



**EXPERT EVALUATION NETWORK  
DELIVERING POLICY ANALYSIS ON THE  
PERFORMANCE OF COHESION POLICY 2007–2013**

**TASK 2: COUNTRY REPORT ON  
ACHIEVEMENTS OF COHESION POLICY**

**ITALY**

**VERSION: FINAL**

**DATE: NOVEMBER 2010**

**ANDREA NALDINI**

**WITH PAOLA CIRILLI AND ELDA MARIA RIZZO**

**ISMERI EUROPA**

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

## Contents

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS .....	3
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	4
SECTION 1 – SOCIO–ECONOMIC CONTEXT .....	7
SECTION 2 – THE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY PURSUED, THE EU CONTRIBUTION TO THIS AND THE POLICY ACHIEVEMENTS OVER THE PERIOD .....	9
SECTION 3 – EFFECTS OF THE INTERVENTIONS .....	30
SECTION 4 – EVALUATIONS AND GOOD PRACTICE IN EVALUATION .....	34
SECTION 5 – CONCLUDING REMARKS – FUTURE CHALLENGES .....	41
REFERENCES.....	43
INTERVIEWS .....	44
TABLES .....	44

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AIR	Annual Implementation Report
CIPE	Inter-ministerial Committee for Economic Planning
CSF	Community Support Framework
DPS	Department of Development policies
EC	European Commission
ERDF	European Regional Development Fund
ESF	European Social Fund
EU	European Union
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
ICT	Information & Communication Technology
ITP	Integrated Territorial Projects
MA	Managing Authority
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
NSRF	National Strategic Reference Framework
NOP	National Operational Programme
PA	Public Administration
R&D	Research & Development
ROP	Regional Operational Programme
RTDI	Research, Technological Development and Innovation
SME	Small and Medium-sized Enterprises
UVAL	Evaluation Unit of Public Investment

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Regional disparities in Italy are strongly affected by the low rate of national growth over the past decade, which, in turn, is in part a consequence of the lack of national structural reforms (budgetary policy, productive adjustments, internal competition and efficiency of public goods and services). While regional policy can offset to some extent the adverse effect of low national growth on regional disparities, it cannot close the gap with the EU average GDP per head alone. Even regions in the South of Italy which are no longer supported under the Convergence Objective and now are under the Competitiveness Objective have difficulty in catching up with more advanced regions, and disparities in GDP per head and productivity have remained largely unchanged in recent years.

The crisis has hit mainly the manufacturing sector and since the beginning of the decade its levels of investment have been worryingly low, especially in the less developed regions. The adjustment in the production system and in productivity to face globalisation, which began some years ago, is still incomplete and the crisis makes it more difficult as well as giving rise to social costs. Cohesion Policy has to face this challenge and its performance will be measured by its capacity to bring about an increase in productivity and maintain social cohesion.

The strategy of the NSRF is largely valid. However, it is arguably “parentless”, in the sense that the commitment of government and institutions could prove insufficient to achieve the ambitious targets set. The recent cuts in national funds for regional development are particularly significant (over EUR 20 billion over 7 years) and inevitably have implications for the existing strategy. The effects of the crisis, the changes in national and regional governments and the reduction in national funding for development would necessitate a renewal of the NSRF strategy, the basic design of which has been maintained but in which the objectives have been updated in the light of the current situation. The operational aspects have also been reinforced by applying stricter conditions, but the European Commission could play a more active role in this respect by imposing conditions to increase the effectiveness of policy, as happened in the previous programming period (e.g. by making financial transfers conditional on an effectively functioning monitoring and evaluation system).

Implementation of programmes has been delayed: achievements are very limited and results are still not evident. The overlap of the two programming periods and an insufficient advanced preparation of the new programmes are the main causes of this delay. The effects of the OPs will probably only begin to be visible at the end of the period. The effects of the ERDF in countering the recession has consequently been weak and interventions in the coming years can only make a difference if they bring about adjustments in the productive system. It is, therefore, important to keep the focus on “innovation” in firms, but also in modes of transport

and telecommunications, energy sources, social dialogue and local partnership, security conditions, the management of structural policy and decision-making processes. Breaking away from the past is key to implementing the NSRF strategy.

Examination of the OPs across policy areas reveals a black and white picture and the disappointing pace of implementation requires effective initiatives to be taken. In some cases, projects have been identified and, even if delayed, operations can get underway with good possibility of success. In these cases, the need is for careful monitoring of the process of implementation and the avoidance of possible procedural and organisational obstacles. In other cases, planning capacity and sectoral strategies are weak and, in these cases, more urgent and more complex initiatives are necessary to simultaneously define the direction and content of interventions. The national authorities are not yet committed to this objective and efforts need to be increased.

These problems principally affect Convergence regions but are not entirely absent in Competitiveness ones. In the latter, financial resources are more limited and their absorption is easier, but delays in implementation are also significant and a major effort also needs to be made in these regions to make up lost time.

The potential impact of interventions in Convergence regions is difficult to assess in the initial phase of operations and without updated evaluations. Assuming the continuation of current trends and on the basis of past evaluations, support for R&D, transport, education and training and energy should produce significant results. In the case of energy and education, these should come through more quickly than in the case of R&D and transport. Significant effects could also result in other policy areas, though only if certain conditions are met:

- support to enterprise typically involves a high deadweight cost and requires a clear understanding of the needs of enterprises to increase productivity; in this case, support needs to be shifted more towards innovation;
- urban and environmental interventions are important to improve the territorial balance and the quality of life in Convergence regions, even if resources are limited relative to needs. Delays in planning and difficulties in concentrating resources on large and high quality projects are obstacles which need to be overcome in order to have a significant impact within a reasonable period of time;
- support to the energy industry, broadband telecommunications and tourism is important to increase the opportunities for growth and strengthen traditional activities, but the strategy in these areas needs to be made more coherent and better coordinated between central, regional and local governments.

The potential impact of support in Competitiveness regions is essentially dependent on the success of RTDI policies. In this regard, the ERDF is providing significant financial resources relative to national funding and the 7-year programming period enables a coherent strategy on research and innovation to be developed. The possibility of success is high because interventions are generally effective and based on a long-term experience, but to make a real difference there will be a need to reach more SMEs and build up effective cooperation between the private and public sectors. Other interventions can have a significant local impact, but can rarely change deep-seated trends in regions.

Other conditions for the NSRF strategy to be effective include in particular the activation of the national funds for regional development, the maintenance of the planned level of public investment and the avoidance of measures taken to reduce the government deficit and public sector debts affecting this.

The planned actions to improve governance and administrative capacity are evidently needed and they should be fully implemented and reinforced to reduce delays and ensure more effective implementation. The current award system based on context indicators of some essential services to people is an important experiment to improve management and programming, but it is still too early to assess its effects on the current programming period.

Evaluations of the current OPs have still to begin. Indications of potential results can be gained from evaluations of intervention in the previous period and from recent studies. These indicate that national macroeconomic and structural policies can have major effects on regional disparities and that recent subsidies to enterprises are of limited effectiveness. They also demonstrate the significant effects produced by interventions in R&D and education and the need for a stronger effort to invest in rail and intermodal transport infrastructure as well as for a rethink of local development policy. The quality of past evaluations is uneven, the standard being set by the requirements of the former mid-term review.

## SECTION 1 – SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONTEXT

The North–South divide is the main regional disparity in Italy. It has remained unchanged in recent decades, even if there was a small reduction in disparities as regards the smallest southern regions (Basilicata, Molise, Sardegna, Abruzzo). These regions are no longer covered by the Convergence Objective, partly because of statistical effects following EU enlargement. In Convergence Objective regions, the population is now over 17 million (including Basilicata, which receives phasing out support), around 30% of the national population (see Table 1<sup>1</sup>).

The north–south divide depends on historical factors. The reasons for the divide are rooted in gaps in infrastructure endowment in transport, water, energy, cultural activities, R&D and so on, in the under–development of local resources (human resources and physical assets relating to the cultural and environmental heritage) and in institutional deficiencies less efficient public administration, the more limited role of the social partners and NGOs and (weak intermediary bodies).

GDP per head in the Convergence regions fell from 74% of the EU average in 2000 to 66% in the 2007, because of a major slow down in national growth which makes development of the lagging regions difficult.

These economic problems are aggravated by resistance to change in society and by the widespread presence of criminal organisations in the southern regions. Public transfers and the welfare system prop up disposable income by enough to prevent social conflict.

This situation is not uniform in the South and examples of successful producers, research centres, social innovation and resistance to organised crime are evident, but they are not sufficiently large to change the overall regional performance. The same regions which were assisted under Objective 1 for almost two decades, do not show any significant catching up with the centre–northern levels of productivity and GDP.

In recent years, a number of economic and institutional tendencies have affected regional disparities and could help to narrow them:

- the single market, the single currency and globalisation have increased the necessity of structural adjustment in the centre–northern regions but have reduced the interest of northern producers in the southern market, which is no longer protected and open to outside competitors. This has induced a demand for the creation of a federal state and for a reduction in r transfers to the southern regions which would accordingly be encouraged to increase efficiency. This process is underway and the institutional and

---

<sup>1</sup> See Excel file for Table 1.

economic results are yet to become clear, but it will certainly lead to changes in the current relationships between regions and the funding of regional policies.

- The national debt (116% of GDP in 2009; see Table 2<sup>2</sup>) and the uncompleted institutional and economic reforms started at the beginning of the 1990s (on competition regulation, political structure, civil justice, the efficiency of public administration, and the fight against organised crime) reduce the resources available for development, depress national growth and penalise the less developed regions in particular. Consequently, national factors hamper the ability of the southern regions to catch up. This is not only a “regional concern” but also a “national” one.

Among the centre–northern regions disparities are not large, if we exclude regions previously assisted under Objective 1 (Sardegna, Abruzzo and Molise which have a GDP per head of around 75–80% of the national average and patterns of growth still affected by low productivity and a low employment rate). The other more developed regions are characterised by the strong presence of industry (accounting for 25% of total employment) and by a polycentric spatial organisation, with SMEs, productive services and know–how distributed around a number of local centres. Only Milan, Turin and Rome, however, are of international importance and have significant concentration of advanced services.

The economy of these regions is based on an export oriented model and is strongly dependent on developments in international markets. Their adjustment to globalisation has been the main structural problem in recent years. A 2008 survey by the Bank of Italy<sup>3</sup> highlighted the extent to which productivity and technological adjustment has occurred only in a limited number of companies. The small size of enterprises, the specialisation of many areas in traditional sectors and the low level of expenditure for R&D are structural weaknesses which have delayed and fragmented the adjustment of the economy to global developments.

The economic crisis which started in 2007 is making this adjustment more difficult and costly in terms of employment and productive capacity. The crisis has not tended to widen regional disparities significantly, though the situation in Convergence regions has worsened slightly despite of their limited exposure to international markets.

The industrial sector has been strongly hit by the crisis; in the Southern and Centre–northern regions, production declined by around 20% –and employed by 12% between 2008 and 2009. In the Convergence regions the situation is particularly worrying because of the small size of the industrial sector and the fact that investment: fell by 28% between 2001 and 2009 as against

---

<sup>2</sup> See Excel file for Table 2.

<sup>3</sup> Andrea Brandolini e Matteo Bugamelli (a cura di ), *Rapporto sulle tendenze nel sistema produttivo italiano*, 2008, Banca di Italia.



18% in the rest of the country. There is a progressive decline in industry without advanced services developing significantly. In the centre–northern regions, this process is stretching its competitive capacity and social dialogue, but unemployment is still only 6%, the same as in 2000. In the Convergence regions deindustrialisation runs the risk of eliminating the major engine of innovation and productivity growth and is associated with an unemployment rate of 13%, high but still much lower than in 2000.

Anti–crisis measures counteracted the main deflationary forces, but did not stimulate more emphasis on regional development policy. The anti–crisis measures essentially concerned the transfer of liquidity to the financial sector, improving the access to credit of businesses and increasing income support of the unemployed<sup>4</sup>. The need to service public debt has prevented the allocation of extra resources to public investment and anti–crisis measures have taken away resources from development policy (see below).

## **SECTION 2 – THE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY PURSUED, THE EU CONTRIBUTION TO THIS AND THE POLICY ACHIEVEMENTS OVER THE PERIOD**

### **THE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY PURSUED**

#### ***Main priorities of regional development policies over the period 2007–2013***

The 2007–2013 regional strategy continues the approach adopted for the 2000–2006 period, which in brief consists of:

- increasing the supply of public goods and services as the main means of supporting private investment through a mobilisation of local resources, attractiveness and efficiency of local economies and the development of positive externalities;
- promoting institutional building and making a substantial effort to improve governance, especially in the Convergence regions where weakness of institutions and social capital is an evident obstacle to regional development;
- integrating EU and national policies in a single strategy with increasingly similar implementation rules, in order to disseminate EU efficiency and effectiveness principles in the national policy.

---

<sup>4</sup> A social scheme supporting all unemployed people in same way does not exist in Italy. During the current crisis special support was implemented for the less protected segments of labour forces.

**Table A – STRATEGY OF THE ITALIAN NSRF 2007–2013** based on four macro-objectives and ten priorities:

- 1. developing knowledge circuits**
  - 1.1.human resources improvement and enhancement;
  - 1.2.research and innovation promotion for competitiveness;
- 2. improving living standards, security and social inclusion**
  - 2.1.sustainable and efficient use of environmental resources for development;
  - 2.2.social inclusion, services for quality of life and territorial attractiveness;
- 3. fostering clusters, services and competition;**
  - 3.1.promotion of natural and cultural resources to enhance attractiveness and development;
  - 3.2.transport networks and links, with particular emphasis on TENs corridors;
  - 3.3.competitiveness of production systems and employment, notably supporting SMEs;
  - 3.4.competitiveness and attractiveness of cities and urban areas;
- 4. internationalising and modernising the economy.**
  - 4.1.internationalisation and investments, consumption and resource attractiveness;
  - 4.2.governance, institutional capacity and effective markets and competition.

In 2000–2006 this approach required a transformation of the previous regional policy and a push for a change in local and national governance. Even if this strategy addressed the main needs, especially in the Objective 1 regions for which it was designed, it did not achieve its initial objectives for three main reasons<sup>5</sup>: 1) the slow growth of the national economy and the cutback in the planned resources to public investment in the less developed regions; 2) the dispersion and fragmentation of projects without generating critical mass and the inclusion of a large number of ‘deadweight’ projects; 3) insufficient improvement in institutional and administrative capacity.

The 2007–2013 NSRF takes account the lessons from the previous period and outlines the approach to regional policy in 4 macro-objectives and 10 priorities (see Table A). The strategy is coherent with EU priorities (the Lisbon strategy and, now, Europe 2020) and proposes some important innovations in comparison to the past:

- a major and increasing effort to develop the knowledge economy (notably, education and research);
- a reduction in capital grants and an increase in financial support for investment in research and innovation in enterprises;
- a significant commitment to renewable energy production;
- the abandonment of a widespread local development approach;

<sup>5</sup> See Cohesion Policy ex-post evaluation for DG Regio (2009) Work package 1 – Coordination; Task 4 – Country reports: Italy (drafted by Ismeri Europa).

- a new award mechanism to promote capacity building, based on targets related to the performance of essential public services in the Convergence regions<sup>6</sup> with EUR 3 billion of national resources set aside. This mechanism is not directly related to EU policy but is aimed at improving administrative capacity in the Mezzogiorno.

With the exception of the last point, which involves only Convergence regions and former Objective 1 regions (Molise, Abruzzo, Sardegna and Basilicata), the other points are common to all regions. The allocation of resources (see Table 3<sup>7</sup>) reflects the above mentioned priorities in the following way:

- in both Convergence and Competitiveness regions the main policy area is the “enterprise environment” which accounts for, respectively, 36% and 45% of overall ERDF resources in the two groups of regions;
- in Convergence regions, “transport”, “the environment and energy”, and “territorial development” each receives around 20% of total ERDF resources;
- in Competitiveness regions, “the environment and energy” receives 30% of ERDF resources and “territorial development” 15%, while transport receives only 7%.

