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Executive summary

The Flanders-the Netherlands programme is clustered with three other A-strand programmes, which share the common characteristics that there are low levels of cross-border economic disparities; that there is very high density of border crossing possibilities; that all borders are internal EU-borders (including CH); that they are partly above-average & partly below-average concentration of ERDF-support on a limited number of “priority topics” listed in the INTERREG III Communication; that the depth & intensity level of cooperation achieved under the programmes is partly at high level and partly at a medium level; and that there exist strong or few common historic ties / a shared culture and in many cases also a common language. In general, these characteristics favour cross-border cooperation, which is supported by the findings of this case study.

In contrast to the Interreg I and II period, the Member States and the European Commission decided that the Euregios Scheldemond (ESM) and Benelux Midden Gebied (BMG) should develop a joint Interreg III programme for the period 2000-2006 for the Border Region Flanders - the Netherlands. The decision that both Euregios should make a programme together came at a relatively late moment, resulting in some delays starting up the programme due to organisational and procedural changes. Since both Euregios had drawn up their own programme strategy separately, the merging of the operational programmes resulted in the end in one programme document, in which actually two sub programmes were hidden. The collaboration between the two Euregios was at a minimum level. The case study shows that in the beginning of the programme period a high number of procedures, tasks and responsibilities were not clear. Due to the late merging of the two Operational Programmes, the programme underwent severe problems with the N+2 rule and the absorption of funds. Also the payment to project responsibles took a very long time.

Despite that the two sub programmes (ESM and BMG) were rather focussed on specific intervention codes, the overall programme strategy was broad, covering most of the fields of intervention (also with regard to the other programmes in the cluster). The financially most important intervention codes are 130, adaptation of rural areas 131, encouragement of tourist activities and 164, shared business services (business estates, incubator units, stimulation, promotional services, networking, conferences, trade fairs). There are major deviations between the relative intensity of the expenditure across the fields of intervention in the Flanders-the Netherlands programme and the INTERREG.

The ex ante budget of the programme and the measures meet the effective demand for the respective interventions, however, after the mid-term evaluation the budgets slightly shifted. On one hand it appeared difficult to fund projects aiming at creating jobs, on the other hand, in other priorities and measures the limit had already been reached. The decommitment of funds by the N+2 rule has mostly been felt by the measures not receiving a lot of project applications. The budgetary shifts were not only because of the low
absorption of funds, the changing socio-economic situation and the difficulties with the N+2 rule are also responsible for changes. At the end of the programme period, the budget shifted from ESM to BMG, since ESM had emptied their projects and still had the availability over aditional funds. These funds have been shifted to absorption projects in BMG.

The relation between the indicators and the intervention logic shows weaknesses. This makes it difficult to indicate the relevance of the results to the problems addressed in the SWOT. Despite this, one can say that with regard to some ‘solid’ indicators the programme scores realistic (not exceeding a 200% overperformance). The use of indicators in the monitoring and evaluation of the projects and the programme as a whole is rather limited. Instead, the project quality control is of major importance for monitoring at the project level.

The programme resulted in community value added on all levels (political, institution, socio-economic and socio-cultural). Not all results are tangible and some informal cooperations have started because people start to know each other. The impact of the project especially aimed at bringing people closer to each other (people-to-people projects) is impossible to measure. Still effects are expected.

Cross-border cooperation in the programme area has long historic ties. Mainly on a regional policy level, the benefit of confronting problems, weaknesses in a joint, transnational manner is acknowledged. The main elements that make regional governments cooperate are mutual trust and a common interest in specific priorities. During interreg III this trust and interest was established in the two distinct Euregios ESM and BMG. However, it has not been fully established between the two Euregios. The low number of truly joint ‘cross-projects’\(^1\) reflects this point. On an institutional level, the Interreg III programme enhanced the cooperation and alignment of organisations and institutions on both sides of the border. Also on a sustainable basis, after the Interreg III programme exchange of experience takes place. For many organisations therefore, the interreg III programme can be seen as a learning tool for cross-border cooperation, accessing European funds and organisational learning in finding co-financing.

The programme focuses on the socio-economic cohesion of the whole area as well as the socio-cultural cohesion. The opening of the labour market appeared to be a difficult task, also because of the negative economic development. Also infrastructural projects that help mobility in a direct way were hard to implement and effects can therefore not be expected. However, the potential is present and first steps have been made to increase the socio-economic cohesion and benefits from cross-border cooperation.

The socio-cultural cohesion received, amongst others, attention in the small but numerous People-to-people across-the border projects. These projects made it possible to fund small projects initiated by small organisations. They did not only bring ‘Europe’ closer to the people, but made the organisations to learn to work across the border.

\(^1\) So called kruisprojecten; projects in which both ESM and BMG participated.
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Mainly the Euregio ESM had the priority to further develop the touristic potential of the region. This has been done by developing infrastructure related to the cultural heritage of the region. This resulted in the whole region of an increase of the own, shared culture and heritage.

**Recommendations**

On the basis of the Flanders- the Netherlands case-study, the following recommendation can be made:

- A key issue for the Flanders - the Netherlands programme is whether there is an optimum with regard to the programme area to be covered while respecting the unique characteristics of the programme area. The programme merged two sub programmes into one programme. Each programme area had his unique characteristics. Experience shows that merging two programme areas needs to be based on a careful analysis of the specific socio, economic, political and physical infrastructure in each of the programme area and whether they could be covered within one programme. This should be carefully monitored in the future whether there are some drawbacks in economies of scale. A second element in this is that it takes some time to merge two independent operating programmes. Each programme has its own organisation structure and procedures. Experience in the Flanders Netherlands programme shows that in the beginning of the programme period a high number of procedures, tasks and responsibilities were not clear. Also the added value of one programme was not clear for every stakeholder interviewed during the case study, probably caused by the organisation of the programme and the level of cooperation within the programme that clearly needed to develop during the programme period.

- Analysis of the monitoring system shows that the set of indicators is not fully capturing the aims of the programme. The official evaluation frameworks thus rely on the use of quantified indicators to measure the production of tangible and measurable outputs (such as infrastructure investments or the creation of jobs), but they fail to grasp the degree and intensity of cooperation processes between different stakeholders across national borders. Learning as an essentially indirect effect of INTERREG is materialized in the mentioned intangible co-operation processes. But if learning and policy transfer is in fact the major outcome of INTERREG, the consequence would be that the impact of that Community Initiative is simply not yet captured, because the monitoring and evaluation techniques have been inadequate. The highly insignificant and erratic effectiveness results based on the monitoring indicators of the Flanders Netherlands programme (sometimes exceeding 300% of the quantified target) is characteristic for INTERREG as confirmed by the horizontal analysis, particularly for strand A. The reluctance of the Managing Authority to seriously consider those indicators can be well understood. The results of the programme study strongly support the mentioned research finding that the major learning effects cannot be monitored and evaluated by the traditional tools of indicators.
1 Introduction

1.1 Research interest and methodology

The Ex-post Evaluation of Interreg III comprises a number of tasks that are interactively and iteratively linked. One of the tasks is the in-depth evaluation of a sample of sixteen Interreg III programmes selected from all three strands. The current case study on the border region Flanders-Netherlands is one of the sixteen programmes.

This case study is based on the methodology developed during the pilot study. The scope of research is determined by the terms of reference (ToR) for the Ex-post Evaluation for INTERREG III and the method proposed in the Inception Report is implemented in this study.\footnote{Panteia (and partner institutes) 2009, Ex-post Evaluation of INTERREG 2000-2006 – Inception report to the European Commission DG Regio, pp. 82 ff.} In order to draw up the report the research team studied the programme-documents, project fiches and the latest financial figures. The research team subsequently conducted interviews with the Management Authority (3 persons), Paying Authority (1 person), Project managers (JTS) (2 persons) and 1 person from the JTS who was involved in the development of indicators and target values. Five persons who were responsible for projects were interviewed, four by telephone and one face to face. Furthermore four representatives of regional newspapers were interviewed in order to map the public reputation of the programme.

The Flanders-Netherlands programme is clustered with three other INTERREG IIIA programmes, which share the same characteristics:

- A-D Austria-Bavaria
- F-D-CH Oberrhein-Mitte-Sud
- F-B France-Wallone-Flandre

And the characteristics that are common and specific for this cluster of programmes are:

- Low levels of cross-border economic disparities
- Very high density of border crossing possibilities
- Internal EU-borders (including CH)
- Partly above-average & partly below-average concentration of ERDF-support on a limited number of "priority topics" listed in the INTERREG III Communication
- The depth & intensity level of co-operation achieved under the programmes is partly at high level and partly at a medium level
- Existence of strong or few common historic ties / a shared culture and in many cases also of a common language.
1.2 Outline and characteristic features of the programme

1.3 Historical remarks on INTERREG II

In the programme period of Interreg II, the region was divided into two Euregios i.e. Euregio Scheldemond (ESM) and Euregio Benelux Midden Gebied (BMG). Both Euregios have long historic ties in cross-border cooperation. During the Interreg II period both Euregios prepared there own programmes for the Interreg III period. An external Bureau (ERAC) has written the operational programmes for both Euregios. Just before the Operational programmes were submitted, the Euregios were asked to develop a joint programme, to cover the two Euregios and to merge the two operational programmes into one. It is necessary therefore to take a look at the historic background of the two sub-programmes before going into the structure of the joint programme.

**Euregio Scheldemond: INTERREG II 1994-1999**

The strategic objective of the INTERREG II programme of Euregio Scheldemond was “Promoting a sustainable and qualitative social and economic development of the region, aligned with the geographic location and natural characteristics - through improved exploitation of economic, natural, and human potentialities that, as a result of the border have remained unexploited till now”. At the same time, regional economic development and cross-border economic cooperation in the border region must be promoted. This strategic objective is translated into the following six priorities:

1. improving physical structure;
2. promote economy, technology and innovation;
3. environmental protection;
4. developing human resources;
5. promote social participation; and
6. technical assistance.

**Euregio Benelux Middengebied: INTERREG II 1994-1999**

The central objectives of the Interreg II programme BMG were the promotion of regional economic development and strengthening cross-border cooperation within the Euregio Benelux Midden Gebied (BMG). In the Operational Program, apart from Technical Assistance for the implementation, five priorities have been identified, subdivided into 13 measures. Approximately the same six priorities as in the INTERREG II programme Scheldemond were distinguished:

1. improvement of physical infrastructure;
2. promotion of economy, technology and innovation;
3. protection of the environment;
4. development and utilisation of human resources;
5. promoting social inclusion;
6. technical assistance.
1.3.1 Joint nature of the programme

In contrast to the Interreg I and II period, the Member States and the European Commission decided that the Euregios Scheldemond and Benelux Midden Gebied should develop a joint Interreg III programme for the period 2000-2006 for the Border Region Flanders Netherlands. The decision that both Euregios should make a programme together came at a relatively late moment, resulting in some delays starting up the programme due to organisational and procedural changes. Since both Euregios had drawn up their own programme strategy, the merging of the operational programmes has resulted in the end in one programme document, in which however two sub programmes were actually hidden. The collaboration between the two Euregios in drafting the joint programme was at a minimum level. From the beginning of the programme period it has shown that in the Flanders-Netherlands programme a high number of procedures, tasks and responsibilities were not clear.

The Border Region Flanders-Netherlands covers the following areas:

- Flemish provinces: Antwerp, Limburg, East Flanders, West Flanders (except the districts of Veurne and Ypres) and Flemish Brabant (only arrondissement Leuven)
- the Dutch provinces of Limburg, Noord-Brabant, Zeeland

The area of the Border Region Flanders-Netherlands has about 9 million inhabitants, with densely populated urban centers such as Ghent, Bruges, Ostend, Antwerp, Eindhoven, Den Bosch and Maastricht. The Border Region Flanders-Netherlands has the presence of ports, main transport routes (roads, railways and waterways) and good logistic infrastructure. The landscape in the Border Region Flanders - the Netherlands is characterized by different types of landscapes, form the sea side in the West to hills in the East.

1.3.2 Aim of the programme: Priorities and measures

For the Flanders-Netherlands Programme, the following main objective is formulated:

**By means of cross-border cooperation, the sustainable socio-economic development and exploitation of opportunities arising from geographical location and natural characteristics of the region will be stimulated.**

This objective is in line with the previous INTERREG programs in both areas. This also applies to the subprogrammes ESM and BMG where the objective is further operationalised. The sum of the results of the subprogrammes ensures that the objective of the programme is realised. The sub objectives of the programme are:

- improving the physical infrastructure;
- optimizing the competitiveness of regional industry;
- improving the production environment within the region;
- removal of barriers (raised by the existence of the border) in the fields of economy, technology and science;
- further development and use of human resources;
improving the functioning of the labor market;
• maintaining and improving the natural and cultural environment;
• promotion of social integration.

Furthermore, the following order of priorities and measures has been identified:\textsuperscript{1}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|}
\hline
Priorities and measures & ERDF budget \\
\hline
\textbf{Priority 1: Improvement of the physical infrastructure} & 17.800.025,00 \\
• Measure 1.1 Infrastructural Facilities & 10.371.043,00 \\
• Measure 1.2 Spatial planning and cross border mobility & 7.428.982,00 \\
\hline
\textbf{Priority 2: Stimulation of economic and scientific / technological cooperation} & 23.078.447,00 \\
• Measure 2.1 Stimulating the economic structure & 12.437.130,00 \\
• Measure 2.2 Innovation, knowledge exchange and cooperation & 10.641.317,00 \\
\hline
\textbf{Priority 3: Protecting the environment} & 18.118.415,00 \\
• Measure 3.1 Nature and environment & 8.393.799,00 \\
• Measure 3.2 Preservation and renewal of the specific features of the landscape & 9.724.616,00 \\
\hline
\textbf{Priority 4: Development and utilisation of human resources} & 5.548.650,00 \\
\hline
\textbf{Priority 5: Promoting social inclusion} & 9.749.628,00 \\
• Measure 5.1 Social integration & 4.996.923,00 \\
• Measure 5.2 Culture & 4.752.705,00 \\
\hline
\textbf{Priority 6: Technical assistance} & 5.488.673,00 \\
• Measure 6.1 Technical Assistance Management & 3.789.222,00 \\
• Measure 6.2 Technical Assistance Other & 1.278.426,00 \\
• Measure 6.3 Programme management Border region & 421.023,00 \\
\hline
\textbf{Total} & 79.783.838,00 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{1} Budget based on financial annual report 2008, certified expenditure.
2 In-depth analysis of the results and impacts in terms of effectiveness and the socio-economic effects

2.1 The financial implementation of the programme

2.1.1 Introduction

It is envisaged in the ToR of the Ex-post Evaluation of Interreg III that the case studies will include an in-depth analysis of the financial implementation and, an examination of the patterns of expenditure as well as its distribution among the different intervention fields at 3 digit code level. Budgeting and expenditure patterns are considered as major factors that characterise the programmes in Interreg III, which will lead to further deepened policy-level conclusions on budgeting in relation to different interventions and to any improved absorption.

In this case study, the following research questions are addressed:

*Budgets and expenditure at the three-digit code level*
- How do sectoral patterns of financial budgeting and expenditure of the pilot programme differ from the usual (average) patterns under INTERREG (e.g. weight of different codes, deviation from the average GM and IM, and striking details), and where has been the focus of the programme?
- Does the programme emphasise areas of intervention that are typical for Interreg?,
- Why, if any, did the deviations incur?
- How far have the financial targets been achieved? and
- why, if it applies, the targets were not achieved?

*Expenditure for interventions associated with Lisbon*
- Analysis of the expenditure for Lisbon-relevant interventions (retrospective view on actual policy debate for the assessed programme): Here particularly the respective areas of intervention that are earmarked as Lisbon interventions under the 2007-2013 programming period are being viewed, regarding the relative intensity in terms of budget, expenditure as well as absorption. Furthermore, it is examined whether during the programming cycle increasing emphasis was laid on Lisbon related measures (Reference: Inforegio Panorama 24: Regions as partners: The European territorial Cooperation Objective).

*Dynamic analysis of expenditure*
- Analysis of the expenditure dynamic at measure level, focussing on the annual reports and important open questions. The methodology developed in the inception report is deployed.
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For an in-depth financial analysis we will access the entire database at the three-digit code level for INTERREG, since the two-digit aggregated database does not show the variations that can underpin a rigorous analysis.

The expenditure data at the three-digit-code-level are then analysed in terms of
(i) the distribution of codes supported by the Flanders- the Netherlands programme in relation to the ranking of frequency under Interreg,
(ii) the rank correlation between the codes supported by the Flanders- the Netherlands programme and the Interreg in general,
(iii) the share of codes from the ex-ante budget, and
(iv) the intensity measure (IM), expressed in terms of the share of the overall certified expenditure for 2000-2006 at the field of intervention level (three-digit-code).

Finally Gap Measure (similar to the Intensity Measure) will provide evidence on the performance of absorption.

The first measure above will simply reveal the distribution patterns. The second will shed light on characteristic features of the programme in comparison with Interreg in general. Since the third coefficient is the expenditure rate, it shall give some insight into financial performance within the programmes. The third measure will provide evidence on whether or not the respective field of intervention has the same weight as the cluster average. If expenditure for an INTERREG-relevant field of intervention is relatively small, it might reveal problems or weaknesses in the programme with respect to the declared strategies of the respective INTERREG strand. Finally, the last measure provides insight into the absorption patterns for different fields of intervention. If the GM is low, specific problems of a programme and its circumstances are to be examined more closely. To better illustrate the two indices we will also present the numerators and denominators graphically.

In addition to the analysis of areas of intervention, the dynamic of financial implementation is examined as well, namely the different trend patterns in implementation. This analysis, which can only be done based on the trends at measure level, should display the financial performance over time and should also provide insight into the funds distribution among the different intervention areas.

One important remark has to be made. In analysing the financial figures it is realized that the data provided by the Commission are different from those included in the Annual implementation report. In this case study, data from both sources are used in explaining the financial progress of the programme.
2.1.2 Financial analysis across the intervention codes

The codes of intervention should help the European Commission to compare expenditure in the context of policy intervention sector by sector. Below we will analyse the financial performance of the Flanders- the Netherlands programme in terms of ex-ante budgeting and expenditure and across all codes of intervention that are applied in the programme.

A first analysis is related to the ‘financial character’ of the programme. The question is then how far or close does the Flanders- the Netherlands programme follow the sectoral intervention patterns of Interreg?

