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

YEAR 1 – 2011

TASK 2: COUNTRY REPORT ON ACHIEVEMENTS OF COHESION POLICY

FRANCE

VERSION: FINAL

PROF. MICHEL LACAVE

TECHNOPOLIS ITD

A report to the European Commission
Directorate-General Regional Policy

CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- AIR Annual Implementation Report
- ARF *Association des Régions Françaises*
- CPER *Contrat de Projet Etat-Région*
- CRITT Regional Innovation and Technology Transfer Centres
- DATAR *Délégation interministérielle à l'aménagement du territoire et à l'attractivité régionale*
- DGCIS *Direction générale Compétitivité Innovation Services* (Ministry of Economy and Finance)
- EIF European Investment Fund
- ERDF European Regional Development Fund
- FP EU Framework Programme for Research & Development
- FUI *Fonds unique interministériel* (funding the projects of *pôles de compétitivité*)
- GIS Geographical Information System
- HEI Higher Education Institutions
- NSRF National Strategic Reference Framework
- OP Operational Programme
- PACA Region Provence-Alpes-Côte-d'Azur
- PRES *Pôles de Recherche et d'Enseignement Supérieur*
- PRIDES *Pôles Régionaux d'Innovation et de Développement Economique Solidaire* (Provence-Alpes-Côte-d'Azur)
- PUI Integrated Urban Projects
- PV Photovoltaic solar energy
- RTDI Research, Technological Development and Innovation
- SME Small and Medium-size Enterprise
- SRDE *Schémas Régionaux de Développement Economique*
- SRI Regional Innovation Strategies (*Stratégies régionales d'innovation*)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The regional development policy pursued in France can be analysed through the combination of *Contrats de Projets Etat-Région* (CPER) – ERDF Operational Programmes, the regional schemes for economic development (SRDE) and, from 2010, the regional innovation strategies (SRI). There are no significant discrepancies between these documents which give priority to **four main policy areas**: knowledge economy, innovation, competitiveness; sustainable development and environment; accessibility (including ICT) and transport; issues of 'territorial development' concerning cohesion in general, urban areas or specific parts of the regional territory.

In 2010, the 'Great Loan', aimed at funding 'Investments for the future' (EUR 35 billion), is the major new policy measure with an impact on regional development: first for higher education / training (EUR 11 billion) and research (EUR 7.9 billion), then for industrial *filières*, sustainable development and the information society. As in 2009, the recovery plan also contributed to combat the crisis. However, the 2010 economic recovery is still fragile and without a significant impact on employment.

The ERDF OPs mid-term revisions, already decided or being prepared, are in general relatively minor. They mainly concern 'earmarked' measures which are strengthened, and transfer funds from under-committed measures to more used ones, following recommendations of the mid-term evaluations.

The **commitment rate** made a significant leap forward in 2010: 48% for Competitiveness & Employment regions, and 40% for Convergence ones, often explained in the AIRs by the fact that a 'cruising speed' has been reached, and sometimes by the necessity of combating the crisis. By contrast, the progress of the **implementation rate** is modest (Competitiveness & Employment regions: 21.4%; Convergence regions: 17.4%). The policy areas 'Knowledge Economy' comes slightly first (about 20%), followed by 'Sustainable Development and Environment' (about 18%), then 'Accessibility & Transport' and 'Territorial Development' (14% each). The policy area 'Sustainable Development and Environment' has been catching up fast in terms of commitment as well as implementation.

The analysis of **achievements** is made difficult by the lack of homogeneity and non-comparability of indicators, in spite of some progress, and of a tendency of AIRs to focus more on programming than on outputs and results. The main results are in the policy area **'Knowledge Economy'**: the regional governance of innovation has made progress due to SRI; ERDF has significantly contributed to the achievements of the *Pôles de compétitivité* (collaborative R&D projects, technical platforms) and in some regions of the regional clusters; the results in the field of research are less visible because they are more long term as they take longer to complete. As for the '**Environment'**, ERDF has contributed to a clearer insight into problems (studies, sensitisation) and to a much lesser extent to the protection and management of natural areas; it has also contributed to the prevention of flood risk.

With respect to **Energy**, it has contributed to the improvement of energy efficiency in social housing (however, few quantitative data are available so far) and strongly to the use of PV solar energy (contribution to biomass is making progress). In the **'Accessibility, Transport, ICT'** policy area, the number of people benefiting from broadband communications has significantly increased while e-services have been set up; access to and the environment of railway stations have improved in some cities; speed on the future Bretagne railroad has increased. In **'Territorial Development'**, achievements involve projects in urban districts facing social problems and operations targeted at social inclusion within PUI, projects in rural areas often related to tourism, the diversification of touristic activities and equipment of touristic sites. There is little ERDF money allocated to **Human Resources**; however, the commitment rate is rather high, and achievements are linked to services for employment and training, in connection with the restructuring of sectors; support for self-employment and business start-ups; support for social inclusion.

With regard to **Cross-Border Cooperation** OPs, increased networking is the main tangible result with AIRs highlighting cooperation agreements and joint uses of infrastructure.

The **effects of ERDF intervention** are necessarily limited in the Competitiveness & Employment regions because of financial allocations. However, ERDF interventions may have long-term effects when there is a clear convergence between EU strategic orientations and national ones, as in the field of R&D and *pôles de compétitivité*. ERDF funding of energy efficiency and renewable energy investment in social housing helps to boost the French energy efficiency policy. Finally, ERDF, as in 2009, probably played a positive, though modest, role in combating the crisis and contributing to the 2010 recovery.

A large majority of regions have carried out or are carrying out **mid-term evaluations** which in general confirm the relevance of the strategic orientations; thematic evaluations have been carried out so far mainly in the policy area 'Enterprise environment and RTDI', but themes will be more diverse from 2011; only few regional evaluations have been made public.

In **conclusion**, a first challenge is to improve the implementation rate which is disappointing in all policy areas. This is due to the predominance of small scale projects, particularly in the fields of access to employment, human capital, energy, environment and prevention of risks, resulting in a dispersion of ERDF funding which hampers ERDF visibility and strategic effects in regions. Projects managed by well-identified operators and/or which are related to robust national (and sometimes) regional policies (R&D infrastructure and projects, collaborative R&D projects related to *pôles de compétitivité* and innovative clusters etc.) or, to a much lesser extent, collective actions are the most effective and easier to implement. Commitment and implementation in environment and energy caught up in 2010 partly because of the effective applications of the agreements of the Environment Round Table (*Grenelle de l'environnement*), and of the 2009 EU regulation allowing for ERDF co-funding of energy investment in social housing, a field with well-identified and rather strong operators.

Another challenge concerns indicators and future evaluations. A set of relatively simple indicators that allow effective monitoring of outputs and results, guarantee homogeneity and comparability, has to be established, following the DATAR action plan. There is increasing awareness of the importance of this issue. Mid-term evaluations cannot provide a real strategic vision due to the low level of implementation so far, and it will be essential to concentrate on the quality of ex-post evaluations, in particular through focusing more on the extent to which the effects and outcomes of a project address the problems of the regions concerned.

1. THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONTEXT

In a 2006 study[1], five groups of regions were identified in mainland France: Ile de France (the capital region), Rhône-Alpes, Southern regions, Western regions, and changing regions with specific problems – the outermost regions (assisted under the Convergence Objective) presenting quite a different picture:

- Ile de France occupies a unique position with its concentration of government services and headquarters of large companies, a young and active population and life-long learning at an exceptional level, compared to the French average. All indicators concerning higher education, public and private R&D expenditure are very high. Ile de France generates around 28% of the national value-added. However, it has been losing ground in relative terms for the last decade at least to Southern and Western regions in the share of national added value, growth of GDP per capita and research potential[2].
- Rhône-Alpes comes second in terms of population and GDP. Its share of the national value-added has increased slightly in the last 2 decades and its unemployment rate is below the national average. It has a complex economic structure with an industrial, banking and service centre (Lyon), a world class R&D stronghold in Grenoble, some manufacturing hot spots together with traditional manufacturing and rural areas.
- Southern Regions (PACA, Languedoc-Roussillon, Midi-Pyrénées, and to a lesser extent Aquitaine) constitute a French "sun belt" with a higher than average ratio of R&D expenditure to GDP. They are attracting thousands of migrants from Ile de France and Northern regions, and their population is younger. Midi-Pyrénées is a specific case with large business R&D (EADS Airbus). In Languedoc-Roussillon and Midi-Pyrénées, there are big intra-regional disparities between the capital cities and rural and mountain areas. Southern regions benefit from transfers to retired people (pensions) and the unemployed (RMI[3] and RSA[4]) who migrate to "sunny" regions, and GDP per head is lower than the French mainland average, while the GDP growth rates are slightly higher.
- Western regions (Bretagne and Pays de la Loire) have experienced a significant increase in the proportion of highly qualified people and their major cities are among the most attractive in France, while unemployment is below the national average[5]. Alsace, on the German border, is also attractive, with a highly qualified population, low unemployment (8.5% in 2009), mid-to-high-tech manufacturing and a high

[1] Strategic Evaluation on innovation and the knowledge-based economy in relation to the Structural and Cohesion Funds, for the programming period 2007-2013, country report France, 2006.

[2] L. Davezies, La République et ses territoires, 2008.

[3] Revenu minimum d'insertion.

[4] Revenu de solidarité active.

[5] In 2009, the unemployment rate was 5.9% in Bretagne and 8% in Pays de la Loire (French mainland average: 9.2%).

ranking for scientific and technological competences. These regions had much higher GDP growth rates than the French average before the crisis.

- In contrast, other regions do not have very specific features: some have a "rural profile" and are poor performers in higher education, R&D, the qualification of the work force (Poitou-Charentes, Champagne-Ardenne, Basse-Normandie, Corsica) and may have a low unemployment rate because of emigration of active population (Limousin: 6.5% in 2009); others have an old industrial base (Lorraine, Nord Pas-de-Calais) and, in spite of huge restructuring efforts, still lag behind with respect to the same indicators, and have an above average unemployment rate.
- The outermost regions (Convergence Objective) suffer from a number of factors: remoteness, lack of critical mass, costs of access, environmental challenges, and a high dependence on the *'métropole'*. Business activities depend heavily on tourism and the government sector. The economic fabric is mainly composed of service-related SMEs and micro-enterprises, often family owned and neither export nor innovation oriented. The proportion of beneficiaries of minimum income support is six times that of mainland France. Unemployment is high (in 2009: 24.3% on average as against a national average of 9.2%), but significantly lower than in 2000 (31.1%). The outermost regions have been catching up: GDP per capita grew by 29.9% between 1990 and 2008 as against the national average of 22.8%.

It must be added to this global picture that recent studies[6] have renewed the approach to territorial disparities. A paradox has emerged in the last 10-15 years: the less productive regions are those with significant progress in terms of income, population, employment and social well-being, while poverty is increasing in some parts of the most prosperous regions. The former regions rely on a 'public-residential economy' fed by social and public transfers[7] which shelter them from global competition; this is typically the case of Southern regions, at least parts of them, and of some rural regions. The latter are the engines of French growth and the main providers of taxes, the best example being the Paris metropolitan area, which accounts for 30% of national GDP but whose households only receive 22.5% of the national household income[8]. As a consequence, a policy debate has arisen concerning the strengthening of the capital region[9] in particular with the concept of *"Grand Paris"*. This should differentiate OPs priorities more than they are at the moment[10].

The most recent changes are as follows:

[6] L. Davezies, op.cit.

[7] Social and public expenditure are over 50% of GDP.

[8] Another interesting example (on the other side): in the Nice metropolitan area (eastern part of Provence-Alpes-Côte-d'Azur), it is increasingly difficult to find available land to establish or relocate enterprises, as municipalities and property developers give preference to housing (including housing for retired people). See the *Schéma d'accueil des entreprises de la Communauté urbaine Nice Côte d'Azur*, SCET – ITD-Eu.

[9] « *Economie francilienne : et si Laurent Davezies cauchemardait…* », La vie des idées.fr, 12 March 2008.

[10] It is true however that the Ile de France OP is rather different from the others.

- demographic growth has decelerated in the Southern and Western regions in the period 2006-8;
- the regions most affected by the crisis have been the manufacturing regions (especially those where the automotive industry plays an important role: e.g. Franche-Comté, Haute-Normandie);
- the crisis has greatly increased social disparities with consequences for poverty in urban areas linked to high levels of unemployment;
- the crisis had its climax in 2009 and resulted in a significant increase in unemployment (9.2% from 7.4% in 2008) with particularly high levels in 'old' industrial regions (Nord-Pas-de-Calais, Lorraine) and Languedoc-Roussillon, the less favoured Southern region (13.9%, the highest in mainland France);
- there was a slow and fragile recovery in 2010 (with a growth rate of +1.5% against -2.7% in 2009), supported by a recovery plan based on public spending[11]; unemployment decreased only slightly and industrial regions (e.g. Haute-Normandie, Nord-Pas-de-Calais, Franche-Comté) have continued to suffer from the crisis; nevertheless, it is interesting to note that, the Southern (except Corsica) and Western regions[12] are included among the regions with the highest net balance of job creation.

The crisis raises questions about the future of public expenditure and investment, national as well as regional. The French government reacted by increasing expenditure and investment, which led to a further rise in the public sector deficit[13] and a strong increase in consolidated debt[14] of the public sector. Regions have tried to maintain the level of investment, but local authorities in general are expected to face a reduction in financial transfers from the State in the near future; some of them, in rural areas, have already encountered difficulties for co-funding projects.

2. THE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY PURSUED, THE EU CONTRIBUTION TO THIS AND POLICY ACHIEVEMENTS OVER THE PERIOD

THE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY PURSUED

The main features which have characterised the regional development policy for the last years remain valid:

- Regional development policy primarily results from the combination of *'Contrats de Plan Etat-Région'* (CPER) and ERDF SPD/Operational Programmes (OP), which embodies the French paradigm of co-operation between the State and regional (and

[11] E.g.: *Prime à la casse* aimed at supporting the automotive industry.

[12] See *Observatoire de l'investissement* : www.trendeo.net

[13] Public expenditure as % of GDP went up to 56% against an average of 52.6% for the period 2000-6; public sector balance rose to -7% in 2010 against an average of -27% for the period 2000-6 (Eurostat).

[14] Debt as % of GDP rose to 81.7% in 2010 against an average of 61.6% for the period 2000-6 (Eurostat).

local) authorities based on co-funding. ERDF support to regional development policy is quite coherent with the national policy because of this combination.

