



**Expert evaluation network
delivering policy analysis on the
performance of Cohesion policy 2007-2013
Year 3 – 2013**

**Task 2: Country Report on Achievements of
Cohesion policy**

Greece

Version: Final

**Lena Tsipouri and Sophia Athanassopoulou
National and Kapodistrian University of Athens**

**A report to the European Commission
Directorate-General Regional Policy**

Contents

Executive summary	3
1. The socio-economic context	5
2. The regional development policy pursued, the EU contribution to this and policy achievements over the period	8
The regional development policy pursued.....	8
Policy implementation.....	9
Achievements of the programmes so far.....	12
3. Effects of intervention.....	21
4. Evaluations and good practice in evaluation.....	22
5. Further Remarks - New challenges for policy.....	30
References	32
Interviews.....	33
Annex 1 - Evaluation grid for examples of good practice in evaluation	34
Annex 2 - Tables.....	37

List of abbreviations

- AIR Annual Implementation Report
- EIB European Investment Bank
- ESFRI European Strategy Forum on Research Infrastructures
- FEI Financial Engineering Instruments
- FRSP Funded Risk Sharing Product
- GSRT General Secretariat for Science and Technology
- JEREMIE Joint European Resources for Micro to Medium Enterprises
- JESSICA Joint European Support for Sustainable Investment in City Areas
- MA Managing Authority
- OP Operational Programme
- RES Renewable Energy Sources
- ROP Regional Operational Programme

Executive summary

The Greek economic situation continued deteriorating with GDP reduced by about 25% throughout the crisis. Growth is expected in 2014 for the first time since 2009 and a very slight improvement of the still exorbitantly high unemployment was observed in the second quarter of 2013. Insolvencies, credit crunch, brain drain and relocation of Greek companies are significant threats for the future development of the country. In this context regional policy is more a “survival strategy” rather than an instrument to support development.

The regional policy pursued was determined to a large extent by the economic situation: Entrepreneurship was given priority to ensure the survival of companies in the context of the crisis; in the transport area, the PPPs for the large concession agreements were at standstill as both the public sector and the banking system faced difficulties to honour their financial commitments; similar delays were observed in Environment and Energy, however, these delays are more related to the maturity of projects rather than to the current financial constraints.

In terms of achievements, regions have performed quite differently, although there was a significant overall improvement compared to 2012. This reflects the enforcement of Financial Engineering Instruments (FEI) and initiatives addressed to SMEs, shifting of funds but also the approach of the end of the programming period that stimulates absorption efforts and as a consequence improves achievements considerably, a characteristic visible in past periods as well and also evident in most Member States.

In many cases indicators report overachievements, as in the case of number of education projects, jobs created gross in full time equivalent, the number of additional population covered by broadband and km of constructed roads. Conversely in other areas, despite progress, achievements are still well below targets as in the number of students benefitting from the interventions and in the number of large transport projects. Results to target are in general very low in the Energy and Environment area. The Joint European Resources for Micro to Medium Enterprises (JEREMIE) has developed and plays an increasingly important role in terms of financing, mainly in Attica.

One major problem of the assessment of impact in Greece is the lack of dedicated studies. There is no evidence of structural changes. Infrastructure development is delayed and it will not be used in full capacity before the crisis is over. Regional disparities have not changed significantly during the period 2007-2013, but whatever the changes, they are mostly attributed to their reaction to the crisis (as determined by their structural characteristics).

Opinions expressed during the interviews consider Cohesion funding as a way to prevent bankruptcy for some of the supported companies rather than an instrument to facilitate structural change.

There is no evaluation culture in the country and there are no evaluation reports except the mid-term reviews, which consist of surveys on achievements. R&D is the only area where there are more results; for instance the General Secretariat for Science and Technology (GSRT) has already launched a thematic evaluation on scientific excellence.

One of the most important future challenges is the need to adopt an explicit long-term strategy and implement it systematically through detailed planning. Policies still give the impression of

merely paper exercises, agreed at the time of adoption and then watered down during implementation. A rigorous change in mentality pursuing achievements and impacts rather than absorbing funds will be necessary in the next programming period.

1. The socio-economic context

The economic difficulties that Greece has been facing in the last 5 years are merely the result of a service-oriented economy, with persistent balance of payment deficits. Looking at the trade balance in the last decade, it is evident that the Service Balance has been positive rising from EUR 4,400 million in 1995 to EUR 14,400 million in 2008, while the Goods Balance has remained negative, increasing from EUR 11,000 million in 1995 to EUR 48,700 million in 2008. The current account balance has improved during the recession period, principally due to imports adjustment and the net fall of interest payments attributed to the Private Sector Involvement¹ and the debt buy back; current account deficit decreased from -14.9% of GDP in 2008 to -3% of GDP in 2012².

The socio-economic situation in Greece in 2012 was characterised by a continuation of GDP contraction and rising unemployment. These resulted from the need to align deficit with the Maastricht criteria, which triggered an overall reduction of GDP by 25%. In 2012, GDP contracted by 6.4%, compared to a decrease by 7.1% in 2011. GDP per capita is now at EUR 17,200, compared to EUR 18,500 in 2011 and EUR 19,600 in 2010. At the end of 2012, the unemployment rate was at 24.2%, compared to 17.7% in 2011. Unemployment increased further to 27.4% in the first quarter of 2013 but was slightly reduced for the first time in the second quarter of 2013 to 27.1%³. Greece marked the highest insolvency growth in the period 2010-2011, followed by Spain and Portugal; insolvencies increased by 27.3% in 2011.⁴ A positive GDP growth is predicted for the first time since the crisis in 2014. Public sector consolidated debt was at 156.9% of GDP at the end of 2012, compared to 170.3% in 2011. Inflation increased by 1%, compared to 3.1% in 2011 (see Excel Table 2).

According to the 2012 country report⁵:

- Economic recession had a systematic effect on the regional distribution of unemployment. The most severely hit regions in terms of relative rise of unemployment were convergence regions. Compared to the 2011 report, insular regions were better off. Among convergence regions, intraregional fluctuation of annual employment increase was significant. Equally significant was the intraregional fluctuation of annual employment in competitiveness regions;
- Regional policy placed emphasis on employment and development initiatives that would ensure the “survival” of the whole country. It has led to significant Public Funding Budget reductions affecting the national matching funds.

¹ Haircut of Greek sovereign bonds held by the private sector.

² [Greek National Reforms Programme 2013, April 2013](#)

³ http://www.statistics.gr/portal/page/portal/ESYE/PAGE-themes?p_param=A0101

⁴ [Insolvencies in Europe 2011/2012, A survey by the Creditreform Economic Research Unit, February 2012](#)

⁵ Expert Evaluation Network, Delivering Policy Analysis on the Performance of Cohesion Policy 2007-2013, Year 2- 2012, Task 2: Country Report on Achievements of Cohesion Policy, Greece, http://cohesion-evalnet.eu/achievements-of-cohesion-policy/2012/national-contributions/final-versions-country-report-on-achievements-of-cohesion-policy-january-2013/EL_Task_2_Final_report_2012.doc/view

The principal drivers of regional disparities are path dependent and originate in their geographic position (proximity to urban centres or not; insular character), educational attainment, the role of manufacturing, productivity of agricultural production, type of services (in particular tourism) and transport infrastructure. Recognising regional disparities, the Investment Law (L.3908/2011) divides Greece into three areas and offers commensurate subsidies by geographic area; as least privileged areas are recognised the regions of East Macedonia and Thrace, North and South Aegean islands and the Ionian islands (regions with GDP less than 75% of the average GDP of the country).

Recent data on regional disparities are very limited with the exception of unemployment. Phasing out⁶ regions exhibit the highest percentages of educational attainment both in basic and tertiary education. As evidenced by Excel Table 1, the percentage of people who have obtained upper secondary and tertiary education all over Greece is steadily increasing since 2010, leaving the population with only basic education accounting for just 34.3% of total at the end of 2012, compared to 37.5% at the end of 2010.

- Regional GDP data is published with significant delays; hence any changes in the regional performance can only be assessed based on unemployment trends. In 2012, West Macedonia had the highest unemployment rate (29.9%), with the Ionian Islands on the other extreme (14.7%). The situation remained the same in the second semester of 2013, albeit unemployment increased further to 32.9% and 16.6%, respectively. Phasing Out regions exhibited the highest unemployment rates, as well as the highest annual increase rate (about 35%). Among convergence regions, intraregional fluctuation of annual employment increase was significant, ranging between 48.3% in North Aegean islands to a marginal increase of 3.5% in Ionian Islands. Equally significant was the intraregional fluctuation of annual employment in competitiveness regions (see Table 1).

⁶ The country is divided into 13 NUTS 2 regions, including two “phasing-in/competitiveness” regions (Sterea Ellada and South Aegean Islands), three “phasing-out” ones (Attica, Central Macedonia and Western Macedonia) and eight “convergence” regions.

Table 1 - Regional annual unemployment rate in Greece (%)

Type of regions	Region	2011	2012	% change 2012-2011	2013 (Q2)	Weighted average % change 2012/2011 ¹	Average % change 2012/2011
Convergence	East Macedonia/Thrace	19.9	22.5	13.1	26.9	32.8	32.0
	Thessalia	16.8	22.6	34.5	25.6		
	Ipeiros	16.7	22.9	37.1	27.7		
	Ionian islands	14.2	14.7	3.5	16.6		
	Western Greece	17.3	25.5	4.4	28.5		
	Peloponnese	14.2	19.9	40.1	22.2		
	North Aegean	14.3	21.2	48.3	21.6		
	Crete	15.4	21.7	40.9	23.7		
Phasing out regions	Central Macedonia	19.5	26.0	33.3	30.1	36.5	35.3
	West Macedonia	23.2	29.9	28.9	32.9		
	Attiki	17.6	25.3	43.8	28.1		
Competitiveness and employment	Stereia Ellada	18.9	27.8	47.1	26.7	20.6	23.9
	South Aegean	15.0	15.1	0.7	19.3		

¹ Weighted by GDP, own calculations.

Source: Eurostat, National Statistical Service of Greece (quarter statistics) and own calculations.

The magnitude of the crisis has shifted emphasis away from regional development towards safeguarding the permanence of the country in the Eurozone. Developing funding has in general been curtailed; however, the quotas agreed in the axes of the ROPs have been maintained.

Export performance is a major issue: Greek exports to GDP are much lower than those of the EU-15. The structural composition has shifted towards a proportionately too large public sector and low tech services. Manufacturing has dropped to less than 10% of GDP. Main exporting products are manufactured goods (38%), food and live animals (17%), machinery and transport equipment (10%) and mineral fuels (10%), while imports are concentrated in machinery and transport equipment (31%), manufactured goods (27%), mineral fuels (13%), chemicals (13%) and food and live animals (11%)⁷.

While the crisis has contributed to continuous import reductions and improved the balance of payments, exports have moved back and forth with periods of growth followed by stagnation and occasional reduction. While the more dynamic companies have turned into exports, credits are practically drained and hence exports have hampered. In 2012-2013 some of the largest holdings relocated their headquarters to ensure access to finance, whereas others (the most solvent ones) turned to international convertible company bonds to ensure financing of their operational capital. Tourism performance was low in 2012 but 2013 proves to be a record year.

