

APRIL 2015
EUROPEAN COMMISSION

SUPPORT TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STRATEGIC WORK PROGRAMME OF THE SOUTH
EAST EUROPE TRANSPORT OBSERVATORY (SEETO) – TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

ACTION PLAN TO ESTABLISH SOUTH EAST EUROPEAN TRANSPORT FLAGSHIP CORRIDORS

DISCLAIMER:

The content of this report is the sole responsibility of the Framework Contractor and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the European Union

APRIL 2015
EUROPEAN COMMISSION

SUPPORT TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STRATEGIC WORK PROGRAMME OF THE
SOUTH EAST EUROPE TRANSPORT OBSERVATORY (SEETO) – TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

ACTION PLAN TO ESTABLISH SOUTH EAST EUROPEAN TRANSPORT FLAGSHIP CORRIDORS

PROJECT NO.	2013/329043 (MFC2-332)
DOCUMENT NO.	ACTION PLAN
VERSION	2
DATE OF ISSUE	16/03/2015
PREPARED	Tatjana Mirkovic and Klaus Uhl
CHECKED	THTS
APPROVED	THTS

Contents

Introduction to the Action Plan.....	7
Objectives	7
Structure.....	7
Corridor related structure of the subgroups:.....	8
Progress monitoring mechanism for ACTION PLAN	8
Further actions to be included in the future:	9
Conclusions.....	9
Expected results from the implemented Action Plan	9
HORIZONTAL ACTIONS	11
Action No. 1 Establish the Transport Facilitation Working Group (TF WG)	12
Action No. 2 Establish corridor management on selected flagship corridor that have a Sub-group on a pilot basis by using the model of the corridor management for the European Corridors.....	14
Action No. 3 Support Rail Market opening for the SEETO region.	16
Action No. 4 Ensure that the electronic transmission system of the road sector (e.g. SEED or NCTS) or rail-specific systems (e.g. RAILDATA, RNE systems, etc.) are applied to the railway sector	17
Action No. 5 Establish joint road border crossings with the principle of one stopping based on Sukobin-Murican BCP	19
Action No. 6 Harmonise the axle load taxes between the SEETO participants and the EU member states .	20
Action No. 7 Study the possibility of division of labour between geographically close road BCPs in order to reduce queuing and procedure times at the borders	21
Action No. 8: Transpose into national law the Regulation 913/2010/EU to establish international market-oriented Rail Freight Corridors (RFCs)	22
Action No. 9 Prepare the application and become a member of RNE and join RNE international Working Groups	23
Action No. 10 Enhance rail operations in the entire port operations of the ports on SEETO Flagship Corridors Bar, Durrës and Ploče by improving the railway infrastructure, the efficiency of rail operations and the logistics between maritime and rail transport.....	25
Action No. 11 Actively involve the ports (authorities and operators) of the SEETO Flagship Corridors in the promotion and management of the respective flagship corridors where they are located.....	27
CORRIDOR X (HIGHEST TRAFFIC FLOWS + CONNECTIVITY PORT OF THESSALONIKI AND BELGRADE)	29
Action No. 12 Conclude negotiations on all rail BCAs between Hungary and Serbia based on the models for the border crossing agreements	30

Action No. 13 Conclude negotiations between Croatia and Serbia based on the model for the rail BCAs ...	32
Action No. 14 Find a solution to render possible the signature of the border crossing agreement between the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Greece according to the model agreement of SEETO	34
Action No. 15 Initiate activities with the support of the European Commission and SEETO to open up technical discussions on the various border crossing agreements according to the SEETO model for the new border crossing point (BCP) between Bitola and Florina.	35
Action No. 16 Initiate meetings with the competent EC DG Customs to discuss the possibilities of simplifying the transit procedures for goods to and from EU member states to and from Greece, based on model agreements Switzerland/EU, Norway/Sweden or EU/Russia for the corridor Kaliningrad – Lithuania	36
Action No. 17 Install a fully functional border police office at the Greek border station (BCP Idomeni – Corridor X) to shorten delays for international passenger trains.	37
Action No. 18 Support the competent Ministries in Serbia and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to implement the border crossing agreement	38
Action No. 19 Adapt the BCA between Bulgaria and Serbia to the EU legislation, use as model the BCA Ruse (already notified by EC) or the SEETO model	39
Action No. 20 Build new parking space for lorries on E 70 motorways that enter into Croatia to avoid blocking the motorway by waiting lorries.....	40
Action No. 21 Establish joint border control, customs and border police on the motorway E-70 of Serbian border point Batrovci and the Croatian border point Bajakovo for border police and customs.....	41
Action No. 22 Initiate research on the present legal status of the terminal in Serbia at the Serbian-former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia border in order to find out why the terminal has not been used for its original purpose.....	42
CORRIDOR Vc (CONNECTIVITY PORT OF PLOCE AND SAVA RIVER)	43
Action No. 23 Conclude negotiations between Bosnia and Herzegovina and Croatia for all rail BCA, based on the SEETO model for the BCA.....	44
Action No. 24 Find out the legal, operational and technical demands of the market participants that shall act on the Corridor Vc to ensure an increasing competitiveness and attractiveness of Corridor Vc to and from the port of Ploce	45
CORRIDOR VIII + ROUTE 7 (CONNECTIVITY PORT OF DURRES, CORRIDOR X AND BLACK SEA)	46
Action No. 25 Find out the legal, operational and technical demands of the market participants that shall act on the Corridor VIII to ensure an increasing competitiveness and attractiveness of Corridor VIII to and from the port of Durres.	47
Action No. 26 Study the possibility/feasibility of reopening respectively rehabilitating the railway line between Pristina and Nis and build a new joint railway border crossing point station at Merdare/Podujevo (not part of SEETO flagship axes)	48
Action No. 27 Provide one parking lane on each side of joint crossing point Merdare in order to avoid the occupation of the normal road by waiting lorries and busses and to increase the safety	49

Action No. 28 Build new parking space for lorries to avoid blocking the motorway by waiting lorries at the BCP Albania- Kosovo*.....	50
ROUTE 4 (CONNECTIVITY PORT OF BAR, CORRIDOR X, DANUBE AND CORRIDOR IV).....	51
Action No. 29 Improve the competitiveness and attractiveness of the flagship Corridor Bar – Belgrade and Eastern Europe by improving the communication among the border stakeholders/railways by means of electronic transmission	52
Action No. 30 SEETO initiates the respective steps with both Montenegro and Serbia border police and customs authorities to render possible the installation of the respective office space at the rail border stations in order to enable joint controls on moving trains between the two countries.	54
Action No. 31 Adapt the existing rail BCA between Serbia and Montenegro based on the model for the border crossing agreement	55
Action No. 32 Provide joint border infrastructure (single window) installations at the road border control on Route 4 between Serbia and Montenegro.....	56
Action No. 33 Port of Pancevo to be included in the comprehensive Flagship Corridor	57

Introduction to the Action Plan

Objectives

The ACTION PLAN has two basic objectives:

- › Actions to establish an organisational structure the aim of which is to implement specific activities, the “Horizontal Actions”.
- › Corridor related Actions the aim of which is to improve the attractiveness and competitiveness of the SEETO FLAGSHIP CORRIDORS, the “Corridor related Action”.

Structure

The ACTION PLAN is structured in the following way:

Action:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › What to do? (horizontal and corridor related measures to be undertaken) › A brief description of the main measure and some sub-measures › The activities are the direct outcome of the field visits, the interviews with market participants, the two workshops in Brussels and Belgrade and, partially of the recommendations of the SEETO 2009 report.
Actors:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Who does it? › Who does it with whom? › The responsible institution/agency that should be the leader for the implementation. The decision on who is the responsible person or institution is paramount importance. The decision on who is the responsible person or institution is paramount importance. The experience shows that THERE IS NO CLEAR RESPONSIBLE for actions proposed in various reports, even if they do not require any funds but simply engagement and maybe a relatively easy work to detail them. However, the lack of management and lobbying experience or sheer lack of interest have hampered execution of activities in the past. Therefore, the consultants (the "TEAM") expects many discussions on the Who does it? The responsibility and hopes that the EC will closely monitor the actions.
Timeline:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Until when? › The time schedule proposed by the TEAM is based on a start of implementation immediately after the end of the project (i.e. May 2015). This has to be adapted by the TFWG and the responsible person in charge of the activity.
Cost:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Cost estimates for the actions if available › The cost estimations proposed by the TEAM are estimations based on similar activities or projects carried in the region, in the process of implementation/tendering or data from similar projects in the EU, information received from people in the field that proposed or supported the activity.
Justification:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › What is the best practice/are the benchmarks (examples from the region or from the European Union)? › This column gives a brief description of the reasoning of the activity and refers to the mission reports for more details (Annex 12). › The data underlying data has been obtained by the TEAM during the field visits.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › The TEAM understands that the proposed action being in reality short term actions will have an immediate positive effect on the attractiveness and competitiveness of the corridors in the region. › The persons interviewed and the two workshops carried out clearly prove that the market participants have the same perception that is mirrored in the ACTION PLAN. › It is not new that the market, in particular the industry, expects these actions. The market participants have so far reacted to the unactivity of the competent bodies by looking for alternative ways and higher logistics cost (as defined of the totality of the cost of a supply chains). › In other words, the proposed activities are not new, no innovation by the TEAM, nothing revolutionary. They can be found as recommendations, proposals, etc. in many reports since, at least 2003 when the TEAM started working in the region.
Expected results:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › What are the expected results (what will the benefits be to improve the international transport in the region)? › A brief description of a possible outcome.

