg Berchtesgadener Land Traunstein	
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle		
Mode	Bus, Train	
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation		
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up		
Type of CBPT set-up problem	-	
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT		
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	-	
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT		
Type of CBPT quality problem	Different ticket formats or ticket validation methods	Other adverse consequences
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	Within the EuRegio Salzburg Berchtesgadener Land Traunstein, 9 direct cross-border bus lines and 6 direct cross-border rail or rapid-transit rail connections are operating. In order to better integrate the wide range of fares applied within the EuRegio, the existing system shall be replaced by a territorially more wide-ranging and also structurally further integrated cross-border "EuRegio transport / tariff association" (EuRegio-Verkehrsverbund / Tarifverbund). For this to achieve, an institutionalisation is necessary because a tariff association requires that there is an organsiation / structure ensuring a neutral distribution of revenue between the involved transport companies from both sides of the border. The sharing of revenue is also associated with high one-time investment costs and ongoing operating costs, for which a permanent financing base must be found that does not lead to transport fare increases.	
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle		
5.1 Negative direct effects		
Type of direct effect	Other direct effects	

Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	Several transport companies with cross-border activities within the EuRegio have decided to mutually recognise their domestic associative or in-house tariffs and also became partners of the "Salzburg Transport Association SVV". However, the cross-border expansion of the SVV tariff zone affects only the Bavarian county of Berchtesgadener Land. Due to this, a wide range of fares is currently applied for cross-border journeys with public transport in the entire area covered by the EuRegio.					
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region						
Type of RoE or KoE	-					
6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle						
6.1 Summary obstacle description						
Type	Complex source-problem-effect relationship					
Comment	In order to address the obstacle, an institutional solution for "bridging" the complex national / regional legal differences has to be found.					
6.2 Problem solving approach						
Type	Interstate agreements in the field of CBPT	Pragmatic "bridging" of shared problems	Establishment of joint structures for managing CBPT (e.g. EGTC)	Stronger coordination of neighbouring domestic fare systems for public transport	Up-building of a joint knowledge base on CBPT	More intense and structured cross-border collaboration between key actors
Description of the envisaged or already started problem-solving approach and/or comment on "other practices"	The small-scale Interreg V-A project "EuRegio-Verkehrsverbund" (December 2015 – June 2016) realised a comprehensive current situation analysis for cross-border public transport services (bus and rail) and also examined the legal / organisational framework conditions for establishing a cross-border "EuRegio transport and tariff association" (EuRegio-Verkehrsverbund / Tarifverbund). The study results are intended to lay the foundations for another small follow-up project that shall develop various practical solutions, which later guide a comprehensive implementation project aimed at setting up the EuRegio transport and tariff association. Within this context, also the establishment of an EGTC is discussed. The aim of the currently ongoing discussions for a cross-border solution within the EuRegio is therefore to create the largest possible area for this tariff association so that the additional costs per passenger linked to the distribution of revenue are as low as possible. What is really planned is a common transport association where common means of transport are ordered and a uniform tariff system is applied. This, however, requires solid data. The federal state of Salzburg is already in the process of collecting data on who commutes by car into Salzburg and out to Bavaria (commuter flow analysis). On the Bavarian side, however, concrete progress will take longer. The counties of Traunstein and Berchtesgadener Land are currently negotiating with the Bavarian government in Munich about the necessary financing for the implementation of the project.					
7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)						
Possible relevant players	Regional authority	Transport agency / association	corss-border entity			
8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study						
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 3: Problems emerging from inadequate ticket pricing, lacking tariff integration (incl. non-recognition of free public transport for severely disabled persons) or sub-optimal passenger information: • Case 7, • Case 13, • Case 21, • Case 22, • Case 23, • Case 29, • Case 32, • Case 40, • Case 41, • Case 42, • Case 43, • Case 44					

Case study references	-

9. Sources

ESPON 2020 Cooperation Programme (2018d), Cross-border Public Services (CPS). Targeted Analysis. Final Report. Scientific Report – Annex IV Case study report – "EuRegio Salzburg-Berchtesgadener Land-Traunstein".

Salzburger Verkehrsverbund (2016) Bericht „Verkehrsverbund EuRegio Salzburg Berchtesgadener Land Traunstein

ORF.at (2019), Grenzübergreifender Verkehrsverbund geplant

22	**Lacking integration of tariffs and ticketing systems for CBPT**	
Short description	Lacking integration of tariffs and ticketing systems for cross-border rail passenger transport between the Autonomous Province of Bolzano - South Tyrol and its neighbouring regions in Austria	
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices		
Type of obstacle	Administrative obstacle	
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(III.5) a lacking harmonisation of fare systems existing on both sides of a border or the absence of a single cross-border fare system	
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle		
Geographical extent	Smaller segment of a specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)	
Border	AT-IT	
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	Autonomous Province of Bolzano - South Tyrol (IT) Federal state of Tyrol (AT)	
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle		
Mode	Train	
Particular features of operation	(1.2) international railway line, also comprising stops in each of the contiguous border areas of a cross-border region	
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation		
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up		
Type of CBPT set-up problem	-	
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT		
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	-	
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT		
Type of CBPT quality problem	Different ticket formats or ticket validation methods	Strong differences in fare levels for local transport services
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	In the Province of South Tyrol, public transport has been conceived as a fundamental element that guarantees a sustainable territorial development of the Province through a coherent integration of different public transport modes. This integration, which is valid for all owners of the Südtirol/Alto Adige pass, includes regional trains for routes within the jurisdiction of the Province as well as for those reaching Trento and Innsbruck, urban and long-distance buses, city buses and certain cable car lines and funiculars. Within the Euregio Trentino – Alto Adige/Südtirol – Tyrol (IT-AT), however, the non-integration of rail tariffs constitutes a major critical issue that needs to be addressed urgently. The cross-border train connections to/from Lienz and Innsbruck are performed hourly in both directions, either with a direct train (by SAD or Trenitalia in collaboration with ÖBB) or with a change at the Brenner station (in this case, timetables between Italian and Austrian railways are harmonized). It is possible to pay with the South Tyrolean Mobility pass, but tariffs are not harmonized. For the owners of the Südtirol/Alto Adige pass, tariffs to reach Innsbruck and Lienz are integrated but not harmonized. The ÖBB-Vorteilscard can be registered and associated to a Südtirol/Alto Adige Pass. For the journeys with origin or destination Lienz and Innsbruck, the reduced tariff is automatically calculated. However, with other types of ticket, the integration is not possible and a separate ticket from Brenner to Innsbruck or from Prato alla Drava to Lienz has to be bought in advance, either at the automatic machines at Brenner or in a South Tyrolean station (in this last case validation is required at the border station).	

5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle		
5.1 Negative direct effects		
Type of direct effect	Long waiting / travel times	Passengers bear high ticket cost
Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	As regards the performance or railway passenger transport, it is observed that the commercial speed along the Brenner line is quite competitive. However, the connection to Lienz and East Tyrol is less competitive, which is also due to technical characteristics of the railway line (average speed is 47 km/h = 1h 39m for 75 km). Currently, Austrian tariffs are due according to the ÖBB scheme. The Austrian tariffs are more expensive than those applied in South Tyrol.	
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region		
Type of RoE or KoE	(KoE) Traffic jams and air or noise pollution on main road axes used by cross-border commuters due to missing or sub-optimally developed CBPT	
Background information for the negative secondary effects and / or comment on "other secondary effects"	Most cross-border commuters between South Tyrol and Austria used their car to reach the place of work (75% in 2011), while public transport was limited to 25% of the total journeys.	

6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle				
6.1 Summary obstacle description				
Type	Straightforward source-problem-effect relationship			
Comment	The causal relation might indeed be straightforward, but the differences in the tariff schemes make a further integration difficult to be achieved.			
6.2 Problem solving approach				
Type	Pragmatic "bridging" of shared problems	Demand-related measures for stimulating a greater use of CBPT	Stronger coordination of neighbouring domestic fare systems for public transport	More intense and structured cross-border collaboration between key actors
Description of the envisaged or already started problem-solving approach and/or comment on "other practices"	For elimination negative effects resulting from the non-integration of rail tariffs, some initiatives are currently ongoing (e.g. the hypothesis of a card for university students valid for the free circulation in the three regions).			

7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)			
Possible relevant players	Regional authority	Transport agency / association	Corss-border entity

8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study	
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 3: Problems emerging from inadequate ticket pricing, lacking tariff integration (incl. non-recognition of free public transport for severely disabled persons) or sub-optimal passenger information: • Case 7, • Case 13, • Case 21, • Case 22, • Case 23, • Case 29, • Case 32, • Case 40, • Case 41, • Case 42, • Case 43, • Case 44
Case study references	-

9. Sources
CONNECT2CE (2017), Territorial needs assessment for South Tyrol Version 1.0, 10-2017

23	**Incomplete cross-border information and ticketing system.**
Short description	Not all cross-border bus lines between the Autonomous Province of Bolzano - South Tyrol and the Canton of the Grisons (CH) from part of a cross-border information and ticketing system.
1. **Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices**	
Type of obstacle	Administrative obstacle
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(III.5) a lacking harmonisation of fare systems existing on both sides of a border or the absence of a single cross-border fare system
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle	
Geographical extent	Smaller segment of a specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)
Border	IT-CH
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	Autonomous Province of Bolzano - South Tyrol (IT) Canton of the Grisons (or Graubünden), CH
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle	
Mode	Bus
Particular features of operation	(3.1) local / regional cross-border bus line, comprising at least one stop in two contiguous border regions in two different countries
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation	
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up	
Type of CBPT set-up problem	-
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT	
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	-
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT	
Type of CBPT quality problem	Other adverse consequences
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	In the Autonomous Province of Bolzano - South Tyrol, Article 36 of the Provincial law of 23 November 2015 provides for the integration of all public transport services operating in South Tyrol based upon a unique tariff system. This integration, which is valid for all owners of the Südtirol/Alto Adige pass, includes regional trains for routes within the jurisdiction of the Province as well as for those reaching Trento and Innsbruck, urban and long-distance buses, city buses and certain cable car lines and funiculars. The main cross-border public transport connections to Switzerland are • the bus line from Malles in South Tyrol over Nauders (AT) to the Swiss locality of Martina (13 connections by bus per day), guaranteed by the provincial concessionaire SAD Trasporto Locale Spa (the main local public transport society in South Tyrol), • the bus line from the Swiss locality of Zernez (Engadina), through the Tubre pass to Malles in South Tyrol, guaranteed by the Swiss company AutoPostale. The bus connection from Malles to Nauders and Martina (and vice-versa) is integrated into the South Tyrolean information and ticketing systems. However, the bus line from the Swiss locality of Zernez to Malles is not yet integrated into the South Tyrolean information and ticketing systems.
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle	
5.1 Negative direct effects	
Type of direct effect	Passengers bear high ticket cost
Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	Due to partial tariff integration, passengers on some cross-border bus trips have to pay higher ticket proces.
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region	
Type of RoE or KoE	-

6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle			
6.1 Summary obstacle description			
Type	Straightforward source-problem-effect relationship		
Comment	Negative effects can be eliminated by including the cross-border bus line into the South Tyrol information and ticketing system.		
6.2 Problem solving approach			
Type	Pragmatic "bridging" of shared problems	Stronger coordination of neighbouring domestic fare systems for public transport	More intense and structured cross-border collaboration between key actors
7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)			
Possible relevant players	Regional authority	Transport agency / association	
8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study			
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 3: Problems emerging from inadequate ticket pricing, lacking tariff integration (incl. non-recognition of free public transport for severely disabled persons) or sub-optimal passenger information: • Case 7, • Case 13, • Case 21, • Case 22, • Case 23, • Case 29, • Case 32, • Case 40, • Case 41, • Case 42, • Case 43, • Case 44		
Case study references	-		
9. Sources			
CONNECT2CE (2017), Territorial needs assessment for South Tyrol Version 1.0, 10-2017			

24	**Scattered demand potentials hinder planning and set-up of CBPT**
Short description	Planning and implementing a more effective cross-border public transport system between Vas County (HU) and Burgenland (AT) is difficult because of scattered demand potentials.
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices	
Type of obstacle	Other obstacle
"other type of obstacle" or "other adverse practices"	Adverse spatial context conditions and / or complex structural factors (e.g. unbalanced pattern of cross-border commuter flows, limited demand potentials, variable service supply intensity, low profitability of service etc.) in neighbouring border regions are hindering the development of CBPT
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle	
Geographical extent	Smaller segment of a specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)
Border	AT-HU
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	Southern Burgenland (AT) Vas County (HU)
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle	
Mode	Bus, Train
Particular features of operation	
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation	
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up	
Type of CBPT set-up problem	Other adverse consequences
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	Vas County has a diverse landscape (i.e. mountains, hilly and plain areas) and shares borders with Burgenland (AT) and Slovenia. Overall, the county has a fragmented small-villages-dominated settlement network with low population density. The most important town in Vas County is Szombathely (78.000 inhab.), but only for other towns have a population of more than 10.000 inhabitants (Sárvár, Kőszeg, Körmend and Celldömölk). The population density of Vas County is relatively low, 77 inhabitants per km2 compared to both the country average (107 inhabitants / km2) and the Western Transdanubia average (88 inhabitants / km2). This settlement structure represents a major obstacle for public transport to reach efficiently the cross-border commuters, who are living in small villages with a population less than 500 inhabitants especially in the eastern and southern area of the county.
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT	
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	-
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT	
Type of CBPT quality problem	-
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle	
5.1 Negative direct effects	
Type of direct effect	Other direct effects
Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	In Vas County, the main bottlenecks for achieving sustainable cross-border mobility are the not good enough connected bus and rail services and the need for demand responsive public transport systems. There is only one smaller cross-border rail connection at Szentgotthárd, which was served by 14 pairs of trains on a workday as of 2017.
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region	
Type of RoE or KoE	(KoE) Traffic jams and air or noise pollution on main road axes used by cross-border commuters due to missing or sub-optimally developed CBPT

Background information for the negative secondary effects and / or comment on "other secondary effects"	According to the Hungarian Central Statistical Office (Census 2011), 21% of all Hungarian commuters to Austria come from Vas County, (4.855 persons). In Vas County, 44% of the local residents are commuting to work (34% HU average value) and the share of cross-border commuters among all commuters is at around 10% (2.1% HU average value). Roughly 80% of the cross-border workers in Vas County are spending up to one hour in cross-border commuting (71% HU average value), while the average commuting time of all Hungarian commuters was around 28 minutes in 2011. In terms of modal split, however, cross-border public transport by bus accounts for less than 1% of the commuters and public transport by rail for only around 1-2 %. The rest of the cross-border commuters realised their trips by car and 1-2% by motorbike. The growing number of private car usage is an issue in several settlements, which are suffering from transit traffic. Several junctions on the outskirts of Szombathely are facing with increasing traffic jams in peak-hours.

6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle

6.1 Summary obstacle description

Type	Complex source-problem-effect relationship
Comment	This obstacle to CBPT is difficult to address, since a "workable solution" depends upon various influencing factors, some of which are barely changable (esp. dispersed settlement structure)

6.2 Problem solving approach

Type	Pragmatic "bridging" of shared problems	Demand-related measures for stimulating a greater use of CBPT	Elaboration of a joint strategy for developing and planning CBPT	Up-building of a joint knowledge base on CBPT	More intense and structured cross-border collaboration between key actors
Description of the envisaged or already started problem-solving approach and/or comment on "other practices"	To improve the situation, some previously closed railway lines are planned to be rebuilt in the mid-term. This is foreseen for the county-internal line between Zalalövő - Körmend and especially for the cross-border line form Szombathely to Oberwart in Burgenland. The latter was already subject to cross-border feasibility planning, supported by an Interreg project ("GrenzBahn"). The expected impact of the "GrenzBahn" would be improved local connections, better connections to the close-by and more distant hubs (i.e. Szombathely, Sopron, Eisenstadt, Wiener Neustadt, Graz, Budapest and Vienna) and a better accessibility of the area for tourists in both regions (wellness, biking, wine). For the time being, however, no further progress in implementing that line is noticed.				

7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)

Possible relevant players	National authority	Regional authority	Transport agency / association

8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study

Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 2: Problems emerging from difficult territorial context conditions and / or missing demand potentials: • Case 2, • Case 5, • Case 9, • Case 17, • Case 24	
Case study references	Bus connection Szombathely (Hungary) – Oberwart (Austria)	Rail connection Vienna (Austria) – Győr (Hungary)

9. Sources

CONNECT2CE (2017), Territorial needs assessment for Western Hungary, Version 1.0, 10-2017

Wachholder, C. (2015), The cross-border project „GrenzBahn", Südburgenland Pro Bahn.

25	**Sub-optimal cross-border timetable coordination**		
Short description	Public transport needs in the border area of Pilsen region (CZ) are neglected and cross-border timetable coordination for cross-border rail passenger transport is sub-optimal.		
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices			
Type of obstacle	Administrative obstacle		
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(III.4) a lack of cross-border coordination of already existing national, regional or local public transport services		
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle			
Geographical extent	Smaller segment of a specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)		
Border	CZ-DE		
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	Free state of Bavaria (DE) Pilsen Region (CZ)		
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle			
Mode	Bus, Train		
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation			
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up			
Type of CBPT set-up problem	-		
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT			
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	Lacking economic viability	Other adverse consequences	
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	Beyond the still suboptimal cross-border coordination of timetables, there are also a number of other problems that further complicate a cross-border integration of public transport. These are legal issues and organisational problems (i.e. different systems and different responsible organisations), economic problems (i.e. higher cost of cross-border connections for the operators, more problematic regional subsidies) and also some tax-related problems (i.e. different level of VAT in domestic and cross-border transport) etc.		
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT			
Type of CBPT quality problem	Different ticket formats or ticket validation methods	Strong differences in fare levels for local transport services	Other adverse consequences

Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	In the Czech region of Pilsen, international and cross-border timetable coordination is just "ad hoc" and on a basic level. Also a transport plan for the border areas of Pilsen region and its international transport connections is missing. Finally regional public transport is not even integrated in the less populated regions close to the borders. The international timetable coordination for the long distance international trains is done from national level by the Ministry of transport, which cooperates in this with the competent partners in other countries. However, the functioning of the system and the modes of international communication with partners from other European countries is not clear at this moment. For the cross-border coordination of train and bus timetables, Pilsen regional transport organising company (POVED) communicates with the competent partners in Bavaria (i.e. transport operators, organiser or local authorities). However, there is no regular system of communication and coordination yet. When there is a demand for a change from one from both sides of the border, one partner contacts the other and an agreement is necessary.

5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle

5.1 Negative direct effects

Type of direct effect	Strongly reduced cross-border mobility by CBPT, especially in rural or sparsely populated areas	No cross-border strategy for integrating domestic public transport services or elaborating new CBPT	Transport operators bear additional cost for running CBPT
Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	On the Czech side, the "Integrated Transport of Pilsen Region" (IDP) is a system for public passenger transport that currently works in Pilsen and its surroundings, covering an area of about 35 km around Pilsen. IDP includes urban public transport in Pilsen (trams, trolleybuses, buses) and sections of regional bus lines and railway lines. However, IDP doesn't include the majority of the rural border areas that are sparsely populated and less developed. On the majority of the Pilsen region territory, especially in border areas, passenger can only use single tickets whose price depends on the distance travelled). These tickets do not allow neither interchanges between the transport operators nor interchanges between bus connections of one operator. Since IDP was not extended to the border areas (yet), it also does not integrate any cross-border connections (yet).		

5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region

Type of RoE or KoE	(ReE) An existing language barrier reduces awareness of potential users about the scope of existing CBPT or specific cross-border ticket offers (i.e. lack of multilingual passenger information)
Background information for the negative secondary effects and / or comment on "other secondary effects"	Inhabitants of border areas in Pilsen region are not very much using cross-border public transport, which is also due to the existing language barrier.