⁷ [Greek National Reforms Programme 2013, April 2013](#)

2. The regional development policy pursued, the EU contribution to this and policy achievements over the period

The regional development policy pursued

The main characteristics of the regional development policy pursued can be summarised as follows (see Excel Table 3):

- A total of EUR 20,460 million from ERDF and Cohesion funds is allocated to Greece, EUR 14,000 million out of which are targeted to the Convergence Objective, EUR 6,200 million are Multi-objective and EUR 253,8 million are earmarked for the Cross Border Cooperation Objective;
- There are Cross Border Cooperation programmes with Cyprus, Italy and Bulgaria, which prioritise the reinforcement of competitiveness and entrepreneurship, promotion of RTDI, improvement of quality of life, environmental security and sustainable development, reinforcement of accessibility and human resources development.
- In terms of priority areas, Transport ranks first with 23.6% of total allocated funding, closely followed by Enterprise Environment (22.2% of total allocated funding). Territorial development accounts for about 12.5% in total but gathers 25.9% of funds allocated to CBC;
- Compared to 2011 and excluding the cross-border cooperation programmes, there has been a shift of funds to Enterprise Environment (EUR 918.5 million), with emphasis on the sub priority areas of RTDI and related activities and the Support for innovation in SMEs. Regions eligible for support under the Convergence objective, accounted for 84.5% of total shift of funds. There was no major shift of funds in the cross-border cooperation programmes.

Developments since the 2012 report

The total budget of OP Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship was revised for the second time in 2012, and it is now equal to EUR 1,800 million (about 19.7% increase since the first revision of the OP in 2011). The revision shifted funds from innovation support (EUR 73.7 million) to initiatives to promote youth employment (EUR 223.7 million) and the support to SMEs (EUR 125.6 million). In addition, new programmes were launched:

- KRIPIS “Development Proposals of Research Organisations” aiming at strengthening research capacity (basic research, industrial/applied research and pilot development) and facilitating exploitation of results through high level projects;
- Financing of Greek partnerships for their participation in ESFRI initiatives;
- Creation of clusters between innovating SMEs⁸.

Regarding on-going projects, 85 out of a total of 582 proposals were approved in August 2012, for the cooperation between the industry and research organisations. In the context of the programme COOPERATION II and 18 projects were approved as part of the Corallia initiative.

⁸ AIR OP Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship, June 2013.

In the OP Transport there was a decrease in total funding compared to 2011 since the financial crisis held up financing of projects that were already underway. The financial crisis and the severe liquidity problems of the Greek banks have stopped all concession agreements except for the Egnatia highway. Negotiations are in place between the Greek banks, EU and the concessionaires, in order to structure a revised financing programme for a total of EUR 1,200 million. In Egnatia highway, construction works have resumed since 13 April 2013 and the motorway is being privatised. In May 2012, a new contract was signed for the construction of Patra motorway (connection between the port and the city).

Up until the end of 2012, emphasis was placed on the transfer into the programme of 24 infrastructure projects that were previously funded by the 3rd CSF, as well as on the transfer into the programme of 39 new mature projects and 66 projects of technical support. In 2012, a law was voted (4072/2012) for the facilitation of expropriations which are necessary for the conclusion of construction works in major infrastructure projects. The same law enabled the reimbursement of advance payments even in projects where the respective tenders did not foresee it and makes the inclusion of advance payments compulsory in all tender documents for EU transport projects.

The second revision of the programme has been postponed for 2013⁹.

The OP Environment and Energy was revised for the second time in December 2012, in order to accommodate the changing economic environment and to introduce initiatives that will stimulate competitiveness and enhance the development prospects of the Greek economy. Delays were observed in fund allocation to projects related to waste collection, transfer, processing and distribution as well as to water treatment and to solid waste treatment.

New initiatives addressing Climate Change and the Strategy “Europe 2020” have been adopted. Funds have shifted from the sub priority areas of prevention of environmental risk and institutions and mechanisms¹⁰ to other sub priority areas that necessitate investments (management and protection of water resources, waste management, protection of the environment)¹¹.

In a nutshell the Structural Funds have been the only source of funding in this difficult period of time. Using advance payments and applying the 95-5% rule allowed some activity to take place in the overall shrinking economy. However, they have been insufficient to start a recovery and bankruptcies have been significant.

Policy implementation

Main points from the previous country report:

- Competitiveness and Employment regions spent more than twice the available funding in Competitiveness and Employment actions. Important was also Environment and Energy, followed by Transport;
- Human Resources recorded a limited number of approvals in Convergence regions;

⁹ AIR OP Transport, June 2013

¹⁰ This sub priority area includes actions addressing the effectiveness of the services of the Ministry of Environment and Climatic Change in the areas of urban planning and energy policy

¹¹ AIR OP Environment and Energy, June 2013

- In OPs, approvals were the highest in the areas of Enterprise Environment, followed by Transport and Telecommunications and Technical Assistance;
- Territorial cooperation OPs, placed emphasis on Territorial development and Transport. Initiatives addressing technical assistance were also implemented in all territorial cooperation OPs. Only the Greece-Cyprus programme progressed faster. ;
- There were significant delays in the implementation of initiatives related to Transport. Delays were also evident in Territorial Development and Environment and Energy

Developments since the 2012 report

Progress of expenditure

In terms of absolute numbers, Phasing Out regions accounted for over 53% of total expenditure in the period 2007-2012, with an emphasis on Enterprise Environment, as well as Environment and Energy. In Convergence regions, Enterprise Environment and Transport accounted for more than 58% of total expenditure. In Competitiveness and Employment regions, Enterprise Environment accounted for over 56% of total funding.

About 62% of total funding allocated to Enterprise Environment priority area had been spent by the end of 2012, making it the area with the highest absorption rate in Convergence regions, followed by Transport (50.6%) and Territorial Development (48.6%), as evidenced by Table 2 below. Enterprise Environment area spent more than its total funding (108.9%) in Competitiveness and Employment regions; about 87.2% of its total funding was spent in Human Resources priority area and 67.8% of its funding was spent in Transport priority area. In Phasing out regions, Technical Assistance recorded the highest absorption rate (85.8%), followed by Enterprise Environment (58.3%) and Human Resources (57.9%); approvals in Technical Assistance priority area were channelled to studies and advisory services for the implementation, monitoring, evaluation and disclosure of the ROP of Attica and the ROP of Macedonia and Thrace (region Central Macedonia).

A more detailed analysis of priorities in specific regions may be found in Annex Table B.

Table 2 - Relative policy priority by type of region as reflected by approvals of allocated Community contribution (expenditure/funding) (%) -31.12.2012

	Enterprise Environment	Human Resources ¹	Transport	Environment and Energy	Territorial Development	Technical Assistance
Convergence	Top (62.1)		Second (50.6)		Third (48.6)	
Phasing Out	Second (58.3)	Third (57.9)				Top (85.8)
Competitiveness and Employment	Top (108.9)	Second (87.2)	Third (67.8)			

¹includes education services

Source: Own calculations on the base of DG Regio data

Approvals in OPs in 2012 were the highest in Territorial Development, followed by Enterprise Environment, Technical Assistance and Human Resources (Table 3).

Table 3 - Relative policy priority in Operational Programmes as reflected by approvals of allocated Community contribution (expenditure/funding) (%)-31.12.2012

Policy area	(expenditure/funding) (%)
1. Enterprise Environment	55.5
2. Human resources ¹	47.2
3. Transport	37.2
4. Environment and energy	29.4
5. Territorial development	73.7
6. Technical assistance	47.8

¹includes education services

Source: Own calculations on the base of DG Regio data.

In Territorial cooperation OPs, Transport and Territorial Development accounted for more than 78% of total expenditure.

In terms of progress, Transport recorded the highest ratio of expenditure to total funding in all territorial cooperation OPs. Territorial Development received also many approvals in Greece-Cyprus and Greece-Italy OPs, with total expenditure accounting for 33.5% of total funding in Greece-Cyprus OP and 21.8% in Greece-Italy OP (Table 4). Territorial development has only small projects with limited interest in their results. The Greece-Cyprus programme progressed faster than the other two territorial cooperation OPs.

Table 4 - Relative policy priority in Territorial cooperation OPs as reflected by approvals of allocated Community contribution (expenditure/funding) (%)-31.12.2012

	Enterprise Environment	Human Resources	Transport	Environment and Energy	Territorial Development	Technical Assistance
Greece-Cyprus			Top (43.1)		Second (33.5)	Third (18.6)
Greece-Bulgaria			Top (27.8)		Third (0.9)	Second (8.5)
Greece-Italy			Top (55.1)		Second (21.8)	Third (6.6)

Source: Own calculations on the base of DG Regio data.

Progress of commitments

In 2012, commitments increased by 30.2% compared to 2011 (EUR 26,200 million in 2012 versus EUR 20,100 million in 2011). As evidenced in Table 5, there was an increase in Human Resources and Territorial Development and a decrease in Transport. Enterprise Environment and Technical assistance retained their overall participation to total to about 21% and 2.5%, respectively.

Table 5 - Commitments by priority area

Policy area	% to total 2011	% to total 2012
1. Enterprise environment	21.1	21.3
2. Human resources	13.9	14.8
3. Transport	26.1	23.3
4. Environment and energy	24.9	24.7
5. Territorial development	11.6	13.2
6. Technical assistance	2.4	2.7
Total	100.0	100.0

Source: Own calculations from Excel Table 4.

In 2012, commitments accelerated practically in all areas, as evidenced by Annex Table C. The average commitment rate (commitment in relation to allocation) for the OPs and ROPs cofunded by the ERDF and the Cohesion Fund reached about 135.8%, compared to 105.3% in 2011 and it is higher in Convergence objective regions (Excel Table 4). Human Resources was the only priority area where commitments did not exceed financial allocation at the end of 2012. Environment and Energy recorded the highest commitment rate 165.6% of financial allocation at the end of 2012 (Excel Table 4).

The implementation is (as often in the past) driven by the need to accelerate absorption. In 2012 implementation was in line with expectations but still behind schedule. The reasons for that include the lack of maturity in larger projects (not all permissions, certificates and foreseen feasibility or other studies are ready) and the lack of funding.

Achievements of the programmes so far

Main points from the previous country report:

- 23,889 investment aid projects to SMEs were supported and 2,034 number of start-ups at the end of 2011. ROP Attica had the highest contribution in terms of number of RTD projects, direct investment aid projects to SMEs, number of start-ups supported and new jobs created.
- The main outcomes are modest: 204 transport projects and 310 km of roads reconstructed. Significant delays were observed in the implementation of initiatives related to Transport priority area. The ROPs of Macedonia, Thrace and Thessalia, Ipeiros, Sterea Ellada had the highest contribution in terms of number of transport projects in the period 2007-2011. In terms of km of reconstructed roads, there was a significant progress in ROP Macedonia, Thrace. The same programme was the only one to show progress in reconstructed railways.
- Only 40 renewable projects were implemented in 2011, compared to a target of about 680 projects. The bulk of these targeted projects came from OP Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship, which also contributed the most in 2011. In the period 2007-2011, 160,817 people were served by water projects, compared to a target of about 1,025,000 people. ROP Macedonia, Thrace contributed the most to the target. In the same period, 208,581 people were served by wastewater projects, with significant progress by ROP Western Greece-Peloponnese-Ionian islands, though its contribution to the overall target is small.

- Significant delays were observed in the implementation of actions related to territorial development priority area, resulting in low achievements. In the period 2007-2011, only 88 tourist projects were implemented. In the same period, 410 projects ensuring sustainability and improving the attractiveness of towns and cities were implemented, 50% of which in ROP Attica. The second largest contribution came from ROP Thessalia-Stereia Ellada-Ipeiros, with 153 projects ensuring sustainability and improving the attractiveness of towns and cities in 2011, compared to only 1 in 2010. Practically there were no achievements in policies related to youth unemployment.

