

# Achieving results, looking ahead: EU Cohesion Policy's evaluation and future prospects



Based on on-going evaluations and the mid-term review of the EU budget 2007-2013, the future prospects of the Cohesion Policy have become an ongoing focus of debate over recent years. In this connection, the most important dates in 2009 and 2010 are the publication of the 'Barca Report' ('An agenda for a reformed Cohesion Policy', April 2009), the publication of a report on the budget review by the European Commission (November/December 2009), the presentation of ex-post evaluations for the 2000-2006 period by the European Commission (early 2010), the publication of strategic reports on the 2007-2013 period by the Member States before the end of 2009 and of a strategic report by the Commission before 1 April 2010, and finally, the adoption of the 5th Cohesion Report in the Autumn of 2010. With the wider debate on the EU's future political priorities and budget being held in parallel, discussions on EU cohesion policy will most probably be accompanied by difficult negotiations at national and EU level.

During the OPEN DAYS, a total of 27 seminars presented evaluations of urban development and environment and transport investments, as well as discussing the future of EU Cohesion Policy - including a joint seminar of the European Parliament's Committee on Regional Development and the Committee of the Regions' Territorial Cohesion Commission - and covering aspects of co-operation on regional policy with Brazil, China and other third countries.

# Theme D - Workshops

## Achieving results, looking ahead: EU Cohesion Policy's evaluation and future prospects



### Climate and demographic change: Debating solutions to multiple challenges

**06D01**  
**6 October 2009,**  
**9:00-12:30**

**Organiser:**  
2020 Regions: Acting for the Future

**Chair:**  
**Fabian Zuleeg**, European Policy Center

**Speaker:**  
**Peter Berkowitz**, European Commission, DG Regional Policy

**Panelists for the demographic change round table:**  
**Prof. Paul Cosford**, NHS East of England, United Kingdom  
**Ana Abrunhosa**, Central Portugal Region, Portugal  
**Marta López de la Cuesta**, Analysis and Planning of Castilla y León, Spain

**Panelists for the climate change round table:**  
**Dan Griffiths**, Northwest Regional Development Agency, United Kingdom  
**Agnieszka Pawlicka**, Ecological Policy Office Warmia and Mazury Region, Poland  
**Prof. Ellen Margrethe Basse**, University of Aarhus, Denmark  
**Lisbeth Iversen**, City Government of Bergen, Norway

**More information:**  
Best practices on energy efficiency and RES:  
[www.climatechangenorthwest.co.uk/european-co-operation-projects.html](http://www.climatechangenorthwest.co.uk/european-co-operation-projects.html)  
Background Paper from Ellen Margrethe Basse, University of Aarhus:  
[www.klima.au.dk/fileadmin/filer/Dokumenter/EMB-indlaeg\\_6.10.09\\_oversaettelse.pdf](http://www.klima.au.dk/fileadmin/filer/Dokumenter/EMB-indlaeg_6.10.09_oversaettelse.pdf)

#### Outline

Each round table started by a brief introduction by each of the speakers on the topic of main demographic change/climate change challenge for his/her region? and on examples of an initiatives that each Region has put in place to begin to tackle it. After this introduction, Moderator **Fabian Zuleeg** invited panelists and public to answer a series of questions. **Peter Berkowitz** presented the study on the four main challenges European Regions will have to face in the mid-term: demographic change, climate change, the energy challenge and globalization, following the European Commission Communication "Regions 2020". He linked it to the future of Cohesion Policy.

#### Debate

Panelists and public give their opinion to some questions, for example:

For the **demographic change round table:**

- Does your region want to increase its population? What have been the most successful measures? Does it include incentives for immigration, assistance in integration to encourage people to stay? Methods to encourage fertility rate increases (parental leave, grants, methods for work/life balance)?
- How do we provide the services and infrastructure needed for a dispersed and ageing population? Which are the main changes your region is introducing to adapt services demand and infrastructures for the elderly? Do you have any specific measures concerning on demand transport, home care services, telemedicine, tailor-made initiatives, specialization in age-related diseases? Is there an integrated plan or there are separate different measures?

For the **climate change round table:**

- Efficiency or renewables? What is more important for your region: reducing the amount of energy consumed or producing more green energy? What do you think the public sector needs to concentrate on and how?
- Words into action – role of regions? It will take everyone working together to make a real difference – what roles can regions play in catalyzing these relationships and turning words into action – what good examples do you have?
- Making real tangible changes. If we continue our European lifestyles, we will need 3 planets to sustain us. What, in your experience, is the main message to be communicated to the general public in order to bring about action?

#### Conclusions

- **Demographic change:** Very different regions share common problems: East of England, Castilla y León and Central Portugal share concerns on ageing population, depopulation of rural areas and concentration of population in urban areas. Solutions on how to improve services and minimise the cost of infrastructures are based in similar premises. Innovation in the provision of public services is crucial, offering quality services with fewer resources for instance for health and social care.
- **Climate change:** Central Denmark, England's Northwest, Warmia Mazury and West Norway share the problems caused by climate change. They all suffer its consequences on environment, agricultural, urban planning, health, etc. Developing environmental technologies is crucial but the key issue to fight against climate change is changing people's behaviour. By involving people you can make a lot of progress, for example in energy efficiency.
- **Both challenges,** climate change and demographic change, are interlinked. Changing our way of living, making it healthier and more sustainable, would help to minimise the impact of both challenges.

*"We have to choose: do we want less polluting cars or do we want to make pedestrian cities? What we need is a new way of living, more healthy and sustainable: promoting walking, cycling, healthier and more active life for the elderly, using less resources, fostering energy efficiency, promoting the consumption of natural products, etc. will help older generations have a better quality of life and will help our environment."*



### Regions brainstorming on the future Cohesion Policy

#### Outline

The discussion took the form of a two-part debate, presenting first the political vision and then the expert view. **Mr Sluijters** asked the regional politicians about the main problems they faced in implementing the current programme; how they adapted to overcome these problems; and what lessons for future programmes they have drawn from the experience. The progress made by the regions through past structural policies was illustrated, since looking 'into the future requires an understanding of the past'. The discussion addressed the impact of the global crisis on future cohesion policy. The expert panel addressed questions from **Mr Landabaso** on whether cohesion policy post-2013 should address a closed or open list of priorities; if the role of the Commission should be more administrative or strategic; and if there should be a focus on grants and subsidies or soft loans, credits and financing facilities. They also discussed the impact of regional policy on administrative capacity in regions.

#### Debate

##### Political Panel Session

**Petr Osvald** spoke about the (CoR) COTER Commission report on the future of Cohesion Policy, to be published at the end of the year. "Regarding Pilsen City, we have an integrated plan which provides a global view of measures. This creates synergies." The need for a Cohesion Policy is agreed. We need to consider not just absorption rates but the overall effectiveness of the policy, including the social effects. Thanks to the Commission for the simplification measures in the Recovery Package, but practitioners don't see much difference on the ground. The system is bureaucratic and it is difficult to shift money between priorities in the Operational Programme. For the future Cohesion Policy, it is important to have a strong Commission. **Matti Lipsanen** noted that Häme is one of 3 regions in South Finland. Due to a major decrease in funds (to 25% of previous levels), concentration is needed in allocating resources. However, administrative structures have remained the same, so the money is heavily over-administrated. Häme's Development Plan has focuses on 3 'E's: Education, Enterprise & Environment. The region has undertaken two concrete projects to tackle current challenges. 'Häme Open Campus' uses open networks to improve education and research in the region, where there are no major universities. The second is the 'Global' project, which aims to internationalize the economy of Häme. With relatively small sums this has met quite positive results. **Dr. Co Verdaas** explained that East Netherlands focuses funds on innovation, climate change and social well-being. Europe needs varied regions and the diversity they create. Organisationally, there is a need for cooperation with all levels, including enterprises. Cohesion Policy has identified new objectives throughout its evolution, but the tool of generic legislation isn't effective anymore. Cohesion Policy must not think in governance layers. It must be both strategic and flexible. In the current age of transition, a more cooperative model must replace the existing competitive model. This is not only about money, but about how to address challenges. Europe needs a flexible rather than uniform approach. **Dr. Josef Martinz** brought forward the fact that the Competitiveness and Employment objective is vital for the successful implementation of the Lisbon Strategy, since regions would not be able to invest in areas crucial for the EU's global competitiveness without EU funding. Carinthia focuses on R&D, university-business links, innovation and SMEs. EU funding is necessary to maintain the successful approach (research quota exceeds the Austrian average). Problems: *disproportionate administrative burden for small projects* - Carinthia suggests lump-sum payments/small-project funds. *Co-financing* is strongly supported -there can be problems when the co-financed amount varies in *cross-border projects*. *Special SME-support is needed*. **José Antonio Poncela** outlined the need to reduce the administrative requirements associated to the management of the EU funds in order to facilitate the work for the responsible authorities. The EU regional policy must be more flexible to adapt itself to the current changing environment. The future of the cohesion policy has to fit the specificities of all regions in Europe and, to this end, it would be necessary to decentralize this policy. **Francisco Morillo Sanchez** outlined the situation in Andalucía. In 2008 its GDP reached 82,1% of the EU mean, making it a Competitiveness region, despite being Convergence for 2007-2013. The priorities focus on the Lisbon Strategy and infrastructure, innovation and entrepreneurship. Current problems are: a) Programmes devoted to one fund when Andalusia has been dealing with "multi-fund" programmes; b) excessive control problems; c) excessive OP approval delay; d) lack of real management decentralization. Possible solutions: a) More human resources; b) Greater coordination between administrations; c) anti-crisis measures are positive, but intermediate and faster payments are more beneficial for regions.

##### Expert Panel Session

**Anne Ainsworth** stated that Lancashire has developed an integrated strategy covering planning, housing, and transport. This focuses on place through the concept of 'functional economic areas'. Programmes should reflect place and should not be centralised. Plans need to consider what the regional economy will look like in future. Partnership, between local authorities, universities and the private sector, is key for delivery. The private sector is a key partner as it drives growth, but the public sector can provide the catalyst. Good programmes should be rewarded, but there is a distinction between rewarding processes or outcomes. Administration of funds should be simplified but choice should

#### 06D02

6 October 2009,  
9:30 - 13:00

#### Organiser:

Cohesive Regions for a Stronger Europe

#### Chairs:

1st session: **Willebrordus Sluijters**, European Commission, DG Regional Policy

2nd session: **Mikel Landabaso**, European Commission, DG Regional Policy

#### Speakers:

##### Political debate

**Petr Osvald**, CoR Member, Pilsen City Assembly, Czech Republic

**Matti Lipsanen**, Regional Council of Häme, Finland

**Co Verdaas**, CoR Member, Province of Gelderland, The Netherlands

**Dr. Josef Martinz**, Martinz KG, Regional Government of Carinthia, Austria

**José Antonio Poncela**, Castilla La Mancha, Spain

**Francisco Morillo Sanchez**, Regional Ministry of Finance, Andalusia, Spain

##### Expert Debate:

**Anne Ainsworth**, Lancashire County Council, United Kingdom

**Agata Matusiak**, Implementing Authority for the Regional Operational Programme, Wielkopolska, Poland

**Francisco Morillo Sanchez**, Regional Ministry of Finance, Andalusia, Spain

**Dr. Fabiola Mota**, Center of Andalusian Studies, Spain

#### More information:

[www.wielkopolska.eu](http://www.wielkopolska.eu)

[www.lancashire.gov.uk](http://www.lancashire.gov.uk)

[www.juntadeandalucia.es/presidencia](http://www.juntadeandalucia.es/presidencia)

[www.jccm.es/europa](http://www.jccm.es/europa)

[www.nl-prov.eu](http://www.nl-prov.eu)

[www.regioeuropa.net](http://www.regioeuropa.net)

[www.vbb.ktn.gv.at](http://www.vbb.ktn.gv.at)

[www.southfinland.org](http://www.southfinland.org)

[www.plzensky-kraj.cz](http://www.plzensky-kraj.cz)

# Theme D - Workshops

## Achieving results, looking ahead: EU Cohesion Policy's evaluation and future prospects



Regions brainstorming on the future Cohesion Policy (suite)

remain the same, or increase. **Agata Matusiak** noted that a shopping list of priorities is preferable to a closed list, as the economic crisis shows the importance of flexibility. It provides for varied regions. Convergence regions still have an infrastructure need: they 'cannot build from the 2nd floor up'. The Commission's role in the Monitoring Committee is important. It should be proactive and intervene to deal with emerging problems and issues. It is inevitable and necessary that the policy will move from grants to financial engineering tools. Cohesion policy should acknowledge the role of cities as motors of regional growth and should consider urban restructuring and SMEs. Public authorities cannot solve problems on their own. **Francisco Morillo** answered the three questions asked by Mr. Landabaso:

1. A closed programme has been positive but due to the crisis programmes are now flexible to solve the situation. As a personal opinion, he added that a shopping list of priorities can suggest that Europe does not have a clear strategy
2. The role of the Commission should be more strategic and less focused on payment controls.
3. Regarding the future of Cohesion Policy, every region will have its own needs. In Andalusia, we are working to change the mentality in companies with instruments like JESSICA, JEREMIE or Public-Private Partnerships with universities, research centres and the public administration to develop R&D.