The development of “Human resources” receives negligible resources from the ERDF, but with the ESF, it accounts for 15% of the total finance from the Structural Funds in Convergence regions and 44% in Competitiveness regions. Specific interventions to support security and the fight against organised crimes still receive significant amounts in the Convergence regions. “Technical assistance” in both regional groups accounts for around 3.5% of ERDF resources.

It is noteworthy that RTDI receives around 20% of the ERDF under both Objectives. Compare to the past, in Convergence regions, other significant increases in the share of resources are in rail, energy and social infrastructure and in Competitiveness region, in energy and innovation in SMEs.

In general, the allocation of resources is associated with a reduction in the weight of aid schemes for investment (Italy was one of the main users of these in the past), but provides the same level of support to enterprises through an increase in assistance to RTD policy.

---

<sup>6</sup> For instance, it includes drop-out rate in secondary school, percentages of municipalities with childcare assistance and percentages of children 0–3 aged using the services. See DPS, “Obiettivi di servizio: stato di avanzamento per la verifica intermedia 2009”, July 2010.

<sup>7</sup> See Excel file for Table 3.

### *Priorities under the Territorial Cooperation Objective*

Under the Territorial Cooperation Objective, cross-border cooperation programmes involving Italian regions account for EUR 635 million of ERDF resources. Only 20% of these resources concern Convergence regions (Puglia in Italy-Greece OP and Sicilia in Italy-Malta OP).

The ERDF allocation of cross-border cooperation programmes (see Table B) is concentrated around three main policy areas: “enterprise environment”, “territorial development” and “the environment and energy”. In the last two, tourism and environmental protection are the main focus. Although some of these programmes are multiregional cross-border programmes often respond to the main interests of a particular region (e.g. Lombardia with Switzerland) and consequently strongly reflect the development priorities of that region and its capacity to pursue them. In this respect, Convergence regions are collaborating with other Convergence regions and in the past they have faced more complex planning and implementation problems.

**Table B – Territorial Cooperation priorities (cross-border programmes)**

<b>Cross-border cooperation OPs</b>	<b>EUR million</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>1. Enterprise environment</b>	<b>164.1</b>	<b>25.8</b>
ICT and related services	56.5	8.9
Innovation support for SMEs	68.3	10.8
RTDI and linked activities	39.2	6.2
<b>2. Human resources</b>	<b>39.0</b>	<b>6.1</b>
Education and training	25.1	4.0
Labour market policies	13.9	2.2
<b>3. Transport</b>	<b>70.8</b>	<b>11.1</b>
Rail	1.3	0.2
Road	0.7	0.1
Other	68.7	10.8
<b>4. Environment and energy</b>	<b>154.5</b>	<b>24.3</b>
Energy infrastructure	33.9	5.3
Environment and risk prevention	120.7	19.0
<b>5. Territorial development</b>	<b>166.9</b>	<b>26.3</b>
Planning and rehabilitation	8,1	1,3
Social Infrastructure	29,6	4,7
Tourism and culture	129,2	20,3
<b>6. Technical assistance</b>	<b>40,0</b>	<b>6,3</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>635,4</b>	<b>100,0</b>

### *Financial allocation and objectives of policy*

It is difficult to assess the coherence of Cohesion Policy with the main national needs for two main reasons. The first is because EU resources in Italy cover only a limited part of development policy (12–13% in Convergence regions, which becomes 25% when national co-financing is

added); especially in Competitiveness regions. The second is because the lack of structural reforms at national level strongly reduces the effectiveness and coherence of the strategy. In addition, the recent crisis has sharply changed social needs and increasingly split the long term policy requirements from the short-term priorities. However, some provisional assessments are possible as compared with of past experience. In this respect, the Italian NSRF shows some important improvements:

- A strategy more focused than before on some major economic development drivers, notably human resources and R&D. while strategies at regional level and the policy measures they contains are not always up to influencing such drivers, their identification is a first crucial step to bringing about the adjustment of the economy required and to reduce the gap with the more advanced economies in innovation capacity.
- The commitment to capacity building is more explicit and ambitious than in the previous period. The new incentive schemes are no longer based on administrative changes but on the effective benefits delivered to citizens by public services. The partnership and coordination requirements are very challenging, involving regions with different needs and capacity. The principal gap is in not including a direct link between capacity building and enterprise support (public services to businesses are not included among the indicators);
- The reduction in non-refundable grants to private investment with significant deadweight is positive factor, although the dramatic reduction in industrial investment in the Convergence regions calls for some direct support. In this regard, a broad revision of industrial policy measures which enable companies to respond to globalisation is still lacking. Not all the aid schemes, especially to RTDI, have to be abandoned, but the increasing preference for automatic means of support (tax credit) should be accompanied by them being better designed, as well as new incentives for promoting innovation, industrialisation, environmental investment and the use of advanced services.

One of the main limits of the strategy concerns the lack of strict conditions and rules to change behaviour in pursuing the ambitious objectives which have been set. Examples include reforms to improve the quality of the projects and speed up their implementation, a more efficient organisation and increased capacity at national level so as to give clear and operational indications to local and regional administrations, and a set of intermediate objectives to achieve within a particular time scale. Capacity building initiatives go in this direction, but broader legal and organisational reforms are required.

In addition, new Structural Fund regulations have increased the vagueness of the Operational Programmes and do not encourage concentration and selectivity in the choice of projects.

A second problem is the weakness of some sectoral strategies, such as the delays in updating of the national and regional aid schemes for investment, the undefined strategy for broadband and the absence of a national energy plan to coordinate priorities as regards renewables. This can reduce the potential effects of individual measures because they are not linked to other interventions within a coherent operational framework.

### *EU support to regional development policy in the country*

According to the NSRF data and the Ministerial decree for its implementation (December 2007, see Table C) the Structural Funds amount to around 23% of the total planned resources for regional development<sup>8</sup>.

**Table C – Resources for Regional Policy in Italy**

2007–2013 period	National funds (FAS)	Structural Funds	Co-financing of Structural Funds	TOTAL	Cols. 2+3 relative to total	Structural Fund rel total
	EUR million				%	
Southern regions	53,782.10	22,991.60	24,311.10	101,084.80	46.8	22.7
Centre–Northern regions	9,491.00	4,972.80	7,622.60	22,086.40	57	22.5
<b>Total planned funds (December 2007)</b>	<b>63,273.10</b>	<b>27,964.40</b>	<b>31,933.70</b>	<b>123,171.20</b>	<b>48.6</b>	<b>22.7</b>
Reductions and other allocations (June 2010)	21,500.00					
<b>Total Planned funds (June 2010)</b>	<b>41,773.10</b>	<b>27,964.40</b>	<b>31,933.70</b>	<b>101,671.20</b>	<b>58.9</b>	<b>27.5</b>
<b>Potential available resources (*)</b>	<b>17,040.00</b>					
Residuals from past years	11,700.00					
Resources from 2000–2006 "similar projects"	5,340.00					

(\*) In July 2010 the national government presented the results of a survey on available resources from the previous programming period in the inter-ministerial committee (CIPE); potential available resources from the previous period also include resources allocated to projects for which the advancement is lower than 10% and/or for which feasibility needs to be verified. CIPE has not decided how to use the available resources.

Sources: CIPE Decision n.1666/2007, CIPE Decision n.79/2010; CNEL "La programmazione dello sviluppo economico nelle regioni italiane", June 2010.

In 2008 and 2009, various adjustments were made to national resources for development and in June 2010 a reduction of almost one third (EUR 21.5 billion, equal to around 75% of the total Structural Funds allocated) was estimated. This reduction is composed of cuts to reduce the public deficit and reallocate funding towards areas not related to development policy. If this reduction is not compensated, EU Cohesion Policy, including national co-financing, would become the main component of regional development policy in Italy and the Structural Funds would cover 28% of total expenditure in this respect.

<sup>8</sup> The data in Table C are calculated for the southern regions (including Molise, Abruzzo and Sardegna currently in Competitiveness Objective) because the national policy is oriented to all the southern regions, but the results would not be very different if data were calculated only on the Convergence regions.

This reduction in national resources has affected mainly the poorer regions. It has also diminished the role of the Central Government in regional policy<sup>9</sup>. The reduction also affects the policy design of the NSRF considerably: national programmes for enterprises and research, education, the recovery of abandoned sites, governance and capacity building have been abandoned. The programming approach has been weakened because part of the resources will be allocated on single projects proposed by the Office of the Prime Minister and plans about the future availability of resources are lacking.

In July 2010, an administrative survey on the financial residual from the previous programming period was presented to the Inter-ministerial Committee for Economic Planning (CIPE); this amount is estimated at about EUR 17 billion (EUR 11.7 billion from unspent national funds and EUR 5.3 billion from EU funds reimbursing similar projects funded by national sources in the previous period). If all this residual were to be devoted to regional policy, it would almost balance the recent cuts in national plans.

If we consider other public investment in the regions as well as that for explicitly regional development purposes, the weight of the Structural Funds in total national resources falls from 23% to 12% (see Table D), which is approximately in line with the 13% in the previous period.

**Table D – Contribution of Structural Funds to national policy for development in Convergence regions (calculations from additionality table)**

Annual average 2007–2013	Total public expenditure on development (% on total)	NSRF (% of total)	Structural Funds as % of total national expenditure for development
<b>Basic infrastructures</b>	<b>43.7</b>	<b>50.9</b>	<b>9.8</b>
– Transport	21.9	25.2	7.4
– Telecommunication	1.8	2.1	16.1
– Energy	7.8	12.4	4.6
– Environment and water	7.7	7.6	25.1
– Health	4.5	3.7	1.5
<b>Human resources</b>	<b>10.2</b>	<b>8.5</b>	<b>30.2</b>
– Education	4.1	3.4	12.3
– Training	3.6	3.1	36.8
– R&D	2.5	2.1	50.2
<b>Productive environment</b>	<b>25.2</b>	<b>22.5</b>	<b>10.7</b>
– Industry	17.1	14.9	7.9
– Services	3.2	3.6	5.5
– Tourism	4.9	4.0	23.7
– Others	20.9	18.0	7.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>11.6</b>

Source: our calculation on NSRF data

<sup>9</sup> The uncertainty linked to the destination of the national funds has, however, delayed the approval and the implementation of the regional programmes funded by national resources (so called PAR, “Programmi Attuativi Regionali), which only in 2009 started to be approved.

On the basis of data for additionality, it is possible to assess the importance of the Structural Funds in different areas of national development policy. As shown in Table D, it is high in human resource development and support for research (around 30% to 50% depending on the sub-areas), as well as in environmental and water infrastructure (25%) and tourism (24%); while it is relatively low in healthcare (2%). In the other areas, the EU contribution ranges from 5% to 10%, with a high of 16% in telecommunications. Table D (in the first two columns) indicates that the relative weight of investment in different areas is similar for national and EU funding, though a slightly larger share of the latter goes to transport and energy and a slightly smaller share to industry.

The effect on additionality of the above mentioned reduction in national funding for regional development has not yet been calculated. However, the internal stability pact is the more relevant constraint affecting both additionality and public investment, obliging regions and local authorities to reduce, or limit, borrowing stemming from current expenditure, especially on healthcare. The sanctions of the pact affect not only current expenditure, but also capital expenditure and national co-financing of the ERDF. In this way, the pact adversely affects national and EU investment, and at the moment is seriously limiting the expenditure of the southern regions, which are the most indebted.

In conclusion, regional policy in Italy is increasingly dependent on EU resources, since national resources have diminished. These are constrained by the internal stability pact and the way they are allocated has been uncertain in recent years. The EU financial contribution is becoming even more important because it is directly available and not usable for purposes other than development, but at the same time it is more difficult to spend because of internal budget constraints.

### ***Modifications to the initial priorities***

Regional strategy was defined in 2006–2007, before the economic crisis, and it does not take into account output and employment problems which have occurred since 2008. The crisis did not lead to any significant modification in the initial plans. Structural problems remain unchanged and restructuring is now more urgent and difficult. The most marked change affected the ESF which has been used to co-finance income support to the unemployed; while the ERDF has mainly been used to increase access to credit of enterprises through guarantee fund. Most changes in financial plans are not significant and often not measurable because they are within the same priority axis. As noted above, the most important modifications concern the amount of national resources for regional policy.

In this last respect, the commitment to reduce public debt and the consequent limitations on public expenditure, especially for regional and local governments could adversely affect not



only the national regional policy, but also overall public investment in development in the coming years.

A political change in the national government and in many regional governments took place just after the NSRF was designed. The new government did not abandon the initial strategy, but it intends to adjust it according to new economic priorities (such as constructing nuclear power plants and the bridge between Sicilia and Calabria and implementing reform of the PA) and new preferences (for large projects, simplifying procedures and different approaches to governance). Until now, important modifications have not occurred, but a new government Plan for the Mezzogiorno is expected in the coming months. Political changes have affected mostly the implementation of Cohesion Policy, due to the uncertainty over the functioning of the administration.

## POLICY IMPLEMENTATION

The implementation of the ERDF involves 7 national OPs<sup>10</sup> and 5 regional OPs under the Convergence Objective, 16 regional OPs under the Competitiveness Objective and 7 cross-border OPs under the Territorial Cooperation Objective. Many of these programmes were approved at the end of 2007.

**Table E – Advancements of ERDF in Italy as at June 2010**

Objective	Commitments as % total planned resources	Expenditure as % total planned resources
Convergence	15.9	7.2
Competitiveness	23.4	12.5
Cross-border cooperation	28.5	4.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>17.5</b>	<b>8.1</b>

Source: Economy and Finance Minister (IGRUE); June 2010

Recent national data (June 2010) indicate commitments below 20% and expenditure below 10% in Convergence programmes (see Table E). More financial progress was made in Competitiveness programmes, while expenditure in Cross-border cooperation was below 5% of allocations. In the middle of the programming period (after 3 and half years) these financial results are disappointing. However, there is significant variability:

- Under the Convergence Objective, the Tourism NOP recorded no commitments and expenditure in Campania was less than 5% of overall resources; by contrast, NOP Governance, NOP Security, NOP Education and ROP Calabria had commitments amounting to over 30% of total resources, but expenditure was 15% of resources or

<sup>10</sup> Two of these National OPs, on energy and tourism, are managed by Regions (respectively, Apulia and Campania) and are called "interregional" programmes.

below in nearly all cases. Between February and June 2010 eight out of ten OPs did not increase commitments at all (or appreciably);

- in the Competitiveness ROPs of Marche, Umbria, Bolzano and Trento, commitments were over 30% of total funding in Valle d'Aosta and Veneto, expenditure was around 20% of available resources. Delays were significant in Friuli Venezia-Giulia and Molise, and in 6 other OPs, expenditure was below 10% of overall resources;
- in two Cross-border OPs<sup>11</sup>, commitments were close to zero (Italia-Malta and Italia-Slovenia), while in the other OPs under this Objective, commitments were around 30% or above; in all cases expenditure, was less than 10% of total resources.

While disaggregation by policy area is not possible, some conclusions are evident:

- Programmes are seriously delayed and their initial impact is likely to be felt only at the end of the programming period;
- Convergence regions show more of a lag in implementation than implied by the figures since their projects are usually larger and consequently their financial performance should be better than that of the Competitiveness regions;
- The cuts in resources for national development policy, the difficulties in co-financing Structural Fund interventions for some regions due to the internal stability pact, and the different levels of implementation between OPs suggest that there are specific problems in some regions and policy areas, but they also imply an uneven performance of the common strategy with consequences for its overall effectiveness.

The adverse economic conditions are not a good reason for these delays. First, the economic crisis and the reduction in the national resources should have led to a speeding up of expenditure, not a slowing down. Secondly, traditional incentives for investment – normally the component of development policy reduced most by an economic downturn – are limited in this programming period and companies have shown a high demand for incentives for research and innovation. Despite the fact that they are still not fully operational in many OPs, they demonstrate significant demand for support for restructuring.

Causes of the delays have to be looked for elsewhere; a list of possible factors is as follows:

- a one year administrative delay in the design and approval of programmes, common to all the OPs;
- insufficient planning and administrative capacity, which limits the number of ready-to-start projects and prevents procedures being accelerated<sup>12</sup>;

---

<sup>11</sup> No information is available on Italy-Greece, because the MA is Greek.

