

**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**

**BELGIUM**

**VERSION: FINAL**

**DR. LYDIA GREUNZ**

**APPLICA**

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

## CONTENTS

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Executive summary .....  | 3  |
| 1. The socio-economic context .....  | 4  |
| 2. The regional development policy pursued, the EU contribution to this and policy achievements over the period..... | 6  |
| The regional development policy pursued.....   | 6  |
| Policy implementation .....  | 7  |
| Achievements of the programmes so far.....   | 10 |
| 3. Effects of intervention .....   | 17 |
| 4. Evaluations and good practice in evaluation .....   | 18 |
| 5. Concluding remarks – future challenges .....  | 22 |
| References.....  | 24 |
| Acknowledgements .....   | 27 |
| Tables .....   | 27 |

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- CBCP Cross-Border Cooperation Programme
- CEP Competitiveness and Employment Programme
- CP Convergence Programme
- EEN Expert Evaluation Network
- ERDF European Regional Development Fund
- ESF European Social Fund
- EU European Union
- GDP Gross Domestic Product
- OP Operational Programme
- RTDI Research, Technology, Development and Innovation

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The main priorities in both in the Convergence Programme (CP) in Hainaut and the Competitiveness and Employment Programmes (CEPs) in the Walloon, the Flemish and the Brussels Capital regions are to promote the “Enterprise Environment and RDTI” and to support “Territorial Development”. Over 80% of funding is allocated to these policy areas and there has been no change in this share since the programmes were implemented in 2007.

According to the Annual Implementation Reports 2010 (AIRs) reallocation of funding in 2010 was marginal. The Flemish Government decided to shift some funding from support to entrepreneurship towards investment in infrastructure and energy efficiency of social housing. The rationale was the low financial absorption of measures promoting entrepreneurship. The Government of the Brussels region decided to abandon several projects for which the selection criteria set by the Government were not fulfilled or which proved to contribute little to the overall objective of the programme. The funds freed up were mainly allocated to projects which have applied for additional funding.

Although there was progress in all regions during 2010 to implement the programmes, it was overall slower than planned and there was no catching up with the delay accumulated in the first years of programme implementation. The pace of implementing programmes was fastest in the Flemish region where the implementation rate (expenditure relative to allocation) was 26% at end-2010 and slower in Hainaut and the Walloon region which had implementations rates of 22% and 17% respectively and slowest in Brussels where just 11% of funding had been spent.

Since most of the projects were not completed by end-2010, it is still too early to see significant achievements from the programmes and there is no evidence yet as to whether the expenditure is having the intended effects. Overall, the measures carried out by end-2010 under the CP have supported 284 business start-ups (42% of end target) and are estimated to have led to the creation of 1,472 direct jobs (22% of end target). Under the CEPs, 597 start-ups had been supported by end-2010 (31% of end target). In terms of jobs created, it is estimated that around half of the end target had been achieved by end-2010 but a direct comparison of jobs created is not possible because of the different ways these are measured and reported.

During 2010 two evaluations were carried out for the CP of Hainaut and the CEP of the Walloon region. The first assessed the value added of integrated projects (“project portfolios”) in both programmes. The results tend to indicate that this new approach to project implementation helps to overcome a number of problems which in the past may have prevented support from producing its full effects. The second evaluated the effectiveness of advanced support services in Hainaut and in the Walloon region and the adequacy of these to meet the needs expressed by the companies in this respect. The results suggest that the services should be further streamlined and that the operators responsible for providing the service need to collaborate more effectively.

## 1. THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONTEXT

### Main points from last year's country report<sup>1</sup>

- There is a North–South divide mirrored in the main economic indicators with Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per head in the Flemish region being over 30 percentage points higher than in the Walloon region. This in a large measure reflects the situation of the Convergence region Hainaut, home to 40% of the population in Wallonia.
- GDP per head in the Brussels capital region is nearly twice as high, as measured, as the national average<sup>2</sup> because it is a major business and cultural centre where the main European institutions are located. In spite of this, the region contains large poor, deindustrialised areas suffering from urban decay, high unemployment and social exclusion.
- Over the period 2000–2007 the main socio-economic imbalances in the country widened slightly with Hainaut falling further behind the national average in terms of GDP per head, productivity and employment growth and with unemployment in the Brussels capital region increasing, though not within the most problematic areas where the unemployment rate slightly went down.

### Developments in 2010

Although the Belgian economy was strongly affected by the financial and economic crisis, the impact was less severe than in many other Member States and recovery has also proceeded more quickly. A decline of GDP by 2.8 % (–4.3% in the EU27) in 2009 was followed by an expansion of 2.2% (1.8% in the EU27) in 2010 which continued in 2011 (2%) and which is expected to persist in 2012 (2.3%)<sup>3</sup>. The economic recovery in 2010 was primarily underpinned by exports but the upward trend in domestic demand driven by a relatively high level of consumer and business confidence also fuelled growth.