Before further analysing this data, we however firstly explored the general perception of the codes of intervention and the usefulness from the viewpoint of the Managing Authority. After the analysis of the three-digit-code databank on budget and expenditure, and an interview with the Managing Authority, our impression is that the codes are not used to a great extent.

The allocation of budget to codes of intervention is done by categorising the projects under the codes. Hereby a project can only be clustered under one code. This makes it hard to cluster projects that serve more fields of intervention. Furthermore, the information obtained directly from the management authority is not in line with the data from the Commission. In analysing the sectoral composition and the budgetary weight, some remarks will be made to indicate differences between the databases.

Sectoral composition

To assess the sectoral composition of the programme, the codes of intervention both at a high and low frequency are compared to those under Interreg as the average.

The financial implementation of the programme can be analysed by having a closer look at the expenditure on the intervention codes. This analysis gives insight of the programme along the pre-defined codes of intervention. Furthermore, it can tell whether the programme concentrated on certain interventions or instead, whether the programme has carried out a variety of possible interventions.

The funding support from INTERREG III has been rather broad thematically. In total 94 codes were covered between the 64 programmes. The most frequent codes under INTERREG have been those of Technical assistance (e.g. monitoring/implementation, evaluation, studies, information, all belonging to the code family 41), rural development (130) and non-physical investment in tourism (172), education (230), human resources (220) and basic infrastructure (31-35).

The codes with a high frequency are more or less completely covered by the Flanders-the Netherlands programme. The only exception is code 353 (Protection, improvement and
regeneration of the natural environment) and 354 (Protection, improvement and regeneration of the natural environment), for which activities were neither scheduled nor implemented under the programme. On the right side of the chart (see chart 1.1 in annex 1) where codes with a relatively low frequency across the Interreg programmes are represented, there is also significantly less coverage by the Flanders-the Netherlands programme.

The comparison between the information from the Commission and the information from the financial annual reports (2007 and 2008) shows, that there are some noticeable differences. The codes 161, 162, 173, 250, 312, 317, 324, 341, 343, 344, 345, 360, 412 and 414 are mentioned in the Commission documents, but not in the annual reports; the codes 111, 114, 127, 148, 152, 153, 154, 183, 184, 310, 321, 352, 353 and 354 are included in the annual reports, but not in the Commissions documents.

However, the comparison presented in the chart in annex 1.1 alone does not yet sufficiently reveal the budgetary weights of the single fields of intervention. This will be discussed in the following section.

**Budgetary weights and comparisons**

The overview table presented in annex 1.2 provides a comprehensive overview of the different codes of intervention covered by the Flanders-Netherlands programme in terms of budget, certified expenditure, achievement rate, shares of expenditure and the comparison with the average expenditure shares and achievement rates of Interreg (Intensity Measure and Gap Measure).

Though the programme covers 38 fields of intervention, the management authority does not consider the programme to be broad. The merging of two programmes also causes the apparent diversity of field of interventions: both sub-programmes have their own dynamics, own way of selecting and implementing projects, and priority focuses. The ESM sub programme is in this sense more focussed on touristic and cultural priorities, while BMG emphasises the innovative and economic priorities.

As can be seen in the figure in annex 1.3, almost 12% of the expenditure is allocated to the field of intervention 130: Adaptation of rural areas. This field of intervention receives attention in a variety of projects. In the second figure provided in annex 1.3, data is used from the financial annual report. In this figure a slightly different picture occurs, indicating the programme was more focussed on a small number of fields of intervention.

**Shares of codes of intervention compared**

In a first analysis, we explore how different codes in terms of expenditure are ranked under the programme. For this purpose, we first look at the shares of the codes in relation to the expenditure at the initiative level. Here we notice that codes 414, 413, 312, 130, 131 etc.
are attributed a strong weight, while fields such as fishing, forestry, noise reduction etc. are of negligible importance.

In the following table we compare the ten most and least important codes in Interreg with those of the Flanders-the Netherlands programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fields of intervention</th>
<th>Code expenditure/programme</th>
<th>Code expenditure %</th>
<th>Interreg Ref: code expenditure/programme</th>
<th>Interreg Ref: code expenditure %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>414. Innovative actions</td>
<td></td>
<td>0,16%</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413. Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,57%</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312. Roads</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,15%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130. Adaptation of rural areas</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,87%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131. Encouragement of Tourist activities</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,60%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172. Non-physical investments (development and provision of tourist services, sporting, cultural and leisure activities, heritage)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,12%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323. Services and applications for the citizen (health, administration, education)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0,35%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322. Information and Communication Technology (including security and safe transmission measures)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0,35%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163. Business advisory services (information, business planning, consultancy services, marketing, management, design, internationalisation, exporting, environmental management, purchase of technology)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,65%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411. Preparation, implementation, monitoring, publicity</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,24%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316. Waterways</td>
<td></td>
<td>0,51%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0,87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317. Urban Transport</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,27%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0,84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319. Intelligent Transport Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,27%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0,76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250. Positive labour market actions for woman</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,60%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0,65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351. Upgrading and Rehabilitation of industrial and military sites</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,75%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0,57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161. Investment in physical capital (plant and equipment, co financing of state aids)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,41%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0,55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166. Services in support of the social economy (providing care for dependents, health and safety, cultural activities)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,56%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0,51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167. Vocational training</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,51%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0,46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412. Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>0,16%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0,32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341. Air</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,15%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0,23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is noticed that in most cases the code expenditure in this programme are not always similar to the code expenditure at initiative level. Some codes (like e.g. adaptation of rural areas, encouragement of tourist activities, non physical investments, business advisory services, preparation, implementation, monitoring, publicity Upgrading and Rehabilitation of industrial and military sites and services in support of the social economy) played a major role in the programme while considered less important at initiative level. Other codes like
innovative actions, studies and roads have played a smaller role compared to the average of INTERREG. This becomes even clearer when the data from the annual report is taken (see second figure annex 1.3).

The following graph shows the differences in expenditure on code level between Interreg and the Flanders-the Netherlands programme.

**Figure 2.1  Programme and Initiative Expenditure on code level**

![Graph showing differences in expenditure on code level between Interreg and the Flanders-the Netherlands programme.](image)

*Source: Analysis Research voor Beleid on the basis of data from the Commission*

On the left side of the chart, we see a steep decline of the Interreg reference curve while the expenditure shares of the Flanders-the Netherlands programme fluctuate significantly. On the right side, the deviations of the programme from the Interreg are becoming much smoother. The chart has shown therefore, that the difference in relation to Interreg in general are more reflected in the more important fields of intervention from the programme, which are represented at the left side of the graph.

**The relative intensity of expenditure and budgetary achievement**

The intensity measure (IM) explains the share of the overall certified expenditure for 2000-2006 at the field of intervention level (three-digit-code). It shows how the budgetary weight of the respective code deviates from the average weight under Interreg. Similar to that, as a relative gap analysis, the Gap Measure (GM) can be calculated. This shows the realisation rates of codes of intervention compared to the average of Interreg. The table included in annex 1.2

\[ IM = \frac{x_{code}}{x_{interreg}} \]

\[ GM = \frac{y_{real}}{y_{plan}} \]

1 The IM is calculated as follows: \[ IM = \frac{x_{code}}{x_{interreg}} \]. The GM is calculated as follows: \[ GM = \frac{y_{real}}{y_{plan}} \]
shows the results of the Flanders- the Netherlands programme for all codes of intervention. In total the programme has allocated funds to 38 fields of intervention.

**Analysis of the expenditure rate**
For some fields of intervention, the expenditure rate is low, even below 50%. This is because the data is taken from the annual report 2006 (data Commission). In the latest annual report (2008) the expenditure is close to 100%. This is mainly because the infrastructural projects have been started only in the last year of the programme which have come to spend the planned budget.

**Analysis of the concentration rate (comparing with other programmes in the cluster)**
The programme addresses more intervention codes than other programmes in the cluster. For example, the France-Wallone-Flanders programme mentioned only 8 codes of intervention. This difference is not due to differences in resources, since the latter programme even receives more funding than the Fl-Nl-programme.

The mean intensity measure, i.e. the mean overall share of the expenditure over the fields of intervention for the programme is 2,63. In contrast, the other programmes show the following mean intensities: A-B: 2,08%, F-W-F: 12,50% and O-M-S: 3,33%. This indicates that the two programmes in this cluster concentrate more on a selective number of fields of intervention.

**Analysis of the intensity measure**
The field of intervention 130 "Adaptation of rural areas" has received the biggest share, at more than 10% of the total expenditure. This is not in line with the situations in three other programmes in the cluster. The Austra-Bavaria-programme and the France-Wallone-Flanders programme have a share of +/- 4% dedicated to this field of intervention while it is merely a 1,63% in the O-M-S programme, the latter obviously has shown a different priority fields.

In the following, a chart is inserted illustrating the relative intensity of three-digit areas of intervention and their relative performance. This figure is based on the table described above. It is clearly visible that the variation of relative intensity of an area of intervention is much higher than the relative performance (i.e. the achievement level of the Flanders-the Netherlands programme compared to the Interreg average). On the one hand, we notice positive outliers. The only outlier is code 351 (Upgrading and Rehabilitation of industrial and military sites). This area is of significantly higher relevance than for the Interreg average. On the other hand, areas with significantly lower weight than the average are also found (181, 312, 315, 322, 323, 413-415).
Even though the programme was elaborated before the official publication of the Lisbon strategy, we can confirm that the programme had emphasised fields of intervention related to Lisbon to a large extent. The Lisbon-targets are notably covered by codes 162, 164, 181, 182, 230, 240, 250, 311, 322, 323, 324 (see figure 2.3).¹

¹ Determined by the annex IV (Categories of expenditure referred to Article 9(3), Regulation 083/2006)
Figure 2.3 shows that in some fields associated with 'Lisbon' the Flanders- the Netherlands programme is relatively strong, compared to Interreg. This is particularly the case for 'innovation and technology', 'positive labour market actions for woman' and 'workforce flexibility'. The other Lisbon related fields of intervention are not considered to be of major importance, since they score under the Interreg average.

In annex 1.4, with respect to the cluster to which the Flanders-Netherlands programme belongs, the distribution of budgets, expenditure, and the corresponding achievement rates is presented. The table shows that in terms of the overall achievement rate, the Flanders-Netherlands programme scores with 78,28%, slightly below the average in the cluster at 81,62%.

2.1.3 Dynamic financial analysis

Apart from the static analysis at the three-digit code of intervention level, the budgets and the dynamic of expenditure at the measure level is worth to look at briefly.

By comparing the budget and expenditure data at code level with the respective data at measure level we notice that sums differ slightly. This has possibly to do with different points of time in reporting.

During the programme period the socio-economic characteristic of the programme area has changed. The mid-term evaluation states that the programme strategy leaves enough room to slightly adjust the programme without changing the strategy as a whole. However, budgets have been shifted between measures and priorities. It should be noticed that budgets were shifted between measures and priorities earlier than between the two Euregios. However, at the end of the programme period, budgets have been shifted from Euregio Scheldemond to Euregio Benelux Midden Gebied, in which absorption projects were installed.

A second major event that had impact on the finances of the programme was the refunding of more than 4 million due to the N+2 rule in 2004.

At measure level there were major differences in the expenditure over time. Some measures, like measure 3.2 and 4 started fast in spending and reached their end in 2006. Other measures, like 1.2 started only after 2006 virtually. Not surprisingly, this measure concerns infrastructural projects that normally take more time for money spending. More rapid expenditure took place in measures with a high number of projects in programme area ESM, compared to the measures with a high percentage of projects in BMG. One explanation is that the projects in BMG are considered to be more innovative, more focussed on innovation and economy and involve more private partners and private co-financing than in the ESM. The projects in programme area ESM are more often funded by governmental co-funding from the provinces involved, while BMG project includes more private co-funding.
The mean of yearly expenditure over the different priorities and measures shows a rather balanced pattern: every year the expenditure is approximately at the same level. In the last year the expenditure increases a little bit more than in the previous years. In the last year the programme almost spent the total budget. This is mainly due to the absorption projects and the late certification of infrastructural projects.

2.1.4 Interim conclusions

Code level analysis

The financially most important intervention codes are 130, Adaptation of rural areas 131, Encouragement of Tourist activities and 164, Shared business services (business estates, incubator units, stimulation, promotional services, networking, conferences, trade fairs). These intervention codes had the greatest budgetary importance.

There are major deviations between the relative intensity of the expenditure across the fields of intervention in the Flanders-the Netherlands programme and Interreg. The codes 414, 413 and 312 (roads) are underperforming and codes like 130, 131, 172 (Non-physical investments (development and provision of tourist services, sporting, cultural and leisure activities, heritage)) are overperforming. Also codes, such as 351 (Upgrading and Rehabilitation of industrial and military sites) and 166 (Services in support of the social economy (providing care for dependents, health and safety, cultural activities)) deviate strongly fromor the Interreg average.

The strongest deviation between budget and expenditure can be found at the codes: 316 (water ways), 317 (urban transport), 318 (Multimodal Transport), 319 (Intelligent Transport Systems), 412 (Evaluation), 141 (Adjustment of the fishing effort) and 415 (Information to the public).
The mean intensity over the programmes in the cluster, of which Flanders-the Netherlands is categorised is 5.14%. This means that every field of intervention mentioned in every programme, receives around 5% of the overall total budget. Compared with the 2.63% of the Fl-Nl programme, this means that the programme is less concentrated than the other programmes in the cluster.

**Measure-level analysis (static and dynamic)**

The ex ante budget of the programme and the measures meet the effective demand for the respective interventions, however, the budgets slightly shifted. It appeared difficult to fund projects aiming at creating jobs. In other priorities and measures the limit had been reached. After the mid-term evaluation budgets have been shifted. The decommitment of funds by the N+2 rule has mostly been carried by the measures not receiving a lot of project applications.

With regard to the linearity or non-linearity of the implementation of measures during the programme cycle, measures 5.1, 5.2, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3 show a very linear trend. Other measures show non-linear trends. Hereby it makes making a distinction between those measures starting fast and ending slow (2.1, 3.2, 4) and measures starting slow and ending fast (1.1, 1.2, 2.2, 3.1)

It can be said that more innovative, complex projects have been carried out in the last phase of the programme. However also administrative reasons, like the late start of the programme, delays in certification etc. made expenditure rise against the end of the programme period. The concerns for absorption can also be said to be a driver for selecting more complex projects. The context trends are both the result of administrative reasons and the implementation of projects of higher complexity.

The budgetary shifts were not only because of the low absorption of funds. The changing socio-economic situation and the difficulties with the N+2 rule are responsible for changes. However, at the end of the programme period, the budget shifted from ESM to BMG, since ESM had emptied their projects and still had the availability over free-fallen funds. These funds have been shifted to absorption projects in BMG.

**2.2 The effectiveness of the programme**

This chapter aims to shed light on the degree of achievement of the goals initially set, as well as analysing the degree of relevance with regard to local needs. Effectiveness means the achieved share of a predefined objective. In its simplest form it is just a comparison of plan and achievement. Achieved results are, however, not necessarily relevant; at least results may be obtained at high opportunity cost. This means, there might have been alternatives to achieve a goal or even, alternative goals.

In the context of a programme like those supported by INTERREG, relevance of achieved results is closely determined by the quality of the programme and its intervention logic and by the adequacy of the goals and their quantification.
On basis of the conclusions from the mid-term evaluation, the set of indicators has been adjusted since then. The elaborated set of indicators used after the mid-term evaluation is more applicable on the projects and can be used to monitor the progress of the programme in a better way. Since the monitoring of projects in general takes place by interviewing the project responsibles on a regular basis, the indicators are not always the main issue in such discussions. However, after the mid-term evaluation the indicators are used in order to monitor more on a project level. In doing so the projects must contribute clearly to at least one indicator.

2.2.1 Plan and achievement

The programme uses indicators that are used in all priorities and measures. In this section, the targets and achievements of the programme as a whole are presented and discussed.

The target values have been set on the basis of previous experiences in Interreg II. In general it can be stated that targets have been set very conservative. This is not only the case on programme level, but also on project level. As a result, the achievement ratios are normally very high.

The programme secretariat has found it, and still finds it very difficult to define indicators and to set target values. This is because no clear definitions existed, for example what is considered to be a sustainable workplace; or what can be counted as a promotion campaign (e.g. Is one folder a campaign; does it have to involve more different promotion instruments etc.? The programme therefore faced big difficulties in translating the indicators used on a project level to the indicators intended for a programme level. The mid-term evaluator has in the end, carried out this translation exercise. The indicators are not used internally to monitor the progress of the projects though, which is the task of the project managers who keep in touch with the project responsibles on regular bases and to help them out when problems occur.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of institutions / networks of cooperation that take part in cooperation projects</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>158%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of joint plans / studies</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>261%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of jobs created - sustainable jobs (FTE)</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>100,67</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of joint promotional campaigns</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>138%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 This method of monitoring is further implemented in the Interreg IV-operational programme
Almost all indicators show an overachievement, some even of more than 1000% (number of participants in training courses). The mean of the achievement is also high, at 320%. Only one indicator – number of jobs created – sustainable jobs (FTE) - shows a lower achievement ratio of 68%. But since some major infrastructural projects have been carried out in the last year, this ratio is also expected to rise to be close to 100% at least.

The two sub programmes monitored the implementation of their own programmes and drew up their individual progress reports, which were then sent to the joint management authority / JTS to be merged into the programme report. The same indicators were used within the two sub programmes.

In the following figures, the achievement ratio on priority level is presented. Both general indicators and specific indicators are presented along side each other with the same priority.

At priority level the results have been as follows:

**Figure 2.5 Achievement rate Priority 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value 1</th>
<th>Value 2</th>
<th>Percent Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of jointly developed tourism products</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>121%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross border measures related to resettlement of land (hectares)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21.49</td>
<td>195%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase of public transport projects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>150%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of companies that participated in the program</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>462%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of companies cooperating within the framework of the program</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>328%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase capacity of waste management- number of projects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area jointly created or nature area restored (hectares)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>114.9</td>
<td>575%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of participants in training courses</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>3187</td>
<td>1062%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>385%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and cultural events - number of activities</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>160%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and cultural events - number of participants</td>
<td>36000</td>
<td>228020</td>
<td>633%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Annual report 2007
Comparing to other priorities, the achievement ratio for priority 1 - Improvement of the physical infrastructure - is low. However, the average of the indicators is close to 100%. Since the figure is based on data from the annual report 2007, while within priority 1 the majority of the money is spent indeed in the last two years, it can be expected that the overall achievement will be in fact above 100%. Mainly measure 1.2, spatial planning and cross border mobility faced severe delay but triggered most of the created sustainable work places.