- The *Schémas régionaux de développement économique* (SRDE : Regional Schemes for Economic Development) elaborated by the French regions in 2005-2006, ahead of the 2007-13 programming period, are essentially policy blueprints which do not entail financial commitments of the regional authorities. There are no significant discrepancies between the SRDE and the CPER/ERDF OPs[15].
- Analysis of the priority axes of the CPER and ERDF OPs shows that there are four main policy areas:
    - the knowledge economy with two related dimensions: research and technology transfer (supply), innovation and enterprise support (addressing the needs and demand for innovation of enterprises, in particular in relation with the national programme *Pôles de compétitivité*), with the aim of increasing the competitiveness of both the region and its enterprises – the aim of improving attractiveness is sometimes associated with that of competitiveness;
    - sustainable development: preservation of the environment, management of risks, renewable energies;
    - accessibility and transport – accessibility is often related to the aim of improving attractiveness – including ICT infrastructure;
    - issues of 'territorial development' concerning 'territorial' (and often social) cohesion in general, urban areas or specific parts of the region.
- Differences between Convergence and Competitiveness & Employment regions are limited: Convergence regions give more importance to education and human resource development through the ERDF[16], and of course they have a priority axis dedicated to the compensation for the cost of ultra-peripheral location and structural handicaps.
- The Cross Border cooperation programmes have globally similar priorities. The main feature of the Territorial Cooperation OPs which involve Convergence (outermost) regions is not surprisingly the emphasis put on regional integration.

There were no major changes in 2010 in the regional development policy pursued and in the allocation of EU funding, but some shifts coupled with the strengthening of previous trends.

In November 2009, a commission co-chaired by 2 former Prime Ministers proposed to launch a 'Great Loan' (*Grand Emprunt*) which would fund a programme of 'Investments for the Future' (*Investissements d'avenir*). This programme was adopted by the Parliament at the beginning of 2010. Of a total amount of EUR 35 billion, EUR 11 billion are dedicated to

[15] The SRDE give to some extent more importance to employment, education and training, in particular with respect to the anticipation of economic and social change, and to internationalization.

[16] Three of them have a priority axis dedicated to human potential or education.

higher education and training, EUR 7.9 billion to research, EUR 6.5 billion to industrial *filières* and SMEs, EUR 5.1 billion to sustainable development and EUR 4.5 billion to the information society ('*numérique*')[17]. The bulk of the programme falls into the 'innovation' priority of the OPs, although with a heavy focus on universities – the objective being to make emerge and support a few world-class universities[18]. The programme is not aimed at regional development, but at making France more competitive and attractive on the world scene, and it is mainly implemented through competitive calls for proposals. However, the 'Investments for the Future' have *de facto* a structuring impact on the regions in which universities and research labs are benefiting from them[19].

In 2009 again, every French region, in collaboration with the State administration, carried out its own regional innovation strategy (SRI: *Stratégie régionale d'innovation*), following a request of the European Commission directed to French regions[20]. The SRI was intended to have an impact on the OPs priorities dedicated to RTDI and the knowledge economy. In effect, a large majority of AIRs observes that the priorities set up in this new strategic document are (or will soon be) taken into account in the mid-term revision of the OPs. In Auvergne, for instance, measures of Axis 1 are now focused on sectors targeted by the SRI (nutrition/food/health, biotechnologies...). In Bourgogne, the 3 strategic axes of the SRI have been "integrated" in the OP (developing partnerships research-business; strengthening human resources; implementing a strategy focused on excellence, differentiation and attractiveness); the same happened in Picardie (improving the visibility of the region in terms of competitiveness and research through focusing on a few key sectors; stimulating innovation in emerging sectors; having more innovative projects through a better coordinated regional innovation system). In Nord-Pas-de-Calais, 17 SRI actions have been defined which will feed the OP Axis 1. In Lorraine, the operational implementation of the SRI has started with again an impact on the OP. On the whole, the "integration" of the SRI in the OPs seems to have led to more focused measures in the OPs axes dedicated to RTDI. On the other hand, the implementation of the SRI has in general started with the setting up of an 'innovation governance system' (often as a *Comité stratégique regional de l'innovation*). The most notable exceptions are Martinique and Corsica where a change in the regional political majority resulted in delays in implementing the SRI.

Finally, mid-term revisions of the OPs, as they appear in the 2010 AIR, are in general relatively minor and follow mid-term evaluations. They mainly concern 'earmarked'

[17] *Rapport relatif à la mise en œuvre et au suivi des investissements d'avenir, Annexe au projet de loi de finances pour 2011.*

[18] *Rapport sur les politiques nationales de recherche et de formations supérieures, annexe au projet de loi de finances pour 2011.*

[19] E.g. with the selection of 5 to 10 'Campuses of excellence' and of a number of 'labs of excellence', as well as with the funding of research facilities and equipments.

[20] *Étude sur l'évolution des diagnostics et des stratégies régionales d'innovation dans les régions françaises dans le cadre des PO FEDER 2007-2013,* ADE, July 2010.

measures which are strengthened, and transfer funds from under-committed measures to more used ones[21].

They benefit first RTDI and higher education as a result of the orientations related to the implementation of the SRI and to the 'Investments for the Future'. For instance, the AIR Centre indicates a transfer from priority axis 3 ("Strengthening the sustainable attractiveness and the competitiveness of the territory") to priority axis 1 ("Supporting research, innovation and the development of enterprises") because of the SRI. The mid-term revisions of the OPs Champagne-Ardenne, PACA, Languedoc-Roussillon provide additional funding to their priority axis on innovation for funding the implementation of the SRI. The AIRs Bourgogne and Nord-Pas-de-Calais signal that the mid-term revision will take account of the 'Operation Campus' benefiting the Lille universities[22].

Mid-term revisions also concern systematically measures regarding energy efficiency and the use of renewable energy in social housing, following the regulation N°397/2009 (6 May 2009).

In conclusion, RTDI (and universities) are the main beneficiaries of the changes in 2010 and this reinforces the role played in France by ERDF in favour of innovation and collaborative research[23] (already important through ERDF co-funding of collaborative research in *Pôles de compétitivité*).

POLICY IMPLEMENTATION

The 2010 country report highlighted the following points:

- The OPs implementation rate was low, 8% to 14% in the Competitiveness & Employment regions, and 5% to 12% in the Convergence regions. With respect to the different policy areas, it was highest in the broad policy area "Knowledge economy, innovation and competitiveness", and lowest in "Environment/energy" and "Territorial development". This situation can be attributed to 4 factors at least: the crisis which affected the interest of businesses for new projects (in particular support to collective and individual (investment) actions; the difficulties of the administrations in charge of environment in generating projects of a certain scale; the need for feasibility studies for transport and infrastructure projects; and finally the fact that

[21] The exception to this pattern is in Poitou-Charentes where the mid-term revision was focused on a transfer of ERDF funding to the benefit of the 'sustainable management of territories' (environmental risks and anticipating the consequences of climate change) because of the Xynthia storm which caused a lot of damage in the coastal part of the region at the end of February 2010.

[22] AIR Nord-Pas-de-Calais, p. 35: mid-term revision proposal presented to the *Comité de Suivi* of January 2011. AIR Bourgogne, p. 18.

[23] See AIR Rhône-Alpes: Axis 1 (Innovation and the knowledge economy) gets additional funding in particular for collaborative research through a transfer from axis 2 (Diversification and promotion of economic activities). See also: AIR Pays de la Loire (additional funding to the global grant to the Region for non-OSEO supported innovative projects - seed capital, venture capital); AIR Champagne-Ardenne (additional funding for collaborative projects).

the beginning of the implementation of the 2007-2013 OPs was carried out simultaneously with the final steps of the 2000-2006 SPDs.

- The commitment rate at the end of 2009 was 27.6% in the Competitiveness & Employment regions, lower than the EU27 average (26.1% in the Convergence regions, slightly higher than the EU average). The broad policy area "Knowledge economy, innovation and competitiveness", including "Human resources", was characterised by the highest rate.

The 2010 AIRs reveal quite a different picture. The commitment rate made a significant leap forward and the implementation rate had made some progress by the end of 2009.

Table A - Commitment and implementation rates (in %) (1 January 2011)[24]

	Committed (ERDF)	Paid (total)
Convergence Regions FR	39.9	17.4
Competitiveness & Employment Regions FR	47.7	21.4
EU27 average		16.0

Source: État d'avancement des programmes européens - État financier au 1er janvier 2011[25] - * Source : Financial tables provided by the core team.

A large majority of AIRs report the catching up of commitment in 2010, generally justified by the fact that a 'cruising speed' was reached (AIR Languedoc-Roussillon), and sometimes just the necessity of fighting the effects of the crisis (AIR Haute-Normandie). However, there were difficulties in 2010 regarding the measures supporting the investments of businesses in spite of the recovery (AIR Bourgogne and others). The gap between the regions with the lower commitment rate and those with the higher is larger in the C&E regions than in the Convergence ones. The commitment rate of Corsica (the lowest), Basse-Normandie, Alsace and PACA is under 38% while that of Aquitaine, Haute-Normandie, Limousin and Rhône-Alpes (the highest with 62.2%) are over 55%. In a large number of regions, as in 2009, the priority axis focused on the knowledge economy, innovation and competitiveness has the highest commitment rate[26]. The commitment rate of the priority axis focusing on sustainable development and environment, relatively low in 2009, has been catching up in some regions (e.g.: Bourgogne, Languedoc-Roussillon, Poitou-Charentes)[27].

This is confirmed by the following data (source: DG REGIO):

[24] A detailed table by region is given in Annex Table B.

[25] http://www.europe-en-france.gouv.fr/Des-programmes-pour-qui-pour-quoi/Avancement-des-programmes/Moteur-de-recherche-sur-l-avancement-des-programmes/2011/Les-etats-d-avancement-2007-2013-situation-au-1er-janvier-2011

[26] E.g.: Guadeloupe (51.0%), Pays de la Loire (62.8%), Aquitaine (57.9%), Picardie (55.8%).

[27] Languedoc-Roussillon (56.0% vs 50.1% for the axis "innovation"), Poitou-Charentes (63.4% vs 54.1% for the axis "innovation").

Table B - Competitiveness & Employment regions – Commitment rate by main policy area

ERDF commitment rate by main policy area (by end-2010)	% of financial allocation
Enterprise environment of which:	25.8
RTDI and linked activities	*32.1*
Support for innovation in SMEs	*20.7*
ICT and related services	*21.1*
Human resources	24.0
Transport	19.2
Environment and energy of which:	27.4
Energy infrastructure	*32.3*
Environmental infrastructure	*23.4*
Territorial development	34.5

Table C - Convergence regions – Commitment rate by main policy area

ERDF commitment rate by main policy area (by end-2010)	% of financial allocation
Enterprise environment of which:	55.4
RTDI and linked activities	*116.1*
Support for innovation in SMEs	*16.8*
ICT and related services	*28.3*
Human resources	54.0
Transport	32.0
Environment and energy of which:	48.8
Energy infrastructure	*24.7*
Environmental infrastructure	*51.7*
Territorial development	26.1

Table D - Cross-border Cooperation[28] - Commitment rate by main policy area

ERDF commitment rate by main policy area (by end-2010)	% of financial allocation
Enterprise environment of which:	25.8
RTDI and linked activities	*22.0*
Support for innovation in SMEs	*30.8*
ICT and related services	*11.8*
Human resources	24.8
Transport	-
Environment and energy of which:	46.0
Energy infrastructure	*15.9*
Environmental infrastructure	*61.6*
Territorial development	64.7

The progress in the **implementation rate** at the end of 2010, though real, is relatively modest with a difference of 4 points between the Competitiveness & Employment regions (21.4%) and the Convergence ones (17.4%). In the former regions, the implementation rate varies from 10.6% (PACA), 12.7% (Nord-Pas-de-Calais) and 12.9% (Alsace, Corse) to more

[28] Data are available for the CBC programmes France(Manche)-Angleterre, 2 Mers, France-Suisse, Rhin Supérieur, Grande Région. Even for these programmes, some data concerning funds committed are missing.

than 30% for Limousin (31%), Rhône-Alpes (31.5%), Midi-Pyrénées (34.2%) and Auvergne (35.8%). In the latter, it varies from 11.55% (Martinique) to 24.6% (La Réunion).

With respect to the 4 broad policy areas corresponding to the main priority axes, the implementation rate is in general much higher for the axes focusing on "Knowledge economy, innovation and competitiveness" (average: almost 20%) and "Environment and sustainable development" (average: 18%) than for the axes focusing on "Accessibility and transport" (average: about 14%) and "Issues of territorial development" (average: about 14%):

- "Knowledge economy, innovation and competitiveness": 10 regions have an implementation rate of over 20%, of which 3 over 30% (3 regions under 10%);
- "Environment and sustainable development": 8 regions have an implementation rate of over 20%, of which 2 over 30% (5 under 10%);
- "Accessibility and transport": 7 regions have an implementation rate of over 20% (11 under 10%);
- "Issues of territorial development": 3 regions have an implementation rate of over 20% (8 under 10%).

The "Knowledge economy" is slightly ahead, which confirms its strategic importance for a large majority of regions – if not all – and the 'boosting' effect of the SRIs. "Environment and sustainable development" caught up significantly in 2010, due to the implementation of the *Grenelle de l'environnement* and to an effort made in the field of energy efficiency and renewable energies, in the context of the recovery plan.

The implementation rate rose again as of 1 August 2011 with 22.10% in the Convergence regions and 28.47% in the C&E ones (total paid).

ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE PROGRAMMES SO FAR

Three major issues were emphasized in the country report 2010 concerning the achievements:

- AIRs differed considerably with respect to the presentation of outputs and results; in some of them it was difficult to differentiate between what had been achieved and what had simply been launched or programmed;
- in many AIRs, there was an 'abundance' of indicators (strictly 'regional', national, with EU indicators more or less neglected), while there were none in a few AIRs; this situation made comparisons very difficult;
- the first achievements were just beginning to appear in 2009, and this was probably one of the reasons why AIRs emphasised what had been programmed more than what had been achieved.

A careful review of the 2010 AIRs shows some changes with respect to the 2009 AIRs.

On the whole, there has been significant progress in the harmonisation and quality of the presentation of outputs and results in a number of AIRs[29]. However, this positive assessment has to be mitigated by two remaining negative aspects. One is relatively minor: a few reports focus too much on the evolution of the context, even if it was surely necessary to take account of the crisis and of the following limited recovery[30]. The other is of a more serious nature: a clear-cut differentiation between what was achieved and what was programmed in 2010 is still missing in a number of reports as it was in the 2009 AIRs; some regions have preferred to present the list of projects for which ERDF funding was committed[31] and it is very difficult to understand what has been actually achieved.

