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Purpose of the research

• Development of knowledge regarding the degree to which the effects of programmes implemented in Poland within the Interreg IIIA Community Initiative contributed to an improvement of social, commercial and territorial coherence of the areas covered by the operation of the programmes.

• Evaluation of the system of implementation of the Interreg IIIA programmes in Poland.
The Interreg IIIA cross-border co-operation programmes in Poland in 2004-2006:

- Mecklenburg –Vorpommern/Brandenburg – Poland (Zachodniopomorskie) 2004-2006 (abbr. PL-MV),
- Poland (Lubuskie) – Brandenburg 2004-2006 Poland (abbr. PL-BB),
- Saxony – Republic of Poland (Dolnośląskie) 2004-2006 (abbr. PL-SN),
- Czech Republic – Poland 2004-2006 (abbr. PL-CZ),
- Poland – Slovak Republic 2004-2006 (abbr. PL-SK),
- Neighbourhood Programme Poland – Belarus – Ukraine (abbr. PBU),

Source: Ministry of Regional Development
Concept of the research

• The analysis was conducted "bottom up" – an analysis of all implemented projects, drawing conclusions on this basis regarding effects of the programme at sectoral and general levels.

• Results were analysed for the following three types of intervention instruments:
  • investment projects,
  • soft projects,
  • microprojects.

• Comparison of impact of 7 cross-border programmes required a common platform of programme comparison. It was set by the following two variables:
  • types of intervention (measures/projects) implemented as part of cross-border co-operation programmes (instead of priorities and measures from operating programmes which differ depending on the programme),
  • scope of impact of Interreg IIIA cross-border co-operation programmes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of intervention</th>
<th>Areas of operation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Promotion of development of municipal, rural and seaside areas,</td>
<td>• REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT – reduction of differences in social and economic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Development of entrepreneurship spirit, small and medium-sized enterprises, tourism</td>
<td>of regions divided by state borders (increase of economic, human and environmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and local development, as well as initiatives connected with employment,</td>
<td>capital of border areas).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Integration of the labour market and promotion of social integration,</td>
<td>• PERIPHERALITY – decrease of peripherality of border areas (improvement of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Co-operation in the field of research, technical development, education, culture,</td>
<td>quality of life, social integration, natural environment and increase of possibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communication, healthcare and population,</td>
<td>of spending free time and earning money in the vicinity of a person’s place of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Environmental protection, power effectiveness and renewable sources of energy,</td>
<td>residence, as well as improvement of aesthetic appearance of the surroundings).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Basic infrastructure of importance for border areas,</td>
<td>• FLOW CAPACITY – increase of territorial coherence of areas located on both sides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Legal and administrative co-operation,</td>
<td>of the border (infrastructural investment projects increasing the flow capacity of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Co-operation between citizens and institutions.</td>
<td>the border for trans-border passenger and cargo traffic, as well as “flow capacity”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of information – monitoring and information exchange systems).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• COMMON MARKET – reduction of barriers in business operations and free flow of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>employees (projects supporting corporate co-operation, development of offers for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>foreign clients (including tourist products), elimination of barriers for increase of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>employability on the other side of the border).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ECOSYSTEMS – reduction of barriers in coherent management of ecosystems divided by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>national borders (including security systems concerning ecological and natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>disasters).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• INTEGRATION – reduction of barriers in social and cultural integration on both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sides of the border (increase of knowledge about societies and areas on the other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>side of the border, increase of mutual trust, overcoming prejudices, knowledge of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the language).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• PARTNERSHIP – creation of stable structures and co-operation habits by encouraging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>partnership (INSTITUTIONAL PARTNERSHIP) of institutions and organizations involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in programming, programme implementation and execution of common projects, as well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as to target group partnership (CITIZENS’ PARTNERSHIP) in implemented projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methods of research