**Figure 2.6  Achievement rate Priority 2**

The ratio of priority 2 - stimulation of economic and scientific / technological cooperation - is on average at slightly over 200%, indicating an overachievement. However, on a number of indicators no information is available.

**Figure 2.7  Achievement rate Priority 3**
Priority 3 - the protecting the environment - shows an over performance of more than 300%. This is mainly caused by the number of companies that participated in the programme, which is rated at 1100%. The question may be raised whether the target has been set too low for this indicator.

Despite the fact that it appeared difficult to find projects that focus on development of human resources, and that the economic developments were not very helpful in implementing reintegration projects, the priority 4 - development and utilisation of human resources - succeeded in achieving an over performance of nearly 500%. It can be seen that the core of this priority, creating sustainable jobs, does not show the same level of over achievement.

Of course there are some positive examples in which reintegration of disadvantaged people succeeded very well: e.g. Neurological Reintegration (see project fiche).
The priority 5 - Promoting social inclusion - shows an over performance of 400%. In this priority many very small projects, the so called People-To-People-projects, have been implemented. These projects create a great number of events and involve many people, with a minimum of resources. The results of these projects however, are rather intangible.

To better illustrate the performance at measure level the following figure depicts the mean achievement rates per priority, measure, and the planned achievements.

Also, it shows the absorption of funds per measure:

**Figure 2.10  Mean achievement rates at measure level (based on the indicators and unweighted)**

![Mean achievement rates at measure level](image)

Source: INTERREG III, calculation Research voor Beleid

From the figure, it becomes clear that the measures in priority 1 were slightly underachieving. It should however be noticed that especially in these measures many projects have been started in the last two years of the programme. Because the data used in this figure is up to the year of 2007 only, the achievements of these projects during the last two years have not been included in the figure above. Except priority 1, all other measures are overperforming in which measure 3.2 is slightly overperforming, while measure 4, 5.1 and 5.2 are overperforming by +/- 400%.
INTERREG III ex-post evaluation. In-depth evaluation of the PROGRAMME: INTERREG IIIA Flanders and the Netherlands

If the achievement on measure level is related to the absorption of funds on measure level, it can be seen that there is no relation between the two; the height of the absorption rate does not relate to a height of the achievement.

This also means that the indicators are not strong enough to monitor the implementation of the various measures appropriately.

2.2.2 Reviewing the programming quality and the programme relevance on the basis of the results achieved

As has been said, the two Euregios developed their own operational programmes based on their own SWOT-analyses. At a later stage these two SWOT-analyses were merged and a joint programme strategy has been developed, taking elements from both programmes. Despite this one operational programme, it must be noticed that both sub-programmes used their own initial programme as working document. It is therefore difficult to assess whether the programme strategy has addressed the issues that concern the whole area, or those concerned for only one of the two sub-programme areas.

The mid-term evaluator concludes that the programme has, thematically, been defined very broad and hardly any specific choices have been made to let the strategy attune to actual social-economic developments. Furthermore, the main aim of the programme is cross-border cooperation. Without a specific socio-economic target, therefore the analysis of the socio-economic development of the region is of minor importance for the programme strategy. This is also the reason why the programme strategy has not been adjusted to actual (mainly) negative economic developments: within the strategy, these actual developments had only minor influence on the content of the programme and the priorities that the programme addresses. In the midterm evaluation, some strength have been transformed to weaknesses due to the stagnating economic development. These changes affected mainly the priorities 2 and 4. Priority 2 and 4 should have received more attention to keep in line with the programme strategy and to confront the actual economic developments.

As said, despite the additional efforts for acquiring projects within priority 2 and 4, the efforts did not achieve the desired result due to external and macro-economic causes. In the end budgets have been shifted from these priorities to other priorities. This story is not supported by the achievement ratios of priority 2 and 4. Both priorities over achieve heavily. However, in relation to the indicator ‘creating sustainable jobs, both priorities under perform.

The broadness of the programme strategy makes it possible to include all issues identified in the SWOT analysis. It is however questionable whether all issues receive the attention they deserve. When looking at the actual expenditure on the 3 digit code of intervention, it appears that adaption of rural areas has received a lot of attention despite the fact that it is
not identified as a main priority, not even as a field in which particular weaknesses have been identified.

This broadness of the strategy can be explained by the different situation of the two sub programmes. Both sub programmes have their own strategy, based on the previous operational programme, with their specific choices in their strategy. In the merging of the two operational programmes, no programme-area broad choices have been made in order to fine-tune the overall strategy. This explains as well that the programme secretariat and the management authority do not recognise this broad strategy: Within the two sub-programmes a very specific focus was present and choices were made in which BMG is focusing more on economic development, while ESM was more focused on touristic development.

With regard to the level of experimentation of the projects that are carried out in the programme, it can be noted that here as well differences exist with regard to the two Euregions. When the level of experimentation can be identified by the involvement of new partners, with reference to the previous programme-period and the involvement of private funding, the BMG- regions has reached a higher level of complexity than the ESM-region. In this sense, the ESM walked ‘safer’ paths by the involvement of more public organisations. Since the indicators are not solid enough to monitor the implementation of the projects, it is hard to conclude whether the ‘experimental’ projects underperformed or not, also the ‘learning’ element that comes with the experimental projects is hardly measurable.

However, since the interest for Interreg IV under private partners was big, we can reasonably conclude that the ‘experimental’ projects have contributed to the further exploitation of the involvement of private funding, which can be sees as an indicator of learning to work with private partners.

**Overview: The quality of the intervention logic and the indicator system**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion / scoring</th>
<th>excellent</th>
<th>sufficient</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data use and analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Since the baseline consists of two operational programmes that have been merged, the contextual data has not been used to analyse the programme area as a whole and this did not lead to specific choices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td></td>
<td>The focus of the overall programme was poor. However, the focus of the two sub programmes was excellent (ESM, more focus on tourism, BMG more focus on innovation).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality and logic of the SWOT analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td>The SWOT analysis contains a lot of information on sub-programme level. The analysis on overall programme level leads to a varied strategy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency of the</td>
<td>The programme strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
programme strategy | has been defined very broadly. Therefore, the consistency was guaranteed.
---|---
Determination of programme measures | The measures are defined broadly as well. This leaves room for the sub programmes to further implement their strategy within each measure.

With regard to the Flanders- the Netherlands programme, it should be kept in mind that there are actually two sub-programmes carrying out their own Operational Programmes. The characters of the sub-programmes differ largely. In general, the BMG-sub programme has selected more complex and experimental projects than the ESM sub programme. This is largely due to the involvement of private funding and private partners in the projects: In ESM this is nearly absent.

### 2.2.3 Comparison with horizontal results across INTERREG III

Analyses have revealed that the average percentage of target values achieved in the context of the horizontal evaluation of the strand A programmes is generally high. As we have seen in the previous section this is also the case for the Flanders- the Netherlands programme, where the set of indicators shows a heavy overperformance on most measures and priorities. The comparison between the Flanders- the Netherlands programme and the Community Initiative on the quality of the monitoring systems reveals the same conclusions, namely, that the monitoring system is not in place to monitor the progress of the projects. The quality of the set of indicators was under discussion in the mid-term evaluation and even now. Most of the time, for strategic reasons, the targets have been set too conservative. The overperformance therefore is not representing a realistic picture of the projects or the programmes as a whole. The analysis of the Flanders- the Netherlands programme also supports the horizontal conclusion in that the high average achievement ratio is a result of a smaller number of indicators that have over performed extremely, rather than a general over performance among all programmes and indicators.

The further results of the horizontal analysis of the ex-post evaluation state: ‘...If looking at performance in relation to the priority topics of strand A programmes, as laid out in the INTERREG III Communication, we see that the relatively high average achievement ratio was spread over the priority topics, with the lowest average achievement ratio within the priority topic 6 “basic infrastructure of cross-border importance” and within priority topic 7 “cooperation in administrative fields” and the highest within the priority topic 4 “cooperation on research, technological development, education, culture, communications, health and civil protection’ and 8 “Cooperation between citizens and institutions”...’ Also this horizontal conclusion is supported by the Flanders- the Netherlands programme.

Other general results of the horizontal analysis suggest that the INTERREG III programmes have achieved a lot within the framework of the wider INTERREG III goals. According to that, a variety of physical, institutional, informational, and educational outputs have been achieved in various fields, such as transport, communication, environment, tourism etc.
Additionally, a large number of networks have been created or are operating within the framework of INTERREG III. Apparently, these outputs have generated socio-economic results, such as employment opportunities, and have had beneficial effects for businesses. The Flanders- the Netherlands programme also supports this finding, but there exists no data in order to prove the further economic impact of the programme.

2.2.4 Interim conclusions

As regards the more global viewpoint (priority topics defined in the Communication) there is a high correspondence between the results of the Flanders- the Netherlands programme and INTERREG strand A.

The relation between the indicators and the intervention logic shows weaknesses. This makes it difficult to indicate the relevance of the results to the problems addressed in the SWOT. Despite this, one can say that with regard to some ‘solid’ indicators the programme scores realistic (not exceeding a 200% overperformance).

The implementation can be better monitored according to the financial implementation because the monitoring system does not allow a progress-evaluation during the programme. The progress has been monitored by informing the project managers regularly. The implementation over time of the measures shows a slow start, but speeded up towards the end of the programme period.

The delay of the implementation on measure level is due to the late start up of the entire programme, caused by procedural difficulties in the late merging of the two sub programmes into one programme. However, the implementation of activities within the projects does not show delays: when projects started, the only issue was the late refunding of declarations.

Since nearly all projects overperform, the indicators cannot be used to assess very well the complexity or level of experimentation of projects very well. A way to ‘quantify’ the learning from ‘experimental’ project, involving private partners, is the involvement of more private partners in the application for interreg IV projects. However, also this does not capture the learning side-effects completely. Projects of this kind have been implemented in the one Euregion (BMG) more than in the other (ESM).

The results of the projects have strongly enhanced the culture of co-operation in the region. This can be illustrated with the high interest in Interreg IV, also from private partners.
2.3 Project-level co-operation under the programme

2.3.1 Selection of the project sample

Based upon the structure of the ex-post assessment at programme level that has been outlined, a further in-depth evaluation at project level has been carried out. This represents a core step in further deepening the empirical character of the evaluation of the programme.

The selection of projects has been made in a way that optimally covers the “priority topics” that have been set out for INTERREG III strand A. The preselection concluded with the following projects.

Table 2.2 Preselection projects for case-study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interreg-A Priority Topics (Communication)</th>
<th>Pre-selection of projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>promoting urban, rural and coastal development;</td>
<td>1) Maritime heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encouraging entrepreneurship and the development of small firms (including those in the tourism sector) and local employment initiatives;</td>
<td>2) ROMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promoting the integration of the labour market and social inclusion;</td>
<td>3) Industrial services and Spin-offs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sharing human resources and facilities for research, technological development, education, culture, communications and health to increase productivity and help create sustainable jobs;</td>
<td>4) Linker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encouraging the protection of the environment (local, global), increase energy efficiency and promote renewable sources of energy;</td>
<td>5) Neurological Re-integration Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improving transport (particularly measures implementing more environmentally-friendly forms of transport), information and communication networks and services and water and energy systems;</td>
<td>6) BeNekempen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developing cooperation in the legal and administrative spheres to promote economic development and social cohesion;</td>
<td>7) Clear creeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increasing human and institutional potential for cross-border cooperation to promote economic development and social cohesion</td>
<td>8) Quality development logistic centre Hazeldonk-Meer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9) Grenswijzer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10) Cross-border people to people European Parliament</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final selection of five projects to be assessed more closely, was done in close co-operation with the Management Authority. The selection has been oriented to the criteria of the terms of reference and the adequacy of the projects (stock of information and experience, existence of good practice experience). In addition, projects from both sub-programmes have been included in the selection. The finally selected projects are:

1) Maritime heritage (ESM, partly BMG)
2) Neurological Re-integration Programme (BMG)
3) Grenswijzer (ESM)
4) Quality development logistic centre Hazeldonk-Meer (BMG)
5) Clear creeks (ESM)

The analyses were based on documentary analysis (project fiches), as well as pre-announced and co-ordinated phone interviews. For one project (Quality development logistic centre Hazeldonk-Meer) a face-to-face interview has been conducted.
2.3.2 In-depth evaluation of projects realised under the priority topics of the Community Initiative

The appraisal of the projects has been carried out in strict compliance to the approach defined in the Inception Report. Annex 2 contains the project background information.

**Project study 1: Maritime Heritage I and II**

**I. General Project Information**

The project intended to serve different goals, both in developing the touristic infrastructure, maintenance of the own, shared, maritime heritage and stimulating reintegration of disadvantaged unemployed people. Furthermore this project is called a ‘cross-project’ involving provinces from two Euregios within the programme areas Nederland-Vlaanderen.

Besides the province of Zeeland (lead partner), several local organisation (mainly volunteers) were involved in the restoration of ships, wharfs and docks.

**II. Selection process**

The project continued the activities started in Interreg II. The programme secretariat was highly involved in writing the proposal in cooperation with the Province of Zeeland (NL) during a rolling procedure.

The project aimed at increasing the exchange of knowledge between different groups working with maritime heritage and also to create awareness and touristic potential for the maritime heritage. The strategy had been to get local organisations involved. Herein, no deficiencies have been identified in the programme strategy by the lead partner.

Since the programme secretariat was highly involved in the selection and implementation of the project, the project has not been hampered by inadequate and cumbersome decision-making processes.

During Interreg II a start has been made to develop the maritime heritage in the cross-border area. The partners cooperating in Interreg II indicated that there could be more nautical sites restored. This signal was heard by the province of Zeeland, who introduced the project in the meeting for tourist issues with the other provinces in the Euregio Scheldemond.

The project started with 13 restoration projects throughout the region. When these projects started the programme secretariat found 4 other organisations who wanted to join the project. Therefore a ‘Maritime Heritage II’ was initiated. In this last selection of projects not only provinces from the Euregio Scheldemond (ESM), but also one province of the Euregio Benelux Midden Gebied (BMG) was involved (province of Antwerp).

**III. Partnership/sustainability**

The project aims to bring together several groups of people wanting to rebuild sites on the maritime heritage in the region. Under the flag of the province of Zeeland, small foundations purchase materials and wood for constructing the maritime heritage and exchange knowledge on how to rebuild maritime heritage. Furthermore, the projects (ships) present themselves and attend cross-border maritime festivals etc.

However, one can doubt the true cross-border nature of the project. The funded sub-projects work essentially independently from one another. The exchange of experience only came later in the project.

The lead partner for this project has been the province of Zeeland. This region controlled the finances and facilitated the meetings between the project partners.

It cannot be said that the nature of the project is experimental. The project has been carried out during Interreg II and continues the same approach in Interreg III. For future interreg projects major changes have been proposed: One central issue with regard to maritime heritage is that people do not have the knowledge about how to build a ship. By means of interviewing elderly people and making instruction books on how to use the materials and the tools, this knowledge can be preserved for future generations. This knowledge can help to restore maritime heritage in the future.
The results of the 17 projects are very tangible, reflected in such as ships, docks and wharfs. The touristic infrastructure that has been created triggers the local authorities to get involved as well. The impact can go therefore different ways: in creating jobs and stimulating social cohesion in a local community.

In general the projects work independently. However, during the period the participants discovered the benefits of the cross-border cooperation since they noticed that all the projects deal with the same problems, setbacks and difficulties. They can share experience and learn from each other’s way of solving problems. The background of the project is however different. They can be initiated by local governments or on the other hand by groups of volunteers gathered in a foundation.

The expectations were not homogeneous at the start of the project. This was because there were different expectations among the partners some of which had participated in earlier programmes, while some participated in a European project for the first time.

The project does not have the strategic potential to sustain on the scale as it is arranged in Interreg III. However some partners still exchange knowledge and order materials together though rebuilding ships is no longer a priority. The province facilitates the website www.boegebeelden.org on which the partners can present content for a broader public.

Furthermore, a Platform has been established for maritime heritage in the province of Zeeland, this is however not a cross-border initiative.

The budget and the financial contribution from Interreg has been sufficient for sustainable partnership. All projects have been carried out and there are enough ships and docks being rebuild. Some organisations still exchange knowledge and order material.

**IV. Learning and indirect effects**

The organisational learning is satisfactory. A lot of partners, institutions, local authorities had no idea that funding projects like this within a European context was possible. The administrative issues were too great a barrier for them. They therefore learned from the project to use European funding. Possibilities for funding projects of the kind in other policy-fields are also recognized within the regional authorities.

As has been mentioned, the regional authorities facilitate a website for the partners to communicate the outcomes of the projects and to use the site for further dissemination. The maritime heritage has become a policy field in the province of Zeeland and receives a lot of attention on a policy level. The project has triggered further initiatives of cooperation; however, more attention has been paid to this policy field in Zeeland than in Flanders.

The project enhanced the awareness that the European funding could be used for cultural and touristic infrastructural activities as well. In restoring ships, organisations (mostly working with volunteers or people reintegrating in the labour market) face similar issues. These are however not specifically related to the border.

Since in this field the relations between the Netherlands and Flanders are historically good, there was no particular need to overcome and remove prejudice. The interaction concentrated more on the exchange of knowledge and practices in dealing with restoring old ships. Here there has been mutual exchange of knowledge and experience on how to restore old ships. Experiences in attracting volunteers and purchasing materials have been discussed between the different projects.

The aim of the project was in the first place to restore the maritime heritage in the region. Hereby the different restoration projects made use of volunteers and people going through a reintegration trajectory. The projects themselves (restoration of a ship, wharf, and dock) remained a local initiative, which has in the first place a local effect on tourism, social cohesion and knowledge on maritime heritage. The transnational market only was relevant in purchasing material, which has done in collaboration with other project partners.

The project partners initially saw the project only as a good way to receive funds for restoration of maritime heritage. During the project the partners realised that exchange of knowledge and experience was a very satisfying way to improve their own work.

The project has to some extent led to the improvement of policy and administrative processes. It made local authorities aware of the potential of maritime heritage and the province of Zeeland developed a policy on maritime heritage, which though is not explicitly at a cross-border dimension.
Project study 2: Neurological reintegration

I. General Project information
The intention of the project was well described. The project intended to help people with multiple sclerosis (MS) and victims from severe traumas or strokes, who lost part of their skills and capacities and often their work. The Flemish and Dutch rehabilitation centres work together to help those people to get back to work in a shorter time.