Developments since the 2012 report

In the current period, there are significant improvements in achievements based on the Annual Implementation Reports (AIRs) and the AIR Core indicators submitted in Excel. While these improvements can be explained partly by the intensified efforts to sign contracts and absorb funds before the end of the programming period and partly by the late validation of projects completed in earlier periods, the reporting may need more careful scrutiny in the case of some of the reported indicators, which appear overvalued: Few indicators simply do not make sense, because they appear to lack logic (e.g. number of kilometres that exceed the size of the region). Efforts to clarify them via interviews were in vain. In other cases the achievements are so much higher than the targets (e.g. 2,500%) that one raises the reasonable question whether it was the targets or the reporting that suffer (in 24 cases achievements are reported above 100%). Besides, in some cases aggregation over sub-regions may hide inconsistencies (i.e. unreasonable overachievements are levelled out with very high under-achievements). The quality of the reporting of achievements is also put in question because, while the AIR reports are expected to aggregate achievements until 2012, there are a non-negligible number of cases where the 2012 data are lower than the 2011 data. While one or two changes of this type might be explained with corrections there may also be cases where authorities confuse achievements with plans/commitments or there are straightforward mistakes.

Being unable to clarify all these changes that emerge from different reports, the rest of this section describes achievements based on the AIRs highlighting in red the cases where double-checking would be advisable. There may also be other cases where reporting might be inadequate.

The main findings on achievements by priority area are summarised as follows:

- Enterprise support and RTDI including ICT: Emphasis was placed on Financial Engineering Instruments (FEIs), namely the Entrepreneurship Fund, JEREMIE scheme and a new European Investment Bank (EIB) Fund for the funding of SMEs¹², where progress peaked up. Intermediaries expect that the funds will reach final beneficiaries by the end of the period (in fact increased demand is already perceived). Interviewees suggested that the main difference between intermediaries using nationally managed support funding and the EIF management is that the latter is more flexible and time-conscious thus helping intermediaries perform their tasks more effectively. Attica had

¹² The Fund provides to EIB guarantees up to EUR 500 million (EUR 172.8 million from ROP Attica) for the provision of up to EUR 1,000 million loans to Greek banks for the financing of SMEs.

the highest contribution in terms of numbers of Research Technology Development (RTD) projects and numbers of supported start-ups. The region of Macedonia-Thrace contributed the most in terms of number of direct investment aid projects to SMEs, accounting for 31.7% of total projects (9,246 projects in the period 2007-2012);

- Human Resources: the highest contribution in terms of education projects was provided by the ROPs Macedonia, Thrace and Thessalia, Ipeiros, Sterea Ellada; there is an overachievement with respect to targets in all ROPs. A total of 43,858 students benefited from education projects in the period 2007-2012, 85.7% of them from initiatives undertaken by the mentioned ROPs;
- Transport: There are significant delays in the implementation of initiatives related to Transport priority area. Macedonia and Thrace had the highest contribution in terms of numbers of new transport projects in the period 2007-2012, accounting for 44.7% of all projects. No achievement in railways was recorded and no additional population was served with improved urban transport.
- Energy and Environment: The OP Environment and Sustainable Development suffers from problems which affect asymmetrically its sub priorities; the programme seems well advanced with respect to targets associated with the 15% reduction of energy consumption compared to the anticipated target for 2020, and the reduction of gas emissions by 4% compared to 2005. The OP Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship and the ROP Macedonia and Thrace accounted for all the energy projects in the period 2007-2012, but results to target remain below 27%. The ROPs Western Greece-Peloponnese-Ionian islands and Macedonia and Thrace accounted for 73.6% of people served by water projects. Results to target remained low with respect to people served by wastewater projects. The OP Environment and Sustainable Development and the ROP Thessalia, Iperios Sterea Ellada accounted for 88.6% achieved results (182,977 people served by waste water projects).
- Territorial Development: Significant delays were observed in the implementation of actions related to this policy area, resulting in low achievements. Delays were observed in urban regeneration projects financed by the Joint European Support for Sustainable Investment in City Areas (JESSICA) due to the restructuring of the Greek banking sector. A total of 118 tourist projects were implemented in the period 2007-2012, concentrated in Western Greece-Peloponnese-Ionian islands, Macedonia, Thrace, Thessalia, Ipeiros, Sterea Ellada and Crete/Aegean. The ROP Thessalia, Iperios, Sterea Ellada implemented the most projects ensuring sustainability and improving the attractiveness of towns and cities; The ROP Western Greece, Peloponnese and Ionian islands was the ROP with second largest contributor to the number of projects ensuring sustainability and improving the attractiveness of towns and cities. There were no achievements of policies aiming at reducing youth unemployment. Initiatives for the enhancement of youth employment are financed by the Entrepreneurship Fund.

More detailed information on the main outcomes achieved by the end of 2012 is presented by broad policy area in the following paragraphs. In the cases where data from indicators set are missing, the analysis of the achievements of the programmes is based on qualitative information available in the AIR 2012 and complemented by additional sources (e.g. interviews with the corresponding authorities).

Enterprise support and RTDI, including ICT and increase access to finance by SMEs¹³

As evidenced by Annex Table D, Attica had the highest contribution in the indicators “number of Research Technology Development (RTD) projects” and “number of supported start-ups”. At the end of 2012, there were 336 RTD projects in Attica, compared to 256 in 2011 (31.3% increase). ROP Macedonia and Thrace followed suit with 304 RTD projects, (2.3 times increase compared to 2011) and together with Attica accounted for more than 77% of total RTD projects in the period 2007-2012. The number of RTD projects created by OP Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship in 2012 almost quadrupled compared to 2011 (Annex Table E). RTD projects were principally implemented by SMEs in the industry, tourism and services sectors and sustained employment in these companies. The baseline in this indicator appears to be greatly underestimated in Attica and Macedonia and Thrace, with zero projects and 40 projects, respectively, while it is greatly overestimated in OP Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship where the baseline is at 2,276 projects.

Emphasis was placed in 2012 on Financial Engineering Instruments (FEIs), namely the Entrepreneurship Fund, JEREMIE scheme and the new EIB Fund. The changes that were introduced to the Entrepreneurship Fund (financing of working capital, change of loan ratio to 1:1 for matching funds) raised the total number of loans to 274 in the period December 2011-December 2012. In December 2012, the capital of the Fund increased by EUR 80 million, to allow for the financing of SMEs in the tourist sector¹⁴.

Regarding the JEREMIE scheme, by the end of 2012, EUR 180 million had been activated for loans to SMEs (50% own funds, 50% JEREMIE). By the end of 2012, 1,304 out of 2,665 applications for SME financing had been approved, with a total budget of EUR 79.5 million, and EUR 65.4 million (82,2% of total) were reimbursed for 1,127 loans (risk sharing facility). In the microfinance scheme, 356 applications had been submitted by programme closure at the end of May 2012 for a total loan value of EUR 5.1 million. A total of 166 loans (EUR 3.14 million) had been reimbursed to final beneficiaries at the end of 2012. The Funded Risk Sharing Product (FRSP), providing financing to SMEs for investments and working capital in high-risk companies such as ICT, was launched in February 2012. In June 2012, a new tender was addressed to intermediary parties of the FRSP Generic Risk Allocation scheme, for the reallocation to SMEs of undistributed funds from risk allocation products of the OP Digital Convergence and Competitiveness and Business (ICT, SMEs, Microloans). By the end of 2012, the seed ICT fund and the early stage ICT fund had been launched.

In May 2012, a common Ministerial Decision was signed for the creation of the new EIB Fund. A total of EUR 150 million of loans had been contracted with Greek banks at the end of 2012¹⁵.

A total of 1,680 start-ups were created by the initiatives undertaken in ROP Attica and OP Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship in the period 2007-2012 (70% of total start-ups), as shown in Annex Table E., compared to a baseline of 1,800 start-ups in OP Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship. ROP Macedonia and Thrace ranked third with a total of 374 start-ups at the

¹³ The OP Digital Convergence is also included.

¹⁴ AIR 2012, OP Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship.

¹⁵ AIR 2012, OP Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship.

end of 2012, compared to 225 in 2011 (66.2% increase), as evidenced in Annex Table E and a baseline of 155 start-ups. Overall, 2,400 start-ups were created thanks to ERDF.

The region of Macedonia-Thrace contributed the most in terms of number of direct investment aid projects to SMEs, accounting for 31.7% of total projects (9,246 projects in the period 2007-2012), compared to a baseline of 1,227 projects. Attica ranked second with a total of 7,529 projects in the period 2007-2012. It is worth observing that the indicator related to the number of direct investment aid projects to SMEs in Attica was reported higher at the end of 2011 (8,640 projects), thus marking an inconsistency in core indicators. Also, there was no baseline.

The ROP Macedonia and Thrace accounted for all population covered by broadband access (727,827 people). Macedonia and Thrace significantly outperformed other regions also in 2011 in relation to this indicator (661,716 people). These ROP and more specifically the region of Western Macedonia, along with OP Digital Convergence and the Rural Development Programme of Greece provide funding to the major project "Development of Broadband access to Rural White Areas of Greece and Exploitation Operations". The application for this project was submitted to the European Commission in July 2012, comments were received in November 2012 and cooperation has started with JASPERS¹⁶ team ever since¹⁷. The improvement of the digital divide in the region of Western Macedonia is expected to increase educational level and extroversion.

The region of Western Greece-Peloponnese-Ionian islands contributed to most of the gross FTE jobs created in the period 2007-2012, accounting for 82.3% of the total, that is 83,785 gross FTEs compared to just 1,024 in 2011, and a baseline of 1,286 gross FTEs. The OP Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship presented also significant achievement in FTE job creation in 2012 (almost 7 times more compared to 2011). This OP is expected to increase overall employment by at least 11,286 FTEs, compared to 6,770 from the 5 ROPs. About 8,100 new jobs will be created, compared to 7,074 jobs created in ROPs from initiatives addressing competitiveness and entrepreneurship. Finally about 40,000 jobs will be sustained in corporations that are supported by actions of the OP Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship¹⁸.

Table 6 presents the main indicators of the Enterprise Support and RTDI policy area, while a more detailed analysis of these indicators, also by OPs and ROPs, is available in Annex Table E.

¹⁶ Joint Assistance to Support Projects in European Regions.

¹⁷ AIR 2012, OP Digital Convergence, ROP Macedonia, Thrace.

¹⁸ AIR 2012 OP Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship.

Table 6 - Main Indicators: Enterprise support and RTDI policy area

Policy area	Main Indicators	2011	2012	% change	Results to target (%)
Enterprise support and RTDI including ICT Increase access to finance by SMEs	Number of direct investment aid projects to SME	23,912	29,143	21.9	85.8 Increase of R&D capacity of SMEs
	Number of RTD projects	493	825	67.3	81.4 Support of mostly SMEs in industry, services and commerce sectors that has increased employment prospects
	Jobs created (gross, full time equivalent)	11,881	101,845	757.2	396.1 Enhancement of employment prospects
	Number of additional population covered by broadband access	824,608	727,287	-11.8	478.2 Decrease of digital divide
	Number of start-ups supported	2,034	2,400	18.0	65.0 Enhancement of innovation

Source: Excel file 0903 SFC07_11-a-AIR_CoreIndicator.xls and own calculations

Human resources

As evidenced in Annex Table D, the highest contribution in terms of education projects and number of benefitting students was provided by the ROPs Macedonia, Thrace and Thessalia, Ipeiros, Sterea Ellada; there is overachievement with respect to targets by all ROPs. In ROP Macedonia and Thrace 224 projects were implemented in 2012, compared to 135 in 2011 (65.9% increase) and there is overachievement with respect to target (108.2%). The baseline was at 228 projects. In ROP Thessalia, Ipeiros, Sterea Ellada 183 projects were implemented in 2012, compared to 102 in 2011. Overachievement was at 152.5%. The baseline was at 151 education projects.

In ROP Attica, achievements in human resources were relatively small, with only 55 education projects being implemented in the period 2007-2012¹⁹, compared to a baseline of 76 education projects. In ROP Crete-Aegean, 107 education projects were implemented in the 2012, benefiting more than 3,200 students²⁰. These projects focus on the development and enhancement of infrastructure in primary and secondary education in Attica, the development and enhancement of infrastructure in primary, secondary and tertiary education in the region of Crete-Aegean and the support of technology equipment of schools in these regions.