**Fabiola Mota** answered Mr Landabaso's question regarding how Cohesion Policy has influenced the administrative capacity of regions in Spain. Multi-level governance implied in the management of EU funds has caused an institutional change that has been very useful in Spain. Cohesion policy has developed the administrative capacity of Spanish Convergence regions creating a clearer separation of tasks; better coordination mechanisms; better planning (through SWOT analysis); and a better control capacity. She concluded by underlining that the development of the administrative capacity has been one of the most important achievements of Cohesion Policy, comparable to the effects of funds.

*"The economic crisis demonstrates we need a flexible Cohesion Policy, which suits all regions, and promotes cooperation between different levels and sectors."*

### Conclusions

- Disagreement on whether a shopping list or a closed list of priorities was best but agreement on need for flexibility to address regional needs
- Greater programme flexibility needed to respond to major economic changes
- Acknowledgment that Cohesion Policy requires controls but administrative burden is too great
- Administrative burden for Competitiveness regions too great considering the size of funds and some projects
- Need for integrated plans and communication between different layers of government
- Cohesion policy has many successes, including better governance and reporting procedures and practical results like infrastructure development
- In the future, greater use should be made of financial engineering instruments and partnership with the private sector, although the administrative burden can discourage private sector partners.



### Empowering cities: Local responsibilities in Cohesion Policy programmes?

#### Outline

In her introduction, **Natalija Kazlauskiene** stressed the fact that Cities are and have always been important players in Cohesion Policy programmes – in- and outside specific programmes for urban development. Much of the investment from Structural funds which is targeted at research or innovation is being spent in cities. She underlined however, that this does not necessarily mean that cities – or local authorities in general – are necessarily involved in the design or implementation of operations on their territory. At the end, regions and Member States apply fairly different approaches in involving their cities into Cohesion Policy programmes. Ms Kazlauskiene stressed that the Commission is convinced that local authorities have to play a key role in delivering our policy operations.

#### Debate

The workshop focussed on different aspects of local involvement in Cohesion Policy programmes and tried to draw first conclusions for the debate on the future of Cohesion policy. In his presentation, **Alexander Ferstl** underlined that with the urban mainstreaming, the urban dimension of Cohesion Policy has been (financially and thematically) strengthened in the current programming period. Reaching regional convergence and boosting Europe's competitiveness mean that cities have to play a vital part in our policy. However, their involvement in the design and implementation process of ERDF Operational Programmes is limited: Regulatory mechanisms for empowering cities and local authorities, such as global grants and sub-delegations, remain widely unused. **Lamia Kamal-Chaoui** underlined in her presentation that recent research from the OECD stresses that any regional development policy must seek to use the full potential of cities – and the advantages of concentration. Thereby, growing responsibilities must go hand in hand with growing competences and empowerment. In this context, the integration of actions on a specific territory – such as a city – is key. As **Michele Calandrino** illustrated, integrated policy approaches require strong efforts to combine place-based and people-based policies. Under the ESF programmes, cities are currently being empowered both by giving them responsibilities for the set-up and the implementation of local actions and by involving them in policy making cycles. Not only the need for better coordination between ESF and ERDF, but also the necessity to involve cities into the discussion process on the post-2013 period at due time has been underlined by represented stakeholder organizations.

**Marie Ranty** from EUROCITIES strongly supported an "improved urban mainstreaming" of Cohesion Policy post-2013, giving cities and local authorities more competences and responsibilities for the design and implementation of actions on their territories. As **Flo Clucas** illustrated with the example of Liverpool, Cohesion Policy can make a real difference in urban development. It can help cities to recover faster from social and economic problems and to be better prepared for future challenges. After decades of decay, Cohesion Policy programmes – designed in close co-operation between the city, its hinterland and the regional government – helped Liverpool to change its face and to become an outward-looking, prosperous city.

#### Conclusions

Ms **Natalija Kazlauskiene** concluded the workshop by summing up the discussions as follows:

- Cities are important players in Cohesion Policy programmes and need to have an important place when it comes to the design and implementation of Structural Funds programmes. Member States and regions need to make better use of existing regulatory provisions
- Urban development today also means working across traditional borders – sectoral or administrative. It is therefore vital to follow functional approaches.
- For the future, there are some important challenges ahead. It is clear however, that cities and local communities will need to play a key role in facing them. For urban areas, themes like social inclusion, climate change, demography or energy efficiency seems very important. Only by mobilising all levels of governance, Europe will be successful.

#### 06D03

6 October 2009,  
09:30-11:45

#### Organiser:

European Commission, DG Regional Policy

#### Chair:

**Natalija Kazlauskiene**, European Commission, DG Regional Policy

#### Speakers:

**Lamia Kamal-Chaoui**, Urban Development Programme, OECD  
**Alexander Ferstl**, European Commission, DG Regional Policy  
**Michele Calandrino**, European Commission, DG Employment and Social Affairs  
**Marie Ranty**, EUROCITIES  
**Flo Clucas**, City of Liverpool, United Kingdom

#### More information:

Urban development and Regional Policy:  
[www.ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/themes/urban/index\\_en.htm](http://www.ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/themes/urban/index_en.htm)  
Urban Audit:  
[www.urbanaudit.org](http://www.urbanaudit.org)  
Progress ESF-programme:  
[www.ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=327&langId=en](http://www.ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=327&langId=en)  
OECD:  
[www.oecd.org](http://www.oecd.org)  
Eurocities:  
[www.eurocities.eu](http://www.eurocities.eu)  
Liverpool:  
[www.liverpool.gov.uk](http://www.liverpool.gov.uk)

*"If the term "place-based" wants to be more than just a phrase, cities and local authorities need to have an empowered role in the post-2013 period."*

# Theme D - Workshops

Achieving results, looking ahead: EU Cohesion Policy's evaluation and future prospects



## The specific situation of Transition Regions in Europe and the current role of Cohesion Policy

**06D04**  
**6 October 2009,**  
**14:30-16:15**

### Organiser:

European Commission, DG Regional Policy

### Chair:

**Graham Meadows**, formerly European Commission, DG Regional Policy

### Speakers:

**Helmut Stegmann**, Ministry of Finance, Saxony-Anhalt, Germany

**Carolyn Rule**, Economy and Regeneration, Cornwall Council, United Kingdom

**Erhard Weimann**, State Secretary, Saxony, Germany

**Prof. Josef Syka**, former president of the Czech Science Foundation

**Tomasz Slawinski**, Spatial planning and regional development, Mazovia, Poland

**Martin Plachy**, Ministry for Regional Development

### More information:

[www.opendays.europa.eu](http://www.opendays.europa.eu)

### Outline

This workshop focused on the specific situation of Transition Regions in Europe to date and the specific challenges they will face in the future. The workshop was aimed at stimulating a debate about the future need for cohesion intervention in Transition Regions by bringing a large number of local and regional authority decision-makers together to discuss the latest developments.

### Debate

**Cllr Carolyn Rule** spoke about Innovation as a key challenge for Transition Regions and described experience to date in Cornwall. Cornwall & Isles of Scilly is one of two Convergence Regions in the UK, but now falls outside the 75% GDP/capita threshold (against EU27), and will therefore become a Transition Region in 2013. Carolyn explained the upcoming challenges, including the economic crisis, and explained the measures that were already being taken to ensure a sustainable growth beyond 2013. **Erhard Weimann** gave an interesting presentation about the changing pattern of manufacturing in Saxony by way of underlining some of the challenges that would face Transitional Regions in future. The most important branch of Saxony's economy is the manufacturing industry that is responsible for one fifth of the gross value added. Mr Weimann pointed out the importance of continuous and uninterrupted investment in the infrastructure and R&D projects as being critical during the next few years. He argued that on a Europe wide basis, a knowledge-based and CO<sub>2</sub> neutral economy is becoming an increasing prerequisite for future competitiveness. **Professor Josef Syka** outlined the role of new technologies in Central Bohemia as a priority for Transition Regions. Surrounding the capital Prague, Central Bohemia benefits from its central location. Mr Syka underlined the importance of R&D and innovation as a key driver for regional economic development. One of the main examples he quoted was BIOCEV, a Biotechnology & Biomedical Research Centre in the region. He explained the special effect that BIOCEV was having on the development of Central Bohemia and the important contribution that it helps the region make to targets within the Lisbon strategy. **Tomasz Slawinski** spoke about the urban/rural co-operation in Transition Regions, something that is typified in his region of Mazovia. Mazovia faces the challenge of combining effective urban and rural development. The GDP per capita in Warsaw, the capital, is roughly *four times higher* than in the poorest sub region of Mazovia, making it impossible to formulate a standard "one size fits all" development strategy. Mr Slawinski explained how Mazovia's urban/rural co-operation strategy differentiates between "formalised" and "offer-based co-operation" as a means of capitalising on the strengths of neighbouring urban and rural sub regions.

### Conclusions

**Martin Plachy** underlined the key role of cohesion policy within the European integration process. Referring to the above examples, he underlined the fact that significant progress was being made in these regions on innovative and higher level added value investments. He did warn that many of these "fledgling" developments were susceptible to both the tumultuous effects of the economic crisis and the subsequent review of the EU Cohesion Policy post 2013. He also stated his interest to be engaged in the future debate on Transition Regions.