- Documents’ analysis
- Individual interviews with central administration (IDI, n=10)
- Individual interviews with regional administration and partner institutions (IDI, n=47)
- Group interviews with regional administration and partner institutions (FGI, n=7)
- CAWI questionnaire among programme beneficiaries (n=809)
- CATI questionnaire among „inactive” communes (gminas) (n= 600)
- CAWI questionnaire among foreign partners of Polish applicants (n=47)
- Quantitative analysis of data from all applications and reports (n=1916)
- Analysis of press releases from local press (n=204)
Research results
Project structure

Source: own work on the basis of data from applications and final reports of beneficiaries of Interreg IIIA projects in Poland.
## Interreg IIIA products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>PL-MV</th>
<th>PL-BB</th>
<th>PL-SN</th>
<th>PL-CZ</th>
<th>PL-SK</th>
<th>PBU</th>
<th>LPR</th>
<th>Total Interreg IIIA in Poland</th>
<th>Total Interreg IIIA in EU*</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total budget of implemented projects (mln euro)</td>
<td>29.20</td>
<td>32.83</td>
<td>27.86</td>
<td>18.01</td>
<td>10.93</td>
<td>37.07</td>
<td>23.49</td>
<td>179.39</td>
<td>3948.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of implemented projects</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>18057</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networks, partnerships, co-operation, links, exchange platforms, co-operation structures initiated or strengthened</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>11971</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New and changed transport routes, roads, railways, rivers, canals, bicycle and pedestrian routes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newly-constructed or modernized transport infrastructure sites</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental protection infrastructure – sites</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of constructed or modernized waterworks (km)</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td>no data available</td>
<td>no data available</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of constructed or modernized sewage systems (km)</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>128.2</td>
<td>no data available</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established, supported or modernized tourist sites, locations or routes</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2595</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>3137</td>
<td>25238</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interreg IIIA Scale

Value of financing - the EU part (in mln PLN) for projects implemented within programmes and initiatives of the 2004-2006 period

## Structure of intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of intervention</th>
<th>Measure covered by the Operational Programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PL-MV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 DEVELOPMENT OF MUNICIPAL AREAS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 DEVELOPMENT OF RURAL AREAS</td>
<td>Measure D-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 DEVELOPMENT OF SEASIDE AREAS</td>
<td>Measure 2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ENTREPRENEURSHIP, SME, tourism and local development, employment</td>
<td>Measure A-1, A-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND SME</td>
<td>Measure B-1, B-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 TOURISM</td>
<td>Measure B-1, B-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 LOCAL DEVELOPMENT AND EMPLOYMENT</td>
<td>Measure E-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Integration of the labour market and promotion of social integration</td>
<td>Measure A-2, B-1, F-1, F-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Co-operation in the area of research, technical development, education, culture, communication, healthcare and population</td>
<td>Measure C-1, C-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Environmental protection, power efficiency and renewable sources of energy</td>
<td>Measure C-1, C-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Basic infrastructure of importance for border areas</td>
<td>Measure B-1, B-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Legal and administrative co-operation</td>
<td>Measure F-1, F-2, F-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Co-operation between citizens and institutions</td>
<td>Measure F-1, F-2, F-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Types of projects

Types of investment projects. Share of the number of projects of a given type in total number of investment projects within the Interreg IIIA programmes

- Investments made in transport infrastructure (ways, bridges, railways, water routes)
- Investments made in circum-manufacturing infrastructure (industrial zones, economic zones, business supporting institutions)
- Investments in cultural and educational objects/devices
- Investments in sport objects/devices
- Investments in tourist objects/devices
- Investments made in those objects/devices that serve environmental protection/fire protection/disaster protection
- Investments in other objects/devices
- Renovation/protection of cultural heritage and monuments

Source: own work on the basis of data from applications and final reports of beneficiaries of Interreg IIIA projects in Poland.
Types of projects

Types of soft projects. Share of the number of projects of a given type in total number of soft projects within the Interreg IIIA programmes.

Source: own work on the basis of data from applications and final reports of beneficiaries of Interreg IIIA projects in Poland.
Types of microprojects. Share of the number of projects of a given type in a total number of microprojects within the Interreg IIIA programmes

Source: own work on the basis of data from applications and final reports of beneficiaries of Interreg IIIA projects in Poland.
Spatial concentration

Number of projects implemented in communes (gminas) belonging to the intervention area of Interreg IIIA in Poland

Source: own work on the basis of data from applications and final reports of beneficiaries of Interreg IIIA projects in Poland.
Spatial concentration

Average number of projects implemented by project-originators from cities of a given size category (according to the population size).