A total of 43,858 students benefited from education projects in the period 2007-2012, 85.7% of them from initiatives undertaken by the ROPs Macedonia, Thrace and Thessalia, Ipeiros, Sterea Ellada.

¹⁹ Regional Operational Programme, Programming Period 2007-2013, "Attica", Athens, June 2012

²⁰ Most likely the number refers to pupils since the indicator covers primary and secondary education

Table 7 - Main Indicators: Human Resources policy area

Outcomes and results (physical outcomes plus brief note on what has been achieved)					
Policy area	Main Indicators	2011	2012	% change	Results to target (%)
Human Resources	Number of education projects	387	634	63.8	102.1 Improvement of infrastructure, technology upgrade
	Number of benefiting students	18,720	43,858	134.3	26.4 Enhancement of education environment

Source: Excel file 0903 SFC07_11-a-AIR_CoreIndicator.xls and own calculations

Transport

There were significant delays in the implementation of initiatives related to the Transport policy area. The OP Transport includes 29 major projects with a budget higher than EUR 50 million each; 9 of them are new, namely they have started in the current programming period, and are mostly related to road infrastructure. The rest of the projects continue from the previous programming period. In total, 17 applications have been filed, 11 out of which have been accepted, 2 are at a standstill due to liquidity problems and 1 is being reviewed by the European Commission. The majority of transport projects came from ROP Macedonia and Thrace which recorded 145 new transport projects in 2012.

In ROP Attica, no achievements were recorded under this priority area.

Macedonia and Thrace had the highest contribution in the indicator related to the number of new transport projects in the period 2007-2012, accounting for 44.7% of all projects (Annex Table D), with 181 projects compared to 17 at the end of 2011 (Annex Table E) and a baseline of 228 projects. ROP Crete-Aegean ranked second, with a total of 106 new transport projects at the end of 2012, compared to 97 projects at the end of 2011 (Annex Table E) and a baseline of 263 projects. Results at the end of 2012 were at 90.5% of targets, principally due to the overachievement in ROPs Macedonia-Thrace and Crete-Aegean, while the other two ROPs were at about 80%-85% of target (Annex Table E)

The vertical axis Siatista-Kristallopigi was concluded. No achievement in railways was recorded and no additional population was served with improved urban transport.

Table 8 - Main Indicators: Transport policy area

Policy area	Outcomes and results (physical outcomes plus brief note on what has been achieved)				
	Main Indicators	2011	2012	% change	Results to target (%)
Transport	Number of transport projects	223	398	78.5	90.5
	km of reconstructed roads	-	259 *	-	37 -

(* Note: the km of reconstructed roads are based on the latest DG Regio verified data on core indicators. The 2012 is calculated as the total of the core indicator no. 16, except for the dubious figure reported in relation to the ROP Macedonia and Thrace (6,611 km).

Source: DG Regional Policy database

Energy and Environment

The OP Environment and Sustainable Development contributes to the environmental targets of the National Reform Programme²¹:

- 20% contribution of Renewable Energy Sources (RES) to the energy balance: the OP includes 226 projects that have received financing, 15 out of which for the promotion of solar energy and 39 projects for the development of solar and geothermal energy in school buildings;
- 15% reduction of energy consumption compared to the anticipated target for 2020: reduction of energy consumption is attainable through the implementation of district heating programmes in Ptolemaida, Amideo and Kozani, whereby the included projects so far surpass targets by 176.9%;
- 4% reduction of gas emissions compared to 2005; the target of 373.28 equivalent Kt CO₂/year has been overachieved (124.4%), but there is a delay in the implementation of related projects.

The OP Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship and ROP Macedonia, Thrace accounted for all the energy projects recorded in the period 2007-2012 (Annex Table D) and results to target remain below 27%. Additional capacity from RES was only generated from initiatives undertaken in OP Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship, there is a significant underachievement in other ROPs and targets do not seem attainable.

By the end of 2012, a total of 106,480 applications had been submitted from households for the funding of energy efficiency initiatives in their buildings, 40,260 applications had been pre approved and 20,124 applications had received financing (18.9% of total hit rate). Proposals had a higher success rate in Central Macedonia where total filed applications were 23,490, and 4,487 received financing (19.1% of total)²².

In the period 2007-2012, 450,291 people were served by water projects (2.8 times more compared to 2011), compared to a target of about 1,500,000 people (Annex Table D) and a baseline of 4,458,600 people. The ROPs Western Greece-Peloponnese-Ionian islands and Macedonia, Thrace accounted for 73.6% of total. Targets were overachieved by ROPs Thessalia, Ipeiros, Sterea Ellada and Western Greece-Peloponnese-Ionian islands. It is worth observing that the number of people served by water projects was reported higher at the end of 2011

²¹ AIR 2012 OP Environment and Sustainable Development, June 2013.

²² AIR Macedonia, Thrace, June 2013.

(39,489 people) in ROP Thessalia, Ipeiros, Sterea Ellada, thus marking an inconsistency in core indicators (Annex Table E).

In the period 2007-2012, 206,458 people were served by wastewater projects, 1% less than in 2011 hence there is an inconsistency in reported indicators principally due to the reporting for OP Environment and Sustainable Development. Results to target remain low, with the exception of ROP Western Greece-Peloponnese-Ionian islands (Annex Table E). The OP Environment and Sustainable Development and ROP Thessalia, Iperios Sterea Ellada account for 88.6% of achieved results (182,977 people served by waste water projects).

Table 9 - Main Indicators: Energy and Environment policy area

Policy area	Outcomes and results (physical outcomes plus brief note on what has been achieved)				
	Main Indicators	2011	2012	% change	Results to target (%)
Energy and Environment	Number of renewable energy projects	40	50	25.0	26.9 Contribution of energy resources to the energy balance
	Additional capacity of renewable energy production (MW)	57	106	86.0	0 Contribution of energy resources to the energy balance
	Additional population served by water projects	160,817	450,291	180.0	26.0 Enhancement of quality of life
	Additional population served by waste water projects	208,581	206,458	-1.0	13.0 Enhancement of quality of life

Source: Excel file 0903 SFC07_11-a-AIR_CoreIndicator.xls and own calculations.

Territorial Development

Significant delays were observed in the implementation of actions related to this policy area, resulting in low achievements. Information in the AIRs is not homogeneous but fragmented. In addition, the provided core indicators for this priority area present many omissions.

Delays were observed in urban regeneration projects financed by JESSICA funds, due to the restructuring of the Greek banking sector. New contracts were negotiated with the three Greek banks that participate in JESICCA. At the end of 2012, a total of 180 urban regeneration projects were eligible for financing through JESSICA, the majority of which was recorded in Peloponnese (28 projects), Central Macedonia (22 projects), Sterea Ellada (21 projects) and Attica (19 projects). The total budget of eligible projects was EUR 1,100 million. Applications had been submitted only for 31 projects (12 projects from Attica) with a total budget of EUR 373.7 million. Financing was approved for 6 projects (four in Attica and one in Crete) for a total budget of EUR 138.2 million (32.2% financing from JESSICA)²³.

A total of 118 tourist projects were implemented in the period 2007-2012, 30 of which in 2012. The baseline was at 5,725 projects. There was a concentration of projects in Western Greece-Peloponnese-Ionian islands, Macedonia, Thrace, Thessalia, Ipeiros, Sterea Ellada and Crete/Aegean, and Thessalia, Ipeiros, Sterea Ellada accounted for 43.2% of total (Annex Table D). Results are below target, with the exception of Western Greece-Peloponnese-Ionian islands.

²³ AIR ROP Macedonia, Thrace June 2013.

In the period 2007-2012, 330 projects ensuring sustainability and improving the attractiveness of towns and cities were implemented, compared to a baseline of 452 projects. About 47% of the total was attributed to ROP Thessalia, Iperios, Sterea Ellada (Table 11 and Annex Table E). The second largest contribution came from ROP Western Greece, Peloponnese and Ionian islands, with 68 projects ensuring sustainability and improving the attractiveness of towns and cities in 2012, compared to a baseline of 55 projects. Attica ranked third with 60 projects (Annex Tables E and F). In Sterea Ellada, total population served by urban development projects is reported at 79,000, compared to a target of 50,000 (140% overachievement)²⁴. Such projects include town-planning studies and large scale regeneration projects that increase the attractiveness of towns and cities and are principally addressed to residents of the local communities. In Ionian Islands, total population served by urban development projects is reported at 20,000 and it is on target²⁵.

In terms of policies directed to combat youth unemployment, no achievements were observed. There was no record of projects offering services to promote equal opportunities and social inclusion for minorities and young people.

Table 10 - Main Indicators: Territorial development policy area

		Outcomes and results (physical outcomes plus brief note on what has been achieved)			
Policy area	Main Indicators	2011	2012	% change	Results to target (%)
Territorial development	Number of tourism projects	88	118	34.1	8.9 Enhancement of tourist product
	Number of projects ensuring sustainability and improving the attractiveness of towns and cities	147	330	124.5	146.7

Source: Excel file 0903 SFC07_11-a-AIR_CoreIndicator.xls and own calculations.

3. Effects of intervention

In 2012, there was lack of evidence of tangible effects of interventions on regional development in AIRs. The same was observed in 2013.

As there are no systematic thematic evaluations or econometric work in the area, impacts can only be assessed on the basis of interviews with policy makers and with the business world. The main remarks which can be made in relation to wider effects of intervention are the following:

- Firms see the Structural funds and the ERDF in particular as the most important source of supporting investments in the country. It is estimated that many of the companies supported might have been unable to survive without support. However, longer term changes in competitiveness are not observed.
- The impact of transport and environment interventions is not significant, as the major part of the planned activities has not been implemented. Overall, their impact will be visible once the economy takes off and these projects will be completed and fully utilised.

²⁴ AIR ROP Thessalia, Sterea Ellada, Ipeiros, June 2013.

²⁵ AIR ROP Western Greece, Peloponnese, Ionian Islands, June 2013.

- There is no evidence of overall reduced regional disparities thanks to the interventions. The crisis has hit convergence and competitiveness regions and it is the main force determining cohesion in decline. The crisis has hit them all but the overall evolution of regional GDP and unemployment is determined by the economic turmoil; ERDF funds are too limited and dispersed to make a real change.

Looking at the achievements, Enterprise support and RTDI including ICT priority area performed well due to prioritizing them because of the crisis and to the implementation of FEI. Transport and Territorial Development priority areas experienced significant delays in the implementation of initiatives. Energy and Environment priority area seems on track.

4. Evaluations and good practice in evaluation

The main features of the strategy for evaluating the effects of the interventions co-financed by the ERDF and Cohesion Fund are summarised as follows:

- The Greek government complies, even if with significant delays, to its obligations to monitor and launch reviews and impact analyses; however, these reports appear, over the years to be more exercise on paper, than effective, evidence-based regional development policies. Evaluations come too late to influence decision making, whereas there are also doubts on the reliability of monitoring indicators.
- In the formal evaluation reports there is emphasis on quantitative data and lack of qualitative assessments.
- All reports have a structured outline including an analysis of the macroeconomic environment, a SWOT analysis of the region in the current socio-economic environment, an impact analysis of the progress of the program through the use of core indicators, an analysis of the principal problems related to program implementation, a description of the principal guidelines for the review of the program, an assessment of the potential impact of such review and its expected benefits.

The evaluation culture in Greece is very poor, due to the overall quality of the public administration, which has never worked in an effective policy cycle, as well as to the political system decision making process, which works on electorate requests and intuition. There is little programming, ambiguous strategy and focus and as a consequence limited scope for evaluation. Evaluations related to the Structural Funds have been introduced by the Commission and the administration has respected its obligations but did never take ownership of the process. There are practically no evaluations beside those that are mandatory. Administrative changes have often delayed the cycle of evaluations merging the ex post evaluation of one period to the ex ante impact assessment of the next. Mid-term reviews are usually conducted towards the end of the programming period, thus with limited use for improvements within the period they refer to.