6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle

6.1 Summary obstacle description

Type	Complex source-problem-effect relationship
Comment	Considering the different factors causing the obstacle, it becomes clear that the entire public transport system should be improved to make public transport in Czech border areas and also CBPT more attractive.

6.2 Problem solving approach

Type	Pragmatic "bridging" of shared problems	Establishment of a new CBPT or consolidation of the existing CBPT-offer	Demand-related measures for stimulating a greater use of CBPT	Stronger coordination of neighbouring domestic fare systems for public transport	Elaboration of a joint strategy for developing and planning CBPT	More intense and structured cross-border collaboration between key actors

Description of the envisaged or already started problem-solving approach and/or comment on "other practices"	Pilsen region is aware that tariff integration of the region's border areas can be improved a lot and that cross-border coordination of timetables with Bavaria is not yet optimal.
7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)	
Possible relevant players	Regional authority
8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study	
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 7: Problems emerging from sub-optimal timetable coordination (train) or non-user friendly timetables (bus): • Case 25, • Case 28, • Case 39
Case study references	-
9. Sources	
CONNECT2CE (2018), Territorial needs assessment for Pilsen Region, Version 1.0, 02-2018	

26	**Different governance systems hindering CBPT**
Short description	Cooperation on CBPT is difficult at some borders of Austria and Italy, due to very different governance systems for public passenger transport (i.e. roles / responsibilities for decision-making and service ordering).
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices	
Type of obstacle	Administrative obstacle
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(III.2) an asymmetric cooperation constellation between the competent public authorities in the cross-border region, which leads to different policies on CBPT on each side or prevents that specific problems of CBPT are jointly tackled
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle	
Geographical extent	Multiple borders
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	Entire length of the following bilateral EU land borders: AT-HU AT-SI IT-SI
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle	
Mode	Bus, Train, Ferry (IT-SI)
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation	
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up	
Type of CBPT set-up problem	National, regional or local public transport authorities from both sides of the border have different functions and responsibilities, which hinders or prevents cooperation
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	A review of the roles / responsibilities for decision-making on public passenger transport and for ordering public services shows that governance systems are very heterogeneous in the CONNECT2CE project partner regions . Basically two groups appear: (1) Decentralized structures can be found in the federal Member States Germany and Austria having more than one system of law (e.g. Federal States of Berlin, Brandenburg and Burgenland), but also in Italy where regions or autonomous provinces have powers in the field of transport (i.e. Autonomous Province of Bolzano/Südtirol, Autonomous Region Friuli Venezia Giulia, Veneto Region). In these cases, authorities of the Federal State or of the region / autonomous province are responsible for the suburban and regional public transport (bus train). Below that level, municipalities (or counties) are in charge of urban / local public transport (bus, metro, tram). To this group also belong Poland and the Czech Republic, since regions of both countries are in charge of suburban / regional public transport (bus train) and municipalities take care of urban / local public transport (bus, metro, tram). (2) Clearly more centralized structures can be found in other Eastern European Countries (i.e. Slovenia, Croatia, Hungary). Central governments are responsible for long-distance, regional and suburban public transport (bus train), while municipalities take care of urban / local public transport (bus, metro, tram). Where considerably different structural settings are meeting at the border between neighbouring, countries (e.g. AT-HU, AT-SI, IT-SI), they can create serious administrative barriers for designing effective and integrated cross-border public transport.
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT	
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	-

4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT	
Type of CBPT quality problem	-
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle	
5.1 Negative direct effects	
Type of direct effect	Other direct effects
Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	Differences in public transport governance systems do not generally exclude a high level of cross-border cooperation and interoperability. Provided the functions are replicated both sides, there will usually be a counterpart within the other country's system of governance, from the highest political level down to the technical and specialised levels. However, cooperation can be more difficult (even though by no means impossible) if a country with a centralist structure and little to no regional competences is next to a country where competences for public transport have been relayed to the regional level. Representatives of such border regions may have to deal with the central authority in the neighbouring country's capital city each time an issue arises. Naturally, it would be better for them to turn to a colleague on the regional level who has a similar perception of the issue and is closer to where things actually happen. In such a constellation cross-border connectivity is typically low, although there may be exceptions with an improved or even satisfactory connectivity due to historic reasons, local initiatives, EU projects, or special geographic situations where a particular need has been successfully addressed.
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region	
Type of RoE or KoE	-
6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle	
6.1 Summary obstacle description	
Type	Complex source-problem-effect relationship
Comment	In the case of neighbouring public transport systems characterised by strong differences, it can be difficult to eliminate the causes or problems since basic structural settings cannot be changed.

6.2 Problem solving approach						
Type	Pragmatic "bridging" of shared problems	Establishment of joint structures for managing CBPT (e.g. EGTC)	Stronger coordination of neighbouring domestic fare systems for public transport	Elaboration of a joint strategy for developing and planning CBPT	Up-building of a joint knowledge base on CBPT	More intense and structured cross-border collaboration between key actors
Description of the envisaged or already started problem-solving approach and/or comment on "other practices"	Best cooperation results are achieved between neighbouring transport systems that have similar standards and service levels. Essentially, they just have to agree on the scope and type of cooperation while relying on each other's existing structures. An example is the introduction of a cross-border day pass that boils down to an extended offer of the two transport associations. At best, all of what has to be added is a clearing routine for ticket revenue, updating passenger information, and briefing of staff members on the new product. Achieving cross-border solutions can become more complex in case of larger differences in standards or practice for connectivity, service levels, tariff, ticketing, and terms of carriage.					

7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)			
Possible relevant players	National authority	Regional authority	Transport agency / association

8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study	
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 4: Problems emerging from a diversity of public transport governance systems, different policy concepts, lack of cooperation between key actors (national or regional public authorities, transport providers etc.) and complex administrative procedures or adverse political behaviour: • Case 8, • Case 14,

	• Case 15, • Case 16, • Case 26, • Case 31, • Case 33, • Case 37, • Case 38, • Case 45, • Case S-50, • Case S-54, • Case S-55, • Case S-56
Case study references	-

9. Sources

CONNECT2CE (2018), Transnational study on regional/cross-border railway and PT connections, Version 1.0, 05-2018, pp. 9-14, 16,17

27	**Poor railway infrastructure and lacking interoperability hamper CBPT**
Short description	Poor quality of railway infrastructure and persisting problems with interoperability are hampering cross-border rail passenger transport between Germany and Poland
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices	
Type of obstacle	Administrative obstacle
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(III.1) non-awareness or non-willingness of national-level authorities to initiate or support solutions that could eliminate specific problems for CBPT
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle	
Geographical extent	Smaller segment of a specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)
Border	DE-PL
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	Federal states of Berlin and Brandenburg (DE) West Pomerania Voivodship (PL) Lubuskie Voivodship (PL)
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle	
Mode	Train
Particular features of operation	(1.2) international railway line, also comprising stops in each of the contiguous border areas of a cross-border region
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation	
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up	
Type of CBPT set-up problem	Lacking interoperability of national railway systems requires specific rail rolling stock able to operate on both sides of the border
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	SET-UP AND OPERATION OF SERVICES: Further to the bad quality of the railway infrastructure, there are still problems with the interoperability of trains between Germany and Poland that have also to be solved at the national level.
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT	
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	-
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT	
Type of CBPT quality problem	Other adverse consequences
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	The cross-border railway lines between Berlin / Brandenburg and the West Pomerania and Lubuskie Voivodships are often still characterised by bad quality of the infrastructure. This is partly due to a lack of commitment of national levels to international railway transport and especially a lacking awareness for cross-border regional services, both in Germany and in Poland (esp. in the national ministries of transport). While Poland indeed concentrates efforts on an improvement of railway infrastructure, this seems to be a weak point especially in Germany. Other factors are the instable financial and legal situation in Poland, as well as the different planning horizons in Germany and Poland.
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle	
5.1 Negative direct effects	
Type of direct effect	Long waiting / travel times

Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	Poor rail track conditions reduce the operating speed of cross-border public rail passenger transport services:
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region	
Type of RoE or KoE	(ReE) Poor rail track conditions or missing road traffic management infrastructures reduce operating speed of CBPT (rail, bus)
Background information for the negative secondary effects and / or comment on "other secondary effects"	In the border area of Berlin / Brandenburg (DE) and West Pomerania Voivodship (PL), the main passenger intermodal point of the cross-border interurban and regional road and railway transport network is the city of Szczecin (PL). The main cross-border railway sections are Angermünde - Szczecin and Pasewalk - Szczecin. Although improvements of the railway are planned (esp. track upgrade Angermünde to the DE/PL border), the position of railways in intermodal competition is difficult due to heavy investments in road network improvements (e.g. motorways and expressways, including new bridges and tunnels). In the border area Brandenburg (DE) and Lubuskie Voivodship (PL), the main passenger intermodal points of the cross-border interurban and regional road and railway transport network are the cities of Cottbus (DE) and Zielona Góra (DE). The main cross-border railway sections are Forst / Lausitz (DE) - Żary (PL) and Guben (DE) - Czerwieńsk (PL). Despite many territorial needs, only few improvements are planned in the railway network. On the two cross-border railway sections, there is an evident need for revitalisation. Due to the general lack of expressways (except A15 / A18 motorway), the position of railways in intermodal competition might be quite good in future.

6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle

6.1 Summary obstacle description	
Type	Straightforward source-problem-effect relationship
Comment	The observed problems can be eliminated by speeding up the required rail infrastructure modernisation measures at national level.

6.2 Problem solving approach				
Type	Elaboration of a joint strategy for developing and planning CBPT	Up-building of a joint knowledge base on CBPT	More intense and structured cross-border collaboration between key actors	Other practice
Description of the envisaged or already started problem-solving approach and/or comment on "other practices"	Railway track upgrades already take place upon order of the national transport ministries in both countries, which are then implemented by the relevant national infrastructure operators in Germany (DB Netz AG) and Poland (Polskie Linie Kolejowe SA - PKP PLK). The current status of and timetable for railway infrastructure improvements on cross-border lines can be summarised as follows: • Berlin - Szczecin: Electrification of the railway line (foreseen for the next 6-7 years). • Berlin - Kostrzyn - Gorzów Wielkopolski: Upgrade of the railway line to cut travel times (ongoing). • Cottbus - Forst/Lausitz - Żary - Żagań -Wrocław: Upgrading of the railway line in order to reduce travel times (need).			

7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)

Possible relevant players	Regional authority

8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study

Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 6: Problems emerging from inadequate railway infrastructure or lacking interoperability of rail-rolling stock: • Case 18, • Case 20, • Case 27, • Case S-46, • Case S-53
Case study references	Rail connection Berlin (Germany) – Kostrzyn (Poland)

9. Sources

CONNECT2CE (2017), Territorial needs assessment for Verkehrsverbund Berlin-Brandenburg GmbH, Version 1.0
10-2017

28	**Difficult timetable harmonisation for CBPT**
Short description	Difficult timetable harmonisation for cross-border rail passenger services between Berlin, Brandenburg and the Voivodships of West Pomerania and Lubuskie.
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices	
Type of obstacle	Administrative obstacle
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(III.6) different administrative cultures (i.e. ways of delivering policies) or different working procedures / routines of transport operators on either side of the border
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle	
Geographical extent	Smaller segment of a specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)
Border	DE-PL
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	Federal states of Berlin and Brandenburg (DE) West Pomerania Voivodship (PL) Lubuskie Voivodship (PL)
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle	
Mode	Train
Particular features of operation	(1.2) international railway line, also comprising stops in each of the contiguous border areas of a cross-border region
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation	
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up	
Type of CBPT set-up problem	National, regional or local public transport authorities from both sides of the border have different functions and responsibilities, which hinders or prevents cooperation
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	HERE ALSO FOR SERVICE OPERATION: Between Germany and Poland, there are strong differences in the responsibilities for railway passenger transport. • In Germany, the federal states are responsible for organising local and regional railway transport, including interregional trains. Long-distance trains are operated on commercial basis on a commercial basis without subsidies. • In Poland, voivodships are responsible for local railway transport. Interregional trains (TLK, Intercity) are operated by PKP Intercity with the framework of a Public Service Contract and receive public grants. Only a few long-distance services on connections between major Polish cities and Warsaw (i.e. EIC - Express Intercity; EIP - Express Intercity Premium) are operated on commercial basis. In both countries, regional railways receive public funding, but the organisation of services is quite different. In Germany, federal states (Länder) or public transport associations (Verkehrsverbünde) carry out the planning of services, which are subsequently awarded through competitive tendering processes to the operators. In Poland the operators are either public operators owned by the regions who are directly awarded to carry out services or the services are tendered usually to Przewozy Regionalne / Polregio, the former national and now region-owned operator of regional railways. Whereas in Germany contracts run for around 10 years and tendering processes start 3-5 years before the award of contract, in Poland contracts usually run only for very short periods (1-2 years, in exceptional cases 4 years) and are awarded in short term. The Public Service Contract for interregional TLK and Intercity services has been directly awarded to PKP Intercity for 10 years. Another difference between both countries is that in Germany railway services are based on the "Taktfahrplan" so there are services running regularly every 30 or 60 minutes during the whole day. On the contrary in Poland services on most lines run irregularly according to demand with denser services in morning and afternoon and larger gaps before noon and in the evening, and in general with less services over the day. Organisational differences also affect the provision of regional cross-border railway passenger transport services between Berlin / Brandenburg and the neighbouring Voivodships of West Pomerania and Lubuskie. On the German side, formal organisers of regional railway transport are the competent administrations of the federal states of Berlin and Brandenburg. However, they have charged the public transport association Berlin-Brandenburg VBB (Verkehrsverbund Berlin-

	Brandenburg) with organising regional railway transport on their behalf. Within the VBB area, different railway companies are operating cross-border passenger transport services to Poland: • DB Regio AG is the operator on the line Berlin-Angermünde and the duration of the concession contract is 12 years (2014/2015 – 2025/2026). • On two lines, the East German Railway ODEG (Ostdeutsche Eisenbahn GmbH) is the operator and the duration of concession contracts are either 10 years (i.e. Berlin-Cottbus: 2012/2013 – 2021/2022) or 10 and 12 years (i.e. Cottbus-Forst /Lausitz: 2008/2009 – 2017/2018; 2018/2019 – 2029/2030). In the Voivodships of West Pomerania and Lubuskie, the respective Marshal's Office are organisers of local railway transport (and regional bus transport) and also owners the EU-financed modern railcars. The regional railway operator is in both Voivodships Przewozy Regionalne, however with a different duration of concession contracts. In the Voivodship of West Pomerania, the concession contract now has a duration of 4 years (2016/2017 - 2019/2020, until 2015/2016 there were annual contracts). In the Voivodship Lubuskie, however, there is still an annual concession contract (2016 / 2017).		
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT			
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	-		
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT			
Type of CBPT quality problem	Other adverse consequences		
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	Organisational differences in the field of rail passenger transport are also crucial for understanding the difficulties in a cross-border harmonisation of timetables. In Germany, timetables are defined for long periods and have defined times when nodes in the network have to be reached. Therefore there is hardly any flexibility for changing timetables in order to reach connecting trains in Poland. In Poland, timetables change very often (up to 4-6 times per year) and interchange connections, which have been agreed, often are cancelled again due to construction works or other changes within the Polish railway network.		
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle			
5.1 Negative direct effects			
Type of direct effect	Other direct effects		
Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	Weaknesses in cross-border timetable coordination / harmonisation can cause inconventient travel conditions for users.		
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region			
Type of RoE or KoE	-		
6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle			
6.1 Summary obstacle description			
Type	Straightforward source-problem-effect relationship		
Comment	The observed problems can be eliminated by intensifying cooperation and coordination between the compentent railway authorities on both sides.		
6.2 Problem solving approach			
Type	Pragmatic "bridging" of shared problems	Elaboration of a joint strategy for developing and planning CBPT	More intense and structured cross-border collaboration between key actors
Description of the envisaged or already started problem-solving approach and/or comment on "other practices"	For timetable harmonisation, VBB is in continuous dialogue with the neighbouring Polish region. This is done during the normal national planning process once a year in winter before the operators register their timetables at the rail network operator. This has brought about some improvements in timetable coordination over the last years. Also the long-term strategic questions concerning the development of cross-border services are discussed within the "Transport Round Table" of the Oder-Partnership once (up to twice) a year.		
7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)			
Possible relevant players	Regional authority		

8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study	
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 7: Problems emerging from sub-optimal timetable coordination (train) or non-user friendly timetables (bus): • Case 25, • Case 28, • Case 39
Case study references	Rail connection Berlin (Germany) – Kostrzyn (Poland)

9. Sources
CONNECT2CE (2017), Territorial needs assessment for Verkehrsverbund Berlin-Brandenburg GmbH, Version 1.0 10-2017

29	**Inadequate passenger information system for CBPT**
Short description	Inadequate passenger information system on cross-border rail services between Berlin, Brandenburg and the Voivodships of West Pomerania and Lubuskie.
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices	
Type of obstacle	Administrative obstacle
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(III.4) a lack of cross-border coordination of already existing national, regional or local public transport services
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle	
Geographical extent	Smaller segment of a specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)
Border	DE-PL
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	Federal states of Berlin and Brandenburg (DE) West Pomerania Voivodship (PL) Lubuskie Voivodship (PL)
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle	
Mode	Train
Particular features of operation	(1.2) international railway line, also comprising stops in each of the contiguous border areas of a cross-border region
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation	
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up	
Type of CBPT set-up problem	National, regional or local public transport authorities from both sides of the border have different functions and responsibilities, which hinders or prevents cooperation
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	HERE ALSO FOR SERVICE OPERATION: On the German side, the formal organisers of regional railway transport are the competent administrations of the federal states of Berlin and Brandenburg. However, they charged the public transport association Berlin-Brandenburg VBB (Verkehrsverbund Berlin-Brandenburg) with organising regional railway transport on their behalf. This general task covers also several cross-border railway services to Poland. Within VBB's service area on the German side, the "VBB-Fahrinfo" provides an operator-independent state-of-art service for passenger information covering all modes of public transport. For the cross-border railway services to Poland, this is unfortunately not yet the case. In Poland there is a national travel planner for the railway system and additionally privately operated travel planning systems for cities and for regional connections which only cover selected operators and which do not offer a comprehensive service. Additionally these systems only provide the foreseen timetables without including real time information.
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT	
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	-
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT	
Type of CBPT quality problem	Inadequate or lacking passenger information
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	For the moment, passenger information on cross-border lines is limited to the German section. Displays in the trains only show connecting bus and train services in German stations, but not in Poland. Unfortunately, VBB discovers a certain lack of awareness to the need of comprehensive passenger information in Poland among Polish transport authorities.