Some further explanatory notes:

Corridor related structure of the subgroups:

- › If the subgroups of the TFWG will be organised according to corridors, the sub-groups will tackle the proposed activities in a multimodal approach. They will be able to prove to the market that there is a will to improve the supply chains using the corridors.
- › A certain competitive behaviour might emerge since some corridors are in direct competition with each other. This applies in particular to the corridors of Ploce and Bar with their markets in Serbia/ Hungary and Durres and Bar with their markets in Albania and Montenegro, not to mention Corridor X that is already in full competition with the EU corridors to Turkey via Ruse and pretty soon with the Bulgarian corridor to Greece via the new Danube bridge Calafat – Vidin.

Progress monitoring mechanism for ACTION PLAN

- › An efficient and transparent monitoring is the key to a successful implementation of the Action Plan. Action Plans that have been carefully prepared, the implementation of which has not be properly and seriously monitored, cannot be consider sustainable and will sooner or later lose their meaning, their role and they will disintegrate.
- › To properly monitor the ACTION PLAN, those who monitor, those who are monitored and the means of monitoring have to be determined. Finally the timing of monitoring should be well known.
- › Although this project aims at the regional harmonisation and integration, it is worthwhile discussing whether the monitoring shall be carried out regionally if considering the past performance on monitoring.
- › The Consultant suggests a compromise. The monitoring shall be carried out by the future TF WG under the chairmanship of the EC with the support of SEETO Secretariat.
- › The members of the TF WG come from the relevant ministries in charge of trade, customs, border police, phytosanitary inspections of each SEETO Participant.
- › If the chairman is from DG MOVE it is the direct link between the SEETO Participants and DG MOVE.
- › TF WG does not need to meet more than twice a year since most of the implementation work is done in the SUB-GROUPS. On the organisation of the sub-groups see further down.
- › The TF WG directly reports to the SEETO Steering Committee.

- › In addition, TF WG will prepare a comprehensive annual report on the progress in the implementation of the ACTION PLAN. The report will be sent to the DG MOVE, DG NEAR, SEETO Steering Committee, to the Annual Ministerial Meeting and to IFI for their due consideration.
- › In the case that the next SEETO Annual Ministerial Meeting adopts the ACTION PLAN, the Ministers can give the mandate to the TF WG in order to propose remedial actions to the Ministers at future annual ministerial meetings in case of deviations and delays.

Further actions to be included in the future:

- › Ongoing Regional Transport Study (REBIS update) is expected to finish by June 2015. It will have a special part devoted to horizontal measures related to transport & logistics facilitation.
- › Worldbank study on Assessing options for establishing an EDI System in border crossing points in South East Europe to be finished by end of March 2015.
- › World Bank study Technical Assistance to Port of Ploce authority to improve efficiency and competitiveness on rail Corridor Vc and competitiveness of Port of Ploce, which will be finished in the last quarter of 2015.
- › It is recommended to integrate the proposed “priority actions” into the present Action Plan from the three above mentioned studies.

Conclusions

- › This ACTION PLAN tries to create the framework for the implementation of the outputs and measures suggested by this project in order to achieve the overall goal of the project.
- › The TF WG and its subgroups shall be responsible for the monitoring of its implementation in close collaboration with the EC and the SEETO Secretariat.
- › The resources needed are minimal and totally manageable for the SEETO Participants and for the SEETO Secretariat.
- › The major challenges of road BCP are not bilateral or legal instruments at the border but the electronic transmission among border authorities on both sides at the border.
- › The major challenges of rail BCP are the implementation of the SEETO model BCAs, their subsequent agreements and the electronic data transmission:
 - › new BCAs in conformity with EU legislation have not been probably or partially implemented with the result that they do not function
 - › The majorities of rail BCAs are not at all in conformity with EU legislation even if the BCPs are located at EU borders.
 - › There is a lack of electronic transmission of data among railways and between railways and border authorities on both sides of the border.
- › Finally, what is needed is the commitment of SEETO Participants to the common goal that this project has tried to serve and a vision for the quickest possible integration of SEETO Region into the European Transport Community and eventually into the European Union.

Expected results from the implemented Action Plan

- › Short term (1-2 years):
 - › Reduction of border dispatching times due to improved communication between the railways and border authorities (in particular customs)
 - › Improvement of road safety and security at road BCPs due to new parking lanes/places (with respective infrastructure eg. hygienic and sanitary).

- › Reduction of dispatching time at road BCPs due to the installation of single-window BCPs
- › Medium term (2-5 years)
 - › Increase in the attractiveness and competitiveness of corridors due to one-stop-shops for rail and the possibility of developing attractive supply chain products
 - › Installation of corridor/regional wide electronic exchange of data for customs and railways.
- › Long term (5-8 years)
 - › Integration of the SEETO Region into the European Transport network and in the global transport network.

HORIZONTAL ACTIONS

Action No. 1 Establish the Transport Facilitation Working Group (TF WG)

Activities

Under the chairmanship of the Commission, this group shall meet regularly (at least yearly) to deal with wide range of issues related to transport barriers, including rail and road border crossing issues, ports and terminals. In fact, the TF WG will guide the work for implementation of this Action Plan, establish corridor related subgroups and monitor them.

- › 1.1. Establish Terms of Reference for its own TF WG and for the respective Sub-groups.
- › 1.2. Hold meetings, at least twice per year. Invite the competent ministries, respective border authorities, other agencies, institutions and external stakeholders to the meetings. Prepare materials & conclusions
- › 1.3. Establish sub-groups per flagship axes corridor in coordination with core network corridors of the TEN-T
- › 1.4. Establish a monitoring system for the Action Plan
- › 1.5. Clarify the funding of the TF WG and the Sub-groups

Actors

Based on the decision of the SEETO Steering Committee (SC) meeting dated 4th December 2014

- › Activities 1.1 – 1.4: DG MOVE in coordination with relevant other DGs of the EC and with secretarial support of the SEETO Secretariat

Timeline

Start in May 2015

Cost estimations

- › 50.000 Euros consisting of one annual meetings of the TF WG and two annual meetings of each sub group. It is assumed that some participants are prepared to participate in the funding or at least pay the travel expenses
- › 4-5 subgroups, 5.000 Euros per subgroup meeting, 2 meetings per year

Justification

Without a result-oriented TW WG and its corridor-based sub-groups there will be no force to improve the transport sector of the SEETO Region. All past attempts with the given structures have not fulfilled the expectations.

Therefore:

- › Without objective oriented chairmanship the TF WG will not be successful. Therefore chairmanship by EC for European Commission is necessary.
- › TF WG is consisting of high-ranking persons such as assistant ministers competent for the overall implementation of the Action Plan including members from IFIs so decided by Chairman and the chairman of the SEETO SC.
- › Sub groups are necessary to implement the details per corridor.

Expected Results

- › The TF WG oversees implementation of the Action Plan. The TF WG:
 - › has established the sub-groups, defines their tasks to implement the activities of the Action Plan,
 - › has requested the competent authorities/market participants of the SEETO Participants and the EU to appoint the members of the Sub-groups,

- › has solved the questions of funding with the EU and the SEETO participants,
- › has established a monitoring system for itself and the sub-groups.

The major task of improving, the attractiveness of the flagship axes, in particular the border crossing by road and by rail has been achieved according to the requirements of the EU legislation in particular Directive 2012/34/EU based on agreement models already designed by the SEETO in previous studies and on the best practices of existing BCAs in the region.

Action No. 2 Establish corridor management on selected flagship corridor that have a Sub-group on a pilot basis by using the model of the corridor management for the European Corridors

Activities

- › 2.1. Prepare the required Memorandum of Understanding respectively another form of agreement based on the model used for the European Corridor I.
- › 2.2 Select the first corridor for the pilot.
- › 2.3. Select the chairman of the corridor management.
- › 2.4. Secretarial support to the chairman of the corridor management to get operating.

Actors

- › Activity 2.1: TFWG In close cooperation with the coordinators of – Orient/East Med corridor/Mediterranean Corridor/Rhine-Danube Corridor/EU Rail Freight Corridor I
- › Activity 2.2: TFWG as 2.1 + Sub-Groups TFWG
- › Activity 2.3: TF WG+ Sub-Group of the respective corridor
- › Activity 2.4: Sub-Group of the respective corridor or TFWG

Timeline

September 2015

Cost estimate

- › Estimated costs of 30.000€ per annum mostly consisting of travel expenses, marketing activities on the assumption that the corridor manager is equally employed by one of the market participants and can fully use the office infrastructure. In the case of flagship axis with ports at the beginning/end, it is preferable that the ports are the corridor managers.

Justification

- › The Flagship corridor analysis showed that there is no corridor management established and that it should be inaugurated.
- › The Corridor Management consisting of the Corridor manager, assisted by the infrastructure managers, railway undertakings, customs and other authorities of the respective corridor (mostly 2-3 SEETO participants) is the implementing force of the activities.
- › They meet upon demand of the Corridor manager and have meetings with the competent persons on the corridor.
- › The Corridor manager should be a leading person from the Port Authority (or equivalent) or a Port operator since the Ports are the main feeders of goods, think multimodal and in terms of supply chains, and are the most interested stakeholders in building up a competitive hinterland transport system.
- › Since among the corridors related it is expected that there will be a certain degree of competition among the corridors which will be helpful to advance in the implementation.

Best practice: Corridor management used in the EU with one difference, corridor manager is not rail infrastructure manager but port to ensure a multimodal

approach.

Reference: The presentation of the Corridor I management during the Railway Group meeting in Podgorica on 23rd May 2014 (under Chairmanship of Mr. Frank Jost, DG MOVE) showed the benefits of the Corridor management.