*"The development of high-quality partnerships is a key achievement of EU Cohesion Policy that brings together actors from all levels – EU, national, regional and local."*



### Present and future benefits of Cohesion Policy

#### Outline

The workshop was opened by **Michael Schneider** who referred briefly to the policy lessons that can be learnt from the past 20 years of cohesion and mentioned the example of Eastern Germany where the leverage effect of structural funds is clearly visible. In his example he stressed that cohesion policy interventions resulted in the creation of a high number of jobs and managed to attract private investment that otherwise would have not been realised. He highlighted a few points that he considered crucial for the future of Cohesion policy (CP), namely: build on the lessons from the past (the successes as well as the failures) and the need for CP to "come back to basics", i.e. to concentrate on its basic objectives. The Barca report was mentioned as a good basis for discussion on the future of the policy. He added that thorough consideration must be given to the role that cohesion policy can play in tackling the current economic crisis. Too many objectives have been added recently to CP; we should concentrate on the key objective: foster economic development so that the social and territorial cohesion dimensions can be addressed. As regards fostering economic development, he highlighted the importance of the place based policy approach as well as further simplification of the implementation rules. Finally Mr Schneider welcomed the cooperation between the European Parliament and the Committee of the Regions, stressing the need of constructive dialog and partnership. **Danuta Hübner** stressed that "Europe is a project of economic integration for everybody" and thus CP must remain a policy for all regions, also because it is the only European policy with a strong territorial dimension. It is also a unique policy because of its focus on integrated solutions and its capacity to mobilise actors across boundaries. In this regard she wondered if the existing policy tools are sharp enough for the purpose of building a sustainable and prosperous Europe and if we are using them at their full capacity. She highlighted in this respect that specific regional assets play a very important role in today's economic development patterns, as key drivers of economic growth are linked to the territory. The key for sustainable long term development policy lies in removing barriers to growth in lagging regions so they can contribute more to overall growth. In trying to find the best ways to support regional competitiveness we need to focus on SME development, know-how and innovation. Commenting on the added value of territorial cooperation she recalled that there is an increasing demand for shared implementation mechanisms in the context of cross-border projects; the Baltic Sea Strategy has emerged as a response to this demand. Finally, she emphasized that the principle of solidarity should remain at the heart of CP and pointed to the priorities for the years to come: try to build stronger links between CP and the Lisbon strategy and treat sustainable development as a horizontal challenge that should play a role in every policy. Ms Hübner agreed on the importance of analysing how the economic crisis has influenced regions, and what new challenges emerge as a result of it. She pointed out that the weaknesses and the risk aversion of the banking sector during a downward economic cycle make available financial resources scarce especially for high risk activities such as innovation. This is why economies that are vulnerable need to be supported by cohesion policy instruments and financial engineering to be put on a long term growth path. Ms Hübner also agreed that exchanges between the EP Committee on Regional Development and COTER of the Committee of the Regions need so that "local and regional Europe" can express its views in the process of policy development.

#### Debate

**Mr Van Nistelrooij** (MEP) recalled the CP important role in supporting decentralization and subsidiarity. Also, with a view to the next programming period, he mentioned the big tendency to split up the money between different funds with several different objectives as opposed to the integrated approach. **Sir Albert Bore** (CoR Member) pointed out that the current Cohesion funds are too thinly spread over too wide a spectrum of policy objectives. This should be avoided for the post-2013 programming period. Moreover, regions respond to Lisbon objectives differently so the varying specific needs of these regions need to be addressed; a set of horizontal measures with discreet funding programmes attached to them is needed. **Mr Olbrycht** (MEP) wondered about the political compromise that will emerge for the post 2013 period and put forward several questions for reflection: "do we still believe that economic social and territorial cohesion is a necessary condition for European growth?"; "is it important to achieve for eliminating disparities and do we need a specific policy for this?"; "should we accept pursuing cohesion through sectoral policies?"; "should we follow a regional or a macroregional approach? if yes, what will the implementation systems be like?"; "what it really means for Local and Regional authorities (LRAs) the reference to LRAs as partners for European policies contained in the Lisbon Treaty?" **Mr Osvald** (CoR Member) emphasized the need to reconcile the integrated approach and the concept of place-based policies and the important role of CP in helping regions exit the crisis. He added that local and regional authorities need sufficient financial resources to embark upon developing their regions. **Mr Godmanis** (MEP) indicated that there is a need to invest in infrastructure as an exit strategy to the crisis but the problem is that these investments are very far from the Lisbon Strategy and the educational and innovation objectives. He also stressed the importance of the Baltic Sea Strategy in terms of energy infrastructure and wondered about how we can use climate change dedicated funds to

#### 06D05

6 October 2009,  
14:30-16:15

#### Organiser:

Committee of the Regions, European Parliament

#### Speakers:

**Michael Schneider**, CoR Member, Commission for Territorial Cohesion (COTER) of the Committee of the Regions

**Danuta Hübner**, Chair of the Committee on Regional Development (REGI) of the European Parliament  
CoR Members of the COTER Commission and MEPs of the EP REGI Committee

#### More information:

COTER website:  
[www.cor.europa.eu/pages/EventTemplate.aspx?view=detail&id=0054c5ae-7a29-43fa-8095-8a594fd97caa](http://www.cor.europa.eu/pages/EventTemplate.aspx?view=detail&id=0054c5ae-7a29-43fa-8095-8a594fd97caa)

REGI website:  
[www.europarl.europa.eu/activities/committees/homeCom.do?language=EN&body=REGI](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/activities/committees/homeCom.do?language=EN&body=REGI)

*"The role of Cohesion Policy has always been to ensure that the European project of economic integrations is for everybody; this project can only work if we mobilise the full potential of regions so that all citizens benefit from it."*

# Theme D - Workshops

## Achieving results, looking ahead: EU Cohesion Policy's evaluation and future prospects



### *Present and future benefits of Cohesion Policy (suite)*

improve cohesion. **Mr Harlinghausen** (CoR Member) insisted on the fact that the objectives of efficiency and fairness have been around since long time and on the need to achieve better coordination between the ESF and ERDF. He wondered whether in the time of crisis is it possible to keep a focus on social cohesion. **Ms Greze** (MEP) stressed that environmental and climate change related criteria should be made a priority in the allocation of Structural Funds, and called for the strengthening of democratic participation of citizens in such climate change related issues. **Mr Krochmal** (CoR Member) stated that the experience so far had shown that the CP had contributed to the development of all the regions in Europe and therefore it is still necessary to face the contemporary challenges faced by the European economy. **Mr Rouillon** (CoR Member) asked for the link between the fight against climate change and social cohesion to be made. The future CP should in particular include the possibility of granting loans to fund the refurbishment of social housing and ensure the highest possible environmental standards. He pleaded to increase the budgets available for cohesion policy.

### **Conclusions**

**Ms Hübner and Mr Schneider** concluded the workshop by summing up the discussions as follows:

- There is a general support for CP as a European development policy that strives for economic, social and territorial cohesion
- It is important to follow an integrated approach when applying cohesion policies and there is a need to limit sectorial approaches that can dilute the objectives of CP
- Macroregional strategies, if carefully managed, can provide a framework for a new territorial cooperation that invests in real projects; however the regional dimension should not be overridden by a national approach
- The involvement of local and regional level is very important and the Treaty of Lisbon will allow for a closer cooperation in this respect.



### Simplification of Cohesion Policy regulations: the 2007-2013 programming period

#### Outline

The workshop was opened by **Rudolf Niessler**. He started by noticing that the huge participation from the public to the workshop (almost 250 people registered to this workshop) is because simplification is considered as a 'magic word', which anybody is interested in. The exercise of simplification started by setting up a working group with the experts from the Member States. The approach was to assess what was reasonably to do for the current period 2007-2013. Following the discussion within this group, several simplification proposals were considered to be opportune and to be put forward. In addition to the previous legislative measures adopted during 2008 and 2009, the earliest proposal from the Commission is at the moment under discussion within the Council.

#### Debate

**Garry White** presented a contribution entitled: '*Member States expectation about simplification of programme implementation*'. He started underlining that with the word 'simplification' Member States intend to become wealthy more easily and quickly by managing Structural and Cohesion Fund programmes. The Member States welcome Commission flexibility and amendment of Regulations but further step should be put forward to simplify the implementation of the programmes by the national and regional authorities. **Angela Martínez Sarasola** presented a contribution entitled: '*Making cohesion policy simpler*'. She gave an exhaustive overview of all the legislative measures adopted in 2008 and 2009 to simplify the implementation of the Programmes and the delivery system of the Funds for Cohesion Policy. She also introduced the current proposal for the modification of General Regulation for the Structural Funds and the Cohesion Fund. **Laurent Sens** presented a contribution entitled: '*The simplified cost options*'. Among the legislative measures adopted by the Commission to simplify the management and control of the programmes cofinanced by the Funds for Cohesion Policy, amendments to the regulations were adopted to allow the use of simplified cost options: Flat rate for indirect costs, standard scale of unit costs and lump sums. The objective of the presentation was to present the three simplified cost options and their origin, to build a common understanding on these options and, finally, to provide a few guidance on how to implement and audit them. **Daniel Braun** presented a contribution entitled: '*Challenges of simplification for the future*'. He started stressing on the attributes of the current system, identified as complex and administratively heavy. He also expressed the dilemma to shift from processes to a higher focus on results and outputs vs. pressure from Court of Auditors, European Parliament to ensure sound financial management.

#### Conclusions

**Rudolf Niessler** concluded the workshop by registering a positive mood about simplification. The focus on the effectiveness of the results and the delivery system is one of the future challenges.

#### 06D06

6 October 2009,  
14:30-16:15

#### Organiser:

European Commission, DG Regional Policy

#### Chair:

**Rudolf Niessler**, European Commission, DG Regional Policy

#### Speakers:

**Daniel Braun**, Ministry for Regional Development, Czech Republic  
**Laurent Sens**, European Commission, DG Employment  
**Angela Martínez Sarasola**, European Commission, DG Regional Policy  
**Garry White**, Communities and Local Government, United Kingdom

#### More information:

DG Regional Policy web site:  
[www.ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/index\\_en.htm](http://www.ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/index_en.htm)

# Theme D - Workshops

Achieving results, looking ahead: EU Cohesion Policy's evaluation and future prospects



## Possible cohesion policy responses to Transition Regions in Europe

**06D07**

**6 October 2009,  
16:45-18:30**

### Organiser:

European Commission, DG Regional Policy

### Chair:

**Gerhard Stahl**, Committee of the Regions

### Speakers:

**Alvarez Areces Vicente**, Principado de Asturias, Spain

**Gerd Harms**, Federal and European Affairs, Brandenburg, Germany

**Derek Vaughan**, Member of the European Parliament

**Ramon Luis Valcarcel Siso**, Region of Murcia, Spain

**Nicola de Michelis**, European Commission, DG Regional Policy

**Dr. Michael Schneider**, COTER Commission, Committee of the Regions

### More information:

DG Regional Policy web site:  
[www.ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/index\\_en.htm](http://www.ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/index_en.htm)

### Outline

This workshop focused on the future policy responses towards Transition Regions. It discussed and assessed the emerging definitions that could be considered by the European Commission for defining "Transition Regions". Furthermore, it discussed the importance of supporting Transition Regions through cohesion policy and pointed towards collaborative work between the local and regional authorities concerned as to how this might be implemented into the next generation of structural funds programmes.

