




Annex I: supporting Material




Source: N. Yassoglou – C. Kosmas, Desertification in the Mediterranean Europe. The case of Greece, RALA Report no 200, p.7

Map 5 Percentage built-up area for NUTS3




Source: ESPON 2006a, Territorial trends of management of natural heritage

Map 11 Fragmentation index for NUTS3




ESPON 2006a, Territorial trends of management of natural heritage

Map 7.1: Internet access and broadband connections in households, by NUTS 2 regions, 2008
Share of households with Internet access and broadband connection




Source: EUROSTAT, Regional Yearbook, 2009

Map 7.2: Regular use of the internet by NUTS 2 regions, 2008
Percentage of persons who accessed the Internet, on average, at least once a week




Source: EUROSTAT, Regional Yearbook, 2009

Map 8.1: Total R & D expenditure as a percentage of GDP, all sectors, by NUTS 2 regions, 2006




Source: EUROSTAT, Regional Yearbook, 2009

Figure 4 Map of Europe based on indicator A.1




Source: ESPON 2006c, The role and the spatial effects of cultural heritage and identity.

Figure 35 Supply of cultural assets in NUTS III regions of Europe




Source: ESPON 2006c, The role and the spatial effects of cultural heritage and identity.

Figure 37 Potential demand of cultural assets by local population and visitors in NUTS II regions of Europe




Source: ESPON 2006c, The role and the spatial effects of cultural heritage and identity.

Figure 6 Map of Europe based on indicator F.1




Source: ESPON 2006c, The role and the spatial effects of cultural heritage and identity.

Figure 10 Lagging NUTS II regions and levels of cultural supply




Source: ESPON 2006c, The role and the spatial effects of cultural heritage and identity

Figure 11:



Source: ESPON 2006c, The role and the spatial effects of cultural heritage and identity

Figure 12: Aggregate Natural and Technological Hazards



Source: ESPON 2006d, The spatial effects and management of natural and technical hazards in EUROPE

Examples of best practice

The Åland Islands are a self-governed part of Finland with some 6,500 islands divided into 16 municipalities. Six of these are considered "archipelago municipalities" because you cannot reach them other than by boat (no bridges). These six municipalities cover a vast area and include many islands and skerries but only have a population of 2,500 people. One of these is Kökar, separate case study in the Euroislands project.

The four examples of best practice A-D presented below regard Kökar as well as the other five municipalities of the Åland Islands archipelago.

A The Archipelago Board/Skärgårdsnämnden

1 Short description

To ensure good, formal and informal communication between the Government of the Åland Islands and the six archipelago municipalities, an Archipelago Board was formed fifteen years ago.

The delegates of the Board are the six Cabinet Members of the Government and one representative from each municipality, most often the Chairman of the Executive Board. The Mayors are also invited, as well as the President of the Åland Islands. The Chairman of the Board is the Minister for Trade and Industry and there is a part-time Secretary to ensure documentation, action and continuity.

The Board meets four times a year. Two meetings are in town, two meetings out on the islands. Two meetings deal with all kinds of important archipelago questions, two meetings have a main theme such as "Europe and the Archipelago", "Scenarios for the year 2020", "Image and Profile of the Åland Archipelago", "Next Step for Cultural Tourism" or "Law and Order in the Archipelago".

The Board has a small budget (mainly to pay the Secretary) and no legislative or steering power, but has great influence on both the Government and the Parliament in archipelago-related questions.

2 Theme

Government and municipal cooperation.

3 Administration level

Regional.

4 Financing

Government financed, the Board has a budget of 46,000€ for 2009.

5 Why is this a good example?

Because it arranges regular, fairly prepared round-the-table discussions between local small island politicians and Government politicians.

6 Can it be applied to other islands?

Yes, where there is a central authority (a Government) on a large island/mainland and small islands scattered far away.

7 More information

Website: <http://www.regeringen.ax/naringsavd/skargardsnamnd.pbs>

B Ferry Transports

1 Short description

Beginning in the 1950's, the archipelago of the Åland Islands went through a structural change beginning, with electrical power (Kökar 1958), ferries that could transport cars (1970's) and emigration (from 4,500 inhabitants 1950 to 2,500 inhabitants 2008).