Expected Results

- › **By means of establishing a corridor management, transport fluidity shall be improved on a selected flagship corridor in the region thus rendering the corridor more effective and competitive.**

Action No. 3 Support Rail Market opening for the SEETO region.	
Activities	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › 3.1 Influence, monitor and report to EC the implementation of the railway laws and subsequent ordinances of the SEETO participants. › 3.2 Set up an objective for all activities in the table of the Addendum to the Memorandum of Understanding on the Development of South East Europe Core Regional Transport Network for the South Eastern European Railway Transport Area to be fulfilled until end of 2015. › 3.3 Revise the Table for implementation of the Addendum to the Memorandum of Understanding on the Development of South East Europe Core Regional Transport Network for the South Eastern European Railway Transport Area. 	
Actors	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Activity 3.1: SEETO Railway Working Group (RWWG) under chairmanship of DG MOVE › Activity: 3.2: TFWG supported by SEETO Secretariat 	
Timeline	Cost
Beginning of activity in July 2015, Ending cannot be estimated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › No additional costs on the assumption that funds are available for the RWWG.
Justification	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › The main obstacle for smooth traffic operations in SEETO region is the lack of implementing the national railway laws of the SEETO Participants. This is blocked either by the competent ministries (for example Kosovo*, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Bosnia and Herzegovina), the powerful incumbent state-owned railways (Serbia) and the regulatory bodies (Kosovo*). The cases are known in the RW WG and documented in the respective minutes of the RW WG. The information is available at the DG MOVE, chairing the RWWG and in the SEETO Secretariat. Therefore, no further comments and justifications are necessary. This is a major task of the TF WG in close cooperation with the RW WG. 	
Expected Results	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › National and cross-border rail market opening for railway operators from the region and EU has been achieved 	

* This designation is without prejudice to positions on status, and is in line with UNSCR 1244/1999 and the ICJ Opinion on the Kosovo declaration of independence. This designation is applied throughout this document.

Action No. 4 Ensure that the electronic transmission system of the road sector (e.g. SEED or NCTS) or rail-specific systems (e.g. RAILDATA, RNE systems, etc.) are applied to the railway sector

Activities

- › 4.1. Implement application of NCTS and SEED to railway sector
- › 4.2. Implement application of rail-specific systems to improve electronic data exchange between RUs, Ims, and Border Authorities.
- › 4.3. Select one or two pilot BCPs to install such system.

Actors

- › Activity 4.1: Relevant Ministries, SEETO SC and CEFTA
- › Activity 4.2: Two competent ministries of SEETO Participants with joint borders, CER Customs Working Group (Contact person Wessel Sijl), Relevant Commission Services
- › Activity 4.3: SEETO Secretariat and European Commission (DG Customs) and TF WG Sub-Group of the respective flagship corridor.

Timeline

Beginning of July (when the road NCTS will be functioning at SEETO/EU borders.
Latest end of 2015

Cost estimation

- › SEED for road: 100.000€ per BCP including the installation of hardware and software.
Source: SEED specialist from EU project in SIV 3 building
- › EDI System: Initial Investment appr. 100.000€, operation and maintenance cost of appr. 33.000€ p.a., estimated annual saving of costs of 85.000€.
- › Estimated time saving 35% in comparison to existing technology (Source: WB study “Assessing options for establishing an EDI System in border crossing points in South East Europe” – to be published in April 2015).

Justification

- › Contrary to road, rail has not yet introduced neither SEED nor NCTS. In the EU, a new rail dedicated simplified transit procedure is in preparation based on Art. 233.4 UCC.
- › The basis should be the World Bank Report on the issue available as of April/May latest. One expert of the Consultant monitored this WB project on behalf of the WB.
- › The SEED system has already been installed at most road BCPs but so far has not been installed at all at rail BCPs which puts the railways at a competitive disadvantage and decreases its attractiveness for shippers and freight forwarders.
- › It can be considered as a regional transnational data transmission system between SEETO Participants among themselves as long as the NCTS has not been introduced. The NCTS is only applicable for trade movement with the EU. It is therefore installed at border points of SEETO Participants that are direct neighbours of EU MS and in this case for road only. To render rail more attractive and competitive, SEED shall be applied to international rail transport inside the SEETO region.

- › The RUs of the SEETO region have no electronic exchange of data, one of the major reasons for long stopping times at BCPs. This is a major competitive disadvantage. The WB study “Assessing options for establishing an EDI system in border crossing points in South East Europe” confirms it again. It will propose short-term and long-term options for the development. The short-term option could be easily introduced at various BCPs. It would already reduce dispatching times by up to 35% and will support the long-term implementation of harmonized EDI systems.

Best practice examples: Norwegian-Swedish rail border crossing between an EU Member State and an non-EU Member State; Russian-Finnish rail border crossing between an EU Member State and an non-EU Member State; former Swiss-EU transit rules.

Expected Results

- › Electronic transmission system has been applied to railways at BCPs to ensure an equal level of customs dispatch with the road.
- › Significant reduction in dispatching time achieved thanks to the introduction of an electronic interchange of data among the stakeholders (up to 35-70%).
- › The SEED or NCTS system for customs communications has been installed and implemented for the rail border crossings in the region.

Action No. 5 Establish joint road border crossings with the principle of one stopping based on Sukobin-Murican BCP

Activities

- › 5.1. Propose the road BCPs where police and custom control can be performed as “single window” (one stopping) based on already established agreements and protocols on Sukobin-Murican between Montenegro and Albania.

Actors

- › TF WG together with respective ministries of each country of the borders.

Timeline

After establishment of TF WG

Cost estimation

- › No additional cost

Justification

- › The principle of “single window” (one stopping) will reduce stopping time and delays on BCPs.
- › Improvement of safety and security on BCPs.

Best practice: Single Window BSP Albania-Montenegro.

Expected Results

- › Border control is jointly performed by officials of both parties in one location, carrying out all procedures of border control, including passport control, customs, veterinary and phytosanitary control.

Action No. 6 Harmonise the axle load taxes between the SEETO participants and the EU member states

Activities

- › 6.1. Prepare a Convention between the SEETO participants and the EU member states/the EU with respect to harmonised axle load taxation in order to avoid discrimination.

Actors

- › SEETO Secretariat together with a mandate from SEETO SC with DG MOVE, respectively Ministries of Transport of the SEETO participants.

Timeline

Beginning: Middle of 2015

Cost estimation

- › No additional cost

Justification

- › There have been complaints from Albanian truck operators. They pay higher axle load taxes when driving to Italy than, for example, Montenegrin truck drivers leading to a significant distortion. (Source: Port of Durres)
- › This might be one of the “soft discrimination measures” frequently applied to protect one’s own trucking industry irrespective of existing laws and regulations. This has to be investigated in more detail.

Expected Results

- › Harmonised or, at least, non-discriminatory axle load taxes between the SEETO participants and the EU member states.

Action No. 7 Study the possibility of division of labour between geographically close road BCPs in order to reduce queuing and procedure times at the borders	
Activities	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › 7.1. After study, submit proposals to the respective border authorities to evaluate the findings of the study. › 7.2 Support the implementation of the pilot programmes and monitor it. 	
Actors	
› All Activities: TF WG (road) supported by SEETO Secretariat, Competent border authorities, National SEED technical units and competent Ministries of Finance	
Timeline	Cost estimation
September 2015	› No additional cost
Justification	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › There is a good practice: A pilot project at the Serbian and Macedonian road border in Pelince between BCPs of: Presevo and Tabanovce. › The smaller BCP has led to a significant reduction of queuing time since many empty lorries are re-diverted. 	
Expected Results	
› Due to a division of labour between road and BCPs which are close geographically the border crossing time shall be reduced by re-directing empty lorries and buses or smaller lorries up to 7.5 tons to one of BCPs.	

Action No. 8: Transpose into national law the Regulation 913/2010/EU to establish international market-oriented Rail Freight Corridors (RFCs)	
Activities	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › 8.1. Transpose into national law the Regulation concerning a European Rail Network for Competitive Freight (Rail Freight Regulation 913/2010). 	
Actors	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › RWWG (in close cooperation with TFWG and SEETO SC), Infrastructure managers, SEETO secretariat 	
Timeline	Cost estimation
Beginning in 2016 earliest.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › No additional cost on the assumption that the involved infrastructure managers bear their own travel expenses.
Justification	
<p>Establishment of Corridor Management (See Action No. 2) and adoption of EU regulation concerning European Rail Network for Competitive Freight (RFC)) to meet three main challenges:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › strengthening co-operation between Infrastructure Managers on key aspects such as allocation of paths, deployment of interoperable systems and infrastructure development; › finding the right balance between freight and passenger traffic along the Rail Freight Corridors, giving adequate capacity for freight in line with market needs and ensuring that common punctuality targets for freight trains are met; › promoting intermodality between rail and other transport modes by integrating terminals into the corridor management process. › http://www.rne.eu/corridor-information-document-specification.html. 	
Expected Results	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › The Regulation concerning a European Rail Network for Competitive Freight (Rail Freight Regulation 913/2010) has been adopted. › Become part of RFC 6, 5 or form a new Rail freight corridor. 	