### Debate

**Alvarez Areces Vicente** gave a presentation on Transition Regions in Europe as a part of the future cohesion policy in Europe. He quoted key references from the 'Fifth progress report on economic and social cohesion' and the 'Barca Report' to reinforce the case for Transitional status. In his conclusion, he pointed out that "cohesion is the only guarantee of the long-term growth and sustainability of the Union." **Gerd Harms** spoke about the future scope for the Structural Funds interventions in Transition Regions. Mr Harms reminded delegates of the tension between the European Union goal of strengthening the economic and social cohesion, on the one hand, and improving global competitiveness on the other. Using the example of Brandenburg, he demonstrated that the use of EU funding "buil[t] on regional strengths" as a key part of the region's economic development response. **Derek Vaughan** outlined how to place Transition Regions in the future layout of cohesion policy in Europe. He supported the belief of Wales' First Minister Rhodri Morgan that a revised Cohesion Policy should apply to all regions and disburse funds on a graduated basis. It is important to give more to the poorest regions, but it is even more important not to cut out other struggling regions altogether, especially in light of the current economic crisis. As an ex-Leader of Neath Port Talbot and the Welsh Local Government Association, he reminded delegates of the value that these funds and their processes played in regeneration of communities across West Wales & the Valleys. Mr Vaughan underlined the importance of the Committee of the Regions and the European Parliament working effectively together to reinforce the case for Cohesion Policy in the new EU Budgetary framework. **Ramon Luis Valcarcel Siso** gave a presentation about the Region of Murcia and how it might feature in the framework of the Transition regions. After losing their Convergence (Objective 1) status in 2006, having exceeded the GDP/capita threshold of 75%, Murcia became a statistical effect region. Having experienced a significant reduction in funding, Mr Siso gave some useful examples of how the region had had to adapt to the situation. **Nicola de Michelis** gave a personal response of the current thinking of DG Regio towards any specific status for Transition Regions. He asked the regional representatives to answer the question on the future needs for structural funds intervention in those regions. In particular, he urged delegates to consider providing clear evidence that might quantify the important contribution Cohesion policy had made in financial, governance and methodological terms to the regions concerned.

### Conclusions

**Dr. Michael Schneider** gave a short summary of the recent developments in European Cohesion policy and underlined the important contribution being made by the policy. He added that whilst progress is being made in many of the transitional regions they would be very susceptible to any significant short terms changes in the policy. With his upcoming Outlook Opinion on the future of Cohesion Policy in mind, Dr. Schneider underlined the important contribution that local and regional authorities should be ready to make to the Fifth Progress Report on Economic and Social Cohesion. He reminded the local and regional authority decision-makers present to develop their thinking, and to find alliances through meetings such as this one, and to work proactively to influence the ongoing discussions on the future of Cohesion policy.

*"Cohesion is the only guarantee of long-term growth and sustainability."*



### Territorial cohesion: Metropolitan regions as new forms of urban-rural partnership and the territorial governance model

#### Outline

There are still high regional disparities within Europe. At the European level rural named areas are constituted by the peripheral and underdeveloped regions and by areas with low connectivity. The cooperation of urban and rural regions in strategic alliances could be one strategy to adjust the differences in development. Thereby is the core of regional governance not the opposition of urban and rural areas but the intense partnership between them. Nuremberg Metropolitan Region is a model for such kind of governance model. The involved partners develop regional clusters by integrating their technological competences and by common strategic planning. In addition the metropolitan regions offer opportunities for interregional and international cooperation in the fields of economy, science and culture. They are 'gateways' and 'hubs' in the context of international research, education and culture, and make a central contribution to territorial cohesion.

#### Debate and Conclusions

The workshop was opened by **Dr. Ulrich Maly**. He presented the Nuremberg Metropolitan Region as model for urban-rural-partnership based on regional governance. Nuremberg Metropolitan Region is conducting a Federal Regional Planning Model Project (MORO) recognized by the German ministry for transport, building and urban development. This project supports especially regional clusters and strengthens regional economic cycles. In open discussion was asked, how cities and rural regions could work together on the same level practically. Dr. Ulrich Maly stressed that it is indispensable for the success of the cooperation that the large cities act with a certain humility. **Dr. Birgit Seelbinder** reported about the active cross-border exchange of people, goods and services in the border region between the Czech Republic and Germany. Some Czech municipalities and administrative districts feel more connected to the Nuremberg Metropolitan Region on the German side than to Prague. This shows that regions should not cooperate only on the base of administrative unities, but on the basis of interweaving relations. As **Ursula Männle** pointed out the Bavarian state government strengthens especially rural areas with different activities, as for example the cluster initiative. Nevertheless, a strategical alliance between urban and rural areas brings a clear added value. Within Bavaria the governance model of Nuremberg Metropolitan Region is valid as a particularly successful example how regions can develop their polycentrality advantageously. **Claudio Tolomelli** stressed in his statement, that the rural areas have to be considered as part of the urbanised system. From this point of view we must establish a new partnership based on physical and ICT connectivity. In Emilia-Romagna are new policies under development based on the creation of a public ICT network. He emphasized the role of the "rebalancing" metropolitan areas and of the infrastructural corridors in the European context. Indeed - so Tolomelli on further inquiries from the audience - there is not yet a working model of cooperation or multi-level governance system between the different regional levels in Emilia-Romagna region. Last but not least there was discussed how the implementation of the territorial agenda can be supported by the EU. **Dirk Ahner** reported about topical considerations for the future regional support through regional policy of the EU after 2013. He pointed out that in future even Metropolitan Regions can receive own budgetary responsibility for supports from structural funds. They offer chance for the interregional and international cooperation in economy, science and culture. In this respect they perform a central contribution to territorial cohesion.

**06D08**

**6 October 2009,**

**16:00-18:00**

#### Organiser:

Urban-rural alliances - METREX plus

#### Chair:

**Dr. Ulrich Maly**, Nuremberg Metropolitan Region, Member of the CoR, Germany

#### Speakers:

**Dirk Ahner**, European Commission, DG Regional Policy, Belgium

**Prof. Männle**, Bavarian Parliament, Committee for Federal and European Affairs, Germany

**Birgit Seelbinder**, Euregio Egrensis, Germany

**Claudio Tolomelli**, InterMETREX Project, Emilia-Romagna (METREX-partner), Italy

#### More information:

Nuremberg Metropolitan Region:  
[www.em-n.eu](http://www.em-n.eu)

Cross-border cooperation:  
[www.euregio-egrensis.de/](http://www.euregio-egrensis.de/)

METREX:  
[www.eurometrex.org/](http://www.eurometrex.org/)

METREX-partner:  
[www.regione.emilia-romagna.it](http://www.regione.emilia-romagna.it)

*"It is indispensable for the success of urban-rural cooperations that large cities act with a certain humility."*

# Theme D - Workshops

Achieving results, looking ahead: EU Cohesion Policy's evaluation and future prospects



## Lisbon beyond 2010 – towards a New Vision. Prospects for the future – the role of Cohesion policy in the new Lisbon cycle

**06D09**  
**6 October 2009,**  
**16:45-18:30**

**Organiser:**  
European Commission, DG Regional Policy

**Chair:**  
**Katarína Mathernová**, European Commission, DG Regional Policy

**Speakers:**  
**Lucio Gussetti**, Committee of the Regions  
**Juan Tomas Hernani**, Ministry of Science and Innovation, Spain  
**Ann Mettler**, The Lisbon Council, Belgium

**More information:**  
[www.opendays.europa.eu](http://www.opendays.europa.eu)

### Outline

An audience of over 200 attended the plenary session on "Lisbon beyond 2010-towards a new vision at OD 2009." The Chair, **Katarína Mathernová**, explained the substantial contribution of Cohesion policy to the Lisbon strategy in programming period 2007-2013 through the "earmarking" process. She referred to the upcoming Communication on Member States' strategic reporting, assessing the implementation of Lisbon strategy at national and local level, due early next year.

The panellists discussed the role of Cohesion policy in the implementation of the Lisbon post-2010 strategy focussing on the following questions:

- i) What should be the new fields of intervention for the new Lisbon post 2010 strategy?
- ii) What role for the Commission, and in particular for the Cohesion policy in the implementation of the strategy at national and regional?
- iii) How the ownership of Member states and regions towards the Lisbon post 2010 vision and fields of intervention can be reinforced?

### Debate

**Gerard De Graaf** explained some of the general features and contours of the new strategy, emphasizing the need for better involvement and stronger ownership of local and regional authorities. The starting position is more difficult than in the past due to the financial crisis and fiscal constraint and it will be challenging to turn into reality the EU2020 vision shaped by the President of the Commission. Mr de Graaf mentioned the need for further advancing in the fields of education and skills, labour market policies as well as providing more dynamism to Europe's economy by deepening the single market and bundling together a number of policies in the field of R&D and Innovation. He stressed the importance of "not innovation policies, but policies for innovation". Regarding the role of Cohesion Policy, he underlined its importance in contributing to a greener, fairer, more inclusive skilled economy for the Union in 2020. He also underlined the importance of Cohesion Policy in solving investment gaps, increasing the quality of public expenditure and contributing to efficiency gains through institutional building and better quality of administration. He said that earmarking was an important step and that in the future we should consider an even more focused thematic approach. He also raised questions on how to improve the delivery mechanism of the new strategy in order to make it more binding and more committing, eventually by establishing clear cut targets which might be differentiated at national as well as regional level. Finally, he asked for new ways to broaden the regional and local partnership and invited regional and local participants to take a proactive stand and communicate to the Commission their ideas about the new strategy. **Ann Mettler** recalled the importance of the Lisbon strategy in prioritising together economic and social objectives. Some elements need to be improved, such as governance and communication. The new Lisbon strategy must have a holistic view of the kind of society we want to build for the future. Its vision must change behaviour and thinking. Innovation must be based on changes in processes, knowledge management and organisational business models, making it broader and touching on many more people than before. The renewed strategy should focus on social innovation and open innovation. The Lisbon strategy lives in regions and regions will be at core of the Lisbon strategy post-2010. Still, there is room for improvement of communication, as current vocabulary used for describing reforms – competitiveness, liberalisation, better regulation, pro-business, pro-market – is not adequate to mobilize commitment and ownership amongst large parts of society. **Juan Tomas Hernani** stressed the Spanish commitment towards innovation and presented some of the ideas of the Spanish Presidency concerning post-Lisbon innovation strategy. He illustrated the latter by describing the recently approved national innovation strategy which emphasized the need for effective multilevel governance between the Community, national and regional levels. He referred to the different though complementary aspects of this strategic approach including, markets, finance, people and territorial cohesion. Spain will be presiding over the Union at the time of the launch of the Lisbon post 2010 strategy.

### Conclusions

The panel concluded that the post 2010 Lisbon Strategy should "live in the regions". In this sense, it should involve deeper the local and regional authorities in a structured cooperation. Thus, the new strategy should promote coordinated and integrated policy-making at all government levels. Indeed, the Cohesion policy has a key role to play in shaping the EU 2020 vision and in implementing the renewed Lisbon strategy.



### Social inclusion as an instrument for restoring growth and strengthening cohesion

#### Outline

**Fernando Alonso** introduced the theme. The two seminars focus on actions undertaken by regions in response to the economic crisis under two broad themes: skills and inclusion. Through the seminar, we seek to underline the importance of taking action under both themes to restore growth and strengthen cohesion at the European level. **Jerome Vignon**, noted that the current EU treaty makes a distinction between territorial/social cohesion and internal market/economic growth, and added that yet we tend to forget that there is no economic growth without a will for inclusion. In this area, regions and cities have a vital role to play.