The ferry system was designed to:

- enable transports all year around
- transport persons, goods and cars on the same (köl)
- be free of charge for residents
- give all populated islands the same level of service

This led to a system with nine big ferries capable of ice-breaking transports with up to five lorries, 25 cars and 200 people that are part of the Åland Islands public roadnet.

2 Theme

Services of public interest.

3 Administration level

Regional.

4 Financing

Government financed. The budget for 2009 is 18 MEUR.

5 Why is this a good example?

Ferries cannot compete with bridges when it comes to stop emigration from small islands, but they have been a brake on the ongoing trend and as such an important financial measure from the national/regional level to keep the small islands populated.

6 Can it be applied to other islands?

Yes.

7 More information

C Skärgårdssmak/A flavour of the Archipelago

1 Short description

Each year some three million people visit the archipelago between Stockholm and Helsinki. They come to enjoy everything that the Archipelago has to offer - smooth rocks, glittering water, and fresh air. They want good food with a flavour of the Archipelago and often want to buy a little something to remember their visit.

Ten years ago, there was no brand to unite products, services and sub-brands of local restaurants, food stores, local food producers and handicraft artists. The Skärgårdssmak project provided a system of good quality and good taste.

2 Theme

Promotion of entrepreneurial activities.

3 Administration level

National, regional and local.

4 Financing

Mainly financed through Interreg IIA and IIIA, total 4,5 MEUR 1995-2006.

5 Why is this a good example?

During the first project period 1995-1998, 50 restaurants, 50 producers and 50 handicrafters joined the project. The restaurants increased their turnover with 20 percent, their number of employees with 10 percent and the deliveries from local producers increased with 10 percent.

During the second period the project focused on media, especially TV, and incorporated 30 food stores in the system. All entrepreneurs within the project increased their turnover with in between 15 and 20 percent during these years.

6 Can it be applied to other islands?

Yes.

7 More information

Website: www.skargardssmak.com/start.con?iLan=3

D A Biking Path over National Boundaries

1 Short description

Bikers used to be seen as people "who don't have enough money to buy a car" by island residents on Åland and southwestern Finland. Nowadays, we have learned that bikers spend a couple of hundred euros per person/day and that they are an environment-friendly kind of tourism that appreciate nature, culture, good food and a healthy life.

It is possible to go "island-biking" on and between the small islands of the Finnish and the Åland archipelagos using the public ferries, but it is not well known and the ferry time-tables are complicated to read and understand (even for islanders).

Therefore, a joint, two year long project was initiated by the Archipelago Board on Åland in 2008 to attract more bikers. The project, called "Archipedale", will map and

check a path, give seminars to tourist entrepreneurs along the path, increase quality and service, and find and develop suitable market channels.

2 Theme

Promotion of entrepreneurial activities

3 Administration level

Inter-national, regional and local.

4 Financing

The project has a budget of 165,000€.

5 Why is this a good example?

It is a modern example of cross-national, environment-friendly, profitable cultural tourism.

6 Can it be applied to other islands?

Yes.

7 More information

Website: not yet.

Stakeholder: **The Åland Islands**

Island: **Kökar**

Name and position: Christian Pleijel

Archipelago Developer at the Åland Government

Vice-Chairman of the Municipal Executive Board of Kökar



Christian Pleijel



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL
REGIONAL POLICY

The Director-General

02 JUN 2010

Brussels, 27.05.2010*004336
DG REGIO C.2 JD/ct D(2010) 660149

Dear Mr MacDonald

Many thanks for your letter of 26 March addressed to Mr Hahn and the wealth of proposals for improvements of our policy approach. Commissioner Hahn has passed them on to me for a more detailed evaluation and reply.

The points raised by you and your colleagues are undoubtedly of considerable relevance for DG REGIO, notably as regards the statistical treatment of these territories. It is also true that the Working Paper on territories with specific geographical features does not address the issue of possible handicaps affecting these territories.