This situation is made even more difficult if we consider the issue of availability and comparability of indicators between regions. Once again, there has been significant progress as can be seen in tables E and F. However, while some regions provide a summary table of indicators at the beginning of their AIR (which in some cases mix implementation, result and impact indicators, as well as regional, national and EC ones) and sometimes a table by priority axis[32], others only provide a table for each priority axis or even measure[33]. Moreover, a number of regions have still had problems with filling in the indicators or ensuring their reliability. What is positive is that the AIRs signal these difficulties and indicate that measures have been taken to mitigate the problems, e.g. through training or sensitisation seminars (Centre, Franche-Comté, Languedoc-Roussillon, Rhône-Alpes[34]). In some cases, the issue of indicators has been addressed in the mid-term evaluations (Auvergne, Centre) and will be taken into account in the mid-term revisions (Haute-Normandie, Nord-Pas-de-Calais)[35].

Since all French regions acknowledge the importance of having reliable indicators, the Commission should capitalise on such progress by encouraging a harmonised presentation of indicators which would surely help to identify the actual achievements due to ERDF funding.

Outputs resulting from indicators

9 EU indicators have been selected which can be compared relatively reliably and for which data are reported in a large number of regions[36]. We have aggregated the data available and indicated in the annex the regions where they were available[37].

[29] E.g. : Alsace, Bourgogne, Centre, Ile de France, Lorraine, Pays de la Loire, Rhône-Alpes, La Réunion, …

[30] The most striking example is the AIR Picardie with a third of the AIR dedicated to the change of the economic context detailed by *arrondissement*.

[31] E.g. : Bretagne, Champagne-Ardenne, Franche-Comté, Languedoc-Roussillon, Nord-Pas-de-Calais, PACA, Guadeloupe, La Réunion.

[32] The AIR Bourgogne delivers the clearest presentation of indicators.

[33] E.g. : Limousin.

[34] Rhône-Alpes has set up a 'support platform indicators-evaluation'.

[35] Midi-Pyrénées is even contemplating for 2011 a feasibility study of quantitative implementation and result indicators.

[36] A detailed table of indicators by region is given in Annex Table A

Table E – Indicators Competitiveness & Employment Regions

Policy area	Main indicators	Outputs
Enterprise support and RTDI	Number of supported RTD projects (EU4): 1,904 (2009: 397) Number of collaborative projects between enterprises and research organisations (EU5): 603 (2009: 160)	Research facilities – Technological platforms mutualising R&D equipment and open to enterprises – R&D projects (corresponding to R&D filières of excellence, pôles de compétitivité and regional clusters Collaborative projects related to pôles de compétitivité or to regional filières, clusters or poles of excellence Support to technology transfer and innovation-support organisations (development of services to enterprises) Collective actions and actions targeted at individual enterprises – Creation and transfer of businesses – Improved access to finance for SMEs
Human Resources (ERDF only)	Research jobs created (public and private) (EU6): 467	Services for employment, training and support in connection with the restructuring of sectors – Support for self-employment and business start-ups – Operations targeted at social inclusion
Transport and telecommunications	Number of projects in the sector of transport (EU13): 92 (2009: 19) Number of projects concerning the information society (EU11): 763 (2009: 65)	Railways – Urban transportation systems (in particular 'multimodal poles' Access to broadband communications – e-services for enterprises and citizens (e-administration, health) – Cyber-bases
Environment and energy	Number of projects related to renewable energies (EU23): 1,461 (2009: 628) Number of projects aiming at prevention of risks (EU31): 424 (2009: 125)	Studies in biodiversity and protection of the environment – Rehabilitation and requalification of sites Prevention of risks (floods) Energy efficiency and renewable energies in social housing – Support to renewable energies (more and more biomass, in particular wood; less photovoltaic)
Territorial development (urban areas, tourism, rural development, cultural heritage, health, public security, local development)	Number of projects related to services offering equal opportunities and fight against social exclusion (EU41): 179 (2009: 84) Number of sustainable projects improving the attractiveness of cities (EU39): 212 (2009: 27)	Urban projects in urban districts facing social problems – Projects in rural areas (often related to tourism) – Diversification of touristic activities and equipment of touristic sites – Operations targeted at social inclusion, jobs and training

[37] the excel files given in annex IV to the AIRs were used as a primary source and the data were checked with the tables of indicators given in the AIRs. Curiously, in some regions, there is nothing for 2010 in the excel files while there are indicators in the reports themselves.

Table F – Indicators Convergence regions[38]

Policy area	Main indicators	Main outputs
Enterprise support and RTDI	Number of supported RTD projects (EU4): 47 (2009: 24) Number of collaborative projects between enterprises and research organisations (EU5): 19 (2009: 0)	Research infrastructure and projects – collective actions and individual actions targeted at enterprises – Instrument for access to finance for SMEs
Human Resources (ERDF only)	Research jobs created (public and private) (EU6): 121	
Transport and telecommunications	Number of projects concerning the information society (EU11): 40 (2009: 10) Number of projects in the sector of transport (EU13): 5 (2009: 1)	Port and airport infrastructure – Support to maritime freight Broadband infrastructure and development of e-services
Environment and energy	Number of projects related to renewable energies (EU23): 47 (2009: 21) Number of projects aiming at prevention of risks (EU31): 3 (2009: 2)	Waste treatment and recycling Prevention of risks (floods) Support for renewable energies Management of water resources
Territorial development (urban areas, tourism, rural development, cultural heritage, health, public security, local development)	Number of sustainable projects improving the attractiveness of cities (EU39): 3 (2009: 3) Number of projects related to services offering equal opportunities and fight against social exclusion (EU41): 0 (2009: 0)	Urban projects in urban districts facing social problems – Equipment of touristic sites – homes for retired and disadvantaged people

The figures given in the tables should be interpreted very carefully due to shortcomings in the quality of indicators and some lack of reliability. Nevertheless they demonstrate a real progress in outputs and results achieved in the Competitiveness & Employment regions, in particular for the number of information society projects and the number of projects related to the attractiveness of towns and cities; it is also true to a lesser extent for the number of RTD projects and of collaborative business-research projects, and for the number of transport projects (all of them long to implement according to AIRs).

Globally, the outcomes, as well as the implementation rates in the different broad policy areas are in line with the policy objectives set. A majority of OPs gave priority in terms of financial allocations to the knowledge economy, innovation and competitiveness and it is in fact in this policy field that outputs are most visible and implementation relatively satisfactory, in line also with the national policy. On the other hand, the catching up of implementation (and commitment) for sustainable development and environment is in line with the national policy initiated with the *Grenelle de l'environnement*. All this highlights the relative 'victory of ear-marking' by end-2010.

[38] No indicators for La Réunion filled in 2010: we have used 2009 indicators.

Overview of concrete outputs and results in a sample of regions

As in the country report 2010, the qualitative analysis of concrete outputs and results was focused on 12 regions which were selected according to the following criteria: giving more weight to the larger regions in terms of population; providing a representative view of policy intervention in the smaller regions; balancing urban regions with mainly rural ones and including at least two Convergence regions. We have also taken account of inter-regional disparities and the regional groups presented in Section 1.

The final selection (which was discussed with DATAR officials) comprises: Rhône-Alpes, Provence-Alpes-Côte-d'Azur (PACA), Midi-Pyrénées, Nord-Pas-de-Calais, Bretagne (larger regions); Centre, Champagne-Ardenne, Franche-Comté, Languedoc-Roussillon, Limousin (smaller regions); Guadeloupe and La Réunion (Convergence). Four groups of Groups of competitiveness regions identified in Section 1 are represented: Rhône-Alpes; three Southern regions (PACA, Midi-Pyrénées and Languedoc-Roussillon); one Western region (Bretagne); changing regions with specific problems, mainly rural ones (Centre, Champagne-Ardenne and Limousin), and industrial ones (Franche-Comté and Nord-Pas-de-Calais).

The main outputs and results by policy area for these 12 regions are presented below.

1. "Knowledge Economy, Innovation, Competitiveness"

A major 2009 achievement across all French regions was the carrying out of SRIs. It must be emphasised again that a large majority of regions report that the priorities defined in the SRI are being taken into account and are having or will have an impact on the mid-term revisions, even minor in financial terms.

A first group of outputs relates to R&D and innovation and a second to competitiveness of enterprises.

1.1. R&D and Innovation

Most outputs are reported for **R&D**, **collaborative (research-industry) R&D projects** (as in 2009) and **innovation-support and technology transfer infrastructure, networks and services**. In fact, 2009 was the real kick-off for implementation. However, relatively few projects are completely achieved because the preparation phase has been long and the implementation, for research projects as well as for collaborative projects, in general takes 2 to 3 years (e.g.: Champagne-Ardenne, Limousin, Midi-Pyrénées). We have thus a more realistic view of actual achievements than in the country report 2010.

Concerning **R&D**, outputs cover first infrastructure and equipment of 2 types: either research *stricto sensu* or 'technological platforms' supporting applied research[39]. In the field of research, the feasibility study for the strategic project 'Temis Sciences' in Franche-Comté (relocation in a single place of micro- and nano-technologies labs) is achieved. In Limousin, phase 2 of the European Centre for Ceramics (school of engineers and research labs) is also

[39] They can be defined as "mutualised equipment open to the industry" (AIR Languedoc-Roussillon).

achieved and the new building dedicated to XLIM (a grouping of labs: mathematics, optics, electromagnetism, electronics) has been built. In Rhône-Alpes, the European Centre for Nuclear Resonance has benefited from new equipment. Support to R&D infrastructure has also started in Midi-Pyrénées (after delays in obtaining building licenses).

First achievements concerning 'technological platforms' are mentioned in the AIRs (they may concern feasibility studies or first phases of implementation more than complete realisations): development of *Institut Pierre Vernier* (industrial process) and the technical platform Innova@LIM[40] in Franche-Comté; 2 *plateaux techniques* in Bretagne (biology/health; sport/health); 3 technical platforms created or strengthened in Centre; a technical platform on extraction and characterisation of vegetal fibres in Champagne-Ardenne; the House of Innovative Processes in Midi-Pyrénées; and the selection of 5 technological platforms in Rhône-Alpes.

R&D projects have been effectively started, but only a few of them are fully implemented: marine research projects (Bretagne with the development of *Europôle Mer*), regional research clusters (Centre). In Champagne-Ardenne, 4 operations of commercialisation of large-scale research projects have been supported (agro-resources and sustainable development of regional agriculture, advanced materials, information systems, health/oncology). In Limousin, the only projects achieved within the specific priority axis dedicated to interregional and international cooperation, are research projects. By contrast, in Franche-Comté and PACA, the AIRs only mention programmed R&D projects. Finally, some AIRs mention Ph.D grants to students (Limousin) and the implementation of projects related to scientific and technical culture (Midi-Pyrénées).

In the Convergence regions reviewed, research infrastructure (Guadeloupe) and research projects (La Réunion) have been funded with a 'structuring' effect on labs for the latter (attraction of 'external' researchers: 30 by end-2009).

As in 2009, **the results achieved so far as regards R&D are in general related in each region to its *pôles de compétitivité*, *filières* or poles of excellence**. There is some shift from what happened during the programming period 2000-2006 (mainly in the first years) when in many cases the influence and interests of academic institutions prevailed over the logic of regional development.

The number of **collaborative (research-industry) R&D** projects supported has significantly increased (see indicator EU5). These projects are either related to *pôles de compétitivité* or to the regional *filières* or poles of excellence. The situation is however varies among the different regions. Centre, Champagne-Ardenne, Languedoc-Roussillon, Midi-Pyrénées, Rhône-Alpes, and La Réunion have good achievements. In Midi-Pyrénées, the implementation of projects (and their programming) has been boosted by the success of the aerospace industry (Airbus) through the *pôle de compétitivité* Aerospace Valley. In Rhône-

[40] Innovation in food and cooking.

Alpes, important projects have been developed through the *pôles* Minalogic, Lyonbiopole and Imaginove and through the 'regional' clusters (for the latter due to the action of the regional development and innovation agency, ARDI)[41]. In La Réunion, the collaborative projects are related in particular to the *pôle* Qualitropic. The case of Languedoc-Roussillon, with its 36 projects, is particularly interesting since there was an external evaluation of the impact of the projects which showed that they have[42]: favoured partnerships between SMEs and large companies; contributed to increase patents; opened new markets to SMEs; increased scientific publications in the labs involved; stimulated the relationship between SMEs and research and the development of new collaborative projects outside *pôles de compétitivité*.

By contrast, some regions report delays in implementation and programming, due to problems related to ERDF funding for projects supported by the FUI[43] and led by public research labs (Limousin, PACA) or to the crisis (Nord-Pas-de-Calais)[44]. PACA, which has its own regional cluster policy with the PRIDES[45], is still in a sensitization and audit phase with respect to PRIDES collaborative projects. There is some specificity attached to the Convergence regions: the depth of the crisis, difficulties in involving businesses (generally very small ones), the weakness of 'project engineering'.

The third area with significant outputs and results is the **support to technology transfer and innovation-support organisations**. Three examples illustrate the role of ERDF funding in this area. In Languedoc-Roussillon, ERDF has contributed to the establishment of the regional innovation network, under the coordination by *Transferts LR* of the regional innovation actors. In Nord-Pas-de-Calais, ERDF has supported *Nord France Innovation Développement* through the funding of its back-office missions (in particular: the improvement of the professional level of staff and the management of information systems). In Rhône-Alpes, ERDF is supporting the actions of ARDI, created in 2009, and of its PULLTECH project, which aims at putting in relation the suppliers of technologies coming from public research with the industry needs as identified by ARDI.

On the whole, it appears that: a) while it was relatively easy to commit funds for R&D projects, implementing projects is relatively long in particular when public research is involved; b) the implementation (and programming) of collaborative R&D projects depends for a significant part upon the economic context – which explains the differences between regions.

[41] Region Rhône-Alpes has set up a cluster policy supporting 'research clusters' and 'industrial clusters'.

[41] "*Mobilisation du FEDER pour le financement des projets des pôles de compétitivité*".

[42] Evaluation des besoins de financements des projets collaboratifs de R&D, Strasbourg Conseil, 2010.

[43] Fonds unique interministériel which funds the collaborative projects of pôles de compétitivité.

[44] Curiously, Languedoc-Roussillon did not seem to encounter difficulties in starting 23 projects co-funded by ERDF and FUI (out of the 36 mentioned in the 2010 AIR).