II. Selection process
During Interreg II some partners already experienced cross-border cooperation. In 2001 some rehabilitation centres came together to think about a continuation of their cross border activities. The ideas were communicated to the programme-secretariat. The project manager(s) were very cooperative and advised the partners in drawing up the application, which was submitted in a rolling procedure.

The problem was in the procedures in particular regarding the transition from Interreg II to Interreg III. New structures and people involved have made it difficult and time consuming to get to know each other and to go through the procedures. Also the new and often changing rules and criteria made it harder to draw up the application (mainly, the budget was calculated higher. Therefore the ambitions have been lowered seriously.)

The project was able to contract 8 partners, including not only the rehabilitation centres, but also an academic research centre. All partners shared the same ideas on the subject, and saw ways to improve the rehabilitation on a larger scale than limited to their own centre. The project was in that sense research based and included the development of psychological tests and physical and psychological measurement instruments. The project confronted a serious problem in reintegration in the labour market for people with a (temporally) disability. The project has been developed with the collaboration of the project manager and the project fitted the priority 4 Labour market and education very well. Therefore, no deficiencies in the programme strategy have been noticed. The cooperation with the project manager from Euregion ESM was very good. The programme secretariat of BMG was very approachable during the application and implementation phase and beyond. Some problems still existed though, which were the delays in payments. The project is carried by (semi) private organisations which are under a heavy financial pressure. For them it is hard to wait over 6 months to get the money refunded. Also the many personal changes in the company that carried out the external financial monitoring caused frustration, leading to changed agreements and delays.

The project is based on a shared diagnosis and need assessment among the partners of the project. During the drawing up of the application some partners left and others joined, This made that the partners were aware of the added value of cross-border cooperation. It must be noticed that, since the partner are semi-private organisations, they had to bring in their own money as well. Unfortunately one partner was less involved and less willing to cooperate.

In general the expectations regarding the project among the partners have been homogeneous except one partner. The differences in expectations made the cooperation with this particular partner more difficult.

Unfortunately it was impossible to include a partner from the Euregion Scheldemond, since the centres are wholly, or partly private organisations as it appears, while Euregio ESM was not bursting to fund private organisations with Interreg-funds.

III. Partnership/sustainability
The project was a genuine action. The cooperation goes beyond not only the exchange of experiences, but also has involved the development of a join methodology to help people. It must be noticed that some partners, during the course of the project, were less involved whom could have better not been involved at all. However, this did not cause severe problems.

In the project a true cross-border partnership has been established. The partners first shared a joint vision on the problem and one partner decided to carry the load. Then, to take care of the project management a consultant , who was already involved in previous projects and in the start of this project, has been asked to coordinate the project and to handle the administrative and procedural issues.

The project and its activities can be said to be experimental. Despite the fact that during Interreg II, there has been cooperation involving some partners, the aims and the range of the project are very different and new. The project included several activities including sharing experience, developing methods, drawing up a manual and creating a joint network.
In the reintegration of these people a lot of different issues are relevant, for example the medical care that has to be taken care of, advising employers on suitable accommodation and the working environment, communication with colleagues and applying for financial support for the employer.

Since the Euregion ESM is not involved the results are not traceable in the whole border region. However within the Euregion BMG, organisations from all provinces are involved. The outputs (tests, methods, manual) and the results from the reintegration can be seen everywhere since 390 patients with a neurological constrain are reintegrated in the labour market.

Also after the programme-period and without Interreg IV funding some partners still work together in helping rehabilitation of temporarily disadvantaged people.

Even though the project was never intended to end after the interreg-period, the need for rehabilitation and exchange of knowledge and experiences between the organisations remains the same after the project is finished. Some partners are currently carrying out another project.

The project therefore has the strategic potential to sustain, even without INTERREG co-finance. The financial contribution from Interreg has been sufficient; however it is not only the contribution from Interreg, but also the added value of cross-border exchange and cooperation that triggered the partners to further cooperate.

**IV. Learning and indirect effects**

The organisational learning of the project is big. The participating organisations continue their cooperation after the period. Also possibilities for new projects and opportunities, involving new partners are explored.

The project certainly enhanced the awareness on common challenges: in both countries it is important, from a humanistic, medical, and psychological but also from an economic perspective to reintegrate people with a neurological constrain as soon and fast as possible. The cooperation was not hampered by prejudice, since in this field the relations between the Netherlands and Flanders are historically good and there was no particular need to overcome and remove prejudice.

Despite the fact that the project had one lead partner, the partners participated in the mutual exchange of knowledge. The project enhanced knowledge of each other’s practices and the transparency across the border.

The results of the project speaks for itself: the aim (checked and validated by academic experts) for reintegration of patients was 30%. The result is 61% for patients with a non-congenial constrain and 70% for people with MS. However since the project exceeded the budget, the partners had to bring in a lot of their own hours unpaid. No effects on the level of improved policy and administrative processes have been recorded other than within the partners’ organisations.

---

**Project study 3: Border-pointer (Grenswijzer)**

**I. General Project information**

The intention of the project is to stimulate cross-border entrepreneurship and to strengthen the position of micro-enterprises. This will be pursued by providing information, consultation, guidance and training and by assisting the micro-enterprises in their cross-border activities. The idea is that cross-border entrepreneurship involves specific competences needed in entrepreneurs on one hand, and on the other hand a certain familiarity with the concept of entrepreneurs in order to see opportunities across the border.

**II. Selection process**

The application has been drawn up in a very ‘organical’ way. The Organisation for the Self-Employed and SMEs (UNIZO) in Western and Eastern Flanders and the SME-Zeeland (MKB-Zeeland) in the Netherlands acknowledged that the same problems are present on both sides of the border. The introduction of the Euro made enterprises look more closely to opportunities across the border, but missed the expertise and competences to start cross-border activities. The organisations (on national level) participated in more international/European projects, but for this specific regional issue they asked for Interreg support. The project manager from the Interreg programme Euregion ESM has advised the organisations during the rolling procedure.

In the initial plan, there was a lot of criticism, since it was assumed that advising entrepreneurs is a core-business of the partner organisations. In the application it had to be explained what the added value of the joint project would be and that the specific know-how concerning cross-
border entrepreneurship is not available within the three organisations either. This took a lot of time.

The project is developed from a joined analysis of the problem and a shared idea on the way the micro-enterprises could be stimulated to cross the border. The three partner-organisations who joined in the non-profit institution Grenswijzer had homogeneous expectations concerning the project.

The project matches perfectly the programme strategy, in particular the priority 2, economic development. The project is designed to support micro-enterprises and presenting ways of overcoming the barriers that the border raises for enterprises and the opportunities that the border provides as well.

Despite the fact the project fitted the priority 2 of the programme very well, it took a long time to align the project with the project strategy, since there were doubts whether the activities executed would not have been core-activities of the organisations themselves. During the drawing up of the application it has been explained that the particular know-how is absent in all the partner organisations.

In the implementation stage no problems occurred, except there was some debate with the programme-secretariat to what extent certain activities could be compensated within the project-plan.

Another problem is about the period for refunding. This made that the organisations had to pre-fund the activities which in some occasions caused problem with the liquid assets.

### III. Partnership/sustainability

The project is a genuine joint action. The partners created a cross-border organisation (Grenswijzer), legally located in Flanders (VZW, non-profit institution) which was responsible for the actions, session, information, consultations and acted as the information point. This body implemented also other and similar projects (Grenswijzer-ambassadeur, Grenswijzer.net, etc.). The partners established an own organisation implementing the project (www.grenswijzer.org). This body has been established from a joint strategy of the three participating partners.

The project and its activities can be said to be experimental. Entrepreneurs come with questions concerning a lot of different field of expertise. For example, dealing with tax measures, pensions, advertisement, education, how to send bills, cultural differences etc. Since the organisations do not have the expertise in-house, other organisations had to be involved to provide info-sessions and deliver expertise. Because the consulting of entrepreneurs individually was a (small) part of the project, this has put a heavy weight of the time of the organisations.

The project only took place in the Euregion ESM. Here the impact is traceable. The project enhanced the willingness to look over the border for opportunities for enterprises. The info-sessions stimulated the micro-enterprises to think about cross-border business. Also the training programmes enhanced the competences of entrepreneurs in the region in this field.

The project had a lot of potential to sustain after the programme period, which unfortunately has not all been realized. The know-how on specific problem for cross-border entrepreneurship is very valuable and this expertise is shared on a national level in Flanders (UNIZO) and the Netherlands (MKB). Also the same activities are carried out by Grenswijzer (info-sessions, info-point etc.) but in a much lower frequency. The collaboration and tuning between UNIZO-Flanders (west and East) and MKB-Zeeland still takes place.

A pilot project also carried out by Grenswijzer (Grenswijzer-Ambassadeur) with funds from Interreg III which were intended to continue in the following Interreg-period. Despite that the results of the pilot are excellent, due to the changed structure of the Interreg IV-programme and politic issues, the project did not have a follow-up (the provinces willing to participate do not border and the other provinces placed their priorities on other fields. Especially for a project of this kind, it is important that the provinces involved are bordering each other.)

The project tried to start a change of mentality in the border regions. Entrepreneurs are pragmatic people. When they see chances, they go for it, also when it is across the border. But really changing the mentality will take a long time. Without the intense distribution of knowledge, advice and consultation the mentality will never take place. Despite the fact that there is at this moment a cross-border institution and that entrepreneurs are actually doing cross-border business, the border as a mental-barrier still exists and long-term investments should be done to lower this barrier.
IV. Learning and indirect effects
The organisational learning within the project is big. The establishment of a joint institute and
the collaboration and tuning of the partner-organisations increased the know-how and expertise
in the field of cross-border entrepreneurship. Because the partners are joined in one body, the
mutual exchange of knowledge is guaranteed.

The project enhanced awareness on common challenges and perspectives across the border,
though unfortunately not on a fundamental basis: a mentality change will only take place by a
long-term intensive approach. Within the organisations (and on national level) the problems
that come with cross-border entrepreneurship have been recognised and addressed.

To some extent, besides the practical issues (tax, advertisement etc.), the project noticed that
the greatest barriers are cultural ones: All administrative issues can be solved; the only thing
that is needed is the willingness to expand the business across the border. Awareness of the
potentials is the most important element in stimulating cross-border entrepreneurship. This
entails removing prejudice concerning practices in the other member state and removing
prejudice concerning ‘international-business’: this business is sometimes closer and more
obvious than ‘national business’.

The project improved transparency of cross-border or transnational markets very much. The aim of
the project has been exactly this: providing transparency in cross-border entrepreneurship for
micro-enterprises. Towards this end the project reached a lot of enterprises and collected a lot
of know-how on cross-border entrepreneurship.

Because the failed application for Interreg IV which was caused by political differences and
priorities set at provincial level, the trust that has been established in the Interreg-programme
has been washed away.

The project contributed to improved policy and administrative processes, since the organisations
share their experiences in these fields. There is currently discussion to share the membership of
entrepreneurs between UNIZO Flanders and MKB-Zeeland.

Project study 4: Quality development logistic centre Hazeldonk-Meer
I. General Project information
The intention of the project was to revitalise the enterprise zone Hazeldonk on the Dutch side of
the border and Meer on the Belgium side. The two zones had a bad reputation, suffered from
criminality and illegal activities while the infrastructure was outdated. Furthermore, it was the
intention within the project to built a new consolidation centre where there would be room for
six companies to share their logistic abilities in order to reduce costs, reduce the burden on the
environment by reducing the number of lorries on the road.

II. Selection process
The plans to build the consolidation centre are initiated by a small number of companies. This
idea had been taken up by the local authorities of Breda, who saw an opportunity to build the
centre in enterprise zone Hazeldonk. The project came with a very large private investment
from the constructor and future owner of the consolidation centre.

The municipally of Breda participated already in Interreg II projects and heard that there were
still funds within the infrastructural priority. To make financial room for revitalising the
enterprise zone, the local authority of Hoogstraten, in which enterprise zone Meer is situated is
approached and agreed to participate. The application was done in a rolling procedure. The final
confirmation was provided in December 2006.

With regard to the existence of a shared diagnosis, the lead partner, Breda, had to convince the
municipally of Hoogstraten, that the project has benefits for both border municipalities. The
project was a very complex one, with many different facets, responsibilities and interest for the
partners. The expectation to revitalise the enterprise zone was shared by both Breda and
Hoogstraten, however Breda took very much the lead.

The project matches the aims of priority 1. The project aimed at creating real cross-border
cooperation between the two enterprise zones, including a joint park management and the
exchange of experience, knowledge on the activities of the companies etc. Furthermore the
project made it possible to raise the absorption of the Interreg-funds at a late stage of the
programme.

Unfortunately the initial private partner responsible for the construction of the consolidation
centre had withdrawn from the project, increasing the percentage of ERDF-funding in the
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Here the time-pressure (N+2) was an advantage for the project responsible: the project was able to spend large amounts of money within a short time, increasing the absorption of the programme. The contribution of other funds than ERDF exceeds still the 50% of the total budget.

III. Partnership/sustainability
The project is genuine joint action. The two municipalities collaborated in a lot of different fields to tune the different regulations in order to make cross-border measures possible, including for example privacy regulations (camera-surveillance) and digging fibre optic cable to improve the communication possibilities in a cross-border scale, using only one provider.

To a large extent, the partnership approach has been applied, however it must be noticed that the role of the municipality of Breda is much bigger than that of Hoogstraten. This is not surprising because Breda is 5-6 times bigger than Hoogstraten, just like Hazeldonk is bigger than Meer. Despite this, the enterprise zone has only one management dealing with the management of the complete zone.

The project and its activities can be said to be experimental. The project included the creation of a logistic centre, the establishment of a joint structure to manage the zone and other very specific issues, dealing with regulations on surveillance, placing fibre optic cables etc. Therefore a lot of public and private partners were involved.

The effects of the project are very traceable: It has become one enterprise zone, with its own logo, park management and surveillance system. There are new roads, fibre optic cables and last but not least a logistic consolidation centre. Not all of these are visible in the whole programme area but it has impact on a larger region, including attracting more companies (Hazeldonk is currently full, Meer nearly full) and creating more jobs.

The project has the potential to sustain since the companies on Hazeldonk-Meer pay a fee to manage the park. The infrastructural facilities are sustainable and so are the created jobs. The joint park management creates a firm basis for future cooperation. In fact there is only one enterprise zone, instead of two! Furthermore, also the contacts between Breda and Hoogstraten are closer than before the project.

IV. Learning and indirect effects
The organisational learning within the project is big. The establishment of a joint park management and dealing with very complex issues like surveillance, cross-border security actions, dealing with criminality, PR infrastructural issues etc. makes the organisational learning very big. Also the more informal part: companies getting to know and understand the neighbours across the border. The project triggered cooperation between companies on the enterprise zone, improvement of the organisation from municipalities towards companies.

Since the project involved a long preparation, and all the regulations, permits were already dealt with, the project was implemented in a very short time. The decision-making was helped by the N+2 rule in case of any problems concerned with the co-financing.

The project enhanced awareness on common challenges and perspectives across borders like fighting crime, fighting criminal activities, stopping illegal immigrants etc., and asked for a joint perspective and approach. There are differences between Belgium and Dutch municipalities, their organisation, capacity etc. In addition, companies differ. The joint enterprise zone Hazeldonk-Meer thus created a platform on which companies and municipalities can learn from each other, exchange experiences, doing business, explore opportunities and last but not least, the zone stimulates to remove possible prejudices. Because of the differences between Breda and Hoogstraten the exchange was initially going in different directions. Now there is one park management, both partners bring in their knowledge.

The one enterprise zone made it easier to see what companies are at the other side of the border which therefore has contributed to the transborder transparency of markets.

The revitalisation of the enterprise zone was a success. The results are very concrete and tangible and a platform is created for more cooperation. As it is Hazeldonk-Meer is the biggest cross-border enterprise zone in Europe (it is not said that being a cross-border enterprise zone is an advantage, but it works good in terms of PR).

To a large extent the project contributed to improved policy and administrative processes. The project has addressed issues with regard to some important regulatory problems concerning infrastructure, telecom and security, which had to be tuned between the member-states.
**Project study 5: Clean Creeks III (Schone Kreken III)**

**I. General Project information**
The intention of the project was to increase the attractiveness and the living environment of the cross-border creek areas. The creeks will be upgraded in collaboration with different partners from both sides of the border. The project contains several different activities.

**II. Selection process**
In the field of water management there has been a long tradition of cooperation between different partners across the border. Since 1989 relevant partners participated in the initiatives for the inventory of problems, the consultation of experts and the solving of the problems. This resulted in a policy document on water, lakes and streams in the region, concerning both quantitative as qualitative aspects.

During Interreg I a pilot project has been carried out. In interreg II the joint project aimed at solving problems with pollution, and the exchange of solutions to overcome the problems. With a slight focus shift from overcoming pollution to the improvement of the water in the lakes and streams.

The projects is based on a shared diagnosis and need assessment among the partners. The partners are involved for a long time and have drawn up a policy plan to solve issues on the long term. Also, the expectations have been homogeneous. Every partner knew the way the project would develop during the Interreg period and participate in the new Interreg IV application.

The project Clean Creeks III consists of two phases, both with their own application.

The project matches the programme strategy priority 3 protection of the living environment perfectly: it aims at improving the quality of the lakes, the environment, and the attractiveness that comes with it. This creates possibilities for cross-border recreation and tourism. Because the project is based on a long tradition of (Interreg) cooperation, no deficiencies in the strategy has been perceived. Specific smaller problems have been dealt with during the course of the project (for example, financial procedures, tender procedures etc.).

Since there is a long tradition in cooperation and a long involvement of interreg, there is an ongoing contact between the project responsible and the programme secretariat of ESM. The secretariat has been involved since the start of preparation of the application.

**III. Partnership/sustainability**
The project is a genuine joint action. The water regulatory authority (Waterschap) of Zeeuws-Vlaanderen (NL) was the project responsible and steered the whole project, as it facilitates the long cross-border cooperation between the relevant partners. In the Netherlands, the policy field concerned with water quality is more centrally organised than in Flanders. This makes that the Dutch organisation has more (financial) abilities to facilitate the cross-border cooperation. However, since the partners are involved for a long period there is a mutual policy, shared analysis of the problems and last but not least a mutual trust.