Source: own work on the basis of data from applications and final reports of beneficiaries of Interreg IIIA projects in Poland.
Spatial concentration

Number of projects depending on city size – location of the project-originator’s registered office. Poland-Mecklenburg Programme

Source: own work on the basis of data from applications and final reports of beneficiaries of Interreg IIIA projects in Poland.
Spatial concentration

Number of projects depending on city size – location of the project-originator’s registered office. Poland-Brandenburg Programme.

Source: own work on the basis of data from applications and final reports of beneficiaries of Interreg IIIA projects in Poland.
Number of projects depending on city size – location of the project-originator’s registered office. Poland-Saxony Programme.

Source: own work on the basis of data from applications and final reports of beneficiaries of Interreg IIIA projects in Poland.
Spatial concentration

Number of projects depending on city size – location of the project-originator’s registered office. Poland-Czech Republic Programme

Size of places
- village
- town up to 9,999 population
- town 10,000 - 19,999
- town 20,000 - 49,999
- town 50,000 - 99,999
- town 100,000 - 199,999

Source: own work on the basis of data from applications and final reports of beneficiaries of Interreg IIIA projects in Poland.
Spatial concentration

Number of projects depending on city size – location of the project-originator’s registered office. Poland-Slovakia Programme

Size of places
- village
- towns up to 9,999
- towns 10,000-19,999
- towns 20,000-49,999
- towns 50,000-99,999
- towns 100,000-199,999

Source: own work on the basis of data from applications and final reports of beneficiaries of Interreg IIIA projects in Poland.
Spatial concentration

Number of projects depending on city size – location of the project-originator’s registered office. Poland-Belarus-Ukraine Programme

Size of places

- Village
- Town up to 9,999
- Town 10,000-19,999
- Luvii 20,000-49,999
- Town 50,000-99,999
- Town 100,000-199,999
- City 200,000-499,999

Source: own work on the basis of data from applications and final reports of beneficiaries of Interreg II A projects in Poland.
Spatial concentration

Number of projects depending on city size – location of the project-originator’s registered office. Lithuania-Poland-Russian Federation (Kaliningrad Oblast) Programme.

Source: own work on the basis of data from applications and final reports of beneficiaries of Interreg IIIA projects in Poland.
Spatial concentration

Investment projects. Share of the number of projects implemented in border gminas and other gminas.

Source: own work on the basis of data from applications and final reports of beneficiaries of Interreg IIIA projects in Poland.
Conclusions

• **Interreg IIIA achievements in Poland are proportional** from the point of view of proportions of available budgets to the achievements of the Interreg programmes in Europe, and – on the other hand – taking into account the fact that they were implemented for a period shorter by 3 years (from 2004) than the other programmes, we may state that they were implemented in a more effective manner.

• **Expenditure on Interreg IIIA programmes in Poland was too small to talk about actual impact of this programme on general development indicators.** An impact of cross-border co-operation throughout EU is evaluated in a similar manner.

• In none of the Interreg IIIA programmes implemented on Polish borders **was it possible to concentrate resources on a certain number of priority areas** because the mere structure of operational programmes, due to its capacious thematic contents, promoted the ‘demand’ model among project-originators.

• **Spatial concentration of projects is correlated with the structure and density of the city network of the border areas.**
Evaluation of impact of cross-border programmes
Evaluation of project impact = impact "strength" * effectiveness of implementation

Impact strength:
• 0 – impossible to state that the project will bring about effects characteristic for a given impact area;
• 1 – main effects of the project belong to a different impact area, but it is possible to state that the project will bring about additional effects characteristic for the analysed impact area;
• 2 – the project gives equal effects in more than one impact areas;
• 3 – the project exhibits one main effect characteristic for a given impact area, the other effects may be omitted.