5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle			
5.1 Negative direct effects			
Type of direct effect	No cross-border strategy for integrating domestic public transport services or elaborating new CBPT		
Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	Inadequate passenger information system on cross-border rail services can cause inconventient travel conditions for users. Moreover, the absence of information services for Poland on regional cross-border rail passenger services (apart from direct railway services) may result in a loss of passengers.		
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region			
Type of RoE or KoE	-		
6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle			
6.1 Summary obstacle description			
Type	Straightforward source-problem-effect relationship		
Comment	There is the possibility to integrate Polish information data into the VBB system (if wanted).		
6.2 Problem solving approach			
Type	Pragmatic "bridging" of shared problems	Demand-related measures for stimulating a greater use of CBPT	More intense and structured cross-border collaboration between key actors
Description of the envisaged or already started problem-solving approach and/or comment on "other practices"	VBB has made several approaches towards the neighbouring Polish voivodship to provide a passenger information system based on the technical platform of VBB-Fahrinfo. So far, however, VBB was not able to convince the border regions to provide passenger information systems for their networks. VBB regrets this, since there is a big potential for public transport if information is provided more easily and passengers are guided through the public transport system.		
7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)			
Possible relevant players	Regional authority		
8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study			
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 3: Problems emerging from inadequate ticket pricing, lacking tariff integration (incl. non-recognition of free public transport for severely disabled persons) or sub-optimal passenger information: • Case 7, • Case 13, • Case 21, • Case 22, • Case 23, • Case 29, • Case 32, • Case 40, • Case 41, • Case 42, • Case 43, • Case 44		
Case study references	Rail connection Berlin (Germany) – Kostrzyn (Poland)		
9. Sources			
CONNECT2CE (2017), Territorial needs assessment for Verkehrsverbund Berlin-Brandenburg GmbH, Version 1.0 10-2017			

30	**Low profitability of CBPT**
Short description	Low profitability of cross-border rail passenger transport is a strong barrier for service improvements at the German border with West Pomerania and Lubuskie Voivodships
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices	
Type of obstacle	Other obstacle
"other type of obstacle" or "other adverse practices"	Adverse spatial context conditions and / or complex structural factors (e.g. unbalanced pattern of cross-border commuter flows, limited demand potentials, variable service supply intensity, low profitability of service etc.) in neighbouring border regions are hindering the development of CBPT
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle	
Geographical extent	Smaller segment of a specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)
Border	DE-PL
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	Federal states of Berlin and Brandenburg (DE) West Pomerania Voivodship (PL) Lubuskie Voivodship (PL)
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle	
Mode	Train
Particular features of operation	(1.2) international railway line, also comprising stops in each of the contiguous border areas of a cross-border region
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation	
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up	
Type of CBPT set-up problem	-
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT	
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	Lacking economic viability
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	In the area of the public transport association Berlin-Brandenburg VBB (Verkehrsverbund Berlin-Brandenburg), the major passenger groups on cross-border rail passenger transport services are cross-border workers and university students on Fridays and Sundays (i.e. weekly commuters). Weekend services are primarily used by persons crossing the border for touristic and shopping purposes. The number of passengers on cross-border services varies very much due to the different service levels on the lines. The highest numbers are found on the lines Berlin - Szczecin and Berlin - Kostrzyn, whereas significantly lower numbers use the other two services. Due to the fact that the cross-border lines run in peripheral parts of the VBB service area, ticket revenues are rather low. The ratio between revenues and costs of the cross-border services is estimated at around 10-20% only, compared to 50% in average for Berlin-Brandenburg. This is also due to the special fares applied to the Berlin-Poland-Tickets. This low profitability is a strong barrier for improvements in cross-border services. Nevertheless, the federal states of Berlin and Brandenburg committed themselves strongly to improve cross-border services to Poland for political reasons. Another threat for cross-border services is the fact that Berlin and Brandenburg bear the full costs of operation of the trains on the lines to Kostrzyn and Szczecin within Poland, as it is not possible to carry out joint tenders for the international services with Polish partners.
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT	

Type of CBPT quality problem	Different ticket formats or ticket validation methods	Limited distribution channels for cross-border tickets	Strong differences in fare levels for local transport services	Other adverse consequences

Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	Very often, cross-border-railway services are based on the international tariff of railway operators. These tickets are generally very expensive, and therefore ticket prices for local / regional cross-border service are not attractive for customers. Passengers either split national tickets to the border points or used other modes of transport as cars or open access coach services. Within the area covered by the public transport association Berlin-Brandenburg VBB (Verkehrsverbund Berlin-Brandenburg), cross-border railway passenger transport services are very much oriented towards Berlin. From four railway border crossings at the border with Poland, three are directly served from Berlin, and one has short interchange connections to Berlin. • Berlin - Szczecin • Berlin - Kostrzyn • Berlin - Frankfurt/Oder - Zielona Góra • Cottbus - Żary - Żagań In order to provide competitive tickets for cross-border rail passenger services, VBB introduced a series of Berlin-Poland-Tickets. Currently VBB offers tickets for four destinations: Szczecin, Kostrzyn, Gorzów Wielkopolski and Zielona Góra. With these cross-border tickets, VBB covers the most important destinations for regional railways between Germany and Poland. The tickets are calculated according to the national ticket fares between Berlin and the border point and between the border point and the Polish city. Due to the big competition of coach and minibus operators, the Berlin-Szczecin-Ticket is sold at a lower price in order to increase the modal share of railway on that line. The Berlin-Poland tickets are available at ticket machines and at the counters of the operators in the relevant cities in Germany and Poland. In Germany tickets are sold in Euro, and in Poland in Złoty (PLN) at a fixed exchange rate. Currently these tickets are paper tickets only. However, marketing for the cross-border-tickets is still weak and potential users might not know them. The cross-border tickets are valid for the trains between Germany and Poland and within the urban transport systems of Berlin and the Polish destination cities. So with one Berlin-Szczecin-Ticket passengers can use public transport within Berlin, the train from Berlin to Szczecin and the tram or bus in Szczecin. In Polish cities, however, the (city-owned) urban operators do not receive a share of the revenues. This agreement was made by the relevant cities for pragmatic reasons, as international financial flows are very complicated to manage for Polish public operators.
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle	
5.1 Negative direct effects	
Type of direct effect	No CBPT due to reasons of economic viability
Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	The low profitability is a strong barrier for improvements in cross-border rail passenger services. Despite the loss-making of the currently offered services, the federal states of Berlin and Brandenburg committed themselves strongly to improve cross-border services to Poland for political reasons.
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region	
Type of RoE or KoE	-
6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle	
6.1 Summary obstacle description	
Type	Straightforward source-problem-effect relationship
Comment	Despite the clear problems with the profitability of the services, a politically supported solution can be found (or maintained).

6.2 Problem solving approach				
Type	Pragmatic "bridging" of shared problems	Demand-related measures for stimulating a greater use of CBPT	Stronger coordination of neighbouring domestic fare systems for public transport	More intense and structured cross-border collaboration between key actors

Description of the envisaged or already started problem-solving approach and/or comment on "other practices"	SOLUTIONS (IMPROVEMENTS): For political reasons the current approach is not questioned now. However, this solution might turn out not to be sustainable under different political conditions. Nevertheless the system should be extended to some more destinations in Poland and Germany (e.g. on the Cottbus-Żary-Żagań-Wrocław connection). Additional improvements would be the possibility to buy tickets also in the urban bus and tram systems in Poland and to include the Polish cities in the tickets' revenue sharing system.
7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)	
Possible relevant players	Regional authority
8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study	
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 1: Problems emerging from an unprofitable operation of CBPT, missing public subsidies and other financial matters (bus, train): • Case 1, • Case 3, • Case 4, • Case 10, • Case 30, • Case 35, • Case 36, • Case S-48
Case study references	Rail connection Berlin (Germany) – Kostrzyn (Poland)
9. Sources	
CONNECT2CE (2017), Territorial needs assessment for Verkehrsverbund Berlin-Brandenburg GmbH, Version 1.0 10-2017	

31	**Adverse political influence complicates operation of CBPT**
Short description	Adverse central-level political influence complicates the operation of a local cross-border bus service at the German-Polish border.
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices	
Type of obstacle	Administrative obstacle
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(III.1) non-awareness or non-willingness of national-level authorities to initiate or support solutions that could eliminate specific problems for CBPT
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle	
Geographical extent	Smaller segment of a specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)
Border	DE-PL
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	Frankfurt Oder (DE) Slubice (PL)
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle	
Mode	Bus
Particular features of operation	(3.1) local / regional cross-border bus line, comprising at least one stop in two contiguous border regions in two different countries
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation	
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up	
Type of CBPT set-up problem	-
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT	
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	Lacking economic viability
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	The border towns of Frankfurt Oder (DE) and Slubice (PL) are separated by the Oder River. Since 2012, the bus line 983 is operating between the two cities every hour. Negotiations lasted for years, but finally the bus was allowed to operate across the border. With just under 400,000 passengers per year, this volume is a good result for an hourly operating bus. Actually, there are no problems with the operation of the line, as everything is relatively clearly regulated under EU law (i.e. what applies in Germany also applies in Poland, with small nuances). However, some problems then lie "in the details". Sometimes the buses had to be equipped with fire extinguishers, while at other times there were concerns about a Polish municipality transferring money to Germany. This is because every year Slubice pays around 40,000 euros from the city budget to the Frankfurt transport company in order to keep on rolling the bus. This is due to the fact that the operation of bus line 983 is still a loss-making business, with the only difference that here the deficit is distributed across borders. Sometimes, however, the operation of the cross-border public bus service becomes a "political border experience".
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT	
Type of CBPT quality problem	

Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	The question of cross-border deficit sharing is not quite so simple and has become more complicated in recent years than it actually should be. Due to "inappropriate" behaviour, the state government of Brandenburg and the representatives of the Voivodeship Lebus in Poland are now also indirectly observing the local talks (informally, in the background). Together, the Voivodeship and the State government are trying to keep the way clear for the bus line against scepticism about Polish-German cooperation in the field of public transport.
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle	
5.1 Negative direct effects	
Type of direct effect	Other direct effects
Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	Due to "inappropriate" politicisation, the operation of the cross-border bus service becomes more complicated.
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region	
Type of RoE or KoE	-
6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle	
6.1 Summary obstacle description	
Type	Straightforward source-problem-effect relationship
Comment	
6.2 Problem solving approach	
Type	More intense and structured cross-border collaboration between key actors
Description of the envisaged or already started problem-solving approach and/or comment on "other practices"	
7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)	
Possible relevant players	National authority
8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study	
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 4: Problems emerging from a diversity of public transport governance systems, different policy concepts, lack of cooperation between key actors (national or regional public authorities, transport providers etc.) and complex administrative procedures or adverse political behaviour: • Case 8, • Case 14, • Case 15, • Case 16, • Case 26, • Case 31, • Case 33, • Case 37, • Case 38, • Case 45, • Case S-50, • Case S-54, • Case S-55, • Case S-56
Case study references	-
9. Sources	
Deutschlandfunk (2019), Grenzenloser Linienverkehr – Zwei Städte, zwei Länder, ein Bus.	

32	Sub-optimal cross-border ticketing and passenger information systems	
Short description	Not yet optimal ticketing and passenger information systems in the cross-border public transport system of the Øresund Region.	
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices		
Type of obstacle	Administrative obstacle	
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(III.5) a lacking harmonisation of fare systems existing on both sides of a border or the absence of a single cross-border fare system	
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle		
Geographical extent	Specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)	
Border	SE-DK	
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle		
Mode	Bus, Train	
Particular features of operation	-	
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation		
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up		
Type of CBPT set-up problem	National, regional or local public transport authorities from both sides of the border have different functions and responsibilities, which hinders or prevents cooperation	
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	HERE ALSO FOR SERVICE OPERATION: In the cross-border area, also cooperation asymmetry seems to play a non-negligible role. In Sweden, the Öresund rail traffic and the cross-border traffic is mainly run by Region Scania through Skånetrafiken and Öresundståg (cross-border rail network). That means that the Scanian regional council have to negotiate with the Danish Transport Ministry, or that civil servants within a region have to negotiate with civil servants at a ministry. This is an imbalance of power and this often poses some problems. Finally, it appeared that the prioritization of country-internal cooperation (intra-regional, inter-regional cooperation) was a key concern for most public transport actors. The actors have a lot to deal with ensuring cooperation between different organizations within the respective regions (esp. on the Danish side), which consumes a lot of focus and energy. This adversely impacts "external" cooperation, since there appears to be an apparent lack of explicit responsibility for cross-border cooperation with respect to certain issues. For instance, some issues surrounding the sharing of public transport information seemed to be linked to a lack of defined and explicit responsibility, although it was highlighted that ample opportunity exists.	
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT		
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	-	
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT		
Type of CBPT quality problem	Inadequate or lacking passenger information	Different ticket formats or ticket validation methods
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	In the Øresund Region, also known as Greater Copenhagen, there are several challenges (or obstacles) to be tackled for increasing the coherence of the cross-border public transport system in the Greater Copenhagen region before cross-border mobility could be characterized as being seamless. The main issues at play with respect to improving the coherence of the public transport system are ticketing and public transport information. As part of a recent Interreg project, a study on experiences of passenger travelling over the Øresund revealed that, overall, the users are quite satisfied. However, there were reports that certain of the existing public transport solutions appear illogical. Especially solutions related to both ticketing and public transport information were described as confusing by several passengers. Inconsistencies with travel guarantees were also cited as problematic, as was the existence of many different platforms (e.g. applications, websites, and on-site information) with conflicting public transport information. Some passengers even highlighted their reliance on informal platforms for up-to-date public transport information, particularly when delays arise. These issues have differing levels of importance for different groups. For	

	instance, it was found that, in general, commuters tend to draw on strategies based on their experience, and tend to be well-prepared in the event of a serious delay by bringing food with them or having a back-up plan. Key findings of a recent empirical study involving interviews with main public transport actors from both sides of the border suggest the following main reasons causing this fragmentation: (1) A lack of customer-orientation: From the public transport provider perspective, it was highlighted that the focus on inter-organizational matters is a negative development and questions how the customers could possibly become the main focus of improvements. Important reasons for the extremely fragmented ticketing system are that all the regions want to have their own optimal ticketing system. Drivers behind this could be politics, the municipal or regional autonomy. Similar issues were apparent in cross-border cooperation efforts, since the difficulty associated with different types of governance was emphasized in interviews. "In other words, it's difficult when you have one [type of] governance in Sweden, one [type of] governance in Denmark and one that should be common". Also with respect to improving integration across the border, it comes to the fore that the focus on customers is not as central as it could be ("If we really want to have this integration over the border, then we have to also set aside the resources that are required to get it to work. I think that the biggest problem is mental. It is a mental challenge more than a technical challenge"). (2) Another important aspect is the lack of knowledge about "the other side". There is an apparent lack of communication, clarity or knowledge (or lack of all three) regarding what is happening on the other side of the Öresund fixed link. This issue was rather evident with respect to key areas such as changes to zones, or even train movements, particularly in relation to delays or disturbances in the network. For instance, it became apparent that planning is carried out separately on either side, but traffic / operations are managed in cooperation with one another
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle	
5.1 Negative direct effects	
Type of direct effect	Other direct effects
Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	Interviews with groups representing passengers or individual customer highlight that some aspects make cross-border travelling far from being simple: Interviewed passenger representative groups tend to question whether public transport providers really do have the customer (the passengers) as their main focus. There is a lack of compatibility between zones and also a lack of communication across the border. Especially the complexity of the zoning system and the related difficulties adversely affect the customers / passengers as well as tourists. The effects of fragmentation are highlighted by a young person travelling from the Swedish to the Danish side: "What should I expect when I travel to Denmark? "Yes, it's awkward and there's a lot to keep track of!" If I'm 17 years old I'm not a child anymore, which I am in Scania. Then I'm all of a sudden an adult when I travel to Denmark. If I'm going to Sydhavn [a district in Copenhagen], well we've changed some zone there so it'll be more expensive. And then I also have to have a metro supplement, except only if I have a monthly ticket, except not if I have a single ticket. Yet there's the Rejsekort [Denmark's smart card] and then I have to have the supplement for that as well … or you take the car or just drop it [the trip]". In extreme cases customers even feel like criminals if they have unintentionally bought the wrong ticket.
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region	
Type of RoE or KoE	-
6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle	
6.1 Summary obstacle description	
Type	Straightforward source-problem-effect relationship
Comment	There are different options for eliminating the obstacle, ranging from incremental improvements to a more substantial review of the entire transport system.

6.2 Problem solving approach				
Type	Pragmatic "bridging" of shared problems	Establishment of joint structures for managing CBPT (e.g. EGTC)	Stronger coordination of neighbouring domestic fare systems for public transport	More intense and structured cross-border collaboration between key actors
Description of the envisaged or already started problem-solving approach and/or comment on "other practices"	Public transport actors from both sides share the view that there is no need for an overhaul of the entire system (or systems) with respect to public transport information and ticketing. Instead, improvements to coherence in the cross-border transport system will most likely take the form of small incremental changes to some key areas where investments have already been made and of adopting common standards for public transport information (e.g. the same information but in different formats). This is opposed to the desirable development of common systems, or of a significant departure from existing systems. The study findings point to the need for a further formalization of the cooperation and stronger coordination between actors on both sides of the Øresund. One step towards such formalization could be the allocation of explicit responsibility for cooperation and coordination at the respective organizations. This is with respect to both ticketing and public transport information systems. Several actors and organizations would most likely need to be involved in such a formalization process; a task that could be facilitated by and through Din Oentlige Transport (DOT) (or an equivalent) which is the partnership organization currently facilitating cooperation within the Danish region of Zealand. The establishment of a dedicated cross-border user forum or panel comprising different user types (e.g., daily commuters, airport users, weekend visitors, tourists and business travellers) could strengthen the focus on the customers (the passengers) and their specific perspectives at the organizations, in turn consolidating the focus of the cross-border cooperation and its sustainability. This would also allow for longitudinal analyses to be carried out, and for new policies and provision changes to be "tested" among user groups who face the rather unique challenge of travelling between two countries.			
7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)				
Possible relevant players	National authority	Regional authority	Transport agency / association	corss-border entity
8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study				
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 3: Problems emerging from inadequate ticket pricing, lacking tariff integration (incl. non-recognition of free public transport for severely disabled persons) or sub-optimal passenger information: • Case 7, • Case 13, • Case 21, • Case 22, • Case 23, • Case 29, • Case 32, • Case 40, • Case 41, • Case 42, • Case 43, • Case 44			
Case study references	Rail connection Copenhagen (Denmark) – Malmö (Sweden)			
9. Sources				
Ryan / Wretstrand (2020), Improving Coherence in a Cross-Border Public Transport System: Lessons from the Greater Copenhagen Region.				

33	**Slow cooperation between national transport administrations**
Short description	Slow cooperation between national transport administrations in Sweden and Finland hinders the establishment of cross-border rail passenger transport.
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices	
Type of obstacle	Administrative obstacle
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(III.1) non-awareness or non-willingness of national-level authorities to initiate or support solutions that could eliminate specific problems for CBPT
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle	
Geographical extent	Smaller segment of a specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)
Border	FI-SE
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	Cross-border twin-cities Tornio and Haparanda
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle	
Mode	Train
Particular features of operation	(1.2) international railway line, also comprising stops in each of the contiguous border areas of a cross-border region

4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation				
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up				
Type of CBPT set-up problem	Missing cross-border transfer service between two domestic lines ending close to the common border	National, regional or local public transport authorities from both sides of the border have different functions and responsibilities, which hinders or prevents cooperation	Lacking interoperability of national railway systems requires specific rail rolling stock able to operate on both sides of the border	Other adverse consequences
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	Today, Finland and Sweden are the only two neighbouring countries within the EU that do not have any cross-border rail passenger transport. The bridge over the Torne river between the cross-border twin cities of Haparanda and Tornio is the only direct connection between the Swedish and Finnish rail systems. Both cities had rail passenger transport until the 1990's. In Sweden, a passenger train was tested between Boden and Haparanda in the early 2000s, but was stopped as it was unprofitable. Today, only rail freight traffic is crossing the border between Sweden and Finland. However, the two national networks use different track gauges. Between Haparanda and Tornio, there is a dual gauge track continuing over the bridge into the railway marshalling yards in either country (a Swedish-gauge marshalling yard in Tornio, and a Finnish-gauge yard in Haparanda). This dual system requires all freight wagons crossing the border to have their cargo reloaded or their bogies exchanged. On the Swedish side, the Haparanda railway line (Haparandabanan) connects Boden with Haparanda and is part of the so called Bothnian corridor, which is an important and strategic transnational link for freight transport in Europe. Today, rail passenger transport does not reach Haparanda yet but measures are taken to make this possible. Trafikverket is planning on building a new platform in Kalix and renovate the existing one in Haparanda during spring 2020. This will open up for passenger transport on the Haparanda railway and contribute to the two cities accessibility and development. On the Finnish side the train connections are better, with night trains stopping during the winter season and from 2019 this traffic will be extended to run all year around. However, the section between Kemi and Tornio is not electrified today, which would be desired. It has been up for debate for many years, but now the new Finnish government have promised 10 million Euros. The same is valid for the train bridge over Torne river, which, to make the situation more complex, has the ownership divided equally between Finland and Sweden.			