To a large extent, the partnership approach has been applied. The overall project responsible is not automatically the puller of the different activities. In some cases, other partners coordinate the sub-projects within the Clean Creeks III project.

The cross-border cooperation exists for a long time and the successive action taken within Interreg I, II and III, are part of a bigger plan. This makes that the project did not face problems that occur in newly started projects. However, the issues taken up in the project are complex and involve not only the implementation of measures, but also dealing with regulations of water quality, different organisations, and levels of authority. Dealing with this makes the project complex.

The effects of the project are very traceable: the quality and attractively of the lakes have been improved, creating further possibilities for tourism across the border.

The project has the potential to sustain even without Interreg co-funding to some extent. The cooperation between the partners will continue. The inventory of problems, exchange of knowledge and the exchange of possible solutions will continue. However, the implementation of measures and actual activities will be limited. This will be mainly the case in Flanders, since the organisational structure does not support these kind of projects to the same extent as the case in the Netherlands. Interreg funds are therefore necessary. The project serves as a good practice to overcome cross-border issues concerning water for other border-regions.
IV. Learning and indirect effects
The organisational learning within the project is big. Partly because of the cooperation, the Flemish organisations move closer to an organisational model as used in the Netherlands. This will make cooperation between the two member states in this field easier. Also knowledge on each others regulations and legal articles, financial procedures etc. enables the cross-border cooperation to improve and to get acquainted with best practices across the border.

The cooperation has not been formalised, but there are very strong connections between the organisations, which enable the exchange of knowledge. This cooperation continues also when there are no Interreg projects being implemented.

The cooperation between the project responsible and the ESM programme secretariat was very good and no cumbersome decision-making processes have hampered the selection and implementation of project. The financial processes and the refunding of expenses made though could have taken less time.

The project is the result of the awareness of common challenges and perspectives: water is by definition a cross-border matter and should be dealt with in a cross-border way. It enhanced the awareness of new opportunities (dealing with water-related climate issues and increasing the attractiveness of the lakes-region for touristic activities). The project improved transparency of the situations on both sides of the border.
There are differences in organisational structure between Flanders and the Netherlands. Dealing with these differences is eased with the help of good personal contact, getting to know each other etc. The project increased and intensified the contacts between the partners. This made it possible that the partners can mutually provide knowledge on the way they deal with certain problems and the solutions they apply. In every situation, the best way of dealing with issues (whether they are content, water related issues, financial, organisational or procedural issues) is examined and selected. The project lived up to the expectation of the partners and contributed to mutual understanding of the financial and administrative procedures and policy. Before the project started there has been a joint policy plan related to water management of the lakes and streams. The project enhanced this understanding.

2.3.3 Interim conclusion and relevance for the programme level analysis

All aspects of the synthetic indicator have been explored across the project samples. The project studies are all common actions, in diverse fields and using diverse measures. In most cases the projects appointed a lead partner from one of the two countries, but in some cases the partnership was formalised in a cross-border body. The complexity of the project differs as well, from projects implemented by the provinces and carried out by volunteers to highly complex multi-dimensional projects revitalising enterprise zones. The diagnosis of the need for intervention was shared, but in some cases there was noticeably one partner who initiated the project and another partner who followed. Differences in need assessment and expectations came to consensus during the project period.

Some of the projects are based on previous projects, like the Maritime Heritage project. Other projects had their foundings in earlier Interreg periods but extended their cooperation heavily during Interreg III (Neurological reintegration). Most projects aim at sustainable cooperation (f.e. Grenswijzer and Hazeldonk-Meer). Unfortunately some projects indicate that the enthusiasm within Interreg III made place for desillusion in Interreg IV, since they were not able (because of administrative, political reasons) to continue the cooperation to the same extent.

The project responsibles feel they are part of one of the sub-programmes and feel strongly connected to the identity of the Euregion. The way the priorities and measures are shaped
in the Euregions fits with the ideas of the project responsibles. Continuous problems have been the delays in payments, the late start of the programme and continuous changing personnel.

The individual and organisational learning was significant in all projects.

2.4 Analysis of factors that determine the character of the programme

2.4.1 Important contextual factors characterising cross-border / transnational programme areas

Contextual factors
Under the task 4 of the ex-post evaluation, a typology of the programmes has been jointly developed for all strands, based on the data from task 2. This typology includes the features and factors for the programmes, such as geographic type of land border, the political administrative nature of the common border, the “density of border crossing possibilities”, and level of cross-border economic disparities and existence of common historic ties. The following figure depicts the position of the Flanders-Netherlands programme in relation to the average of strand A programmes with respect to contextual factors. The lower the score, the better the preconditions are for cross-border co-operation.

Figure 2.11 The taxonomic position of the Vlaanderen-Nederland programme

The programme’s type of land border is identified as “medium (a mixed mountain-river-green border)”. With regard to this first item, the geographical type of land, the Flanders-the Netherlands programme scores below the Interreg average. This means that with regard to the type of land, the preconditions for cross-border cooperation are better in relation to the Interreg average. The programme’s political, administrative nature of the common border is also scored far below average which means that barriers for cooperation are lower than the Interreg-average. Also with regard to the existence of common historic ties, the

1 Cf. Panteia (and partner institutes) 2009, Ex-post evaluation INTERREG III – interim report
programme is assessed much lower than the INTERREG average. The programme has been indicated as "Strong common historic ties, a shared culture, and a common language". This, of course, makes cross-border cooperation easier.

Only on the item of the level of cross-border economic disparities, the programme scores above the Interreg average. The cross-border economic disparities are about Interreg average. A fifth contextual criterion "density of border crossing possibilities", not included in the above figure, classes the programme with a score of 150 high above the Interreg average of 47.

Table 2.3 Contextual criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A 1.1 – geographic type of land:</th>
<th>A 1.2 – The political administrative nature of the common border&quot;</th>
<th>A 1.3- &quot;density of border crossing possibilities&quot;</th>
<th>A 1.4- The level of cross-border economic disparities</th>
<th>A 1.5 – The existence of common historic ties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vlaanderen-Nederland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>149,83</td>
<td>2,307692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3,50</td>
<td>2,05</td>
<td>46,61</td>
<td>1,76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation from mean</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>321%</td>
<td>131%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: INTERREG III, RvB

A complicating factor that is not included in the numerical representation of the programme is the structure over two Euregios. In the practice of programme management, this border appeared often to be higher than the national borders.

The success of the programme in addressing the initial priority topics & concentration principles of the INTERREG Communication

In this section, the programme will be assessed in accordance with the priority topics as defined in the Interreg Communication. Furthermore, the financial concentration on a limited number of priority topics will be examined (concentration principle). The outcomes are presented in the table below.

Table 2.4 Priority topics and concentration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deviation from mean</th>
<th>A 2.1 - Extent to which the programme addressed the &quot;priority topics&quot; as listed in the INTERREG III Communication</th>
<th>A 2.2 - Extent to which the programme has actually concentrated its financial resources on a limited number of &quot;priority topics&quot; as listed in the INTERREG III Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vlaanderen-Nederland</td>
<td>104,92%</td>
<td>87,43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Strand A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0,76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,77</td>
<td>0,87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As regards the extent to which Flanders-the Netherlands addresses priority topics, 5 topics are identified by the typology. The mean value across strand A is at only 4.77, so that the programme scores with 5 percentage points above the average. The reason why the
Flanders-the Netherlands programme addresses a considerable number of priority topics could be the broad programme area and the large cultural, historical differences, not between the two countries, but between the two ESM and BMG. The merging of the two operational programmes at a late stage of programme development preveded specific and clear choices from being made.

In terms of concentration, 0.76 (=80%) of the total budget is allocated to the six largest measures (in terms of the budget) the programme scores under-average, confirming that the use of ERDF funds is rather spread among the measures.

The effectiveness and efficiency of the overall implementation process
The sub-criteria to map the character of the programme are related to efficiency (financial performance), effectiveness and sustainability at both the programme and project level. The scales given in the table below are different. For financial performance, degree of achievement and robustness of projects, a scale of more than 100% suggests over-average performance, while for the degree of programme stability the scale of less than 100% also shows over-average performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deviation from mean</th>
<th>A 4.1 - The overall “financial performance of the programme”</th>
<th>A 4.2 - The overall “degree of programme sustainability”,</th>
<th>A 4.3 - The overall “degree of achievement for all quantifiable outputs &amp; results at programme level”,</th>
<th>A 4.5 - The overall “degree of robustness / durability of projects”,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vlaanderen-Nederland</td>
<td>112,33%</td>
<td>128,57%</td>
<td>183,19%</td>
<td>147,69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0,82</td>
<td>2,33</td>
<td>1,51</td>
<td>50,78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of financial performance, the programme has spent 92% of the budget. This is 10 percentage points above the average. The sustainability of the programme is high and almost 30% higher than the INTERREG IIIA average. An explanation for this is the long history of the cross-border cooperation. On the other hand, the joint structure (two INTERREG II programmes merged) could have caused instability. The degree of achievement is given with 2,76 (276% achievement rate). This is more than 80% above the average of Strand A. The robustness of the projects is with 148% favorable. With 75% of the projects sustaining after two years, the Vlaanderen-Nederland programme scores rather high.

With respect to the character of the programme we can conclude that the programme is stable and characterized by a high absorptive capacity. It furthermore convinces with a

---

1 There may be differences between the results of the taxonomic analysis carried out under tasks 2 and 4 of the ex-post evaluation and the Commission data on which we have based our analysis of financial performance. The achievement rates of the three-digit codes are on average higher than those calculated in the table above. It might be that data of different points of time lead to different results.
more than 100% achievement rate in effectiveness and has generated many sustainable projects.

2.4.2 Intermediate conclusions

In the following table, the determining factors of the programme character are summarized.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determining Factor</th>
<th>Effects (*)</th>
<th>at programme level</th>
<th>at project level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context factors characterising cross-border &amp; transnational programme areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-border programmes: topographic / geographic nature of the common border</td>
<td>The cross-border cooperation is not hindered by the river Schelde. In fact this river is one of the binding elements within the Euregio Scheldemond.</td>
<td>There are no geographical barriers at project level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-border programmes: political / administrative nature of the common border</td>
<td>The programme area is entirely within EU borders, therefore there is no political or administrative hinder.</td>
<td>The programme area is entirely within EU borders, therefore there is no political or administrative hinder.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-border programmes: density of border crossing possibilities</td>
<td>The density of border crossing possibilities is high; however, the infrastructure (railways) could be improved.</td>
<td>The same counts at project level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-border programmes: economic disparities</td>
<td>The economic disparities within the programme area is, with 2,31, rather high. However, the area is one of the most prosperous areas in Europe, the disparities therefore do not create barriers for cooperation</td>
<td>The economic disparities do not cause barriers at project level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-border programmes: existence of historic ties &amp; converging cultural / linguistic circumstances</td>
<td>In the programme area, the historic ties are long and cultural/linguistic circumstances form no hindrance for cooperation. However there are cultural differences between the western and eastern part of the programme area (ESM, BMG)</td>
<td>The same counts at project level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historic factors determining cross-border / transnational / interregional co-operation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous co-operation tradition</td>
<td>The countries have a long tradition of cross-border cooperation. Also during previous Interreg-periods, the area developed joint programmes for fostering cooperation.</td>
<td>At project level cross-border cooperation is helped by the common history and shared language. Some projects had prior experience in cooperation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior existence of specific legal instruments</td>
<td>Legal instruments of cooperation going beyond the Regulation 1260/1999 have not been applied.</td>
<td>In the Euregion Scheldemond, the Scheldemondraad (council) is a cross-border legal entity and enables cooperation between three provinces in The Netherlands and Flanders. This helps some projects carried out in the Euregion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior existence of permanent cooperation structures</td>
<td>There are several permanent cooperation structures. One of the oldest is the Scheldemond council, consisting of the three Scheldemond-provinces. Structural cooperation started in the 60s, which let to the foundation of the council in 1993.</td>
<td>At project level, many thematic cooperation structures have been developed. Also the Scheldemondraad had a prior existence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A distinction between effects at programme and at project level is necessary because in many cases projects do not intervene across the entire programme area. Hence, effects can be rather different.

2.4.3 The synthetic indicator

The synthetic indicator (real rate defined in the typology\(^1\) as indicator A3.1) aims to measure the depth and intensity of co-operation. It is composed of the following variables: intensity of shared diagnosis, partnership and decision making power, management structures, nature and location of joint projects and impact of projects. The detailed definition of those indicators is given in the Inception Report\(^2\).

The aggregation of the sub-variables has been defined as the so-called ‘real rate’, a normative synthetic indicator (arithmetic mean) measuring the performance of an INTERREG programme. Furthermore, a separated historical criterion has been added to estimate by regression analysis how historical ties have had an impact on the performance (Real Rate). The arithmetic mean of all scores for the Vlaanderen-Nederland programme is at 72 as the following table shows. The ‘real rate’ as such does not include the historical criteria. They have been used to estimate the influence of history and experience in co-operation on the performance of the programme, i.e. to observe the differences between a predicted (expected) rate and the ‘real rate’ as such (see annex 3.1).

The mean value for strand A is at 72.03. The Vlaanderen-Nederland programme is exactly on the average score of Strand A.

### Table 2.6 The synthetic indicator of ABH compared to the strand A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deviation from mean</th>
<th>The depth/ intensity of cooperation (real rate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vlaanderen-Nederland</td>
<td>100.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>72.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now it is interesting to have more insight into the distribution of the ‘real rate’ across the strand A and the position of the Vlaanderen-Nederland programme within the cluster it is classed to. The following programmes have been classed by cluster analysis into one of six clusters.

### Table 2.7 The Cluster compared

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Real rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NL-BE - Vlaanderen Nederland</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-D Austria-Bavaria</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-B - France-Wallonie-Flandre</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-D-CH Oberrhein-Mitte-Sud</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Panteia (and partner institutes) 2009, Ex-post evaluation INTERREG III - interim report on task 4
The characteristics that are specific for this cluster of programmes are:

- Low levels of cross-border economic disparities.
- Very high density of border crossing possibilities.
- Internal EU-borders (including CH).
- Partly above-average & partly below-average concentration of ERDF-support on a limited number of “priority topics” listed in the INTERREG III Communication.
- The depth & intensity level of co-operation achieved under the programmes is partly at high level & partly at a medium level.
- Existence of strong or few common historic ties / a shared culture and in many cases also of a common language.

A box-whisker plot (see annex 3.2) illustrating the respective positions shows the comparative distribution of the programme and cluster values across the distribution of the Real Rate for the entire Community Initiative.

We see here that the distribution of the ‘real rate’ across INTERREG is uneven and skewed. The programmes between the 25th and 75th percentile are placed in the small range of ‘real rate’ values between 72 and 81.5. The range of scores up to the lower 10th percentile is much larger than that up to the 90th percentile. The cluster, to which the Flanders- the Netherlands programme is classed, is located in the upper area of the distribution, all of the programmes scoring around or above the median (yellow arrows). The Flanders-Netherlands programme cannot be considered as one of the best performing programmes in the context of INTERREG IIIA (red arrow).

2.5 Extrapolating results on effectiveness and impacts to all INTERREG programmes

The section above has dealt with the analysis of the character of the programme. Most of the analyses (like the financial analysis and the taxonomic analyses) have been already viewed comparatively, so that the position of the Flanders-the Netherlands programme within INTERREG, the strand A and even the cluster to which the programme has been classed can be depicted.

Regarding financial performance, the concentration of budgets and the expenditure rate determine major characteristic results. Further major results are related to the physical achievement rate, the sustainability of projects, and the stability of the programme. The following table illustrates the share of the programmes along the strands and the entire Community Initiative, where a concentration of budgets, a high performance rate in financial implementation, stability of programming, a high physical achievement and robust projects were found.
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For strand A all structured results were achieved by more than half of the programmes (i.e. a majority); this is also true for INTERREG as such, whereas for the two other strands, the results vary a bit more. In conclusion we can say that the Flanders-the Netherlands programme is fully in line with the results for INTERREG and the strand A.

In the following table those above and some further specific results of the Flanders-the Netherlands programme are compared.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major results</th>
<th>Budgets are rather concentrated</th>
<th>High performance rate in financial implementation (&gt;mean ~81.5%)</th>
<th>There were no or only minor shifts of budgets during 2000-2006 (&lt;mean=2.33)</th>
<th>High achievement rate at programme level (&gt;100%)</th>
<th>Projects are robust and sustainable (&gt;50%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean strand A</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean strand B</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean strand C</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Interreg</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For strand A all structured results were achieved by more than half of the programmes (i.e. a majority); this is also true for INTERREG as such, whereas for the two other strands, the results vary a bit more. In conclusion we can say that the Flanders-the Netherlands programme is fully in line with the results for INTERREG and the strand A.

In the following table those above and some further specific results of the Flanders-the Netherlands programme are compared.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results of the in-depth analysis</th>
<th>Already suggested by the results of tasks 1 and 2 (Yes - to some extent - no)</th>
<th>Strength of evidence for INTERREG (clear - with uncertainty - no evidence)</th>
<th>How the results materialised in the individual programme?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High performance of financial implementation</td>
<td>To some extent</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Decommitment in 2004, finally high financial performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were only minor shifts of programming</td>
<td>To some extent</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Some shift between measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High achievement rate at programme level</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>High achievement ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project are robust and sustainable</td>
<td>To some extent</td>
<td>With uncertainty</td>
<td>Typology analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures show a more or less linear trend in financial implementation</td>
<td>To some extent</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Late start up of spending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators are less useful for estimating the achieved results as they are too simple and not well coordinated between the different levels of intervention</td>
<td>To some extent</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Indicators are comparable between levels of intervention. However, poorly defined for project level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A shortcoming has the rather poor achievement rates for studies, evaluation and publicity. The reason for that has been the perceived moderate utility of those instruments</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project funded are by their nature rather experimental and complex. It is not so much the intention to carry out projects that meet their originally scheduled physical outputs but rather to establish sustainable networks, Trail and error are information tools of overarching importance.</td>
<td>To some extent</td>
<td>With uncertainty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Analysis section (part 2): The overall performance: Major impacts in terms of utility and Community Value Added – how have achievements been obtained

3.1 Evaluation of the policy coherence of the programme

Policy coherence is defined by the level of interaction and co-ordination with other spatially relevant Community- / national- / regional-level policies and the systematic embedding of a programme into the overall regulatory framework. A high level of policy coherence can contribute to enhanced policy synergy and is thus relatively efficient and effective. For this task we can again consider the findings of the ex-ante and the two mid-term evaluations (since this task was also compulsory in those evaluations) and complement them with a further review from the ex post point of view. The following sections deal with some leading issues.