- delays in implementation in the previous programming period associated with limited capacity in this respect, preventing the immediate start up of programmes in this period;
- the internal stability pact, which blocks available national resources and forces a reduction in national and EU-funded public investment;
- the political and administrative uncertainty provoked by the changes in national and regional governments, which made decision-making more complex and time consuming.

### **ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE PROGRAMMES SO FAR**

Assessment of progress is based on the information and the indicators extracted from the AIRs. In past years, a well designed and detailed monitoring system<sup>13</sup> has been developed, which is meant to be fed by MAs with information at the level of individual projects. At the moment, the monitoring system is still not fully functioning and it has been impossible to collect information at a central level; the system is expected to produce a set of useful indicators by the end of this year.

The Italian monitoring system deserves further discussion, as it is relatively complete and effective (see Table F). The part of the system related to context indicators is extensive, effective and advanced in terms of design. It is also used to define specific targets and follow them through during the implementation independently of the results of the implementation. The part on project indicators, as noted above, has been recently improved in terms of definitions and methods, but the novelty and ambitiousness of these innovations will need some time to be completely operational. In this phase, more effort should be devoted to this part so as to comprehend and compare the progressive achievements of the OPs. Finally, the part on programme indicators is generally adequate in comparison with the past, but it could still be significantly improved in many OPs through more pertinent indicators<sup>14</sup> and a clearer approach to the identification of the relationship between physical, result and impact indicators.

---

<sup>12</sup> This aspect has already been underlined in the 2000–2006 ex-post evaluation report for Italy; in some infrastructural sectors it works as a supply side constraint, which, also in relation to an increasing amount of available resources, hampers the increase in the number of funded operations.

<sup>13</sup> See references.

<sup>14</sup> Indicators like “number of projects”, “jobs created” or “Jobs saved” are debatable: they do not help to identify effective achievements and necessitate stronger definitions and very complex calculation methods to be useful.

**Table F – Outline of the Italian monitoring system**

Type / Level	Indicators	Sources
Context indicators	Indicators to follow trends in the <b>variables relevant for the NSRF priorities</b> (more than 80 indicators)	ISTAT and Ministries
	Indicators of overall <b>territorial public expenditure</b> for development (additionality)	DPS and Regions
	Indicators for monitoring the impact of the interventions on <b>CO2 emissions</b>	ENEA
	Selected context indicators with explicit targets: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Mezzogiorno and Convergence Objective</b> (polluted coast on total coast.; tourist presences in not summer months on population; adults in Long Life Learning; businesses expenditure for R&amp;S; rate of irregular work; consumption of renewable energy sources)</li> <li>• <b>Centre-North and Competitiveness Objective</b> (adults in Long Life Learning; businesses expenditure for R&amp;S; consumption of renewable energy sources)</li> </ul>	ISTAT and Ministries
	Indicators for the <b>award system</b> on the essential services (Mezzogiorno only): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Education</b> (Reducing the early school leavers from 26% to 10%, Reducing the percentage of students with poor competency in reading from 35% to 20%, Reducing the percentage of students with poor competency in mathematics from 48% to 21%)</li> <li>• <b>Child and elderly care</b> (Increasing the percentage of municipalities with child-care facilities from 21% to 35%, Increasing the percentage of children in child care from 4% to 12%, Increasing the share of elderly beneficiaries of home assistance from 1,6% to 3,5%)</li> <li>• <b>Urban waste management</b> (Reducing the amount of urban waste landfilled from 395 kg to 230 kg per head, Increasing the percentage of recycled urban waste from 9% to 40%, Increasing the percentage of composted waste from 3% to 20%)</li> <li>• <b>Water service</b> (Increasing the percentage of water distribution from 63% to 75%; increasing the population served by waste water treatment plants from 57% to 70%)</li> </ul>	ISTAT and Ministries
Programme indicators	<b>Programme indicators</b> (physical, result, impact) by OP	OP
	<b>Core indicators</b> of the European Commission by OP	OP

This section of the report is focused on achievements and accordingly it focuses on physical output indicators of completed interventions. Sometime AIRs use physical output indicators without a clear distinction between “completed” and “started” interventions and figures have to be interpreted with caution, but it does not prevent a consistent picture of the implementation phase being drawn.

In order to summarise the state of implementation Annex Tables A and B for each policy area (enterprise environment, human resources, transport and telecommunications, and territorial development) with basic information on expenditure, physical indicators – attained and

targeted – and principal launched initiatives is presented. The main results of this analysis by Objective and policy area are summarised below.

## **Convergence programmes**

### ***Enterprise support and RTDI***

This policy area receives 35% of the overall ERDF under the Convergence Objective and, according to DG Regio data. The policy area is included in five regional OPs and one NOP. As noted above, the orientation towards stronger support to innovation and R&D is the main strategic priority in Convergence regions as well as Competitiveness ones. Regions are making a significant effort to create their own RTDI policy, since competences were transferred to them only in 2000 and their business sector as well as their experience in industrial policy is weak.

The progress made in implementation in this policy area is limited in all OPs, the completed interventions were less than 10% of targets and in some OPs zero (see Annex Table A1), expenditure was over 20% of allocated resources only in Basilicata.

NOP “Research and competitiveness” accounts for over EUR 3 billion of ERDF financing and for around half of the overall allocation for this policy area. In 2009, despite serious delays the OP made significant progress: around 60 R&D projects, 23 public private laboratories, 32 training courses, 52 innovation projects and some 30 cases of support to foreign investment were concluded. The OP is composed of two different axes: one devoted to R&D and the other to innovation. The first axis contains incentives and structural intervention for research according to well tested schemes. Even though results are still limited, the calls for tender elicited many proposals and confirmed the importance of R&D policy in Convergence regions.

The second axis (innovation) suffers from the absence of new and sufficient incentives; up to now, it had principally funded projects from the previous programming period and in December 2009 transferred EUR 100 million to a guarantee fund for SMEs, but this fund is still not operational. The OP has encountered difficulties in coordinating the strategies of the two Ministries which are responsible for the two axes and in defining a control system complying with EC requirements.

There are fewer completed projects and achievements in the regional OPs than in the NOP. The ERDF has been invested mainly in projects aimed at strengthening SME competitiveness, developing productive infrastructure and in land reclamation. Because of the economic and financial crisis, various Convergence regions, such as Sicilia and Campania, have implemented JEREMIE and JESSICA funds to support the competitiveness of local SMEs. Basilicata instead has created a Regional Guarantee Fund for SMEs (amounting to EUR 35 million).

Efforts have been made in this policy areas in particular to accelerate expenditure and counter the credit crunch, but needs are less evident than in the centre–northern regions.

Implementation (access and managing rules, controls) is taking time and many of the measures concerned risk having little effect. With regard to RTDI, the ROPs do not record physical progress, even though they have launched calls for projects in research, innovation, strengthening of technological transfer activities and spreading the use of ICT in SMEs and public administration. Calabria and Campania are pursuing a regional strategy directed at research, innovation and information society.

“Enterprise support and RTDI” is negatively affected by the indefiniteness of national industrial policy and by the need to consolidate regional innovation policy. Resources are substantial, but the operational delays in setting up guarantee funds and in the implementation of other interventions suggest that more support of interventions is needed to counteract the effects of the crisis.

### **Human Resources**

Only 1% of ERDF resources are allocated to this policy area. Intervention is focused on equipment of schools and hospitals and on the creation of social, healthcare and educational services in order to promote social inclusion. NOP Learning environments is funding projects left uncompleted from the previous programming period on ICT in schools to increase equipment, networks and laboratories. At the end of 2009, 4,109 projects had been implemented, while expenditure amounted to around 20% of the total allocation. Among ROPs, Basilicata had implemented 77 projects; Calabria had launched initiatives to implement “Pilot projects for a cosy school” and a web portal on education in collaboration with Piemonte (see Annex Table A2).

Even though interventions involve only a small amount of financial resources, they are very important because national resources for schools and social infrastructure are even scarcer. Implementation is helped by there being only one Ministry responsible) and regional interventions are important to ensure a diffused network of services. Nevertheless, there are too few results to allow an assessment to be made of achievements.

### **Transport and telecommunications**

This area receives 20% of ERDF allocation and is implemented through a NOP devoted to interregional infrastructure and five ROPs focused on local transport systems and ICT development.

Results in transport are still very limited and dependent on the completion of ‘pre-funded’ projects<sup>15</sup> or the completion of projects from the previous programming period. In comparison

---

<sup>15</sup> On the use of pre-funded projects see: Ex post evaluation of the ERDF in Objectives 1 & 2 (2000–2006) “Work package 1 Development and achievement in the Member States: Italy” and “Work package 5a: Transport: Regional case studies: Puglia (IT)”. [http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/rado2\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/rado2_en.htm)

with the 2000–2006 period, the NOP “Networks and mobility” has concentrated more funds on railway projects and is paying more attention to intermodal and road–rail distribution hubs.

The NOP has been seriously delayed by the complexity of projects, long implementation times and ambitious objectives. The recent agreement with RFI (the rail company) identified 48 feasible projects costing close to the total available for railways and can accordingly reduce the lag. In Axis II (nodes and hubs) expenditure only amounted to 7% of available resources.

ROPs show similar delays, with the exception of Basilicata (expenditure of 23% of the total available); completed projects are few in number and well below OP targets. In addition, it is very difficult to assess the importance the projects launched because physical targets are always defined in terms of the number of projects and not in terms of results, such as improved accessibility. The expected effects of regional intervention are more related to urban and local transport; The Sicilia OP has also put resources for transport and telecommunications into JESSICA and JEREMIE funds.

There are no tangible results up to now for interventions in ICT. Initial plans include investment in broadband and widespread installation of new e–services in healthcare and public administration. The former suffers from the lack of a national telecommunications strategy, which has been announced various times, but never defined because public resources to support it are not available<sup>16</sup>. A number of interventions in e–services have only just been launched and are likely to produce initial results only after two years or so.

### **Energy and Environment**

Resources allocated to this policy area amount to 18% of the total ERDF (around 8% for energy and 10% for the environment and water). Interventions are included in five ROPs and one interregional programme for energy, which is managed by Puglia and which is intended to support interventions with a wider scope than that of a single region and to realise synergies between regional interventions.

ROPs have planned to implement projects in the following areas: energy saving, production of energy from renewable sources, prevention of natural risks, reclamation of polluted and disadvantaged areas, waste treatment, and the monitoring and control of water resource. Even if completed projects are not numerous, some physical results are evident on environmental interventions in Calabria and Sicilia and derived from investments launched in the previous period. In Puglia, Basilicata and Sicilia several interventions have been launched on water resources, waste treatment and reclamation of polluted areas. Interventions have been delayed

---

<sup>16</sup> A technical analysis for the Government (the so called “Piano Caio”, from the name of the expert responsible for it, of 2009) estimated from EUR 5 up to EUR 10 billion of investment in the next 5 years for the entire country.

in respect of the strengthening of natural parks and the defence of biodiversity since the bodies responsible failed to respect all the European directives.

After an initial delay, the NOP “Renewable Energy and Energy Saving” programme has identified a stock of projects to support, but no physical progress is evident. Projects to support the production of energy from renewables and to increase the energy efficiency of buildings and the public sector have also been launched, and a tranche in a national guarantee fund for SMEs has been created for energy investment (amounting to EUR 96 million).

### **Territorial Development**

This policy area includes a range of interventions (including support to tourism, urban regeneration, security and social infrastructure) and is allocated around EUR 3.8 billion (approximately 20% of the total) of total ERDF resources.

Among ROPs, the greatest physical progress is in Puglia with 91 projects completed and expenditure amounting to 19% of the total contribution; the projects in question having been started in the 2000–2006 period. As at the end of 2009 the interregional OP (managed by Campania, like the energy NOP examined above) had still not got underway, though it was officially approved only in 2008. Specific aid schemes for tourist companies have also not yet been activated.

At the end of 2009, few projects on urban regeneration and the renovation of public buildings had been implemented (6 projects in Sicilia and 7 in Calabria). In the urban policy area, regions are currently committed to identifying new investment and local development initiatives and, to a large extent, this urban approach is replacing the local development approach in the 2000–2006 period (*Progetti Integrati Territoriali*)<sup>17</sup>. The delay in implementing these urban initiatives is worrying because they are complicated and time-consuming from an administrative and managerial perspective. JESSICA funds have also been set up, but interventions still have to start.

Interventions in relation to security have made significant progress in the NOP and in the Calabria’ ROP, which is the only one of the ROPs that has launched activities in this area up to now. In Calabria a project to spread a culture of respect for the law and one to re-use property confiscated from organised crime for social aims have been funded. The Security NOP records progress in Axis I (“Security for economic and entrepreneurial freedom”), which has funded 36 projects of video surveillance systems and in Axis II (Spread of legality), which has funded 42 projects, including for a system for monitoring migration flows. However, expenditure under this second axis is still close to zero.

---

<sup>17</sup> The operational instruments are different, for instance: “Progetti di area vasta” in Puglia, “Programmi di sviluppo urbano” or “territorial” in Sicily, or cities as intermediate bodies in Campania.



No rural development or similar initiatives have been launched.

### **Governance**

Even if governance is not identifiable in the financial allocation of funding, in Italy it deserves specific attention, because governance plays a key role in the overall strategy and some specific interventions are devoted to it under the Convergence Objective.

Some important aspects related to governance have already been mentioned: the absence, up until now, of a monitoring system that collects information from all OPs; the fact that evaluation has not started (see below); the difficulties created by having authorities with similar powers (for instance the two Ministries in the “Research and Competitiveness” OP created difficulties by their inability to agree on how control should be exercised); the delayed application of EU Directives in the environmental sector; inadequate initial planning and identification of feasible projects which delayed the launch of many programmes; the late approval of control and audit systems (most of them only in 2009); and political changes which halted the implementation of many OPs for many months. No improvements over the period in the management of EU programmes are evident – on the contrary, in comparison with the launch of the 2000–2006 programming period, decision-making processes have worsened.

A specific NOP (“Governance and Technical Assistance”) is funded by the ERDF in the Convergence regions to improve governance, with an amount of EUR 138 million of ERDF. At the end of 2009, expenditure was equal to 7% of overall resources. Up until now, the programme has funded different forms of technical assistance and software and hardware equipment for administrative and communication activities. In many cases, the NOP has funded integrated projects of different parts of the central administration. The projects started recently or which are starting now are often carried out in-house and results are still very scattered (around 260 person-years of technical assistance and 33 studies completed). It will be important to assess in the near future how far these interventions have improved governance.

The award system implemented for the national funds<sup>18</sup> for Mezzogiorno regions (Convergence regions plus Abruzzo, Molise and Sardegna) and for the Ministry of Education, University and Research for education measure should be mentioned here. Analysis of the 2008 data (latest available) shows that for some regions and in some policy areas, there have been significant advances towards targets: out of a total of 72 cases (regions and indicators), improvements were made in 64 (in 7 cases the target was exceeded), while a decline was reported in 8 cases. Sardegna is in a favour position with respect to several indicators. Sicilia shows no significant progress on several indicators and remains at the lowest level among the Southern regions.

---

<sup>18</sup> The prizes of the award system are defined for national funds because this prevents difficulties in the expenditure of EU funds (n+2) at the end of the programming period, but all the available resources contribute to the achievement of their targets.

Between these two extremes, the other regions vary in terms of performance; Calabria shows an improvement in all indicators and in some cases a significant one. Improvements in *Education* and *Water provision* have not been significant in all regions.

In *Waste Management* and *Care Services* significant progress has been made, although limited to certain regions exceeding the target. In the case of *Care Services* the three most populated regions (Campania, Puglia, Sicilia) failed to increase the coverage of services for older people. These results can be attributed in part to the improvement in management brought about by the award system and in part to the investment implemented in the previous programming period. The low level of achievement in the current programming period (given also that national plans are more delayed than EU plans) makes it impossible to establish any reliable relationship between indicators and the current EU programming period at the moment.