4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT			
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	-		
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT			
Type of CBPT quality problem	-		
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle			
5.1 Negative direct effects			
Type of direct effect	Strongly reduced cross-border mobility by CBPT, especially in rural or sparsely populated areas	No cross-border strategy for integrating domestic public transport services or elaborating new CBPT	No CBPT due to reasons of economic viability
Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	Since 2005, the cross-border twin-cities Tornio and Haparanda have rebranded themselves as "Haparanda-Tornio" in Sweden and "Tornio-Haparanda" in Finland. Both cities are also collaborating on having better connections for passenger trains to their region, both for day and night services. The twin-cities perceive it very difficult to achieve better cross-border train connections, especially for passenger transport. Since these decisions are made on national and regional levels, the local authorities have less influence on this issue. A solution therefore requires not only good collaboration with the regional and national levels, but also good cross-border collaboration between the national transport administrations in Finland and Sweden. So far, however, it has been difficult for Haparanda and Tornio to get an insight of the collaboration between the two national transport administrations, and feedback on how their issues of interest are being handled. ”We have a strong collaboration with both Sweden and Finland to get better train connections since this is a key issue for us to be able to switch to fossil free transports in Haparanda and Tornio” (Göran Wigren, City of Haparanda). Nevertheless, there seem to be deficiencies in border crossing collaboration of national actors in the field railway passenger transport. Removing the bottleneck of the Haparanda-Tornio connection is mostly a matter of technical creativity and political will. The notorious difference in gauges has never been a major obstacle for running trains along the northern coast of Bothnia since its launch in the beginning of the twentieth century.		
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region			
Type of RoE or KoE	(ReE) Lacking or poorly developed support infrastructure at local access points or transition interfaces (train stations, bus stops) reduce the use of CBPT	(KoE) Adverse consequences for the cross-border labour market / economy due to high travel-to-work times by CBPT (less persons seeking jobs across the border)	(KoE) Reduced internal accessibility of a cross-border region because local / regional CBPT are not initiated or stopped due to lacking economic viability.
Background information for the negative secondary effects and / or comment on "other secondary effects"	Around the northern part of the Gulf of Bothnia, from the cities of Luleå in Sweden to Oulu in Finland, there is currently no cross-border railway passenger traffic available. This area covers around 280.000 inhabitants and is home to several major world famous university centres in the North. A new cross-border railway passenger service would significantly reduce travelling time in the region and open new opportunities for cross-border cooperation among people and businesses. As for now, one has to use automobile transport to reach any destination north of Luleå, adding to the alarming rates of environmental footprint in the region.		
6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle			
6.1 Summary obstacle description			
Type	Straightforward source-problem-effect relationship		
Comment	The negative effects caused by the obstacle can in principle be eliminated quite easy, but implementing the solution might take some time and also requires more intense cooperation between national-level authorities.		

6.2 Problem solving approach					
Type	Pragmatic “bridging” of shared problems	Demand-related measures for stimulating a greater use of CBPT	Stronger coordination of neighbouring domestic fare systems for public transport	Elaboration of a joint strategy for developing and planning CBPT	More intense and structured cross-border collaboration between key actors

Description of the envisaged or already started problem-solving approach and/or comment on "other practices"	CURRENT SITUATION: In Sweden, it is expected that passenger services won't restart until spring of 2021. Two daily night trains (one from Stockholm and one from Gothenburg) will terminate in Luleå with a connecting express bus to Haparanda waiting. In Finland, there are seasonal overnight trains from Helsinki that call in Tornio. From there, passengers can walk across the river to Haparanda. For Tim Andersson, International Secretary at the Barents Regional Youth Council, the lack of cohesion in regards to infrastructure policies is the major issue for ensuring people-to-people contact, one of the things the Barents cooperation is known and praised for. "We need national engagement and responsibility for the railway traffic in Haparanda/Tornio", he said in his address.
7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)	
Possible relevant players	National authority
8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study	
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 4: Problems emerging from a diversity of public transport governance systems, different policy concepts, lack of cooperation between key actors (national or regional public authorities, transport providers etc.) and complex administrative procedures or adverse political behaviour: • Case 8, • Case 14, • Case 15, • Case 16, • Case 26, • Case 31, • Case 33, • Case 37, • Case 38, • Case 45, • Case S-50, • Case S-54, • Case S-55, • Case S-56
Case study references	Bus connection Haparanda (Sweden) – Tornio (Finland)
9. Sources	
Dahlstrand, A., Granbäck, S., Mellin, A. (2019), Collaboration between Haparanda and Tornio on climate smart mobility. An interview with Göran Wigren, City of Haparanda and Kirsi Ylipiessa, City of Tornio. 2019-05-16. High North News (2019), Working Out a Puzzle: Transport Connectivity a Top Priority in the North	

34	**Lacking integration of CBPT in cross-border twin-cities**		
Short description	Still incomplete integration of domestic bus services operating in the cross-border twin-cities Tornio and Haparanda,		
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices			
Type of obstacle	Other obstacle		
"other type of obstacle" or "other adverse practices"	Simultaneous existence and complex interplay of various adverse factors mentioned under types 1, 2 and 3		
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle			
Geographical extent	Smaller segment of a specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)		
Border	FI-SE		
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	Cross-border twin-cities Tornio and Haparanda		
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle			
Mode	Bus		
Particular features of operation	(3.1) local / regional cross-border bus line, comprising at least one stop in two contiguous border regions in two different countries		
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation			
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up			
Type of CBPT set-up problem	Other adverse consequences		
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences "	Between the cross-border twin-cities Tornio and Haparanda, an official cooperation structure was established in 1987 that is called "Provincia Bothniensis". It consists of elected representatives from both cities and also deals with passenger and freight transport. Since 2005, the cities have rebranded themselves as "Haparanda-Tornio" in Sweden and "Tornio-Haparanda" in Finland. Since the inhabitants of both cities are commuting on a regular basis across the border for work and school, as well as shopping and pleasure, the two cities are working together on issues related to passenger transport. One part of their joint work is to combine the cities via pedestrian and bike path networks. Another part of the work focused on better integrating bus services. Before 2014, the Finnish and Swedish buses (both regional and national) had different bus stops in the Tornio and Haparanda regions. This changed in January 2014, when a joint travel centre was opened (HaparandaTornio Resecentrum). Since then all local, regional and national buses make a stop at this travel centre with the aim of having a smoother transfer and facilitate commuting with public transport. Despite the improvements achieved during the past years, there is not yet a single and joint public transport operator for the urban buses operating in the cross-border twin-cities. Until now, separate operators exist on both sides of the border. The cross-border twin cities are focussing their continuous work on setting up a single public transport operator. However, a large number of difficulties prevent local stakeholders from making progress in this respect.		
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT			
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	-		
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT			
Type of CBPT quality problem	Inadequate or lacking passenger information	Different ticket formats or ticket validation methods	Other adverse consequences

Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences "	HERE APPLICABLE TO CBPT SET-UP: The main legal and administrative aspects that hinder progress in setting up a joint transport operator for city buses are the following: • EU laws and national regulations for organising public transport. There should be no heavy organisation and various possibilities for developing cross-border public transport. Local cross-border public transport can be delivered by public authorities (tax payers) or by private transport companies. • Taxes: for tickets, VAT in Finland is at 10% and in Sweden at 6%, whereas for international traffic VAT is at 0%. • In cross-border traffic, the ticket must show different starting countries and different boarding countries. • There is the rule that "the ticket selling country is the transporting country". However, how is this rule applied to cross-border urban traffic? • Local stakeholders also have to find a joint selling system that works for both countries. This is easy for domestic travelling, since one can find and buy all tickets from one selling system. • Finally, also the issue of fare distribution has to be solved (i.e. how to credit the income of the ticket selling and to which country/city).

5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle

5.1 Negative direct effects

Type of direct effect	No cross-border strategy for integrating domestic public transport services or elaborating new CBPT	Other direct effects
Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	The described legal and administrative aspects hinder the cross-border twin-cities Tornio and Haparanda in making progress with the set-up of a joint transport operator for city buses. There are also other issues in the field of cross-border local public transport that would require optimisation or improvement: • The possibility to mobile pay and getting tickets with an app, independent from the country in which passengers are. • The issue of seamless intermodal cross-border connections for public transport (bus-rail), due to the envisaged development of an intercity-train line Helsinki-Haparanda-Stockholm and more night trains between Sweden and Finland. • The issue of elaborating a joint working model for organising local public transport (domestic) and cross-border traffic.	

5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region

Type of RoE or KoE	(ReE) An existing language barrier is hindering cooperation between key actors of CBPT (public authorities, transport operators)	(ReE) An existing language barrier reduces awareness of potential users about the scope of existing CBPT or specific cross-border ticket offers (i.e. lack of multilingual passenger information)	Other secondary effects
Background information for the negative secondary effects and / or comment on "other secondary effects"	There are also other issues in the field of cross-border local public transport that would require optimisation or improvement: • The existence of two languages generates administrative requirements for passenger information in both languages, for a bilingual ticket system and also for the driving personnel that has to be able to serve in both languages. This makes the set-up of the service more time consuming and also more expensive. • Also the issues of two different time-zones and of two different currencies applying in Tornio and Haparanda have to be considered. Yet, these aspects are not so difficult to solve nowaday		

6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle

6.1 Summary obstacle description

Type	Complex source-problem-effect relationship
Comment	The negative effects emerging from the interplay of manifold factors can be eliminated, but this requires time and also dedication (political will) for finding an appropriate solution.

6.2 Problem solving approach

Type	Pragmatic "bridging" of shared problems	Establishment of joint structures for managing	Establishment of a new CBPT or consolidation of the	Stronger coordination of neighbouring domestic	Elaboration of a joint strategy for developing	More intense and structured cross-border collaboration

		CBPT (e.g. EGTC)	existing CBPT-offer	fare systems for public transport	and planning CBPT	between key actors
Description of the envisaged or already started problem-solving approach and/or comment on "other practices"	CURRENT SITUATION: Overall, the main conclusion of local stakeholders is that a solution to a joint provision of public transport is possible when there is a (political) will to develop it together and that transport enterprises are associated to this work.					
7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)						
Possible relevant players	National authority	Regional authority	Local authority			
8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study						
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 5: Problems emerging from a sub-optimal development of CBPT (bus, rail): • Case 12, • Case 19, • Case 34, • Case S-49, • Case S-51					
Case study references	Bus connection Haparanda (Sweden) – Tornio (Finland)					
9. Sources						
Dahlstrand, A., Granbäck, S., Mellin, A. (2019), Collaboration between Haparanda and Tornio on climate smart mobility. An interview with Göran Wigren, City of Haparanda and Kirsi Ylipiessa, City of Tornio. 2019-05-16. European Commission (2016), Connecting cultures with connected transportation. City of Tornio (2021), Public transport within the city area E-mail reply to a short questionnaire sent to local stakeholders (elaborated by Hanna-Leena Ainonen, Kirsi Ylipiessa and Göran Wigren)						

35	**Prohibited public subsidies for a bus line between cross-border twin cities**	
Short description	National laws in Estonia and Latvia prohibit public subsidies for an urban cross-border bus line between the twin cities of Valga and Valka, which has to be operated as an international bus line and on a 100% commercial basis.	
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices		
Type of obstacle	National legal obstacle	
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(II.3) an asymmetric cross-border legal context for CBPT, due to different national or regional legal provisions or administrative directives on specific aspects of transport and CBPT for which no EU competence does exist	
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle		
Geographical extent	Smaller segment of a specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)	
Border	EE-LV	
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	Cross-border twin cities of Valga (EE) and Valka (LV)	
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle		
Mode	Bus	
Particular features of operation	(3.1) local / regional cross-border bus line, comprising at least one stop in two contiguous border regions in two different countries	
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation		
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up		
Type of CBPT set-up problem	Missing cross-border transfer service between two domestic lines ending close to the common border	Other adverse consequences
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	With the expansion of the Schengen Agreement and the abolition of systematic border controls between Estonia and Latvia, also the establishment of regional / local cross-border public transport became a topic on the bilateral intergovernmental discussion. Since 2004, the Joint Sessions of the Estonian-Latvian and Latvian-Estonian Intergovernmental Commissions (IGC) are an important platform for the border regions' local and regional governments', enabling them, as equal members, to address their development needs and obstacles in the field of cross-border cooperation directly, at the government level. Regarding the cross-border twin cities of Valga (EE) and Valka (LV), there had been discussion in 2012 within the IGC's working group 2 on the idea that Valga train station should be commonly used by both cities. It was decided to continue solving the issue on specialist level and to evaluate the mutual benefit of the joint use of the railway junction. Within the Estonia – Latvia cross border cooperation programme 2007-2013, the project "Renovation of Valga-Valka Railway station"; was approved with the aim to upgrade Valga-Valka Railway station to today's standards and improve services for Estonians and Latvians. Moreover, also the possibility for introducing an urban bus service between the cross-border twin cities of Valga (EE) and Valka (LV) das discussed within the IGC. In the 2017 the agenda of the IGC, a point on establishing a joint urban public bus transport service in Valga / Valka was included. After the Joint Session, the Estonian delegation proposed to organize an expert-level meeting for mapping the challenges and possibilities related to the establishment of a joint urban public bus transport in Valga/Valka.	
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT		
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	-	
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT		
Type of CBPT quality problem	-	

5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle			
5.1 Negative direct effects			
Type of direct effect	Transport operators bear additional cost for running CBPT	No CBPT due to reasons of economic viability	Other direct effects
Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	The legislation review has been provided by the responsible authority in Latvia. According to the requirements of the public transport regulatory framework the proposed route Valka - Valga does not correspond to the intercity route status. According to the laws, this connection is considered to be international as the final destinations are located in two different countries. On the basis of the Regulation No.1073/2009 on common rules for access to the international market for coach and bus services and the Public Transport Services Law, public transport services within the country, including transport intercity routes, are subsidized from the state budget. Such state aid regime does not apply to the carriage of international importance, and consequently, they cannot be included into the Latvian public transport route network. Routes of international importance are opened by the initiative of private enterprises, and they are conducted in line with principles of free competition. The persisting requirement to register the urban cross-border bus line as a 100% commercial international service and the lacking access to public subsidies has until now prevented an introduction pf this service in the cross-border twin cities of Valga and Valka.		
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region			
Type of RoE or KoE	-		

6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle				
6.1 Summary obstacle description				
Type	Straightforward source-problem-effect relationship			
Comment	The negative effect of the obstacle can in principle be solved by concluding an interstate agreement between both countries, provided that it is possible to obtain an exemption from the relevant EU regulation.			
6.2 Problem solving approach				
Type	Interstate agreements in the field of CBPT	Pragmatic "bridging" of shared problems	Establishment of a new CBPT or consolidation of the existing CBPT-offer	More intense and structured cross-border collaboration between key actors
Description of the envisaged or already started problem-solving approach and/or comment on "other practices"	Since the legislation review in 2017, however, IGC discussions on introducing a joint urban public bus transport in Valga/Valka were not continued. It was decided by the IGC not to include the issue on the agenda until there is an examination made by the specialists on the options on exemption from EU regulation.			

7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)	
Possible relevant players	National authority

8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study	
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 1: Problems emerging from an unprofitable operation of CBPT, missing public subsidies and other financial matters (bus, train): • Case 1, • Case 3, • Case 4, • Case 10, • Case 30, • Case 35, • Case 36, • Case S-48
Case study references	-

9. Sources
IGC - Estonian-Latvian and Latvian-Estonian Intergovernmental Commissions for Cross-border Cooperation: Proposals for the Latvian-Estonian Governmental Commission in 2017. Minutes of joint IGC sessions on March 10, 2017

36	Different legal provisions on public subsidies hamper CBPT		
Short description	Different national legal provisions for subsidizing public bus services hamper the development of regional cross-border bus lines between Estonia and Latvia.		
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices			
Type of obstacle	National legal obstacle		
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(II.3) an asymmetric cross-border legal context for CBPT, due to different national or regional legal provisions or administrative directives on specific aspects of transport and CBPT for which no EU competence does exist		
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle			
Geographical extent	Specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)		
Border	EE-LV		
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle			
Mode	Bus		
Particular features of operation	(3.1) local / regional cross-border bus line, comprising at least one stop in two contiguous border regions in two different countries		
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation			
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up			
Type of CBPT set-up problem	Other adverse consequences		
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	With the expansion of the Schengen Agreement and the abolition of systematic border controls between Estonia and Latvia, also the establishment of regional / local cross-border public transport became a topic on the bilateral intergovernmental discussion. Since 2004, the Joint Sessions of the Estonian-Latvian and Latvian-Estonian Intergovernmental Commissions (IGC) are an important platform for the border regions' local and regional governments', enabling them, as equal members, to address their development needs and obstacles in the field of cross-border cooperation directly, at the government level. However, the national legislations in Estonia and Latvia make no distinction between international transport and short distance cross-border bus transport. Every bus line that crosses border is automatically considered an international long distance bus line despite clear differences between the two (e.g. international transport or intercity bus lines operate on a 100% commercial basis, whereas bus lines crossing the border locally are public services and usually depend on public subsidies). Although this legislation does in principle not create an obstacle for restoring / establishing regional cross-border bus services between Estonia and Latvia, problems can emerge out of these national laws with regard to the economic viability of local or regional cross-border bus services.		
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT			
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	-		
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT			
Type of CBPT quality problem	-		
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle			
5.1 Negative direct effects			
Type of direct effect	Transport operators bear additional cost for running CBPT	No CBPT due to reasons of economic viability	Other direct effects
Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	The requirement to register a local or regional cross-border bus line as a 100% commercial international service and the lacking access to public subsidies hinders or even prevents the establishment of an economically self-sustaining cross-border service. This is why no bus company has up to now shown an interest whatsoever to establish such a service. In 2011, the IGC observed that there should be a distinction between international public transport and cross-border public transport legislation. International public transport should not be supported by national governments, because according to European Union's Rules it should operate on commercial basis, whereas cross-border public transport could be		

	supported by the national governments or could be supported if there is an Agreement between the countries. It would be stipulated in the legislation, therefore the discussions must continue. In 2012, however, the IGC closed discussions on restoring cross-border bus services on the lines Pārnu/Viljandi to Rūjiena / Valmiera due the absence of the demand for such bus services. In 2013, the WG discussed the possibility of prolonging the bus line of Pärnu-Ikla line to Ainaži. Also in this case, the problem was the difference of subsidy systems for public transport in Estonia and Latvia. It was decided to keep the issue under surveillance.
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region	
Type of RoE or KoE	-
6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle	
6.1 Summary obstacle description	
Type	Straightforward source-problem-effect relationship
Comment	The negative effect of the obstacle can in principle be solved by concluding an interstate agreement between both countries, provided that it is possible to obtain an exemption from the relevant EU regulation.

