

Conclusion of Working Meeting of the DONAUREGIONEN+ project

Date: 2nd February 2011

Place: Hotel Flamenco, Budapest, Hungary

Budapest, 1113, Tas vezér utca 3-7.

<http://www.danubiushotels.hu/flamenco>

Participants:

1. Darázs Melinda - Lead Partner
2. Július Hanus - ERDF PP1 - Institute for Spatial Planning
3. Aleš Baláži - ERDF PP1 - Institute for Spatial Planning
4. Ľubomír Macák - ERDF PP1 - Institute for Spatial Planning
5. Pavol Petrík - ERDF PP1 - Institute for Spatial Planning
6. Henrieta Hošovská - ERDF PP2 - Bratislava Self-Governing Region
7. Ladislav Olekšák - ERDF PP2 - Bratislava Self-Governing Region
8. Romana Peniakova - ERDF PP2 - Bratislava Self-Governing Region
9. Roman Tašký - ERDF PP 3 - Trnava Self-governing region
10. Adriana Píšová - ERDF PP 3 - Trnava Self-governing region
11. Daniela Páleníková- ERDF PP 3 - Trnava Self-governing region
12. Martin Čaja - ERDF PP4 - Nitra Self-Governing Region
13. Gertrúda Čuboňová - ERDF PP4 - Nitra Self-Governing Region
14. Beláková Tatiana - ERDF PP4 - Nitra Self-Governing Region
15. Attila Bognár - ERDF PP5 - Self Government of Pest County
16. Katalin Nemeth - ERDF PP6 - Pest County Regional Development Agency
17. Lajos Veres - ERDF PP7 – Scientific Association for Spatial Development
18. Tamas Dienes - ERDF PP7 – Scientific Association for Spatial Development
19. Marton Lendvay-ERDF PP7– Scientific Association for Spatial Development
20. Attila Korompai - ERDF PP7 – SASD external expert
21. László Herald - ERDF PP7 – SASD external expert
22. Péter Kovács - ERDF PP7 – SASD external expert
23. Dániel Tarnai - ERDF PP7 – SASD external expert
24. András Kovács - ERDF PP7 – SASD external expert

Project administration

The 2nd Cross Danube Meeting in Budapest was dedicated to continue the discussion in the 1st CDR in Podbanske, Slovakia in April 2010. At the beginning of the 2nd CDR Melinda mentioned the main re-allocation changes, which is that ERDF PP 7 will receive a total of 48800 EUR (from ERDF PP1 - 7800 EUR and from ERDF PP 5 - 41000 EUR.)

Methodology

Pavol Petrik described the main methodological issues for the CDRs. It included the SWOT analysis, the strategy objectives, map outputs, time accessibility. It also requires the analysis of NUTS 3 for the 4 GS-s and meetings with the stakeholders as well. In terms of the measures we take into account only the ones which were included in WP 5. The source of the SWOT is the WP 5. The strategy includes objectives, priorities and measures and specialized for the 4 General schemes. Map outputs will be displayed for the 4 GS-s. New proposal for the measures evaluation: minimum and maximum for probability and value. Responsibilities for the 6 ASH subregions: 1, Bratislava- PP2, 2, Győr- PP3, 3, Tatabánya – PP4, 4, Esztergom – PP6, 5, Budapest – PP5, 6, Székesfehérvár – PP6. (the last 3 can be changed). Final deadline: 30. September 2011. For each CDR an analytical and synthetical analysis is required.

The GIS accessibility map was highly developed by Ales Balazi. In Slovakia the settlement, transport, natural conditions, was made in different layers for different layers (1996, 2001, 2006, 2008). The base maps will be finished by the workshop in Moldova (by the end of March). The data for Hungary is missing at the moment. GIS data is important in terms of the indicators.

Presentations

Tamás Dienes in his presentations highlighted the characteristics of the Hungarian part of the Bratislava- Mosonmagyaróvár CDR. The border can be the Mosonmagyaróvár small region. Julius Hanus told that the Slovakian part was mainly described in the webportal. Question is the evaluation of the impact of the measures to the specific indicators. There are lot of measures with no cross danube impact.

Attila Korompai mentioned the importance of Győr in his CDR presentation with different tables and calculations. He also draw attention to the water port at Gönyű, the airport at Pér and the automobile cluster of Audi in Győr.

András Kovács described the Komárom-Esztergom CDR, where a new ferry is expected at Látatlan (within one year) and there are plans for two new bridges (Komárom and Esztergom). The Cross Danube cooperation can be the tourism (forest, health tourism) as well as common research work withing the universities (Tatabánya College, Nitra). The border can be the Esztergom-Látatlan small region.

Márton Lendvay talked about the Danube-bend CDR. Here there are too many organisations dealing with the Danube and there are plenty of documents. Probably Vác should be treated separately. According to Julius Hanus it is just the opposite than the Mosonmagyaróvár part.

László Herald described the Budapest and its agglomeration CDR. Julius Hanus highlighted the disurbanisation process.

Péter Kovács introduced the Dunaújváros-Székesfehérvár CDR but only its part in Fejér county. The biggest city here is Székesfehérvár. Dániel Tarnai described the other part of the Dunaújváros-Székesfehérvár CDR, which is located in Bács-Kiskun county. The main development here is the Mercedes – Benz factory in Kecskemét as well as the Department for Automotive Industry in the Kecskemét College.

Discussion – measures and indicators

After the presentations on the different DCRs Julius Hanus highlighted the importance of estimating the impacts of the measures.

Lajos Veres told that it is important to position the values now and by 2020. His opinion that it is very important to make priorities within the measures as there are plenty of measures. According to Julius Hanus only the relevant measures are important and we have to take into account the ones which have CDR effect (we have to decide these measures in WP 5). Julius Hanus described the importance of the web portal and his idea is to have a minimum and a maximum value of the impact values therefore determine an optimist and a pessimist scenario. It is also required to match the relevant documents to relevant measures. Lubomir Macak's idea is to make a table which shows the indicators and the following values for each indicator:

- Y (2020),
- Y (cross danube- 2020)
- change.

Whereas: Y (cross danube- 2020) is the value which is the sum of Y plus the impact of the other CDR on this region (Y1). He told that in WP 6 not only county SWOTs are needed but a common summary also.

Julius Hanus told that at least 1 sample can be made which includes the definition of the connection between the measures and the indicators. The first sample can be Nitra and Komárom-Esztergom county, but we have to finish WP 5 first. We should not loose the special characteristics of the CDR, in which the opinion of the local stakeholders have to be taken into account. The question is how to select the measures. The determined appr. 100 measures for Nitra county. Lajos Veres told that we can also create new measures (after making priority in the rpresent ones). There is only a few measures related to the Danube. Julius Hanus replied that each measure should have geographic representation, however in case of 50 CDRs and 100 measures it means 5000 measures. Attila Korompai suggested the filtering should be made if it has impact on the Danube. We can define direct, indirect impacts and key measures for the area. We can also group the measures: environment, transport, public services etc. Julius Hanus recommended to create a reference table and to built a stimulation modell.

In the group works we tried to border the CDR and define the main objectives and measures but finally it seemed that the discussion on this question as well as on the number of the CDRs has to be continued later.