#### Debate

**Part 1: Jean Lambert:** How do we move on from the Lisbon agenda? It is quite clear that the current agenda have not put enough focus on social issues and this aspect will definitely have to be taken into account in a new agenda. It will even have to be analysed through the aspect of social cohesion. "How effective is the OMC method?"; "How can we improve contacts with civil society and regions?" In the field of anti-discrimination, Ms. Lambert questioned the "Europe of values" and emphasised that these values will have to be for everyone. All barriers that stop people from realising their talents should be removed. **Stefano Valdegamberi** described the current demographic crisis in Italy. He mentioned that the 50 % of all the health expenses of the Veneto Region goes to people who are above the age of 65. The number of elderly will also increase dramatically in the coming years, which is also the case for Europe as a whole and therefore a European challenge. The fact is that Italy has among the lowest birth rates in the world as well as the longest life expectancy. What the Veneto Regions is trying to do here is ensure sustainability of services in this difficult period. **Guillaume Vuilletet** of the ARTESI network, an initiative created to fight the so called digital break spoke briefly about the work of Ile-de-France, trying to ensure that young people have a greater access to computers. Internet can actively prevent social exclusion and build new partnerships with groups that were previously excluded. The question whether technology be an obstacle for social integration was also raised. **Dimitrios Kalogeropoulos** explained the current situation in the Attica region, describing a region that is massively hit by migration waves. What policies can effectively be applied? He then explained that there is a slight change in views with their Turkish neighbour, a fact that makes the situation difficult. More action is needed from European level in order to solve the situation. There is a need for more reception facilities, better border controls etc. The main challenges are including the migrants in the education and health systems. **Kayamba Tshitshi Ndouba** told that the Madrid region has lots of experiences in working strategically with migration. Currently there is a migration plan running for 2009-2011. Economical investments are targeted to migration policies within 11 policy areas. Within these can be mentioned the "Know your Laws" Programme, a training for immigrants to know their rights in the institutional system; the programme for building capacities of immigrant professionals; opening of 17 centres for civic participation where immigrants meet others. **Frederic Geers** highlighted the Belgian situation where skills are matched and the 3 regions work actively together to fight unemployment. There are investments in language training etc. As for Flanders, the region works intensively with modern technology in order to reduce the youth unemployment.

**Part 2: Carol Thomas** introduced the speakers and set the theme: "How do we match skills and create more, better jobs in times of crisis?" **Carmen Mier** introduced the action plan for working with labour groups in Navarra. She also described Navarra's work with ESF projects and the ambition to re-focus the European Social Funds while also stating that "In a changing economic atmosphere, more interlinked and submerged in a crisis model, Europe has to focus on its human resources. People is Europe's potential, their talent is a raw material to become more competitive". She also referred to the Commission's communication "New skills for new jobs" that tries to point out the need to a better and different matching with labour market. **Pehr Granfalk:** The City of Solna, Stockholm County, has several times been chosen the most business friendly municipality in Sweden. The city has 2,7 percent unemployed this year, last year that was sum was 1,5 percent. The "Solna Model" is a succesful partnership between social welfare and enterprises and a matching of skills. The questions to ask are: What jobs do we have? What skills do we have? The model has been very successful, leading to low unemployment rates. A question from the floor was "is this model ESF funded in any way?". Mr. Granfalk responded that "No, the model finances itself entirely". **Frederic Geers** explained that labour market issues is a regional competence in Belgium and therefore models differ from one region to another. However, there is a stable interregional cooperation. Unemployed people from Wallony, for example, are matched with vacancies in Flanders. Target groups of "people with opportunities" are being identified. There is also a preventive approach targeted especially to young people. Within this approach service is provided to young people under 20 years already after 1 month of unemployment. There is also a curative approach which is more long term. **Sue Dunn** raised questions like "How do we build flexible systems and structures that address youth unemployment issues and meet the individual needs of unemployed young people?" and "how do we create an integrated service for long term unemployed young people?"; "What role can the EU play in supporting regions address issues like youth unemployment and skills mismatches in the mid-long term?". Kent have successfully worked with young people, trying to tackle these issues. **Lesley Calder** spoke about developing partnerships and networks to improve people's skills. **Simonne Abraham-Thisse** briefly explained the work undertaken in the Ile-de-France region with focus on skills. They have several ESF-funded projects trying to improve/match people's skills. However, she was not very happy with the current rules, being to complicated. The ESF funds should have more flexibility. **Seyit Yeyden** the Noord-Brabant region as "the region of knowledge", being home to ca 55 per cent of all the patents in the Netherlands. As for skills, they have developed a model similar to Solna's, matching skills with public/private actors in close cooperation with universities. **Robert Strauss** spoke about the European Employment strategy, a strategy aimed at creating more and better jobs in every Member State. The skills part of this strategy is a new element.

**07D01**

**7 October 2009,  
09:30-13:00**

#### Organiser:

Addressing the Crisis through Skills and Inclusion: Regional and Local Responses

#### 1st part: Inclusion

##### Chair:

**Jerome Vignon**, Formerly European Commission, DG Employment and Social Affairs

##### Speakers:

**Jean Lambert**, MEP  
**Dimitrios Kalogeropoulos**, TEDKNA, CoR member, Municipality of Egaleo, Greece

**Kayamba Tshitshi Ndouba**, Regional government of Madrid, Madrid Region, Spain

**Stefano Valdegamberi**, Social Policies, Veneto Region, Italy

**Guillaume Vuilletet**, Regional Council of Ile de France, France

#### 2nd part: Skills

##### Chair:

**Carol Thomas**, Conference of Peripheral and Maritime Regions

##### Speakers:

**Simonne Abraham-Thisse**, Val-de-Marne County Council, Ile-de-France, France

**Frederic Geers**, Permanent Representation of Belgium to the EU, Flemish Representation, Belgium

**Robert Strauss**, European Commission, DG Employment and Social Affairs

**Lesley Calder**, ONE NorthEast, North East England

**Sue Dunn**, 14-24 Innovation Unit, Kent County Council, Kent, United Kingdom

**Carmen Mier**, International Development, Navarra, Spain

**Pehr Granfalk**, Employment and skills committee, City of Solna, Stockholm Region, Sweden

**Seyit Yeyden**, Economic Affairs, City of Helmond, Noord-Brabant, The Netherlands

# Theme D - Workshops

Achieving results, looking ahead: EU Cohesion Policy's evaluation and future prospects



## The Future of EU Cohesion Policy post-2013

**07D02**  
**7 October 2009,**  
**9:30-11:45**

### Organisers:

European Commission, DG  
Employment, Social Affairs &  
Equal Opportunities European  
Commission, DG Regional Policy

### Chair:

**Thomas Bender**, European  
Commission, DG Employment, Social  
Affairs and Equal Opportunities  
**Katarína Matherňová**, European  
Commission, DG Regional Policy

### Speakers:

**Fabrizio Barca**, Italian Ministry of  
Economy and Finance, Italy  
**Kadri Uustal**, Permanent  
Representation of Estonia to the EU  
**Benedict Wauters**, Flemish ESF  
Managing Authority

### More information:

[www.opendays.europa.eu](http://www.opendays.europa.eu)

### Outline

In the framework of this seminar, representatives of the European Commission, Member States and regions and academics presented the challenges and issues in connection with the reform of EU Cohesion Policy post-2013.

### Debate

The discussion was channeled to conditions to build up a result/output-oriented system for the future EU Cohesion Policy. Particular attention was paid to ESF, considered to be a complex system, which does not provide efficient evidence for a political debate on results of ESF interventions. The conditions / elements for the result-oriented policy were introduced by FB and further developed and completed by other panelists, as follows:

- Designing a system for a prospective counter-factual impact evaluation as a learning instrument and a way to improve the policy;
  - Concentration on core priorities reflected in a set of indicators ("core indicators" at EU level complemented with indicators specific for MS). There is a need for political commitment for achieving targets and results for the policy. If MS fails to reach targets for core indicators, the system should allow for explanations, common (MS-EC) recommendations for improvements, and finally penalties;
  - Clear division of responsibilities within the shared-management system; Commission to develop in a policy adviser. CoA and EC should be involved in this process.
- As an example BW presented a two-option approach of the ESF Agency of Flanders, which varies in terms of the accountability level:
1. top-down ("MA thinks, local level executes"): MA responsible for outputs, coordination at higher level, payments tied to outputs;
  2. bottom-up (labour market actors come up with solutions): MA provides recommendations whereas the local level is responsible for implementation, most of analysis, coordination, etc.; payments are not tied to outputs. It leads to substantial simplification, but control is needed anyway; Accountability lies at local level.
- Combination (balanced) of EU priorities and regional and local potentials;
  - More effective coordination at place, which should occur at all levels (EU, MS, regional/local) and go through the whole policy life-cycle; There was an interesting voice of a representative of rural development agency in PL calling for a single delivery system for a single OP at regional level comprising various sources of financing stemming from various EU and national policies);
  - "can-do attitude": there is political and technical feasibility for reforms to arrive at result/output (or even outcome) oriented policy.

### Conclusions

The panelists agreed that the system used today is well placed to be adapted following presented recommendations. However, no radical change should be launched as it induces a "risk minimisation attitude".



### Civil Society forum: Partnership principle and practice?

#### Outline

**Marco Lopriore** welcomed the speakers and explained that the workshop was structured in two parts. The first consisted of an introduction to the concept of partnership. The speakers would address such questions as, what the partnership principle is, how to measure its added value and is there a need to compare best practice and learn from each other in a network of regions for partnership. The second part would focus on 3 case studies and concrete examples from Région du Centre (France) Regione Lazio (Italy) and Region Saxony Anhalt (Germany) on how the partnership principle works in practice.

#### Debate

**Mr Ahner** stressed the partnership principle as an essential pillar of Cohesion Policy. Practice shows that the capacity of establishing genuine partnerships is often one of the keys to effectiveness. For this reason the principle has been strengthened with each successive programming period. However, a lot remains to be done in order to have a real and active partnership. In some Member States the potential benefits from partnership are still not widely understood and the method of its application is not fully transparent. He stated that the Commission welcomes the efforts and work of the civil society in this direction and he underlined that the study conducted by ECAS is an excellent contribution and example. Exchange of experiences and good practice can be useful tools which can help to enhance the implementation of this principle. He further gave some ideas on what could be the best tools from the Commission to strengthen the partnership (more recommendations, frequent discussions with Member States, meetings with social partners, and more interaction with civil society at European level). Mr Ahner, finally, welcomed the initiative to create a network of regions working on this principle. **Ms Schroedter** pointed out that the role of the civil society has been strengthened with the Structural Funds Regulation 2007 – 2013, Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 for extending partnership to "any other appropriate body representing civil society." Unfortunately, some Member States do not consider this modification and as a consequence we face a general lack of transparency, information and involvement in the planning process. She thinks that to strengthen the principle of partnership, the Commission should better involve the partners, their opinions should be added to the proposed operational programmes and sanctions could be foreseen, if necessary. Moreover, an active involvement of partners in all steps of the process should be ensured, providing them with minutes, decision procedures and all information in a reasonable time and manner. **Mr Venables** said that this event is held this year as a partnership between ECAS and Région du Centre, Regione Lazio and Region Saxony Anhalt. He affirmed that ECAS has learnt from the interaction with these regions that partnership is first a legal obligation. He then suggested some recommendations to better implement the partnership principle. For instance, Member States and regions should draw up an information, consultation and participation plan covering all stages of cohesion policy operations, and publish it; the European Commission should look at advanced practice and propose a new framework for multilevel governance and partnership; and the capacity building of partners should be developed. The regions and local authorities should set the example on how partnership principle should work. **Ms Lisch** introduced the concrete case of her region and the "Competence Centre of the Economic and Social partners". This centre is composed of a solid group of economic and social partners whose objectives consist, among others, in helping social partners, in the preparation of documents and papers of the Local Committee of the Structural Funds for partners, in carrying out activities for the improvement of background knowledge and in providing information about the structural funds and the cross sectoral objectives, and discussion of strategies concerning equal opportunities, sustainability, growth, employment, education and integration. She also pointed out some problems encountered by the "Competence Centre": impartiality, for instance, is not always guaranteed and the partners' interests and objectives are sometimes insufficiently respected and handled. **Mr Duneau** said that according to the Managing Authority the implementation of the structural funds has been carried out according to a participatory approach involving the regional partners, both institutional and socio-economic. He also stated that in the Région du Centre the implementation of the partnership, on the one hand, seems limited to a restricted regional partnership, but on the other hand, the partnership was involved to a large extent in the elaboration of operational programmes. The objectives of the partnership principle of the Région du Centre are the methods of appointing the partners, a framework for discussion and action and enabling the strategic decisions to be taken during the life of the programmes. He also underlined that the added value of the partnership is to make it possible to define policies and actions better suited to the local operators and to their needs to develop the local areas. Ms Bellotti said that in order to implement the partnership principle, the Lazio Region had adopted an action plan for 2009 that foresaw sharing information and documents, the organization of thematic Round Tables on intervention areas of OP ERDF and activities organized for the purpose of involving Partnership members in defining evaluation questions. She added that since 2006, Lazio Region has been adopting a specific model of consultation of citizens that live or work in the Region and of all public and private enterprises based in Lazio. This process is divided in an information and communication phase and a consultation phase and ends with the drafting of the so-called "participation document".