Effectiveness of implementation:
• percentage of implementation of the main product indicator.
Average grades of projects in the PERIPHERALITY area

PERIPHERALITY - decrease of peripherality of border areas (improvement of the quality of life, social integration, natural environment and increase of possibilities of spending free time and earning money in the vicinity of a person’s place of residence, as well as improvement of aesthetic appearance of the surroundings)

Source: own work on the basis of data from applications and final reports of beneficiaries of Interreg IIIA projects in Poland.
Grades in PERIPHERALITY – investment projects, division into types of intervention

Source: own work on the basis of data from applications and final reports of beneficiaries of Interreg IIIA projects in Poland.

Share of budgets of projects affecting exclusively PERIPHERALITY

- Promotion of development of municipal, rural and seaside areas
- Entrepreneurship, SME, tourism and local development, as well as initiatives connected with employment
- Integration of the labour market and promotion of social integration
- Co-operation in the field of research, technical development, education, culture, communication, healthcare and population
- Environmental protection, power effectiveness and renewable sources of energy
- Basic infrastructure of importance for border areas
- Legal and administrative co-operation
- Co-operation between citizens and institutions
Average grades of projects in the area of FLOW CAPACITY

- **FLOW CAPACITY** - increase of territorial coherence of areas located on both sides of the border (infrastructural investment projects increasing the flow capacity of the border for trans-border passenger and cargo traffic, as well as "flow capacity" of information –monitoring and information exchange systems).

Average grades of projects in the area of ECOSYSTEMS

ECOSYSTEMS - reduction of barriers in coherent management of ecosystems divided by national borders (including security systems concerning ecological and natural disasters).

Source: own work on the basis of data from applications and final reports of beneficiaries of Interreg IIIA projects in Poland.
Average grades of projects in the area of COMMON MARKET

- COMMON MARKET - reduction of barriers in business operations and free flow of employees (projects supporting corporate co-operation, development of offers for foreign clients (including tourist products), elimination of barriers for increase of employability on the other side of the border).

Average grades of projects in the area of INTEGRATION

- INTEGRATION - reduction of barriers in social and cultural integration on both sides of the border (increase of knowledge about societies and areas on the other side of the border, increase of mutual trust, overcoming prejudices, knowledge of the language).

Source: own work on the basis of data from applications and final reports of beneficiaries of Interreg IIIA projects in Poland.
Conclusions:

- The greatest impact of investment projects was on reduction of peripherality and improvement of the quality of life in border areas. They do not directly generate the cross-border effect. **Beneficiaries**, having at their disposal a wide spectrum of interventions, decided to satisfy the most urgent developmental needs.

- Soft projects had a significant impact on reduction of barriers in socio-cultural integration of the communities on both sides of the border (increase of knowledge about the communities and areas on the other side of the border, increase of mutual trust, overcoming prejudices, knowledge of the language).
Evaluation of partnership

INSTITUTIONAL PARTNERSHIP:
• 0 – co-operation between partners took place only formally and there was no actual co-operation at the time of project implementation;
• 1 – co-operation took place but there was no declaration of continuation of co-operation;
• 2 – co-operation was efficient, partners declare that they plan to continue co-operation;
• 3 – co-operation was efficient, partners declare and plan continued co-operation, there is evidence to prove it in the form of plans of common undertakings or formal documents (establishment of structures), such as agreements, memorandums of understanding, membership in the same organizations, associations, etc.

CITIZENS’ PARTNERSHIP:
• 0 – the project does not anticipate direct participation of target groups from the other side of the border;
• 1 – direct participation in the project of target groups from the other side of the border is anticipated;
• 2 – the project meets the need of integration of target groups;
• 3 – it was possible to demonstrate that as a result of the project, bottom-up integration took place and co-operation between representatives of target groups from both sides of the border was established.
Evaluation of partnership

Average values of grades of projects in the INSTITUTIONAL PARTNERSHIP impact area

Number of partners in projects. Investment projects

Source: own work on the basis of data from applications and final reports of beneficiaries of Interreg IIIA projects in Poland.
Evaluation of partnership

Average values of grades of projects in the CITIZENS’ PARTNERSHIP impact area

Source: own work on the basis of data from applications and final reports of beneficiaries of Interreg IIIA projects in Poland.
Conclusions

• Microprojects brought about significant effects in the case of creation of permanent structures and co-operation habits by encouraging to partnership of institutions and organizations in implementation of common projects, in particular in case of microprojects implemented along the western border.