3.1.1 The ‘Flanders-the Netherlands’ Programme and the supranational policy context

There are no reasons to assume that the programme has not been in line with the various regulations of the European Commission on Interreg (2000/C 143/09) and ESF (regulations 1260/1999, 1783/1999). The not reaching the N+2 rule resulted in the decommitment of 4 million euro ERDF-funds.

3.1.2 Coherence with other Interreg programmes (including ESPON and INTERACT)

Regions involved in the Flanders-the Netherlands programme are also involved in other Interreg IIIA programmes. In the Eastern part of the programme area, the Dutch Province of Limburg is involved in the Interreg IIIA programme the Netherlands-Germany, and in the Western part, the Belgium provinces of Western and Eastern Flanders participate in the Flanders-Wallonia-France programme. The strategy for all INTERREG programmes at the German-Dutch and Belgian-Dutch border in the period 2000-2006 have the same six priorities. These priorities have been jointly established by the Dutch government, the German Federal Republic and the Länder, the Flemish Region, the Walloon Region, the Government of the German-speaking Community and the Government of the French Community. From the interviews it became clear that the provinces themselves decide which programme is most suitable for funding a particular project. When an initiative is issued, the project managers will look into other provinces for suitable partners. When the partners are in the Netherlands-Flanders region, the initiative will be submitted in this region.

In Interreg IV the cooperation between the different programmes has been increased. For example the paying authority of the Flanders-the Netherlands (Eastern Flanders) is also the paying authority of the new Interreg IV Flanders-Wallonia-France programme. Also in the
Dutch province of Limburg there is active exchange of experience and even cross-programmes projects, involving partners from both the Flanders-the Netherlands programme, and the the Netherlands-Germany programme.

The paying authority found the INTERACT conference is very beneficial for paying authorities. Some project managers shared experiences with Interreg IIIA, B and C programmes during the annual meeting of the WVEG in Lappeenranta, Finland (12-15 September 2007). ESPON was not mentioned.

3.1.3 Coherence with other EU policy interventions

The programme Flanders-Netherlands overlaps partially with the plans for rural development and various Objective 2 and 5b (phasing out) targeted programmes as well as ESF-programmes (priority 4).¹ Content-wise there exist a particular link between Priority 1 and 2 of the present programme and the priorities of the Objective 2 and 5b programmes. Priority 1 and 2 (and to a lesser extent the other priorities) are directly aimed at strengthening the economic development of the programme area. This economic development is also one of the main objectives of the Objective 2 and 5b programmes. For this reason, a good coordination between existing programmes and the various target programmes has been necessary, and was foreseen in the Programme Complement. The check on double financing is carried out by the programme secretariat. When the programme secretariat concludes that a project content-wise potentially can be financed by other European funds, an additional step is added to the usual treatment procedure. The project will be forwarded to the partner region (s) in which the project will focus. The partner region will then assess whether the project can be carried out with other European funding programmes. The programme management / secretariat of other programmes will be consulted by the partner region. For some other European programmes the partner regions themselves are responsible, in other cases they will contact other organisations that conduct the programmes.

An important distinction is that the economic development that INTERREG pursues should have a transnational character. The check on double funding concerns also the LEADER, URBAN and EQUAL programmes which have no cross-border objective.

The Euregios ESM and BMG were in the programme period of Interreg III still the driving forces behind the entire programme. Besides the Interreg programme they participate in the EURES-network as well, which deals with labour mobility. Some partners, who implemented projects on labour mobility and barriers for mobility and entrepreneurship, have cooperated in the EURES-network as well.²

¹ As part of the transition arrangement 'phasing out' for former target regions the region Zeeuw-Flanders can count on a contribution under the phasing-out programme 5b Zeeuw-Flanders.
² UNIZO (Belgium), MKB (the Netherlands, see: http://www.euresscheldemond.info/index.php?id=41
3.1.4 Relationship with external organisations and networks

Within the area, there are several organisations that ensure the regional development of a certain part of the area. In some cases these organisations operate cross-border (for example the Scheldemondraad). Most of the time those organisations are actually involved in the programme and therefore can not considered to be external anymore (the cooperation between the three provinces in the Scheldemondraad initiated long before Interreg).

In the academic and technological field there is cooperation between the universities both in the Region and beyond which is out of direct area of Interreg III.

Some provinces have strong relations with other interreg programmes, since they are participating in more than one programme (The Netherlands-Germany, Flanders-Wallonia-France). In most cases such provinces exchange knowledge and expertise, and keep each other informed of projects on a regular basis.

3.1.5 Public reputation

Both BMG and ESM had their own Communication plan and public relations policy. To increase the public reputation several activities have been carried out by the two programme-secretariats, including distribution of promotion material, symposia, flyers, press releases, a website [www.Europawerkt.eu](http://www.Europawerkt.eu) (BMG), a photo competition and the DVD “Europa in Limburg”. The budget for communication for each of the provinces in the sub-programme BMG was 90,000 Euro. Furthermore, projects can choose to use only the name of the European Union, instead of Interreg, ESM or BMG. In the media the European funds are most of the time mentioned in a descriptive way: “this project has been financed by European funds aiming at increasing the cross-border cooperation.”

Despite the Community Initiative as such (as a brand) is not perceived in the public, the media reports on Interreg related activities.¹ The media publishes only what is newsworthy, given a certain thematic issue of the newspaper or the local focus of the paper. Most of the time the information is provided to the newspapers by the provinces or the partners involved in the projects. It is a good sign that the media all know the Interreg programme and that they are aware that newsworthy items can be published on projects funded by Interreg. The focus of the media is on newsworthy items, most of the time these items are related to socio-economic issues or tourism. The newspapers indicate that articles on Interreg projects appear on a regular basis, four or five times a year. One newspaper² took the European elections last year as an opportunity to publish articles on European projects carried out in the region.

---

¹ Information is obtained from the interviews of four reporters and chief editors of four newspapers in the Programme area: Brabants Dagblad, Dagblad de Limburger, PZC (The Netherlands), KW, Krant van West-Vlaanderen (Flanders).
² Dagblad de Limburger
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On the basis of the interviews with local newspapers in the Netherlands and Flanders it can be concluded that the people do not necessarily know Interreg, rather the projects from which they benefit (e.g. sports events, encounters etc.). The articles can address new projects in the region, activities that have been carried out and the results of projects. The involvement of the public can be indicated by the comments on articles published on Interreg-activities. However, it must be noticed that most of the time reactions come from people involved in the projects themselves (local authorities, project partners, participants, etc.).

Furthermore, the interviews with the newspapers and the project managers indicate that while the public is not yet largely aware of Interreg, local administrations, NGOs and the media are mostly well informed. Given the fact that for Interreg IV a lot of new proposals have been submitted involving partners who were never involved in European projects and programmes, the reputation of Interreg III under possible beneficiaries is great.¹

In the Interreg IV programme only one logo and name is used as opposed to the two different names of the Euregions and the overall programme in the Interreg III period. From the interviews with the newspapers there is no indication that they noticed this change and effects on public reputation from this can be expected to be limited.

3.1.6 Interim conclusions

The programme was systematically embedded in the regulatory framework. Only controversies concerning the N+2 rule occurred.

The programme closely co-operates with neighbor INTERRG programmes, such as The Netherlands-Germany and Flanders-Wallonia-France. There have been activities in participation at INTERACT seminars; however, no use has been made by ESPON.

Everything is in place to present funding across other Structural Fund interventions and other Community initiatives. The check on double funding form Structural Fund Intervention (objective 1-3) and other Community Initiatives (URBAN, LEADER, EQUAL) is included in the standard procedures.

The programme interacts closely with all governmental and non-governmental levels. There is a permanent consultation between the organisations responsible for the other interventions on national and regional level.

The Interreg III (sub) programme(s) reached a lot of beneficiaries. This resulted in a high number of applications for the Interreg IV period. The small people-to-people projects brought Interreg closer to the people, but the outreach is limited. Furthermore, the

¹ The downside of this reputation is that a lot of proposals will not be carried out or will be amended heavily. This can cause a decrease of the public reputation by potential project partners.
programme secretariat does not insist on the use of the name Interreg, but is satisfied with the name European Union.

3.2 Analysis of the intrinsic performance of the programme

3.2.1 Evaluation of the programme management

Co-funding rules
Structural interventions in the context of the Flanders-the Netherlands programme are co-financed, as usual, at maximum 50% of the eligible cost of a project in accordance to the Council Regulation 448/2004. No minimum budget has been set, to enable small people-to-people projects.

Application procedures and publicity
The application procedures differ in the two Euregios ESM and BMG. In the Euregio ESM, the provinces who joined the Scheldemondraad are actively involved in the development of applications. The programme secretariat on the other hand is not actively approaching and stimulating possible partners to draw up proposals. In the Euregio BMG, the project managers are actively involved in bringing possible partners together. The initiative however, must come from one partner involved. The two distinct methods result in different projects: the ESM-method results in projects with public partners, the BMG-method has mobilised more private partners and companies in their projects.

The manual ‘administrative organisation’ mentions the following activities to be carried out in the handling of proposals. First the secretariat receives the initial project idea, secondly the project manager and the secretariat, in collaboration with the project responsible will draw up the project proposal. Thirdly, the project manager will draw up the pre-advice, obtaining external advise. In ESM the pre advice and application are forwarded to external advisors with the request to react within 3 weeks. No reaction will count as an approval. In BMG the pre advice and application are discussed in the team of the programme secretariat. The policy position of the five provinces is at issue here as well. It may be that pre advice is also discussed in policy discussions so that external advice is obtained. Lastly, if necessary the project manager and project responsible will adjust the allocation and, draw up the final advise.

Selection criteria and quality of co-operation at the project level
Projects within the Euregio Scheldemond are submitted to the secretariat of the Euregio Scheldemond and projects within the Euregio BMG are submitted to the secretariat of the Euregio BMG. When a project proposal is submitted, the programme secretariat will advise the partners involved in the project during their final application stage. After the final application is submitted, the programme secretariat will advise the Steering committee on the project. The two Steering Committees are responsible for reviewing and approving projects. This is supported by the respective secretariats. If the Steering Committee
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reached no consensus, the application will be forwarded for decision to the Monitoring Committee.

In practice, the programme secretariat and project managers play an important role in the development of the final proposal. Of course, the project responsible has to initiate the project application, but the project managers will advise in the application, suggest possible partners, and advise on ways how the project can be aligned in the programme strategy.

The decision-making follows the next steps. First, the Steering Committee will make a decision concerning the allocation. Secondly, the project manager includes the decision in the monitoring system. Lastly, the project manager and secretariat will draw up the award letter or rejection letter which will be send as well to the paying authority, accompanied by the complete file (allocation, co financing commitments, financial plan, legal permits etc and possibly annual reports).

**Governance and management modes: Formalisation of co-operation**

Co-operation between the participating countries and regions is not formalised to a major extent in the context of INTERREG. Co-operation is based rather on historical long-standing ties between the participating border regions and networking in different cross-border bodies (for example the Scheldomondraad). The figure here below presents the implementation structure of the PCI Borderregion Flanders- the Netherlands.
The Monitoring Committee

The Monitoring Committee oversees the implementation of the whole Flanders-the Netherlands programme. The Monitoring Committee plays an assessing role with respect to the decisions taken by the steering committees in the two Euregios. Decisions are taken by consensus. The Monitoring Committee consists of representatives from the following parties:

- the Executive of the provinces in the programme area. These are the Belgian provinces of East Flanders, West Flanders, Antwerp, Flemish Brabant, and Limburg. The Dutch provinces are Limburg, Noord-Brabant, and Zeeland.
- the Member States: Belgium (Flemish Region) and the Netherlands (Ministry of Economic Affairs);
- a representative of the DG Regio of the European Commission.

The Monitoring Committee consists almost of the same members as the two Steering Committees. The question is therefore justified whether members of the Monitoring Committee are able to monitor themselves as Steering Committee Members. Despite the fact the members are the same, the chair man is different. The interviewees indicate that the overlap of Monitoring Committee and Steering Committee can be seen more as an advantage than a disadvantage: the stream of information between the two gremia was organised in the most efficient way.

The Monitoring Committee meets twice a year (June and December), often in conjunction with a Steering Committee meeting. There is a personal union between the secretary of one of the sub-regions and the Secretary of the common PCI. At the start of the programme this has been indicated as a problem, since the management authority (directed by the Secretary of the common PCI) was involved too much in the project management of one of
the sub-programmes. This situation had an historic background and was improved during the first phase of the programme.

The steering committee
The two Euregios have their own Steering Committee. The Steering Committee is responsible for assessing the content of the individual applications for ERDF assistance by project responsibles. The Steering Committee will take notice of the progress reports, annual reports, and interim evaluations and will provide advice regarding the use of funds for promotion, publicity and research. The Steering Committees are established by the Monitoring Committees of both sub-programmes ESM and BMG, seeking the widest possible representation of national and provincial governments and the municipalities, transnational institutions such as the Benelux Economic Union, social partners and the Paying Authority are members without voting right.

The secretariats of the Steering Committees are the Secretariat of the respective Euroregions Scheldemond or BMG. The secretariats are also advisory members of the Steering Committees. If desired, the Steering Committees will be supported by existing working groups / advisory groups for each theme / priority. The Scheldemondraad is also involved in advising the projects in the ESM sub-region.

Co-operation: Managing Authority – Paying Authority: Effectiveness of financial Management
The Flemish Region has the final responsibility for the implementation of the Flanders–the Netherlands programme. The provincial government of Antwerp was appointed as the management authority.¹ The precise modalities of the relations between the Flemish Region, the management authority, and the European Commission have been drawn up in an agreement. This means that the Flemish Region remains the final responsible, but that a number of tasks of the Flemish Region are delegated to the province of Antwerp. The province of Antwerp is the managing authority and the first contact for the European Commission. Due to the delay in the start-up phase, the actual staffing of the management authority has taken place relatively late in the programme, namely in the last quart of 2002. Therefore at the development stage and the implementation of the programme, the programme lacked steering, guidance and a clear vision in the direction-making processes. Tasks that supposed to be carried out by the management authority have been carried out by the two programme secretariats. This caused differences in the two programme areas with regard to the selection and implementation of projects and the administrative handling of the project applications. After the management authority had been staffed, the MA was able to fully execute the tasks. However, because of the personal union, now the management authority was too much involved in the management of the sub programmes. After some time the right balance has been found.

¹ as foreseen in Articles 9 and 34 of Regulation 1260/1999 of 21 June 1999 laying down general provisions on the Structural Funds.
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The Paying Authority
At first a tender procedure has been attributed to assign the paying authority. Because there were two candidates, the procedure failed and the tasks of the paying authority were delegated to the province of East Flanders. The total procedure caused the late involvement of the paying authority in the programme. This led to delays in the projects and the uncertainty of project responsibles with regard to the costs they already made. The paying authority is operational since the beginning of 2003. After a first check of the declarations by the project managers, an external accountant carries out the second check. Then the paying authority is able to make the payment.

The Joint Technical Secretariat
Originally, it was the intention that the programme management would have been provided by one of the two Euregios in turn, but here, the European Commission made objections. Therefore, it was decided that the joint programme secretariat will be carried out by the Euregio BMG in Turnhout (BE). The post of Secretary of the whole programme, one day in the week, was taken up by the Secretary of BMG. The creation of a joint programme management was delayed and the collaboration between the two Euregios did not always went smoothly, because everyone was accustomed to his own way of working. This caused delay in the development of necessary documents and procedures for the implementation of the programme (procedures for project approval, procedures dealing with the responsibilities of the management authority and paying authority).

To overcome difficulties, and to exchange knowledge and experiences between the Euregios, the secretaries of the two Euregios meet on a monthly basis under supervision of the management authority.

Use of indicators and evaluation
The mid-term evaluator judged that the set of indicators are inadequate to monitor the progress of the programme and the projects. Many indicators were not defined properly and the indicators used on programme level were not in line with indicators used on project level. The mid term evaluation suggested a new and improved set of indicators to be used.

Despite the fact that the indicators were better defined on the basis of the comments from the mid-term evaluator, the indicators have not been used during the programme to monitor the progress of projects, which instead has mainly been done by keeping close contact with the project responsible. Furthermore, the project responsibles were obliged to cooperate in evaluation studies, as well as physical and financial controls. These concerns also the reporting on policy effects after the project has formally and financially ended. The update of the mid term evaluation mentioned that some of the suggestions are effectively implemented, like the changing of the indicator structure, the adjustment of the procedural documents and the intensifying of actions in priority 2 and 4. Others will be kept in mind in designing the operational programme for Interreg IV, for example the attention towards the added value of cross-border cooperation. Furthermore, after the decommitment
of funds due to the N+2 rule in 2004, an internal analysis has been carried out to prevent this from happening in the future.

3.2.2 Evaluation of sustainability and durability

Programme stability over time
Because of the broad scope of the programme strategy (see section 2.2.2), the programme strategy could cope with the (negative) economic developments in the area. The strategy did not have to be changed. The mid term evaluator suggested placing more emphasis and effort on some priorities. This target has been reached only partially when some were taken over by the management authority and the programme secretariats.

Due to economic developments and the difficulties in dealing with the N+2 rule, budgets have shifted from measures where there were only few project proposals, to measures where there were more proposals.

The ESM made use of the long-existing structures between the three provinces without involving many new partners. The BMG focused on involving more private partners who are not involved in cross-border cooperation yet. Therefore the ESM used mainly public co-funding while in BMG there involved more private funding. The structures in which the ESM projects have been implemented can be more stable and long-existing than the structures that BMG adopts, which were fairly new. In general, the sub programme of ESM appeared to be more stable than the sub programme of BMG.

Robustness and durability of projects
The selection of the five projects for further case study is made in cooperation with the management authority and project managers from the two sub programmes ESM and BMG. Despite the selection procedure, the selection is by no means a representative selection, therefore conclusions on robustness and durability of the five projects cannot be extrapolated to all projects within the programme. This being said, the five projects studied have all shown durable results and have partly continued after the programme period. Furthermore, the descriptions of the projects carried out in the programme period indicate that a lot of them show robust and durable results. This is supported by the management authority who remarks that though projects may have had difficulties, no projects failed since the selection procedure guarantees the execution of projects. In this sense, the selection procedure favors more ‘conservative’, than ‘experimental’ projects (especially in ESM).