#### 07D03

7 October 2009,  
09:30-11:45

#### Organiser:

European Citizen Action Service  
(ECAS)

#### Chair:

**Marco Lopriore**, European Institute  
of Public Administration

#### Speakers:

1. Panel:

**Dirk Ahner**, European Commission,  
DG Regional Policy

**Elisabeth Schroedter**, MEP,  
Committee on Regional  
Development

**Tony Venables**, European Citizen  
Action Service

2. Panel:

**Baerbel Lisch**, League of Non-  
statutory Welfare Associations of  
Saxony Anhalt e.V.

**Nicolas Duneau**, Structural Funds,  
Région du Centre

**Rosanna Bellotti**, Managing  
Authority, Regione Lazio

**Prof. Simona Piattoni**, University of  
Trento, Italy

#### More information:

ECAS:

[www.ecas.org](http://www.ecas.org)

# Theme D - Workshops

## Achieving results, looking ahead: EU Cohesion Policy's evaluation and future prospects



### *Civil Society forum: Partnership principle and practice? (suite)*

The document is taken up by the Regional Executive and subsequently submitted to the appropriate committees or to the Regional Council. The process has created, in the regional organization structure, an area called "Participatory Economy". **Prof. Piattoni** said that partnership aims to achieve better policy making, a larger local consensus and more EU legitimacy. This principle encounters typical difficulties having to do with the territorial and institutional level, the institutional structure and the political culture of the Member State in which it is applied and implemented. Prof. Piattoni then "provoked" the participants with some questions. She asked whether or not civil society is positioned to represent interests of the population or whether civil society organizations want to be really involved in policy-making, spending time and energy. She then underlined the importance of the phase in which the partners are involved and the existence in some case of intermediate structures which may be necessary for effective partnership. Prof. Piattoni also said that one partnership format does not fit all political contexts and practices must be shared and systematically compared for learning to take place.

### **Conclusions**

To sum up the discussion, the partnership principle could be strengthened by an active involvement of partners in all steps of the process and by ensuring a deeper transparency and access to documents.

The better application and implementation of the partnership principle will lead to a profitable discussion between Member States and the social and economic partners which will generate an improvement of democratic capacity and an independent regional policy.

ECAS and the three partners intend to develop this cooperation and extend the number of participating regions.



### The ESPON 2013 Programme: First results

#### Outline

The workshop was opened by **Thiemo Eser** who started by welcoming some 80 participants and recalling the main features and objectives of the ESPON programme. ESPON stands for "European observation network on territorial development and cohesion". This programme covers all EU-Member States, Norway, Switzerland, Iceland and Liechtenstein. It was approved by the European Commission on 7 November 2007 for the period 2007-2013 and involves Community support for all EU Member States under the European Territorial Co-operation objective. The objective of the ESPON 2013 Programme is to support policy development in relation to the aim of territorial cohesion and a harmonious development of the European territory. It shall provide comparable information, evidence, analyses and scenarios on framework conditions for the development of regions, cities and larger territories. The programme also aims at facilitating exchange, debate and networking among Europe's experts and decision-makers in regional and local development.

#### Debate

**Natalija Kazlauskienė** presented the policy demand for European territorial evidence from the perspective of the European Commission. Territorial cohesion is the general framework in which ESPON operates. Research in the field is at the same time complex and necessary for policy making and ESPON has a specific role to play in this context, feeding the territorial agenda with robust analysis and helping regions and Member States to gain a better understanding of the policy implications of this research. **Peter Mehlbye** gave an overview of the development of the ESPON Programme and the running calls for proposals and expressions of interest. The ESPON 2013 Programme focuses on research related to territorial development, competitiveness and cohesion. It also contributes to creating a European scientific platform and tools. A number of applied research projects have already started, addressing themes such as functionalities of cities and urban agglomerations, impact on regional competitiveness of energy challenges, demography and migration issues, climate change impacts on regions and cities, development opportunities in different types of regions for strengthening European competitiveness and cohesion, like for islands. The full list of ongoing and previewed project themes is available at the link below. **Erik Gløersen** and **Odd Godal** shared their experiences with ESPON Targeted Analyses by introducing the first results from the Territorial Diversity (TeDi) research project. They confirmed that the political relevance of "geographic specificity" does not in general stem from "laggardness" or from a low degree of economic performance, but should rather be approached in terms of improving the economic returns and creating the basis for a socially and ecologically sustainable development. **Andrew Copus** presented the first results of the Applied Research Project EDORA - European Development Opportunities in Rural Areas. The project aims at identifying the development opportunities of diverse types of European rural areas. It addresses some key issues such as the manner rural-urban linkages can be utilised to drive rural development, how can policy design and implementation better accommodate rural complexity/heterogeneity, or how can we achieve better synergy between EU policies in a rural context.

#### Conclusions

**Mr Eser** concluded the workshop by leaving the floor to the audience. Reactions underlined the following aspects:

- There is a strong support for the ESPON 2013 Programme and a wide dissemination of the results as it responds to the need for better knowledge about the EU territories and more research on territorial cohesion.
- Indeed, research in the field is complex and necessary for policy making and ESPON has an important role to play in feeding policy development and provide support to EU Cohesion Policy.
- A systematic observation emerging from the various ESPON researches on aspects of European territorial dynamics is the heterogeneity and the complexity of EU territories.
- This calls for a holistic approach in the design of territorial development strategies at all levels, taking into account the various elements from the local to the European context and combining policy interventions in various fields into a coherent policy framework.
- In that perspective, there is a need to develop further diagnosis instruments that could support the formulation, the design and the implementation of such integrated place based approaches to territorial development and cohesion, with a strong local and regional involvement.

#### 07D04

7 October 2009,  
09:30-11:45

#### Organiser:

European Commission, DG Regional Policy

#### Chair:

**Thiemo Eser**, ESPON Managing Authority

#### Speakers:

**Natalija Kazlauskienė**, European Commission, DG Regional Policy

**Peter Mehlbye**, ESPON Coordination Unit

**Erik Gløersen**, Nordregio, Sweden and Odd Godal, Ministry of Local Government and Regional Development Norway

**Andrew Copus**, UHI Millenium Institute

#### More information:

ESPON 2013 Programme:

[www.espon.eu/mmp/online/website/content/programme/1455/index\\_EN.html](http://www.espon.eu/mmp/online/website/content/programme/1455/index_EN.html)

# Theme D - Workshops

Achieving results, looking ahead: EU Cohesion Policy's evaluation and future prospects



## Evaluation of URBAN II – an example for local development?

**07D06**  
**7 October 2009,**  
**09:30-11:45**

### Organiser:

European Commission, DG Regional Policy

### Chair:

**Michael Parkinson**, European Institute for Urban Affairs, Liverpool John Moores University

### Speakers:

**Tim Fox** and **Jan Maarten de Vet**, ECOTEC/ECORYS

**Jean-Loup Drubigny**, URBACT secretariat

**Karl Jasper**, URBAN programme, Dortmund-Nordstadt

### More information:

Ex post evaluations (including URBAN):

[www.ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/rado2\\_en.htm](http://www.ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/rado2_en.htm)

URBACT:

[www.urbact.eu](http://www.urbact.eu)

Dortmund URBAN II:

[www.dortmund.de/urban](http://www.dortmund.de/urban)

### Outline

URBAN II is often quoted as an important example – both for future urban actions and for local development measures more generally. But what does the evidence say? Can clear results and impacts be measured on the ground? And are they sustained after the programme ends? The workshop heard emerging evidence from the ex post evaluators, as well as from the managers of the URBACT network for exchange of experience and of the Dortmund urban programme. The session was chaired by one of the foremost international experts on urban and local development. Programme managers and key local actors joined in a lively discussion.

### Debate

**Tim Fox** and **Jan Maarten de Vet** introduced the ex post evaluation. Findings are interim, based on data analysis and interviews with programme managers – 15 indepth case studies are currently underway. Headline figures include: 65,000 people trained, 4,000 local jobs created, 2.3 million m<sup>2</sup> of buildings renovated and 3.2 million m<sup>2</sup> of green space created. This may understate results, since in many cases good data were lacking. Early evidence suggests programmes often had strong impacts on the area, but varied significantly in terms of long term sustainability and strength of partnership/local involvement. This will be investigated in the case studies. **Jean-Loup Drubigny** presented URBACT, the urban network for exchange of experience. URBACT I (2000-2006) was a vast exercise in knowledge generation – 230 partner cities in 21 thematic networks. He agreed the findings of the ex post evaluation: individuals involved in the networks learned a lot, the challenge is to spread the knowledge outside this circle. URBACT II is actively promoting such "institutional learning", as well as working to transfer knowledge to mainstream programmes. **Karl Jasper** presented results from Dortmund. He emphasised that urban regeneration is much more than just physical regeneration. Instead Dortmund URBAN II combined construction with fostering local business and empowering the local community. The programme helped 4,410 businesses and trained 3,483 local people – the impact is visible when you visit the area. North-Rhine Westphalia has set aside 30% of its funding for such measures in the new Operational Programme.

### Conclusions

- There is clear evidence locally of economic and social impacts. Delegates agreed these would never have happened without URBAN.
- But some programmes were better managers than monitors – over-elaborate indicator system set up in the first flush of enthusiasm, patchy reporting in later years.
- Intangible factors – capacity of local government, empowerment of local people, image of the area – are crucial. This was often a strength of URBAN's "local development approach".
- Deprived urban areas will not just "go away". When finished, the evaluation will have important lessons for future actions.
- Tight budgets make it crucial to show evidence of value for money – and to articulate even the intangible effects.

*"Deprived urban areas will not just go away. But changing their fate requires a sustained commitment to various complex (and often intangible) issues. An intelligent, evidence-based approach is essential."*



### Multilevel governance in the EU: New prospects for a European Union with its regions and cities

#### Outline

The workshop had two distinct sessions:

*Session 1: "A partnership based renewed Community Method"*, chaired by Mr. Sanchez, EIPA, Barcelona: During the first session the following key questions were addressed by various speakers: How does the concept of multilevel governance (MLG) work out for different policy actors in the EU? What place for MLG in the overall agenda of the Community institutions and the specific European macro-strategies? A key issue of discussion was the "renewed community method" and its compatibility with difference governance models within the EU. A major point of reference for all speakers was the newly adopted *White Paper on Multilevel Governance by the Committee of the Regions*. One case study was also presented by Mr. Benassi during this first session. It concentrated on a better delivery of EU policies targeted to SMEs, generally strongly anchored in the regional level.