• The implementation strategy adopted for cross-border programmes, consisting of application of the partnership principle in preparation and implementation of projects, is an important principle contributing a significant added value. Apparently, even when individual projects do not contribute significant cross-border effects, the mere process of project preparation and implementation brings about effects in the form of establishment and consolidation of cross-border co-operation between entities participating in this process.

• Significantly weaker effects, apart from the Poland-Mecklenburg Programme, were achieved in the area of partnership of project target groups.
Types of beneficiaries

Types of beneficiaries of investment projects. Percentage share of projects implemented by a given type of beneficiary in total number of projects.

Source: own work on the basis of data from applications and final reports of beneficiaries of Interreg IIIA projects in Poland.
Types of beneficiaries of microprojects. Percentage share of projects implemented by a given type of beneficiaries in the total number of projects.

Source: own work on the basis of data from applications and final reports of beneficiaries of Interreg IIIA projects in Poland.
Conclusions

• Interreg IIIA Programmes in Poland provided local governments of border areas with a platform to establish and consolidate partner relations with local governments on the other side of the border.

• Microprojects, due to their scale, are more accessible for other types of beneficiaries than territorial self-government units (e.g. non-governmental organizations), thus extending the spectrum of communities covered by the programme.
Propagation of cross-border co-operation

In your opinion, did the project you implemented contribute to an increase in co-operation between institutions on both sides of the border?

Source: results of CAWI questionnaire among beneficiaries, n = 809.
During the programme, foreign participants in Polish programmes gained solid knowledge of their neighbours. The knowledge of the geographical, structural, economic, socio-cultural and historical situation of the border area was spread in a thorough, repeated and consolidated manner.

A circle of co-operation animators and propagators committed to the case, such as churches, schools, youth and adult education centres, authorities responsible for protection of monuments, cultural associations, libraries, museums, etc., was established and continues to develop.

On both sides of the border, the number of persons having a thorough knowledge of the language of the neighbouring state increased.

Source: Individual interviews with representatives of the central (n=10) and regional (n=47) administration
Propagation of cross-border co-operation

Added value – Was it possible, in Polish projects, to notice an increase in mutual understanding and an improvement of mutual relations among participants coming from both sides of the border?

Source: individual interviews with representatives of central (n=10) and regional (n=47) administration
Evaluation of the implementation system
Implementation system

• The system of implementation of Interreg IIIA was quite complicated. Just as in the case of each cross-border programme, the institutional structure was doubled on both sides of the border. This complication is the cost incurred in connection with the basic strategy of implementation of cross-border programmes, such as partnership of participants in the process on both sides of the border.

• The level of costs of management of Interreg IIIA in Poland, as compared with the allocation, does not differ from costs of management of the other Interreg IIIA programmes in the EU. It is, however, higher than the level of costs of management of ‘national’ programmes, but this is a result of the adopted partner formula of implementation of cross-border programmes.
Implementation system

Relative average (compared to allocation) costs of management of Interreg IIIA programme in Poland with a breakdown into costs of management of selected Interreg IIIA programmes in the EU

Promotion

- **Too little funds** were allocated for promotion of the Interreg programmes. This was not only a result of a small promotional budget (financed from Technical Assistance) but mainly the consequence of low significance which the implementing entity attributed to promotional activities, because small allocations for promotions were still not fully used.

- The best channel of dissemination of information about the programme turned out to be the Internet and trainings conducted by **Regional Contact Points**. Especially training was indicated as a desired form of transfer of in-depth information.