The quality of the evaluations varies. There is very strong concentration in the same few national consultants over the years with hardly ever any international teams partnering with them. Low quality deliverables are not penalised: evaluations respect the specifications formally but the specifications themselves are poor and deliverables are often accepted without any major scrutiny of their content. Quality problems start with the data collection of the Integrated

Information System; hence the reliability of results is rather limited. At any rate results are usually too late to seriously affect decision making.

As the Greek administration lacks an evaluation culture, there are a very limited number of evaluations, mainly the evaluation reports that are mandatory in the context of the mid-term review. For all ROPs OPs, these evaluations were launched with significant delay and are still under way. As they were late, it is unlikely that they will be of high value for the preparations of the next programming period, which has started some time ago.

Apart from the mandatory reports, very few studies or evaluations are launched. The GSRT has launched an evaluation of its main programmes, which are all co-financed by the ERDF or the ESF. Only one proposal was received and the GSRT is in the process of preparing the contract. No other large evaluations are launched or planned. However, ad hoc or very small studies are launched without a central repository, which would allow accessing the full set. One such study was published recently by the National Documentation Centre, whereas others have been launched throughout the programming period to cover immediate needs identified by the administration. The process in this case is for the Administration to express a specific request (thematic mostly) and the competent MA selects one person/organisation from a list of certified evaluators and awards a contract. However, these studies do not constitute evaluations, they may include scattered evidence, but without a central repository they cannot be identified.

There have been no decisions relative to the ex post evaluation.

In 2013, although there is a limited supply of Evaluation Reports presented in Table 1 below, differences are observed in terms of their structure, depending on the OP. The common elements in their structure include:

- a SWOT analysis in the areas of production, employment and social cohesion, the society of knowledge and innovation, attractiveness;
- core and output indicators by priority axis, comparing actual to baseline figures;
- analysis on implementation, commitments and allocation of expenditures versus targets by different priority axes and regions.

Some of the Evaluation Reports are more detailed than others, including:

- a synopsis of the main delays observed in the implementation of the programme (OP Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship, ROPs Attika, Crete and Aegean);
- an assessment of the synergy, additionality of the programme with respect to other ROPs, with detailed analysis per region, and OP (OP Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship);
- an overview of the macroeconomics of the country (regions) (OP Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship, ROPs Attika, Sterea Ellada-Thessalia-Ipeiros, Crete and Aegean);
- a description of the principal management and administration problems (OP Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship, ROPs Attika, Crete and Aegean);
- presentation of the contribution of the programme to NSRF targets in terms of commitments and allocations (OP Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship, ROPs Attika, Crete and Aegean, Sterea Ellada, Thessalia, Ipeiros);

- an assessment of labour created during the implementation and the operation of the initiatives, both by region and by priority axis (ROPs Sterea Ellada-Thessalia-Ipeiros, Crete and Aegean);
- an assessment of the accuracy of core and output indicators (OP Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship, ROP Crete and Aegean)
- environmental considerations of the programme in the context of the principles of green development (OP Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship, ROPs Crete and Aegean);
- evolution of employment by industrial activity and region. (ROPs Sterea Ellada-Thessalia-Ipeiros).

It seems that overall it is the same evaluators undertaking all evaluations in the country with limited involvement from outside the country. Criticism is never harsh and interviewees consider that over the years policy makers and evaluators have co-evolved into a systematic pattern of formal rather than in-depth evaluation. Externally imposed/formally requested evaluations may have become routine as they are systematically and consecutively launched by the same programme owners. Evaluators are careful in their criticism as they are expecting to be part of the next evaluation rounds. It would be of high interest to receive the names of the consortia making such evaluations over time and check for continuity in all Member states and Operational Programmes. Involving foreign evaluators may also contribute to more competition.

In addition to Evaluation Reports prepared for the OP and ROPs, another evaluation report was published by the National Documentation Centre, "Scientific Excellence in Convergence Regions of the EU, the case of Greece 2007-2012", Tzenou G, Malliou N., Sachini E. The report evaluates the impact of the programme "Research Potential (REGPOT)" on the convergence regions. The programme aims at the enhancement of research potential (personnel and infrastructure) in convergence regions and is addressed to groups with at least 10 permanent researchers. In total 128 proposals were financed for a total investment of EUR 280 million, EUR 247 million of which is financed by EU. Projects have duration of about 3 years and are implemented in 20 countries.²⁶ The main impacts of the programme based on the comments of 34 coordinators are summarised as follows:

- repatriation of 1-4 researches;
- increase of publications of researchers in academic journals;
- improvement of research results;
- publication of research results in Open Air European network.

In order for the evaluation activity in Greece to improve, it is necessary to:

- Improve transparency and accountability of the existing process: All evaluations need to be public domain including the assessment of their quality by the awarding authority. Consultants who deliver evaluations that are not satisfactory should not be appointed again in the future.

²⁶ 57 in new EU members, 49 in old EU members, 22 in associated members). Germany, France and UK are the most common counterparties.

- Adopt evaluation as a policy instrument: It is important to launch evaluations in addition to those that are mandatory because of the EU regulations; make targets of the programming documents more specific and launch larger portfolio or thematic evaluations to understand what the longer term impact of the interventions is really.

Table 11 – Recent evaluations

Title and date of completion	Policy area and scope (*)	Main objectives and focus (*)	Main findings	Method used (*)	Full reference or link to publication
Analysis according to article 48.3 of the C(EC) 539/2010. Amending C(EC) 1083/2006, Deliverable B2, June 2012	9	2	Delays in all priority areas attributed to lengthy maturity periods of projects, complex procedures related to funds' allocation and commitments and often lack of coordination between cooperating parties. There is no explicit reference to Territorial Development priority area.	3	Analysis according to article 48.3 of the C(EC) 539/2010. Amending C(EC) 1083/2006 Operational Program Competitiveness and Enterprise 2007-2013, 2 nd Deliverable, REMACO, OMAS EXERGIA,
Deliverable C: Evaluation Report of the Programme 2012 (Interim Evaluation), December 2012	9	1,2,3	Significant delays in three priority areas (Creation and exploitation of innovation supported by research and technological development, Improvement of the Business Environment, Integration of the Energy System of the Country and Enhancement of Sustainability). Adequate progress in priority area Enhancement of Competitiveness and Extroversion principally attributed to the impact of the New Investment Law on the financing of SMEs and entrepreneurs and in Technical Support. There is no explicit reference to Territorial Development priority area.	3,4	Evaluation Advisor for Competitiveness and Enterprise Operational Program 2007-2013, REMACO, OMAS, EXERGIA, Deliverable C: Evaluation Report of the Programme 2012 (Interim Evaluation), December 2012
Deliverable B1: Analysis for the revision of the Attika programme 2007-2013, August 2012	9	1,2,3	Priority area Transport experiences significant delays since included projects represent 46% of the public expenditure, while contracts account only for 21% of public expenditure. Priority axis Enterprise Environment is characterised by over-inclusion of projects compared to budget, and needs to be reassessed. Environment and Energy progresses well principally due to JESSICA initiatives; Technical support is characterised by low absorption rates; It was suggest that the overall budget of the programme is redistributed between priority axes Transport, Environment and Energy and Enterprise Environment, in order for the budget of the latter to increase; There is no explicit reference to Territorial Development priority area.	3	Evaluation Advisor for the Regional Operational Program Attika 2007-2013, Deliverable B1: Analysis for the revision of the Attika programme 2007-2013, AKN Analysis, Institute of Regional Development of Panteion University, August 2012
Deliverable C: Evaluation Report of the Programme 2012 (Interim Evaluation), March 2013	9	2	Most of priority axes are below targets due to lengthy maturity periods of projects, complex procedures related to funds' allocation and commitments and often lack of coordination between cooperating parties. Priority area Environment and Energy progresses well, principally due to JESSICA initiatives. There is no explicit reference to Territorial Development priority area.	3,4	Evaluation Advisor for the Regional Operational Programme Attika 2007-2013, AKN Analysis, Institute of Regional Development of Panteion University, Deliverable C: Evaluation Report of the

Title and date of completion	Policy area and scope (*)	Main objectives and focus (*)	Main findings	Method used (*)	Full reference or link to publication
					Programme 2012 (Interim Evaluation), March 2013
Deliverable C: Evaluation Report of the Programme 2012 (Interim Evaluation), September 2012	9	2	Central Macedonia experiences slow progress in priority axis Transport, with the exception of Rail (TEN-T) and Regional/Local Roads, where it seems likely that allocated expenditures will be implemented. Ports and Rail appear to be the least progressed. In Western and Eastern Macedonia, activation surpassed commitments and allocation in Regional/Local Roads and Urban Transport. There is an over commitment in the priority area Enterprise and Environment, principally attributed to initiatives addressed to SMEs; There is no explicit reference to Territorial Development priority area.	3	Evaluation Advisor for the Regional Operational Programme Macedonia, Thrace 2007-2013, Planet, Eurotec, Deliverable C: Evaluation Report of the Programme 2012 (Interim Evaluation), September 2012
Evaluation Report of the Programme 2012 (Interim Evaluation), October 2012	9	2	Enterprise Environment priority axis seems on track; The Transport priority axis presents over-commitments and adequate contractualisation, but delays are observed in the implementation. Final targets seem feasible; Environment and Energy priority axis has low commitments and even less contracts, while implementation experiences delays. JESSICA initiative needs to be activated if targets must be attained. No reference to Technical Support and Territorial Development priority areas.	3,4	Evaluation Advisor for the Regional Operational Programme Sterea Ellada, Thessalia, Ipeiros 2007-2013, Infogroup SA, Prooptiki SA, Akronimio Meletitiki Ltd, Interim Evaluation, October 2012
Analysis for the revision of the programme	9	2	Delays are observed in all priority areas in the region of Thessalia; Sterea Ellada seems on track in all priority axes. In Ipeiros, sufficient progress has been made in priority axes Transport, Enterprise Environment and Technical Support. In Energy and Environment more projects need to be included taking advantage of JESSICA initiatives. There is no explicit reference to Territorial Development and cooperation priority area.	3	Evaluation Advisor for the Regional Operational Program Sterea Ellada, Thessalia, Ipeiros 2007-2013, Infogroup SA, Prooptiki SA, Akronimio Meletitiki Ltd, Analysis for the revision of the programme
Analysis according to article 48.3 of the C(EC) 539/2010. Amending C(EC) 1083/2006, 2 nd Deliverable	9	2	Adequate inclusion of projects for rail and ports in priority area Transport; delays in the implementation of projects related to roads in the region of North Aegean and ports in Crete; Overachievement in priority area Enterprise Environment in all regions. In priority axis Environment and Energy,	3	Analysis according to article 48.3 of the C(EC) 539/2010. Amending C(EC) 1083/2006 Operational Program Crete, Aegean 2007-2013, 2 nd Deliverable, ICAP SA, OMAS SA,

Title and date of completion	Policy area and scope (*)	Main objectives and focus (*)	Main findings	Method used (*)	Full reference or link to publication
			there is sufficient progress in all regions and targets seem rather realistic;. Reference to priority axis Territorial Development is only made for the region of South Aegean, where progress is sufficient, with the exception of school infrastructure. There is limited information on output indicators in priority area Technical Support.		ETAM SA
Evaluation Report of the Programme for 2012 (Interim Evaluation), Deliverable C	9	1,2,3	Road and port infrastructure in priority area Transport experiences delays in Crete. Overachievement in priority area Enterprise Environment in North Aegean and Crete, sufficient progress in South Aegean. In priority area Environment and Energy in Crete, there is a risk of underachievement in sub priorities related to cultural projects and initiatives for the protection of environment; in North Aegean there are delays in projects related to waste and water management and also targets were wrongly estimated therefore it is almost certain that they will not be implemented. Significant delays are also observed in South Aegean. Reference to priority axis Territorial Development is only made for the region of South Aegean, where progress is insufficient. Technical Support priority area is experiencing significant delays in all regions.	3,4	Evaluation Advisor for the Regional Operational Program Crete, Aegean, Evaluation Report of the Programme for 2012 (Interim Evaluation), Deliverable C, ICAP SA, OMAS SA, ETAM SA
Analysis for the revision of the programme, June 2012,	9	2	Transport priority axis in Western Greece though currently below target based on core indicators is expected to catch up and achieve targets by 2013. In Peloponnese there is risk of underachievement of forecasted rural road network (off motorway). In Ionian islands the program is on target in road networks but will require extra funding to finance the commitments for ports' upgrading. In priority axis Enterprise Environment in Western Greece there is underachievement in the expansion/ upgrading of tourist infrastructure, but other core indicators are well above targets. The same applies for Ionian islands and Peloponnese. In Peloponnese, additional funds will be needed to satisfy commitments. There are significant delays in priority axis Environment and Energy due to lengthy maturity periods and complex contractualisation processes. In addition, there are delays in the approval process from the administrative services of Ministries of Health and	3	Evaluation Advisor for the Regional Operational Program Western Greece-Peloponnese-Ionian islands 2007-2013, Analysis for the revision of the programme, EEO Group, REMACO, Logotech, June 2012

Title and date of completion	Policy area and scope (*)	Main objectives and focus (*)	Main findings	Method used (*)	Full reference or link to publication
			Education in Western Greece. In Peloponnese targets seem attainable.		