Action No. 9 Prepare the application and become a member of RNE and join RNE international Working Groups

Activities

- › 9.1. IMs – Prepare application and become member of RNE and join RNE international Working Groups
- › 9.2. Integrate SEETO flagship axes into the RNE corridor system and implement respective RNE procedures

Actors

- › All activities: Infrastructure Managers of Montenegro, Albania, and Kosovo

Timeline

During 2015

Cost estimation

- › Costs have to be born by the IMs (membership fee + traveling cost to meetings)

Justification

Becoming a member of RNE will foster the development of Flagship Corridors. Members benefit from:

- › Harmonised international timetabling process;
- › OSS network guarantees competent, prompt advice and support across all borders with a single face to the customer;
- › RNE TIS - Real-time supervision & management of European Rail Traffic;
- › RNE PCS – a IM and RU tool for processing international timetabling;
- › RNE CIS - access to European Infrastructure Pricing information;
- › Traffic Management & Train Performance Management - several projects to improve international operations and train performance.

As an umbrella organisation, most of RNE's work takes place through standing Working Groups and ad-hoc teams. Four Working Groups deal with the following areas on a permanent basis:

- › Sales & Timetabling;
- › Traffic Management.
- › Legal Matters
- › Network Statements

Expected Results

- › By means of OSS improved communication for the establishment of paths for international freight trains beyond the SEETO region.
- › Establish respective tools for Flagship Corridors.
- › Include the SEETO flagship axes into the RNE corridor system and implement respective RNE procedures.

Action No. 10 Enhance rail operations in the entire port operations of the ports on SEETO Flagship Corridors Bar, Durres and Ploce by improving the railway infrastructure, the efficiency of rail operations and the logistics between maritime and rail transport

Activities

- › 10.1. Clarify/ solve the legal and institutional issues with respect to ownership, management, operation and maintenance of rail infrastructure in the port.
- › 10.2. Clarify/ solve the legal and institutional issues with respect to rail operations.
- › 10.3. Improve the electronic communication and interchange between port operators, port authorities, rail operators and other stakeholders involved in the transfer of goods.
- › 10.4. Assess the market opportunities for commercial port operators or port authorities to establish their own rail operations inside and outside the ports.
- › 10.5. Improve the efficiency of loading and unloading of goods/ transfer of containers between ship and rail/ road in the ports.

Actors

- › All activities: Port Authorities and Port Operators, potentially railway infrastructure managers

Timeline

- › 10.1 – 10.2: until August 2015 for all ports
- › 10.3: latest until December 2016
- › 10.4: latest until December 2015
- › 10.5: latest until December 2016

Cost estimation

- › 10.1 – 10.2: no additional cost.
- › 10.3: up to 1 million Euros per participant (source: northern Adriatic ports).
- › 10.4: no additional cost. Later for licencing and safety certification varying according to the fees in the respective states, investing in equipment mostly on leasing basis. Different costs according to type and number of traction.
- › 10.5: difficult to estimate. Depending on assessment in each port.

Justification

- › The visits to the ports Bar, Durres and Ploce have shown that clarification is needed on the legal and institutional role of the railways, resulting from historical developments.
- › In some cases, the respective railway laws are not very explicit when dealing with ports as rail infrastructure managers and/ or rail operators.
- › There seems to exist conflicts between national port/ maritime and railway laws. It remains unclear whether the rail infrastructure in the port belongs to the port authority, the concessioned port operator or the state-owned infrastructure manager.
- › Rail network statements do not exist, neither do clear agreements on private sidings. The result is that in many cases nobody responsible to improve infrastructure and rail operations, although port operators have expressed interest to establish their own operations inside and outside the ports and consider it as a market opportunity to attract more volumes to their ports. Even if open access is legally possible, a new entrant could not enter the port or be active in the port due to the above mentioned legal and institutional uncertainties.
- › Port authorities and port operators do not seem to have the necessary exchange of information, railways, port operators and shipping companies do not have

process oriented electronic communication to ensure an efficient transfer of goods between the two modes.

Best practice examples: In the wider region Port of Koper. Most successful ports of Hamburg and Duisburg/ Rhine.

Expected Results

- › Possibility for ports to establish hinterland supply chains under their own control, thus offering multimodal chains of transportations with shipping lines, as a new market opportunity to render their port more attractive and competitive.
- › Open access to ports increasing efficiency and competitiveness with a perspective to lower the logistics costs of the overall transport. Better communication among the various stake holders in the supply chain reduce handling costs and handling time.

Action No. 11 Actively involve the ports (authorities and operators) of the SEETO Flagship Corridors in the promotion and management of the respective flagship corridors where they are located

Activities

- › 11.1. Improve the marketing and sales organisation of the ports in order to attract additional traffic flows along the corridors by establishing a network of sales points (sales representatives).
- › 11.2. Invest or participate (via joint ventures) in hinterland logistics centers alongside the corridors. With the aim of establishing seamless supply chains to their ports.
- › 11.3. Take over the intermodal corridor management of the respective flagship corridor as corridor manager heading various working project teams. The objectives of which are to implement the corridor specific actions proposed in the present action plan. See a Action No. 2.

Actors

- › All activities: Port authorities (or national equivalent) and port operators

Timeline

- › 11.1: latest until June 2016
- › 11.2: latest until December 2016
- › 11.3: until September 2015

Cost estimation

- › 11.1: Employment of marketing director plus one or two sales persons per operator. Appr. 100.000€ p.a. (salaries, boni, labour costs). Depending on the location 50.000-75.000€ p.a. per sales point, assuming one sales representative plus assistant and office rent, plus material (source: similar transport sales services in the area).
- › 11.2: a financial evaluation for each case is required – depending on type of participation and investment volume.
- › 11.3: see Action 2.

Justification

The visits to the ports and interviews with participants in the transport sector have clearly shown that the three ports Bar, Durrës and Ploče have no sales activities (hard selling) in the hinterland alongside the corridors. Contrary to the competitors in the North Sea range, they are not present in the industrial centers and big logistic centers of the area, in particular in the land locked countries of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Hungary, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Serbia. Presentations of the ports in the occasional seminar or workshop do not help to actively acquire new customers!

The ports in question do not have and do not participate in logistic centers in their catchment areas. They leave hinterland logistics centers to freight forwarders that can decide on the selection of the ports freely.

The more successful ports, in particular in the North Sea range, have already established a network of logistic centers or participate in logistics centers of land locked countries of Czech Republic, Slovakia, Austria and Hungary, thus ensuring that goods are attracted to their ports.

The fact finding missions have shown that the only stakeholders that could really be interested in an attractive and competitive corridor are the ports, which are the “feeder institutions” for the corridors. Their competitiveness depends on an attractive hinterland corridor. The state owned railway companies do seem to have an

interest in thinking corridor-wise. More over, they lack any marketing and sales organisation.

Expected Results

- › 11.1: better marketing and sales performance of the three ports Bar, Durres and Ploce, which are in strong competition with the northern Adriatic ports as well as southern Italian, Greek and Black Sea ports (Constanta, Danube). Better promotion of corridors that are not really known in the transport market by the global transport players that serve the Adriatic Sea.
- › 11.2: establishment of “seamless” multimodal chains of transport, land and sea managed by the port operator.
- › 22.3: see Action 2.

CORRIDOR X (HIGHEST TRAFFIC FLOWS + CONNECTIVITY PORT OF THESSALONIKI AND BELGRADE)

Action No. 12 Conclude negotiations on all rail BCAs between Hungary and Serbia based on the models for the border crossing agreements

Activities

- › 12.1 Prepare of Border police agreement
- › 12.2 Prepare of Customs agreement
- › 12.3 Prepare of Phyto-sanitary agreement
- › 12.4 Prepare of Sanitary agreement

Actors

Ministries of Serbia and Hungary with their competent Directorates

- › 12.1: Ministries of Internal Affairs (Hungary and Serbia)
- › 12.2: Ministries of Finance (Serbia and Hungary)
- › 12.3: Ministries of Agriculture (Serbia and Hungary)
- › 12.4: Ministries of Health (Serbia and Hungary)
- › All activities: In cooperation with Sub-Group of the respective corridor. Involvement of the European Commission might be necessary

Timeline

- › Beginning of negotiations August 2015

Cost estimation

- › No additional cost for the legal implementation such as agreements and subsequent agreement.
- › When it comes to the decision to establish joint border stations, costs will arise but they are difficult to estimate at present. This would require a detailed costing study.

Justification

- › Since 2009, no action has been undertaken by the competent governments.
- › Existing rail BCA is NOT in conformity with EU legislation, in particular with Art. 5, 7, 10, and 13 of 2012/34/EU.
- › Danger of infringement process against Hungary.
- › As long as the BCA between Hungary and Serbia are not in conformity with Directive 2012/34/EU, it is of no use carrying any investment in rail infrastructure

beforehand of the joint border station at Subotica

- › There exists already a bilateral agreement on joint controls of Border Police in a border zone
- › Model BCA could be the BCA between Serbia and former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

Expected Results

- › Bilateral border crossing agreements between Serbia and Hungary have come into force according to the SEETO model, including the subsequent agreements between the border police, customs authorities, phytosanitary and sanitary (veterinary) agreements and considering specific items of the EU legislation concerning EU borders (Schengen etc.)

Action No. 13 Conclude negotiations between Croatia and Serbia based on the model for the rail BCAs

Activities

- › 13.1. Prepare Border police agreement
- › 13.2. Prepare Customs agreement
- › 13.3. Prepare Phyto-sanitary agreement
- › 13.4. Prepare Sanitary agreement

Actors

- › Ministries of Croatia and Serbia with their competent Directorates
 - › 13.1. Ministries of Internal Affairs (Serbia and Croatia)
 - › 13.2. Ministries of Finance (Serbia and Croatia)
 - › 13.3. Ministries of Agriculture (Serbia and Croatia)
 - › 13.4. Ministries of Health (Serbia and Croatia)
- › All activities: Support from SEETO Secretariat

Timeline

- › Beginning of negotiations March 2015.
- › End: December 2015

Cost estimation

- › No additional cost for the negotiation.
- › There will be costs for the joint station and accommodation of the border agencies of other countries. This cost can not be estimated by Consultant but there is a need for Feasibility study.