[45] Pôles régionaux d'innovation et de développement économique et social.

1.2. Competitiveness of enterprises

Implementation of **Collective actions** has effectively started in 2010. They benefit regional *filières* or promising economic sectors and aim at supporting innovation: Centre, Limousin, Nord-Pas-de-Calais, Champagne-Ardenne (realisation of a development strategy of the ICT sector, setting up of a cluster focused on medical devices), Franche-Comté (ICT and computing), Midi-Pyrénées (agro-food and mechanical industry, the latter in relation to Airbus)[46], Rhône-Alpes (11 implemented, among which ARDI actions on the 'textile ecosystem'). In all these regions, collective actions are considered as 'dynamic'. Other collective actions are supporting retail and craftsmanship (in Centre, the 2013 target has already been reached) and very small enterprises (Franche-Comté with the project *L'Usine Belfort*). Languedoc-Roussillon has supported actions favouring the access of innovative enterprises to new markets. The PACA AIR indicates collective actions focused on the "sustainable performance" of SMEs and very small enterprises[47] which seem to have started.

Actions targeted at individual enterprises have also been implemented: support to innovative investment (Franche-Comté, Languedoc-Roussillon, Limousin, Midi-Pyrénées); support services to development or innovative projects (Franche-Comté, Nord-Pas-de-Calais, Rhône-Alpes). However, in some cases, it appears that only operations of sensitisation and training have been achieved. There is again a contrast between regions due to the economic context: while individual actions suffer from delays in Languedoc-Roussillon because of the crisis, they are very successful in Midi-Pyrénées because of the dynamism of the aerospace industry[48] (144 projects of innovative investment of SMEs and very small enterprises).

OSEO[49] support to innovative projects – in principal channelled through an ERDF global grant – is implemented successfully as illustrated in Champagne-Ardenne, Languedoc-Roussillon, and Nord-Pas-de-Calais. In Nord-Pas-de-Calais, 132 projects have been implemented, 59% of which corresponding to radical innovation with high technical and economic risk.

Measures relating to the **creation and transfer of businesses** have started to produce outputs. They are particularly important in Nord-Pas-de-Calais and Midi-Pyrénées. In Midi-Pyrénées, 5,800 businesses have been supported within the regional scheme *Reprise-Création-Transmission*. Concerning the **creation and incubation of innovative enterprises**, 13 start-ups have been created and incubated in Franche-Comté, and 11 in Midi-Pyrénées; however, in Languedoc-Roussillon, support to the creation of innovative businesses has

[46] 22 collective actions implemented in relation with the *Contrats d'appui à l'industrie*.
[47] *Programme PLATO PME*.
[48] Plus the regional scheme *Contrats d'appui à l'industrie* (see country report 2010).
[49] OSEO is the national innovation support agency.

stopped for lack of valuable projects. The AIR Bretagne, Champagne-Ardenne, Languedoc-Roussillon and Rhône-Alpes signal the construction of *pépinières d'entreprises*[50].

Outputs in terms of **industrial real estate** can be seen in Centre (1st phase of the technological park of Sologne) and 6 innovation parks are being built in Franche-Comté (47 enterprises with R&D activities located in them). However, projects in Languedoc-Roussillon have been delayed.

A last area for which outputs are reported is **access to finance for SMEs or 'financial engineering'**. JEREMIE effectively started in Languedoc-Roussillon with EUR 30 million granted to the *Fonds de participation*, but there has not been so far investment in businesses. Champagne-Ardenne, Midi-Pyrénées, and Rhône-Alpes have fed regional funds of *prêts d'honneur* benefiting to very small businesses. Limousin has funded a *Plate-forme d'initiative locale* (PFIL) which was so successful that the all money committed has been spent. Midi-Pyrénées has funded regional guarantee funds. By contrast, the AIR Nord-Pas-de-Calais indicates difficulties in starting the implementation of 'financial engineering' measures.

In the 2 Convergence regions reviewed, there has been a slowdown in private investment in relation with the crisis which has hampered the implementation of collective (9 implemented in Guadeloupe) and individual actions targeted at enterprises. However, there have been in La Réunion some outputs in terms of support to investment in the sectors of building, transport and water management and treatment, and 5 innovative projects have been incubated. In Guadeloupe, the preliminary studies for the creation of a regional investment fund (FIP: *Fonds d'investissement de proximité*) have been achieved and the fund was created by end-2010; ERDF money also fed the 0 interest loans granted by the PFIL.

Conclusion: Main results

- The regional governance of innovation has made progress in a number of regions.
- ERDF has significantly contributed to the results of the policy of *Pôles de compétitivité*, in particular collaborative (business-research) R&D projects and technological platforms, and, in some regions, to results of the regional clusters.
- Results in competitiveness of enterprises (though collective actions and support to creation and transfer) widely differ according to the regions: they are important in the regions, such as Midi-Pyrénées, where there are robust regional policies in this field.
- There is no result so far for access to finance for SMEs since outputs only concern the creation of or investment in funds (including JEREMIE).

[50] In France, there is a distinction between incubator facilities (for innovative enterprises, start-ups and academic spin-offs in their early stage) and *pépinières* dedicated to 'classical' new businesses. The Rhône-Alpes operation, CAMPUS PRO (600 m2), is part of the "Integrated Urban Project" of Lyon Metropolitan Authority

2. "Sustainable development and Environment"

As already emphasised, there has been an important catching up of this policy area in terms of commitment rate[51] and, though to a lesser extent, of implementation rate[52] with respect to 2009.

Outputs and results are particularly visible in the areas of Biodiversity / natural resources / protection of environment, Energy, and Prevention of risks.

Concerning **Biodiversity, natural resources and the protection of environment**, a number of studies have been implemented such as a study for a regional plan 'migrating fish' (Bretagne), inventories of biodiversity and remarkable landscapes (Centre), an observatory of phyto-sanitary practices in agriculture (Champagne-Ardenne), schemes for water management (Midi-Pyrénées), a study on the knowledge of water resources and for setting up an observatory of humid areas (PACA), etc. PACA also realised a diagnostic concerning the sustainable management of water resources for preparing a call for proposals to be launched in 2011. ERDF also contributed to the drafting of Charters of regional natural parks and local Agenda 21[53]. Various actions of information, communication and sensitisation have also been implemented. In general, the projects are small and require local operators which may be difficult to identify.

Beyond studies and sensitisation, Languedoc-Roussillon has started the rehabilitation of 5 coastal sites, and a large operation concerning water quality and the restoration of a natural area (*Etang de Thau*). Other operations achieved concern the management of a protected natural area (Champagne-Ardenne), the support to tourism businesses in terms of environmental management (Bretagne), and the funding of a device helping migrating fish to bypass river dams (Midi-Pyrénées). Nord-Pas-de-Calais has realised studies for an ambitious and complex project of restoration and management of natural areas, known as *Trame bleue-trame verte* which concern river environments (there is a specific evaluation concerning this project).

In the field of **energy (renewable energies and energy efficiency)**, the *Grenelle de l'environnement* and a 2009 EU regulation[54] have boosted programming and implementation at a lesser level. Following the 2009 EU regulation, Centre, Champagne-Ardenne, Limousin, Languedoc-Roussillon, Midi-Pyrénées, Rhône-Alpes, have started or implemented programmes of energy efficiency and renewable energy investments in social housing. 2010 was with this respect a crucial year even if some regions are late: Nord-Pas-de-Calais (still at an "experimental stage"), or PACA (at project selection stage: 16 operations selected). The AIR Franche-Comté explains that the starting of such a

[51] E.g.: AIRs Bretagne, Nord-Pas-de-Calais, PACA.

[52] E.g.: AIRs Midi-Pyrénées (strong progress of commitment, but few projects implemented so far and Rhône-Alpes.

[53] Agendas 21: Champagne-Ardenne, Franche-Comté, Limousin, Rhône-Alpes.

[54] Regulation (EC) No 397/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 6 May 2009 amending Regulation (EC) No 1080/2006 on the European Regional Development Fund as regards the eligibility of energy efficiency and renewable energy investments in housing.

programme required a preliminary process for collecting demands and proposals and an action towards public or semi-public property companies; in addition, it underlines that operations are highly diversified with a few large scale projects and a lot of very small ones.

Apart from social housing, a number of projects have been achieved in the field of renewable energies, increasingly concerning wood heating and biomass (Champagne-Ardenne, Franche-Comté, Limousin, Languedoc-Roussillon, Midi-Pyrénées, PACA, Rhône-Alpes), less and less the photovoltaic (PV) sector. This shift is in relation with the over-consumption of funding in the PV sector in some regions (e.g.: Midi-Pyrénées) and the change in the French government policy. Moreover, wood has an economic development dimension since a number of regions are supporting a *filière bois-énergie* (e.g.: Franche-Comté, Languedoc-Roussillon, Midi-Pyrénées).

Actions of information, communication, sensitisation have also been implemented: towards enterprises in the field of eco-building (Centre, Nord-Pas-de-Calais, Rhône-Alpes, Franche-Comté). Centre has supported a project of R&D, testing and exhibition centre concerning concrete (*Centre d'études et de recherche de l'industrie du béton*). Rhône-Alpes has supported a comprehensive awareness raising action 'Energy-Environment' in its territorial projects.

The **prevention of risks** is the third area where outputs and results have made significant progress. Studies and works have been achieved mainly with respect to flood risk: Champagne-Ardenne, Franche-Comté, Languedoc-Roussillon – where there were catastrophic floods in past years. In Languedoc-Roussillon, small projects have been implemented so far, but a few large projects are now sufficiently 'mature' for being funded[55].

PACA has set up an alert system for forest fire (RYTMME project) and Rhône-Alpes for the risk of flood coming from a natural water reservoir inside the glacier of Tête Rousse.

Beyond the three areas reviewed, two projects are worth mentioning. Bretagne has set up a unit for industrial waste treatment and transformation (wood waste) and Rhône-Alpes has established an inter-enterprise transport plan for the employees working in the business park *Savoie Hexapole*.

The outputs in the 2 **Convergence regions** reviewed are different to some extent. In Guadeloupe, they are focused on waste: a process of selective recycle of packaging has started, and the negotiations with the Commission concerning *Grand Projet* of a platform of waste treatment in Pointe-à-Pitre have progressed[56]; the construction of a ground-based PV unit has also started. The results are much more diversified in La Réunion: 25 operations concerning renewable energies in social housing (PV and biomass); support to businesses for waste recycling; construction of waste reception centres; prevention of risks (floods); 6

[55] Population benefiting from measures of protection against floods : 230,000 in Franche-Comté and 370,000 in Languedoc-Roussillon by end-2010.

[56] A study on eco-enterprises has also been achieved.

actions of protection of the environment; and, last but not least, important operations concerning water resources (irrigation of the western coast, drinkable water, construction or extension of waste water treatment units).

Conclusion: Main results

- Environment and biodiversity: ERDF has contributed to a better knowledge of problems and issues and to a much lesser extent so far to the protection and management of natural areas (through a number of studies and sensitisation actions.
- Energy: ERDF has started to contribute to the improvement of energy efficiency in social housing (very few quantitative data are so far available[57]); it has contributed strongly to the use of PV solar energy in housing pushing changes in the national renewable energy policy; it has started to contribute to the development of biomass energy (wood).
- ERDF has also contributed to the prevention of the flood risk.

3. "Accessibility and Transport" (including ICT)

In the field of **transport**, some large railway operations have started such as *Bretagne Grande Vitesse* (79.4 km have been completed allowing for higher speed); the electrification of the railroad Bourges-Saincaize (Centre) started in September 2010. Midi-Pyrénées has achieved 3 projects of modernisation of railway stations (within the *Plan Rail 2008-2013* of the Regional Council. Three projects of urban transportation (tramway) have started or are making progress in Rennes (Bretagne), Valenciennes and Maubeuge (Nord-Pas-de-Calais). A number of projects of 'multimodal poles'[58] are supported (Champagne-Ardenne, Limousin, Nord-Pas-de-Calais, PACA, Rhône-Alpes), but the majority seems to be at the feasibility study stage; 2 have been realised in Nord-Pas-de-Calais, and 4 operations favouring the use of cycles in railway stations have been achieved in Rhône-Alpes. Nord-Pas-de-Calais has also realised an action in favour of clean and sustainable urban transportation ('clean buses' using biogas).

Implementation in the field of **ICT** involves two types of projects: access to broadband infrastructure and uses of ICT (and e-services). Operations aimed at giving access to broadband infrastructure started in 2009 while there was no project in the field of e-services.

In 2010, access to broadband infrastructure made progress (Bretagne, Centre, Franche-Comté, Languedoc-Roussillon, Midi-Pyrénées, Nord-Pas-de-Calais, Rhône-Alpes). In Bretagne and Franche-Comté, about 15,000 more people are benefiting from broadband

[57] There are some data concerning energy efficiency projects implemented (50 in Bretagne, 13 in Champagne-Ardenne) or the number of TOE (ton oil equivalent) saved due to ERDF intervention (41 per year in Rhône-Alpes; 297 per year in Midi-Pyrénées; 2100 by the end of 2010 in Champagne-Ardenne; 18,413 by the end of 2010 in Nord-Pas-de-Calais).

[58] *Pôles d'échanges multimodaux* : the projects concern infrastructure and equipment in railway stations aimed at facilitating the connection with pedestrian ways and urban transportation, and the use of cycles.

infrastructure. 57 operations have been implemented in Nord-Pas-de-Calais, leading to a replenishment of the funding dedicated to the measure. Languedoc-Roussillon (*Num'Hér@ult*: +40,000 beneficiaries[59]) and Rhône-Alpes (*Ardèche-Drôme Numérique*) have pursued the implementation of their optical fibre network[60].

Concerning uses of ICT and e-services, Languedoc-Roussillon has a high implementation rate with 21 projects achieved in the field of *espaces publics numériques*[61] or 'cyber-bases' and dematerialisation of services. Champagne-Ardenne and Nord-Pas-de-Calais have developed services in the field of health and medicine, Bretagne in the field of geographical information systems (GIS: *Plate forme d'échange et de visualisation GEOBRETAGNE*). Midi-Pyrénées has set up 6 'cyber-bases', e-administration services, and a specific service of real-time information regard regional transportation. Rhône-Alpes has implemented a batch of actions in the field of services to enterprises: promotion of the appropriation of ICT by SMEs and very small enterprises (1st phase: *Espace numérique Isère*); experimentation of 'teleworking' in 6 very small enterprises; support to the uses of ICT in urban areas facing social problems[62] (within PUI: 'Integrated Urban Projects'); setting up of the *Pôle numérique de la Drôme* with an area dedicated to enterprises. By contrast, the AIR Limousin signals delays in implementation due to the delayed approval of the regional scheme for the development of ICT uses and services (SDUS).