Note: (*) Legend:

Policy area and scope: 1. RTDI; 2. Enterprise support and ICT; 3. Human Resources (ERDF only); 4. Transport; 5. Environment; 6. Energy; 7. Territorial development (urban areas, tourism, rural development, cultural heritage, health, public security, local development); 8. Capacity and institution building; 9. Multi-area (e.g. evaluations of programmes, mid-term evaluations); 10. Transversal aspects (e.g. gender or equal opportunities, sustainable development, employment).

Main objective and focus: 1. assess the arrangements and procedures for managing or administering programmes; 2. support monitoring, or check the progress made in implementing programmes, such as many mid-term evaluations; 3. assess the outcome or effects of programmes in terms of the results achieved and their contribution to attaining socio-economic policy objectives.

Method used: 1. Counterfactual; 2. Cost-benefit analysis; 3. Other quantitative; 4. Qualitative.

5. Further Remarks - New challenges for policy

Main points from the previous country report:

1. *The economic problems* of Greece are the main problem of the country at the moment, reducing intra-country disparities as unemployment grows significantly everywhere. were further aggravated in 2012 and 2013.
2. Implementation and certified expenditure has over all past programming periods, including the current one, been delayed, speeding up towards the end of the period, reflecting *absorption rather than restructuring and developmental concerns*.
3. State Aid to the business and entrepreneurship are the main concern in a time of crisis and both distribution of funds and achievements appear high, with differentiated degrees of progress in different regions. *Accessibility*, which has a significant share of the funding, is suffering from the credit crunch (no banking liquidity to fund the private sector for the large public-private partnerships), whereas large projects in energy and the environment suffer from immaturity and social resistance.
4. *In terms of regional progress* absorption was higher in certain regions but there are no data indicating clear patterns of convergence or divergence. Although there is a lag in data collection, experts and proxies (unemployment) do not suggest any systematic pattern; there is however clear divergence to the EU average in recent years.
5. *Last but definitely not least, in terms of administrative capabilities*, the country suffers significantly, and major improvements are needed. The interpretation of the ERDF Regulation, the lack of consistency of national rules and their frequent changes, the lack of evaluations, despite availability of funding in the Technical Assistance and the lack of transparency and coordination of studies hamper a sound systematic priority setting and a rewarding policy cycle.

The five points summarising the situation until 2012 remained valid in the current year, with the exception of achievements and certified expenditure, which has increased significantly, sometimes to the extent of illusory. The past experience in Greece indicates that “business as usual” did not help the country over the last 20 years to transform its economy. Hence, two important points need to be taken into consideration for the next programming period.

State aid has to shift towards quality and competitiveness: In the past, amplified during the crisis, ERDF support was used to support the survival of incumbents. As the bank recapitalisation was accomplished and the country seems at the verge of turning into growth again in 2014 business support has to focus on companies with potential to grow and export (the share of exports to GDP being much lower than the EU average). The administration needs to find ways to end the deeply rooted behaviour of political clientelism and dominance of intermediaries. The challenge is to impose business funding on merit and future prospects.

All ***administrative reforms aiming at evidence-based policy*** have (to a very large extent) failed: Although the current economic climate leading to lowering salaries for civil servants damps enthusiasm and drive to change, this is absolutely imperative for the future. The Greek administration does not show signs of learning over time and the arrival of the EU Task Force may be an opportunity for leapfrog in that respect. Accountability and controls that proved less

severe in the past need to be strengthened at all levels. Most importantly the basic elements of good policy need to be integrated and not only formally respected: strategy, planning (linked to strategy), monitoring (controlling for the quality of monitoring indicators), evaluations (on time for corrective action) are needed. If these steps are not taken seriously then there will be no major impact in the future, as there has been no major impact in the past.

Ideas for small beneficial changes abound:: impose a central and user friendly repository of all studies supported by the Technical Assistance; launch a platform for beneficiaries to propose administrative simplifications (and implement/respond to them; look for a different approach and ask cities to take responsibility for their development plans; focus more on exports etc. However, as long as development policy remains unmotivated and fragmented, while state aid is not envisaging change of the business model the country will continue to trail without taking off.

References

Analysis according to article 48.3 of the C(EC) 539/2010. Amending C(EC) 1083/2006 Operational Program Competitiveness and Enterprise 2007-2013, 2nd Deliverable, REMACO, OMAS EXERGIA

Analysis according to article 48.3 of the C(EC) 539/2010. Amending C(EC) 1083/2006 Operational Program Crete, Aegean 2007-2013, 2nd Deliverable, ICAP SA, OMAS SA, ETAM SA

Evaluation Advisor for Competitiveness and Enterprise Operational Program 2007-2013, REMACO, OMAS, EXERGIA, Deliverable C: Evaluation Report of the Programme 2012 (Interim Evaluation), December 2012

Evaluation Advisor for the Regional Operational Program Attika 2007-2013, Deliverable B1: Analysis for the revision of the Attika programme 2007-2013, AKN Analysis, Institute of Regional Development of Panteion University, August 2012

Evaluation Advisor for the Regional Operational Programme Attika 2007-2013, AKN Analysis, Institute of Regional Development of Panteion University, Deliverable C: Evaluation Report of the Programme 2012 (Interim Evaluation), March 2013

Evaluation Advisor for the Regional Operational Programme Macedonia, Thrace 2007-2013, Planet, Eurotec, Deliverable C: Evaluation Report of the Programme 2012 (Interim Evaluation), September 2012

Evaluation Advisor for the Regional Operational Programme Sterea Ellada, Thessalia, Ipeiros 2007-2013, Infogroup SA, Prooptiki SA, Akronimio Meletitiki Ltd, Interim Evaluation, October 2012

Evaluation Advisor for the Regional Operational Program Sterea Ellada, Thessalia, Ipeiros 2007-2013, Infogroup SA, Prooptiki SA, Akronimio Meletitiki Ltd, Analysis for the revision of the programme

Evaluation Advisor for the Regional Operational Program Western Greece-Peloponnese-Ionian islands 2007-2013, Analysis for the revision of the programme, EEO Group, REMACO, Logotech, June 2012

Evaluation Advisor for the Regional Operational Program Crete, Aegean, Evaluation Report of the Programme for 2012 (Interim Evaluation), Deliverable C, ICAP SA, OMAS SA, ETAM SA

Expert Evaluation Network, Delivering Policy Analysis on the Performance of Cohesion policy 2007-2013, Year 2- 2012, Task 2: Country Report on Achievements of Cohesion policy, Greece

Insolvencies in Europe 2011/2012, A survey by the Creditreform Economic Research Unit, February 2012

Greek National Reforms Programme 2013, April 2013

Other References:

Annual Implementation Report OP Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship, June 2013

Annual Implementation Report OP Digital Convergence, June 2013

Annual Implementation Report OP Enhancement of Accessibility, June 2013

Annual Implementation Report OP Environment and Sustainable Development, June 2013

Annual Implementation Report OP Technical Assistance, June 2013

Annual Implementation Report ROP Attica, June 2013

Annual Implementation Report ROP Crete/Aegean, June 2013

Annual Implementation Report ROP Macedonia, Thrace, June 2013

Annual Implementation Report ROP Thessalia, Ipeiros, Sterea Ellada, June 2013

Annual Implementation Report ROP Western Greece-Peloponese-Ionian islands, June 2013

Territorial Cooperation Programme Greece-Bulgaria, Annual Implementation Report June 2013

Territorial Cooperation Programme Greece-Cyprus, Annual Implementation Report June 2013

Territorial Cooperation Programme Greece-Italy, Annual Implementation Report June 2013

Interviews

Firbas Yiannis	Evaluation and Strategy Unit, Ministry of Development, Competitiveness and Shipping
Deniozos Dimitris	Special Adviser, Ministry of Development, Competitiveness and Shipping
Doxiadis Aristos	Open Fund, Partner
Haritakis Nikos	TANEO, CEO
Iakovidis D.	Special coordination unit, Ministry of Development, Competitiveness and Shipping
Poulakaki L.	Managing Authority, Programme of Competitiveness and Enterprise
Sidiropoulos Nikos	Ministry of Infrastructure, Transport and Networks
Tsaltakis Panos	Managing Authority, Programme of Competitiveness and Enterprise

Annex 1 - Evaluation grid for examples of good practice in evaluation

Evaluation Grid A - Evaluation of the structural performance of OP

BASIC INFORMATION	
Country: Greece	
Policy area: (Enterprise support, RTDI, Transport, etc.) Multi-area	
Title of evaluation and full reference: Evaluation Advisor for Competitiveness and Enterprise Operational Program 2007-2013, Deliverable C: Evaluation Report of the Programme 2012 (Interim Evaluation)	
Intervention period covered (2000-2006; 2007-2013; specific years): 2007-2013	
Timing of the evaluation (when it was carried out): December 2012	
Budget (if known): Unknown, this is a preliminary analysis.	
Evaluator: External evaluator (REMACO, OMAS EXERGIA)	
Method: (counterfactual analysis, process analysis, case study, econometric model, etc. indicate if a mix of methods) Quantitative and qualitative	
Main objectives and main findings: Significant delays in 3 out of 5 priority areas, principally attributed to lengthy maturity periods of projects, complex procedures related to funds' allocation and commitments and often lack of coordination between cooperating parties. The revised output indicators, seem accurate, appropriate and correct to capture the effect of interventions as long as principal input parameters are accurately documented.	
Appraisal: (Why you consider the evaluation an example of good practice: - 3-4 lines) The evaluation is considered as an example of good practice, as it provides a very good documentation of any progress update in all priority areas, a detailed justification of the delays, an assessment of the accuracy of labour, core and other output indicators	
CHECK LIST	
Score each item listed below from 0 to 2 as follows: 0: No; 1: Yes, but not fully; 2: Yes	
Report	
Are the objectives, methods and findings of the evaluation clearly set out?	2
Are the findings and recommendations clearly supported by the analysis?	2
Are the methods used suitable given the objectives of the valuation and have they been well applied?	2
Are the quantitative and qualitative data used reliable and suitable for the purpose of the evaluation?	1
Are the potential effects of other factors (e.g. the economic situation) on the outcome fully taken into account?	1
Is a serious attempt made to distinguish the effects of the intervention from these other factors?	0