6.2 Problem solving approach				
Type	Interstate agreements in the field of CBPT	Pragmatic "bridging" of shared problems	Establishment of a new CBPT or consolidation of the existing CBPT-offer	More intense and structured cross-border collaboration between key actors
Description of the envisaged or already started problem-solving approach and/or comment on "other practices"	Since the debates in 2012/2013, however, the issue of introducing / restoring cross-border bus services or the conclusion of a dedicated interstate agreement has not been addressed again within the IGC (2014-2019). Similar to the case of introducing a joint urban public bus transport in Valga/Valka, there should an examination made by specialists on the options on exemption from the relevant EU regulation.			

7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)	
Possible relevant players	National authority
8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study	
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 1: Problems emerging from an unprofitable operation of CBPT, missing public subsidies and other financial matters (bus, train): • Case 1, • Case 3, • Case 4, • Case 10, • Case 30, • Case 35, • Case 36, • Case S-48
Case study references	-
9. Sources	

European Commission (2017), Database of the ELABOR Study

IGC - Estonian-Latvian and Latvian-Estonian Intergovernmental Commissions for Cross-border Cooperation:

Minutes of the IGC meeting on September 16th 2011

Joint IGC Session on 10 October 2012, protocol.

Minutes of the IGC meeting on October 30th, 2013

37	**Diverging national policy priorities hinder set-up of CBPT**	
Short description	Lengthy intergovernmental discussions and diverging national policy priorities hinder the introduction of a new cross-border (international) rail passenger transport service between Tallinn and Riga.	
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices		
Type of obstacle	Administrative obstacle	
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(III.1) non-awareness or non-willingness of national-level authorities to initiate or support solutions that could eliminate specific problems for CBPT	
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle		
Geographical extent	Specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)	
Border	EE-LV	
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle		
Mode	Train	
Particular features of operation	(1.2) international railway line, also comprising stops in each of the contiguous border areas of a cross-border region	
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation		
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up		
Type of CBPT set-up problem	Other adverse consequences	
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	Since 2004, the Joint Sessions of the Estonian-Latvian and Latvian-Estonian Intergovernmental Commissions (IGC) are an important platform for the border regions' local and regional governments', enabling them, as equal members, to address their development needs and obstacles in the field of cross-border cooperation directly, at the government level. Already in 2012, the IGC identified that the opening of a Tallinn-Riga direct passenger train service should be addressed in the coming years. Estonia has upgraded the Tallinn-Tartu-Valga railway section to 120 km/h and new trains were ordered from 2013. The precondition for Tallinn-Riga train service along the existing railroad is that Latvia invests into repairs between Valga and Riga before 2015. Estonia is then ready to start Tallinn-Riga passenger train service and the operator would be an Estonian company. Further issues to be solved are infrastructure fees (in Latvia, railway access fees are about 10 times higher than in Estonia) and the conclusion of an agreement on subsidies that is needed in order to open the Tallinn-Riga passenger train service in 2016. To determine the amount of the subsidy, discussions on the number of stations, services, schedule of the train and fees are needed. Due to this, it was decided to start negotiations between the responsible ministries (Latvian Ministry of Transport and Estonian Ministry of Economic Affairs and Communications), infrastructure owners, eventual operators and other interested actors about the possibility to open Tallinn-Riga passenger train service.	
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT		
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	-	
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT		
Type of CBPT quality problem	-	
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle		
5.1 Negative direct effects		
Type of direct effect	No CBPT due to reasons of economic viability	Other direct effects

Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	Although a third passenger train between Tallinn-Tartu-Valga was launched in May 2014 on the Estonian side, there was still no operational cross-border Tallinn-Riga passenger train in 2015. While the Estonian delegation stressed the possibilities for establishing this line, the Latvian delegation is concerned in the sustainability of this service. On the line Riga-Tallinn about 20 buses are operating, which ensure comfortable driving at different times of the day. A train service would not be able to offer such flexible driving times as buses currently do. Nevertheless, it was agreed that the Tallinn-Riga passenger train topics should remain within the IGC list of tasks at least for a year in order to reach final conclusion whether a contribution or a solution can be provided by the IGC.
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region	
Type of RoE or KoE	-
6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle	
6.1 Summary obstacle description	
Type	Straightforward source-problem-effect relationship
Comment	The negative effect of the obstacle can in principle be solved by concluding an interstate agreement between both countries, provided that it is possible to reach a common position on the related financial questions.

6.2 Problem solving approach

Type	Interstate agreements in the field of CBPT	Pragmatic "bridging" of shared problems	Establishment of a new CBPT or consolidation of the existing CBPT-offer	More intense and structured cross-border collaboration between key actors
Description of the envisaged or already started problem-solving approach and/or comment on "other practices"	CURRENT SITUATION: In 2017, the Estonian delegation observed that the issue still has not found a suitable solution for the border regions and therefore would keep this aspect on the IGC agenda for further discussions. Moreover, it was agreed to keep the issue of monitoring the progress of exchanging information on train schedules and harmonizing train schedules on the railway routes Rīga–Valga and Valga–Tallinn as an informative issue on the IGC agenda for 2017. Since then, however, no further discussions and also no progress has been made in subsequent IGC meetings (2018, 2019).			

7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)	
Possible relevant players	National authority
8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study	
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 4: Problems emerging from a diversity of public transport governance systems, different policy concepts, lack of cooperation between key actors (national or regional public authorities, transport providers etc.) and complex administrative procedures or adverse political behaviour: • Case 8, • Case 14, • Case 15, • Case 16, • Case 26, • Case 31, • Case 33, • Case 37, • Case 38, • Case 45, • Case S-50, • Case S-54, • Case S-55, • Case S-56
Case study references	-
9. Sources	

IGC - Estonian-Latvian and Latvian-Estonian Intergovernmental Commissions for Cross-border Cooperation:
Minutes of the IGC meeting on 10 October 2012,
Minutes of the IGC meeting on 20th February 2015
The legal and administrative cross-border obstacles identified for the 2017/2018 IGC agenda

38	**Diverging national policy priorities hinder set-up of CBPT**
Short description	Lengthy intergovernmental discussions and diverging national policy priorities hinder the introduction of a new and direct cross-border rail passenger transport service "Tartu-Riga".
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices	
Type of obstacle	Administrative obstacle
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(III.1) non-awareness or non-willingness of national-level authorities to initiate or support solutions that could eliminate specific problems for CBPT
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle	
Geographical extent	Specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)
Border	EE-LV
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle	
Mode	Train
Particular features of operation	(1.2) international railway line, also comprising stops in each of the contiguous border areas of a cross-border region
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation	
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up	
Type of CBPT set-up problem	Other adverse consequences
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	Since 2004, the Joint Sessions of the Estonian-Latvian and Latvian-Estonian Intergovernmental Commissions (IGC) are an important platform for the border regions' local and regional governments', enabling them, as equal members, to address their development needs and obstacles in the field of cross-border cooperation directly, at the government level. In 2017, the Estonian delegation to the IGC proposed to discuss the possibility of introducing a Riga-Tartu direct cross-border train service. For developing this cross-border railway connection, representatives of the railway companies Eesti Liinirongid Ltd (ELRON) and JSC "Pasažieru vilciens" met in Riga on 16 February 2017. The aim of the meeting was to find ways how to ensure successful cooperation between the two companies in providing passenger traffic services on the Rīga-Tartu line. The mayors of the cross-border twin cities Valga and Valka also participated at this meeting. It was agreed that both companies will appoint a representative who will be responsible for exchange of information between them, including information on train schedules and changes therein. It was also agreed that the objective of two companies is to harmonize the train schedules so that there will be at least one synchronized train connection in Rīga-Tartu line a day in both directions, starting from 2018. In addition, it was noted that all the questions related to possible re-opening of Rīga-Tartu direct train line, including potentially conducting a comprehensive feasibility study of such a line, are in the competence of Ministries responsible for transport of Latvia and Estonia. Finally, also the possibility of a further harmonisation of ticketing systems of the two companies was discussed. The IGC meeting of 2017 then decided that cooperation on the issue of the cross-border railway connection should proceed at the level of the responsible Ministries of both countries. With regard to timetable harmonisation, the train schedule for 2017 / 2018 has already been synchronised at the end of 2017 (i.e. new schedule in force since 10 December 2017). Nevertheless, further inter-governmental discussion in the following years did not advance substantially on the entire issue at stake.
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT	
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	-
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT	
Type of CBPT quality problem	-
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle	
5.1 Negative direct effects	
Type of direct effect	

Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	In 2018, the Estonian delegation informed the IGC members that the National Budget Strategy 2019-2023 of the Republic of Estonia does not foresee funds for opening the direct connection of the Tartu-Riga passenger train as a state commission. The provision of high-quality service for servicing this line requires the acquisition of three new express-type trains with a total cost of 30 million euros (initial estimations), plus a subsequent grant from the state budget to cover the operating costs, since incoming ticket revenue does not cover a significant part of the costs of servicing the line. At the same time, in the course of the Estonian budgetary strategy, the acquisition of three new express trains in the directions of Tallinn-Tartu and Tallinn-Narva is a national priority, as the demand for these lines exceeds the capacity of today's trains. , Nevertheless, the mayor of the Municipality of Valka stressed that on the Tartu-Riga railway route, a sufficient number of passengers can be expected in case that a high-quality service is provided. Economically, the connection would be beneficial to both sides since it would help to develop Tartu as a tourist destination, improve connectivity with the Riga airport, save the environment, and so on. He also expressed the hope that once a political priority would be given to this lien, then also the technical solution would be found. However, discussions with the national railway companies revealed that both operators have internal problems which have to be solved. Until there is no political guidance provided on this, the Tartu-Riga line is not a priority.	
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region		
Type of RoE or KoE	-	
6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle		
6.1 Summary obstacle description		
Type	Straightforward source-problem-effect relationship	
Comment	The negative effect of the obstacle can in principle be solved, provided that national-level actors of both sides can find a common position on their respective priorities with respect to this railway service..	
6.2 Problem solving approach		
Type	National-level legislative action with regard to transport and CBPT	Other practice
Description of the envisaged or already started problem-solving approach and/or comment on "other practices"	CURRENT SITUATION: Due to the persisting difference of views within the IGC, it was suggested in 2018 that the issue of the Riga-Tartu railway line could be suggested to the agenda of the bilateral Prime Ministers' meeting. In 2019, the IGC also agreed on the necessity to continue work on developing the Riga-Tartu cross-border railway link.	
7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)		
Possible relevant players	National authority	
8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study		
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 4: Problems emerging from a diversity of public transport governance systems, different policy concepts, lack of cooperation between key actors (national or regional public authorities, transport providers etc.) and complex administrative procedures or adverse political behaviour: • Case 8, • Case 14, • Case 15, • Case 16, • Case 26, • Case 31, • Case 33, • Case 37, • Case 38, • Case 45, • Case S-50, • Case S-54, • Case S-55, • Case S-56	
Case study references	-	

9. Sources

IGC - Estonian-Latvian and Latvian-Estonian Intergovernmental Commissions for Cross-border Cooperation:

The legal and administrative cross-border obstacles identified for the 2017/2018 IGC agenda

Minutes of the IGC meeting on March 10, 2017

Minutes of the IGC meeting on 10th October 2018

The legal and administrative cross-border obstacles identified for the 2019/2020 IGC agenda

The Baltic Times (2019), Estonian-Latvian Intergovernmental Commission agrees on continued cooperation in healthcare and transport
2019-11-07

39	**Not user-friendly timetables hamper CBPT use**
Short description	Not user-friendly timetables of cross-border bus and rail services between Sweden and Norway are leading to low public transport use by cross-border workers.
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices	
Type of obstacle	Administrative obstacle
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(III.4) a lack of cross-border coordination of already existing national, regional or local public transport services
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle	
Geographical extent	Smaller segment of a specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)
Border	SE-NO
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	Värmland County (SE) Province of Viken Province of Oslo, since 01.01.2020 (NO)
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle	
Mode	Bus, Train
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation	
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up	
Type of CBPT set-up problem	-
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT	
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	-
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT	
Type of CBPT quality problem	Other adverse consequences
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	The Swedish–Norwegian border region is characterised by cross-border mobility in multiple forms, including cross-border shopping, tourism, migration, smuggling, and temporary forms of labour mobility such as seasonal workers and cross-border commuters. Extensive cross-border interactions between Sweden and Norway have been eased by similarities in languages, societal structures, and cultural values. Today, due to a still flourishing Norwegian economy, including higher wages and demands for labour, the flows of labour including seasonal workers and daily or weekly commuters are mainly one-directional, from Sweden to Norway. The economic development in the Oslo region has been particularly strong, and the Norwegian capital functions as a centre of gravity for its hinterland, including the part adjacent to the Swedish border region. The number of commuters from Sweden to Norway has increased significantly and more than doubled in the past few years, from 13,200 in 2004 to 27,200 in 2012. In 2012, 5,400 inhabitants in Värmland commuted to Norway. Given that the share of cross-border commuters in the county is above the national average, cross-border commuting is not an unusual adjustment in Värmland, where it represents 4% of the population in the age range 20–64 years. Three border municipalities represent a significant share (36%) of the cross-border commuters in Värmland County: Torsby, Eda, and Årjäng. These municipalities are regarded as remote in the Swedish context, but distances from densely populated areas in Norway are less than from densely populated areas in Sweden. Although some cross-border public bus and train services do exist to neighbouring destinations in Norway, many commuters use private cars for reaching their workplace across the border. Since the county of Värmland is rather peripheral from a Swedish perspective, the use of private cars for commuting (national and cross-border has always been high (73% in the period 2008–2009) and decreased only more recently (60%, Trafikanalys 2015).

	The main reason why public transport was not used was that the public transport travel times did not coincide with the commuters' work hours. In this respect, the border functioned as a barrier, as national transport systems tended to be directed towards central regions in the respective countries, often regardless of actual distances to towns and other places across the border.			
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle				
5.1 Negative direct effects				
Type of direct effect	Strongly reduced cross-border mobility by CBPT, especially in rural or sparsely populated areas	Long travel-to-work time for cross-border workers		
Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	From the three border-close municipalities in Värmland, many residents commute to work in Norway. Among all persons commuting (intra-national and cross-border), the share of cross-border commuters is highest in Eda (63%), followed by Årjäng (44%) and Torsby (35%). These municipalities also show slightly less commuting to other Swedish municipalities than other municipalities in Värmland. The main pattern of cross-border commuting in Värmland was weekly commuting (60% among all cross-border commuters), but the share of weekly commuting was significantly lower in the three border-close municipalities (31%). The lower share is not unexpected since the shorter distance from the border allows for daily commuting. While approximately half of the cross-border commuters living in Värmland travelled for more than 60 minutes in one direction to their workplace in Norway, just under half of the intranational commuters travelled to slightly less than 30 minutes Cross-border commuters from the three border municipalities (Torsby, Eda, and Årjäng) commute by private car either exclusively (91%) or most times (6%), whereas only a small portion of cross-border commuters always used public transport (3%). Remarkably, in the cross-border survey, although 18% stated they had access to public transport, only 3% used it frequently (Statistics Sweden 2012).			
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region				
Type of RoE or KoE	(KoE) Traffic jams and air or noise pollution on main road axes used by cross-border commuters due to missing or sub-optimally developed CBPT			
6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle				
6.1 Summary obstacle description				
Type	Straightforward source-problem-effect relationship			
Comment	The negative effects caused by this obstacle can be solved by better aligning public transport timetables with the needs of cross-border workers.			
6.2 Problem solving approach				
Type	Pragmatic "bridging" of shared problems	Establishment of a new CBPT or consolidation of the existing CBPT-offer	Demand-related measures for stimulating a greater use of CBPT	More intense and structured cross-border collaboration between key actors
7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)				
Possible relevant players	National authority	Regional authority		
8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study				
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 7: Problems emerging from sub-optimal timetable coordination (train) or non-user friendly timetables (bus): • Case 25, • Case 28, • Case 39			
Case study references	-			
9. Sources				
Möller / Alfredsson-Olsson / Ericsson / Overvåg (2018). The border as an engine for mobility and spatial integration: A study of commuting in a Swedish–Norwegian context, Norsk Geografisk Tidsskrift - Norwegian Journal of Geography, 72:4, 217-233				

40	**Non-recognition of free public transport for severely disabled persons (DE-NL).**
Short description	On many cross-border rail connections from Germany to the Netherlands, the integration of fare systems is not optimal and leads to non-recognition of free transport for severely disabled people (only on DE-external sections).
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices	
Type of obstacle	Administrative obstacle
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(III.5) a lacking harmonisation of fare systems existing on both sides of a border or the absence of a single cross-border fare system
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle	
Geographical extent	Smaller segment of a specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)
Border	DE-NL
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	Specific railway lines between DE and NL (see list in section 5 on effects)
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle	
Mode	Train
Particular features of operation	(1.1) local / regional cross-border railway line, comprising at least one stop in two contiguous border regions in two different countries
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation	
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up	
Type of CBPT set-up problem	-
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT	
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	-
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT	
Type of CBPT quality problem	Non-application or different recognition of fare reductions for specific person groups on cross-border trips
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	Free transport in local public transport for severely disabled persons serves local mobility and thus participation in public life. Persons with a special severely disabled card can use many buses and trains in Germany free of charge. This severely disabled person's card is issued if the disabled person is deaf, helpless or blind or has a significantly restricted ability to move in road traffic. The free transport of severely disabled travellers on public transport is valid in 2nd class on local transport within the borders of the Federal Republic of Germany. With the "Mobility Portal ÖPNV-Info", the association SehNetz e.V. has set itself the goal of providing severely disabled travellers with as much information as possible so that they can plan and carry out local and long-distance journeys safely, with little stress, comfortably and effectively. The online portal also provides an overview of cross-border railway lines not granting free of charge transportation of severely disabled people on the non-German parts of the journey. The list of lines shows that more coordination / cooperation in the field of tariffs is needed.
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle	
5.1 Negative direct effects	
Type of direct effect	Passengers bear high ticket cost

Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	• On the cross-border line RB 61 between Bad Bentheim (DE) and Hengelo (NL), free transport of severely disabled persons is not recognised. • On the cross-border connection Regionalexpress RE 19 of Abellio Rail NRW, the free transport of severely disabled persons between Emmerich-Elten (DE) and Arnhem Central (NL) is not recognised. • On the railway line Bad Nieuweschans (NL) - Leer (DE) the free transport of severely disabled persons on the trains RB 57 of Arriva Nederlande is only valid on the German Stercken section between Leer and Weener. • On the route Heerlen (NL) - Aachen (DE) the free transport of severely disabled persons in the RE 18 (LIMAX) of Arriva Nederland is only valid on the German section between Aachen Hauptbahnhof and Herzogenrath. • On the regional express trains of Eurobahn on the line RE 13 Kaldenkirchen (DE) - Venlo (NL), the free transport of severely disabled passengers and their accompanying person only applies on the German section from/to Kaldenkirchen. For the Kaldenkirchen - Venlo section, the severely disabled person and their accompanying person require one ticket each. This can either be a ticket according to the VRR tariff or a ticket according to the international rail tariff.	
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region			
Type of RoE or KoE	-		
6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle			
6.1 Summary obstacle description			
Type	Straightforward source-problem-effect relationship		
Comment	The negative effect of this obstacle can be eliminated quite easily by better integrating (recognising) specific fares for severely disabled persons		
6.2 Problem solving approach			
Type	Pragmatic "bridging" of shared problems	Stronger coordination of neighbouring domestic fare systems for public transport	More intense and structured cross-border collaboration between key actors
Description of the envisaged or already started problem-solving approach and/or comment on "other practices"	-		
7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)			
Possible relevant players	Regional authority	Transport agency / association	Service provider
8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study			
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 3: Problems emerging from inadequate ticket pricing, lacking tariff integration (incl. non-recognition of free public transport for severely disabled persons) or sub-optimal passenger information: • Case 7, • Case 13, • Case 21, • Case 22, • Case 23, • Case 29, • Case 32, • Case 40, • Case 41, • Case 42, • Case 43, • Case 44		
Case study references	-		
9. Sources			
Seh-Netz e.V. (2021), ÖPNV-Info — Mobilitätsportal für behinderte Reisende.			