### **Competitiveness programmes**

#### **Enterprise support, including assistance to large firms, SMEs and crafts, and RTDI**

Some EUR 1.4 billion, or 45% of total ERDF resources, is allocated to this policy area. Resources have been concentrated mainly on R&D projects and innovation projects, the regeneration of industrial areas, initiatives to support the spread of ICT in SMEs (in Emilia Romagna, 522 enterprises have already been funded) and partnerships between enterprises and research centres (at the moment, for instance, there are 7 in Friuli Venezia Giulia and 4 in Umbria). In some regions many innovative projects (88 in Toscana), RTDI initiatives (231 in Toscana, 42 in Lombardia) were launched and partnerships between public institutes and enterprises set up. In order to counter the financial crisis, some regions have set up guarantee funds for SME investment: Toscana has created a fund (*Toscana Innovazione*) for SMEs operating in the region (EUR 17.7 million has been committed), Lombardia has implemented three financial engineering instruments for SMEs (FRIM FESR, Made in Lombardia and JEREMIE FESR) and Molise has created a Guarantee Fund amounting to EUR 13 million. Other on-going initiatives concern the development of broadband and the implementation of ICT services for enterprises.

Interventions in this policy area have not made much progress in financial and physical terms and have suffered launching delays. This, however, is not too much of a concern since businesses are able to absorb resources easily and the centre-northern regions are well equipped to speed up implementation. Additional considerations are that:

- the economic crisis has not led to any modification of the initial strategy and the focus has remained on innovation and R&D, which confirms that businesses recognise the importance of technological adjustment to overcome the crisis as well as to improve competitiveness;

- the crisis has led to a greater emphasis on guarantee funds and access to credit. This should not in general encounter absorption problems in the Centre–north regions, but their excessive use could reduce selectivity and the orientation towards innovation;
- the interventions in RTDI in the ROPs provide the main financial and strategic means for developing regional innovation policies in Italy. After a long period of uncertainty as regards resources and competences, this policy has matured and is now focused on cooperation between private and public bodies (poles, network and cluster initiatives). To develop this approach and to integrate it into a national framework, avoiding duplication and overlapping, is the main challenge over this programming period.

### **Human Resources**

The funding devoted to this policy area is 1% of the total ERDF and are principally concentrated in Sardegna. Data show progress in implementing projects aimed at the social inclusion of people with disadvantages.

### **Transport and telecommunications**

The transport and telecommunication policy field area is allocated 7% of the ERDF under the Competitiveness Objective (EUR 212 million). In some regions (Marche and Lazio) this area has acquired major importance. Evidence on physical progress is very limited and there have been no significant achievements.

The ROP transport initiatives involves management and control of regional local public transport (Lazio has scheduled an Info–mobility plan), infrastructure and services for local transport links (access to the Ancona airport in Marche) and the development of advanced services to monitor and manage transport systems (Lombardia). The small amount of resources available prevents the funding of large projects and the main contribution of EU resources is in planning and monitoring.

Telecommunication initiatives are primarily aimed at the development of broadband (Lazio has an agreement with the Ministry of Communications for developing a regional plan) and projects to improve access to data transmission services. The lack of a national plan and public investment as regards broad band significantly reduces the effect of interventions, which are scattered and small scale.

### **Energy and environment**

Some 29% of total ERDF resources (EUR 913 million) is allocated to this policy area. Projects include the production of energy from renewable sources and energy saving, while environmental initiatives are focused on the prevention of natural risks from flooding, earthquakes and so on, and reclamation and the clean–up of polluted areas.

Expenditure is still negligible, though some small initial achievements are reported in respect of energy. These achievements result from direct subsidies linked to the existing national aid schemes and are the easiest to start. As regards the environment, the only significant evidence is in Friuli Venezia Giulia, where expenditure amounted to 44% of the total allocation and 6 projects were completed.

In 2009, many projects were started in the two policy area (to clean up degraded and polluted areas and to increase the use of renewables, especially), and calls for tender in relation to the prevention of natural disasters, land reclamation and investments in increasing energy efficiency were launched. Results of these interventions should be visible in two or three years time.

On the whole, the allocation to this policy area seems too small in relation to the needs it has to respond to and accordingly it is marked by a problem of “relevance”. However, these interventions can be very important as a complement to national policies (especially in energy) and as a continuation of a long-term strategy of spatial restructuring in regions (e.g. Valle d’Aosta). As in other areas, the lack of a national plan or a clear national strategy for energy limits the effects of EU funding.

### **Territorial Development**

Some EUR 474 million, or 15% of total ERDF resources, is allocated to this policy area. Very few projects had been completed by the end of 2009, those that were involving promotion of the natural and cultural heritage to make regions more attractive and increase tourism and urban development. Only in Valle d’Aosta was more than 20% of total resources spent on projects from the previous programming period.

Projects initiated include those on local and urban development (e.g. Toscana with 12 integrated projects in this area and Lombardia with local integrated projects); regeneration of deprived areas and enhancement of the artistic and cultural heritage for tourist development (Piemonte, Friuli Venezia-Giulia, Lazio and Emilia-Romagna).

This policy area covers different policy options (for tourist, urban and local development) which are not always integrated with each other. Potential effects of these interventions are constrained by the limited availability of resources. Up to now, many of the interventions have been delayed and their impact will be evident only over the long term because of the length of time required for their implementation.

## Cross-border cooperation programmes

On the basis of the available information in the AIRs<sup>19</sup>, at the end of 2009 only the Italia-Malta programme had not initiated any projects. In all the other OPs, a significant number of projects had been approved and activities were underway. Physical progress in the AIRs is considered in relation to approved projects rather than to completed ones.

- *Italy-Austria*: The projects are concentrated mainly on improving the internationalisation of enterprises (supporting their competitiveness, exchange of know-how and research and innovation) and the environment (renewable energy, conservation and the cultural heritage). Axis II, "Territory and sustainability", records physical progress equivalent to 28% of the target and is more developed than Axis I, "economic relations, competitiveness", under which only 7% of expected projects had been initiated. Delays in implementation of this axis arose from the need to establish a dialogue between Italian regions and Austrian Länder.
- *Italy-France Alcontra*: the projects mainly focus on management and preservation of the environment (65% of the total projects expected to be undertaken) and integration of the cross border economy (38% of the total expected). The programme shows good progress in all the axes (with 40% to 79% of the projects expected being initiated).
- *Italy-Switzerland*: 55 projects have been funded and 54 have started. The programme supports investment in sustainable development and 32% of the allocation is directed at projects for sustainable transport, to counter climate change, to respond to prospective energy shortages and to protect natural resources. Significant progress is reported for Axis II- Competitiveness – and Axis III- Quality of life – where the projects approved amounted to close to 90% of the total expected to be undertaken.
- *Italy-France Maritime*: the programme has funded and launched 23 projects: under Axis I, there is a project to encourage sustainable solutions for maritime and air transport, two projects on ICT and one to promote logistics. Under Axis II- Innovation and Competitiveness – projects are devoted to improving quality in the agro-food, agricultural and craft industries. Under Axis III – natural and cultural resources – projects involve managing marine and nature parks, environmental protection and prevention of disasters and use of renewable sources of energy. Under Axis IV, projects have been launched to fight social exclusion and support integration into the labour market. In 2009, there was no physical progress.

---

<sup>19</sup> Italy-Greece AIR was not available, because MA is Greek.

- *Italy–Malta*: Interventions are focused on: research and innovation, cross border accessibility, transport systems with low environmental impact, institutional partnerships, preservation of the environment, development of renewable energy and energy efficiency. At the end of 2009, there was no hard evidence of physical or financial progress.

The development of cross border cooperation varies greatly according to the different objectives and highlights the fact that cooperation is a cumulative process, stronger where past levels of cooperation and socio economic integration were more developed. The attention devoted to these programmes by the MAs appears to differ in relation to the scale of available resources.

Potential results of cross–border programmes are difficult to define because interventions are small; but projects seem to focus on real needs and to identify the most likely potential areas of collaboration in respect of the environment and innovation, areas where cooperation can lead to significant results.

### **SECTION 3 – EFFECTS OF THE INTERVENTIONS**

With no significant exceptions, interventions have been delayed and there are few tangible achievements. In view of the time needed by the different interventions to produce tangible results and economic effects, these will become evident only in the next three or four years, at the end of the programming period. In the case of the most complex interventions (in large infrastructure or research projects), substantial effects will occur later still.

The review of achievements also indicates that the ERDF in Italy has not mitigated the adverse effects of the economic crisis. In addition, guarantee funds or other financial engineering schemes co–financed still, in many cases, have to start up or become fully operational, especially in Convergence regions.

The ERDF is playing an important role in increasing the availability of resources for public investment. EU funds are the only planned, unconstrained resources directly available to national administrations because of reductions and restrictions in national funding. In this respect the initial estimate of additionality looks very optimistic at the moment. These constraints also affect the co–financing of EU programmes and their efficiency. This gives rise to a paradox: the fewer resources are available, the slower and more difficult is their absorption. This state of affairs also increases the risk of a progressive and more marked fragmentation of interventions as attempts are made to respond to the many and various political and social demands which can no longer be satisfied from national funding.

Even though information on actual achievements and results is scarce, it is still possible to identify potential outcomes on the bases of the financial and strategic importance of the different kinds of intervention, past performance (where available and consolidated) and the current state of preparation and implementation of projects.

### **Convergence Objective**

As regards the enterprise environment, the most solid programming component at the moment is support for R&D in the NOP, which is has demonstrated good performance in the past. Full exploitation of the opportunity which exists for strengthening performance in this area further will depend on the capacity of involving Centre–northern enterprises (already numerous) in projects, integrating the southern economy with the rest of the country and contributing to restructuring. ROPs have to demonstrate their capacity to spend resources on R&D without duplicating national interventions and with a regional focus that fosters the development of an environment which is innovation friendly.

Other support to enterprises is less easy to assess. There is a need for strategy and the measures to be used to be identified more clearly and for ROPs to support fewer and more effective subsidies to prevent resources being too widely dispersed. The establishment of numerous guarantee funds and financial engineering schemes may be inappropriate in these regions, as they are less effective in bringing about restructuring. These measures are still not very efficient and sometimes fail to address innovation needs. Past evaluations suggest that investment grants involve a large deadweight costs. Moreover, they are unable to provide information on the effects of guarantee funds and the new instruments proposed or implemented in regions, such as tax concessions. There is a need to evaluate support to innovation and guarantee funds quickly to obtain information on their functioning and potential effects.

In transport and communications, the NOP seems to have solved initial problems in identifying feasible projects and now has to focus on their implementation<sup>20</sup>. Results will depend on the capacity to overcome traditional delays and difficulties in the construction of infrastructure. The significant commitment to develop rail transport should be followed carefully, because it could represent an important change in transport policy in Convergence regions<sup>21</sup>. ROPs have potentially an important role in improving local and urban transport. While progress so far is inadequate to indicate potential results, there are important exceptions in Basilicata and Calabria, where ROPs can have a significant impact on regional transport links (mainly roads), improving connections between west and east in the south of the peninsula and producing

---

<sup>20</sup> At the moment no detailed information is available about the financing of new or 'pre-funded' projects.

<sup>21</sup> It can also develop sea transport in Convergence regions improving the movements of goods from the Mediterranean regions to the Centre–European regions.

spill-over effects on the other regions. The timing and scale of results will depend on the implementation capacity of the bodies responsible.

In energy and the environment, the energy component is well defined in the NOP and ROPs and can produce significant results in promoting the use of renewables. While a general improvement in energy efficiency can be expected, the expansion of supply is less probable. Environmental initiatives can contribute significantly to strengthening the fight against pollution, reducing the risk of natural disasters and improving water supply and the treatment of waste. These results will also depend not only on the level of investment but equally on organisational and administrative capacity of the authorities responsible. These interventions are meeting needs and providing basic services; though they are not geared to meeting global challenges (such as climate change), they represent a starting point to tackle this long-term issue. Interventions to preserve bio-diversity are more worrying, since delays are affecting the planning phase.

As regards territorial development, the different types of intervention show differing tendencies. Urban projects are promising, either because of the good results obtained in the past in some areas (e.g. Puglia) or because there is widespread and recognised range of needs to be addressed. In many cases they are directed at local development, which can reinforce results. Lags in the planning and implementation of these interventions are serious. In tourism, neither regional nor national strategy is clear and even though each measure could be significant, there is the risk of not producing a critical mass for achieving the potential effects.

Security measures are not only needed, but they have also a symbolic effect. The more technological interventions (video surveillance, databases and so on) are not very advanced, but do not indicate any significant problems of implementation and can strengthen the fight against organised crime considerably. Their effectiveness should be measured better through in-depth impact evaluations, which are still rare. Other measures (social use of confiscated properties and support to anti-crime organisations as well as local communities) need to be reinforced and their implementation accelerated, especially in the ROPs.

Governance issues remain important. The slow start-up of programmes and the cumulated delays highlight this issue. The institutional, administrative, political and strategic causes of delay have been mentioned frequently above and are not all related to regional policy, but often derive from national weaknesses. The incentive system introduced can contribute to a more efficient management of resources, but its influence on the current implementation of policy is still not evident. However, its experimental value is significant and its performance needs to be monitored and seen in relation to a new definition of programming based on targets instead of a long list of interventions and the introduction of conditionality dependent on context indicators.



Diminishing attention to governance is also evident in the management of programming (e.g. in monitoring delays and evaluation weakness), and the formal compliance with efficiency rules is often insufficient. The lack of independent evaluation of the NSRF does not facilitate debate on implementation delays and identification of the main problems and possible solutions.

In conclusion, ERDF interventions in Convergence regions is fundamental to maintaining an adequate level of public investment and in some areas (R&D, transport, education, energy) appreciable effects can be expected if implementation proceeds without major problems. In other areas (business competitiveness, tourism, the environment, urban development), results can be significant, but to produce critical effects an increasing effort needs to be made to define coherent strategies, efficient means of implementation and good governance. The limits identified in the ex-post 2000–2006 evaluation (fragmentation, poor coherence of interventions and lack of targeting of development drivers) remain risks in the current period.

### **Competitiveness**

In Competitiveness regions, the main results expected are in RTDI. Here, the financial and strategic added value of EU policy is important and meets the development and innovation policy needs in these regions. The potential effects stem from support to private investment in this regard, but also from the creation of growth poles to spread innovation among SMEs. Not all the regions are at the same stage in this process, but the concentration of ERDF on this aspect and the eagerness of businesses to take up funding can produce significant results. It is too early to assess the contribution of ERDF to the restructuring of companies in the Centre–northern regions and, in any case, its success will depend on macroeconomic circumstances and the nature of national policy, but it is an important means of funding regional projects and testing new research structures.

A second potential important contribution of the ERDF concerns energy. EU resources are limited, but they add to national incentives and focus development policy on this strategic factor. They are not sufficient to ensure a significant shift in the mix of energy sources in regions with high energy intensity, but can help to launch important initiatives in this direction.

On other aspects of ROPs (transport, urban and environmental regeneration, the cultural heritage and tourism) expected effects are more limited reflecting the small amount of available resources. Effects will depend on local conditions and the efficiency with which measures are implemented. In Competitiveness regions, local interventions have only a minor risk of fragmentation because they are generally included in well–designed strategies or long–term recovery plans.

### **Territorial cooperation**

Results are very limited, but in the Centre–northern programmes activities have started and show progress in all the main policy areas. The importance of continuity with the past is probably the most evident result, which confirms the capacity of border programmes to generate fruitful cooperation which can be readily extended from one programming period to the next. It is too early to identify area where the effects of cooperation are likely to be largest, but support for RTDI and environmental protection have the most immediate returns due to their features (the international dimension of R&D and the trans–national scale of environmental problems). For the southern programmes, however, implementation still has to begin and the potential effects are uncertain. Indeed, the main result could be limited to defining a viable cooperation strategy.