Justification

- › Since 2009, no action has been undertaken by the competent governments.
- › Existing rail BCA are NOT in conformity with EU legislation, in particular with Art. 5, 7, 10, and 13 of 2012/34/EU.
- › Danger of infringement process against Croatia.
- › Of no use carrying any investment in rail BCP infrastructure beforehand. When the BCA is signed and joint border station agreed, there will be costs for the joint station and accommodation of the border agencies of other countries.
- › There exists already a bilateral agreement on joint controls of Border Police in a border zone
- › Model BCA could be the BCA between Serbia and Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

Expected Results

Bilateral border crossing agreements between Serbia and Croatia have come into force according to the SEETO model, including the subsequent agreements between the border police, customs authorities, phyto-sanitary and sanitary (veterinary) agreements and considering specific items of the EU legislation concerning EU borders (Schengen etc.)

Action No. 14 Find a solution to render possible the signature of the border crossing agreement between the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Greece according to the model agreement of SEETO

Activities

- › 14.1. Initiate actions to determine possible solutions to implement the agreement taking into account the present dispute on the name giving.
- › 14.2. Propose solutions that the parties start discussing the proposal of the border crossing agreement.
- › 14.3. Arrange a meeting supported by the EC and SEETO between the two Ministries of Transport to discuss the contents of the SEETO model agreement taking into account the naming issue. The meeting shall be a purely technical meeting to foster common understanding of the model agreement.
- › 14.4. Discuss the possibility of joint border station and it's financing.

Actors

- › All activities: These need to be done jointly by the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Greece – while the EC can facilitate the dialogue. SEETO SC and Secretariat can be involved on an observer basis.

Timeline

No later than 2nd half of 2015

Cost estimation

- › Cost for the meetings to be planned as part of the regular activities of the respective ministries – participation in mixed commissions for BCPs. In fact, buildings and other rail infrastructure have already been built with EU funds but are not used or only partially used. For further information see reports of the fact finding mission.

Justification

- › The model agreement of SEETO has already been sent to the competent Ministry of Transport in Greece by the Ministry of Transport and Communications in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. So far no reply. However, the model agreement has been proposed by Greece to Bulgaria for the Bulgarian-Greek border crossings and is under negotiation!
- › Without solution, corridor X will not be competitive with sea and with future Vidin-Califat rail corridor.
- › Without pressure from the EU, nothing will happen.

Expected Results

- › Implementable solutions have been found to render possible bilateral agreements between the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Greece concerning the border crossings for rail.

Action No. 15 Initiate activities with the support of the European Commission and SEETO to open up technical discussions on the various border crossing agreements according to the SEETO model for the new border crossing point (BCP) between Bitola and Florina.

Activities

- › 15.1. Open up of technical discussions on the various border crossing agreements according to the SEETO model for the new border crossing point (BCP) between Bitola and Florina (not part of SEETO flagship axis corridor but important border crossing in the region).

Actors

- › Competent Ministries of Transport in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Greece,
- › The European Commission can facilitate the dialogue.

Timeline

December 2017 -2018 depending on how much EU is willing to fund the establishment.

Cost estimation

- › Cost for the meetings to be planned as part of the regular activities of the respective ministries – participation in mixed commissions for BCPs are already financed by the EU.
- › The study will give first indications on how much it will cost.

Justification

- › Design and construction plans are already prepared for reconstruction of this BCP although it is not on the flagship corridors. But EU finances the studies There seems to be a decision that it will be a joint border crossing installed on the Greek side. The notion of joint border crossing is not quite clear to both sides.

Expected Results

- › Before the opening of the new border crossing between Greece and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia on the Bitola line, the respective border crossing agreement and the subsequent agreements with police, customs and other border authorities, as well as infrastructure managers and transport operators shall be prepared and signed

Action No. 16 Initiate meetings with the competent EC DG Customs to discuss the possibilities of simplifying the transit procedures for goods to and from EU member states to and from Greece, based on model agreements Switzerland/EU, Norway/Sweden or EU/Russia for the corridor Kaliningrad – Lithuania

Activities

- › 16.1. Open up discussions on simplifying the transit procedures for goods to and from EU member states on Corridor X to and from Greece, based on a model agreement used between Switzerland and the European Union, between Norway and Sweden or EU with Russia for the corridor Kaliningrad – Lithuania

Actors

- › DG MOVE establishing contacts with the competent DGs (Customs + Home) and involvement of CEFTA.
- › SEETO Secretariat

Timeline

Middle of 2015

Cost estimation

- › Estimation for upgrade of the system and some capacity building is 300.000 Euro

Justification

- › The transit procedures are complicated due to the national borders with Serbia and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. This situation leads to a tendency to avoid Corridor X and to give preference to Corridor IV and the competing Corridor through Bulgaria to Greece with detours of more than 300 km, if via Ruse – which might be shortened when Calafat - Vidin is fully operational.
- › For freight transport with the Greece, it will be less time-consuming in the future to use an “all-in EU” corridor instead of using Corridor X. First test trains between Bulgaria have taken place with good market response. The only problem on the Bulgarian corridor is the BCP with Greece which is not in compliance with EU regulations (see ANNEX 5).Action from the EC is required.

Expected Results

- › The customs procedures for goods going to or coming from EU member states, transiting the Non-EU member states on Corridor X to and from Greece shall be simplified.

Action No. 17 Install a fully functional border police office at the Greek border station (BCP Idomeni – Corridor X) to shorten delays for international passenger trains.

Activities

- › 17.1. Analyse the situation with the help of the Greek border police and TRENOSSE passenger services at Thessaloniki.
- › 17.2. Make a first cost calculation for the costs of installing the equipment.
- › 17.3. Render possible controls of Greek border police and customs on running trains between the two BCPs in step 1.
- › 17.4. Render possible joint controls of border police and customs of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Greece on running trains as step 2.

Actors

- › All activities:
 - › Competent ministries of Greece and the former Yugoslav Republic of as well as national rail and border police.
 - › The European Commission and SEETO can facilitate the work if needed

Timeline

2nd half of 2015

Cost estimation

- › According to civil engineering practice, restoration of the offices is estimated to be not more than 50 euro/m2 according to the Greek border police
- › There is a need for painting of the walls and repair of some installations+ cost for equipment and cost to be furnished by Greek border police
- › TRENOSSE is prepared to pay or to participate for the installation of the electronic equipment. Investment cost would not be more than 200.000 Euro.

Justification

- › At the moment there is an empty border police office at the Greek BCP. The border police officers are not equipped with the respective control equipment including transmission lines which enables them to check the passports. For this reason the passports have to be transported 1 km away to a road border station. During this time the passengers wait for the passports on the train.
- › The border police and passenger service of TrainOSE S.A. as well as customs, are cooperative and willing to collaborate and find a solution in a first step on the Greek side and later on as joint controls on passenger trains between Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Greece (result of visits of SEETO experts on 20th May 2014).

Expected Results

- › The checking of passports on international trains between Greece and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia has been improved by reducing significantly the border stopping times at the Greek border stopping station.

Action No. 18 Support the competent Ministries in Serbia and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to implement the border crossing agreement	
Activities	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › 18.1. Check the status of the subsequent agreements (border police, customs, sanitary, phyto-sanitary, veterinary and rail infrastructure managers) be available for consultations and assist in the implementation of the subsequent agreements 	
Actors	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Ministries in Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia › TFWG and/or the Sub-Group for Corridor X 	
Timeline	Cost estimation
As of December 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Cost for the meetings to be planned as part of the regular activities of the respective ministries – participation in mixed commissions for BCPs.
Justification	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › The SEETO BCA model has been signed by the competent ministries of Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. In order to implement it without delays on the most important rail Corridor in the region, Corridor X, SEETO shall give support for its full implementation. Experience has shown that the signature of the BCA does not necessarily mean that the BCA and its subsequent agreements are applied because most of the subsequent agreements and some technical infrastructure are not available. › There is a protocol dated 28 December 2013 between the border police of Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to intensify the joint police cooperation to diminish the time for border checks which can be considered as an important step for the joint border police inspection for railways. 	
Expected Results	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › The new border crossing agreement (BCA) with its subsequent agreements at the rail BCP Serbia – the former Yugoslave Republic of Macedonia has been implemented. 	

Action No. 19 Adapt the BCA between Bulgaria and Serbia to the EU legislation, use as model the BCA Ruse (already notified by EC) or the SEETO model	
Activities	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › 19.1. Adapt Border police agreement › 19.2. Adapt Customs agreement › 19.3. Adapt Phyto-sanitary agreement › 19.4. Adapt Sanitary agreement 	
Actors	
Ministries of Serbia and Bulgaria with their competent Directorates after due consultation of EC that is in charge of implementing the SCHENGEN agreement.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › 19.1 Ministries of Internal Affairs › 19.2 Ministries of Finance › 19.3 Ministries of Agriculture › 19.4 Ministries of Health 	
All activities: Supported by SEETO Secretariat (concerning electronic transmission issues) based on the results of the WB report. Supported by EC, SEETO and the WB in electronic matters.	
Timeline	Cost estimation
As of September 2015 depending on the finalisation of the WB Report.	Cost for the meetings to be planned as part of the regular activities of the respective ministries – participation in mixed commissions for BCPs. Feasibility of electronic data transmission for the respective options are in the WB report.
Justification	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Existing rail BCA is NOT in conformity with EU legislation, in particular with Art. 5, 7, 10, and 13 of 2012/34/EU on the Serbian side. › Danger of infringement process against Bulgaria. › There exists already a bilateral agreement on joint controls of Border Police in a border zone which has been unilaterally cancelled by BUL due to Schengen and other reasons which are said to have been imposed by the EC (Customs + Border police) › For further information see WB report. 	
Expected Results	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Bilateral border crossing agreements between Serbia and Bulgaria has been adapted to EU legislation according to the SEETO model or the Ruse (Bulgaria-Romania) BCA already notified by EC, including the subsequent agreements between the border police, customs authorities, phytosanitary and sanitary (veterinary) agreements and considering specific items of the EU legislation concerning EU borders (Schengen etc.) 	