41	**Non-recognition of free public transport for severely disabled persons (DE-PL).**
Short description	On many cross-border rail connections from Germany to Poland, the integration of fare systems is not optimal and leads to non-recognition of free transport for severely disabled people (only on DE-external sections).
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices	
Type of obstacle	Administrative obstacle
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(III.5) a lacking harmonisation of fare systems existing on both sides of a border or the absence of a single cross-border fare system
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle	
Geographical extent	Smaller segment of a specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)
Border	DE-PL
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	Specific railway lines between DE and PL (see list in section 5 on effects)
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle	
Mode	Train
Particular features of operation	(1.1) local / regional cross-border railway line, comprising at least one stop in two contiguous border regions in two different countries
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation	
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up	
Type of CBPT set-up problem	-
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT	
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	-
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT	
Type of CBPT quality problem	Non-application or different recognition of fare reductions for specific person groups on cross-border trips
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	Free transport in local public transport for severely disabled persons serves local mobility and thus participation in public life. Persons with a special severely disabled card can use many buses and trains in Germany free of charge. This severely disabled person's card is issued if the disabled person is deaf, helpless or blind or has a significantly restricted ability to move in road traffic. The free transport of severely disabled travellers on public transport is valid in 2nd class on local transport within the borders of the Federal Republic of Germany. With the "Mobility Portal ÖPNV-Info", the association SehNetz e.V. has set itself the goal of providing severely disabled travellers with as much information as possible so that they can plan and carry out local and long-distance journeys safely, with little stress, comfortably and effectively. The online portal also provides an overview of cross-border railway lines not granting free of charge transportation of severely disabled people on the non-German parts of the journey. The list of lines shows that more coordination / cooperation in the field of tariffs is needed.
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle	
5.1 Negative direct effects	
Type of direct effect	Passengers bear high ticket cost

Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	• On the route Kostrzyn (PL) - Berlin (DE) the free transport of severely disabled persons in the NEB RB 26 of the Niederbarnimer Eisenbahn is only valid on the German section between Berlin and Küstrin-Kietz. • On the R 91 trains of Przewozy Regionalne on the route Rzepin (PL) - Frankfurt /Oder (DE), free transport of severely disabled persons is not recognised. • On the route Szczecin Glowny/Stettin Hbf (PL) - Angermünde (DE) the free transport of severely disabled persons in the RB/RE 66 of DB Regio Nordost is only valid on the German section between Angermünde and Tantow. • On the route Szczecin Glowny/Stettin Hbf (PL) - Pasewalk (DE) the free transport of severely disabled persons on the RE 4 of DB Regio Nordost is only valid on the German section (Lübeck -) Pasewalk - Grambow. • On the trains R of Przewozy Regionalne and IRE of DB Regio Nordost on the route Zasieki (PL) - Forst / Lausitz (DE) the free transport of severely disabled persons is not recognised. • On the TL and TLX/KD (RE 1) trains of Trilex on the route Zgorzelec (PL) - Görlitz (DE), free transport of severely disabled persons is not recognised. The free transport of severely disabled persons is recognised on the TL and TLX (RE 1) trains of Trilex only on the German section of the route. Trilex transports an accompanying person registered in the severely disabled person's ID card free of charge on its trains (TL, TLX) also on the Czech route sections.		
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region			
Type of RoE or KoE	-		
6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle			
6.1 Summary obstacle description			
Type	Straightforward source-problem-effect relationship		
Comment	The negative effect of this obstacle can be eliminated quite easily by better integrating (recognising) specific fares for severely disabled persons		
6.2 Problem solving approach			
Type	Pragmatic "bridging" of shared problems	Stronger coordination of neighbouring domestic fare systems for public transport	More intense and structured cross-border collaboration between key actors
Description of the envisaged or already started problem-solving approach and/or comment on "other practices"	-		
7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution			
Possible relevant players	Regional authority	Transport agency / association	Service provider
8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study			
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 3: Problems emerging from inadequate ticket pricing, lacking tariff integration (incl. non-recognition of free public transport for severely disabled persons) or sub-optimal passenger information: • Case 7, • Case 13, • Case 21, • Case 22, • Case 23, • Case 29, • Case 32, • Case 40, • Case 41, • Case 42, • Case 43, • Case 44		
Case study references	Rail connection Berlin (Germany) – Kostrzyn (Poland)		
9. Sources			
Seh-Netz e.V. (2021), ÖPNV-Info — Mobilitätsportal für behinderte Reisende.			

42	**Non-recognition of free public transport for severely disabled persons (DE-CZ).**
Short description	On many cross-border rail connections from Germany to the Czech Republic, the integration of fare systems is not optimal and leads to non-recognition of free transport for severely disabled people (only on DE-external sections).
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices	
Type of obstacle	Administrative obstacle
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(III.5) a lacking harmonisation of fare systems existing on both sides of a border or the absence of a single cross-border fare system
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle	
Geographical extent	Smaller segment of a specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)
Border	CZ-DE
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	Specific railway lines between DE and CZ (see list in section 5 on effects)
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle	
Mode	Train
Particular features of operation	(1.1) local / regional cross-border railway line, comprising at least one stop in two contiguous border regions in two different countries
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation	
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up	
Type of CBPT set-up problem	-
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT	
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	-
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT	
Type of CBPT quality problem	Non-application or different recognition of fare reductions for specific person groups on cross-border trips
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	Free transport in local public transport for severely disabled persons serves local mobility and thus participation in public life. Persons with a special severely disabled card can use many buses and trains in Germany free of charge. This severely disabled person's card is issued if the disabled person is deaf, helpless or blind or has a significantly restricted ability to move in road traffic. The free transport of severely disabled travellers on public transport is valid in 2nd class on local transport within the borders of the Federal Republic of Germany. With the "Mobility Portal ÖPNV-Info", the association SehNetz e.V. has set itself the goal of providing severely disabled travellers with as much information as possible so that they can plan and carry out local and long-distance journeys safely, with little stress, comfortably and effectively. The online portal also provides an overview of cross-border railway lines not granting free of charge transportation of severely disabled people on the non-German parts of the journey. The list of lines shows that more coordination / cooperation in the field of tariffs is needed.
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle	
5.1 Negative direct effects	
Type of direct effect	Passengers bear high ticket cost

Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	• The VGB RB 2 trains of the Vogtlandbahn do not recognise the free transport of severely disabled persons on the route Cheb (CZ) - Bad Brambach (DE). The free transport of severely disabled persons is only valid on the German section of the route. • On the RB U28 train of DB Regio Südost, free transport for severely disabled persons is only recognised on the German section between Sebnitz and Schöna. Cross-border recognition on the route Rumburk/Dolni Poustevna (CZ) - Sebnitz (DE) does not take place. • On the RE 20 of DB Regio Südost, the free transport of severely disabled persons is only recognised on the German section of the route. Cross-border recognition on the route Decin hl.n./Dolni Zleb (CZ) - Schöna (DE) does not take place. • On the ALX/EX RE 25 (Munich - Prague) trains of Alex, on the OPB/Os RB 27 trains of Oberpfalzbahn as well as on the regional express trains RE 47 of DB Regio Bayern, the free transport of severely disabled persons on the route Domazlice (CZ) - Furth im Wald (DE) is not recognised. The free transport of severely disabled persons is only valid on the German section (Munich -) Schwandorf - Furth im Wald. • On the OPB RB 95 trains of Oberpfalzbahn, free transport of severely disabled persons is not recognised on the Selb-Plößberg (DE) - Cheb (CZ) - Schirnding (DE) section. The free transport of severely disabled persons is only valid on the German sections Hof - Selb-Plößberg and Schirnding - Marktredwitz. • On the regional express RE 33 Nuremberg (DE) - Cheb (CZ) of DB Regio Bayern, free transport for severely disabled persons also only applies on the German section Nuremberg - Schirnding. • On the TL L7 and TLX (RE 2) trains of Trilex on the route Hradek nad Nisou (CZ) - Zittau (DE), free transport for severely disabled persons is not recognised. The free transport of severely disabled persons is only recognised in the TL L7 and TLX (RE 2) trains of Trilex on the German section from/to Zittau. • On the route Karlovy Vary / Nejdek (CZ) - Johanngeorgenstadt (DE) the free transport of severely disabled persons is not recognised in the trains Os of Ceske Drahy. • In the trains R and Os of Ceske Drahy the free transport of severely disabled persons on the route Zelezna Ruda / Plzen / Praha (CZ) - Bayerisch Eisenstein (DE) is not recognised. • On the VGB RB 1 and VGB RB 5 trains of Vogtlandbahn, free transport of severely disabled persons on the route Sokolov / Kraslice (CZ) - Klingenthal (DE) is not recognised. The free transport of severely disabled persons is only valid on the German section of the route.		
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region			
Type of RoE or KoE	-		
6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle			
6.1 Summary obstacle description			
Type	Straightforward source-problem-effect relationship		
Comment	The negative effect of this obstacle can be eliminated quite easily by better integrating (recognising) specific fares for severely disabled persons		
6.2 Problem solving approach			
Type	Pragmatic "bridging" of shared problems	Stronger coordination of neighbouring domestic fare systems for public transport	More intense and structured cross-border collaboration between key actors
Description of the envisaged or already started problem-solving approach and/or comment on "other practices"			
7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)			
Possible relevant players	Regional authority	Transport agency / association	Service provider
8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study			
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 3: Problems emerging from inadequate ticket pricing, lacking tariff integration (incl. non-recognition of free public transport for severely disabled persons) or sub-optimal passenger information: • Case 7, • Case 13, • Case 21, • Case 22,		

	• Case 23, • Case 29, • Case 32, • Case 40, • Case 41, • Case 42, • Case 43, • Case 44
Case study references	-

9. Sources
Seh-Netz e.V. (2021), ÖPNV-Info — Mobilitätsportal für behinderte Reisende.

43	**Non-recognition of free public transport for severely disabled persons (DE-AT).**
Short description	On many cross-border rail connections from Germany to Austria, the integration of fare systems is not optimal and leads to non-recognition of free transport for severely disabled people (only on DE-external sections).
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices	
Type of obstacle	Administrative obstacle
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(III.5) a lacking harmonisation of fare systems existing on both sides of a border or the absence of a single cross-border fare system
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle	
Geographical extent	Smaller segment of a specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)
Border	AT-DE
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	Specific railway lines between DE and AT (see list in section 5 on effects)
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle	
Mode	Train
Particular features of operation	(1.1) local / regional cross-border railway line, comprising at least one stop in two contiguous border regions in two different countries
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation	
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up	
Type of CBPT set-up problem	-
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT	
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	-
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT	
Type of CBPT quality problem	Non-application or different recognition of fare reductions for specific person groups on cross-border trips
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	Free transport in local public transport for severely disabled persons serves local mobility and thus participation in public life. Persons with a special severely disabled card can use many buses and trains in Germany free of charge. This severely disabled person's card is issued if the disabled person is deaf, helpless or blind or has a significantly restricted ability to move in road traffic. The free transport of severely disabled travellers on public transport is valid in 2nd class on local transport within the borders of the Federal Republic of Germany. With the "Mobility Portal ÖPNV-Info", the association SehNetz e.V. has set itself the goal of providing severely disabled travellers with as much information as possible so that they can plan and carry out local and long-distance journeys safely, with little stress, comfortably and effectively. The online portal also provides an overview of cross-border railway lines not granting free of charge transportation of severely disabled people on the non-German parts of the journey. The list of lines shows that more coordination / cooperation in the field of tariffs is needed.
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle	
5.1 Negative direct effects	
Type of direct effect	Passengers bear high ticket cost

Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	• On the R and REX trains of Österreichische Bundesbahnen, free transport for severely disabled persons is not recognised on the Braunau/Inn (AT) - Simbach/Inn (DE) section. • On the railway line Bregenz (AT) - Lindau (DE), the free transport of severely disabled persons in the trains REX / S 1 of the Austrian Federal Railways (ÖBB) is only recognised on the German section between Lindau Insel and Lindau-Reutin. • In the trains R and REX of the Austrian Federal Railways, as well as in the regional train (RB 6) of the DB Regio Bayern, the free transport of severely disabled persons is not recognised on the route section Innsbruck (AT) - Mittenwald (DE). • On the R and REX trains of Österreichische Bundesbahnen, the free transport of severely disabled persons on the route Schärding (AT) - Passau (DE) is not recognised.		
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border regio			
Type of RoE or KoE	-		
6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle			
6.1 Summary obstacle description			
Type	Straightforward source-problem-effect relationship		
Comment	The negative effect of this obstacle can be eliminated quite easily by better integrating (recognising) specific fares for severely disabled persons		
6.2 Problem solving approach			
Type	Pragmatic "bridging" of shared problems	Stronger coordination of neighbouring domestic fare systems for public transport	More intense and structured cross-border collaboration between key actors
Description of the envisaged or already started problem-solving approach and/or comment on "other practices"	-		
7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)			
Possible relevant players	Regional authority	Transport agency / association	Service provider
8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study			
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 3: Problems emerging from inadequate ticket pricing, lacking tariff integration (incl. non-recognition of free public transport for severely disabled persons) or sub-optimal passenger information: • Case 7, • Case 13, • Case 21, • Case 22, • Case 23, • Case 29, • Case 32, • Case 40, • Case 41, • Case 42, • Case 43, • Case 44		
Case study references			
9. Sources			
Seh-Netz e.V. (2021), ÖPNV-Info — Mobilitätsportal für behinderte Reisende.			

44	**Non-recognition of free public transport for severely disabled persons (DE-FR).**
Short description	On many cross-border rail connections from Germany to France, the integration of fare systems is not optimal and leads to non-recognition of free transport for severely disabled people (only on DE-external sections).
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices	
Type of obstacle	Administrative obstacle
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(III.5) a lacking harmonisation of fare systems existing on both sides of a border or the absence of a single cross-border fare system
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle	
Geographical extent	Smaller segment of a specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)
Border	FR-DE
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	Specific railway lines between DE and FR (see list in section 5 on effects)
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle	
Mode	Train
Particular features of operation	(1.1) local / regional cross-border railway line, comprising at least one stop in two contiguous border regions in two different countries
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation	
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up	
Type of CBPT set-up problem	-
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT	
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	-
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT	
Type of CBPT quality problem	Non-application or different recognition of fare reductions for specific person groups on cross-border trips
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	Free transport in local public transport for severely disabled persons serves local mobility and thus participation in public life. Persons with a special severely disabled card can use many buses and trains in Germany free of charge. This severely disabled person's card is issued if the disabled person is deaf, helpless or blind or has a significantly restricted ability to move in road traffic. The free transport of severely disabled travellers on public transport is valid in 2nd class on local transport within the borders of the Federal Republic of Germany. With the "Mobility Portal ÖPNV-Info", the association SehNetz e.V. has set itself the goal of providing severely disabled travellers with as much information as possible so that they can plan and carry out local and long-distance journeys safely, with little stress, comfortably and effectively. The online portal also provides an overview of cross-border railway lines not granting free of charge transportation of severely disabled people on the non-German parts of the journey. The list of lines shows that more coordination / cooperation in the field of tariffs is needed.
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle	
5.1 Negative direct effects	
Type of direct effect	Passengers bear high ticket cost

Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	• On the railway line Forbach (FR) - Saarbrücken (DE), the free transport of severely disabled persons on the regional express trains RE 18 of SNCF (TER Lorraine) is not recognised. • On the railway line Müllheim (DE) - Mulhouse (FR), the free transport of severely disabled persons in the regional trains (RB) of DB Regio Baden-Württemberg and SNCF only applies on the German section between Müllheim(Baden) and Neuenburg(Baden). • On the Saarbrücken (DE) - Sarreguemines (FR) railway line, free transport for severely disabled passengers applies between Kleinblittersdorf-Hanweiler (last German stop) and Sarreguemines on Saarbahn GmbH trains (S1 line). This does not apply to SNCF trains between Saarbrücken and Sarreguemines, which run as regional express trains on the RE 19 line. • On the railway line Strasbourg/Strasbourg (FR) - Offenburg (DE), the free transport of severely disabled persons is only valid on SWEG trains on the German section between Kehl and Offenburg. • On the Thionville (FR) - Trier (DE) railway line, the free transport of severely disabled persons in the regional express trains RE 16 of SNCF (TER Lorraine) only applies on the German section between Perl and Trier		
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region			
Type of RoE or KoE	-		
6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle			
6.1 Summary obstacle description			
Type	Straightforward source-problem-effect relationship		
Comment	The negative effect of this obstacle can be eliminated quite easily by better integrating (recognising) specific fares for severely disabled persons		
6.2 Problem solving approach			
Type	Pragmatic "bridging" of shared problems	Stronger coordination of neighbouring domestic fare systems for public transport	More intense and structured cross-border collaboration between key actors
Description of the envisaged or already started problem-solving approach and/or comment on "other practices"	-		
7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)			
Possible relevant players	Regional authority	Transport agency / association	Service provider
8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study			
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 3: Problems emerging from inadequate ticket pricing, lacking tariff integration (incl. non-recognition of free public transport for severely disabled persons) or sub-optimal passenger information: • Case 7, • Case 13, • Case 21, • Case 22, • Case 23, • Case 29, • Case 32, • Case 40, • Case 41, • Case 42, • Case 43, • Case 44		
Case study references	Cross-border tram-train connection "Saarbrücken – Sarreguemines" (Saarbahn)		
9. Sources			
Seh-Netz e.V. (2021), ÖPNV-Info — Mobilitätsportal für behinderte Reisende.			

45	**Competing policy plans hinder service extension of a CBPT**		
Short description	Competing policy plans for developing cross-border rail passenger transport hinder a service extension of the existing Saarbahn tram-train network.		
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices			
Type of obstacle	Administrative obstacle		
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(III.7) other adverse practices		
"other type of obstacle" or "other adverse practices"	Diverging policy priorities on CBPT at regional and local levels		
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle			
Geographical extent	Smaller segment of a specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)		
Border	FR-DE		
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	Eurodistrict SaarMoselle Cities of Saarbrücken (DE) and Forbach (FR)		
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle			
Mode	Tram		
Particular features of operation	(2.2) a "tram-train" (Karlsruhe model) running on a line or network comprising inner-city tracks and mainline railroad tracks, with the latter being also used by other conventional local/regional or international train services (passenger, freight)		
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation			
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up			
Type of CBPT set-up problem	-		
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT			
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	Insufficient service density at peak hours	Insufficient service density throughout the day	Other adverse consequences
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	The German "Saarbahn" is the first tram-train to use the French railway network, on which also some classic regional trains run, mainly between Saarbrücken and Strasbourg. Line S1 of the Saarbahn network is the main rail link from Saarguemines with 33 return trips per day during the week (i.e. one tram-train every 30 minutes). Other French regional train connections (TER) from Saarguemines are more limited, since in 2017 there are 14 return trips to Strasbourg (of which 2 come from Saarbrücken, 8 go to Sarre-Union, 6 to Metz and 5 to Bening). The project for a new interconnected link between Saarbrücken and Forbach that are only 11 km apart from each other was mentioned several times in the early 2000s, particularly in the run-up to local elections, but has not yet been implemented. The objective would be to restore public transport, which only provides an anecdotal share of cross-border journeys (1%) between the two towns that are just some fifteen kilometres apart. However, more than 30,000 cars cross the border every day for home-work journeys. In Saarbrücken, west of the Ludwigstrasse station, there is a railway connection which theoretically would allow the tram-train to use the railway network to Forbach. For this to explore, a study on cross-border public transport was commissioned by the Eurodistrict SaarMoselle. This study has shown that with regard to a light rail extension in the Eurodistrict, the Saarbrücken - Forbach corridor has by far the highest cross-border potential. Therefore, 3 route variants were examined for this corridor. Each has advantages and disadvantages. In particular, some routes open up the opportunity to set new accents in terms of urban planning.		