## **SECTION 4 – EVALUATIONS AND GOOD PRACTICE IN EVALUATION**

In Italy, evaluations are organised according to the evaluation plans. The 2007–2013 NSRF identifies the plan as the main means of stimulating evaluation questions, defining the evaluations to be undertaken and their implementation. The NSRF specifies the need for ex–ante, ongoing and ex post assessment of the effects of regional development policy. Evaluations have to pursue interrelated objectives: cognitive (collecting data and information on the effects and results of policies) and decision–support (providing policy makers with the necessary information and assessments).

In addition, the NSRF proposes a unitary approach to the evaluation of EU and national programmes. In line with this unitary approach, the NSRF stipulate the need to assess "*the combined effects of different actions, also relating to various programmes, on the same territory and on the actual services offered by public institutions*". It also requires evaluation to be undertaken of interventions in the previous programming periods, in order to provide guidance for the implementation of current interventions. Contrary to what happened in the past, the NSRF leaves each authority free to determine the timing, the issues to be examined, the type (on–going, ex post, impact evaluation), and the form (internal or independent) of the evaluations to be carried out. This approach is in line with the Regulations and DG Regio proposals at the beginning of the programming period. It should provide a wider range of knowledge than in the past, extend the use of the evaluation in national policies and better integrate evaluation into decision–making processes.

In the evaluation plans, an additional distinction is made between potential evaluations: a first set of evaluations is defined as “operational” and includes research aimed at supporting implementation procedures and decisions; a second set is defined as “strategic” and includes

thematic or wide scope analysis aimed at supporting strategic and long-term choices<sup>22</sup>. In practice, this division<sup>23</sup> separates traditional programme analysis (more formal and with few specific evaluation questions) and thematic evaluations (more flexible in the objectives and focused on specific themes and, sometimes, shifting towards sectoral advice<sup>24</sup>).

In addition, in Italy, there are extensive academic and other studies undertaken on the Mezzogiorno which tend to focus on territorial disparities and represent important analyses of the regional policies pursued. For present purposes evaluation activity is divided into the programme evaluations commissioned by the Managing Authorities and the academic and other studies on regional policies.

As regards the former and on the basis of a survey carried in July 2010 of the evaluation units of the authorities involved, two contracts for independent evaluations have been assigned at national level (Transport and Security NOPs) but no evaluation reports have been published (i.e. are publicly available) up to mid 2010<sup>25</sup>. At regional level, some Italian Regions launched calls for tender for evaluation in 2009 and 2010<sup>26</sup> or have launched internal evaluations, the findings of which are not yet available. In 2011 the central evaluation unit (UVAL of DPS) intends to launch a self-evaluation among the MAs to determine progress in the present programming period<sup>27</sup>.

Both at national and regional level, the Managing Authorities who launched evaluations are devoting particular attention to the *ex-post* evaluation of the 2000–2006 interventions, as indicated in the evaluation plans, though delays in the launching of these and the increasing urgency to implement measures are reducing the relevance of this kind of evaluation.

In practice, at mid-term, very few evaluation reports are available on the current programming period. Even if many activities have started, only the “*ex-ante*” evaluations have as yet been concluded.

Accordingly, the evaluation plans are not producing concrete outputs and the significant delays in the implementation of the OPs are not being assessed, with a consequent lack of accountability and support to the decision-making process. On the contrary, delays in the

---

<sup>22</sup> This division reflects the classification proposed in a different way by Regulations and Dg Regio, but it puts major emphasis on the difference between analysis of the progress of the programme (operational) and analysis of some parts or strategy of the programme (strategic). On the contrary, the initial differentiation in the EC documents was more oriented to the reasons of the evaluation (ordinary and extraordinary) instead of to its objectives.

<sup>23</sup> At the moment in some call for tenders launched in the last months on ERDF programmes and in the ESF evaluations, which have been more diffused till now.

<sup>24</sup> See, for instance, the call for tender on a thematic evaluation on energy interventions in the Marche ROP.

<sup>25</sup> Even if the independent evaluation of the Transport NOP was carried out in 2009.

<sup>26</sup> Abruzzo, Emilia-Romagna, Lazio, Lombardia, Marche, Piemonte, Sardegna, Valle d'Aosta.

<sup>27</sup> A similar experience was carried out in 2000–2006 with good results in terms of general and diffused information on progress, but limited effects in terms of learning as the current evolution of the OPs is confirming.

implementation of programmes are leading evaluations being postponed. Evaluations run the risk of being relegated to formalities and of not being considered as providing important support to policy.

Table G below shows evaluations and studies are beginning in many regions. The information it contains is not complete and standardised and might understate the situation. There might be additional activities underway, but evaluation plans are not updated regularly and not all the evaluations completed are made public.

The situation is patchy. In some regions, evaluations have been launched and internal and independent evaluators are at work, while in others only some authorities are implementing evaluations. In yet others (Toscana, Friuli Venezia Giulia, Trento) no information is available.

External programme evaluations are, in these cases, the specifications of the calls for tenders launched have followed traditional approaches, essentially: context analysis, effectiveness and efficiency of the interventions and analysis of implementation mechanisms as well as of particular themes. At present, external thematic evaluations as well as internal evaluations are often focused on the effects of the past programming period and tend to be focused on enterprise support, innovation and environmental policy. Some interesting examples of territorial approaches are found in Molise and Emilia-Romagna. As compared with the previous period, internal evaluations are becoming much more common and some regions do not plan to have any independent evaluation at all (such as Calabria).

Although references to impact evaluations are widespread in the evaluation plans, significant studies are still to be implemented. In general, this approach is adopted most frequently in respect of enterprise support. Up to now, there is little methodological attention paid to case studies or other qualitative methods.

As mentioned, only very few evaluations of the current programming period have been completed. More significant reports will probably be available only in 2011. The Annual Evaluation Report of ROP Competitiveness 2007–2013 of Lombardia was completed at the end of 2009. The report focuses on the implementation of the ROP as at 30 June 2009 and on a preliminary analysis of the planning system's capacity to meet the needs of enterprises and public and private research organisations. The evaluator shows that there is no significant evidence of effects and that it is necessary to wait for the programme to advance further before these are likely to emerge.

Table G –State of evaluations in Italy (information as at October 2010)

Region	External Evaluation		Internal Evaluation
	Programme evaluation	Thematic evaluation	Different types of evaluation
<b>CONVERGENCE</b>			
Basilicata			Experimental 2000–06 regional programme for active citizenship (completed)
Calabria		Fourth update of the on-going evaluation 2000–2006 (funded with 2000–06 resources, completed but not in the website)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Analysis of policy of waste's treatment 2000–2006 (on going)</li> <li>Ex post evaluation on policies for urban areas and networks of municipalities 2000–2006 (on going)</li> <li>Planned– Evaluation on initiatives for environment protection (on going)</li> </ul>
Campania		Ex post evaluation on incentives for enterprises, energy, environment, R&D (planned)	Ex post evaluations on ITPs 2000–2006 and school abandon (planned)
Puglia		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effects of 2000–2006 local development ITPs (assigned)</li> <li>Effects of 2000–2006 of R&amp;D policy (planned)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implementation of RUPAR (completed)</li> <li>Evaluation on initiatives concerning cultural activities, tourism and natural reserves 2007–2013 (on-going)</li> <li>Ex post evaluation on governance model 2000–2006 (planned)</li> </ul>
Sicilia		Two impact evaluations of 2000–06 on R&D and aid scheme interventions (call for tender to be assigned)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluation on ITPs 2000–2006 (on-going)</li> <li>Analysis on achievements on regional transport 2000–2006 (on-going)</li> </ul>
POIN Energia	Call for tender (CFT) to be assigned		
PON Trasporti	Assigned		
PON Ricerca e Competitività		Impact evaluation on industrial research projects of 2000–2006 OP (funded on 2000–06 resources and completed)	
PON Sicurezza	Assigned	Ex post evaluation OP Security 2000–2006 (completed, but not available in the website)	
NSRF (UVAL –DPS)		Ex-post evaluation of environment and water 2000–2006 interventions (planned)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Personal services in the rural areas of Calabria (completed in 2009)</li> <li>Infrastructures and public procurement: rules and public market (completed)</li> <li>Territorial disparities in social capital (on-going)</li> <li>Analysis of the ITPs in the 2000–2006 period (completed)</li> </ul>
<b>COMPETITIVENESS</b>			
Abruzzo	Assigned		
Bolzano	Assigned		
Emilia-Romagna	Assigned	Assessment and international benchmarking of innovation poles (assigned)	“Born by combination. Key resources and tools for the setting up of local public goods in the rural areas of Emilia-Romagna” (completed and available)
Lazio		Some thematic evaluations in preparation	
Liguria	CFT to be assigned		
Lombardia	Assigned		

Region	External Evaluation		Internal Evaluation
	Programme evaluation	Thematic evaluation	Different types of evaluation
Marche		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thematic evaluations on: energy, innovation, equal opportunity in 2007–13 interventions (assigned)</li> <li>Evaluation of measure 1.2.1 2000–2006 SPD – Guarantee fund (completed)</li> </ul>	
Molise		“Il Molise e la programmazione: la crescita economica e sociale del territorio attraverso la valutazione degli interventi regionali, nazionali e comunitari attuati nel periodo 1994–2006” (study completed in 2008 and available)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Report on the activity of a Guarantee Fund (completed)</li> </ul>
Piemonte	Assigned		
Sardegna		Macroeconomic regional model KLEM (CfT to be assigned)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluation on achievements on urban policy 2000–2006 (on-going)</li> <li>Evaluation on effects of regional policies concerning scientific research and technological innovation towards enterprises 1994–2006</li> <li>Evaluation on effects of regional policies in fighting school abandon (on-going)</li> </ul>
Umbria		Final evaluation report and thematic analyses on integrated 2000–2006 projects in agro-food and tourism (funded with 2000–2006 resources and completed)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Analysis of the 2002–2008 aids to enterprises for RTDI and ICT (completed)</li> </ul>
Valle d'Aosta	CfT to be assigned	Final evaluation of the obj.2 2000–2006 SPD (completed in 2008 and funded with 2000–06 resources)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluation of the unitary regional policy (completed in 2009)</li> </ul>
Veneto	Assigned		
<b>TERRITORIAL COOPERATION</b>			
PO Italia Svizzera	Assigned		
PO Italia – Austria	Assigned		

As regards the studies on regional policy, among the most interesting are “*South of Italy and regional policies*”<sup>28</sup> and “*The Integrated Territorial Projects in the 2000–2006 Objective 1 CSF – Theories, facts and views on local development policy*”<sup>29</sup>.

The former is an important overview of regional policies in the South of Italy, which sets out to update knowledge about the persistent lagging behind of the region and to open up again a debate on the policy to tackle the “*questione meridionale*”. “*South of Italy and Regional Policy*” collects together and summarises different studies coordinated by the Bank of Italy in recent years on the territorial aspects of the Italian economy. The study reaches some important conclusions, which echo in the political and economic debate:

- the results of EU policies for territorial cohesion have not come up to expectations, in macroeconomic, social microeconomic terms;
- the failure of the new regional policy is related to the difficulties encountered by Italian economic policy in the past 15 years and can be attributed to two main factors: the fact that national policies were implemented differently in the regions, giving rise to asymmetric territorial effects, which generally manifest themselves in a lower quality of public expenditure in the South and the limited effect of direct incentives for private investment, which had no significant impact on employment and productivity. This last conclusion is supported by several impact evaluations.

The policy implications of the study are important and suggest the need for national reforms to modify the traditional delays in the South (defining national standards for public services, improving basic and universal services such as education, improving security and justice). In addition, direct support to investment needs to be replaced by public goods and a policy more oriented towards the enterprise environment. In the debate which followed in the main national newspapers, experts emphasised different aspects of the results: some proposed to transfer funds for development to ‘ordinary’ policy and fund basic public services, others stressed the necessity of a definitive federal reform to ensure clearer political ownership of, and administrative responsibility for, development policy.

The study on *Integrated Territorial Projects (ITP) in the 2000–2006 Objective 1* is aimed at “locating” ITPs in the broader national and international debate on local development policies. The analysis is mainly based on direct interviews and case studies. Some results of this analysis contrast with the conventional views expressed in the recent debates on local economic development policy: the overall commitment to local development has been relatively modest in financial terms; ITPs did not experience implementation difficulties greater than those of the

---

<sup>28</sup> Bank of Italy, November 2009

<sup>29</sup> T. Bianchi, P. Casavola, Ministry of Economic Development, Department of Development Policies, Unit of Evaluations of Public Investments, November 2008

broader programmes to which they belonged; the design and implementation of the projects have never been entirely devolved to local actors. The study affirms that a real effort to identify strategies tailored to local needs was made with the contribution of many participants and especially public institutions. However, not all the components of these strategies have proceeded coherently and in a timely way due to the persistent sectoral separation of responsibilities within institutions and the different ambitions of those responsible. In order to intervene appropriately, it is necessary to increase knowledge of the nature and functioning of local communities. The study does not contradict the criticisms of the TIP (fragmentation, poor strategic framework, low quality of the projects), but it includes them in a more appropriate institutional and administrative context and to identify possible ways of improving local development actions.

Even if it is too early to have a representative sample of evaluations, some examples of good practice in evaluation can be identified in the ex-post 2000–06 exercise and in academic studies.

Among the latter it is worth mentioning research on the effectiveness of the Structural Funds in Europe<sup>30</sup>, which through a counterfactual approach and a regression technique verifies their effectiveness in EU regions. Other studies<sup>31</sup> have examined the impact of aid schemes for investment and research and experimented with advanced techniques for control groups and counterfactual analysis. In many cases their results are debatable because the information available and the variables chosen to verify impact were not always adequate. However, the contribution of these studies to highlighting the large deadweight costs of many generic forms of support to enterprises is notable.

Among the ex-post evaluations, some interesting examples were included in the final evaluation on industrial research projects of the 2000–2006 R&D NOP and in the intermediate evaluation of the competitiveness NOP. A counterfactual approach was used in the first case, adapting cost benefit analysis to estimating the future effects of research and in the second case implementing a survey of around 5,000 assisted firms and a control group and analysing a sample of them.

---

<sup>30</sup> F. Busillo, T. Muccigrosso, G. Pellegrini, O. Tarola, F. Terribile “Measuring the Impact of the European Regional Policy on Economic Growth: a Regression Discontinuity Design Approach”. January, 2010. Working paper n.8/2010, Dipartimento di teoria economica e metodi quantitative per le scelte politiche, Università La Sapienza Roma.

<sup>31</sup> These are only some of the studies on policy impact developed in recent time especially in R&D and enterprise policy field: Bronzini, R. and de Blasio, G. (2006), “Evaluating the impact of investment incentives: the case of Italy’s law 488/92”, Bank of Italy, Research Dept. Bronzini, R. and Iachini, E. (2009), “Are incentives for R&D effective? Evidence from a regression discontinuity approach”, Bank of Italy, Dept. of Structural Studies. De Blasio, G., Fantino, D. and Pellegrini, G. (2010), “Evaluating the impact of innovation incentives: evidence from an unexpected shortage of funds”, Bank of Italy.



Another interesting evaluation was carried out on the rural areas of Emilia–Romagna analysing the local development processes activated by different interventions<sup>32</sup>. A further evaluation of the IC services provided to the public administration in Puglia<sup>33</sup> was interesting for its detailed analysis of the difficulties encountered by these services, which continue to be funded in the present programming period. The results of evaluations of 2000–2006 interventions in education and R&D have been used to develop and strengthen them in the current period.

## SECTION 5 – CONCLUDING REMARKS – FUTURE CHALLENGES

**Productivity recovery and exit from the crisis** – By definition structural policy has a long term horizon and should not be affected by short–term cyclical fluctuations in the economy, but the current crisis and the persistent difficulties of the Italian economy are structural in nature and consequently have to be addressed by Cohesion Policy interventions. The way in which policy tackles these problems will be the measure of its success. If the interventions do not take account of on–going changes in society and in the productive system, their effects will be limited. The strategy as set out initially recognises many of these issues, which are generally related to: globalisation, such as the increasing exposure to competition and the consequent need to develop new areas of specialisation and the knowledge economy; the more limited role of the state implied by the need to reduce public debt; and accordingly the increase in efficiency required, and the need to develop human and physical resources in lagging regions in a sustainable and competitive way.