- **Insufficient promotion** prevented propagation of important features distinguishing the Interreg programme – cross-border co-operation and partnership, which were perceived mainly as an **obstacle in access to the funds of the programme**.
Promotion

Nature of press messages

- 32 critical
- 9 neutral
- 158 promotional

Messages inspired by information services against the all messages analysed

- 14 inspired
- 185 remaining

Source: own work based on an analysis of press releases from local press (67 titles) in the period from January 2007 to June 2008
System of project evaluation

• Criteria of project selection preferred projects with ‘cross-border effect’, however the notion itself is difficult and entailed numerous difficulties in understanding and evaluation to all participants of the process of project selection: applicants, evaluators and implementing entities.

• Procedural solutions of project selection provided a guarantee that interests will clash and attempts of putting pressure and lobbing will be eliminated. The project evaluation system, due to the fact that it had a number of stages and involved various committees, both of experts and political and social figures from both sides of the border, reduced the risk of selection for financing projects which were inconsistent with the programme objectives. The project evaluation system was also positively evaluated by beneficiaries.
Role of Euroregions

- Euroregions contributed their experience from implementation of microprojects in Phare CBC and the knowledge of characteristics of border areas. Their **positive role** in programming Interreg IIIA was noticed both by the administration and by beneficiaries.

- However, it seems that a euroregion, as a local entity, should be a **beneficiary of a cross-border programme** rather than a part of the implementation system, as was the case with Interreg IIIA.
Monitoring system

- **The system of indicators had a number of faults**: certain indicators cannot be measured, they are improperly defined, the system is incoherent.

- The greatest weakness of the monitoring system in Interreg IIIA in Poland seems to be **the freedom granted to beneficiaries** in selection of indicators, which resulted in the fact that it was impossible to aggregate project products for the whole programme and correlate them with result and impact indicators, because there was no coherence between them.
Recommendations
Recommendation 1. **Thematic concentration**

The cross-border programmes should concentrate their resources on selected priority areas. The programmes should concentrate on such types of intervention (priority areas), which, to a relevant degree, contribute to the achievement of the cross-border effect.

• The structure of intervention should be composed of a narrow catalogue of intervention types (priority areas), including a properly-selected instruments (infrastructural and soft projects, microprojects):
  • infrastructural projects – flow capacity of the border and ecosystem management,
  • soft projects – removal of barriers in co-operation of enterprises, mobility of employees and integration of communities,
  • microprojects – co-operation between institutions and citizens.

**Addressee of the recommendation:** EC, Minister for regional development, programming entity

**Deadline for implementation:** applies to financial perspective of 2014-2020
Recommendation 2. **Territorial concentration**

Attempts should be made to achieve territorial concentration of resources by limitation of the eligibility area for investment projects within cross-border programmes.

- The width of the "eligibility strip" – balance between the distance from the border and potential of project-originators (density of the network of cities).
- Advised width – "one poviat" from the border.

**Addressee of the recommendation:** Minister for regional development  
**Deadline for implementation:** applies to financial perspective of 2014-2020
Recommendation 3. **Standard types of intervention and impact areas**

A standard catalogue of types of intervention and impact areas of cross-border programmes should be elaborated, which would serve as a tool of evaluation and monitoring of concentration of the programme resources on selected priority areas and which will become a basis for construction of the system of indicators.

- A tool for evaluation and establishment of a profile of operational programmes at the programming stage, aimed at achievement of concentration of funds.
- A basis for construction of a standard catalogue of indicators which will provide for ongoing monitoring of the degree of achievement of a given type of impact and which may support the process of project selection, choosing the projects which have the strongest influence on a given impact area.

**Addressee of the recommendation:** Minister for regional development

**Deadline for implementation:** applies to financial perspective of 2014-2020
Recommendation 4. **Uniform system of indicators**

A uniform system of indicators should be developed for all cross-border co-operation programmes, providing for monitoring of progress of operational programmes and achievement of their objectives. Beneficiaries should exclusively use indicators from the adopted system and should be obliged to report them.

- The system of indicators based on the assumption according to which the impact of the programme (or a group of projects) may be evaluated by counting the absolute number of projects (or their relative number – a percentage of the number of projects) which meet certain criteria, e.g. they make a ‘single’ contribution to the impact on a given area. The catalogue of indicators should be created on the basis of a standard catalogue of types of intervention.