However, this was not the purpose of the paper. Its main conclusion is rather that there is no scope for setting up specific programmes targeting each of these categories given the wide heterogeneity of the territories in each group. This conclusion precisely calls for reflecting on the challenges faced by these territories on a more detailed basis than allowed by such broad categories.

As a tentative solution to this issue, DG REGIO examined an alternative typology of islands which is based on the size of their population. Formally, island regions are defined as NUTS3 regions completely covered by islands and we consider five categories of island regions based on the population of the most populated island in the region (i.e. the major island):

- major island has more than one million inhabitants;
- major island has a population between one million and 250,000;
- major island has a population between 250,000 and 100,000;
- major island has a population between 100,000 and 50,000; and
- major island has less than 50,000 inhabitants.

Mr Alex MacDonald
Convener Western Isles Council
Acting President of the CPMR Islands Commission
Commission des Iles c/o CRPM
6, rue Saint-Martin
FR – 35700 RENNES

Commission européenne, B-1049 Bruxelles / Europese Commissie, B-1049 Brussel - Belgium, Telephone: (32-2) 299 11 11.
Office: GSM1 4/. Telephone: direct line (32-2) 29-; Fax: (32-2) 296.32.71.
G:\91161 CONCEPTION\02 COHES TERRIT DEV URBAIN\07 GEO-SPECIFICITIES\2008.99 HANDICAPS TO
FILE\Ahnert_a_CPMR April 2010 (2).doc
http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/

In practice, this definition covers islands with more than one NUTS3 region (e.g. Ireland), islands corresponding to one NUTS3 regions (e.g. Gozo) and NUTS3 regions including several islands (e.g. Cyclades). It does not include NUTS3 regions with a major continental part for which the insular population is marginal. In addition, islands with a fixed link to the mainland such as a bridge, tunnel or a dyke are not included.

This typology has several advantages. First, contrary to the one used in the Working Paper, it avoids defining islands on a somewhat institutional basis. In particular, the status of island no longer depends on whether the territory at stake is eligible to Cohesion Funds or has a national capital. Second, it is better adapted to account for the wide diversity within the group of EU islands. Indeed, the size of the population and hence of the local market is a major determinant of the development challenges faced by a given territory and the diversity of situations is likely to be much more limited within each subgroups of islands. A copy of the map corresponding to this typology is attached.

However, as you know perfectly well, such kind of analysis is complex and has clear limitations. It helps to characterise better the territories, but can not in any case be a sufficient basis for policy judgement and decisions. Other studies are currently supporting the process of data collection and knowledge improvement in the framework of ESPON and also of the European Environmental Agency. The Commission, in the coming months will certainly gain a better understanding of the dynamics of those territories with specific geographic features.

You may probably know that following the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty the Commission has created the Inter-Service Group on Territorial Cohesion comprising of representatives of various Directorates-General. This group will take a careful look at the way the various sectoral policies of the European Union are addressing the problems which territories with specific geographical features are facing and develop policy options for tackling these issues. Once visible progress has been made in this field my services wish to invite the respective stakeholders and discuss with them the proposals elaborated by the Inter-Service Group. This will then offer the opportunity for you and your colleagues representing the areas with specific geographical features to make your contributions to the future design of Cohesion Policy for the areas concerned.

Yours sincerely



Dirk Ahner

Figure 13. EEA, The environmental dimension of environmental sustainability, EEA technical Report, 9/2010