Tackling these challenges effectively depends not only on the implementation of the NSRF, but also on the coherent development of other national policies and on a common understanding of the complexity and importance of the challenges. This requires regional policy to be implemented effectively and consistently: In this respect, strategic reflection on the next three years is important to speed up the implementation process, update the strategy and strengthen the governance around a few main targets. The official document due on the Government’s regional policy is an opportunity for this reflection.

**Governance and capacity building** – Many different aspects are included under the broad umbrella of policy governance and many of these need attention. Planning capacity is weak and feasible projects are insufficient to increase expenditure and achievements within a short space of time. It is necessary to invest in making the required improvements. In addition, external technical assistance should be more oriented to planning and simplification of implementation

---

<sup>32</sup> Evaluation Unit of Emilia–Romagna and ERVET “Born by combination. Key resources and tools for the setting up of local public goods in the rural areas of Emilia–Romagna” 2008.

<sup>33</sup> Nucleo valutazione regionale “Ricerca valutativa sugli effetti della realizzazione della Rete Unitaria della Regione Puglia (RUPAR)”, 2008.

rather than to carrying out routine activities which can be undertaken by internal personnel. This last aspect calls for better organisation of the implementation system, which requires knowledge of planning, technical aspects of the interventions and leadership. In particular, coordination between authorities is crucial both for multilevel governance and for inter-departmental cooperation (between departments in the same region, regions in the same OP, and local authorities responsible for the same intervention). This last point has often been the cause of delays in the start-up of interventions. The recent transfer of the coordination unit (DPS) to the Prime Minister's office can reinforce coordination if accompanied by a general commitment of all the authorities involved<sup>34</sup>. As regards governance, there is a need to impose a conditional, or "carrot and stick", approach to the relationships between authorities. There have been interesting experiments with regard to national funds, but the delay in the implementation of the ERDF requires additional and immediate measures. The European Commission can play an important role in this regard in the coming years.

**Evidence on results** – the information and evidence available on results is scarce compared to the past programming period at the same stage. A quicker implementation of monitoring and evaluation is necessary to produce evidence and to identify the possible bottlenecks. A special effort is required with respect to evaluations, and an evaluation of all the OPs, independently from the theme or programme, should be implemented in the coming year if at all possible, to have fresh and well-structured evidence of the achievements. The launch of an evaluation of this sort is also urgent in order to encourage more methodologically complex analyses, such as impact evaluation and in-depth case studies, which require time and organisation. It is worth noting that attention to results does not depend on monitoring and evaluation only. The concentration of resources on significant, strategic and effective projects must be pursued as well.

---

<sup>34</sup> Giving increasing attention to federal reform of the state is fundamental to the development prospects of the country, but they have not to obstruct a constant and diffused effort to promote current public investment.

## REFERENCES

Annual Implementation Reports 2008 and 2009 (where available).

Bianchi T., Casavola P. (2008), "I Progetti Integrati Territoriali del QCS Obiettivo 1 2000–2006 – Teorie, fatti e riflessioni sulla policy per lo sviluppo locale", Unit of Evaluations of Public Investments, Department of Development Policies, Ministry of Economic Development.

Brandolini A., Bugamelli M. (2008), Rapporto sulle tendenze nel sistema produttivo italiano, Banca di Italia.

Bronzini, R. and De Blasio, G. (2006), "Evaluating the impact of investment incentives: the case of Italy's law 488/92", Bank of Italy, Research Department.

Bronzini, R. and Iachini, E. (2009), "Are incentives for R&D effective? Evidence from a regression discontinuity approach", Bank of Italy, Department of Structural Studies.

Busillo F., Muccigrosso T., Pellegrini G., Tarola O., Terribile F. (2010) "Measuring the Impact of the European Regional Policy on Economic Growth: a Regression Discontinuity Design Approach". Working paper n.8/2010, Dipartimento di teoria economica e metodi quantitative per le scelte politiche, Università La Sapienza Roma.

Cannari L., Magnani M., Pellegrini G. (2009), "Quali politiche per il Sud? Il ruolo delle politiche nazionali e regionali nell'ultimo decennio", in "Mezzogiorno e politiche regionali", Bank of Italy, Research Department.

De Blasio, G., Fantino, D. and Pellegrini, G. (2010), "Evaluating the impact of innovation incentives: evidence from an unexpected shortage of funds", Bank of Italy.

Cohesion Policy ex-post evaluation for DG Regio (2009) Work package 1 – Coordination; Task 4 – Country reports: Italy (drafted by Ismeri Europa).

Evaluation Unit of Emilia-Romagna and ERVET (2008) "Born by combination. Key resources and tools for the setting up of local public goods in the rural areas of Emilia-Romagna".

Bianchi T., Casavola P. (2008), "I Progetti Integrati Territoriali del QCS Obiettivo 1 2000–2006 – Teorie, fatti e riflessioni sulla policy per lo sviluppo locale", Unit of Evaluations of Public Investments, Department of Development Policies, Ministry of Economic Development

Expert Italia, Gruppo Clas, (2009), "Annual Evaluation Report of ROP Competitiveness 2007–2013 – Lombardia Region".

Nucleo valutazione regionale (2008) "Ricerca valutativa sugli effetti della realizzazione della Rete Unitaria della Regione Puglia (RUPAR)".

Rapporto annuale di valutazione (2009) del programma operativo FESR 2007–2013 della Regione Lombardia.

Unit of Evaluations of Public Investments, Department of Development Policies, Ministry of Economic Development, (2009), “Obiettivi di Servizio: stato di avanzamento per la verifica intermedia 2009”.

Unit of Evaluations of Public Investments, Department of Development Policies, Ministry of Economic Development (2008), “Orientamenti per l’organizzazione della valutazione della politica regionale: il piano di valutazione”.

## **INTERVIEWS**

Jolanda Anselmo – Uval (Dipartimento Politiche di Sviluppo)

Sabina De Luca –Coordination of structural funds (Dipartimento Politiche di Sviluppo)

Simona De Luca – Uval (Dipartimento Politiche di Sviluppo)

Paolo Praticò – Responsabile Uval (Dipartimento Politiche di Sviluppo)

Saverio Romano – Igrue – Ministero dell’Economia

Massimo Sabatini – Confindustria

Laura Tagle – Uval (Dipartimento Politiche di Sviluppo)

## **TABLES**

See Excel file for Tables 1, 2 and 3

Table 1: Regional disparities and trends

Table 2: Macro-economic developments

Table 3: Financial allocation by main policy area

## Annex Table A – Summary of the achievements – Convergence

ANNEX TABLE A1 CONVERGENCE – Enterprise support, including assistance to large firms, SMEs and handicrafts, RTDI

OP	Financial (exp./alloc.)	Physical indicators COMPLETED	Physical Indicators OVERALL TARGETS	Notes
<b>Puglia</b>	7.2%	Local development systems: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2,700 funded enterprises (target 26,667);</li> <li>• 16,000 Sqm (target 12,800,000 sqm).</li> </ul>	R&I: 717 projects. Local development systems: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 36,867 projects (75 to spread ICT);</li> <li>• 12,800,000 sqm.</li> </ul>	3 call for tenders published in December 2008 for R&D and ICT in businesses (total value of EUR106 million)
<b>Sicilia</b>	7.5%	Local development systems: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3,200 Sqm (target 200,000 sqm.)</li> <li>• 1,015 funded enterprises (target 3,000)</li> </ul>	RTDI: 790 projects; Local development system: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3,136 projects;</li> <li>• 200,000 Sqm.</li> <li>• 120 SMEs linked with ICT services</li> </ul>	
<b>Calabria</b>	IS:15.5%  Local dev. system: 12,3%	Local development systems: 2 projects to financial support (target 2).	RTDI: 854 projects; IS: 697 projects, Local development systems: 677 projects.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Started the financing of the call for tender launched in 2008 on applied research and innovation</li> <li>• Created a guarantee fund for SME (EUR 51.6 million);</li> <li>IS – projects launched: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 portals (target 15); 1 telemedicine project (target 20); 1 public network broadband (target 5);</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Campania</b>	6,6%	No achievements	Local development systems: 1,897 projects;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jeremie Fund: EUR 80 million</li> <li>• Initiative “Campus for industrial research and development's projects” (EUR 50 million);</li> <li>• Funded initiatives regarding Regional Projects' Park (EUR 109.6 million) and Package of facilitations for innovation (EUR 49.7 million);</li> </ul>
<b>Basilicata</b>	23,3%.	No achievements	R&I: 311 projects; Local development systems: 198 prj. 100 private projects for ICT investments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Launched the construction of the Industry Campus</li> <li>• Created a guarantee fund for SME (EUR 35 million)</li> </ul>
<b>PON Ricerca Competitività</b>	Axis 1 – Structural changes 3.3%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 60 R&amp;D projects (target 160)</li> <li>• 66 collaborations enterprises – public research bodies (target 480)</li> <li>• 23 public–private laboratories (target 10);</li> <li>• 32 training courses (target 140)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 9,289 projects.</li> </ul>	Funded projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 46 Public and private laboratories;</li> <li>• 45 support for industrial research;</li> </ul>
	Axis 2 – Support to innovation 17.8%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 52 innovation projects (target 720)</li> <li>• 26 high–tech foreign investments (target 22);</li> <li>• 1 guarantee fund support (target 8);</li> <li>• 100 individual stages (target 12,000)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 16,410 projects.</li> </ul>	

ANNEX TABLE A2 CONVERGENCE – Human Resources

OP	Financial (exp./alloc.)	Physical indicators COMPLETED	Physical Indicators OVERALL TARGETS	Notes
<b>Puglia</b>		No achievements	668 projects;	Funded projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 89 projects for health infrastructures (total value EUR 1.305.997,50);</li> <li>• 119 projects for the creation of social-educational services and structures for children (total value EUR 56.485.171,45);</li> </ul>
<b>Sicilia</b>		No achievements		
<b>Calabria</b>		No achievements	246 projects;	Calabria's Region has launched projects to create Integrated Plan of regional development "Progetti Pilota per una Scuola Accogliente, Moderna, Aperta" and it is realizing a Portal of Education in agreement with the Piemonte Region (total value EUR 400.000)
<b>Campania</b>		No achievements		
<b>Basilicata</b>	10,30%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 77 projects concerning the structural and useful development of school buildings (target 40);</li> </ul>	226 projects;	Started: 18 projects to build infrastructures for social-health services, social- care services and social-educational services;
<b>PON Learning environments</b>	Axis 1 – Information and Knowledge Society 19,72%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 projects to create local networks in schools and CTP (target 2.300);</li> <li>• 1731 Technological equipment in schools (target 3.700);</li> <li>• 2.185 projects for learning science, math, ect (target 4500);</li> <li>• 186 Laboratories (target 1080);</li> <li>• 5 projects to empower and develop centres of knowledge acquisition and their links on network (target 150);</li> </ul>	11.730 projects;	Signed projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1.408 funded projects to create local networks in schools and CTP;</li> <li>• 3.938 Technological equipment in schools</li> <li>• 6.422 projects for learning science, math, etc</li> <li>• 1075 laboratories;</li> <li>• 5 projects to empower and develop centres of knowledge acquisition and their links on network</li> </ul>
	Axis 2 – Quality of school environment	No achievements	8.050 projects;	Planned projects after the agreement between MIUR and Environmental Ministry.

ANNEX TABLE A3 – CONVERGENCE – Transport and Telecommunications

OP	Financial (exp./alloc.)	Physical indicators COMPLETED	Physical Indicators OVERALL TARGETS	Notes
<b>Puglia</b>	9,90%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3 projects for improving railway for around 20km</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>34 projects;</li> <li>150 mq;</li> <li>170 Km;</li> <li>14 projects on digital infrastructures and 10 on transmission services</li> </ul>	<p>Started projects: 14 concernong urban and railway transport;</p> <p>Funded projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2 empowerment of transport system in urban area;</li> <li>1 logistic–transport empowerment of Bari’s road–rail hub;</li> <li>16 for adjustment and empowerment of local railways</li> </ul>
<b>Sicilia</b>	7,48%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7 extension projects (target 13);</li> <li>7 Km secondary roads (target 35);</li> <li>30 car parks created (target 2500)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2534 projects;</li> <li>370 Km;</li> <li>40 projects concerning start up of ICT services, e–government and e–health;</li> </ul>	<p>Launched projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parking in Messina (EUR 6.9 million)</li> <li>Jessica (EUR 9.6 million)</li> <li>Jeremie (EUR 63.3 million)</li> </ul>
<b>Calabria</b>	9,93%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 for regional airport (target 9);</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>115 projects;</li> <li>IS: 100 e–government; 30 e–procurement system</li> </ul>	<p>Started projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 project on cross communication roads (target 9);</li> <li>4 projects in accessibility of internal areas (target 20)</li> <li>IS: 3 portals (target 15); 1 telemedicine project (target 20); 1 public network broadband (target 5);</li> </ul>
<b>Campania</b>	Transport; 4,5% IS: 1,8%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>0,34 Km railway (target 2km);</li> <li>IS: no acievements;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>120 Km roads;</li> <li>Ml. 1.680 platform’s length</li> <li>8,400 car parking spces</li> <li>49 projects;</li> <li>IS: 270 projects;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IS: 21 funded projects;</li> <li>Delays in transport sector caused by segmentation of objectives in Transport Axis, according to AIR;</li> </ul>
<b>Basilicata</b>	21,67%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2 projects, total 15 km;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2Km;</li> <li>8 projects;</li> <li>IS: 100 broad– band;20 wireless networks;15 to empower installations,20 projects RUPAR;10 interactive services;</li> </ul>	
<b>PON Reti e Mobilità</b>	Development of transport 4,08%	No achievements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>521.822 mq;</li> <li>1.141.972 mc;</li> <li>20 projects;</li> <li>684 km;</li> <li>2.713 mtl;</li> </ul>	<p>In December 2009, 48 selected projects, amounting to 93% of all programme funding: 19 scheduled by PON; 8 before the approval of “Selection criteria”; 4 (co–financed by PON Trasporti 2000–2006); 1 involving transport hub; 3 concerning road way (2 Large projects); 13 about TA.</p>
	Improvement of connections between main logistic nodes and hubs 7,50%	No achievements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>12 projects;</li> <li>809 km;</li> <li>100% VTS TEN goods port in Convergence area;</li> </ul>	<p>Proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Road–rail hub in Catania;</li> <li>Road–rail hub in Bari “Lamasinata”</li> </ul>

ANNEX TABLE A4 CONVERGENCE – Energy and Environment

OP	Financial (exp./alloc.)	Physical indicators COMPLETED	Physical Indicators OVERALL TARGETS	Notes
<b>Puglia</b>	5,6%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3 projects to prevent natural risks (target 77);</li> <li>2 projects (target 800) concerning cycle of waste and land reclamation –2kmq.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2922 projects;</li> <li>574 km;</li> </ul>	Started: 36 projects to avoid hydro–geological damage;
<b>Sicilia</b>	5,6%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>11,57 ha land reclaimed (target 22,000 ha);</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>85 projects;</li> <li>1250 km;</li> <li>22.040 ha;</li> <li>200 Mw;</li> </ul>	Funded projects: 60 concerning “Regional plan of land reclaim” (EUR 1.8 million)
<b>Calabria</b>	Energy: 8,1%  Water resources: 14,6%  Reclaim polluted area: 17.0%;	Energy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>245 information and experimental projects;</li> </ul> Environment: <i>Water resources sector:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>53 km network of urban water pipeline (target 215 km);</li> <li>30 km of sewer pipe (target 80 km);</li> </ul>	Energy: 26 projects; 32.229 mq; 65,35 MW; Environment: <i>Water resources:</i> 240 Projects; 295 km; <i>Land and coast safety:</i> 246 projects; 10500 training days; <i>Waste management:</i> 636 projects; <i>Reclaim polluted area:</i> 374 projects; <i>Environment:</i> 212 projects;	Energy: started 304 information, exhibition and experimental projects. <u>Environment:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Water resources, started: 32 projects to build a drinking water delivery network (target 190); 12 purification projects;</li> <li>Waste management: 2 systems (target 5);</li> <li>Land and coast safety, started: 10 projects to save costal erosion area and rebuild shores (target 20); 1 weather–implementation system (target 1);</li> <li>Reclaim polluted area, started: 2 polluted areas (target 150); 4 geological security (target 45); 43 on environmental reclamation (target 45);</li> <li>Environment sustainable, started: 5 projects ( expected target 20);</li> <li>Call for tender energy saving and containment of pollution (EUR 23 million)</li> </ul>
<b>Campania</b>	–	No achievements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>43 projects;</li> </ul>	Region intends to lunch a Plan of renewable energy and energy efficiency in the near future (AIR)
<b>Basilicata</b>	16,3%		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>147 projects;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Started project to restore hydraulic functionality of waterway;</li> <li>In definition: System for waste treatment; Projects to develop and implement advanced technological system to manage water resources;</li> </ul>
<b>PON Renewable energy and energy saving</b>	Axis 1 – Energy production from renewable sources: 6,9%	No information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>235 projects;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Started projects to support the production of energy from renewable sources;</li> <li>Created a financial reserve in Guarantee Fund to SMEs in convergence area (value POI EUR 96 million).</li> </ul>
	Axis 2 – Energy efficiency and improvement of energy system: 5,5%	No information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>520 projects;</li> <li>120 km;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The empowerment and adaptation of transport networks in order to spread renewable sources and micro–small cogeneration, started: planning and administrative activities for the implementation of 4 projects in convergence areas interested in photovoltaic systems;</li> </ul>