Action No. 20 Build new parking space for lorries on E 70 motorways that enter into Croatia to avoid blocking the motorway by waiting lorries.	
Activities	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › 18.1. Make simple Feasibility Study and Main Design for new parking space for lorries. › 18.2. Build new parking space for lorries. 	
Actors	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › All activities: Ministries of Croatia and Serbia with their competent Directorates supported by SEETO Secretariat and TF WG (road). 	
Timeline	Cost estimation
End of 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › From the civil engineering practice the estimated cost is 100 euro/m² of required parking space.
Justification	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Parking on the emergency lane of the motorway E-70 at the border Croatia – Serbia leading to congestion and barring the emergency lane in case of danger. The most frequented BCP in the SEETO region. There is a significant volume of lorries (for 24h: more than 1000 lorries (370.000 lorries in 2013); 35.000 buses in 2013. › Road safety + sanitary + security issue with negative impact on health for waiting lorry drivers. 	
Expected Results	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › New parking space has been made available for lorries on the motorway E70 to avoid parking on the emergency lane on both sides of the motorway access to the Croatia and Serbia border stations. › The potential funding source for this project can be Cross Border Cooperation programme 2014-2020 (http://www.evropa.gov.rs/CBC/PublicSite/Default.aspx) 	

Action No. 21 Establish joint border control, customs and border police on the motorway E-70 of Serbian border point Batrovci and the Croatian border point Bajakovo for border police and customs.

Activities

- › 21.1. Revise border crossing agreements in order to include joint border control procedure
- › 21.2. Sign new BCAs
- › 21.3. Decide on joint border station

Actors

- › All activities: Ministries of Croatia and Serbia with their competent Directorates supported by SEETO Secretariat TF WG (road)

Timeline

End of 2015

Cost estimation

- › Approximate costs have to be determined.

Justification

Establishing the joint border control will provide the following benefits:

- › Transform complicated and time-extensive border crossing procedures into quicker and simpler operations for passengers and goods transit;
- › Reach a higher level of border control efficiency and transparency;
- › Reduce the border checkpoints functioning costs;
- › Reduce the risks of corruption and illegal trafficking.
- › More rapid and secure exchange of information on flow of goods and people, and on other issues related to border control improvement;
- › Enhanced cooperation among the two countries agencies responsible for border control;
- › Improve coordination of efforts focused on fighting criminality;
- › Accelerate border traffics as the time for border formalities is minimal.

Expected Results

- › Joint border control has been established considering specific EU legislation thus reducing delays by almost 50% of the waiting time (Source: based on experience of border police).

Action No. 22 Initiate research on the present legal status of the terminal in Serbia at the Serbian-former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia border in order to find out why the terminal has not been used for its original purpose

Activities

- › 23.1 Regularly ask the competent directorates about the status.
- › 23.2 Avoid that investments are carried out on the Macedonian side due to the temporary closure of the terminal. .
- › 23.3 Submit proposals for the use in close cooperation with the competent border police, customs and other border authorities at the present BCP involving Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.
- › 23.3 Support the decision-makers at EC level and Government level to calculate the costs of using the infrastructure and the funding.

Actors

- › All activities: TF WG, EU Delegation in Belgrade and sub-group Corridor X
- › 23.1 DG MOVE and the competent Serbian Ministry
- › 23.2 Competent Directorate General and the competent Serbian Ministry
- › 23.3 Competent DG of EC and the competent Serbian Ministry
- › 23.4 Competent DG of EC and the competent Serbian Ministry

Timeline

Regular requests on status

- › 23.3 End of May 2015
- › 23.4 End of July 2015

Cost estimation

- › Cost of reinstallation to be determined by EU Delegation in Belgrade together with the competent Serbian authorities.

Justification

- › The visit of the expert to this utterly neglected customs clearance terminal has shown that an important infrastructure for trade facilitation funded by the European Union to a private terminal operator that went bankrupt could be used to facilitate trade on Corridor X by decreasing queuing on both territories for entry into Serbia and further financing of parking space on the side of the the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. Furthermore, the space infrastructure and equipment funded by the European Union could be used.
- › According to information received from DG NEAR, there is a legal dispute regarding the concession and EC cannot do anything before the end this dispute.

Expected Results

- › Re-use of the neglected private terminal at the road border between Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia on E-75 owned by Intersped. It will be prepared for utilization of a customs clearance terminal, including the laboratories funded by the European Union in 2007 and never used for phyto-sanitary and sanitary controls and the parking space for lorries for customs clearance which at present block the access lanes to the BCPs of Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia which require further financing on the side of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia for parking space down to the village of Tabanovce.

CORRIDOR V_c (CONNECTIVITY PORT OF PLOCE AND SAVA RIVER)

Action No. 23 Conclude negotiations between Bosnia and Herzegovina and Croatia for all rail BCA, based on the SEETO model for the BCA.

Activities

- › 24.1. Prepare Border police agreement
- › 24.2. Prepare Customs agreement
- › 24.3. Prepare Phyto-sanitary agreement
- › 24.4. Prepare Sanitary agreement

Actors

- › All activities: Ministry of Transport and Communications of BiH and the competent Ministry of CRO with their competent Directorates in cooperation with SEETO SC and TFWG and/or Sub-Group.
- › 24.1: Ministries of Internal Affairs (BiH and CRO).
- › 24.2: Ministries of Finance(BiH and CRO)
- › 24.3: Ministries of Agriculture(BiH and CRO)
- › 24.4: Ministries of Health(BiH and CRO)

Timeline

End of 2015.

Beginning of as soon as possible in 2015.

End : December 2015

Cost estimation

- › No additional cost for the implementation of the BCA.

Justification

- › Since 2009 (TA SEETO 2008-2009), no action has been undertaken by the competent governments.
- › Existing rail BCA is NOT in conformity with EU legislation, in particular with Art. 5, 7, 10, and 13 of 2012/34/EU (see ANNEX 5)
- › Danger of infringement process against Croatia.
- › Of no use carrying any investment in BCA infrastructure beforehand (before having BCAs agreements in conformity with EU legislation and their implementation).

There exists already a bilateral agreement on joint controls of Border Police in a border zone.

Expected Results

- › Coming into force of the bilateral BCAs between Croatia (CRO) and Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) according to the SEETO model, including the subsequent agreements between the border police, customs authorities, phyto-sanitary and sanitary (veterinary) agreements.

Action No. 24 Find out the legal, operational and technical demands of the market participants that shall act on the Corridor Vc to ensure an increasing competitiveness and attractiveness of Corridor Vc to and from the port of Ploce

Activities

- › 25.1. Organise a workshop (Port Authority of Ploce is prepared to organize and host it) under the joint chairmanship of SEETO and the port authority of Ploce.
- › 25.2. Carry out a structured meeting, type of World Cafe inviting the respective shipping companies, freight forwarders, rail operators, Chambers of Commerce of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia, Hungary, Czechia, Slovakia.
- › 25.3 Based on the results of the workshop establish an Action Plan for Corridor Vc.

Actors

- › 25.1 TFWG and/or Sub-Group, Port authority Ploce
- › 25.2 TFWG and/or Sub-Group, Port authority Ploce
- › 25.3 TF WG (Ports), competent ministries and Port authority of Ploce

Timeline

11.06.2015 for public stakeholders in Sarajevo and in September/October in Zagreb.

Planned in September and October for the private sector in Ploce and Belgrade.

Cost estimation

- › Cost of the workshop is estimated to be 10.000 Euro. Possible finance from TAEX or IPA funds.

Justification

- › During the expert's mission Port Authority of Ploce stated that it intends to build up a new commercial strategy extending the catchment area to Serbia, Hungary, Czechia and Slovakia (see presentation of the port authority) in order to build a competitive and attractive Corridor Vc. It welcomed the idea of a structured workshop under the joint chairmanship of SEETO to find and analyse all legal, technical and operational obstacles that exist. For more details see reports of fact-finding mission: all meetings for Corridor Vc (connectivity port of Ploce and Sava river, Belgrade/Budapest).

Expected Results

- › Have been identified legal, operational and technical demands of the market participants that shall act on the Corridor Vc, to and from the port of Ploce.

CORRIDOR VIII + ROUTE 7 (CONNECTIVITY PORT OF DURRES, CORRIDOR X AND BLACK SEA)

Action No. 25 Find out the legal, operational and technical demands of the market participants that shall act on the Corridor VIII to ensure an increasing competitiveness and attractiveness of Corridor VIII to and from the port of Durres.

Activities

- › 26.1. Organize a workshop (Port Authority of Durres is prepared to organize and host it) under the joint chairmanship of SEETO and the port authority of Durres.
- › 26.2. Carry out a structured meeting, type of World Cafe inviting the respective shipping companies, freight forwarders, rail operators, Chambers of Commerce of Albania and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.
- › 26.3. Based on the results of the workshop establish an Action Plan for Corridor VIII.