	In 2014, an in-depth feasibility study was conducted for the expansion of the Saarbahn. It was divided into several phases: • The first phase focused on the connection between Saarbrücken and Forbach. Two route variants relevant in terms of investment costs, connection possibilities and passenger potential were worked out, with the possibility of realising them with light rail technology or with a rail bus (bus with high service quality). • In the second phase, the feasibility of a small and a large route loop was investigated. It is possible to link the whole Eurodistrict area by using private railway tracks from the mining industry, which allows a significant reduction in construction costs. • Finally, the far-reaching effects of using this new means of public transport have been studied: positive socio-economic effects, e.g. through the creation of permanent jobs and housing, are expected. New perspectives are also opened up in the area of spatial planning. The image of our region would also improve considerably. The last studies were submitted in autumn 2015 but the project has been at a standstill since then. The cost would be between EUR 10 and 15 million per kilometre, depending on the options chosen. The preferred approach would be more of an interurban street tram line than a tram-train, as in the past. The railway network would be excluded.
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT	
Type of CBPT quality problem	-
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle	
5.1 Negative direct effects	
Type of direct effect	Other direct effects
Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	The cost of the Saarbahn extension to Forbach seems to be the main argument used by the Minister of Economy of the Land Saarland to dismiss the project, whereas locally the Municipality of Saarbrücken and the Eurodistrict SaarMoselle support it. Nevertheless, the political priority of the Land government seems to be the implementation of the partnership established in 2018 between Saarland and the Grand Est Region on cross-border rail links, which integrates links from Saarbrücken to Strasbourg and to Metz, the latter via Forbach. In 2018, a comprehensive Franco-German initiative was launched with the aim of offering transfer-free train connections on all rail routes between Rhineland-Palatinate, Saarland and Baden-Württemberg as well as the Région Grand Est from December 2024. Of the total of 7 cross-border rail connections, three connections are of direct importance for the Greater Region: (1) Metz-Thionville-Perl-Trier, (2) Saarbrücken-Forbach-Metz and (3) Saarbrücken-Sarreguemines-Strasbourg. For the concrete implementation of the measures on these connections, a bilateral Memorandum of Understanding for the connections between the Grand Est region and the Federal State of Saarland was signed (6 November 2018). In addition, a trilateral memorandum of understanding was signed between the federal states of Rhineland-Palatinate and Saarland and the Grand Est region (4 April 2019). The planned restructuring will be noticeable above all in an increased range of journeys. On the Metz-Thionville-Perl-Trier line, the service will be increased from the current two daily return trips at weekends and on French public holidays to a daily connection every two hours. Between the Saarland and the Grand Est region, an hourly direct connection between Saarbrücken and Metz and a two-hourly direct connection between Saarbrücken and Strasbourg are planned.
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region	
Type of RoE or KoE	(KoE) Traffic jams and air or noise pollution on main road axes used by cross-border commuters due to missing or sub-optimally developed CBPT
Background information for the negative secondary effects and / or comment on "other secondary effects"	With 30,000 vehicles per day accumulated between the motorway and the RN3 (60% of which are on the motorway), there is certainly room for improvement in the transport offer on the Saarbrücken - Forbach corridor, which offers almost one train per hour all day long (except for two maintenance slots, etc.). It remains to find the right mode of transport. A reinforcement of the half-hourly rail service could be a solution, provided that it is coupled with an improvement in the local service, currently provided by hourly buses, interspersed between trains.
6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle	
6.1 Summary obstacle description	
Type	Straightforward source-problem-effect relationship
Comment	The negative effect of the obstacle can in principle be solved, provided that regional and local level actors of both sides can find a common (political) position on the related financing issues.

6.2 Problem solving approach		
Type	Pragmatic "bridging" of shared problems	Demand-related measures for stimulating a greater use of CBPT
Description of the envisaged or already started problem-solving approach and/or comment on "other practices"	-	

7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)			
Possible relevant players	Regional authority	Transport agency / association	Service provider

8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study	
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 4: Problems emerging from a diversity of public transport governance systems, different policy concepts, lack of cooperation between key actors (national or regional public authorities, transport providers etc.) and complex administrative procedures or adverse political behaviour: • Case 8, • Case 14, • Case 15, • Case 16, • Case 26, • Case 31, • Case 33, • Case 37, • Case 38, • Case 45, • Case S-50, • Case S-54, • Case S-55, • Case S-56
Case study references	Cross-border tram-train connection "Saarbrücken – Sarreguemines" (Saarbahn)

9. Sources

Transporturbain (2020), Saarbahn, le tram-train transfrontalier franco-allemand.

Eurodistrict SaarMoselle (2021) Studie zum grenzüberschreitenden ÖPNV im Metropolraum SaarMoselle

Eurodistrict SaarMoselle (no date mentioned), Tram-train / Metrobus - Ein neues öffentliches Verkehrsmittel für den Eurodistrict SaarMoselle

Saarländischer Rundfunk (2019): Neue Bahnverbindungen nach Frankreich. 21.05.2019

S-46	**Incompatible railway safety standards.**		
Short description	Incompatible railway safety standards hinder cross-border rail passenger transport between Luxemburg, Belgium and France.		
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices			
Type of obstacle	National legal obstacle		
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(II.1) different national-level legal provisions in a CBPT-relevant policy field for which only a supporting EU competence does exist		
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle			
Geographical extent	Multiple borders		
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	Greater Region: Germany, France, Belgium, Luxembourg		
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle			
Mode	Train		
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation			
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up			
Type of CBPT set-up problem	Regional / local public transport authorities have considerably different financial capacities (budgetary resources)	Lacking interoperability of national railway systems requires specific rail rolling stock able to operate on both sides of the border	Different technical standards and safety provisions for transport vehicles (bus, train)
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	-		
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBP			
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	Insufficient service density at peak hours		
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	-		
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT			
Type of CBPT quality problem	Absence of a cross-border direct service	Non-availability of modern rail rolling stock that can operate on both sides	
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	Luxembourg has fully implemented the European Train Control System (ETCS) by the end of 2019. As a result, older trains of foreign railway companies without the latest safety standards cannot ride on the Luxembourg rail infrastructure . Other foreign operators needed to ensure the availability of updated rolling stock to maintain their connections to Luxembourg, notably LU-BE and LU-FR.		

5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle			
5.1 Negative direct effects			
Type of direct effect	Transport operators bear additional cost for running CBPT		
Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	Passengers have to swith trains at the Belgium stations before the Belgo-Luxembourg border (in particular) or take trains from the next close-by Luxembourg train station (esp. Walloon cross-border commuters).		
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region			
Type of RoE or KoE	(KoE) Adverse consequences for the cross-border labour market / economy due to high travel-to-work times by CBPT (less persons seeking jobs across the border)	(KoE) Adverse consequences for the cross-border labour market / economy due to due to frequently delayed CBPT (cross-border commuters are unpunctual at work).	(KoE) Traffic jams and air or noise pollution on main road axes used by cross-border commuters due to missing or sub-optimally developed CBPT
Background information for the negative secondary effects and / or comment on "other secondary effects"	Cross-border commuters often experience train cancellations and risk to come late to work, which adversely affects the companies where they are employed. Moreover, cross-border workers take their car more often for commuting to their workplace or for reaching the next railway station in Luxembourg.		
6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle			
6.1 Summary obstacle description			
Type	Straightforward source-problem-effect relationship		
Comment			
6.2 Problem solving approach			
Type	More intense and structured cross-border collaboration between key actors		
Description of the envisaged or already started problem-solving approach and/or comment on "other practices"	Closer cooperation between neighbouring national/regional railway companies to ensure sufficient availability of certified rolling stock able to operate across borders.		
7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)			
Possible relevant players	National authority	corss-border entity	Service provider
8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study			
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 6: Problems emerging from inadequate railway infrastructure or lacking interoperability of rail-rolling stock: • Case 18, • Case 20, • Case 27, • Case S-46, • Case S-53		
Case study references	Cross-border railway line 70 “Luxembourg - Rodange - Athus”		
9. Sources			
2021 CBPT survey, survey 01EN			

S-47	**Currency and pricing issues**	
Short description	Currency and pricing issues	
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices		
Type of obstacle	EU legal obstacle	
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(I.1) the particular status of a given EU border	
"other type of obstacle" or "other adverse practices"	Differences in currency complicates the definition and agreement on standard fares	
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle		
Geographical extent	Multiple borders	
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	All borders with different currnency, notably Hungary-Slovakia, Hungary-Austria	
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle		
Mode	May apply to all CBPT, it was noted for bus connections between Slovakia and Hungary.	
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation		
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up		
Type of CBPT set-up problem	-	
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT		
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	-	
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT		
Type of CBPT quality problem	Different ticket formats or ticket validation methods	Strong differences in fare levels for local transport services
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	Furthermore, the VAT-content of the fares is also different creating differences in price policies (including the system of discounts).	
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle		
5.1 Negative direct effects		
Type of direct effect	Passengers bear high ticket cost	Transport operators bear additional cost for running CBPT
Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	-	
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region		
Type of RoE or KoE	-	
6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle		
6.1 Summary obstacle description		
Type	Straightforward source-problem-effect relationship	
Comment		

6.2 Problem solving approach		
Type	-	
7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)		
Possible relevant players	National authority	Service provider
8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study		
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	-	
Case study references	-	
9. Sources		
2021 CBPT survey, survey 02EN; Survey 04EN		

S-48	**Incompatible national legislation on public subsidies.**		
Short description	Incompatible national legislation on public subsidies hinder the ongoing operation and development of cross-border public transport by bus between Hungary and Slovakia		
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices			
Type of obstacle	National legal obstacle		
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(II.3) an asymmetric cross-border legal context for CBPT, due to different national or regional legal provisions or administrative directives on specific aspects of transport and CBPT for which no EU competence does exist		
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle			
Geographical extent	Specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)		
Border	HU-SK		
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle			
Mode	All, but the survey respondent referred to: Bratislava-Rajka (801), Komárom-Komárno (228 / 401901), Esztergom-Štúrovo (223 / 404801), Košice-Hidasnémeti (802818)		
Particular features of operation			
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation			
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up			
Type of CBPT set-up problem	Missing cross-border transfer service between two domestic lines ending close to the common border	Different technical standards and safety provisions for transport vehicles (bus, train)	
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	The basic problem is that public transport services cannot be operated without state subvention. It is the reason why the national governments are reluctant to let foreign service providers in their territory. The prohibition of the cabotage stems from this phenomenon. Accordingly, the buses crossing the border may not be used for domestic purposes what remarkably increases the uncovered costs of the lines.		
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT			
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	Restrictions for commercial lines (e.g. ban on cabotage)		
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	In 2014, with the support of the Hungary- Slovakia INTERREG CBC programme, a new busline has been inaugurated between Győr (HU) and Velky Meďer (SK) (the project numbered HUSK/1101/2.3.2/0140 included the procurement of two vehicles meeting the highest technical standards). In 2016, the operator (the municipality of Velky Meďer) had to lessen the density of the trips, and in 2019 (after the mandatory maintenance period), the line has been closed. The average utilisation rate remained below 5% because the large factories in Győr (e.g. the Audi employing more than 12 000 workers) transport their employees with the involvement of bus campanies based on business contracts (door-to-door services).		
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT			
Type of CBPT quality problem	Absence of a cross-border direct service		
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	In the case of Hungary-Slovakia bus lines, the integration level is rather low and undeveloped. In the case of Komárom-Komárno, with the support of the Slovakia-Hungary INTERREG V-A programme, the development of integrated bus line program is under implementation. ˇAt the beginning of 2020 a new CB bike-sharing system has been inaugurated between Esztergom and Štúrovo (Mária Valéria bike) and similar services are under construction between Sátoraljaújhely (HU) and Zemplín (SK) and Oroszlány (HU) and Sala (SK) (Pons Danubii EGTC).		
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle			
5.1 Negative direct effects			
Type of direct effect	Long waiting / travel times	Long travel-to-work time for cross-border workers	Transport operators bear additional cost for running CBPT

Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	Missing connection Nograd county (HU) to Slovakia (Sahy). There is a bus stop at the Hungarian side of the border. From there people, walk / bike / or use a scooter to get to the SK train station at Sahy (13 minutes walk). This is considered by local residents that the cross-border public transport connection.			
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region				
Type of RoE or KoE	(KoE) Adverse consequences for the cross-border labour market / economy due to high travel-to-work times by CBPT (less persons seeking jobs across the border)	(KoE) Adverse consequences for the cross-border labour market / economy due to due to frequently delayed CBPT (cross-border commuters are unpunctual at work).	(KoE) Traffic jams and air or noise pollution on main road axes used by cross-border commuters due to missing or sub-optimally developed CBPT	(KoE) Reduced internal accessibility of a cross-border region because local / regional CBPT are not initiated or stopped due to lacking economic viability.
Background information for the negative secondary effects and / or comment on "other secondary effects"	-			
6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle				
6.1 Summary obstacle description				
Type	-			
6.2 Problem solving approach				
Type				
Description of the envisaged or already started problem-solving approach and/or comment on "other practices"	enccourage national / regional legislative action, planned but not yet implemented (28HU) Establish an own operation that allows to comply with standards and provisions from both sides of the border (04EN) (did not go as planned 28HU). In the Hungary-Slovakia context, the existing bus lines are operated partly based on local demand (several thousands of Slovakian people have settled in Hungary and the twinning ties between Komárom/Komárno and Esztergom / Štúrovo made necessary to introduce the services), partly based on national provisions defining suburban transport services. In Hungary, the suburban transport is meant as an eceryday service of the capital city and cities of country right from a distance of 70 km (Act XLI of 2012 on personal public transport services). Based on this act and the bilateral intergovernmental treaty on international personal and good transport (signed on 6 July, 1999), the bus lines are freed from the prohibition of cabotage, based on their local/suburban character. The relevant Slovak act was amended accordingly in 2019. The introduction of cross-border ticekting systems and larger CB service integration (similarly to the oldest cross-border service system of the Continent, i.e. the GYSEV-Raaberbahn, since 1872) may have a favourable impact on the development of greener CB mobility.			
7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)				
Possible relevant players	National authority	Regional authority	Local authority	corss-border entity
8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study				
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 1: Problems emerging from an unprofitable operation of CBPT, missing public subsidies and other financial matters (bus, train): • Case 1, • Case 3, • Case 4, • Case 10, • Case 30, • Case 35, • Case 36, • Case S-48			
Case study references	-			

9. Sources
Survey 04EN; Survey 28HU

S-49	**Multiple issues affect a cross-border ferry connection**		
Short description	Interrelated legal and administrative obstacles affect cross-border ferry connection between Bulgaria and Romania		
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices			
Type of obstacle	Other obstacle		
"other type of obstacle" or "other adverse practices"	In general: There are no provisions in EU legislation for promoting ferry connections between border regions. It refers to a combination of interrelated legal and administrative obstacles: different currencies; lack of general EU rules; vaious domestic rules		
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle			
Geographical extent	Specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)		
Border	BG-RO		
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	Svishtov, Bulgaria - Zimnich, Romania		
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle			
Mode	Ferry		
Particular features of operation	(4.1) river ferry service (passengers, cars) across a border river separating two contiguous border regions in two different countries		
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation			
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up			
Type of CBPT set-up problem	Missing statistical information on demand or supply potentials for CBPT	National, regional or local public transport authorities from both sides of the border have different functions and responsibilities, which hinders or prevents cooperation	Regional / local public transport authorities have considerably different financial capacities (budgetary resources)
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	Structural differences between key stakeholders, e.g. public and private service providers; Lack of capacity in local and regional bodies to facilitate the process		
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT			
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	-		
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT			
Type of CBPT quality problem	Inadequate or lacking passenger information		
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	-		
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle			
5.1 Negative direct effects			
Type of direct effect	Long waiting / travel times		

Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	Issues with the ferry service increase the waiting time due to low frequence of the service + lack of integration with other internal public transport In general along the Romanian-Bulgarian border: lack of cross-border public transport + long trips due to slow transport		
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region			
Type of RoE or KoE	(KoE) Adverse consequences for the cross-border labour market / economy due to high travel-to-work times by CBPT (less persons seeking jobs across the border)	(KoE) Reduced internal accessibility of a cross-border region because local / regional CBPT are not initiated or stopped due to lacking economic viability.	
Background information for the negative secondary effects and / or comment on "other secondary effects"	-		
6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle			
6.1 Summary obstacle description			
Type	Complex source-problem-effect relationship		
Comment			
6.2 Problem solving approach			
Type	-		
7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)			
Possible relevant players	National authority	Regional authority	Local authority
8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study			
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 5: Problems emerging from a sub-optimal development of CBPT (bus, rail): • Case 12, • Case 19, • Case 34, • Case S-49, • Case S-51		
Case study references	-		
9. Sources			
Survey 07BG Survey 89BG			

S-50	Lacking cooperation on CBPT			
Short description	Lack of capacity of regional authorities to facilitate cooperation process ferry Denmark - Germany			
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices				
Type of obstacle	Administrative obstacle			
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(III.1) non-awareness or non-willingness of national-level authorities to initiate or support solutions that could eliminate specific problems for CBPT			
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle				
Geographical extent	Specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)			
Border	DE-DK			
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	Rødbyhavn and Puttgarten			
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle				
Mode	Ferry			
Particular features of operation	(4.3) maritime ferry service (passengers, cars, trains) across a strait / sound, with trips lasting less than 1 hour in each direction			
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation				
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up				
Type of CBPT set-up problem	Missing cross-border transfer service between two domestic lines ending close to the common border	Missing statistical information on demand or supply potentials for CBPT	National, regional or local public transport authorities from both sides of the border have different functions and responsibilities, which hinders or prevents cooperation	Regional / local public transport authorities have considerably different financial capacities (budgetary resources)
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	Lack of capacities to make the cross-border connection a regional added value: Insufficient connections to domestic services			
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT				
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	-			
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT				
Type of CBPT quality problem	Inadequate or lacking passenger information	Different ticket formats or ticket validation methods	Limited distribution channels for cross-border tickets	
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	-			
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle				
5.1 Negative direct effects				
Type of direct effect	-			

5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region		
Type of RoE or KoE	(ReE) Lacking or poorly developed support infrastructure at local access points or transition interfaces (train stations, bus stops) reduce the use of CBPT	(KoE) Traffic jams and air or noise pollution on main road axes used by cross-border commuters due to missing or sub-optimally developed CBPT
Background information for the negative secondary effects and / or comment on "other secondary effects"	-	

6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle				
6.1 Summary obstacle description				
Type	Straightforward source-problem-effect relationship			
Comment				
6.2 Problem solving approach				
Type	-			
7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)				
Possible relevant players	Regional authority	Local authority	corss-border entity	Service provider

8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study	
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 4: Problems emerging from a diversity of public transport governance systems, different policy concepts, lack of cooperation between key actors (national or regional public authorities, transport providers etc.) and complex administrative procedures or adverse political behaviour: • Case 8, • Case 14, • Case 15, • Case 16, • Case 26, • Case 31, • Case 33, • Case 37, • Case 38, • Case 45, • Case S-50, • Case S-54, • Case S-55, • Case S-56
Case study references	Ferry connection Puttgarden (Germany) – Rødby (Denmark)