ANNEX TABLE A5 CONVERGENCE – Territorial development

OP	Financial (exp./alloc.)	Physical indicators COMPLETED	Physical Indicators – OVERALL TARGETS	Notes
<b>Puglia</b>	19,3%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 47 projects (target 306);</li> <li>• 25 projects for re-launching tourism</li> <li>• 22 projects for tourist promotion;</li> <li>• 44 cultural heritage projects (target 122);</li> </ul>	663 projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regional district has defined projects to outline “Programma stralcio di interventi Area Vasta”, funding EUR 340 million.</li> <li>• In December 2009, identified 10 programmes stralcio Area Vasta.</li> </ul>
<b>Sicilia</b>	Cultural heritage: 4.9% Sustainable urban development: 4.0%	Promotion of cultural identities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 projects for urban sites (target 110);</li> </ul> Sustainable urban development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 projects for new structures (target 20);</li> <li>• 2 adjustment project (target 55);</li> </ul>	437 projects;	
<b>Calabria</b>	Urban areas sector: 1,5%.	Sustainable tourism sector: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 16 projects to promote regional tourist products and services (target 30);</li> </ul> Urban areas sector: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 environmental retraining in the areas interested by flow of tourists (target 20);</li> <li>• 4 areas and degraded public real estate (target 30);</li> </ul>	6686 projects; 280 Km;	Cultural heritage, started: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 17 projects for archaeological parks (target 60), 1 projects in Sibari;</li> <li>• 32 projects for historical sites (target 35), 22 castles and military fortifications (target 10);</li> <li>• 6 projects to achieve ICOM's standards (target 15);</li> <li>• 2 projects to promote investments in cultural tourism (target 50);</li> </ul> Local system, started: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7 projects in old towns (infrastructures and recovery) (target 30);</li> <li>Security and Legality funding EUR 60 million, and started :</li> <li>• 2 Projects “Sicurezza e legalità” and “Beni confiscati alla Criminalità Organizzata”;</li> </ul>
<b>Campania</b>	Territorial development: 4%  Urban development: 1,1%	Territorial development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 8 projects cultural heritage (target 70);</li> <li>• 3 tourist services (target 40);</li> <li>• 64 cultural events (target 80);</li> <li>• 15 projects for tourism promotion (target 25);</li> </ul> Urban development: 1 programme for urban renewal (18);	Territ. development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 150 Km<sup>2</sup>;</li> <li>• 250 Km;</li> <li>• 100 Mln.di m<sup>3</sup>/anno;</li> <li>• 1,156 projects;</li> </ul> Urban development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6,248 projects;</li> </ul>	Urban developmet: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jessica Fund, agreement between EIB and Campania's region in 25/03/2010.</li> <li>• During 2010, it is possible a review of asset of indicators and target of achievements.</li> </ul>
<b>Basilicata</b>	9.0%	Cultural and natural heritage: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 projects to promote cultural heritage (target 45);</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cultural heritage:129</li> <li>• Urban systems: 110</li> </ul>	Development of cultural and natural heritage, started: 2 projects for communication and marketing (target 45);
<b>POIN Cultural, natural pullers and tourism</b>	Axis 1 – Promote cultural, and natural attractors	No achievements	614 projects;	POIN was signed by CE in October 2008
	Axis 2 – Competitiveness of enterprises in tourism	No achievements	505 projects; EUR 10 million grants;	

OP	Financial (exp./alloc.)	Physical indicators COMPLETED	Physical Indicators - OVERALL TARGETS	Notes
PON Security	Axis 1 – Security for economic and entrepreneurial freedom 23,6%	No advancements	1222 projects;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>selected 29 projects of Video surveillance systems</li> <li>selected 2 data base to share data and information to fight illegal trade;</li> <li>selected 5 Projects for training;</li> </ul>
	Axis 2 – Spread of legality 0,4%	No advancements	5358 projects;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>selected 11 Data base, training projects, internet portal, social actions.</li> <li>selected 3 projects for information and orientation helpdesk and to create networks;</li> <li>selected 14 Projects to recovery confiscated real estates;</li> <li>selected 7 training for disadvantaged people and 2 Information systems;</li> <li>selected 5 Projects of urban–environment recovery</li> </ul>

## Annex Table B – Summary of the achievements – Competitiveness

ANNEX TABLE B1 COMPETITIVENESS – Enterprise support, including assistance to large firms, SMEs and handicrafts, RTDI

OP	Financial (exp./alloc.)	Physical indicators n COMPLETED	Physical Indicators – OVERALL TARGETS	Notes
<b>Abruzzo</b> <sup>35</sup>	–	No achievements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 266 innovative, industrial research and cooperative research projects;</li> <li>• 50 funded enterprises;</li> <li>• 6 guarantee funds;</li> <li>• 320 audit and technological transfer projects.</li> </ul>	At the end of 2008, the projects haven't been implemented.  Because of the earthquake of 2009, the Region has decided to implement European initiatives such as Jeremie, Jessica and Jasper to improve the regional economy <sup>36</sup> .
<b>Bolzano</b>	0,08%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 funded enterprise (Target 730);</li> <li>• 1 project (target 2);</li> <li>• 1 project for new financial services (target 3);</li> <li>• 1 funded enterprise on ICT (target 170);</li> </ul>	1,676 projects;	Launched: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project "Health and Nutrition",</li> <li>• 14 projects for innovative studies and services for SMEs,</li> </ul>
<b>Emilia-Romagna</b>	12.5%	Innovation: 522 funded enterprises (target 450)	Industrial research: 1,140 projects Innovation: 852 projects	<i>Industrial research</i> – Funded 10 tecnopoles for industrial research and technology transfers and 210 projects of cooperation between enterprises and public institutes (target 200)
<b>Friuli Venezia Giulia</b>	3,4%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 26 enterprises (target 935);</li> <li>• 26 R&amp;S projects (713);</li> <li>• 7 cooperation enterprises– research centres proj. (3);</li> </ul>	3,211 projects	
<b>Lazio</b>	12.2%	No achievements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1,955 projects;</li> <li>• EUR 200 million investments;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Call for tender on RTDI (350 demands for EUR 36 million, to be selected); and on renewable energy, local filieres (available EUR 79 million demanded EUR 284 million)</li> </ul>
<b>Lombardia</b>	33.5%	No achievements	3,390 projects;	Funded projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 42 projects RTDI cooperation between enterprises and research institutions (target 1200);</li> <li>• 42 projects of collaboration between enterprises for innovation (target 1400);</li> <li>• 3 financial engineering funds (FRIM FESR, Made in Lombardia, JEREMIE FESR) funded with EUR 88 million</li> </ul>

35 Data from AIR 2008.

36 Information from Master Plan Abruzzo 2009.

OP	Financial (exp./alloc.)	Physical indicators n COMPLETED	Physical Indicators – OVERALL TARGETS	Notes
Liguria	7,2%	14 innovation projects (target 2,100);	3,201 projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EUR 8 million to develop and promote broadband in Municipalities with "digital divide";</li> <li>• EUR 5 million funded for the implementation of data transmission services for the citizens and enterprises</li> </ul>
Marche	20,3%	No achievements	R&D / competitiv. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 941 projects;</li> </ul> IS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4.174.910 projects;</li> <li>• 100 (%) municipalities with broad band</li> </ul>	Launched/funded: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 124 R&amp;D projects (target 200); 55% R&amp;S projects involving enterprise's networks (15%); 460 projects to promote innovation and technological transfer to enterprises (target 700); 17% projects to innovation's product (target 40–50%); 56 enterprises have introduced eco–innovative process (target 20); 12 projects to support the building of innovative enterprises (target 25).</li> </ul> IS: 24 projects to support the use and spreading of ICT in entrepreneurship (target 90); Started: 3 project to promote industrial research; 3 projects to promote innovation
Molise	17,1%	No achievements	576 projects; EUR 28 million (R&S);	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Avviso GO" EUR 7 million to start-up of innovative enterprises and support to spin-off processes;</li> <li>• "Donna–Impresa" Project to support female entrepreneurship;</li> <li>• Guarantee Fund, POR FESR EUR 13 million.</li> </ul>
Piemonte	11.8%	No achievements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3,698 projects</li> <li>• EUR 400 million investments;</li> </ul>	Started: 35 RDT projects; 2 projects concerning innovation hubs; 110 industrial research projects; 47 projects aimed at delivering innovative information services; 151 projects aimed at using of innovative information services; 792 operations
Sardegna	51,5%	11 projects for requalification of industrial areas (target 600)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Competitiveness: 2814 projects;</li> <li>• IS: 101.175 projects;</li> </ul>	The financial progress largely depends on the funding of projects launched in the previous period
Trento	–	No achievements	Entrepreneurship sector: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 20 projects;</li> <li>• 50 beneficiary ICT: 50 funded enterprises;</li> </ul>	Call for tender: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Adozione di sistemi informatici per l'innovazione aziendale" started 53 projects</li> <li>• "Interventi attraverso partnership fra imprese ed organismi di ricerca" funded: 12 projects</li> <li>• "Sostegno alla creazione di iniziative imprenditoriali mediante seed money" funded: 23 projects</li> </ul>
Toscana	10.0%	No achievements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6,687 projects;</li> </ul>	Started: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 31 research private–public collaboration (target 100–110)</li> <li>• 110 investment projects (target 2700–2950);</li> <li>• 88 innovation projects (target 2200–2400);</li> <li>• 22 strategic alliance projects (target 500–550);</li> <li>• 231 RTDI projects (target 90–100); 15 led by women</li> <li>• support to equity funds for long term investments of SMEs in renewable energy and innovation Fund "Toscana Innovazione" (EUR 17,7 million) and Guarantee fund (EUR 28,4 million) committed and disbursed.</li> </ul>

OP	Financial (exp./alloc.)	Physical indicators n COMPLETED	Physical Indicators – OVERALL TARGETS	Notes
Umbria <sup>37</sup>	15,7%		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7,939 projects;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>26 enterprises in cooperation projects (target 35);</li> <li>4 cooperation projects enterprises–research centres (target 12);</li> <li>182 RST projects (target 280);</li> <li>55 eco–innovative projects (target 70);</li> <li>21 projects to spread ICT in SMEs (target 750);</li> </ul>
Valle d'Aosta <sup>38</sup>	5,3%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6 support to SME investments (target 100);</li> <li>6 cooperation between enterprises–research centre (target 1);</li> <li>1 to attraction investments and enterprises (target 3);</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>50 funded enterprises;</li> <li>109 projects;</li> </ul> ICT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9 projects;</li> <li>1002 funded enterprises;</li> </ul>	<i>Started projects:</i> Support to development and innovation; Call for tender to implement innovative projects; Support to start up, innovative services; Territorial Marketing.  <i>ICT started:</i> Projects for “Piano di sviluppo regionale di reti di nuova generazione”; feasibility study for economic development of Parco archeologico di Saint–Martin–de–Corléans.
Veneto	36.6%	No achievements <sup>39</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>75 projects</li> </ul>	Recent calls for tenders; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SMEs led by women 618 demands for EUR 7,5 million of public resources;</li> <li>SMEs led by young people 505 demands for EUR7,5 million of public resources</li> </ul>

## ANNEX TABLE B2 COMPETITIVENESS – Human resources

OP	Financial (exp./alloc.)	Physical indicators – COMPLETED	Physical Indicators – OVERALL TARGETS	Notes
Sardegna	3,8%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>45 involved public authorities to develop the quality and access of services to disadvantaged people (target 150);</li> <li>10 pilot projects (target 5);</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>75 projects;</li> <li>39.000 involved students;</li> <li>150 involved public authorities.</li> </ul>	The financial progress largely depends on the funding of projects launched in the previous 2000–2006 period

<sup>37</sup>In the AIR it is not clear if data refer to completed or started projects.

<sup>38</sup>It is not clear if data in the AIR refer to completed or started projects.

<sup>39</sup>There are not data available at this moment.

ANNEX TABLE B3 COMPETITIVENESS – Transport and telecommunications

OP	Financial (exp./alloc.)	Physical indicators – COMPLETED	Physical Indicators – OVERALL TARGETS	Notes
<b>Abruzzo<sup>40</sup></b>	22%	No achievements	IS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 16 funded projects;</li> <li>• 7 Intercentral infrastructures;</li> <li>• 70 infrastructures of spread;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At the end of 2008, there aren't data about physical achievements, because the projects are being implemented at this moment.</li> </ul>
<b>Bolzano</b>	–	No achievements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 551 projects aimed at increasing LPT,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• call for tender “Innovative system of payment”;</li> <li>• planned the project “Infomobilità”;</li> </ul>
<b>Friuli Venezia Giulia</b>	–	No achievements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 22 projects;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planned projects to “smart transport” (Safe and Efficient Cargo);</li> <li>• Planned infrastructural projects to improve the use of broad band;</li> </ul>
<b>Lazio</b>	4,3%	No achievements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 11 projects;</li> <li>• 8 km;</li> <li>• 3800 kmq;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improvement quality and efficiency to strengthen infrastructural networks and nodes: Ferrovia Roma–Civitacastellana–Viterbo; Infomobility plan; Electronic ticket office;</li> <li>• Region has come to an agreement with the Ministry of Communication for the implementation of a regional plan for broad band</li> </ul>
<b>Liguria</b>	3,04%	No achievements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 30 projects;</li> <li>• 250 Ha;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financing EUR 90 million for “Progetti integrati”,</li> </ul>
<b>Lombardia</b>	–	No achievements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 30 projects;</li> </ul>	Call for tender: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to strength railway stations and initiatives linked to interchange areas (EUR 45 million);</li> <li>• to regulate mobility and decrease environmental impacts using ITS (Intelligent Transport System) (EUR 7 million);</li> <li>• to improve accessibility and service of modal interchange of goods (EUR 40 million);</li> <li>• to strengthen road links (EUR 35 million)</li> </ul>
<b>Marche<sup>41</sup></b>	13,5%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3500lm. Rail tracks (target 1.500);</li> <li>• 9.450 lm. Rail tracks to activate Jesi hub (target 10.500);</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 299 projects;</li> <li>• 400 parkings;</li> <li>• 12.000 lm. tracks;</li> <li>• 79.500 m<sup>2</sup>;</li> <li>• 100 Km reserved lane;</li> <li>• 4.2 Km accessibility of platforms to road network;</li> <li>• 1.2 Km to Falconara's airport;</li> </ul>	Funded projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 project to strengthen of transport service in Ancona's seaport (StralcioC);</li> <li>• 4 projects about Jesi's interport and logistic district platforms and empower links of national transport networks;</li> <li>• 2 projects to strengthen Falconara's airport access</li> </ul>
<b>Molise</b>		No achievements	Infrastructural accessibility of SSL interested in activity	This project is devoted to the Termoli–San Vittore axis in order to link the multimodal platforms

<sup>40</sup> Data from 2008 AIR.