Actors

- › All activities: TF WG and/or the Sub-Group and Port authority Durres

Timeline

Beginning: Latest 2nd half 2015

Cost estimation

- › Cost of the workshop is estimated to be 10.000 Euro. Possible finance from TAEX or IPA funds.

Justification

- › The corridor VIII does not function in the rail sector. There are no trains in direction to the border of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. See also Activity 22. The newly built motorway to Kosovo (not part of corridor VIII but a further connection to the port of Durres) , functions but the road infrastructure between the port and the the beginning of the motorway are abysmally bad. In other words, Corridor VIII has so far been a purely theoretical corridor based on some studies. But no real corridor concept exists. The market participants, in particular the port of Durres as the principal feeder of the corridor will have to be the driving force.
- › During the expert's mission Port Authority of Durres and other market participants stated that there is a wide discrepancy between state authorities, including DG MOVE of EC and SEETO and the market realities. In order to build a competitive and attractive Corridor between the Adria and Bulgaria it is necessary to tackle all legal, technical and operational obstacles that exist. For further detail see fact-finding mission report: Meeting 2: Port of Durres

Expected Results

- › Have been identified legal, operational and technical demands of the market participants that shall act on the Corridor VIII, to and from the port of Durres.

Action No. 26 Study the possibility/feasibility of reopening respectively rehabilitating the railway line between Pristina and Nis and build a new joint railway border crossing point station at Merdare/Podujevo (not part of SEETO flagship axes)

Activities

- › 27.1. Organise meeting between SEETO, two Chamber of Commerce and two Infrastructure Managers (Serbian Railways and INFRAKOS) to decide on commercial importance.
- › 27.2. Serbian Railways and INFRAKOS decide in principle on the location of a future joint border crossing point
- › 27.3. Estimate the investment cost for rehabilitation of railway line and joint point station
- › 27. 4. Present the results to SEETO, EU and IPF

Actors

- › All activities: Competent ministries and competent chambers of commerce of Serbia and Kosovo, TFWG Sub-Group
- › 27.1: Chambers of Commerce of Serbia and Kosovo and rail infrastructure managers of ZS and INFRAKOS
- › 27.2: rail infrastructure managers of ZS and INFRAKOS

Timeline

2017

Cost estimation

- › According to civil engineering practice estimation for reconstruction of railway line is 1.000 euro/m (1 Million Euro per 1 km) or (only for substructure without modernization of electro-technical infrastructure) and construction of joint border crossing station is 300 euro/m².

Justification

- › There have been meetings between Serbian and Kosovo Chambers of Commerce. The rehabilitation of the railway line was in the agenda to improve the commercial exchange between Kosovo and southern part of Serbia.
- › This line was interrupted during the war due to an aerial attack of the tunnel and for that reason the tunnel cannot be used. The question is if the the tunnel could be reused as part of a flagship corridor from Nis to Kosovo via Pristina.
- › There seem to be initiatives on the Serbian and Kosovo private sector side. It is a feeder line for Corridor X and Route 10 and therefore should be taken in consideration.

Expected Results

Reestablishment of the railway line between Pristina and Nis

Action No. 27 Provide one parking lane on each side of joint crossing point Merdare in order to avoid the occupation of the normal road by waiting lorries and busses and to increase the safety

Activities

- › 28.1. Prepare a Feasibility Study and Main Design for building of more lanes.
- › 28.2. Construct of lanes

Actors

- › TF WG (road) and SEETO – secretariat in cooperation with competent ministries of Public works in Kosovo, and Serbia.

Timeline

June 2015

Cost estimation

- › Civil engineering practice gives estimation of 200.000 euro/km of one lane. Potential source of financing is IPA.

Justification

- › Road safety and sanitary risks as is with the other BC.

Expected Results

- › Enough parking space has been established to ensure a smooth dispatching at the road joint border station.

Action No. 28 Build new parking space for lorries to avoid blocking the motorway by waiting lorries at the BCP Albania- Kosovo*.

Activities

- › 29.1 Prepare Feasibility Study and Main Design for building of new parking space.
- › 29.2 Construct parking space.

Actors

- › All activities: Competent ministries of Kosovo, Albania. SEETO Secretariat as coordinator

Timeline

Second half of 2015

Cost estimation

- › Estimation according to civil engineering practice is 100 euro/m² of required parking space. Potential funding is from IPA.

Justification

- › Parking on the emergency lane of the motorway E 851 at the border Kosovo – Albania leading to congestion and barring the emergency lane in case of danger.
- › Road safety and sanitary issue.

Expected Results

- › New parking space has been made available for lorries on the motorway E 851 at the road border Morine thus avoiding parking on the emergency lane on both sides of the motorway access to the Kosovo and Albanian border stations.

ROUTE 4 (CONNECTIVITY PORT OF BAR, CORRIDOR X, DANUBE AND CORRIDOR IV)

Action No. 29 Improve the competitiveness and attractiveness of the flagship Corridor Bar – Belgrade and Eastern Europe by improving the communication among the border stakeholders/railways by means of electronic transmission

Activities

- › 30.1. SEETO together with CEFTA propose meetings of the customs authorities nationally and bilaterally to discuss the installation of electronic data transmission or in the framework of TF WG (rail).
- › 30.2. Negotiate to install electronic transmission bilaterally between the customs authorities of Montenegro and Serbia.
- › 30.3. The Serbian railway infrastructure as owner of the railway station Prijepolje installs the necessary communication lines in a way that the customs, police authorities and railways can employ their national data transmission systems.
- › 30.4. Install electronic data transmission systems between the Serbian and Montenegrin customs authorities.
- › 30.5. Install electronic data transmission systems between the Serbian railway infrastructure manager and the Montenegrin railway infrastructure manager

Actors

- › All activities: SEETO Coordination
- › 30.1: TF FG (rail), SEETO Secretariat and competent Ministries of Serbia and Montenegro.
- › 30.2 Competent Ministries of Serbia and Montenegro involved.
- › 30.3 ZS Infrastructure
- › 30.4 Competent ministries
- › 30.5 Rail Infrastructure managers of Serbia + Montenegro

Timeline

Beginning: Latest January 2016 (under competitive pressure from other corridors)

Cost estimation

- › Consultant estimation of cost for workshops, installation of equipment is 500.000 euro that can be potentially financed from TAIEX or IPA fund.
- › 30.3, 30.4 and 30.5: The WB study “Assessing options for establishing an EDI System in border crossing points in South East Europe” deals with this respective issue and shall be available in April 2015. Costs for short-term measure approximately 100.000 EUR/BCP for hard and software (depending on size – based on BCP Dimitrovgrad) and approximately 40.000 EUR for operation/BCP (Source: The WB study “Assessing options for establishing an EDI System in border crossing points in South East Europe”). Long-term cost cannot be estimated since these highly depend on used products, IT-infrastructure, etc.

Justification

- › Prijepolje rail border station has no electronic data transmission at present and all documents have to be handled by hand, although nationally electronic data transmission between railways and separately between customs, and separately between border police function.
- › However, any person that might be searched nationally or internationally can pass without problem, since the border police can only check the passports. The same applies on the Montenegrin side.
- › In fact, Serbia and Montenegro should simply fulfil the provisions of the rail BCA.

Expected Results

- › Improved communication between the border authorities by means of electronic transmission among each other (vertically and not only horizontally) has been installed (and functions).
- › Train delays reduced by between 35 and 70%

Action No. 30 SEETO initiates the respective steps with both Montenegro and Serbia border police and customs authorities to render possible the installation of the respective office space at the rail border stations in order to enable joint controls on moving trains between the two countries.

Activities

- › 31.1. Initiate steps for meetings between Montenegro and Serbian authorities responsible for rail BCP in order to render joint border control by border police and customs possible.

Actors

- › All activities: Serbia and Montenegro border police; Serbia and Montenegro customs authorities together with the two rail infrastructure managers. Support of SEETO Secretariat

Timeline

June 2015

Cost estimation

- › Detailed design study for joint border station is prepared in 2012. The estimated cost is 100.000 Euro. Source: Ministry of Transport of Montenegro.

Justification

- › The joint border agreement between Serbia and Montenegro allows joint border police and customs control on moving trains.
- › The respective protocols were signed long ago. However, the protocols have not been fully implemented due to lack of space for the respective authorities in the two border stations. The main problem is that the respective building in station Bijelo Polje does not exist in land books (it is written as "stone"). There is ongoing procedure to put the respective BCP building into the land books in order to get permit for reconstruction. This process takes long time (source: Ministry of Transport of Montenegro).
- › In fact, Serbia and Montenegro should simply fulfil the provisions of the rail BCA.

Expected Results

- › The office space for the respective border authorities, customs and border police have been installed on both rail border stations and joint border controls on moving trains as well as in border stations are possible.

Action No. 31 Adapt the existing rail BCA between Serbia and Montenegro based on the model for the border crossing agreement

Activities

- › 32.1 Adapt Border police agreement
- › 32.2. Adapt Customs agreement.
- › 32.3. Adapt Phyto-sanitary agreement.
- › 32.4 Adapt Sanitary agreement.

Actors

- › All activities: supported from SEETO Secretariat
Ministries of Transport of Serbia and Montenegro with their competent Directorates and the competent ministries
- › 32.1 Ministries of Internal Affairs (Serbia and Montenegro).
- › 32.2. Ministries of Finance (Serbia and Montenegro).
- › 32.3. Ministries of Agriculture (Serbia and Montenegro).
- › 32.4 Ministries of Health (Serbia and Montenegro).