Table 3.1 Potential territorial dimensions of EU policy areas

Policy area (dg)	Territorial dimension
Agriculture and rural development	(a) no explicit territorial dimension to CAP subsidies, but the activities (including land management) will strongly affect territories across the EU, (b) Rural Development Policy focuses on rural areas and on 'disadvantaged regions'; some MS have delegated management to regions.
Competition	(a) no explicit territorial focus (may have some influence in that it reviews regional aid to ensure that key programmes are focused on disadvantaged regions).
Economic and financial affairs	(a) no explicit territorial focus.
Education and culture	(a) not a focus, but cultural diversity, dialogue and exchange are among the goals.
Employment, social affairs and equal opportunities	(a) European Employment Strategy seeks to support skills, especially in disadvantaged regions, (b) supports the European Social Fund (one of the Structural Funds) as well as other funding programmes such as PROGRESS.
Energy and transport	(a) Transport Policy seeks to ensure connections among EU regions and also supports cooperation and projects in areas such as urban transport, (b) Energy Policy promotes the development of renewable energy and energy system connections across the EU, (c) supports Trans-European Networks (TEN) for energy (e.g. electricity and gas transmission projects) and transport, including highways, roads, maritime and inland waters, combined transport and air.
Enterprise and industry	(a) not a focus, but operates the Enterprise Europe Network with centres for SMEs across the EU.
Environment	(a) an explicit element of several areas of Environmental Policy. These areas are expanded in Table 3.2, below.
Maritime affairs and fisheries	(a) Maritime Policy focuses on coastal zones, regions and European seas; coastal regions have some role in its implementation.
Health and consumers	(a) no explicit territorial focus.
Information society and media	(a) one aspect is the promotion of high-speed Internet access across the EU, thus promoting connections.
Internal market and services	(a) no explicit territorial focus.
Justice, freedom and security	(a) includes policies on migration and border issues, which affect border regions (both land and sea).
Regional policy	(a) focus on territorial policies.
Research	(a) Research Policy, including the European Research Area, promotes cooperation among researchers across different parts of the EU.
Taxation and customs union	(a) no explicit territorial focus.


Table 3.2 Potential territorial dimensions of environmental policy areas within the European Commission

Areas of environmental policy	Examples of territorial dimensions
Climate Key overlaps: (1) water (2) nature and biodiversity	(a) The White Paper on adapting to climate change (April 2009), which notes that since impacts will vary by region, and certain areas (e.g. coastal zones, mountains and flood plains) will be particularly vulnerable, many adaptation actions will need to be carried out nationally and regionally. The White Paper also proposes that the EU should play a role in support efforts to address cross-border issues. White paper explicitly seeks to increase resilience of agriculture and forests, biodiversity, ecosystems and water. (b) A European Commission Staff Working Document (European Commission 2009f) recognises the importance of incorporating adaptation in the implementation of water legislation, and the benefits of planning and acting at a river-basin district level. (c) European Climate Change Programme (ECCP) II working group is also considering regional planning, renewable energy infrastructure, Structural Funds and national strategies for mitigation and adaptation. These elements are likely to have a territorial dimension. (d) Climate change research activities seek to promote cooperation between researchers across the EU. This is intended to be international (external) as well as internal.
Nature and Biodiversity Key overlaps: (1) climate impacts and adaptation (2) water	(a) Explicit territorial focus. The Habitats and the Birds Directives led to the establishment of the Natura 2000 network through the identification of Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) and Special Protection Areas (SPAs) respectively. (b) Outside Natura 2000 sites, nature and biodiversity policy area promotes green infrastructure, ecological connectivity, marine strategy and maritime policy. All of these elements have an explicit territorial focus. Specific guidance and action plans have been developed, such as the <i>Guidance on the maintenance of landscape connectivity features of major importance for wild flora and fauna</i> , and the <i>Biodiversity Action Plan: Halting the loss of biodiversity by 2010 — and beyond</i> (2008).
Waste Key overlaps: (1) water (2) air (3) soil	(a) The Waste Framework Directive and Directives on Waste Incineration and the Landfill of Waste have implicit territorial dimensions, particularly in relation to the transportation, treatment, safe disposal and use of waste as a resource. (b) The Waste Framework Directive requires that Member States should draw up waste management plans. Article 28(1) states that Member States shall ensure that competent authorities establish 'one or more' waste management plans. This allows Member States to draw up regional plans where appropriate.
Water Key overlaps: (1) climate impacts and adaptation (2) nature and biodiversity (3) nitrates	(a) Measures proposed by the Water Framework Directive (WFD) are explicitly territorial in nature, for example the use of river basins as a key planning unit, and managing groundwater at risk, etc. (b) Marine Strategy Framework Directive is explicitly territorial in that it establishes European Marine Regions on the basis of geographical and environmental criteria. (c) The Floods Directive requires the development of national flood risk maps and management plans, based on an assessment of flood risks at the river-basin district level and in associated coastal zones. In some cases, cross-border flood risks will also be important. (d) Bathing Water and Drinking Water Directives have no explicit territorial dimension; however, both have implicit territorial dimension in relation to controlling sources of water pollution. (e) The Urban Waste Water Directive has an explicit territorial dimension in that it requires that Member States should identify and protect sensitive areas/catchment areas from discharge of urban waste water. (f) The Nitrates Directive requires that Member States should designate territories draining into waters that are or could be affected by high nitrate levels or eutrophication as vulnerable zones. Austria, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands and Slovenia decided to provide the same level of protection to their entire territory, rather than designate nitrate-vulnerable zones.
Air Key overlap: (1) transport	(a) The new Air Quality Directive includes explicit territorial dimension in establishing procedures for assessment of air quality; it requires that account should be taken of populations and ecosystems exposed to air pollution, and that each Member State should identify zones/agglomerations as the basis for air quality assessment and management.