The outputs and results in the 2 Convergence regions reviewed concern the bus network (improvement of bus stops) in Guadeloupe, the improvement of port and airport infrastructure (in the axes dedicated to overcoming handicaps) in both regions, access to broadband communications and e-services (Internet portal for enterprises in Guadeloupe, 11 operations in La Réunion among which one dedicated to GIS). Of the 2 large projects "Accessibility & Transport" in La Réunion, one has made progress (*Route des Tamarins*)[63] while the other one was abandoned (*Tram-train*) due to a change of majority in the Regional Council. ERDF has also supported maritime freight in both regions in order to compensate handicaps.

Conclusion: Main results

- The number of people benefiting from broadband communications has already significantly increased due to ERDF intervention (there are some quantitative data although heterogeneous[64]).

[59] And +1,500 households for very high broadband.

[60] Services to enterprises are operational from early 2010 and services to households from autumn 2010.

[61] Public points of access to ICT services.

[62] The so-called Quartiers sensibles.

[63] 28 km of new roads by end-2009.

[64] According to the regions, data concern the number of households, the number of towns, the additional beneficiary population, or the percentage of beneficiary population.

- ERDF has also allowed for the development of e-services to the benefit of enterprises and households (e-administration, health and telemedicine) and the setting up of cyber-bases.
- Access to and environment of railway stations has improved in some cities.
- Speed on the future Bretagne high-speed railroad (BGV) has already accelerated on a portion of the route.

4. "Territorial development and others"

The most noteworthy outputs and results concern urban areas, rural areas, tourism, and social and cultural projects.

Urban projects are generally targeted at urban areas with social problems, often within 'Integrated Urban Projects'. In Centre and Champagne-Ardenne, there were still (as signalled in 2009) problems with the call for proposals for urban projects. However, operations were implemented in industrial parks (industrial park La Radio in Dreux, storage platform in Champagne-Ardenne). Two integrated projects of urban requalification have started in Montpellier and Nîmes/Alès (Languedoc-Roussillon) and a public park was realised in Toulouse within a PUI. In Franche-Comté, 13 urban areas have benefited from actions of 'sustainable development' related to urban policy (e.g.: building of a facility for contemporary music[65]). In PACA, projects have started in the 'sensitive' urban districts of Marseille[66] and Toulon[67] metropolitan areas. In Nord-Pas-de-Calais, 21 projects of 'territorial excellence' (reconversion of derelict urban areas) have been started, but starting them has proved difficult. On the whole, the AIRs emphasise the difficulties encountered in launching urban projects, in general because of complex technical and administrative procedures, sometimes because of the crisis. In Centre, these difficulties have led the managing authority to plan a thematic evaluation on the 'urban strand' of the ERDF OP. In Rhône-Alpes, it is considered necessary to strengthen the network of actors to favour the emergence of new projects (there are however achievements: operations regarding ICT uses for disadvantaged people; the already mentioned CAMPUS PRO on 600 m^2 inaugurated in October 2010).

With respect to **rural areas**, Limousin has funded RUR@CT, a European innovation network of rural regions. Nord-Pas-de-Calais has implemented local development projects concerning craftsmanship and retail activities and studies for rehabilitating old industrial and mining sites. PACA committed funds in 2010 for 80 operations aimed at "improving the contribution of rural areas to regional competitiveness"; this measure had been previously been a victim of the crisis since rural municipalities had difficulties in funding their share. Rural areas also benefit from measures targeted at tourism.

[65] Espaces musiques actuelles in Montbéliard.

[66] 5 projects implemented (communication on commercial districts, preparation to driving license for disadvantaged young people, requalification of an historical district, 'Jobs' platform).

[67] 10 operations supported by non-profit/social organisations.

Tourism projects concern mountain areas in Franche-Comté – 20 projects implemented in Jura: promotion and communication, diversification of touristic activities, equipment of touristic sites – and Midi-Pyrénées – Pyrénées: conservation of natural resources, river tourism. Limousin has realised a museum in Limoges. Languedoc-Roussillon has implemented a requalification of the beaches on the Mediterranean coast[68].Rhône-Alpes has realised the equipment of touristic sites in Savoie, Vercors, and for the 'Chauvet' cave (where remarkable prehistoric paintings were discovered a few years ago).

In the **social and cultural field**, Champagne-Ardenne, Franche-Comté, Limousin, and Midi-Pyrénées have implemented operations targeted at social inclusion, jobs and training (*Maisons emploi-formation*)[69]. Centre has also funded ICT equipment for the Orléans *médiathèque.*

Finally, the Rhône-Alpes programme '*Pour et Sur le Développement Régional*' (PSDR) deserves a special mention[70]. PSDR is carrying out research on regional development in rural areas and the role played by economic activities, in particular agriculture. Within this comprehensive programme, various projects have been implemented beyond the funding of the operational part of the programme, among which 2 methodological projects regarding the application of the research results as tools for local development. An evaluation of PSDR is currently being started.

In the Convergence regions reviewed, we also find urban projects started or implemented: the urban rehabilitation of specific districts of Pointe à Pitre has started (demolition, equipment of public areas, new housing), restructuring of urban districts in La Réunion. In La Réunion, there have been studies and realisations for the equipment of 6 outstanding touristic sites. In Guadeloupe, public buildings have been refurbished to comply with new para-seismic standards. In La Réunion, 3 operations have been implemented in the health and social field (e.g.: home for retired people).

Conclusion: Main results

- ERDF has started to contribute to the *Politique de la Ville* (urban policy) to the benefit of districts facing social problems with very diversified operations (requalification of sites, social inclusion, support to job search, economic development) often complex to set up for administrative and technical reasons.
- The equipment of touristic sites has benefited from ERDF and this result is the most important contribution of ERDF to improvement in rural areas so far.

[68] Aménagement du Lido de Sète à Marseillan.

[69] E.g. Midi-Pyrénées: 20 operations in the field of long life learning, vocational training, maisons employ-formation.

[70] There are in fact PSDR programmes in other regions : Grand Ouest, Aquitaine, Auvergne, Bourgogne, Languedoc-Roussillon, and Midi-Pyrénées.

An overview of Achievements in the Cross-Border Cooperation Programmes

The distinction between the projects approved, those which are ongoing and those which are implemented is again sometimes difficult.

R&D cooperation has started in a satisfactory manner, but a lot of projects are still ongoing because research projects take a minimum of 2-3 years to implement: 14 ongoing projects and one partnership agreement for R&D activities for France (Manche)-Angleterre; 22 co-operation projects between centres of competences and 40 actions in the field of R&D and technology transfer for the Grande Région; 544 R&D institutions participating in networks and using common services for the Rhin Supérieur.

With respect to cooperation between businesses and cross-border economic development, the AIR France-Suisse indicates 85 projects of partnerships and networking of enterprises, and the AIR Rhin Supérieur 29 projects supporting economic cooperation. France (Manche)-Angleterre has implemented a project in the field of support to the creation of new enterprises and services to businesses. The AIR Grande Région presents the following outputs and results: 259 actions of sensitisation to cross-border cooperation, networking operations for 85 clusters, 406 businesses supported for their international positioning, 200 start-ups supported, 65 services to enterprises due to cross-border cooperation, etc.

Implemented projects encouraging and improving environmental protection and joint environmental management are 2 for France (Manche)-Angleterre, 13 for France-Suisse, 24 for Rhin Supérieur. Grande Région has implemented 502 projects in the field of management of natural resources. France (Manche)-Angleterre has supported scientific projects in the field of environment. Grande Région has implemented or is implementing various projects in the field of energy efficiency (293), renewable energies (57 pilot actions, in particular information and sensitisation, biomass, analysis of needs in a pilot area, etc.). France-Suisse has initiated a tri-national network on energy (TRION). Grande Région has also implemented 45 projects in the field of waste treatment and recycling.

Implemented projects aimed at reducing isolation through improved access to transport, ICT networks and services amount to 9 for Deux Mers, 16 for France-Suisse (among which 4 favouring the harmonisation of transport services and 2 focused on ICT) and 7 for Rhin Supérieur. Major achievements concern the Southern business and industrial parks of the Bâle-Mulhouse Airport, and the creation of a cross-border bus line between German cities and Basel.

Tourism projects have been implemented: 6 for Deux Mers (sustainable tourism in particular), 22 for France-Suisse (tourism and culture). Rhin Supérieur has implemented the RheNaTour project focused on the Rhine Valley and created new touristic products; France (Manche)-Angleterre has set up 2 cultural touristic circuits. Grande Région has supported 14 projects for structuring the supply of tourism products and services, in particular for 'niche' tourism, and implemented 43 promotion and communication actions.

Others implemented projects concern: culture and heritage[71]; social and health services[72]; training (linguistic in particular) and employment[73]

Conclusion:

There were very few projects implemented at the end of 2009 and the first achievements are now visible in 2010, even if they are limited. Increased and improved networking is the main tangible result with AIRs signalling a number of cooperation agreements between organisations and joint uses of infrastructure.

3. EFFECTS OF INTERVENTION

The effects of ERDF intervention are necessarily limited in the French Competitiveness & Employment regions because of the amount of financial allocations. However, ERDF interventions may have long-term effects when there is a clear convergence between EU strategic orientations and national ones, as happens in the field RTDI and competitiveness.

As it was stressed in the 2010 country report, the Regional Innovation Strategies (SRIs) have reinforced the interest in and commitment to innovation support policies of most politicians and officials (State and regional administrations) at regional level. This interest and commitment started after the first French reforms on RTDI (1999: *Loi sur l'innovation et la recherche*; 2003: *Plan Innovation*; etc.) and the adoption of the Lisbon Strategy at EU level (2000). However, they were limited to a few regions, in particular to those in the South which had benefited from the re-location of research centres and teams[74] from Ile de France; in these regions, politicians and officials wanted to capitalise on the research potential to support technology transfer to existing businesses and the creation and attraction of innovative companies. The SRIs have contributed significantly across all French regions to the 'homogenisation' of interest in innovation and spreading a 'culture of innovation' in State and regional administrations. The SRIs had a clear impact on raising awareness of the importance of a more demand-oriented (in particular with respect to SMEs) and project-based (as against a 'window-based') approach, giving more weight to non-technological innovation and innovation in services, as well as to financial engineering.

The 2010 study on the development of innovation strategies in the French regions as part of the ERDF OPs 2007-2013[75], carried out on behalf of DG REGIO, confirms in general the points mentioned above, adding that emphasis was put on human resources (considered as a key factor of innovation) and internationalisation. It also stresses that, while the results of

[71] E.g. Rhin Supérieur: a cultural supplement to regional newspapers; the exhibition « *L'art du Rhin supérieur autour de 1500 : étude et diffusion d'un patrimoine commun* ».

[72] E.g. Grande Région: access to health services (exchange and information on patients' mobility); training courses on palliative care.

[73] E.g. Grande Région: implementation of a study on the transparency of the cross-border labour market.

[74] According to the French concept of *décentralisation*.

[75] *Etude sur l'évolution des diagnostics et des stratégies régionales d'innovation dans les regions françaises dans le cadre des PO FEDER 2007-2013*, ADE, July 2010.

the SRI exercise still remain fragile[76], the SRIs have given rise to a mid-to-long-term perspective for innovation support policies.

The 2010 AIRs reveal that a majority of regions have started to set up the 'innovation governance systems' which constituted a key part of the SRIs recommendations. It remains to be seen if these governance systems will be able to keep up the momentum given by the SRIs in the years to come.

In parallel, ERDF supports collaborative (business-research) R&D projects located within national and regional policies supporting innovation-driven clusters. It thus contributes to fostering a culture and practice of collaboration in industry and the academic community. These types of impact may mitigate in part the effects of the new French regional divide between the most productive regions and the regions with an economy based on a 'public-residential' model[77] by helping the most productive regions to innovate even more, and the others to turn to a different model based on innovation and entrepreneurship.
Moreover, the SRIs appear to have 'rejuvenated' the 2005-2006 SRDE to some extent and, accordingly, they may affect the overall approach of regional development in future years.
There is little to say so far about the effects of ERDF intervention in other policy areas, except that the ERDF co-funding of energy efficiency and renewable energy investment in social housing is contributing to boost the French energy efficiency policy.
Concerning the role of ERDF support in combating the effects of the crisis, the *Plan de relance* has helped to accelerate the absorption of the ERDF support for the knowledge economy (R&D infrastructure), energy efficiency and renewable energies, and transport (and to some extent ICT) infrastructure. It has enabled national public investment to be maintained while regional authorities also maintained their level of investment, through co-funding of infrastructure; as a consequence, it is considered that, at least in some regions such as Midi-Pyrénées, ERDF played a modest role in combating recession in 2009 and contributed to the 2010 fragile recovery, in particular to the benefit of fragile sectors and innovative businesses[78].

4. EVALUATIONS AND GOOD PRACTICE IN EVALUATION

DATAR, with its department "Regional Development and EU Policies", has an overall responsibility for evaluations concerning ERDF OPs and *Contrats de Plan Etat-Région* (CPER). This responsibility was established in 2007 by a circular of the Prime Minister completed by a detailed annex[79]. Following this circular, a single national evaluation body (*Instance nationale d'évaluation*) was created for both CPER and ERDF OPs; the secretariat of this body

[76] Especially with regard to the balance between research and enterprises, and the adaptation of innovation support measures to non-technological innovation and innovation in services.
[77] L. Davezies, op.cit.
[78] Evaluation à mi-parcours du PO FEDER 2007-2013 Midi-Pyrénées, November 2010.
[79] Circular of 4 May 2007, and Annexe relative au dispositif national et régional d'évaluation des contrats de projets 2007-2013 et des PO FEDER Objectifs Compétitivité régionale et emploi et Convergence 2007-2013.

is provided by DATAR and the Association of French Regions (ARF) is represented in it[80] due to an agreement signed by the Director of DATAR and the President of ARF. According to the annex and the DATAR-ARF agreement, DATAR and the national evaluation body are in charge of defining the range of thematic orientations which the regions will take into account in their regional evaluation plans[81].

However, this scheme has become mainly theoretical. Disagreements have emerged between ARF and DATAR about the objectives of the evaluations; in consequence, ARF has ceased to participate to the *Instance*, which has been *de facto* replaced by a purely technical working group.