9. Sources
Survey 12 DK

S-51	Inadequate connection to domestic bus services		
Short description	Inadequate connection to domestic bus services France-Spain		
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices			
Type of obstacle	Administrative obstacle		
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(III.4) a lack of cross-border coordination of already existing national, regional or local public transport services		
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle			
Geographical extent	Specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)		
Border	ES-FR		
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	Bedous (FR) - Canfranc (ESP)		
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle			
Mode	Bus		
Particular features of operation	(3.1) local / regional cross-border bus line, comprising at least one stop in two contiguous border regions in two different countries		
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation			
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up			
Type of CBPT set-up problem	Missing cross-border transfer service between two domestic lines ending close to the common border		
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	Inadequate connection to domestic services		
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT			
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	-		
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT			
Type of CBPT quality problem	Inadequate or lacking passenger information		
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	-		
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle			
5.1 Negative direct effects			
Type of direct effect	Strongly reduced cross-border mobility by CBPT, especially in rural or sparsely populated areas	Long waiting / travel times	Passengers bear high ticket cost
Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	-		

5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region			
Type of RoE or KoE	(KoE) Adverse consequences for the cross-border labour market / economy due to high travel-to-work times by CBPT (less persons seeking jobs across the border)		
Background information for the negative secondary effects and / or comment on "other secondary effects"	Reduced mobility for leisure and tourism		
6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle			
6.1 Summary obstacle description			
Type	Straightforward source-problem-effect relationship		
Comment	-		
6.2 Problem solving approach			
Type	-		
7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)			
Possible relevant players	Regional authority	Local authority	corss-border entity
8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study			
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 5: Problems emerging from a sub-optimal development of CBPT (bus, rail): • Case 12, • Case 19, • Case 34, • Case S-49, • Case S-51		
Case study references	Bus connection Bedous (France) – Canfranc (Spain)		
9. Sources			
Survey 13ES			

S-52	**Inadequate road infrastructure hampers CBPT**	
Short description	Inadequate road infrastructure (border bridge) to support larger scale CBPT Poland and Germany	
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices		
Type of obstacle	Administrative obstacle	
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(III.1) non-awareness or non-willingness of national-level authorities to initiate or support solutions that could eliminate specific problems for CBPT	
"other type of obstacle" or "other adverse practices"	Limited tonnage of vehicles that can pass over the border bridge The priorities for the creation of cross-border infrastructural (technical) prerequisites are weighted differently in the Polish part in terms of planning. (Survey 92DE)	
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle		
Geographical extent	Specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)	
Border	DE-PL	
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	not specified	
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle		
Mode	Bus	
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation		
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up		
Type of CBPT set-up problem	National, regional or local public transport authorities from both sides of the border have different functions and responsibilities, which hinders or prevents cooperation	Regional / local public transport authorities have considerably different financial capacities (budgetary resources)
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	The priorities for the creation of cross-border infrastructural (technical) prerequisites are weighted differently in the Polish part in terms of planning. (Survey 92DE)	
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT		
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	Insufficient service density throughout the day	
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	-	
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT		
Type of CBPT quality problem	-	
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle		
5.1 Negative direct effects		
Type of direct effect	Strongly reduced cross-border mobility by CBPT, especially in rural or sparsely populated areas	Long waiting / travel times

Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	-
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region	
Type of RoE or KoE	-
6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle	
6.1 Summary obstacle description	
Type	Straightforward source-problem-effect relationship
Comment	
6.2 Problem solving approach	
Type	-
7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)	
Possible relevant players	Service provider
8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study	
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	-
Case study references	-
9. Sources	
Survey 92DE	

S-53	**Inadequate rail infrastructure hampers CBPT**		
Short description	Inadequate infrastructure for rail connections France-Spain		
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices			
Type of obstacle	Administrative obstacle		
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(III.3) structural differences between transport operators delivering CBPT on each side of a border		
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle			
Geographical extent	Specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)		
Border	ES-FR		
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	La Tor de Querol-Enveig, Latour-de-Carol-Enveitg		
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle			
Mode	Train		
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation			
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up			
Type of CBPT set-up problem	National, regional or local public transport authorities from both sides of the border have different functions and responsibilities, which hinders or prevents cooperation	Regional / local public transport authorities have considerably different financial capacities (budgetary resources)	Lacking interoperability of national railway systems requires specific rail rolling stock able to operate on both sides of the border
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	Regions are still struggling to finance the connection between regional trains, since that means crossing the border regional (Survey 35FR; Survey 93ES)		
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT			
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	-		
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT			
Type of CBPT quality problem	Different ticket formats or ticket validation methods		
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle			
5.1 Negative direct effects			
Type of direct effect	Long waiting / travel times		
Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	Long waiting times due to slow services		
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region			
Type of RoE or KoE	(KoE) Adverse consequences for the cross-border labour market / economy due to high travel-to-work times by CBPT (less persons seeking jobs across the border)	(KoE) Adverse consequences for the cross-border labour market / economy due to due to frequently delayed CBPT (cross-border commuters are unpunctual at work).	

6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle		
6.1 Summary obstacle description		
Type	Straightforward source-problem-effect relationship	
Comment		
6.2 Problem solving approach		
Type	-	
7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)		
Possible relevant players	National authority	Regional authority
8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study		
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 6: Problems emerging from inadequate railway infrastructure or lacking interoperability of rail-rolling stock: • Case 18, • Case 20, • Case 27, • Case S-46, • Case S-53	
Case study references		
9. Sources		
Survey 25ES; Survey 35FR; Survey 93ES		

S-54	**No cross-border tramway line**		
Short description	Unwillingness of national / regional actors in Switzerland to extend the Geneva tramway line 15 to France		
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices			
Type of obstacle	Administrative obstacle		
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(III.1) non-awareness or non-willingness of national-level authorities to initiate or support solutions that could eliminate specific problems for CBPT		
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle			
Geographical extent	Specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)		
Border	FR-CH		
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	Gex (FR) - Geneva (CH)		
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle			
Mode	Bus, Tram		
Particular features of operation	-		
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation			
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up			
Type of CBPT set-up problem	Missing cross-border transfer service between two domestic lines ending close to the common border	National, regional or local public transport authorities from both sides of the border have different functions and responsibilities, which hinders or prevents cooperation	Regional / local public transport authorities have considerably different financial capacities (budgetary resources)
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	Regional actors abandoned the extension of the Geneva tram line 18 to France. The north-western extension of line 18 towards Saint-Genis-Pouilly (Département Ain, arrondissement Gex) was initially authorised by the Swiss federal authorities. However, the Canton of Geneva officially abandoned the project on 21 September 2018 (i.e. too high cost involved) also because the Swiss confederation had announced a few days earlier that it would not co-finance this extension. Instead, a 2 km long high level of service bus between the terminus of line 18 and the centre of Saint-Genis-Pouilly is favoured, for which works have started in 2020 and commissioning is planned for 2021. The current bus cross-border connection (bus F: Gex-Geneva, running every 20 minutes) is crowded and stands in traffic with all cars. Hence the bus service is not competitive. People take instead their bike, but bike lanes are also missing on the French side.		
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT			
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	-		
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT			
Type of CBPT quality problem	-		
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	Transport prices are too expensive, the offer is non-existent so people at 85% take the car		
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle			
5.1 Negative direct effects			
Type of direct effect	Long waiting / travel times	Long travel-to-work time for cross-border workers	

Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	-			
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region				
Type of RoE or KoE	(ReE) Lacking or poorly developed support infrastructure at local access points or transition interfaces (train stations, bus stops) reduce the use of CBPT	(KoE) Adverse consequences for the cross-border labour market / economy due to high travel-to-work times by CBPT (less persons seeking jobs across the border)	(KoE) Adverse consequences for the cross-border labour market / economy due to due to frequently delayed CBPT (cross-border commuters are unpunctual at work).	(KoE) Traffic jams and air or noise pollution on main road axes used by cross-border commuters due to missing or sub-optimally developed CBPT
6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle				
6.1 Summary obstacle description				
Type	Straightforward source-problem-effect relationship			
6.2 Problem solving approach				
Type	-			
7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)				
Possible relevant players	Regional authority	Transport agency / association	corss-border entity	Service provider
8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study				
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 4: Problems emerging from a diversity of public transport governance systems, different policy concepts, lack of cooperation between key actors (national or regional public authorities, transport providers etc.) and complex administrative procedures or adverse political behaviour: • Case 8, • Case 14, • Case 15, • Case 16, • Case 26, • Case 31, • Case 33, • Case 37, • Case 38, • Case 45, • Case S-50, • Case S-54, • Case S-55, • Case S-56			
Case study references	Cross-border tramway line 17 "Geneva - Annemasse"			
9. Sources				
Survey 38FR				

S-55	Unclear responsibilities Hungary-Croatia		
Short description	Unclear responsibilities Hungary-Croatia		
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices			
Type of obstacle	Administrative obstacle		
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(III.2) an asymmetric cooperation constellation between the competent public authorities in the cross-border region, which leads to different policies on CBPT on each side or prevents that specific problems of CBPT are jointly tackled		
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle			
Geographical extent	Specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)		
Border	HU-HR		
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	Murakeresztúr (HU) -Kotoriba (HR).		
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle			
Mode	Train		
Particular features of operation	(1.1) local / regional cross-border railway line, comprising at least one stop in two contiguous border regions in two different countries		
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation			
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up			
Type of CBPT set-up problem	Missing cross-border transfer service between two domestic lines ending close to the common border	National, regional or local public transport authorities from both sides of the border have different functions and responsibilities, which hinders or prevents cooperation	Regional / local public transport authorities have considerably different financial capacities (budgetary resources)
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	Inexisting service, only cargo train. Assymetric and unclear responsibilities among players. Structural differences between players and lack of capacity of local and regional player to facilitate the process		
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT			
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	-		
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT			
Type of CBPT quality problem	Absence of a cross-border direct service		
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle			
5.1 Negative direct effects			
Type of direct effect	-		
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region			
Type of RoE or KoE	(KoE) Adverse consequences for the cross-border labour market / economy due to due to frequently delayed CBPT (cross-border commuters are unpunctual at work).	(KoE) Traffic jams and air or noise pollution on main road axes used by cross-border commuters due to missing or sub-optimally developed CBPT	(KoE) Reduced internal accessibility of a cross-border region because local / regional CBPT are not initiated or stopped due to lacking economic viability.
6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle			
6.1 Summary obstacle description			
Type	Complex source-problem-effect relationship		
Comment	-		

6.2 Problem solving approach	
Type	Establishment of joint structures for managing CBPT (e.g. EGTC)
Description of the envisaged or already started problem-solving approach and/or comment on "other practices"	EGTC did not go as planned bilateral agreement implemented but too early for results increasing demand planned but not yet implemented
7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)	
Possible relevant players	-
8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study	
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 4: Problems emerging from a diversity of public transport governance systems, different policy concepts, lack of cooperation between key actors (national or regional public authorities, transport providers etc.) and complex administrative procedures or adverse political behaviour: • Case 8, • Case 14, • Case 15, • Case 16, • Case 26, • Case 31, • Case 33, • Case 37, • Case 38, • Case 45, • Case S-50, • Case S-54, • Case S-55, • Case S-56
Case study references	-
9. Sources	
Survey 62HU	

S-56	Multiple issues affect CBPT in the Lake Constance area			
Short description	Incompatible legal frameworks, differences between CBPT actors and not yet optimal train services affect cross-border passenger transport in the eastern part of Lake Contance area (AT-CH-LI).			
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices				
Type of obstacle	EU legal obstacle			
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(I.1) the particular status of a given EU border			
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle				
Geographical extent	Specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)			
Border	AT-CH			
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	Eastern part of the Lake Constance region, especially Greater Feldkirch area and Lower Rhine Valley (AT-CH-LI).			
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle				
Mode	Train			
Particular features of operation	(1.1) local / regional cross-border railway line, comprising at least one stop in two contiguous border regions in two different countries			
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation				
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up				
Type of CBPT set-up problem	National, regional or local public transport authorities from both sides of the border have different functions and responsibilities, which hinders or prevents cooperation	Regional / local public transport authorities have considerably different financial capacities (budgetary resources)		
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	Mobility service providers in the 4 countries (DE, AT, LI, CH) are organised very differently. There is a mix of public and private services, without good coordination.			
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT				
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	Insufficient service density at peak hours	Other adverse consequences		
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	Commuter-related congestion situations in the Vorarlberg Rhine Valley (i.e. greater Feldkirch area to lower Rhine Valley) arise due to the lack of high-level and cross-border connections, but especially due to the currently inadequate rail transport infrastructure and the still insufficient offer of rail-bound public transport connections between Vorarlberg and the Principality of Liechtenstein. However, various projects have recently been initiated in rail-based public transport (e.g. partial double-track expansion Lauterach - St. Margrethen, project S-Bahn FL.A.CH.), with which a gradual expansion of cross-border public transport services will also be achieved in the foreseeable future. Nevertheless, in the medium term there is still a clear potential for further expansion of rail-based public transport. Finally, there are still deficits in cross-border public bus transport services between Vorarlberg and the neighbouring cantons in Switzerland, where the mutual coordination of the different tariff structures should also be improved.			
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT				
Type of CBPT quality problem	Different ticket formats or ticket validation methods	Limited distribution channels for cross-border tickets	Non-application or different recognition of fare reductions for specific person groups on cross-border trips	Strong differences in fare levels for local transport services
Background information on the	In the eastern part of the Lake Constance, Swiss and Liechtenstein tickets are more expensive than the German and Austrian tickets. This mainly concerns the railway lines S3			

specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	Bregenz - St. Margrethen, S2 Feldkirch - Buchs and the ÖBB line Feldkirch-Buchs via Liechtenstein Feldkirch-Altenstadt-Gisingen-Tisis-Nendeln- Forst/Hilti-Schaan-Buchs			
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle				
5.1 Negative direct effects				
Type of direct effect	Passengers bear high ticket cost		No cross-border strategy for integrating domestic public transport services or elaborating new CBPT	
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region				
Type of RoE or KoE	(KoE) Adverse consequences for the cross-border labour market / economy due to high travel-to-work times by CBPT (less persons seeking jobs across the border)	(KoE) Adverse consequences for the cross-border labour market / economy due to due to frequently delayed CBPT (cross-border commuters are unpunctual at work).	(KoE) Traffic jams and air or noise pollution on main road axes used by cross-border commuters due to missing or sub-optimally developed CBPT	(KoE) Reduced internal accessibility of a cross-border region because local / regional CBPT are not initiated or stopped due to lacking economic viability.
6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle				
6.1 Summary obstacle description				
Type	Complex source-problem-effect relationship			
Comment				
6.2 Problem solving approach				
Type	Stronger coordination of neighbouring domestic fare systems for public transport	More intense and structured cross-border collaboration between key actors		
Description of the envisaged or already started problem-solving approach and/or comment on "other practices"	A cross-border transport association with an integrated tariff area would make sense, but this is difficult to organise			
7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)				
Possible relevant players	Regional authority	Transport agency / association	corss-border entity	Service provider
8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study				
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	Group 4: Problems emerging from a diversity of public transport governance systems, different policy concepts, lack of cooperation between key actors (national or regional public authorities, transport providers etc.) and complex administrative procedures or adverse political behaviour: • Case 8, • Case 14, • Case 15, • Case 16, • Case 26, • Case 31, • Case 33, • Case 37, • Case 38, • Case 45, • Case S-50, • Case S-54, • Case S-55, • Case S-56			

Case study references	

9. Sources

Surveys 77DE, 82DE, 78DE and 79DE

Stumm, Thomas (2020): Aktualisierte Kontextanalyse für das Interreg-Programmgebiet „Alpenrhein-Bodensee-Hochrhein" (ABH). Ex-ante Bewertung des Kooperationsprogramms Interreg Alpenrhein-Bodensee-Hochrhein 2021-2027, Februar 2020, pp. 26, 27.

S-57	**Lack of EU integration Hungary-Romania**			
Short description	Lack of EU integration Hungary-Romania			
1. Type of obstacle and its relation to specific legal matters or administrative practices				
Type of obstacle	EU legal obstacle			
Specific legislative matter / background or adverse administrative practices	(I.1) the particular status of a given EU border			
"other type of obstacle" or "other adverse practices"	Romania not being part of Schengen makes CBPT more difficult to organise (decrease interest)			
2. Geographical extent and border-specific location of the obstacle				
Geographical extent	Specific EU border between Member States or with UK, CH, LI and NO (specify border)			
Border	HU-RO			
"smaller border segment" or comment on "multiple borders"	Danube-Körös-Maros-Tisza Euroregion			
3. Mode and type of CBPT affected by the obstacle				
Mode	No specific service, respondent speaks of bus or train			
Particular features of operation				
4. Problems for CBPT set-up and ongoing CBPT operation				
4.1 Problems for CBPT set-up				
Type of CBPT set-up problem	Missing cross-border transfer service between two domestic lines ending close to the common border	Missing statistical information on demand or supply potentials for CBPT	National, regional or local public transport authorities from both sides of the border have different functions and responsibilities, which hinders or prevents cooperation	Regional / local public transport authorities have considerably different financial capacities (budgetary resources)
Background information on the specific problem situation and/or comments on "other adverse consequences"	The demand is there, border issuse make transport difficult			
4.2 Supply-side problems for CBPT				
Type of CBPT supply-side problem	-			
4.3 Problems for the quality of CBPT				
Type of CBPT quality problem	Lengthy technical or organisational hand-over procedures (trains)	Absence of a cross-border direct service		
5. Observed negative direct or secondary effects of the obstacle				
5.1 Negative direct effects				
Type of direct effect	Long waiting / travel times	Long travel-to-work time for cross-border workers		

Background information for the negative direct effects and / or comment on "other direct effects"	Romania is not a member of the Schengen area, so buses or trains have to wait at the HU-RO border due to border controls, sometimes for hours.		
5.2 Negative re-enforcement effects (ReE) or knock-on effects (KoE) noticed in the cross-border region			
6. Solutions for overcoming or alleviating negative effects of the obstacle			
6.1 Summary obstacle description			
Type	Straightforward source-problem-effect relationship		
6.2 Problem solving approach			
7. Key stakeholder (suitable to initiate a solution)			
Possible relevant players	National authority	corss-border entity	Service provider
8. Similar obstacle cases (wider relevance) and relation to other elements of the CBPT study			
Similar obstacles cases in the inventory (groups 1-7)	-		
Case study references	-		
9. Sources			
Survey 96HU			

GETTING IN TOUCH WITH THE EU

In person

All over the European Union there are hundreds of Europe Direct information centres. You can find the address of the centre nearest you at: https://europa.eu/european-union/contact_en

On the phone or by email

Europe Direct is a service that answers your questions about the European Union. You can contact this service:

- by freephone: 00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11 (certain operators may charge for these calls),
- at the following standard number: +32 22999696 or
- by email via: https://europa.eu/european-union/contact_en

FINDING INFORMATION ABOUT THE EU

Online

Information about the European Union in all the official languages of the EU is available on the Europa website at: https://europa.eu/european-union/index_en

EU publications

You can download or order free and priced EU publications at: https://op.europa.eu/en/publications. Multiple copies of free publications may be obtained by contacting Europe Direct or your local information centre (see https://europa.eu/european-union/contact_en).

EU law and related documents

For access to legal information from the EU, including all EU law since 1952 in all the official language versions, go to EUR-Lex at: http://eur-lex.europa.eu

Open data from the EU

The EU Open Data Portal (http://data.europa.eu/euodp/en) provides access to datasets from the EU. Data can be downloaded and reused for free, for both commercial and non-commercial purposes.

KN-01-22-009-EN-N

Publications Office
of the European Union