Identification of the most and least financially sustainable co-operation
The financial size of projects in the Interreg programme Flanders-the Netherlands varies between several thousand euro and several millions of ERDF-funding. However the financial size does not say anything about the sustainability of the cooperation. For example on the basis of small people to people projects, interpersonal, durable, cross-border networks have been developed. Those people would not have met without the ERDF-funds.
Community Value Added

According to the Association of European Border Regions four different facets characterize the Community Value Added:

- The political value added (awareness building, subsidiarity, partnership between people etc.)
- The institutional value added (sustainable vertical and horizontal administrative partnership despite different structures etc.)
- The socio-economic value added (mobilisation of cross-border endogenous potentials, opening-up of labour markets etc.)
- Socio-cultural value added (mutual knowledge of geographical, historic, and cultural conditions, broadening of linguistic knowledge etc.)

Cross-border cooperation in the programme area has long historic ties. Mainly on a regional policy level, the benefit of confronting problems, weaknesses in a joint, transnational manner was acknowledged. The main elements that make regional governments to cooperate are mutual trust and a common interest in specific priorities. During interreg III this trust and interest was established in the two distinct Euregios ESM and BMG. However, it has not been fully established between the two Euregios. The low number of truly joint ‘cross-projects’\(^1\) reflects this point. The cross-project studied, for example Maritime Heritage I and II, have not even been characterized as cross-projects by the project responsible, since the main part of the project took part in only one Euregion. Only a minor part of the project took place in another province and is funded by the other Euregion. On an institutional level however, the Interreg III programme enhanced the cooperation and alignment of organisations and institutions on both sides of the border. For example the logistic project Hazeldonk-Meer brought two local authorities Breda (NL) and Hoogstraten (BE) together in vitalizing the two entrepreneur areas next to the border. Another example is the project neurological reintegration, in which revalidation institutes across the border cooperated in order to increase the reintegration of neurologic disadvantaged people on the labour market. Also on a sustainable basis, after the Interreg III programme exchange of experience takes place. This can be seen in the Maritime heritage projects, and above all the Clean Creeks projects in which the mutual learning about how to work with water related issues (also organisational and institutional) takes place. For many organisations therefore, the interreg III programme can be seen as a learning tool for cross-border cooperation, accessing European funds and organisational learning in finding co-financing.

The programme focuses on the socio-economic cohesion of the whole area as well as the socio-cultural cohesion. The opening of the labour market appeared a difficult task, also because of the negative economic development. Also infrastructural projects that help mobility in a direct way were hard to implement and effects can therefore not be expected. However, the potential is present and first steps have been made to increase the socio-economic cohesion and benefits from cross-border cooperation. From the project

\(^1\) So called kruisprojecten; projects in which both ESM and BMG participated.
Grenswijzer, it can be learned that companies do not actually have to cross the border to work across the border. Familiarity with the tax-rules, administrative barriers and cultural differences have made it attractive to bring the services across the border and to expand the market.

The socio-cultural cohesion received, amongst others, attention in the small but numerous People-to-people across-the border projects. These projects made it possible to fund small projects initiated by small organisations. They did not only brought ‘Europe’ closer to the people, but made the organisations to learn to work across the border.

Mainly the Euregio ESM had the priority to further develop the touristic potential of the region. This has been done by developing infrastructure related to the cultural heritage of the region. This resulted in the whole region in an increase of its own, shared culture and heritage.

3.2.3 Interim Conclusion

The cooperation has a long tradition, which is based on a mutual language, in some cases vicinity of facilities and the mutual interest in certain fields. On a provincial level the Scheldemondraad operates cross-border within formal regulations. The formal cooperation is not everywhere very deep, but this is not considered to be a barrier.

The most important instrument of cooperation is decision-making and correspondingly, the herewith- the accompanying exchange of information, experience, and knowledge. The communication did not take place on programme level but on sub-programme level. The communication was however a joint instrument.

The use of indicators in the monitoring and evaluation of the projects and the programme as a whole is rather limited. Instead, the project quality control is of major importance for monitoring at the project level. Both quality as well as use of indicators could be largely improved to better capture the performance of the programme. It is rather difficult to assess the performance of the programme with most simple indicators like ‘the number of projects’. Likewise, the use of evaluation has been limited to the minimum necessary scope. More thematic analysis to help shaping policies and to reflect impacts of interventions would have been important.

Due to the late merging of the two Operational Programmes, the late start, the late appointment of the paying authority and the agreement, which was even at absence, on some procedures, the programme underwent severe problems with the N+2 rule and the absorption of funds. Also the payment to project responsibles took a very long time.

The selection of project de facto varied across the two sub-programmes. Where in ESM the provinces (joint in the Scheldemondraad) looked after good initiatives, in BMG the private sector was contacted by the project managers. Both used a rolling procedure.
The programme resulted in community value added on all levels (political, institution, socio-economic and socio-cultural). Not all results are tangible and some informal cooperations have started because people start to know each other. The impact of the project especially aimed at bringing people closer to each other (people-to-people projects) is impossible to measure. Still effects are expected.

The programme only underwent budgetary shifts because of difficulties reaching the N+2 rule in 2004. The programme can be said to be stable.

Most projects aim to co-operate in a sustainable way, even without INTERREG support in future. For most assessed projects, a long run perspective has been adopted by the nature of the project, e.g. a cross-border revitalising of the enterprise zone and the stimulation of cross-border entrepreneurship. The actually durability can only be assessed on the long term but is assumed expected.

Sustainability is the paramount selection criterion; Financial volumes are not a criterion of project sustainability. On the other hand, where the cooperation has been evolved to a cross-border body with its own financial income, durability is nearly guaranteed (e.g. Hazeldonk-Meer).

3.3 Extrapolating results & conclusions on major impacts in terms of utility and Community Value Added for Interreg III

Prior analyses on major impacts in terms of utility and Community Value Added of INTERREG III are not advanced to such a stage where it is possible to compare results in greater detail, so that it is not easy to compare the results for the Flanders Netherlands programme at a level of INTERREG. However, some related results have been found in the context of tasks 2 and 1 of the ex-post evaluation INTERREG III.

(1) A key issue for the Flander Netherlands programme is whether there exists an optimum in terms of the programme area to be covered while respecting the unique characteristics of the programme area. The programme merged two sub programmes into one programme. Each programme area had its unique characteristics. Experience shows that merging two programme areas needs to be based on a careful analysis of the specific socio, economic, political and physical infrastructure in each of the programme area and whether they could be covered within one programme. This should be carefully monitored in the future whether there are some drawbacks in economies of scale. A second element in this is that it takes some time to merge two independent operating programmes. Each programme has its own organisation structure and procedures. Experience in the Flanders Netherlands programme shows that in the beginning of the programme period a high number of procedures, tasks and responsibilities were not clear. Also the added value of one programme was not clear for every stakeholder interviewed during the case study, probably caused by the
organisation of the programme and the level of cooperation within the programme that clearly needed to develop during the programme period.

(2) Analysis of the monitoring system shows that the monitoring system is not fully capturing the aims of the programme in terms of: improving the physical infrastructure; optimizing the competitiveness of regional industry; improving the production environment within the region; removal of barriers (raised by the existence of the border) in the field of economy, technology and science; further development and use of human resources; improving the functioning of the labour market; maintaining and improving the natural and cultural environment; and promotion of social integration. Further independent research reveals that learning has been the major impact of INTERREG. This has immediate consequences on the choice of the monitoring and evaluation system and the related indicators. The literature survey of the ex-post evaluation concludes that ‘... the official evaluation frameworks thus rely on the use of quantified indicators to measure the production of tangible and measurable outputs (such as infrastructure investments or the creation of jobs), but they fail to grasp the degree and intensity of cooperation processes between different stakeholders across national borders.’ Learning as an essentially indirect effect of INTERREG is materialised in the mentioned intangible co-operation processes. But if learning and policy transfer is in fact the major outcome of INTERREG, the consequence would be that the impact of that Community Initiative is simply not yet captured, because the monitoring and evaluation techniques have been inadequate. The highly insignificant and erratic effectiveness results based on the monitoring indicators of the Flanders Netherlands programme (sometimes exceeding 300% of the quantified target) is characteristic for INTERREG as confirmed by the horizontal analysis, particularly for strand A. The reservation of the Managing Authority to seriously consider those indicators can be well understood. The results of the programme study strongly support the mentioned research finding that the major learning effects cannot be monitored and evaluated by the traditional tools of indicators.
ANNEXES
Annex 1: Related to the financial analysis (chapter 2.1)

1.1 Codes of intervention represented by the Flanders- the Netherlands programme related to the ranking of frequency of codes under INTERREG

![Bar chart showing the frequency of codes under INTERREG]

1.2 Financial tables for comparative analysis at the three-digit code level

Table 0.1 Table codes of interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fields of intervention</th>
<th>Decided amount (programme complement)</th>
<th>Certified expenditure by MS</th>
<th>Realisation rate</th>
<th>Code expenditure / programme expenditure %</th>
<th>Interreg Ref.: Realisation rate %</th>
<th>Interreg Ref.: code expenditure / programme expenditure %</th>
<th>IM</th>
<th>GM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>130. Adaptation of rural areas</td>
<td>9.092.190</td>
<td>7.864.788</td>
<td>86,50%</td>
<td>11,87%</td>
<td>82,12%</td>
<td>4,71%</td>
<td>2,52</td>
<td>1,05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131. Encouragement of Tourist activities</td>
<td>6.420.508</td>
<td>5.699.959</td>
<td>86,78%</td>
<td>8,60%</td>
<td>78,73%</td>
<td>3,47%</td>
<td>2,48</td>
<td>1,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161. Investment in physical capital (plant and equipment, co financing of state aids)</td>
<td>1.865.570</td>
<td>1.598.508</td>
<td>85,68%</td>
<td>2,41%</td>
<td>72,01%</td>
<td>0,55%</td>
<td>4,36</td>
<td>1,19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162. Environment-friendly technologies, clean and economical energy technologies</td>
<td>839.380</td>
<td>762.223</td>
<td>90,81%</td>
<td>1,15%</td>
<td>75,94%</td>
<td>1,22%</td>
<td>0,94</td>
<td>1,20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163. Business advisory services (information, business planning, consultancy services, marketing, management, design, internationalisation, exporting, environmental management, purchase of technology)</td>
<td>4.833.213</td>
<td>4.405.153</td>
<td>91,14%</td>
<td>6,65%</td>
<td>82,08%</td>
<td>2,09%</td>
<td>3,17</td>
<td>1,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164. Shared business services (business estates, incubator units, stimulation, promotional services, networking, conferences, trade fairs)</td>
<td>6.171.346</td>
<td>5.320.500</td>
<td>86,21%</td>
<td>8,03%</td>
<td>77,68%</td>
<td>1,85%</td>
<td>4,33</td>
<td>1,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166. Services in support of the social economy (providing care for dependents, health and safety, cultural activities)</td>
<td>3.482.918</td>
<td>3.020.472</td>
<td>86,72%</td>
<td>4,56%</td>
<td>65,15%</td>
<td>0,51%</td>
<td>8,99</td>
<td>1,33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>167. Vocational training</th>
<th>1.109.730</th>
<th>999.472</th>
<th>90,06%</th>
<th>1,51%</th>
<th>74,80%</th>
<th>0,46%</th>
<th>3,25</th>
<th>1,20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>171. Physical investment (information centres, tourist accommodation, catering, facilities)</td>
<td>2.799.369</td>
<td>2.210.406</td>
<td>78,96%</td>
<td>3,33%</td>
<td>84,74%</td>
<td>1,86%</td>
<td>1,79</td>
<td>0,93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172. Non-physical investments (development and provision of tourist services, sporting, cultural and leisure activities, heritage)</td>
<td>3.674.867</td>
<td>3.394.361</td>
<td>92,37%</td>
<td>5,12%</td>
<td>81,19%</td>
<td>2,60%</td>
<td>1,97</td>
<td>1,14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173. Shared services for the tourism industry (including promotional activities, networking, conferences and trade fairs)</td>
<td>1.243.713</td>
<td>1.065.672</td>
<td>85,68%</td>
<td>1,61%</td>
<td>84,59%</td>
<td>1,74%</td>
<td>0,92</td>
<td>1,01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181. Research projects based in universities and research institutes</td>
<td>532.066</td>
<td>511.105</td>
<td>96,06%</td>
<td>0,77%</td>
<td>78,46%</td>
<td>1,21%</td>
<td>0,64</td>
<td>1,22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182. Innovation and technology transfers, establishment of networks and partnerships between businesses and/or research institutes</td>
<td>3.724.461</td>
<td>3.577.738</td>
<td>96,06%</td>
<td>5,40%</td>
<td>70,64%</td>
<td>2,01%</td>
<td>2,69</td>
<td>1,35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210. Labour market policy</td>
<td>1.109.730</td>
<td>999.472</td>
<td>90,06%</td>
<td>1,51%</td>
<td>76,14%</td>
<td>0,96%</td>
<td>1,57</td>
<td>1,18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220. Social inclusion</td>
<td>1.249.231</td>
<td>1.153.765</td>
<td>92,36%</td>
<td>1,74%</td>
<td>79,27%</td>
<td>1,63%</td>
<td>1,07</td>
<td>1,17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230. Developing educational and vocational training (persons, firms)</td>
<td>1.109.730</td>
<td>999.472</td>
<td>90,06%</td>
<td>1,51%</td>
<td>82,30%</td>
<td>1,59%</td>
<td>0,95</td>
<td>1,09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240. Workforce flexibility, entrepreneurial activity, innovation, information and communication technologies (persons, firms)</td>
<td>2.535.667</td>
<td>2.268.038</td>
<td>89,45%</td>
<td>3,42%</td>
<td>72,17%</td>
<td>1,88%</td>
<td>1,82</td>
<td>1,24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Fields of intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fields of intervention</th>
<th>Decided amount (programme complement)</th>
<th>Certified expenditure by MS</th>
<th>Realisation rate</th>
<th>Code expenditure/programme expenditure %</th>
<th>Interreg Ref.: Realisation rate %</th>
<th>Interreg Ref: code expenditure / programme expenditure %</th>
<th>IM</th>
<th>GM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>250. Positive labour market actions for woman</td>
<td>1.165.530</td>
<td>1.061.189</td>
<td>91,05%</td>
<td>1,60%</td>
<td>72,47%</td>
<td>0,65%</td>
<td>2,46</td>
<td>1,26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312. Roads</td>
<td>1.037.104</td>
<td>763.156</td>
<td>73,59%</td>
<td>1,15%</td>
<td>73,54%</td>
<td>5,55%</td>
<td>0,21</td>
<td>1,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315. Ports</td>
<td>518.552</td>
<td>381.578</td>
<td>73,59%</td>
<td>0,58%</td>
<td>77,00%</td>
<td>1,23%</td>
<td>0,47</td>
<td>0,96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316. Waterways</td>
<td>742.898</td>
<td>337.729</td>
<td>45,46%</td>
<td>0,51%</td>
<td>75,01%</td>
<td>0,87%</td>
<td>0,58</td>
<td>0,61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317. Urban Transport</td>
<td>1.857.246</td>
<td>844.323</td>
<td>45,46%</td>
<td>1,27%</td>
<td>84,99%</td>
<td>0,84%</td>
<td>1,51</td>
<td>0,53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318. Multimodal Transport</td>
<td>1.857.246</td>
<td>844.323</td>
<td>45,46%</td>
<td>1,27%</td>
<td>82,94%</td>
<td>1,03%</td>
<td>1,23</td>
<td>0,55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319. Intelligent Transport Systems</td>
<td>1.857.246</td>
<td>844.323</td>
<td>45,46%</td>
<td>1,27%</td>
<td>79,95%</td>
<td>0,76%</td>
<td>1,68</td>
<td>0,57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322. Information and Communication Technology (including security and safe transmission measures)</td>
<td>249,846</td>
<td>230.753</td>
<td>92,36%</td>
<td>0,35%</td>
<td>84,28%</td>
<td>2,20%</td>
<td>0,16</td>
<td>1,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323. Services and applications for the citizen (health, administration, education)</td>
<td>249,846</td>
<td>230.753</td>
<td>92,36%</td>
<td>0,35%</td>
<td>76,17%</td>
<td>2,34%</td>
<td>0,15</td>
<td>1,21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324. Services and applications for SMEs (electronic commerce and transactions, education and training, networking)</td>
<td>1.596.198</td>
<td>1.533.316</td>
<td>96,06%</td>
<td>2,31%</td>
<td>85,79%</td>
<td>1,63%</td>
<td>1,42</td>
<td>1,12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341. Air</td>
<td>839.380</td>
<td>762.223</td>
<td>90,81%</td>
<td>1,15%</td>
<td>83,47%</td>
<td>0,23%</td>
<td>4,97</td>
<td>1,09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343. Urban and industrial waste (including hospital and dangerous waste)</td>
<td>419.690</td>
<td>381.112</td>
<td>90,81%</td>
<td>0,57%</td>
<td>82,77%</td>
<td>1,41%</td>
<td>0,41</td>
<td>1,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>344. Drinking water (collection, storage, treatment and distribution)</td>
<td>839.380</td>
<td>762.223</td>
<td>90,81%</td>
<td>1,15%</td>
<td>76,16%</td>
<td>1,41%</td>
<td>0,82</td>
<td>1,19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345. Sewerage and purification</td>
<td>839.380</td>
<td>762.223</td>
<td>90,81%</td>
<td>1,15%</td>
<td>84,00%</td>
<td>1,05%</td>
<td>1,09</td>
<td>1,08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351. Upgrading and Rehabilitation of industrial and military sites</td>
<td>4.888.935</td>
<td>3.814.383</td>
<td>78,02%</td>
<td>5,75%</td>
<td>89,27%</td>
<td>0,57%</td>
<td>10,13</td>
<td>0,87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360. Social infrastructure and public health</td>
<td>1.499.077</td>
<td>1.384.517</td>
<td>92,36%</td>
<td>2,09%</td>
<td>81,77%</td>
<td>1,75%</td>
<td>1,20</td>
<td>1,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411. Preparation, implementation, monitoring, publicity</td>
<td>4.721.616</td>
<td>3.471.350</td>
<td>73,52%</td>
<td>5,24%</td>
<td>77,42%</td>
<td>2,04%</td>
<td>2,57</td>
<td>0,95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412. Evaluation</td>
<td>191.764</td>
<td>107.188</td>
<td>55,90%</td>
<td>0,16%</td>
<td>78,55%</td>
<td>0,32%</td>
<td>0,50</td>
<td>0,71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413. Studies</td>
<td>2.235.688</td>
<td>1.701.572</td>
<td>76,11%</td>
<td>2,57%</td>
<td>60,61%</td>
<td>6,05%</td>
<td>0,42</td>
<td>1,26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414. Innovative actions</td>
<td>191.764</td>
<td>107.188</td>
<td>55,90%</td>
<td>0,16%</td>
<td>75,00%</td>
<td>7,61%</td>
<td>0,02</td>
<td>0,75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415. Information to the public</td>
<td>191.764</td>
<td>107.188</td>
<td>55,90%</td>
<td>0,16%</td>
<td>70,94%</td>
<td>1,93%</td>
<td>0,08</td>
<td>0,79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>79.783.838</strong></td>
<td><strong>66.283.717</strong></td>
<td><strong>83,08%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100,00%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: INTERREG III, calculation Research voor Beleid*
1.3 Flanders- the Netherlands programme: budget shares ranked