Due to the problems concerning the monitoring of the implementation through indicators, it is important to underline that DATAR itself and the national evaluation body have ordered a study "Diagnostic of the regional monitoring system"[82] which has led to an action plan[83]. The objective is to make available complete and homogeneous information necessary for carrying out monitoring, evaluation and communication actions at national and regional level.

The national evaluation orientations and the regional evaluation plans are globally implemented as illustrated hereafter and the AIRs of the regions in which mid-term evaluations and thematic evaluations (CPER and OP) have already been carried out indicate that these evaluations are feeding the OP mid-term revisions.

Table G - Evaluations CPER and ERDF OPs (source: AIRs and DATAR)

Title and date of completion	Policy area and scope	Main objectives	Main findings	Full reference or link to publication
France: Mid-term evaluation of CPER / Higher Education and Research (2010-11)	Enterprise environment and RTDI Human Resources	Identify major obstacles to the implementation of projects and operations - Assess the coherence of initial and actual objectives with other public policies and current reforms	The impact of national policies and reforms have been so far limited in the sample of regions reviewed - PRES and universities have become real actors	http://territoires.gouv.fr/sites/default/files/110415_datar_eval_volet_esr_cper_synthese.pdf
France: Evaluation of CPER / Railways and urban transportation (2010-11)	Transport and telecom	Assess the added value of CPER for the contractualisation of investments - analyse the modes of governance and the level of achievement of initial objectives	CPER is a relevant tool bringing a political and strategic added value	http://www.territoires.gouv.fr/sites/default/files/110316_datar_evaluation_volet_ferroviaire_c

[80] Convention entre la DIACT (the former name of DATAR) et l'ARF relative à l'évaluation des CPER et des programmes européens, 16 January 2008.
[81] According to the circular and its annex, each region had to set up an evaluation plan.
[82] Analyse des systèmes de suivi régionaux des PO et des CPER, Ernst & Young, June 2010.
[83] http://www.europe-en-france.gouv.fr/Extranet/Espace-Evaluation/Ressources-documentaires/Courrier-DATAR-Suites-du-diagnostic-du-systeme-de-suivi-des-PO-et-CPER/(language)/fre-FR

Title and date of completion	Policy area and scope	Main objectives	Main findings	Full reference or link to publication
				per__synthese.pdf
Aquitaine: ongoing evaluation	General	Establishment of scoreboards		
Aquitaine: Innovation and sustainable development in the CPER and EU programmes (November 2009)	Enterprise support and RTDI		Necessary to strengthen 'animation' and training and to set up a transversal monitoring of these fields with corresponding indicators	
Aquitaine: Study on the actions favouring ICT (1st semester 2010)	Transport and telecom	Envisage scenarios for the second programming period based on recent data and analysis of first results	Insufficient implementation, though progress of access to broadband	
Centre: Evaluation of the external coherence of CPER and OP (1st semester 2010)	General	Checking if strategic objectives are still valid	Good coherence with respect to the evolution of the economic context (only minor adaptations are needed)	
Centre: Innovation and economic change in the CPER, ERDF and ESF OPs (1er semester 2010)	Enterprise support and RTDI	Analysis of the state of advancement of the programmes in the field concerned	Strong coherence between SRI and ERDF OP – Innovation through services insufficiently taken into account – Implementation rate not satisfactory	
Centre: Evaluation of the efficiency of measure "Favouring a sustainable development of fragile urban areas" (to be started soon)	Territorial development			
Alsace: Evaluation of a measure supporting industrial real estate (1st semester 2010)	Enterprise support and RTDI	Assess the impact of incubators and *hôtels d'entreprises* on regional development and the economic dynamics of territories	Combine proximity with potential creators of new businesses, revitalisation of old industrial sites, and support services to new businesses	
Alsace: Evaluation concerning the implementation and governance of the OP (started 2nd semester 2010)	General	Improve programming and management		
Auvergne: ongoing evaluation	General			
Bourgogne:	Transport			

Title and date of completion	Policy area and scope	Main objectives	Main findings	Full reference or link to publication
Diagnostic on the uses of ICT (2010)	and telecom			
Bourgogne: Analysis of the implementation of transversal priorities (2010)	General			
Bretagne: Mid-term evaluation focused on innovation, environment and economic change (2010)	Enterprise support and RTDI Environment and energy		Deficit of 'project engineering' – Necessity for strengthening capacities for setting up European projects – Lack of flexibility in research – energy efficiency in social housing insufficiently taken into account	
Champagne-Ardenne: Mid-term evaluation (2010)	General		Not necessary to modify the initial strategy, but take into account the impact of the crisis and SRI recommendations	
Corse: Mid-term pluri-fund evaluation (2010)	General (CPER, ERDF OP, PDRC)			
Franche-Comté: Study on gender equality (2009-10)	Transversal			
Franche-Comté: Innovation, research and technology transfer	Enterprise support and RTDI			
Franche-Comté: Environment in CPER and OP (2010-11)	Environment and energy			
Haute-Normandie: Evaluation of the impact of collaborative projects (public research – business) (2010)	Enterprise support and RTDI	Assess the existing collaborations and the involvement of the different actors and their role in the development of research in the region – Identify strengths and weaknesses		
Ile-de-France: Mid-term evaluation (to be started)	General			
Languedoc-Roussillon: Evaluation of a	Environment and energy	Evaluating the effectiveness and efficiency of the measure – Measuring	Very high level of commitment – Too many demands concerning PV	

Title and date of completion	Policy area and scope	Main objectives	Main findings	Full reference or link to publication
measure of the OP "Encourage energy efficiency and the development of renewable energies, and contribute to the reduction of greenhouse gases emissions (2010)		achievements and concrete outputs – Identifying changes that could be necessary with respect to EU, national and regional objectives	solar equipment – Diversify support to other sources of renewable energies (energy mix)	
Languedoc-Roussillon: Evaluation of funding needs of collaborative R&D projects (2010)	Enterprise support and RTDI	Identifying hindrances and leverage effects – Assess the relevance with respect to the changes identified in the SRI	The measure favoured partnerships between SMEs and large companies, contributed to increase patents, opened new markets to SMEs, increased scientific publications in the labs involved, stimulated the relationship between SMEs and research and the development of new collaborative projects outside *pôles de compétitivité*	
Limousin: ongoing evaluation of the regional innovation reference framework (started 2010) (linked to the SRI)	Enterprise support and RTDI	Strengthen the value chain from research to commercialisation for the *pôles de compétitivité* ELOPSYS and Ceramics – Involve users/clients in the process of conception, experimentation and going on the market for innovative products and services		
Limousin: Mid-term evaluation (2010)	General		Relevance of the strategic orientations – Effectiveness of programmes – However: few actions in the field of environment; limited implementation of EU orientations regarding rural areas	
Lorraine: Evaluation of the Scientific and Technological Research Poles (PRST) (started early 2011)	Enterprise environment and RTDI			
Lorraine: Combating	Environment	Review and assess CPER and		

Title and date of completion	Policy area and scope	Main objectives	Main findings	Full reference or link to publication
climate change (started September 2010)	and energy	OP actions – Check coherence with other measures in the field of energy efficiency and renewable energies – Assess the impact of new public policies and emerging needs		
Pays de la Loire: Mid-term evaluation (2010)	General	Improve commitment and implementation taking account of the change in the socio-economic context		
Nord-Pas-de-Calais: Mid-term evaluation (2010)	General	Prepare the mid-term revision	The OP is still relevant with respect to change in the economic context	
Nord-Pas-de-Calais : Evaluation of the project « Trame verte-trame bleue » (2010)	Environment and energy	Identify project dynamics, assess leverage effect of ERDF funding, assess good practices	Relevance of the project and positive results – However, necessity for reconfirming operational objectives and adjust tools for the coming years	
Picardie: Mid-term evaluation (2010)	General			
Poitou-Charentes: Mid-term evaluation (starting September 2011)	General			
PACA: Mid-term evaluation (2010)	General	Prepare the mid-term revision	Implement the SRI – Take into account societal and territorial innovation more – identify better SME projects	
Midi-Pyrénées: Mid-term evaluation (2010)	General			
Rhône-Alpes: Mid-term evaluation with a focus on "Integrated Urban Projects" and sustainable development (2010)	General + Territorial development + Environment and energy	Prepare the mid-term revision	Good level of commitment due to efforts of 'animation' – The overall strategy remains relevant – Implementation tools have been renovated – Delays in commitment and implementation for urban projects – re-evaluate ambitions in relation to some sustainable development actions	
Rhône-Alpes: Study on the effects of	Human Resources	Establish a scoreboard of the impact on employment		

Title and date of completion	Policy area and scope	Main objectives	Main findings	Full reference or link to publication
CPER and OP on employment (started October 2010)		of economic development policies		
Guyane: Mid-term evaluation (started July 2010)	General	Assess the internal and external coherence CPER-OP - Assess the efficiency, effectiveness and relevance		Website DG REGIO
Guadeloupe: Mid-term evaluation (2009-10)	General			Annex to the AIR
Martinique: ongoing evaluation	General			
La Réunion: Mid-term evaluation of the integrated multi-fund strategy of the EU programmes (2010)	General			http://www.reunioneurope.org/UE_DOC-rapport_2007-2013.asp

The DATAR department "Regional Development and EU Policies" is preparing a synthesis of mid-term evaluations which will be made public (expected for October 2011).

The major points emerging from Table G can be summarised as follows:

- A large majority of regions have decided to carry out a mid-term evaluation.
- Mid-term evaluations have not led to 'revolutionary' conclusions: they have in general confirmed the relevance of the strategic orientations.
- As a consequence, they have so far in general led to relatively minor changes in the mid-term revisions. However, it is probably too early assess to what extent their recommendations have been effectively used.
- A large majority of thematic evaluations have so far been carried out in the policy area "Enterprise environment and RTDI" which is not surprising, given its importance and the fact that commitment has become easier in this area over the years.
- "Environment and energy" comes second far behind.
- Only few regional evaluations have been made public so far.
- Evaluation methods remain 'classical' without any significant methodological innovation, such as counterfactual analysis or use of econometric models.

The list of evaluations planned for 2011[84] shows a trend towards diversification: PUI (Aquitaine and PACA), equal opportunities and impact of programmes on employment in beneficiary enterprises (Basse-Normandie), interventions in rural areas (Bourgogne), climate change (Franche-Comté and Lorraine), sustainable development (Martinique), etc.

[84] Crédits d'évaluation PO/CPER 2011 - Synthèse des demandes régionales FNADT - Mars 2011.

It must be emphasised that, apart from the evaluations related to CPER and OPs, other evaluation studies of some importance in relation to the cohesion policy have been carried out in 2010 such as for instance:

- at national level: evaluation of the State policy support to innovation poles for craftsmanship and small enterprises;
- at regional level: evaluation of the *filières* policy (Basse-Normandie and Franche-Comté); evaluation of the regional programme of creation and transfer of businesses, of flagship research projects, and of the regional programme for the development of craftsmanship (Nord-Pas-de-Calais).

A second evaluation of the national policy of *pôles de compétitivité* and of the 71 individual poles is now being planned for end of 2011-spring 2012[85]. It is all the more important since there are now significant outputs and results (there were only few at the moment of the first evaluation which took place in 2008). This second evaluation has been prepared on the basis of a preliminary work done within the *Observatoire des pôles de compétitivité*[86], focusing on methodology and comparisons with similar evaluations in Austria (Lower Austria), Belgium (the Walloon Region) and Germany (the BioRegio programme). This work underlines the existence of 2 methodological models for the evaluation of clusters: an 'economist' one focusing on the economic impacts (BioRegio) and a 'management' one focusing on the building and organisational process – the 'black box' – which was the dominant model for the 2008 evaluation of the French poles.

5. CONCLUDING REMARKS – FUTURE CHALLENGES

The main conclusions of the 2010 country report were:

- Most outputs and results were found in the broad policy area "Knowledge Economy, Innovation and Competitiveness", in particular R&D infrastructure and equipment and collaborative R&D projects, due in part to the momentum given by the SRIs.
- The policy area "Accessibility and Transport (including ICT) came second with the starting of some large-scale projects, and the most disappointing policy area was "Sustainable Development and Environment" (very small projects).
- Accordingly, the challenges identified were: turning the outcomes of SRIs into concrete measures and actions; making a significant effort to make emerge bigger projects and produce outputs and results in the area "Sustainable Development and Environment".

The 2010 AIRs show a clear catching up of commitment and implementation in "Sustainable Development and Environment", in particular for energy efficiency and renewable energies

[85] The call for tenders has been launched.

[86] Evaluer la politique des pôles de compétitivité: quells principles, quels usages ?, Emilie-Pauline Gallié and Frédérique Pallez, February 2011. See also : Evaluer les politiques de clusters : quels principes, quels usages ?, Emilie-Pauline Gallié, Anna Glaser and Frédérique Pallez, February 2011.

(and to a lesser extent prevention of risks) while the policy area "Knowledge Economy, Innovation, Competitiveness" remains ahead.

However, if commitment has made highly significant progress in 2010, the implementation rate is still disappointing in all policy areas. A major reason is the strong predominance of small scale projects[87]: 2/3 of the projects are under EUR 100,000 (ERDF), and 87% under EUR 300,000 (ERDF); almost 50% of the projects are under EUR 50,000 and they represent 5% of committed ERDF funding. Projects are particularly small in the fields of access to employment, human capital, energy, environment and prevention of risks. There is thus, with a few exceptions, a dispersion or 'sprinkling' (in French: *saupoudrage*) of ERDF money which hampers not only ERDF visibility, but also strategic effects of ERDF interventions in regions.

Projects with well-identified operators and/or which are related to robust national (and sometimes) regional policies are the most effective and easier to implement, for example R&D projects: operators are universities/PRES or research institutions and the government has a clear policy in the field of higher education and research (with important reforms and funding). This also happens with collaborative R&D projects which are related to the national policy of *pôles de compétitivité* and regional policies supporting innovative clusters, *filières* and poles of excellence (e.g.: Rhône-Alpes) or, to a much lesser extent, collective actions (Midi-Pyrénées). However, it is not sure that these projects will reveal strong additionality.

Commitment and implementation in "Sustainable Development and Environment" have been catching up in 2010 partly because the implementation of the policy related to the *Grenelle de l'environnement* has started[88]. Another major reason, already emphasised, is the new EU regulation allowing for ERDF co-funding of energy investment in social housing: there are well-identified and rather strong operators in the field of social housing. However, with respect to protection of biodiversity and environment, AIRs systematically point out the lack of reliable operators and the resulting difficulties in promoting projects (which, when they emerge, are generally desperately small).