Evaluation Grid B - Evaluation of the structural performance of ROP Sterea Ellada, Thessalia, Ipeiros

BASIC INFORMATION	
Country: Greece	
Policy area: (Enterprise support, RTDI, Transport, etc.) Evaluation of the structural performance of ROP Thessalia, Sterea Ellada, Ipeiros	
Title of evaluation and full reference: Evaluation Advisor for the Regional Operational Programme Sterea Ellada, Thessalia, Ipeiros 2007-2013, Interim Evaluation	
Intervention period covered (2000-2006; 2007-2013; specific years): 2007-2013	
Timing of the evaluation (when it was carried out): October 2012	
Budget (if known): Unknown, this is a preliminary analysis	
Evaluator: External evaluator (Infogroup SA, Prooptiki SA, Akronimio Meletitiki Ltd)	
Method: (counterfactual analysis, process analysis, case study, econometric model, etc. indicate if a mix of methods) Quantitative and qualitative	
Main objectives and main findings: Transport priority axis presents overcommitments and adequate contractualisation, but delays are observed in the implementation. Final targets seem feasible; Energy and Environment priority axis experiences delays and JESSICA initiative must be activated. There is no reference to Technical Support.	
Appraisal: (Why you consider the evaluation an example of good practice): The report includes an assessment of labour created during the implementation and the operation of the initiatives, both by region and by priority axis and region, and presents the contribution of the programme to NSRF targets, in terms of output indicators, and to the Memorandum of Financial Stability in terms of commitments and allocations.	
CHECK LIST	
Score each item listed below from 0 to 2 as follows: 0: No; 1: Yes, but not fully; 2: Yes	
Report	
Are the objectives, methods and findings of the evaluation clearly set out?	2
Are the findings and recommendations clearly supported by the analysis?	2
Are the methods used suitable given the objectives of the valuation and have they been well applied?	2
Are the quantitative and qualitative data used reliable and suitable for the purpose of the evaluation?	1
Are the potential effects of other factors (e.g. the economic situation) on the outcome fully taken into account?	2
Is a serious attempt made to distinguish the effects of the intervention from these other factors?	1

Evaluation Grid C - Evaluation of the structural performance of ROP Crete, Aegean

BASIC INFORMATION	
Country: Greece	
Policy area: (Enterprise support, RTDI, Transport, etc.) Evaluation of the structural performance of ROP Crete, Aegean	
Title of evaluation and full reference: Evaluation Advisor for the Regional Operational Program Crete, Aegean, Evaluation Report of the Programme for 2012 (Interim Evaluation), Deliverable C	
Intervention period covered (2000-2006; 2007-2013; specific years): 2007-2013	
Timing of the evaluation (when it was carried out):	
Budget (if known): Unknown, this is a preliminary analysis	
Evaluator: External evaluator (ICAP SA, OMAS SA, ETAM SA)	
Method: (counterfactual analysis, process analysis, case study, econometric model, etc. indicate if a mix of methods) Quantitative and qualitative	
Main objectives and main findings: Underachievement in priority area Technical Support in all regions; Overachievement in priority area Enterprise Environment in North Aegean and Crete, sufficient progress in South Aegean. In priority area Environment and Energy in Crete, there is a risk of underachievement in sub priorities related to cultural projects and initiatives for the protection of environment; in North Aegean there are delays in projects related to waste and water management and also targets were wrongly estimated therefore it is almost certain that they will not be implemented. Significant delays are also observed in South Aegean; Reference to priority axis Territorial Development is only made for the region of South Aegean, where progress is insufficient.	
Appraisal: (Why you consider the evaluation an example of good practice): The report includes an assessment of employment creation during the operation and the implementation of the initiatives of the programme (labour indicators by priority area and region), as well as an environmental assessment of the programme in the context of the principles of green development.	
CHECK LIST	
Score each item listed below from 0 to 2 as follows: 0: No; 1: Yes, but not fully; 2: Yes	
Report	
Are the objectives, methods and findings of the evaluation clearly set out?	2
Are the findings and recommendations clearly supported by the analysis?	2
Are the methods used suitable given the objectives of the valuation and have they been well applied?	2
Are the quantitative and qualitative data used reliable and suitable for the purpose of the evaluation?	1
Are the potential effects of other factors (e.g. the economic situation) on the outcome fully taken into account?	2
Is a serious attempt made to distinguish the effects of the intervention from these other factors?	1

Annex 2 - Tables

See Excel Tables 1-4:

Excel Table 1 – Regional disparities and trends

Excel Table 2 – Macro-economic developments

Excel Table 3 - Financial allocation by main policy area

Excel Table 3cbc - Financial allocation by main policy area – cross border cooperation

Excel Table 4 - Commitments by main policy area (by end-2012)

Excel Table 4cbc - Commitments by main policy area (by end-2012) – cross border cooperation

Annex Table A - Broad policy areas and correspondence with fields of intervention (FOI)

Policy area		Code	Priority themes	
1. Enterprise environment	RTDI and linked activities	01	R&TD activities in research centres	
		02	R&TD infrastructure and centres of competence in a specific technology	
		05	Advanced support services for firms and groups of firms	
		07	Investment in firms directly linked to research and innovation (...)	
		74	Developing human potential in the field of research and innovation, in particular through post-graduate studies ...	
	Innovation support for SMEs	03	Technology transfer and improvement of cooperation networks ...	
		04	Assistance to R&TD, particularly in SMEs (including access to R&TD services in research centres)	
		06	Assistance to SMEs for the promotion of environmentally-friendly products and production processes (...)	
		09	Other measures to stimulate research and innovation and entrepreneurship in SMEs	
		14	Services and applications for SMEs (e-commerce, education and training, networking, etc.)	
		15	Other measures for improving access to and efficient use of ICT by SMEs	
	ICT and related services	11	Information and communication technologies (...)	
		12	Information and communication technologies (TEN-ICT)	
		13	Services and applications for citizens (e-health, e-government, e-learning, e-inclusion, etc.)	
	Other investment in firms	08	Other investment in firms	
	2. Human resources	Education and training	62	Development of life-long learning systems and strategies in firms; training and services for employees ...
			63	Design and dissemination of innovative and more productive ways of organising work
64			Development of special services for employment, training and support in connection with restructuring of sectors ...	
72			Design, introduction and implementing of reforms in education and training systems ...	
73			Measures to increase participation in education and training throughout the life-cycle ...	

Policy area		Code	Priority themes
	Labour market policies	65	Modernisation and strengthening labour market institutions
		66	Implementing active and preventive measures on the labour market
		67	Measures encouraging active ageing and prolonging working lives
		68	Support for self-employment and business start-up
		69	Measures to improve access to employment and increase sustainable participation and progress of women ...
		70	Specific action to increase migrants' participation in employment ...
		71	Pathways to integration and re-entry into employment for disadvantaged people ...
		80	Promoting the partnerships, pacts and initiatives through the networking of relevant stakeholders
3. Transport	Rail	16	Railways
		17	Railways (TEN-T)
		18	Mobile rail assets
		19	Mobile rail assets (TEN-T)
	Road	20	Motorways
		21	Motorways (TEN-T)
		22	National roads
		23	Regional/local roads
	Other transport	24	Cycle tracks
		25	Urban transport
		26	Multimodal transport
		27	Multimodal transport (TEN-T)
		28	Intelligent transport systems
		29	Airports
30		Ports	
31		Inland waterways (regional and local)	
32	Inland waterways (TEN-T)		
4. Environment and energy	Energy infrastructure	33	Electricity
		34	Electricity (TEN-E)
		35	Natural gas
		36	Natural gas (TEN-E)
		37	Petroleum products
		38	Petroleum products (TEN-E)
		39	Renewable energy: wind
		40	Renewable energy: solar
		41	Renewable energy: biomass
		42	Renewable energy: hydroelectric, geothermal and other
		43	Energy efficiency, co-generation, energy management
	Environment and risk prevention	44	Management of household and industrial waste
		45	Management and distribution of water (drink water)
		46	Water treatment (waste water)
		47	Air quality
		48	Integrated prevention and pollution control
		49	Mitigation and adaption to climate change
		50	Rehabilitation of industrial sites and contaminated land

Policy area		Code	Priority themes
		51	Promotion of biodiversity and nature protection (including Natura 2000)
		52	Promotion of clean urban transport
		53	Risk prevention (...)
		54	Other measures to preserve the environment and prevent risks
5. Territorial development	Social Infrastructure	10	Telephone infrastructure (including broadband networks)
		75	Education infrastructure
		76	Health infrastructure
		77	Childcare infrastructure
		78	Housing infrastructure
	Tourism and culture	55	Promotion of natural assets
		56	Protection and development of natural heritage
		57	Other assistance to improve tourist services
		58	Protection and preservation of the cultural heritage
		59	Development of cultural infrastructure
		60	Other assistance to improve cultural services
	Planning and rehabilitation	61	Integrated projects for urban and rural regeneration
	Other	82	Compensation of any additional costs due to accessibility deficit and territorial fragmentation
		83	Specific action addressed to compensate additional costs due to size market factors
	6. Technical assistance		84
81			Mechanisms for improving good policy and programme design, monitoring and evaluation ...
85			Preparation, implementation, monitoring and inspection
86			Evaluation and studies; information and communication

Annex Table B - Relative policy priority by region as reflected by approvals of allocated Community contribution (total expenditure/total funding)

Categories	Regions	1. Enterprise environment	2. Human resources	3. Transport	4. Environment and energy	5. Territorial development	6. Technical assistance
Convergence	East Macedonia/Thrace	57.0	#DIV/0!	51.5	37.5	#DIV/0!	11.6
	Thessalia	57.1	41.6	95.0	37.5	40.4	16.6
	Ipeiros	101.1	57.7	72.5	27.9	71.2	20.9
	Ionian islands	54.6	51.0	33.5	32.2	54.0	17.4
	Western Greece	57.5	20.1	35.8	22.9	56.0	15.3
	Peloponnesus	51.0	6.5	24.2	35.3	53.9	11.5
	North Aegean	45.9	30.3	28.2	29.7	44.5	7.0
	Crete	70.8	39.8	64.2	12.5	30.6	6.4
Phasing out regions	Central Macedonia	65.3		38.5	44.7		84.5
	West Macedonia	69.6		62.5	25.8		
	Attiki	52.6	57.9	12.2	26.6	41.1	87.3
Competitiveness and employment	Stereia Ellada	82.6	110.5	82.2	77.1	61.1	40.1
	South Aegean	172.9	61.6	48.7	30.6	23.8	37.9

Source: Own calculations on the base of DG Region data.

Annex Table C - Change of annual commitments 2011-2012 (%)

	ERDF and Cohesion Fund	Total	ERDF and Cohesion Fund	Total	ERDF and Cohesion Fund	Total
	<i>Convergence objective</i>		<i>Multi-objective</i>		<i>Total</i>	
1. Enterprise environment	129.9	129.9	97.6	132.0	123.8	130.3
1.1 RTDI and linked activities	193.2	193.2	168.1	254.4	191.6	208.8
1.2 Support for innovation in SMEs	257.3	257.3	116.9	116.9	248.6	248.6
1.3 Other investment in firms	65.8	65.8	91.3	91.3	73.3	73.3
1.4 ICT and related services	143.7	143.7	135.0	264.5	143.4	150.5
2. Human resources	86.6	257.0	28.4	135.2	72.7	138.1
2.1 Education and training				123.0		123.0
2.2 Labour market policies	86.6	257.0	28.4	146.9	72.7	152.0
3. Transport	116.0	116.0	109.8	109.8	115.2	115.2
3.1 Road	114.6	114.6	104.8	104.8	113.0	113.0
3.2 Rail	120.3	120.3	218.2	218.2	120.6	120.6
3.3 Other	117.1	117.1	162.7	162.7	122.5	122.5
4. Environment and energy	128.4	128.4	124.9	124.9	128.1	128.1
4.1 Energy infrastructure	138.8	138.8	105.2	105.2	137.6	137.6
4.2 Environmental infrastructure	126.4	126.4	126.7	126.7	126.4	126.4
5. Territorial development	157.6	157.6	125.1	125.1	147.7	147.7
5.1 Tourism and culture	145.2	145.2	135.3	135.3	143.1	143.1
5.2 Planning and rehabilitation	147.5	147.5	157.9	157.9	149.8	149.8
5.3 Social infrastructure	170.2	170.2	114.7	114.7	149.1	149.1
5.4 Other			303.6	303.6	303.6	303.6
6. Technical assistance	141.1	140.4	123.9	147.7	140.5	142.0
Total Objective	128.3	129.0	112.0	129.7	125.9	129.2

Source: Own calculations from Excel Table 4.