Areas of environmental policy	Examples of territorial dimensions
Soil Key overlaps: (1) water (2) nature and biodiversity (3) chemicals (4) waste (5) agriculture	(a) The Soil Thematic Strategy calls on Member States to identify and remediate contaminated sites. Implicit territorial dimension, but relates to specific sites only. (b) Com(2006) 232 final, the proposal for a Soils Directive (European Commission, 2006a), recognises the transboundary effects of soil degradation (such as downstream damage to infrastructure due to sediments eroded in another region / country upstream). The proposed directive would seek to establish a framework for the protection of soil, which would enable Member States to identify the appropriate measures at the most appropriate geographical/ administrative level.
Chemicals Key overlaps: (1) agriculture (pesticides) (2) waste	(1) No explicit territorial dimension.
Noise Key overlap: (1) transport	(a) The Environmental Noise Directive has explicit territorial dimension, in that it requires that competent authorities should develop strategic noise maps and adopt action plans for specific noise sources (e.g. major roads and airports) and agglomerations.



**Percentage of the NATURA2000
Network areas inside NUTS3 (99) region**



The Natura2000 Network data does not exist from Norway, Switzerland, Romania and Bulgaria.


The processed NATURA2000 data set does not cover three NUTS3 99 regions in Poland (PL0C1, PL0C2 and PL0C3) and two NUTS3 (99) regions in Germany (DE301 and DE302). These values has been calculated on NUTS3 (03) regions.

© EuroGeographics Association for the administrative boundaries
Origin of the data: DG ENV NATURA2000 Network
Source: ESPON Data Base


Map 3 Percentage of Natura 2000 network areas per NUTS3 region

Source: ESPON 2006a, Territorial trends of management of natural heritage

Map 5.3 Map of natural and environmental assets (10 x 10km grid)



Source: EEA/ETC-LUSI, *Characterisation of European Territories*.



Data aggregated by NUTS 3 regions, i.e. classification of NUTS 3 regions based on the natural and environmental assets

Source: EEA, (2010), *The environmental dimension of environmental sustainability*, EEA Technical Report, no 9/2010

Figure 14. ESPON 2006, Project 2.1.3., The Territorial Impact of CAP and the Rural Development Policy

Map 1.1: Total Pillar 1 Support per Agricultural Work Unit, 1999




Figure 15. ESPON 2006, Project 2.1.3., The Territorial Impact of CAP and the Rural Development Policy

**Map 1.2: Total Pillar 2 Support per Agricultural Work Unit, 1999
(based on Farm Accountancy Data Network data)**




Figure 16. ESPON 2006, Project 2.1.3., The Territorial Impact of CAP and the Rural Development Policy

Map 4.2: Total Pillar 1 support per hectare UAA, 1999




Figure 17. ESPON 2006, Project 2.1.3., The Territorial Impact of CAP and the Rural Development Policy

Additional Map 6.7: Arable as a percentage of total UAA, 1997-99




Figure 18. ESPON 2006, Project 2.1.3., The Territorial Impact of CAP and the Rural Development Policy

Additional Map 6.3: Average size of holding in ESU, 1997