<sup>41</sup> In AIR, it is not clear if the projects are implemented or lunched.

OP	Financial (exp./alloc.)	Physical indicators – COMPLETED	Physical Indicators – OVERALL TARGETS	Notes
<b>Sardegna</b>	5.8%	No achievements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 117 projects</li> <li>• 11 intermodal projects</li> <li>• 5 service networks</li> </ul>	58 projects started (mainly from the previous 2000–2006 period)
<b>Trento</b>	–	No achievements	ICT: 31 projects;	
<b>Toscana</b>	24,9%	No achievements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2512 projects;</li> <li>• 4.067 km;</li> </ul>	Launched projects: 56.554 Km (target 40.000); 10 projects to strengthen broad band infrastructures (target 1); 20 projects to develop sustainable mobility; 10 projects to improve accessibility to telecommunication services;
<b>Umbria</b>	–	No achievements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 14 projects;</li> </ul>	Funded 10 PUCs (Programmi urbani complessi) their aim is to improve urban setting's quality, inner city and roads
<b>Valle d'Aosta</b>	–	No achievements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 project for new urban infrastructures ;</li> <li>• 0,4 Km road;</li> </ul>	
<b>Veneto</b>	–	No achievements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 31 projects;</li> <li>• &gt; 10Km;</li> </ul>	

ANNEX TABLE B4 COMPETITIVENESS – Energy and Environment

OP	Financial (exp./alloc.)	Physical indicators – COMPLETED	Physical Indicators – OVERALL TARGETS	Notes
<b>Abruzzo</b> <sup>42</sup>	–	No achievements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2,5 efficient installed power (photovoltaic and sun heating);</li> <li>• 34 installed network;</li> <li>• 25 cogeneration and regeneration projects;</li> </ul>	At the end of 2008, the projects haven't been implemented.
<b>Bolzano</b>	Environment: 11%	Energy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6 photovoltaic and solar systems (target 44)<sup>43</sup>;</li> </ul> Environment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 study for risk prevention (target 4);</li> <li>• 2 hydraulic projects (target 5);</li> <li>• 1 prevent risks (target 4);</li> </ul>	Environment: 30 projects;	
<b>Emilia-Romagna</b>	1,6%	no achievements	3,076 projects;	Funded projects: 116 energy projects; 133 projects in energy and environmental technologies;
<b>Friuli Venezia Giulia</b>	Environmental sustainable: 44,2%	Energy no achievements Environmental sustainable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6 projects to prevent risks (target 18);</li> <li>• 0,24 Km<sup>2</sup>– surface to recover (35km<sup>2</sup>);</li> </ul>	Energy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 685 projects; 42 Mw;</li> </ul> Environmental sustainable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 406 projects; 35Km<sup>2</sup>; 675Km.</li> </ul>	Signed call for tender to exploitation of geothermic resource through heat pumps.
<b>Lazio</b>	–	no achievements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 805 projects;</li> <li>• 85.000 ha;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CfT for "efficiency of public lighting network and traffic lights' systems" (EUR 12,5million);</li> <li>• CfT "support the implementation of solar systems in buildings" (EUR 16.2 million);</li> <li>• Launched 42 projects for "land reclaimed actions and recovery of polluted areas",</li> <li>• Signed 28 projects to " Prevention and management of hydro-geological risk" (EUR 36 million);</li> </ul>
<b>Liguria</b>	0,69%	Energy <sup>44</sup> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 projects (target 195);</li> <li>• 0,20 Mwe (target 14,23);</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 195 projects;</li> <li>• 18,73 Mwe</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 call for tender "Energy efficiency and renewable sources – Public Authorities";</li> </ul>

42 Data from 2008 AIR.

43 The data come from Environment sustainable of economic growth Axis.



OP	Financial (exp./alloc.)	Physical indicators - COMPLETED	Physical Indicators - OVERALL TARGETS	Notes
<b>Lombardia</b>	-	no achievements	• 103 projects;	Call for tender: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to extend teleriscaldamento networks;</li> <li>to develop energy efficiency of public lighting systems (funded 91 projects);</li> </ul>
<b>Marche</b>	Energy: 3%	Energy <sup>45</sup> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>68 systems to improve energy production (target 80);</li> <li>20 systems to cogeneration (target 16);</li> <li>51 projects to management of Energy in enterprises' system (target 120);</li> </ul>	Energy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>240 projects;</li> <li>8.500 KW capacity installed by renewable sources of Energy;</li> <li>7.500KW capacity installed by cogeneration system;</li> </ul>	Energy, funded projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>68 projects to improve energy production from renewable sources;</li> <li>18 projects to improve energy efficiency through cogeneration;</li> <li>42 projects to support SMEs'm investments to energy saving and use of renewable sources.</li> </ul>
<b>Molise</b>	-	Energy: no achievements Environment: no achievements	Energy: 17.561,60 (Mwh); Environment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>24 (ha);</li> <li>15.000 citizens interested in mitigation of natural risk;</li> </ul>	Call for tender about investment programmes to rational and efficient use of Energy (EUR 9 million);
<b>Piemonte</b>	20,2%	no achievements	• 150 projects; • 10MW;	Started projects: 179 for production of renewable energy(target 100); 53 for energy saving (target 50);
<b>Sardegna</b>	1,9%	Energy: no achievements	• 450 projects; • 220 MW;	
<b>Trento</b>	26%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4 projects to energy efficiency (target 12);</li> <li>2 projects to solar energy (target 400);</li> <li>2 biomass (target 20);</li> <li>2 projects renewable sources (target 2);</li> </ul>	• 439 projects;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Call for tender for research projects about technological district Energy and environment;</li> <li>Call for tender grants to SMEs and Public Authorities to invest in energy efficiency and renewable sources' field, 83 funded projects;</li> </ul>
<b>Toscana</b>	Environment: 4,8%	no achievements	Energy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>370 projects;</li> <li>103 MWe;</li> </ul> Environment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>97 projects;</li> </ul>	Environment started: 4 projects to recover polluted and degraded areas (target 8); 7 projects to control air quality (target 12); 14 projects to prevent hydraulic natural risks, landslide, coast erosion (target 12); 21 projects to prevent and cushion seismic risk (target 20); 4 projects to prevent and to cushion risks of industrial incidents (target 5); Energy, started: 4 projects to give technical support to potential beneficiaries;(target 8);
<b>Veneto</b>	-	Energy: no achievements Environment: no achievements	Energy: 665 projects; Environment: 80 projects;	

44 In AIR, it is not clear if the projects are implemented or lunched.

45 In AIR, it is not clear if the projects are implemented or lunched.

OP	Financial (exp./alloc.)	Physical indicators - COMPLETED	Physical Indicators - OVERALL TARGETS	Notes
Umbria <sup>46</sup>	Environment and prevention of risks: 13,09%	Environment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 11 projects to recover polluted areas (target 15);</li> </ul> Energy <sup>47</sup> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2,9 Mw e 2,637Mwh (target 75 Mw e 270 Mwh) productive capacity from renewable sources;</li> <li>• 15 reached subjects (target 1500);</li> <li>• 3 project for renewable sources and energy saving (target 100)</li> </ul>	Environment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 130 projects;</li> </ul> Energy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1500 subjects to reach ;</li> <li>• 135 projects;</li> <li>• 75 Mw e 270 Mwh productive capacity from renewable sources;</li> </ul>	Energy: Call for tender to support enterprises to invest in renewable sources, environmental preservation and retraining, 7 funded projects, funding EUR 218.760,00
Valle d'Aosta	Promotion of sustainable development: 28,52%		Energy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 study;</li> <li>• 3 pilot projects and tested new technologies;</li> <li>• 2000 buildings for reconnaissance and Energy diagnosis in regional land;</li> <li>• 1 new cogeneration station and recovery of heat;</li> </ul>	

---

46 In AIR, it is not clear if the projects are implemented or lunched.

47In AIR, it is not clear if the projects are implemented or lunched.

ANNEX TABLE B5 COMPETITIVENESS – Territorial development

OP	Financial (exp./alloc.)	Physical indicators – COMPLETED	Physical Indicators – OVERALL TARGETS	Notes
<b>Abruzzo</b> <sup>48</sup>	–	No achievements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 retrained urban area;</li> <li>• 10 financial initiatives;</li> <li>• 4 empowered urban networks;</li> <li>• 8 historical, cultural and architectural buildings for cultural activities;</li> <li>• 22 initiatives about PISU;</li> <li>• 130 funded enterprises;</li> <li>• 30 funded infrastructural projects;</li> <li>• 190 initiatives about PIT;</li> <li>• 16 projects to preserve land;</li> <li>• 8 projects of prevention on strategic buildings with earthquake risk;</li> <li>• 12 land reclamation projects;</li> </ul>	At the end of 2008, the projects haven't been implemented.
<b>Emilia–Romagna</b>	3,7%	No achievements	389 projects;	Funded: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 38 environmental and cultural development projects;</li> </ul>
<b>Friuli Venezia Giulia</b>	–	No achievements	702 projects;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Call for tender for development widespread accommodation;</li> <li>• Projects to recover and restructure building heritage and historical, cultural, artistic and archaeological manufactured products;</li> <li>• Projects to restore infrastructures, public areas, routes;</li> </ul>
<b>Lazio</b>	–	No achievements	20 projects GAC;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• funded 83 projects (EUR 21 million) receptive structures in protect areas,</li> <li>• Signed projects about development and promotion of Grandi Attrattori Culturali;</li> </ul>
<b>Liguria</b>	5%	No achievements	• 47 projects;	
<b>Lombardia</b>	–	109 involved subjects (target 100);	• 150 projects;	Funded projects: 8 PIA (Progetti Integrati d'Area);
<b>Marche</b>	2,5%	No achievements	• 75 projects;	
<b>Molise</b>	–	No achievements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 221.200 projects;</li> <li>• EUR 1,2 million funding for culture;</li> <li>• EUR 8 million foreign investments;</li> </ul>	
<b>Piemonte</b>	1,7%	No achievements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 86 projects;</li> <li>• 120.000mq;</li> <li>• EUR 16.238.377;</li> </ul>	Funded projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 integrated projects to develop cultural values;</li> </ul>

OP	Financial (exp./alloc.)	Physical indicators - COMPLETED	Physical Indicators - OVERALL TARGETS	Notes
<b>Sardegna</b>	Environment, cultural and natural attraction, tourism: 2,75%  Urban development:8,94%	Environment, cultural and natural attraction, tourism <sup>49</sup> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 project to diversify regional tourist supply (target 69);</li> <li>• 4 projects to promote the cultural heritage (target 310);</li> <li>• Urban development:</li> <li>• 3 projects to develop urban innovative services (target 40);</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environment, cultural and natural attraction, tourism:1424 projects;</li> <li>• Urban development: 147 projects;</li> </ul>	
<b>Trento</b>	-	No achievements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 8 projects;</li> <li>• 0,4 Km<sup>2</sup> to recover degraded areas</li> </ul>	
<b>Toscana</b>	1,9%	No achievements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 785 projects;</li> <li>• 268.700 Mq;</li> </ul>	Started: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 12 Integrated Projects Urban development (PIUSS) (target 18–20);</li> <li>• 38 projects to disadvantaged areas (target 30–35);</li> <li>• 1 project to natural and cultural resources in areas affected by geographical and natural disadvantages(target 130);</li> </ul>
<b>Umbria</b> <sup>50</sup>	Environment and prevention of risks: 13,09	• 15 projects to promote environmental and cultural heritage (target 80);		
<b>Valle d'Aosta</b>	Promotion of sustainable development: 28,52%	2.245 m <sup>2</sup> land reclaimed (target 4.000m <sup>2</sup> );	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 industrial area to develop;</li> <li>• 4.000m<sup>2</sup> land reclaimed;</li> <li>• 6 to develop and promote protect areas ;</li> <li>• 3 tourist areas to develop and promote;</li> <li>• 3 hospitality and training structures;</li> <li>• 3 projects to cultural heritage systems;</li> <li>• 3 routes;</li> <li>• 6 promotion projects;</li> <li>• 3 projects for urban equipment<sup>51</sup>.</li> </ul>	
<b>Veneto</b>	-	No achievements	80 projects <sup>52</sup> ;	Started project to develop Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Altino.

49 In AIR, it is not clear if the projects are implemented or lunched.

50 In AIR, it is not clear if the projects are implemented or lunched.

51 Data are from Sustainable development Axis.

52 Data are from Environment and territorial development Axis.

ANNEX Table C – Summary of the achievements – Trans-border Cooperation

OP	Financial (exp./alloc.)	Physical advancements – completed / started projects	Notes
<b>Italy–Austria</b>	Axis I: economic relations, competitiveness 5.9%; Axis II: territory and sustainability 7.93%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 to promote competitiveness and internationalization of enterprises (60);</li> <li>• 5 to strength supply and tourist services (40);</li> <li>• 5 for research, innovation and cooperation (10);</li> <li>• 2 management of reserved areas, environment (20);</li> <li>• 3 prevention of natural and technological risks (10);</li> <li>• 2 for environmental mitigation (10);</li> <li>• 5 to create cross border networks (20);</li> <li>• 2 for urban systems (15);</li> <li>• 5 for development of rural areas (5).</li> </ul>	The Axis I records a physical advancement of 6,8% of the total. The proposed initiatives are focused on support to SMEs, HR and job market. In the Axis II the level of achievement is equal to 27,6% of total.
<b>Italy–France Alcontra</b>	Axis I: D&I 0,4%; Axis II: Preservation and management of territory 0%; Axis III: Life's quality 1,87%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5 for research (6);</li> <li>• 9 for advanced services (14);</li> <li>• 1 to promote process respectful of environment (2);</li> <li>• 5 to promote cultural heritage (16);</li> <li>• 5 to improve tourist services (14);</li> <li>• 4 to mitigate pollution effects (6);</li> <li>• 2 for climate change (6);</li> <li>• 10 to preserve biodiversity (12);</li> <li>• 2 to improve cross border mobility (5);</li> <li>• 11 to promote and preserve cultural heritage (14);</li> <li>• 9 to improve cultural services (13).</li> </ul>	In Axis I physical advancement is 50% of the total. In Axis II physical advancement is on average 60% of the total. In Axis III physical advancement is 40% in transport area, 79% in cultural field. At the end of 2009, 61 funded projects and 20 PITs funded.
<b>Italy– Switzerland</b>	Axis I: environment and territory 5%; Axis II: Competitiveness 11,1%; Axis III: Life's quality 4,7%.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 for preservation of natural resources (15);</li> <li>• 3 for management climate changes' effects (5);</li> <li>• 5 for preservation of biodiversity (6);</li> <li>• 5 for urban systems (6);</li> <li>• 2 for production and use of renewable energy (5);</li> <li>• 2 for pollution's effects (6);</li> <li>• 4 to promote agro–food and agricultural productions (12);</li> <li>• 12 for integration of tourist supply (6);</li> <li>• 11 to improve territory (28);</li> <li>• 10 for R&amp;D (5);</li> <li>• 2 to improve transport system (6);</li> <li>• 7 to promote cultural heritage (25).</li> </ul>	Axis I: Physical advancement is 27% of the total for projects concerning prevention, management of natural risks and emergency and 83% of total the for projects concerning preservation of biodiversity and urban systems. Axis III: physical advancements is equal to 90% of the total projects for cultural promotion.
<b>Italy–France Maritime</b>	Axis I: Accessibility 3.2%; Axis II: Innovation–Competitiveness 3.3%, Axis III: natural & cultural resources 7.09%; Axis IV: integration of resources and services 6.3%	No achievements	Funded and lunched 23 projects: 4 in Axis I, 1 in Axis II, 14 in Axis III, 4 in Axis IV.
<b>Italy–Malta</b>	No expenditure	No achievements	
<b>Italy – Greece</b>	No information available	No information available	No information available