Annex Table D - Main Indicators by policy area, allocation between OPs

Policy Area	Main Indicator	2007-2012	Results/Target (%)	
Enterprise support and RTDI including ICT Increase access to finance by SMEs	Number of direct investment aid projects to SME	29,143	85.8%	
	% to total			
	Competitiveness and Business	5.1		
	Attica	25.8		
	Western Greece-Peloponnese-Ionian islands	11.5		
	Macedonia. Thrace	31.7		
	Thessalia. Ipeiros. Sterea Ellada	10.9		
	Crete/Aegean	15.0		
	Number of RTD projects	825	81.4	
	Competitiveness and Business	8.5		
	Attica	40.7		
	Western Greece-Peloponnese-Ionian islands	3.8		
	Macedonia. Thrace	36.8		
	Thessalia. Ipeiros. Sterea Ellada	9.8		
	Crete/Aegean	0.4		
	Jobs created (gross. full time equivalent)	101,845	396.1	
	Competitiveness and Business	2.9		
	Attica	4.6		
	Western Greece-Peloponnese-Ionian islands	82.3		
	Macedonia. Thrace	5.9		
	Thessalia. Ipeiros. Sterea Ellada	1.9		
	Crete/Aegean	2.4		
	Number of additional population covered by broadband access	-	727,287	478.2
	Attica	0.0		
	Macedonia. Thrace	100.0		
	Thessalia. Ipeiros. Sterea Ellada	0.0		
	Crete/Aegean	0.0		
	Number of start-ups supported	2,400	65.0	
	Competitiveness and Business	22.6		
	Attica	47.4		
Macedonia. Thrace	15.6			
Thessalia. Ipeiros. Sterea Ellada	9.1			
Crete/Aegean	5.3			
Human Resources	Number of education projects	634	102.1	
	Attica	8.7		
	Western Greece-Peloponnese-Ionian islands	10.3		
	Macedonia. Thrace	35.3		
	Thessalia. Ipeiros. Sterea Ellada	28.9		
	Crete/Aegean	16.9		
	Number of benefiting students	43,858	26.4	
	Attica	8.7		
Western Greece-Peloponnese-Ionian islands	10.3			

Policy Area	Main Indicator		2007-2012	Results/Target (%)
	Macedonia. Thrace		35.3	
	Thessalia. Ipeiros. Sterea Ellada		28.9	
	Crete/Aegean		16.9	
Transport	Number of transport projects		398	90.5
	Western Greece-Peloponnese-Ionian islands		8.5	
	Macedonia. Thrace		43.7	
	Thessalia. Ipeiros. Sterea Ellada		21.1	
	Crete/Aegean		26.6	
	km of reconstructed roads		6,826	352.5
	Western Greece-Peloponnese-Ionian islands		0.6	
	Macedonia. Thrace		96.9	
	Thessalia. Ipeiros. Sterea Ellada		1.0	
	Crete/Aegean		1.5	
Energy and Environment	Number of renewable energy projects		50	26.9
	Competitiveness and Business		86.0	
	Attica		-	
	Macedonia. Thrace		14.0	
	Thessalia. Ipeiros. Sterea Ellada		-	
	Additional population served by water projects		450,291	26.0
	Environment and Sustainable Decelopment		13.8	
	Attica		1.9	
	Western Greece-Peloponnese-Ionian islands		35.2	
	Macedonia. Thrace		38.4	
	Thessalia. Ipeiros. Sterea Ellada		4.5	
	Crete/Aegean		6.2	
	Additional population served by waste water projects		206,458	13.0
	Environment and Sustainable Decelopment		43.5	
	Attika		0.5	
	Western Greece-Peloponnese-Ionian islands		2.4	
	Macedonia. Thrace		2.6	
	Thessalia. Ipeiros. Sterea Ellada		45.2	
	Crete/Aegean		5.9	
	Territorial Development	Number of tourism projects		118
Competitiveness and Business			0.8	
Attica			0.8	
Western Greece-Peloponnese-Ionian islands			11.9	
Macedonia. Thrace			29.7	
Thessalia. Ipeiros. Sterea Ellada			43.2	
Crete/Aegean			13.6	
Number of projects ensuring sustainability and improving the attractiveness of towns and cities			330	146.7
Attica			18.2	

Policy Area	Main Indicator	2007-2012	Results/Target (%)
	Western Greece-Peloponnese-Ionian islands	20.6	
	Macedonia. Thrace	0.0	
	Thessalia. Ipeiros. Sterea Ellada	47.0	
	Crete/Aegean	14.2	

Source Excel file 0903 SFC07_11-a-_AIR_CoreIndicator.xls and own calculations

Annex Table E - Main Indicators by policy area, annual comparison

Policy area	Main Indicators (total figures and by OP)	2011	2012	Change (%)	Results to target (%)
Enterprise support and RTDI including ICT Increase access to finance by SMEs	Total number of direct investment aid projects to SME	23.912	29.143	21.9	85.8
	Competitiveness and Business	578	1.492	158.1	23.8
	Attica	8.640	7.529	-12.9	62.7
	Western Greece-Peloponnese-Ionian islands	0	3.351	n/a	82.9
	Macedonia, Thrace	4.962	9.246	86.3	135.7
	Thessalia, Ipeiros, Sterea Ellada	4.763	3.166	-33.5	238.0
	Crete/Aegean	4.969	4.359	-12.3	124.5
	Number of RTD projects	493	825	67.3	81.4
	Competitiveness and Business	18	70	288.9	28.0
	Attica	256	336	31.3	76.4
	Western Greece-Peloponnese-Ionian islands	31	31	0.0	147.6
	Macedonia, Thrace	133	304	128.6	0.0
	Thessalia, Ipeiros, Sterea Ellada	52	81	55.8	0.0
	Crete/Aegean	3	3	0.0	0.0
	Total jobs created (gross, full time equivalent)	11.881	101.845	757.2	396.1
	Competitiveness and Business	443	2.997	576.7	71.4
	Attica	3.939	4.706	19.5	51.2
	Western Greece-Peloponnese-Ionian islands	1.024	83.785	8079.7	2410.4
	Macedonia, Thrace	2.722	5.974	119.5	125.9
	Thessalia, Ipeiros, Sterea Ellada	1.849	1.898	2.7	130.9
	Crete/Aegean	1.905	2.485	30.4	94.1
	Total additional population covered by broadband access	824.608	727.287	-11.8	478.2
	Attica	93.364	0	n/a	0.0
	Macedonia, Thrace	661.716	727.287	9.9	635.7
	Thessalia, Ipeiros, Sterea Ellada	19.528	0	n/a	0.0
	Crete/Aegean	50.000	0	n/a	0.0
	Total number of start-ups supported	2.034	2.400	18.0	65.0
	Competitiveness and Business	395	543	37.5	45.3
	Attica	1.078	1.137	5.5	151.6
	Macedonia, Thrace	225	374	66.2	44.0
Thessalia, Ipeiros, Sterea Ellada	210	218	3.8	114.7	
Crete/Aegean	126	128	1.6	18.3	
Human Resources	Total number of education projects	387	634	63.8	102.1
	Attica	32	55	71.9	122.2
	Western Greece-Peloponnese-Ionian islands	29	65	124.1	125.0
	Macedonia, Thrace	135	224	65.9	108.2

Policy area	Main Indicators (total figures and by OP)	2011	2012	Change (%)	Results to target (%)
	Thessalia, Ipeiros, Sterea Ellada	102	183	79.4	152.5
	Crete/Aegean	89	107	20.2	116.3
	Total number of benefiting students	18,720	43,858	134.3	26.4
	Attica	219	432	97.3	21.6
	Western Greece-Peloponnese-Ionian islands	2,170	2,640	21.7	14.5
	Macedonia, Thrace	9,003	19,447	116.0	34.7
	Thessalia, Ipeiros, Sterea Ellada	5,324	18,139	240.7	69.5
	Crete/Aegean	2,004	3,200	59.7	5.0
Transport	Total number of transport projects	223	398	78.5	90.5
	Western Greece-Peloponnese-Ionian islands	25	34	36.0	85.0
	Macedonia, Thrace	29	174	500.0	147.5
	Thessalia, Ipeiros, Sterea Ellada	72	84	16.7	80.8
	Crete/Aegean	97	106	9.3	109.3
	Total km of reconstructed roads*		259		37
	Western Greece-Peloponnese-Ionian islands		42		23.4
	Macedonia, Thrace				
	Thessalia, Ipeiros, Sterea Ellada		116		58.5
	Crete/Aegean		102		30.8
Energy and Environment	Total number of renewable energy projects	57	106	86.0	0.0
	Competitiveness and Business	57	106	86.0	36.5
	Attica	0	0	n/a	n/a
	Macedonia, Thrace	0	0	n/a	n/a
	Thessalia, Ipeiros, Sterea Ellada	0	0	n/a	n/a
	Total additional population served by water projects	40	50	25.0	26.9
	Environment and Sustainable Development	23	43	87.0	58.1
	Attica	0	0	0.0	0.0
	Western Greece-Peloponnese-Ionian islands	17	7	-58.8	12.5
	Macedonia, Thrace	0	0	n/a	0.0
	Thessalia, Ipeiros, Sterea Ellada	160,817	450,291	180.0	26.0
	Crete/Aegean	0	62,250	n/a	6.8
	Total additional population served by waste water projects	5,475	8,510	55.4	28.4
	Environment and Sustainable Development	39,830	158,282	297.4	155.5
	Attica	74,913	172,932	130.8	31.2
	Western Greece-Peloponnese-Ionian islands	39,489	20,207	-48.8	404.1
	Macedonia, Thrace	1,110	28,110	2432.4	22.5
Thessalia, Ipeiros, Sterea Ellada	208,581	206,458	-1.0	13.0	
Territorial	Total number of tourism projects	199,50	89,727	-55.0	9.1

Policy area	Main Indicators (total figures and by OP)	2011	2012	Change (%)	Results to target (%)
development		0			
	Competitiveness and Business	0	980	n/a	0.2
	Attica	1,500	4,894	226.3	85.5
	Western Greece-Peloponnese-Ionian islands	3,681	5,407	46.9	14.6
	Macedonia, Thrace	0	93,250	n/a	n/a
	Thessalia, Ipeiros, Sterea Ellada	3,900	12,200	212.8	10.6
	Crete/Aegean	88	118	34.1	8.9
	Total number of projects ensuring sustainability and improving the attractiveness of towns and cities	0	1	n/a	2.9
	Attica	0	1	n/a	1.0
	Western Greece-Peloponnese-Ionian islands	11	14	27.3	116.7
	Macedonia, Thrace	29	35	20.7	61.4
	Thessalia, Ipeiros, Sterea Ellada	42	51	21.4	21.1
	Crete/Aegean	6	16	166.7	1.8

Source: for reconstructed roads, DG Regional Policy database (authors' and core team calculations); for all other indicators, Excel file 0903 SFC07_11-a- AIR_CoreIndicator.xls and own calculations.

(* Note: revised on the basis of the latest DG Regio verified data on core indicators.