The recession caused public finances to deteriorate, though less than in the rest of the EU. While the public sector balance had still been in slight surplus on average over the period 2006–2007, a significant deficit has opened up since then, reaching 1.3% of GDP in 2008 (2.4% in the EU27) and 5.9% in 2009 (6.8% in the EU27). Given the dynamics of interest charges and the strong growth in expenditure linked to population ageing, economic recovery alone does not seem sufficient to enable the deficit to be brought back below the 3% threshold stipulated by the Maastricht Treaty. Thus, various fiscal measures have been taken as recovery has taken place to

---

<sup>1</sup> Available at the DG Regio website:

[http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/pdf/eval2007/country\\_reports/belgium.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/pdf/eval2007/country_reports/belgium.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that the high level of GDP per head in Brussels is artificial because half of the people working there are residents of other regions – i.e. they contribute to the GDP of the region but are not included in its population.

<sup>3</sup> Source: Federal Planning Bureau, 2011.

limit 'budgetary drift' and to prevent Belgium's high level of accumulated debt (96.2% of GDP in 2009) from increasing further. While these have helped to bring down the deficit to 4.1% of GDP in 2010 (6.4% in the EU27), they have reduced the funds available for supporting development<sup>4</sup>.

At the regional level, the recession in 2009 hit the Flemish region and Wallonia more severely than Brussels mainly because of the different structures of their economies. Manufacturing was much more affected by the recession than the tertiary sector. Therefore, GDP in the Flemish region and in Wallonia experienced a stronger decline in 2009 (of 3.4% and 3.1%, respectively) than Brussels (just 0.3%)<sup>5</sup>. In 2010, growth resumed in all three Belgian regions, but not in the same way because of their structural differences in activity. The Flemish and Walloon regions benefited most from recovery in external demand for manufacturing goods and each recorded growth rates of just over 2% while in Brussels growth was around 1.9%<sup>6</sup>.

In order to limit excessive public deficits, and in accordance with the government's undertaking under the stability programme of September 2009, the division of budget savings between levels of government was formalised in several co-operation agreements. Each region has therefore established its own policy for fiscal consolidation. The main measures implemented in 2010 are summarised briefly below<sup>7</sup>.

In the Flemish region, the main savings were achieved through reducing expenditure on employment measures ("jobkorting"), a cutback in grants and other support to the business sector and a reduction of funding for communications and consultancy. Efficiency gains in administration and a series of other measures, including zero indexation of funding not linked to salaries, led to further savings.

The Walloon Region and the French Community have implemented a range of measures to contain expenditure and achieve cost savings, some of them taking effect as a result of the budgetary adjustment carried out at the end of 2009. The main cost saving measures were a reduction in the number of ministers in Ministerial Cabinets, a freezing of the funding of public interest and similar bodies, a reduction in funding of the civil service and "non-indexation" of all "primary" expenditure up until 2015. Investment in infrastructure and support to enterprises has also been cut back considerably.

The global economic crisis greatly affected the public finances of the Brussels capital region because of the fall in revenue from taxes and of the upward pressure on social expenditure. In order to deal with this, the Government implemented cost savings of EUR 240 million in 2009 and nearly EUR 290 million in 2010, mainly through cuts in transport, infrastructure investment and transfers to businesses. Substantial efforts were also made to bring down operating costs by reducing expenditure on Ministerial Cabinets and administration.

---

<sup>4</sup> The funding of enterprise support for instance has been reduced by around 8% in 2010. (Source: Federal Planning Bureau, 2011)

<sup>5</sup> Source: HERMREG

<sup>6</sup> See Annex Table A.

<sup>7</sup> Also see Annex Tables B and C.

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

### THE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY PURSUED

#### Main points from last year's country report

- As regions have full autonomy over economic development, each are pursuing their own development plans which are the *"Contract of Economic development and Employment"* in the Brussels region, the *"Marshall Plan 2.Green"* in the Walloon region and the *"Flanders in Action Plan"* in the Flemish region.
- Cohesion Policy in Belgium is aimed at contributing to the objectives set in the national regional development plans by concentrating funds on policy areas where potential leverage effects are supposed to be greatest and/or on geographic areas where there are the most needs.
- The disaggregation of ERDF allocation by policy area shows that enterprise support is the most important area of intervention in all Belgian regions with the largest share of funding going to investment grants in Hainaut and the Walloon region, to enhancing innovation in Small and Medium sized Enterprises (SMEs) in the Flemish region and to Research, Technology, Development and Innovation (RTDI) in the Brussels region. Territorial development in general and the regeneration of old industrial and/or urban land is another policy area receiving substantial funding in all three regions. Enterprise support and territorial development are also the main policy areas in the Cross-border Cooperation programmes, though to a slightly lesser extent.

#### Developments in 2010

Overall, there have been few changes to the initial allocation of funding by policy area. In addition to the very minor shifts of funding in the Walloon and Hainaut programmes in 2009 from innovation and RDT support in SMEs to support in research centres, some, small, reallocation was made in the Flemish programme during 2010 (See Table A).