PUI (policy area "Territorial Development" are another example of the difficulty to encourage using ERDF to fund significant (if not strategic) projects. AIRs mention quasi-systematically problems in committing ERDF money in this field: while PUI are supposed to be "integrated" projects, they actually are an addition of a number of small (even micro-) projects which take long to set up, because of necessary co-funding by the multiple layers of the French local administration[89]. In spite of this, some small projects may reveal a rather strong additionality.

In our opinion the expected (2011) development of thematic evaluations in 'sensible' policy areas reflects these concerns.

[87] As illustrated before in the paragraph "Overview of concrete outputs and results in a sample of regions".
[88] Even if a slowdown can be expected for 2011.
[89] The well-known French administrative *mille-feuilles.*

The lack of visibility and strategic effects of ERDF support is normal to some extent in Competitiveness & Employment regions due to the limited amount of funding, although the leverage effect on the budget of the regions may be important. It however raises the question whether it would be more appropriate to concentrate resources on a limited number of policies having more capable to produce an effect on the regional economic and social fabric.

Finally, the 2010 country report mentioned as important challenges for AIRs, and for monitoring and evaluation:

- the indicators which describe the achievements in the AIRs should be made more homogeneous and comparable;
- future evaluations should not only assess the results of a project *per se*; but they also should concentrate more on the extent to which the effects and outcomes of a project address the problems of the regions concerned.

Awareness of the issue of the quality of indicators has increased significantly and DATAR ordered a study and has now an action plan concerning the regional monitoring system. However, the challenge still remains largely valid if we consider what is provided in the AIRs.

Mid-term evaluations cannot provide a real strategic vision due to the low level of implementation so far, and it will be essential to concentrate on the quality of ex-post evaluations (including dimensions such as additionality and leverage effect).

REFERENCES

- Annual Implementation Reports 2010 (2011)
- Evaluation de la politique de soutien de l'Etat aux pôles d'innovation pour l'artisanat et les petites entreprises, Technopolis Group/ITD-Eu, Avril 2011
- Evaluation à mi-parcours des Contrats de Projets Etat-Région – Volet Enseignement supérieur et Recherche, DATAR, Avril 2011
- Evaluation nationale du volet ferroviaire et TCSP des CPER 2007-2013, Ernst & Young, Février 2011
- Growth Factors in the Outermost Regions, Ismeri Europa and ITD-Eu, 2011
- Evaluation à mi-parcours de l'axe 2, mesure 3 du PO FEDER Languedoc-Roussillon, Les EnR / Factea Durable, Décembre 2010
- Evaluation à mi-parcours du Programme opérationnel FEDER 2007-2013 Midi-Pyrénées, Edater/Erdyn Consultants/Planète Publique, Novembre 2010
- Evaluation à mi-parcours du CPER et des PO FEDER/FSE 2007-2013 de la Guadeloupe, ITD-Eu/Amnyos, Octobre 2010
- Analyse des systèmes de suivi régionaux des PO et des CPER, Ernst & Young, Juin 2010
- Evaluation à mi-parcours du CPER/PO FEDER 2007-2013 Guyane, Ernst & Young, Mars 2010
- Etude sur l'évolution des diagnostics et des stratégies régionales d'innovation dans les régions françaises dans le cadre des PO FEDER 2007-2013, ADE, Juillet 2010
- Study of the Growth Factors in the Outermost Regions, 2010, Ismeri Europa and ITD-Eu for the European Commission, DG REGIO, October 2010
- La prise en compte de la politique de l'innovation dans les zones urbaines en difficulté dans le PO FEDER Ile de France, Réseau In Europe/VIAREGIO, 2010
- Projet de recommandations du groupe thématique « Développement durable » au Groupe de suivi du CRSN en vue d'améliorer les résultats de la programmation FEDER et FSE, Groupe de suivi du CRSN, 20 janvier 2010
- Projet de recommandations du groupe thématique « Développement durable » au Groupe de suivi du CRSN en vue d'améliorer les résultats de la programmation FEDER / FSE et l'approche urbaine intégrée, Groupe de suivi du CRSN, 20 janvier 2010
- Projet de recommandations du groupe thématique « TIC » au Groupe de suivi du CRSN en vue d'améliorer les résultats de la programmation FEDER, Groupe de suivi du CRSN, 20 janvier 2010
- Projet de recommandations du groupe thématique « Innovation » au Groupe de suivi du CRSN en vue d'améliorer les résultats de la programmation FEDER et FSE, Groupe de suivi du CRSN, 21 janvier 2010
- Haute-Normandie, Evaluation de projets collaboratifs de recherche entre organismes de recherche et entreprises pour une meilleure prise en compte du Programme Opérationnel Régional et du Contrat de Projet Etat-Région, Mars 2010

- Languedoc-Roussillon: Evaluation des actions entreprises en faveur des projets collaboratifs de R&D, 2010
- Basse-Normandie: Les pôles de compétitivité et les filières dans la stratégie régionale de développement économique – Evaluation de sa pertinence dans un contexte de bilan du schéma régional de développement économique et de la stratégie régionale d'innovation, 2010
- Aquitaine : Prise en compte de l'innovation et du développement durable, 2009-2010)
- Franche-Comté : Evaluation innovation, recherche, transfert de technologie, 2010)
- Haute-Normandie : Evaluation de l'innovation dans les programmes PO et CPER, 2009-2010
- Franche-Comté and Centre : Evaluation des mesures de développement de la recherche-innovation et de l'adaptation des travailleurs et des entreprises aux mutations économiques, 2010
- Evaluation des PRIDES, Région PACA, 2010
- OSEO, Bilan 2009, Engagements 2010
- Etude sur les conceptions de l'innovation et du développement durable dans les PO FEDER et CPER 2007-2013, DIACT-ARF (pour le compte de l'Instance Nationale d'Evaluation), 2009
- L'impact financier des politiques des régions, ARF, 2009
- Rapport de suivi pour 2009, Programme National de Réforme 2008-2010, 15 Oct. 2009
- Stratégie nationale de recherche et d'innovation, Rapport général, Ministère de l'enseignement supérieur et de la recherche, 2009
- Rapport sur les politiques nationales de recherche et des formations supérieures, Annexe au projet de loi de finances pour 2010, 2009
- Evaluation flash pour l'optimisation des programmes FEDER et CPER en Languedoc-Roussillon, Final Report, Septembre 2009
- Activités d'investissement des FCPI dans les entreprises innovantes 1997-2007, OSEO-AFIC, 2009
- Tableau de bord de l'innovation, 1 July 2009
- Evaluation du dispositif pour l'Europe de la Recherche et de l'Innovation, ITD-Eu pour la Région Pays de la Loire, 2009
- Limousin : Evaluation en continu du cadre de référence de l'innovation, janvier 2009
- Etude portant sur l'évaluation des systèmes productifs locaux (SPL), Groupe BPI, Mars 2008
- Stratégies régionales d'innovation (avec participation d'ITD-Eu) 2009 :
    - Auvergne
    - Bourgogne
    - Corsica
    - Guadeloupe

  - Martinique
  - Basse-Normandie
  - Pays de la Loire
  - Poitou-Charentes

- Etude de l'impact du Crédit Impôt Recherche, Technopolis France pour le Ministère de l'Enseignement supérieur et de la Recherche, 2008
- L'évaluation des pôles de compétitivité 2005-2008 (évaluation réalisée par CM International en association avec BCG), DIACT, septembre 2008
- Evaluation de la politique de la Région Bretagne en faveur des Pôles de compétitivité régionaux, ITD-Eu / Technopolis France pour la Région Bretagne, 2008
- Evaluation du soutien public aux structures de transfert de technologie en Région Basse-Normandie, 2008
- Evaluation du dispositif Jeunes Entreprises Innovantes, Ministère de l'Enseignement supérieur et de la Recherche, 2008
- Evaluation d'un pôle sur les technologies des grilles de calcul, ITD-Eu pour la Région Auvergne, 2008
- Méthode de diagnostic du système d'innovation dans les régions françaises, ADIT, 2008 (et version adaptée à l'Outre-Mer)
- Synthèse du Rapport d'évaluation des pôles de compétitivité, BCG-CMI pour la DATAR, 2008
- Recherche et développement, Innovations et partenariats, Ministère de l'enseignement supérieur et de la recherche, 2008
- Strategic evaluation on innovation and the knowledge based economy in relation to the Structural and Cohesion Funds for the programming period 2007-2013, France Report, Study carried out by Lacave Allemand & Associés (consortium Technopolis / MERIT / LA&A / Ismeri Europa / Logotech) for DG REGIO, juillet 2006

INTERVIEWS

- DATAR, Equipe "Développement regional et politiques européennes"
  - Thomas Péguy, Chargé de mission Evaluation (Développement régional et politiques européennes)
  - Mickaël Vaillant, Chargé de mission
- Régions
  - Basse-Normandie : Fabrice Salemi, Maryvonne Boudet
  - Guadeloupe : Claudia Ruffine
  - La Réunion: Jean Ballandras (SGAR) and Serge Joseph (AGILE)
  - Rhône-Alpes : Thomas Cottinet, Frédéric Gaffiot – ARDI

TABLES

See Excel file for Tables 1-4:

Table 1 - Regional disparities and trends

Table 2 - Macro-economic developments

Table 3 - Financial allocation by main policy area

Table 3 CBC - Financial allocation by main policy area

Table 4 - Commitments by main policy area (by end-2010)

Table 4 CBC - Commitments by main policy area (by end-2010)

Annex Table A - Main physical indicators and achievements (2007 to 2010)

PO / INDICATOR	CE4	CE5	CE6	CE11	CE13	CE23	CE31	CE39	CE41
ALSACE			31,72						
AQUITAINE	46	17	0	9		29	12	0	0
AUVERGNE	20								
BASSE NORMANDIE									
BOURGOGNE	177	22	248	12	20	239			
BRETAGNE	147	58		5		81	0	2	
CENTRE		0						1	
CHAMPAGNE-ARDENNE		17				21		45	
CORSE	6	0		16					
FRANCHE-COMTE	128	50	9,7	30		24	10		4
HAUTE-NORMANDIE	32	50	9,7	30	6	0	10		4
ILE DE FRANCE		0	0	0		0		1	0
LANGUEDOC-ROUSSILLON	70	60	155,32	153		554	322	4	4
LIMOUSIN	50	0	0	0		0			
LORRAINE						41			
MIDI-PYRENEES	0	15		86				0	
NORD PAS-DE-CALAIS	816	210	13	257			22		1
PAYS DE LA LOIRE	93	20		44	16	294	14	15	145
PICARDIE	94	19		44			20	16	21
POITOU-CHARENTES	46	7		6	0	162			
PROVENCE ALPES COTE D´AZUR	0	9	0	24	3	0	0	0	0

PO / INDICATOR	CE4	CE5	CE6	CE11	CE13	CE23	CE31	CE39	CE41
RHONE-ALPES	179	49	0	47	47	16	14	128	0
GUYANE	26	4			5	3		1	
GUADELOUPE				1		1			
MARTINIQUE			111						
LA REUNION (2009)	21	15	10	39		43	3	2	
Total	1951	622	588,4	803	97	1508	427	215	179
Total (country report 2010)	421	160		75	20	649	127	30	84
CE4 - Number of RTD projects									
CE5 - Number of cooperation project enterprises-research institutions									
CE6 - Research Jobs created									
CE11 - Number of information society projects									
CE13 - Number of transport projects									
CE23 - Number of renewable energy projects									
CE31 - Number of risk prevention projects									
CE39 - Number of projects ensuring sustainability and improving the attractiveness of towns and cities									
CE41 - Number of projects offering services to promote equal opportunities and social inclusion for minorities and young people									

Annex Table B -ERDF Commitment rate and ERDF Paid 1.01.2011 in relation to total allocation

Code	Regions	Commitment rate ERDF 1.01.2011	Total Paid DATAR 1.01.2011 in relation to total allocation
161 001	Guyane	49.06	12.17
161 002	**Guadeloupe**	**36.85**	**13.25**
161 003	Martinique	31.31	11.55
161 004	**La Réunion**	**42.25**	**24.57**
Convergence		***39.87***	***17.42***
162 001	Aquitaine	57.06	24.68
162 002	**Centre**	**51.43**	**19.92**
162 003	Alsace	36.8	12.86
162 004	Auvergne	50.82	35.84
162 005	Basse Normandie	36.43	24.61
162 006	Bourgogne	48.57	17.28
162 007	**Bretagne**	**54.4**	**15.78**
162 008	**Champagne Ardenne**	**41.46**	**19.01**
162 009	Corse	35.66	12.9
162 010	**Franche Comté**	**40.22**	**26.77**
162 011	Haute Normandie	56.08	17.93
162 012	Ile de France	50.13	16.34
162 013	**Languedoc Roussillon**	**48.03**	**23.32**

Code	Regions	Commitment rate ERDF 1.01.2011	Total Paid DATAR 1.01.2011 in relation to total allocation
162 014	**Limousin**	**57.77**	**31.05**
162 015	Lorraine	45.61	24.82
162 016	Pays de la Loire	41.94	25.5
162 017	**Nord Pas-de-Calais**	**41.29**	**12.69**
162 018	Picardie	43.75	13.39
162 019	Poitou Charentes	54.24	28.01
162 020	**PACA**	**37.71**	**10.58**
162 021	**Midi Pyrénées**	**53.09**	**34.18**
162 022	**Rhône Alpes**	**62.18**	**31.52**
23	Pluri Alpes	22.54	14.73
24	Pluri Bassin Loire	40.89	22.32
25	Pluri MC	42.7	31.29
26	Pluri Rhône	38.27	19.43
Competitiveness & Employment		***47.69***	***21.39***
38	CBC Deux Mers		
39	CBC Rhin supérieur		
40	CBC F(M)-Angleterre	45.7	5.7
41	CBC F-Suisse		
64	CBC Grande Région		

The 12 regions of the sample for the overview of outputs and results are indicated in bold.