*Session 2: "Increasing multilevel governance through the EU's renewed meta-Strategies and Agenda's"*, chaired by Mme. Taulègne, Forward Studies Unit, CoR: The second session moved from conceptual and institutional issues to policy reality: namely, social and migration policy, Open Method of Coordination (OMC) and the partnership modes of governance at the local and regional level were discussed. Key questions tackled during this second session were: Who and at which authority level should have the final ownership and responsibility of good governance? How do these strategies and approaches go together with the traditional "Community Method" and novel forms of governance such as the OMC?

#### Debate

**Javier Sanchez** stressed the importance of the *White Paper on MLG* for better inclusion of local and regional authorities across Europe as actual European governance needs to better reflect today's role of regions and cities. He also tackled the issue of subsidiarity, tri-partite arrangements and structural dialogue. Prof. Michel Bauer presented a recent research conducted by the University of Konstanz, Germany, on the role of officials of local and regional authorities in EU MLG. He pointed at the existing gaps between effectiveness and legitimacy, and the possible trade-offs emerging when discussing MLG promotion. He also stressed the very heterogeneous nature of EU regions and local entities, but, nonetheless, pointed at the (possible) key role played by the CoR in coordinating and leading this process. **Prof. Frank Delmartino** clearly outlined the added value of the concept of MLG and the ensuing process of using it as a 'practical model', albeit not as a theory. He also made connection with the subsidiarity and the "new regionalism" paradigms, which are in process of being modified, not least by such important political documents such as the *White Paper on MLG*. **Dr. Paolo Ponzano** made the convincing case for a renewed community method with the participation of the largest possible number of stakeholders. He reminded the audience about the objectives of the 2001 *White Paper on Governance*, which were taken over by the CoR President Luc van den Barande in the recently adopted *White Paper on MLG*. He also singled out the challenges and risks posed by the non-inclusion of "impact assessment" strategies ex-ante in the decision-making process. In addition, ex-post evaluation mechanisms need to equally be strengthened. Regions with legislative powers must ensure a better and timely transposition of EU directives. **Andrea Benassi** emphasised the importance of SMEs for local and regional governance in Europe. The concept of MLG is deemed important to explaining not only political and policy, but also business and social relations. As regards the subsidiarity principle, also 'horizontal' subsidiarity needs to be taken into account in order to ensure a proper ex ante debate on possible EU actions towards SME's with the socio-economic partners. **Béatrice Taulègne** emphasised the central role played multilevel governance tools in achieving the objectives of various community policies. The efficiency of the latter is in fact dependent upon the skilful use of such mechanisms and tools, while the participation of local and regional authorities in this process might be crucial to achieving many of these community goals. Moreover, a renewed community method, as defined by the 2001 *White Paper on Governance*, should primarily be based on the principle that "the European Commission proposes and implements, the Council and the EP decide, whilst national and regional actors take an active part in this mainly political process". The proposals put forward by the CoR in its *White Paper on MLG* go to the heart of the matter by being both congruent with other similar reports taking the territorial dimension into account (e.g. the recent Barca and Beaupuy reports) and being innovative, in the sense that local institutional experimentation and policy implementation are also proposed. **Jean-Marie Beaupuy** underscored the importance of governance relationships at the micro-level. He described the blurring of responsibility and juridical competences during such interactions, thus prioritising informal and indirect contacts between citizen groups and authorities. A better definition of the principles of partnership and MLG seems to be the answer. Further he advocated the elaboration of a Charter on MLG and called on policy makers to exchange good practices, provide the necessary training and make the Erasmus for local and regional

#### 07D07

7 October 2009,  
11:00-13:00

#### Organiser:

Committee of the Regions, Forward Studies Unit

#### Chair:

**Béatrice Taulègne**, Committee of the Regions and Javier Sanchez, EIPA Barcelona

#### Speakers:

**Prof. Michel Bauer**, University of Konstanz

**Prof. Frank Delmartino**, University of Leuven

**Dr. Paolo Ponzano**, Fellow European University Institute Florence

**Andrea Benassi**, UEAPME

**Jean-Marie Beaupuy**, Rapporteur on the European Parliament Report on "Governance and partnership at national and regional levels and a basis for projects in the sphere of regional policy"

**Bart Vanhercke**, University of Amsterdam

**Dr. Virginie Guiraudon**, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris

#### More information:

On the CoR White Paper on MLG:

[www.cor.europa.eu/governance](http://www.cor.europa.eu/governance)

On CoR Ateliers:

[www.cor.europa.eu/ateliers](http://www.cor.europa.eu/ateliers)

*"At present, the quality of governance in Europe could only be measured by taking into account the partnership principle between various levels and centres of authority."*

(Prof. dr. Frank Delmartino)

# Theme D - Workshops

## Achieving results, looking ahead: EU Cohesion Policy's evaluation and future prospects



### *Multilevel governance in the EU: New prospects for a European Union with its regions and cities (suite)*

politicians a reality. **Bart Vanhercke** presented in clear and succinct fashion the novelties surrounding the OMC (and its reinvention and launching again after 2010). He exemplified his hypotheses and conclusions with the social policy in Europe. The role of RLA's in the OMC should be stepped up in the future, however a regional OMC seems difficult to put in place. **Prof. Virginie Guiraudon** introduced an interesting aspect of MLG – migration policy. She emphasised the important role of LRAs in the integration and empowering of migrant communities. She also described the idea of "citizen regions" by putting stress on the principle of "solidarity", especially in a territorially concentrated context of migrants in some EU member states.

#### **Conclusions**

- All speakers emphasised the importance of MLG for their research and policy work
- The CoR was given credit for re(launching) this debate and bringing the academic community on board. Its *White Paper on MLG* was at the centre of most debates
- The work of other institutions (European Commission, European Parliament, national and regional administrations) was also mentioned in relation to CoR's ambitions and ongoing activities. Strengthened MLG in Europe can only be achieved in partnership.
- Regional innovation and experimentation were not forgone, especially as regards softer forms of EU governance, such as social, migration and research policy, but also in relation to the renewed OMC after 2010.



### Ex post evaluation 2000-06: Is building environment infrastructure supporting growth in Europe?

#### Outline

During the workshop the consultants (A.D.E.) presented the finding of the ex post evaluation of ERDF environment interventions. The study is at the final stage and will be published in November on Inforegio. The main findings of the study are:

- Interventions related to environment represent a very significant share in ERDF allocations: EUR 25.5 billion, which is 21% of the total ERDF budget (figures are not including the Cohesion Fund). Environment spending is dominated by planning and rehabilitation (45%) and environment infrastructure (42%). Half of the ERDF environment budget was concentrated in the 4 cohesion countries (EL, ES, IE, PT). The workshop and the study mainly focused on environment infrastructure.
- The literature of the impact of environment on economic growth, at least which could be relevant in an EU context, is very poor.
- ERDF investments in environment proved to be successful in general, and greatly contributed to meeting the requirements laid down in various directives. In fact, environment infrastructure investments were driven by the needs of the directives and were not constructed to deliver economic impacts. Consequently, the economic impacts in the region remain isolated, there is no spill-over or identifiable influence on economic growth.
- Even when investments in environment were claimed to be designed to have economic impact, the accompanying measures were missing and coordination with other operations aimed at regional economic development was very limited. Environment investments were actually not part of the general or economic development strategies (even when they were claimed to be).

#### Debate

The members of the audience, mainly MS practitioners and academics, confirmed the findings by saying that they were in line with their experiences.

#### Conclusions

In the future, attention should be paid to the currently unexploited synergies between environment and other public investments.

**07D08**

**7 October 2009,  
14:30-16:15**

#### Organiser:

European Commission, DG Regional Policy

#### Chair:

**Veronica Gaffey**, European Commission, DG Regional Policy

#### Speakers:

**Mary Van Overbeke**, A.D.E., Belgium  
**Benoit Lixon**, A.D.E., Belgium

#### More information:

The report can be found at:  
[www.ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/expost2006/wp5b\\_en.htm](http://www.ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/expost2006/wp5b_en.htm)

# Theme D - Workshops

Achieving results, looking ahead: EU Cohesion Policy's evaluation and future prospects



## The European Social Fund support for administrative capacity building

**07D09**  
**7 October 2009,**  
**14:30 - 16:15**

### Organiser:

European Commission, DG  
Employment, Social Affairs and Equal  
Opportunities

### Chair:

**Tony Venables**, European Citizen  
Action Service

### Speakers:

**Paweł Choraży**, Ministry for Regional  
Development, Poland.

**Alexander Heichlinger**, EPSA 2009  
project, EIPA-ECR Barcelona, Spain

**Viktor Horváth**, Public  
administration reform programs  
managing authority, National  
Development Agency, Hungary

**Mathieu Lefebvre**, European  
Commission, DG Employment, Social  
Affairs and Equal Opportunities

### More information:

European Commission:  
[www.ec.europa.eu/employment\\_](http://www.ec.europa.eu/employment_social/esf/index_en.htm)  
[social/esf/index\\_en.htm](http://www.ec.europa.eu/employment_social/esf/index_en.htm)  
[www.ec.europa.eu/employment\\_](http://www.ec.europa.eu/employment_social/esf/fields/transnational_en.htm)  
[social/esf/fields/transnational\\_](http://www.ec.europa.eu/employment_social/esf/fields/transnational_en.htm)  
[en.htm](http://www.ec.europa.eu/employment_social/esf/fields/transnational_en.htm)  
EPSA:  
[www.epsa2009.eu](http://www.epsa2009.eu)  
Hungarian National Development  
Agency:  
[www.nfu.hu/?lang=en](http://www.nfu.hu/?lang=en)

### Outline

**Tony Venables** opened the workshop introducing the role of the European Social Fund as an important tool to support administrative capacity building in many Member states of the EU. He stressed out two possible points which could be among others discussed in this workshop. 1) The term "administrative capacity building" looks, at first glance, very "inward looking". It appears mainly as reforms decided, implemented and followed up by administrations in order to improve their internal process or their deliveries of services. But the external dimensions of these reforms – the citizens' involvement and the partnership with NGOs – are also a key issue we should address. 2) The crisis has an impact on the political agenda and on the financial resources allocated in the various member states. Thus, it would be interesting to assess to which extent the crisis had modified the context in regards to ESF support for administrative capacity building.

### Debate

**Mathieu Lefebvre** presented the state of play. Administrative capacity building is one of the main ESF priorities under the convergence objective (€2.5 billion). Its implementation is not overly fast but remains in lines with other programmes. ESF supports administrations as well as NGOs in order to facilitate a better involvement of civil society in the design and implementation of public policies. In the context of the crisis, administrative capacity remains a condition for successful public policies and thus socio-economic development. The presentation of **Paweł Choraży** covered the learning network on administrative capacity building recently founded by Poland, Bulgaria, Greece, Lithuania and Romania. It aims to facilitate mutual learning between member states and to stimulate the effective use of ESF resources for public administration reforms. These activities will be carried out for two years through an online space, working groups with face-to-face learning activities and ad hoc contributions to the monitoring committees for ESF operational programmes. **Alexander Heichlinger** presented the "European Public Sector Award 2009". The Award Ceremony will be held in November in Maastricht with the presentation of the best 20 project applications and the delivery of 4 awards in 4 thematic areas: (i) performance improvement in public service delivery, (ii) citizen involvement, (iii) new forms of partnership working, (iv) leadership and management for change. EPSA aims to provide the conditions for a permanent learning platform on leading-edge public administration solutions. **Viktor Horváth** focused on the first experiences learnt in implementing the Hungarian "State Reform" OP (€172 million). 32% of the allocations have been contracted. This OP enjoyed an early start, but the implementation has slowed, due to a learning phase for the actors and sometimes their poor project management capability. Nevertheless, there are already some positive steps in the change of culture (new initiatives reinforced by the use of calls, use of public procurement...).