**Addressee of the recommendation:** Minister for regional development

**Deadline for implementation:** applies to financial perspective of 2014-2020
Recommendation 5. Partnership in cross-border projects

The implementation strategy based on the partnership principle in projects, as adopted in cross-border programmes, should be continued and developed, but it is necessary to diversify and modify programme instruments aimed at implementation of the partnership principle, depending on the level (regional, supra-local, local and the level of organizations and citizens) at which the partnership is implemented.

• **Regional level** – involvement in the process of cross-border programme programming and implementation of self-government authorities of the regional level, by giving them access to dedicated instruments (system and key projects) supporting the process of establishment of functional regions.

• "**Supra-local" level" – strengthening and development of euroregions by giving them access to dedicated instruments (microproject funds in the ‘grant for grants’ formula and system projects) supporting their development.

• **Local level** – investment projects which provide the best partner co-operation platform to territorial self-government units.

• **Level of organizations and citizens - microprojects** which provide a co-operation platform to organizations other than self-government, thus extending the spectrum or communities represented in the programme.

• **Partnership** – required financial contribution of the partner from the other side of the border.

**Addressee of the recommendation:** Minister for regional development, programming entity

**Deadline for implementation:** applies to the financial perspective of 2014-2020
Recommendation 6. **Partnership in programming and implementation**

The strategy of programme implementation in the partnership formula should be continued because the mere process of programming and implementation of the programme in the partnership formula constitutes an important ‘cross-border’ added value for those institutions and communities which participate or are widely represented in it.

Collegiality of authorities taking decisions regarding project financing, wide representation of various groups of experts, social and political circles participating in the selection process, the principle of collegial decision-taking and technical assistance rendered by technical secretariats make this process more objective.

• Implementation of a cross-border programme in a partnership formula generates additional costs. The postulated level of funds for management – **5-7% of the programme allocation**.

**Addressee of the recommendation:** Minister for regional development

**Deadline for implementation:** applies to the financial perspective of 2014-2020
Recommendation 7. **Programme promotion**

Promotion of cross-border programme should be aimed at creation of a positive image of the programme which supports cross-border co-operation according to partnership principles, and the notions of cross-border and partnership character should be presented as an added value of projects, and not as troublesome additional conditions imposed in order to obtain a donation.

• The creation of the image should be financed from the system project which is at the disposal of a national institution managing the European Territorial Co-operation programme; purpose of the promotion – encouragement to participate in the programme, promotion of the idea of cross-border co-operation.

**Addressee of the recommendation:** Minister for regional development, programming entity

**Deadline for implementation:** applies to the financial perspective of 2014-2020
Recommendation 8. **Promotion, information and advisory services in regions**

The scope and scale of applied promotion and information tools in regions should be extended.
The advisory services for applicants should be maintained because this contributes to more mature projects being prepared by applicants.

- **Promotion:** use of PR tools and communication channels, co-operation with the local press.
- **Information:** use of the Internet, information and training activities of Regional Contact Points.
- **Advisory services:** Regional Contact Points.

**Addressee of the recommendation:** institutions of European Territorial Co-operation implementation system - central and regional

**Deadline for implementation:** current and future financial perspective
Recommendation 9. **Advance payments for beneficiaries**

Advance payments for beneficiaries should be implemented.

- Making an advance payment after signature of a contract or
- immediate but conditional settlement of the first payment (possible irregularities to be corrected at the time of submission of beneficiary’s next request for payment).

**Addressee of the recommendation:** institutions of European Territorial Co-operation implementation system - central and regional

**Deadline for implementation:** current and future financial perspective
Recommendation 10. **Monitoring system**

It is necessary to create a simple but uniform system of monitoring of basic data on projects, also the projects which have been submitted but have not been accepted for implementation.

Such a system should assume the existence of at least the following functionalities:

- register of applications for financing,
- register of applications for payment,
- register of reports,
- register of conducted controls,
- module of report and statistics generation.

**Addressee of the recommendation:** institutions of European Territorial Co-operation implementation system - central and regional

**Deadline for implementation:** current and future financial perspective
Thank you for your attention