Source: Financial document distributed by the European Commission

Source: Financial annual report 2008 (Paying authority)
### 1.4 Financial tables for comparative analysis at the three-digit code level: the cluster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Budget (Euro)</th>
<th>Certified expenditure (Euro)</th>
<th>Achievement rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>113. Agriculture-specific vocational training</td>
<td>198.340</td>
<td>164.005</td>
<td>82,69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122. Improving harvesting, processing and marketing of forestry products</td>
<td>198.340</td>
<td>164.005</td>
<td>82,69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123. Promoting new outlets for the use and marketing of forestry products</td>
<td>198.340</td>
<td>164.005</td>
<td>82,69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125. Restoring forestry production potential damaged by natural disasters and fire and introducing appropriate prevention instruments</td>
<td>705.561</td>
<td>623.095</td>
<td>88,31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127. Improving and maintaining the ecological stability of protected woodlands</td>
<td>198.340</td>
<td>164.005</td>
<td>82,69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130. Adaptation of rural areas</td>
<td>14.736.444</td>
<td>12.892.389</td>
<td>87,49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131. Encouragement of Tourist activities</td>
<td>24.016.014</td>
<td>20.989.862</td>
<td>87,40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152. Environment-friendly technologies, clean and economical energy technologies</td>
<td>673.886</td>
<td>473.458</td>
<td>70,26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153. Business advisory services (including internationalisation, exporting and environmental management, purchase of technology)</td>
<td>673.886</td>
<td>473.458</td>
<td>70,26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160. Assisting SMEs and the craft sector</td>
<td>19.792.488</td>
<td>17.272.047</td>
<td>87,27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161. Investment in physical capital (plant and equipment, co financing of state aids)</td>
<td>1.865.570</td>
<td>1.598.508</td>
<td>85,68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162. Environment-friendly technologies, clean and economical energy technologies</td>
<td>1.513.266</td>
<td>1.235.681</td>
<td>81,66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163. Business advisory services (information, business planning, consultancy services, marketing, management, design, internationalisation, exporting, environmental management, purchase of technology)</td>
<td>7.004.726</td>
<td>6.138.838</td>
<td>87,64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164. Shared business services (business estates, incubator units, stimulation, promotional services, networking, conferences, trade fairs)</td>
<td>7.668.972</td>
<td>6.580.727</td>
<td>85,81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165. Financial engineering</td>
<td>1.030.730</td>
<td>892.673</td>
<td>86,61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166. Services in support of the social economy (providing care for dependents, health and safety, cultural activities)</td>
<td>5.030.282</td>
<td>4.342.763</td>
<td>86,33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167. Vocational training</td>
<td>2.171.694</td>
<td>1.919.196</td>
<td>88,37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170. Tourism</td>
<td>28.257.330</td>
<td>24.074.465</td>
<td>85,20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171. Physical investment (information centres, tourist accommodation, catering, facilities)</td>
<td>6.015.382</td>
<td>4.956.492</td>
<td>82,40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172. Non-physical investments (development and provision of tourist services, sporting, cultural and leisure activities, heritage)</td>
<td>7.886.828</td>
<td>6.983.872</td>
<td>88,55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173. Shared services for the tourism industry (including promotional activities, networking, conferences and trade fairs)</td>
<td>4.459.725</td>
<td>3.811.757</td>
<td>85,47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174. Vocational training</td>
<td>3.216.012</td>
<td>2.746.085</td>
<td>85,39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180. Research, technological development and innovation (RTDI)</td>
<td>3.102.824</td>
<td>2.940.742</td>
<td>94,78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181. Research projects based in universities and research institutes</td>
<td>2.098.367</td>
<td>1.742.659</td>
<td>83,05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182. Innovation and technology transfers, establishment of networks and partnerships between businesses and/or research institutes</td>
<td>4.746.528</td>
<td>4.367.280</td>
<td>92,01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183. RTDI Infrastructure</td>
<td>1.061.964</td>
<td>919.724</td>
<td>86,61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210. Labour market policy</td>
<td>12.343.355</td>
<td>9.563.794</td>
<td>77,48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220. Social inclusion</td>
<td>2.297.638</td>
<td>2.004.765</td>
<td>87,25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230. Developing educational and vocational training (persons, firms)</td>
<td>2.892.773</td>
<td>2.396.079</td>
<td>82,83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240. Workforce flexibility, entrepreneurial activity, innovation, information and communication technologies (persons, firms)</td>
<td>5.012.342</td>
<td>4.278.590</td>
<td>85,36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250. Positive labour market actions for woman</td>
<td>2.964.163</td>
<td>2.522.327</td>
<td>85,09%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## INTERREG III ex-post evaluation. In-depth evaluation of the PROGRAMME: INTERREG IIIA Flanders and the Netherlands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Budget (Euro)</th>
<th>Certified expenditure (Euro)</th>
<th>Achievement rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>310. Transport infrastructure</td>
<td>477.202</td>
<td>447.174</td>
<td>93,71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311. Rail</td>
<td>1.656.314</td>
<td>1.591.773</td>
<td>96,10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312. Roads</td>
<td>2.693.419</td>
<td>2.354.929</td>
<td>87,43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314. Airports</td>
<td>995.800</td>
<td>990.024</td>
<td>99,42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315. Ports</td>
<td>1.179.066</td>
<td>983.327</td>
<td>83,40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316. Waterways</td>
<td>1.403.412</td>
<td>939.478</td>
<td>66,94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317. Urban Transport</td>
<td>3.513.560</td>
<td>2.436.096</td>
<td>69,33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318. Multimodal Transport</td>
<td>2.564.939</td>
<td>1.489.054</td>
<td>58,05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319. Intelligent Transport Systems</td>
<td>3.560.739</td>
<td>2.479.078</td>
<td>69,62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320. Telecommunications infrastructure and information society</td>
<td>4.369.457</td>
<td>3.944.115</td>
<td>90,27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321. Basic infrastructure</td>
<td>207.504</td>
<td>167.640</td>
<td>80,79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322. Information and Communication Technology (including security and safe transmission measures)</td>
<td>457.350</td>
<td>398.392</td>
<td>87,11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323. Services and applications for the citizen (health, administration, education)</td>
<td>10.528.156</td>
<td>8.007.733</td>
<td>83,66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324. Services and applications for SMEs (electronic commerce and transactions, education and training, networking)</td>
<td>2.270.598</td>
<td>2.068.510</td>
<td>91,10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332. Renewable sources of energy (solar power, wind power, hydro-electricity, biomass)</td>
<td>881.391</td>
<td>641.097</td>
<td>72,74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333. Energy efficiency, cogeneration, energy control</td>
<td>207.504</td>
<td>167.640</td>
<td>80,79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340. Environmental infrastructure (including water)</td>
<td>673.886</td>
<td>473.458</td>
<td>70,26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341. Air</td>
<td>1.046.884</td>
<td>929.863</td>
<td>88,82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342. Noise</td>
<td>207.504</td>
<td>167.640</td>
<td>80,79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343. Urban and industrial waste (including hospital and dangerous waste)</td>
<td>419.690</td>
<td>381.112</td>
<td>90,81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>344. Drinking water (collection, storage, treatment and distribution)</td>
<td>1.046.884</td>
<td>929.863</td>
<td>88,82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345. Sewerage and purification</td>
<td>1.046.884</td>
<td>929.863</td>
<td>88,82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350. Planning and rehabilitation</td>
<td>2.038.074</td>
<td>1.458.259</td>
<td>71,55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351. Upgrading and Rehabilitation of industrial and military sites</td>
<td>5.993.136</td>
<td>4.702.767</td>
<td>78,47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353. Protection, improvement and regeneration of the natural environment</td>
<td>1.374.735</td>
<td>1.093.242</td>
<td>79,52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354. Maintenance and restoration of the cultural heritage</td>
<td>1.827.567</td>
<td>1.525.381</td>
<td>83,47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360. Social infrastructure and public health</td>
<td>2.031.076</td>
<td>1.842.283</td>
<td>90,70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352. Planning and rehabilitation</td>
<td>2.038.074</td>
<td>1.458.259</td>
<td>71,55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410. Technical assistance and innovative actions (ERDF, ESF, EAGGF, FIFG)</td>
<td>920.400</td>
<td>779.498</td>
<td>84,69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411. Preparation, implementation, monitoring, publicity</td>
<td>10.192.370</td>
<td>7.031.192</td>
<td>68,98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412. Evaluation</td>
<td>708.812</td>
<td>405.231</td>
<td>57,17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413. Studies</td>
<td>2.308.175</td>
<td>1.711.688</td>
<td>74,16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414. Innovative actions</td>
<td>264.251</td>
<td>117.304</td>
<td>44,39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415. Information to the public</td>
<td>264.448</td>
<td>117.611</td>
<td>44,14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>499. Data not available</td>
<td>4.504.022</td>
<td>3.770.487</td>
<td>83,71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** | **247.869.321** | **207.670.145** | **81,62%**
Annex 2: Project background information

Project study 1: Maritime Heritage I and II

Date and time of Interview: Monday 10.08.2009 13:00-14:30 (via telephone)
Name of interviewee: Conny Boersma, Province of Zeeland (NL)

I. General Project information

Name of the Project: Maritime Heritage I and II

Measure: 1.2, 4 and 5.1

Priority topic(s): Promoting urban, rural and coastal development.

Type of project according to COM Communication 28 April, 2000: 354, 131

Duration: 2003-2006

Intended results: The project intended to serve different goals, both in developing the touristic infrastructure, maintenance of the own, shared, maritime heritage and stimulating reintegration of disadvantaged unemployed people. Furthermore this project is called a 'cross-project' involving provinces from two Euregios within the programme areas Nederland-Vlaanderen.

Cost and co-funding: Total costs: 2.414.674 €, EU funds: 1.072.337 €

Lead partner and partners:
Provincie Zeeland
Directie WEB
Abdij 6, 4331 BK Middelburg
Postbus 153, 4330 AD Middelburg
Contact person: Conny Boersma
tel.nr. 0031 118 631479
faxnr: 0031 118 627839
e-mail: cj.boersma@zeeland.nl
INTERREG III ex-post evaluation. In-depth evaluation of the PROGRAMME: INTERREG IIIA Flanders and the Netherlands

**Partners:**
- Verdere ontwikkeling van het toeristisch product 'Jachthaven Blankenberge' (B)
- Stad Dendermonde (B)
- Gemeentebestuur Kruibeke (B)
- Stichting Museumhaven Zeeland (NL)
- vzw Stichting Tolerant (B)
- Stichting Traditioneel Zeilend Zeeland (NL)
- Stichting Zeeuwse Schouw nr. 1 (NL)
- Maritieme site Oostende (B)
- vzw De Gentse Barge (B)
- Gemeentebestuur Knokke-Heist (B)
- Beeldhouwerscollectief Loods 13, VZW (B)
- Toerisme Rupelstreek VZW (B)
- Stichting behoude Hoogaars (NL)
- Stichting behoud loodsensteiger Vlissingen (NL)

**Project study 2: Neurological reintegration**

**Date and time of Interview:** Monday 10.08.2009 15:00-16:30 (via telephone)

**Name of interviewee:** Carl Peeters (Centrum voor ProductiviteitsCoaching)

**I. General Project information**

**Name of the Project:** Neurological reintegration

**Measure:** 4

**Priority topic(s):** Sharing human resources and facilities for research, technological development, education, culture, communications and health to increase productivity and help create sustainable jobs.

**Duration:** 2003-2006

**Type of project according to COM Communication 28 April, 2000:** 220

**Intended results:** The intention of the project was well described. The project intended to help people with multiple sclerosis (MS) and victims from severe traumas or strokes, who lost part of their skills and capacities and often their work. The Flemish and Dutch rehabilitation centres work together to help those people to work in a shorter time.

**Cost and co-funding:** total costs: 3.079.440 euro, EU fund: 1.500.000 euro
INTERREG III ex-post evaluation. In-depth evaluation of the PROGRAMME: INTERREG IIIA Flanders and the Netherlands

Lead partner and partners:
MS & Neurologisch Revalidatiecentrum Overpelt (VL)

Partners:
Nederland:
• Academisch Ziekenhuis Maastricht
• Revalidatiecentrum Blixembosch (Eindhoven)
• Hoensbroeck Revalidatiecentrum (Hoensbroek)
• Revalidatiecentrum Leijpark (Tilburg)

Vlaanderen:
• Academisch Ziekenhuis Middelheim (Antwerpen)
• Nationaal MS Centrum (Melsbroek)
• Ziekenhuis Oost-Limburg (Genk)

Project study 3: Border-pointer (Grenswijzer)

Date and time of Interview: Tuesday 11.08.2009 10:00-11:30 (via telephone)
Name of interviewee: Tom Schiettecat (UNIZO, BE)

I. General Project information

Name of the Project: Border-pointer (Grenswijzer)

Measure: 2.1

Priority topic(s): Developing co-operation in the legal and administrative spheres to promote economic development and social cohesion.

Duration: 2003-2006

Type of project according to COM Communication 28 April, 2000: 163

Intended results: The intention of the project is to stimulate cross-border entrepreneurship and to strengthen the position of micro-enterprises. This will be pursued by providing information, consult, guidance and training and to assist the micro-enterprises in their cross-border activities. The idea is that cross-border entrepreneurship involves in the one hand specific competences of entrepreneurs and on the other hand a certain familiarity with it in order to see opportunities across the border.

Cost and co-funding: total costs: 530.644 € EU funds: 265.323 €
Lead partner and partners:
Grenswijzer Euregio Scheldemon vzw
Lange Kruisstraat 7, 9000 Gent
Contactperson Tom Schiettecat
Tel: 0032-(0)9-235.49.96 or 0032-(0)495-33.16.96
e-mail: tom.schiettecat@grenswijzer.org

Partners:
UNIZO Oost-Vlaanderen (BE), Koninklijke Vereniging MKB Nederland, UNIZO West-Vlaanderen

Project study 4: Quality development logistic centre Hazeldonk-Meer

Date and time of Interview: Wednesday 12.08.2009 10:00-12:00 (Face-to-face)
Name of interviewee: Kees Kerstens (Local authority Breda)

I. General Project information

Name of the Project: Quality development logistic centre Hazeldonk-Meer

Measure: 1.2

Priority topic(s): Improving transport (particularly measures implementing more environmentally-friendly forms of transport), information and communication networks and services and water and energy systems.

Duration: 2006-2008

Type of project according to COM Communication 28 April, 2000: 164

Intended results: The intention of the project was to revitalise the enterprise zone Hazeldonk on the Dutch side of the border and Meer on the Belgium side. The two zones had a bad reputation, suffered from criminality, illegal activities and the infrastructure was outdated. Furthermore, it was the intention within the project to build a new consolidation centre where there would be room for six companies to share their logistic abilities in order to reduce costs, reduce the burden on the environment by reducing the number of lorries on the road.

Cost and co-funding: total costs: 3.770.000 € EU funds: 1.565.500 €

Lead partner and partners:
INTERREG III ex-post evaluation. In-depth evaluation of the PROGRAMME: INTERREG IIIA Flanders and the Netherlands

Gemeente Breda (NL)
Kees Kerstens (Gemeente Breda)
T +31 (0)76 529 37 56 - E cjf.kerstens@breda.nl

Partners:
Nederland:
- Bedrijvenvereniging Logistic Center Hazeldonk**
Vlaanderen:
- Stad Hoogstraten,
- Intercommunale Ontwikkelingsmaatschappij voor de Kempen (IOK),
- VOKA Noorderkempen,
- Werkgroep Industrie Kanton Hoogstraten (WIKAHO)*
Vlaanderen/Nederland:
- Bedrijvenvereniging Logistic Center Hazeldonk-Meer [fusie van * en **]

Project study 5: Clean Creeks III (Schone Kreken III)

Date and time of Interview: Tuesday 01.09.2009 9:30-11:00 (via telephone)
Name of interviewee: Bram de Keuninck (Waterschap Zeeuws-Vlaanderen (NL))

I. General Project information

Name of the Project: Clean Creeks III (Schone Kreken III)

Measure: 3.2

Priority topic(s): Encouraging the protection of the environment (local, global), increase energy efficiency and promote renewable sources of energy.

Duration: 2001-2003

Type of project according to COM Communication 28 April, 2000: 131

Intended results: The intention of the project was to increase the attractiveness and the living environment of the cross-border creek areas. The creeks will be upgraded in collaboration with different partners form both sides of the border. The project contains several different activities.

Cost and co-funding: total costs: 1.254.947 € EU funds: 250.000 €

Lead partner and partners:
Waterschap Zeeuws-Vlaanderen (NL)
INTERREG III ex-post evaluation. In-depth evaluation of the PROGRAMME: INTERREG IIIA Flanders and the Netherlands

Kennedylaan 1, 4538 AE Terneuzen (Postbus 88, 4530 AB Terneuzen)

Contact person Bram de Keuninck
Tel: 0031-(0)115-64.12.46
e-mail: bdke@wszv.nl

**Partners:**
- Gemeente Maldegem,
- Gemeente Sluis-Aardenburg
Annex 3: Related to the taxonomic analysis (chapter 2.4)

3.1 Labels of sub-indicators of the ‘real rate’ and the historical criterion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Historical criteria (not included in the ‘real rate’)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Criterion Joint identification of needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Criterion Governance and partnership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Criterion Nature and location of joint projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Criterion Density of common actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Criterion impact of projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gross Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04-18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Real Rate (RPR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 The ‘Real Rate’: Position of the programme and the cluster in the overall distribution