### Conclusions

**Mr Venables** concluded the workshop by summing up the discussions:

- For the new period 2007-2013, ESF brings a significant support to enhance the capacities of public administrations and public services at national, regional and local level. But implementation should be accelerated and reinforced during the crisis.
- The learning network on administrative capacity building and the organisation of EPSA 2009 offer knowledge and know-how to better implement this priority in the ESF operational programmes.
- ESF support can – in addition to supporting Social Partners - also be used by NGOs in order to promote a better involvement of citizens or civil society in the design and implementation of public policies.

*"Especially at the time of an economic downturn, strengthening institutional and administrative capacity in order to create a stable business environment will underpin structural adjustments and foster growth and jobs. Reducing regulatory and administrative burdens on businesses helps to increase productivity and strengthen competitiveness."*



### Roma Inclusion: experiences from cohesion policy programmes

#### Outline

An estimated 8–10 million Roma are Europe's largest ethnic minority and, in many countries, they are the fastest-growing ethnic group. In most EU Member States, the Roma are deprived of the financial means essential for adequate living conditions, as well as lack of access to education, jobs, and social and health services. Cohesion policy has the potential to improve the situation of these Roma communities. However, it is important to adopt a holistic approach and learn from good practice gathered at the European level when implementing programmes involving a significant Roma population. On 7 October, an audience of over 100 people attended the workshop on "Roma inclusion: Experiences from Cohesion Policy programmes."

#### Debate

**Katarína Matheriová** and **Thomas Bender** co-chaired the session. The Hungarian MEP **Livia Jaroka** opened the workshop and in her speech she called for the need to shift the problem of Roma inclusion from the sphere of moral antidiscrimination to the sphere of economic need and demographic evolution. It is more and more an economic necessity to train and educate the Roma population from infancy because, in countries like Hungary, the birth rate of Roma children has already over-taken the births of non-Roma and demographic projections indicate that in forty years time Roma will represent fifty percent of the total Hungarian active population. Education is a must because we have to give chances to Roma people to get prepared and compete in the economic and social market. In that respect, the Structural Funds have to be used to impact upon the poorest in society and to make available to them funding for the implementation of specific projects targeted to specific needs. Mrs Jaroka invited academics and experts on Roma inclusion to contribute to a Report she is coordinating for the LIBE Committee of the European Parliament on Roma inclusion. **Cristina Balboni** described the composition of the Roma and Sinti population in her region, highlighting the diffusion of persistent discrimination and negative stereotypes toward this ethnic group called in Italian in different ways "zingari", "nomadi", "gitan". The effort of the region has been focused on interventions aimed at the integration of Roma and Sinti into the labour market and the involvement of business, public administration and NGOs in the shaping of specific projects. Ms Balboni concluded that the role of social operators is essential to empower the Roma population and to better address their specific needs. **Juan Carlos Castro** explained that the Roma population in the region represents three percent of the total population and that forty percent of the Roma population is below sixteen years old. The level of education is quite low with only seven out of ten Roma children completing secondary education. The problems to tackle span a range of issues from education, housing, health, and the region is intervening with specific projects in coordination with Segretariado Gitano and other associations active in the territory. The ACCEDER programme is the flagship Spanish project for the integration of the Roma population in the labour market and in Aragon is achieving satisfactory results. **Andor Urmos** explained that segregation is the most significant barrier to Roma integration and urban desegregation can be tackled through housing improvements and the eradication of ghettos. Hungary has succeeded in having equal opportunities as a horizontal priority in all interventions for urban integration. In that way, an integrated approach with projects in education, urban rehabilitation, employment and health-care has been made compulsory for public co-funding interventions. **Lýdia Suchova** explained that the comprehensive approach, under the Marginalised Roma Communities horizontal priority is co-funded by the Slovak government, and comprises contributions from six operational programmes with funding specifically targeted to Roma inclusion. Education, housing, employment and health are the main priorities of the local strategies prepared by the Mayors of the municipalities where the Roma population lives. Indeed the problem in Slovakia is more acute than in western countries because the majority of marginalised Roma population lives in slums and ghettos and need to be educated towards integration. In that respect the role of the social workers is an essential one as they can work on the ground directly with the population.

#### Conclusions

It was concluded that the Structural Funds represent one opportunity for change in the complex world of Roma inclusion and that indeed the problem is different in different EU countries. Roma inclusion policy and strategies have to consider the social and economic aspects together and need to focus strongly on early childhood education and training, bearing in mind that the demographic evolution of the population in a few years will result in a very high percentage of Roma population in the labour market.

#### 07D10

7 October 2009,  
14:30-17:00

#### Organisers:

European Commission, DG  
Employment, Social Affairs & Equal  
Opportunities  
European Commission, DG Regional  
Policy

#### Chairs:

**Thomas Bender**, European  
Commission, DG Employment, Social  
Affairs and Equal Opportunities  
**Katarína Matheriová**, European  
Commission, DG Regional Policy  
**Lenia Samuel**, European  
Commission, DG Employment, Social  
Affairs and Equal Opportunities

#### Speakers:

**Cristina Balboni**, Culture, Training  
and Labour Department, Emilia  
Romagna Region, Italy  
**Juan Carlos Castro Fernández**,  
Institute of Social services, Aragon  
region Government, Spain  
**Livia Jaroka**, European Parliament  
Lydia Suchova, Office of Government,  
Slovakia  
**Andor Urmos**, Ministry of Social  
Affairs and Labour, Hungary

#### More information:

[www.opendays.europa.eu](http://www.opendays.europa.eu)

# Theme D - Workshops

Achieving results, looking ahead: EU Cohesion Policy's evaluation and future prospects



## Ex-post evaluation 2000-06: Does Europe need new roads?

**07D11**

**7 October 2009,  
16:45-18:30**

**Organiser:**

European Commission, DG Regional Policy

**Speakers:**

**Francesco Dionori**, SDG, Italy

**More information:**

[www.opendays.europa.eu](http://www.opendays.europa.eu)

**Outline**

Transport infrastructure is vital for regional development. It brings people and economies together, creating the conditions for growth and development. This workshop presented the emerging findings from the ex post evaluation on the contribution of the ERDF in the transport sector during the 2000-2006 period. The wealth of information collected and analysed surprised everyone involved in the process, and provides the basis for more policy debate on the choices to be made in developing transport infrastructure. Some key figures from the evaluation:

- EUR 34 billion allocated
- 100.000Km of roads and motorways built / reconstructed
- 4000Km of railway built / reconstructed
- 31 airports modernised
- 130 ports modernised.

**Debate**

Following the presentation from **Steer Davies Gleave**, a discussion took place, with the active participation of managing authorities, environmental NGOs and the European Court of Auditors among others. The subject: the future of Transport policy and whether Europe needs more roads, a complex subject that triggered different reactions from the interested parties. For instance, some participants urged the Commission to have a closer look at the climate impact of supported transport investments.

**Conclusions**

The conclusions of this workshop were that for the first time, we have the information to feed a real debate on Cohesion Policy and Transport – and where we wish to go from here. Important issues which must be addressed are the balance between roads and rail, the difficulties being experienced in some Member States in building railways, the issue of sustainability, which must gain greater prominence, and the timeframe for investment in transport infrastructure – often longer than the seven to nine years of Cohesion Policy. It was agreed that there was scope for greater exchanges of expertise and good practice between Member States in this as in many other areas of intervention.



### European Cohesion Policy post-2013

#### Outline

**Commissioner Samecki** opened the session with a keynote speech highlighting a number of questions regarding Cohesion Policy, both on policy development/design and on policy implementation and evaluation. In the second part of this intervention, the Commissioner shared some of his ideas on the future cohesion policy: Cohesion policy will remain central to the European integration process in the years to come to allow all regions to benefit from the single market. However, some changes need to be made:

- concentrate resources on a limited number of narrowly defined core priorities such as innovation or promoting employment and social inclusion
- have a stronger focus on results
- put a stronger emphasis on developing effective institutions
- strengthen the strategic dimension of cohesion policy
- simplify the delivery system and make it more efficient
- make the cohesion policy budget and spending rules more flexible to help generate new ideas and approaches

**Mario Pezzini** added some elements, including:

- There should be an additional financial effort at local level (also fiscal effort in terms of revenue); however public investments should be carefully orientated on development, as without a clear vision on how to use fiscal packages, that effort will be lost
- Regional policy is needed as it is the only policy that is able to exploit potential at regional and local level, based on investments in public goods that involve different actors

In the second half of the panel, the discussion was channelled around a few key topics raised by the moderator, **Jacki Davies**:

**1) Whether the 4 challenges are still the right ones? What are the key priorities for CP to concentrate on?** The panellists agreed that "one policy does not fit all". **Fuente** advised not to constraint regions too much, while **McCann** stated that a great advantage of a place-based approach is that it can be tailored at local level, but the real advantage is to respond locally to the globalization. **Gorzalak** favoured a CP for the whole EU and mentioned globalization as its biggest challenge, stating that Europe should be able to compete in a global world. **Drabenstott** mentioned two challenges: globalisation and crisis. As main priorities, he mentioned investments, as opposed to spending, and development, as opposed to growth.

**2) Whether CP should cover all EU regions? Should we focus on well-being?** **Fuente** stated that we should stick to GDP as the major indicator. **Gorzalak** said that we should detach from convergence, as evidence shows that it cannot be reached, and he stressed there is an urgent need to develop a system of an effective coordination of sectoral policies. For **Drabenstott** the key issue is whether we want all regions to develop, and furthermore - whether we want the "Robin-Hood style" cohesion policy ("let's take from rich and give to the poor") or the regional policy, which unlocks developmental potential of all regions regardless their nature (urban, rural, poor, rich...). For **Tomaney**, what matters is what kind of development we want and to whom we want to address our actions. **McCann** defended CP should work to allow structural adjustment, networking and bringing benefits at local level. Concerning agglomerations he pointed out (by OECD) that most productivity occurs in medium-size cities in Europe.

**3) Key challenge for future EU Cohesion Policy:** **Drabenstott** mentioned two priorities: Invest in competitiveness of regions, with a careful definition of investment, and create a fund at national level to add to CP (financial additionality concept). **Tomaney** proposed that the future debate should go beyond GDP and focus on how to express well-being, while **Gorzalak** and **Fuente** mentioned simplification (avoid excessive complication of procedures and bureaucracy) and balance (performance/results and control).

**08D02**

**8 October 2009,  
9:30-12:30**

#### Organiser:

European Commission, Regional Policy Directorate-General

#### Chair:

**Dirk Ahner**, European Commission, DG Regional Policy

#### Moderator:

**Jacki Davies**, European Policy Center

#### Speakers:

**Commissioner Pawel Samecki**  
**Mario Pezzini**, OECD, DG Regional Policy

**Angel de la Fuente**, Instituto de Análisis Económico, Spain

**Mark Drabenstott**, OECD/Territorial Development Policy Committee  
**Grzegorz Gorzelak**, EUROREG at Warsaw University, Poland

**Philip McCann**, University of Groningen, The Netherlands

**John Tomaney**, Newcastle University, United Kingdom

#### More information:

[http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/policy/future/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/policy/future/index_en.htm)