Annex table C - Broad policy areas and correspondence with fields of intervention (FOI)

Policy area		Code	Priority themes
1. Enterprise environment	RTDI and linked activities	01	R&TD activities in research centres
		02	R&TD infrastructure and centres of competence in a specific technology
		05	Advanced support services for firms and groups of firms
		07	Investment in firms directly linked to research and innovation (...)
		74	Developing human potential in the field of research and innovation, in particular through post-graduate studies ...
	Innovation support for SMEs	03	Technology transfer and improvement of cooperation networks ...
		04	Assistance to R&TD, particularly in SMEs (including access to R&TD services in research centres)
		06	Assistance to SMEs for the promotion of environmentally-friendly products and production processes (...)
		09	Other measures to stimulate research and innovation and entrepreneurship in SMEs
		14	Services and applications for SMEs (e-commerce, education and training, networking, etc.)
		15	Other measures for improving access to and efficient use of ICT by

Policy area		Code	Priority themes
			SMEs
	ICT and related services	11	Information and communication technologies (...)
		12	Information and communication technologies (TEN-ICT)
		13	Services and applications for citizens (e-health, e-government, e-learning, e-inclusion, etc.)
	Other investment in firms	08	Other investment in firms
2. Human resources	Education and training	62	Development of life-long learning systems and strategies in firms; training and services for employees ...
		63	Design and dissemination of innovative and more productive ways of organising work
		64	Development of special services for employment, training and support in connection with restructuring of sectors ...
		72	Design, introduction and implementing of reforms in education and training systems ...
		73	Measures to increase participation in education and training throughout the life-cycle ...
	Labour market policies	65	Modernisation and strengthening labour market institutions
		66	Implementing active and preventive measures on the labour market
		67	Measures encouraging active ageing and prolonging working lives
		68	Support for self-employment and business start-up
2. Human resources (Cont.)	Labour market policies (Cont.)	69	Measures to improve access to employment and increase sustainable participation and progress of women ...
		70	Specific action to increase migrants' participation in employment ...
		71	Pathways to integration and re-entry into employment for disadvantaged people ...
		80	Promoting the partnerships, pacts and initiatives through the networking of relevant stakeholders
3. Transport	Rail	16	Railways
		17	Railways (TEN-T)
		18	Mobile rail assets
		19	Mobile rail assets (TEN-T)
	Road	20	Motorways
		21	Motorways (TEN-T)
		22	National roads
		23	Regional/local roads
	Other transport	24	Cycle tracks
		25	Urban transport
		26	Multimodal transport
		27	Multimodal transport (TEN-T)
		28	Intelligent transport systems
		29	Airports
		30	Ports
		31	Inland waterways (regional and local)
		32	Inland waterways (TEN-T)
4. Environment	Energy	33	Electricity

Policy area		Code	Priority themes
and energy	infrastructure		
		34	Electricity (TEN-E)
		35	Natural gas
		36	Natural gas (TEN-E)
		37	Petroleum products
		38	Petroleum products (TEN-E)
		39	Renewable energy: wind
		40	Renewable energy: solar
		41	Renewable energy: biomass
		42	Renewable energy: hydroelectric, geothermal and other
		43	Energy efficiency, co-generation, energy management
	Environment and risk prevention	44	Management of household and industrial waste
		45	Management and distribution of water (drink water)
		46	Water treatment (waste water)
		47	Air quality
		48	Integrated prevention and pollution control
		49	Mitigation and adaption to climate change
		50	Rehabilitation of industrial sites and contaminated land
		51	Promotion of biodiversity and nature protection (including Natura 2000)
		52	Promotion of clean urban transport
		53	Risk prevention (...)
		54	Other measures to preserve the environment and prevent risks
5. Territorial development	Social Infrastructure	10	Telephone infrastructure (including broadband networks)
		75	Education infrastructure
		77	Childcare infrastructure
		78	Housing infrastructure
	Tourism and culture	79	Other social infrastructure
		55	Promotion of natural assets
		56	Protection and development of natural heritage
		57	Other assistance to improve tourist services
		58	Protection and preservation of the cultural heritage
		59	Development of cultural infrastructure
	Planning and rehabilitation	60	Other assistance to improve cultural services
	Other	61	Integrated projects for urban and rural regeneration
		82	Compensation of any additional costs due to accessibility deficit and territorial fragmentation
		83	Specific action addressed to compensate additional costs due to size market factors
6. Technical assistance		84	Support to compensate additional costs due to climate conditions and relief difficulties
		81	Mechanisms for improving good policy and programme design, monitoring and evaluation ...
		85	Preparation, implementation, monitoring and inspection
		86	Evaluation and studies; information and communication

ANNEX

Examples of good practice in evaluation

BASIC INFORMATION		
Country: FRANCE		
Policy area: General (Enterprise support, RTDI, Transport, etc.)		
Title of evaluation and full reference: Mid-term evaluation of CPER/ERDF OP 2007-2013 Guyane, March 2010		
Intervention period covered (2000-2006; 2007-2013; specific years): 2007-2009		
Timing of the evaluation (when it was carried out): 2009-2010		
Budget (if known): EUR		
Evaluator: External evaluator		
Method Process analysis, interviews of key actors and beneficiaries, analysis of data, thematic workshops		
Main objectives and main findings Objectives: Assess the relevance, coherence and efficiency of implementation; answer evaluation questions on thematic issues; assess the physical and financial advancement of the programmes; formulate recommendations Main findings: high commitment rate and low implementation rate (43% vs. 9.3% total cost); leverage effect higher than expected; concentration of committed funds on a few flagship projects; small number of operators (mainly State) concentrated in the capital		
Appraisal Very clearly presented. Excellent articulation between findings and recommendations, in particular with respect to the thematic evaluation questions		
CHECK LIST	YES	NO
UTILITY		
Report Clarity and Balance		
Are the objectives, methods and findings of the evaluation clearly described?	x	
Are the conclusions and recommendations clearly supported by the analysis?	x	
Are the strengths and weaknesses of the intervention being evaluated fairly assessed and reported?	x	
Is the outcome of the intervention clearly reported?	x	
RELIABILITY OF FINDINGS		
Evaluation design		
Is the approach adopted by the evaluation and method used clearly set out?	x (shortly)	
Is the approach and methods suitable given the objectives of the valuation and the intervention being assessed?	x	
Are the details of the operation of the intervention clearly described?	x	
Are the mechanisms through which the intervention is intended to achieve its objectives clearly identified?	x	
Context		
Is the socio-economic and policy context clearly set out?	x	
Are the effects of the economic and/or policy context on the outcome of the intervention clearly described?	x	
Information Sources		
Are the quantitative and/or qualitative data used suitable for the purpose for which they are used?	x	
Is the reliability of the data fairly assessed and described?		x
Analysis		
Are appropriate procedures/techniques used to analyse the data and/or qualitative information?	x	

Are suitable procedures used to check the validity of findings?	x	
Is the validity of the findings reached clearly demonstrated?	x	
Do the policy recommendations follow clearly from the findings of the analysis?	x	

BASIC INFORMATION		
Country: FRANCE		
Policy area: Energy (Enterprise support, RTDI, Transport, etc.)		
Title of evaluation and full reference: Mid-term evaluation of Axis 2, Measure 3, of ERDF OP 2007-2013 Languedoc-Roussillon "Encouraging energy efficiency and the development of renewable energies and contributing to the reduction of greenhouse gases emissions", December 2010		
Intervention period covered (2000-2006; 2007-2013; specific years): 2007-2010		
Timing of the evaluation (when it was carried out): 2009-2010		
Budget (if known): EUR		
Evaluator: External evaluator		
Method Process analysis; interviews with OP managers and 30 projects operators; analysis of quantitative and qualitative data; analysis of effectiveness and efficiency of the management of the measure and of the technical aspects of projects; analysis of the evolution of regional context and EU and national regulations and assessment of its impact on the OP; 'participative' workshop		
Main objectives and main findings Main objectives: assess the relevance and coherence with respect to the evolution of social and environmental objectives and stakes; check the effectiveness and efficiency of financial management; assess the achievements and concrete results of the actions funded; identify necessary changes in relation to the evolution of European, national and regional objectives; re-positioning the modes of funding Main findings: very high commitment rate (83% by Oct. 2010) mainly due to PV solar projects (more than 60% of programmed projects), to the detriment of other sources of renewable energies and energy efficiency; funding for PV has been stopped replaced by bank loans (in partnership with EIB) - some lack of transparency in the treatment of demands		
Appraisal Very clearly presented. The evaluation mainly confirms the relevance of the decision already taken, i.e. stopping grants for PV solar projects		
CHECK LIST	YES	NO
UTILITY		
Report Clarity and Balance		
Are the objectives, methods and findings of the evaluation clearly described?	x	
Are the conclusions and recommendations clearly supported by the analysis?	x	
Are the strengths and weaknesses of the intervention being evaluated fairly assessed and reported?	X	
Is the outcome of the intervention clearly reported?	x	
RELIABILITY OF FINDINGS		
Evaluation design		
Is the approach adopted by the evaluation and method used clearly set out?	X (shortly)	
Is the approach and methods suitable given the objectives of the valuation and the intervention being assessed?	x	
Are the details of the operation of the intervention clearly described?		
Are the mechanisms through which the intervention is intended to achieve its objectives clearly identified?	x	
Context		
Is the socio-economic and policy context clearly set out?	x	

Are the effects of the economic and/or policy context on the outcome of the intervention clearly described?	x	
Information Sources		
Are the quantitative and/or qualitative data used suitable for the purpose for which they are used?	x	
Is the reliability of the data fairly assessed and described?	x	
Analysis		
Are appropriate procedures/techniques used to analyse the data and/or qualitative information?	x	
Are suitable procedures used to check the validity of findings?	x	
Is the validity of the findings reached clearly demonstrated?	x	
Do the policy recommendations follow clearly from the findings of the analysis?	x	

BASIC INFORMATION		
Country: FRANCE		
Policy area: General		
Title of evaluation and full reference: Mid-term evaluation of ERDF OP 2007-2013 Midi-Pyrénées, November 2010		
Intervention period covered (2000-2006; 2007-2013; specific years): 2007-2010		
Timing of the evaluation (when it was carried out): 2009-2010		
Budget (if known): EUR		
Evaluator: External evaluator		
Method Analysis of data and available documents; individual interviews and working seminars with managing authorities and services; interviews with a sample of beneficiaries		
Main objectives and main findings Main objectives: strategic and global evaluation for preparing the mid-term revision and taking account of the impact of the crisis; answer thematic evaluation questions; contribute to optimising the implementation process; formulate recommendations Main findings: Impact of the crisis lower than the French average; OP has effectively supported fragile sectors in an 'offensive' way through co-funding of infrastructure and direct support to enterprises' projects (with a leverage effect on the regional economy - Good commitment level (esp. R&D and competitiveness of enterprises) - Insufficient monitoring of results (and impacts)		
Appraisal One of the few mid-term evaluations delivering a 'strategic' vision of the effects of ERDF intervention and pointing at the problem of the monitoring of results		
CHECK LIST	YES	NO
UTILITY		
Report Clarity and Balance		
Are the objectives, methods and findings of the evaluation clearly described?	X	
Are the conclusions and recommendations clearly supported by the analysis?	x	
Are the strengths and weaknesses of the intervention being evaluated fairly assessed and reported?	x	
Is the outcome of the intervention clearly reported?	x	
RELIABILITY OF FINDINGS		
Evaluation design		
Is the approach adopted by the evaluation and method used clearly set out?	X (shortly)	
Is the approach and methods suitable given the objectives of the valuation and the intervention being assessed?	x	
Are the details of the operation of the intervention clearly described?		
Are the mechanisms through which the intervention is intended to achieve its objectives clearly	x	

identified?		
Context		
Is the socio-economic and policy context clearly set out?	x	
Are the effects of the economic and/or policy context on the outcome of the intervention clearly described?	x	
Information Sources		
Are the quantitative and/or qualitative data used suitable for the purpose for which they are used?	x	
Is the reliability of the data fairly assessed and described?	x	
Analysis		
Are appropriate procedures/techniques used to analyse the data and/or qualitative information?	x	
Are suitable procedures used to check the validity of findings?	x	
Is the validity of the findings reached clearly demonstrated?	x	
Do the policy recommendations follow clearly from the findings of the analysis?	x	

BASIC INFORMATION		
Country: FRANCE		
Policy area: Enterprise support (Enterprise support, RTDI, Transport, etc.)		
Title of evaluation and full reference: Evaluation of the State support policy to innovation poles for craftsmanship and small enterprises, April 2011		
Intervention period covered (2000-2006; 2007-2013; specific years): 2007-2010		
Timing of the evaluation (when it was carried out): 2010-2011		
Budget (if known): EUR		
Evaluator: External evaluator		
Method Extensive research at national level: interviews with programme managers, innovation-support and craft organisations, managers of poles; analysis of quantitative and qualitative data on each pole - Intensive research on a sample of poles: interviews of the actors of the 'ecosystem': partners, funding institutions, beneficiaries, other support structures - Online survey of a sample of beneficiary enterprises		
Main objectives and main findings Main objectives: General assessment of the poles policy with 3 parts: governance; coherence and complementarities with other policies (RTDI support, Poles of competitiveness, etc.); achievements and results (relations between very small enterprises and centres of competences / scientific partners, diffusion of innovation and new knowledge, direct support) - Formulation of recommendations Main findings: General relevance of the programme, but insufficient coherence and complementarities with other innovation-support programmes and organisations - Financial allocation insufficient with respect to the number of targeted enterprises		
Appraisal Detailed and very clear presentation of the methodology. Precise presentation of findings according to the 3 parts of the evaluation. Excellent formulation of recommendations (strategic / operational) based on evidence from findings		
CHECK LIST	YES	NO
UTILITY		
Report Clarity and Balance		
Are the objectives, methods and findings of the evaluation clearly described?	x	
Are the conclusions and recommendations clearly supported by the analysis?	x	
Are the strengths and weaknesses of the intervention being evaluated fairly assessed and reported?	x	
Is the outcome of the intervention clearly reported?	x	
RELIABILITY OF FINDINGS		
Evaluation design		

Is the approach adopted by the evaluation and method used clearly set out?	X (well detailed)	
Is the approach and methods suitable given the objectives of the valuation and the intervention being assessed?	x	
Are the details of the operation of the intervention clearly described?	x	
Are the mechanisms through which the intervention is intended to achieve its objectives clearly identified?	x	
Context		
Is the socio-economic and policy context clearly set out?	x	
Are the effects of the economic and/or policy context on the outcome of the intervention clearly described?	x	
Information Sources		
Are the quantitative and/or qualitative data used suitable for the purpose for which they are used?	x	
Is the reliability of the data fairly assessed and described?	x	
Analysis		
Are appropriate procedures/techniques used to analyse the data and/or qualitative information?	x	
Are suitable procedures used to check the validity of findings?	x	
Is the validity of the findings reached clearly demonstrated?	x	
Do the policy recommendations follow clearly from the findings of the analysis?	x	