Timeline

End of 2016.

Beginning of negotiations September 2015.

End : September 2016

Cost estimation

- › No additional cost. There will be some cost of bilateral meetings.

Justification

- › There exists already a bilateral agreement on joint controls in a border zone between Serbia and Montenegro. The agreement is NOT in full compliance with the EU legislation, in particular Art. 10 + 13 + Annex II of 2012/34/EU.

Expected Results

- › The bilateral border crossing agreements between Serbia and Montenegro according to the SEETO model have come into force, including the subsequent agreements between the border police, customs authorities, phyto-sanitary and sanitary (veterinary) agreements.

Action No. 32 Provide joint border infrastructure (single window) installations at the road border control on Route 4 between Serbia and Montenegro.

Activities

- › 33.1. SEETO explores the possibility of establishing joint border crossing installations for road at the Montenegro and Serbia road border crossing by contacting the respective Serbia and Montenegro authorities (border police, customs, phytosanitary, and sanitary authorities) and the two EU Delegations to find out if a joint border crossing is possible in order to avoid two separate border crossings of several kilometers of distance.
- › 33.2. In the short-term build a parking space for lorries in Brodarevo and or more parallel lane for lorries that exit Serbia to avoid blocking the road by waiting lorries.

Actors

- › All activities: TF WG, competent ministries and the EU Delegations of Serbia and Montenegro

Timeline

- › 33.1: end of June 2015
- › 33.2: End of December 2015

Cost estimation

Costs are estimated according to civil engineering practice in Serbia:

- › 33.1: 300 euro/m² for installations only.
- › 33.2: 100 euro/m² for required parking space and 200.000 euro/km for one lane.

Justification

- › The EU supported financially the construction of a new road border crossing at Dobrakovo. The EU financed the establishment of the Serbia road border crossing installations (Brodarevo) in containers.

Expected Results

- › Joint border crossing installations for road at the Montenegro-Serbia borders (Route of flagship corridor, Route 4) using the Montenegro border crossing infrastructure for Serbia authorities too by extending the installations have been established.
- › Reduction of dispatching time.
- › The potential funding source for this project can be Cross Border Cooperation programme 2014-2020 (<http://www.evropa.gov.rs/CBC/PublicSite/Default.aspx>)

Action No. 33 Port of Pancevo to be included in the comprehensive Flagship Corridor

Activities

- › Put port of Pancevo on the SEETO Flagship Corridors as an inland port and inland distribution center for Route 4, Corridor Vc and Corridor X.

Actors

- › SEETO Secretariat together with DG MOVE

Timeline

- › September 2015

Cost estimation

- › No additional cost (to be done on a regular SEETO meeting).

Justification

- › Strategic justification: Pancevo is situated in the most important industrial zone of Serbia, the Belgrade area. It is on the Corridor VII (Danube corridor) and at the end of Route 4 and Corridor X. It is also considered to be in the catchment area of corridor Vc.
- › Commercial justification: The port is a privately-run port. The owner of the port is owner of the infrastructure but not of the land. It is infrastructure manager for rail infrastructure, owns a shunting station next to the main line of Belgrade-Bucarest. The motorway between Belgrade and Rumania is next to the port and port has direct access to the motorway.
- › Technical Justification: Enough space to build up a tri-modal (ship, rail, road) logistics and distribution center for the Vojvodina and industrial zone of Belgrade. Draught of the Danube and of the basin is 3,8m. Large Danube barges (Lower Danube barges) and costal ships can call at the port.
- › The port has direct rail connections to all SEETO corridors and is a good turning plate for the continuation of the SEETO corridors to port of Constanta, Rumania and even Ukraine and Russia via Danube Delta.

Expected Results

- › Port of Pancevo is part of the SEETO Flagship Corridors
- › Port of Pancevo becomes an inland port and inland distribution center for Route 4, Corridor Vc and Corridor X with interconnectivity to Danube corridor.

Table of actions per country (which Actions concern which country – for easy reference)

Action number	Actions	Albania	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	Montenegro	Kosovo*	Serbia
	HORIZONTAL ACTIONS						
1	Establish the Transport Facilitation Working Group (TF WG)	√	√	√	√	√	√
2	Establish corridor management on selected flagship corridor that have a Sub-group on a pilot basis by using the model of the corridor management for the European Corridors	√	√	√	√	√	√
3	Introduce Rail Market opening for the SEETO region	√	√	√	√	√	√
4	Ensure that the electronic transmission system of the road sector (e.g. SEED or NCTS) or rail-specific systems (e.g. RAILDATA, RNE systems, etc.) shall be applied to the railway sector	√	√	√	√	√	√
5	Establish joint road border crossings with the principle of one stopping based on Sukobin-Murican BCP	√	√	√	√	√	√
6	Harmonise the axle load taxes between the SEETO participants and the EU member states	√	√	√	√	√	√
7	Study the possibility of division of labour between geographically close road BCPs in order to reduce queuing and procedure times at the borders	√	√	√	√	√	√
8	Adopt the Regulation 913/2010/EU requests Member States to establish international market-oriented Rail Freight Corridors (RFCs)	√	√	√	√	√	√
9	Prepare the application and become a member of RNE and join RNE international Working Groups	√	√	√	√	√	√
10	Enhance rail operations in the entire port operations of the ports on SEETO Flagship Corridors Bar, Durres and Ploce by improving the railway infrastructure, the efficiency of rail operations and the logistics between maritime and rail transport	√	√		√		

Action number	Actions	Albania	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	Montenegro	Kosovo*	Serbia
11	Action No. 11 Actively involve the ports (authorities and operators) of the SEETO Flagship Corridors in the promotion and management of the respective flagship corridors where they are located	√	√		√		
	CORRIDOR X (HIGHEST TRAFFIC FLOWS + CONNECTIVITY PORT OF THESSALONIKI AND BELGRADE)						
12	Conclude negotiations on all rail BCAs between Hungary and Serbia based on the models for the border crossing agreements						√
13	Conclude negotiations between Croatia and Serbia based on the model for the rail BCAs						√
14	Find a solution to render possible the signature of the border crossing agreement between the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Greece according to the model agreement of SEETO			√			
15	Initiate activities with the support of the European Commission and SEETO to open up technical discussions on the various border crossing agreements according to the SEETO model for the new border crossing point (BCP) between Bitola and Florina			√			
16	Initiate meetings with the competent EC DG Customs to discuss the possibilities of simplifying the transit procedures for goods to and from EU member states to and from Greece, based on model agreements Switzerland/EU, Norway/Sweden or EU/Russia for the corridor Königsberg (Kaliningrad) – Lithuania			√			
17	Install a fully functional border police office at the Greek border station (BCP Idomeni – Corridor X) to shorten delays for international passenger trains			√			
18	Support the competent Ministries in Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to implement the border crossing agreement			√			√
19	Adapt the BCA between Bulgaria and Serbia to the EU legislation, use as						√

Action number	Actions	Albania	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	Montenegro	Kosovo*	Serbia
	model the BCA Rouse (already notified by EC) or the SEETO model						
20	Build new parking space for lorries on E 70 motorways that enter from Serbia into Croatia to avoid blocking the motorway by waiting lorries						√
21	Establish joint border control, customs and border police on the motorway E-70 of Serbian border point Batrovci and the Croatian border point Bajakovo for border police and customs						√
22	Initiate research on the present legal status of the terminal in Serbia at the Serbian-former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia border in order to find out why the terminal has not been used for its original purpose			√			√
CORRIDOR Vc (CONNECTIVITY PORT OF PLOCE AND SAVA RIVER)							
23	Conclude negotiations between Bosnia and Herzegovina and Croatia for all BCA, based on the SEETO model for the BCA		√				
24	Find out the legal, operational and technical demands of the market participants that shall act on the Corridor Vc to ensure an increasing competitiveness and attractiveness of Corridor Vc to and from the port of Ploce		√				
CORRIDOR VIII + ROUTE 7 (CONNECTIVITY PORT OF DURRES, CORRIDOR X AND BLACK SEA)							
25	Find out the legal, operational and technical demands of the market participants that shall act on the Corridor VIII to ensure an increasing competitiveness and attractiveness of Corridor VIII to and from the port of Durres	√		√		√	
26	Study the possibility/feasibility of reopening respectively rehabilitating the railway line between Pristina and Nis and build a new joint railway border crossing point station at Merdare/Podujevo					√	√
27	Provide one parking lane on each side of joint crossing point Merdare in					√	√

Action number	Actions	Albania	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	Montenegro	Kosovo*	Serbia
	order to avoid the occupation of the normal road by waiting lorries and busses and to increase the safety						
28	Build new parking space for lorries to avoid blocking the motorway by waiting lorries at the BCP Albania- Kosovo*	√				√	
	ROUTE 4 (CONNECTIVITY PORT OF BAR, CORRIDOR X, DANUBE AND CORRIDOR IV)						
29	Improve the competitiveness and attractiveness of the flagship Corridor Bar – Belgrade and Eastern Europe by improving the communication among the border authorities/railways by means of electronic transmission				√		√
30	SEETO initiates the respective steps with both Montenegro and Serbia border police and customs authorities to render possible the installation of the respective office space at the rail border stations in order to enable joint controls on moving trains between the two countries				√		√
31	Adapt the existing rail BCA between Serbia and Montenegro based on the model for the border crossing agreement				√		√
32	Provide joint border infrastructure (single window) installations at the road border control on Route 4 between Serbia and Montenegro				√		√
33	Port of Pancevo to be included in the comprehensive Flagship Corridor						√