As highlighted in the 2010 report, very little progress had been made by end-2009 in implementing the priority axis "Entrepreneurship" of the Flemish competitiveness and employment programme (CEP). Just one call for tender had been launched and 1% of the allocated funding had been spent. Given this very low absorption, a budget reallocation of EUR 15 million was made from support of entrepreneurship towards the improvement of the business environment and spatial planning (priority axis 3). Most of the projects supported are aimed at building or improving infrastructure as well as increasing the energy efficiency

of social housing<sup>8</sup>. Overall the amount reallocated represented just 7% of the total ERDF of the Flemish programme and did not really involve any major change in the main priorities pursued.

**Table A – Allocation of ERDF by policy area – end 2010 (changes in brackets)**

|   | Flemish<br>region | Walloon<br>region | Brussels<br>region | Hainaut    |  | Flemish<br>region            | Walloon<br>region | Brussels<br>region | Hainaut    |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|------------|
| ERDF allocation end-2010 (EUR million)                                  |                   |                   |                    |            |  | distribution (end-2010) in % |                   |                    |            |
| (difference between allocation 2009 and 2010 in brackets - EUR million) |                   |                   |                    |            |  |                              |                   |                    |            |
| <b>1. Enterprise environment</b>  | <b>103 (-15)</b>  | <b>162</b>        | <b>32</b>          | <b>280</b> |  | <b>51</b>                    | <b>57</b>         | <b>55</b>          | <b>62</b>  |
| 1.1 RTDI and linked activities  | 31 (-3)           | 64 (3)            | 16                 | 72 (4)     |  | 15                           | 23                | 27                 | 16         |
| 1.2 Support for innovation in SMEs                                      | 64 (-10)          | 28 (-3)           | 5                  | 47 (-4)    |  | 32                           | 10                | 8                  | 10         |
| 1.3 Other investment in firms   | 4 (-6)            | 70                | 12                 | 161        |  | 2                            | 25                | 20                 | 36         |
| 1.4 ICT and related services  | 5 (4)             | 0                 | 0                  | 0          |  | 2                            | 0                 | 0                  | 0          |
| <b>2. Human resources</b>   | <b>0</b>          | <b>0</b>          | <b>7</b>           | <b>0</b>   |  | <b>0</b>                     | <b>0</b>          | <b>13</b>          | <b>0</b>   |
| 2.1 Education and training  | 0                 | 0                 | 5                  | 0          |  | 0                            | 0                 | 8                  | 0          |
| 2.2 Labour market policies  | 0                 | 0                 | 3                  | 0          |  | 0                            | 0                 | 5                  | 0          |
| <b>3. Transport</b>   | <b>11 (2)</b>     | <b>22</b>         | <b>0</b>           | <b>22</b>  |  | <b>6</b>                     | <b>8</b>          | <b>0</b>           | <b>5</b>   |
| 3.1 Road  | 0                 | 7                 | 0                  | 7          |  | 0                            | 3                 | 0                  | 2          |
| 3.2 Rail  | 0                 | 0                 | 0                  | 0          |  | 0                            | 0                 | 0                  | 0          |
| 3.2 Other   | 11 (2)            | 15                | 0                  | 15         |  | 6                            | 5                 | 0                  | 3          |
| <b>4. Environment and energy</b>  | <b>33 (13)</b>    | <b>24</b>         | <b>5</b>           | <b>42</b>  |  | <b>16</b>                    | <b>9</b>          | <b>9</b>           | <b>9</b>   |
| 4.1 Energy infrastructure   | 9 (5)             | 6                 | 4                  | 12         |  | 4                            | 2                 | 7                  | 3          |
| 4.2 Environmental infrastructure  | 24 (8)            | 18                | 1                  | 30         |  | 12                           | 6                 | 2                  | 7          |
| <b>5. Territorial development</b>                                       | <b>45</b>         | <b>71</b>         | <b>11</b>          | <b>101</b> |  | <b>22</b>                    | <b>25</b>         | <b>19</b>          | <b>22</b>  |
| 5.1 Tourism and culture   | 1                 | 21                | 0                  | 41         |  | 0                            | 7                 | 0                  | 9          |
| 5.2 Planning and rehabilitation   | 44                | 42                | 9                  | 53         |  | 22                           | 15                | 16                 | 12         |
| 5.3 Social infrastructure   | 0                 | 8                 | 2                  | 7          |  | 0                            | 3                 | 3                  | 2          |
| 5.4 Other   | 0                 | 0                 | 0                  | 0          |  | 0                            | 0                 | 0                  | 0          |
| <b>6. Technical assistance</b>  | <b>8</b>          | <b>3</b>          | <b>2</b>           | <b>5</b>   |  | <b>4</b>                     | <b>1</b>          | <b>4</b>           | <b>1</b>   |
| <b>Total Objective</b>  | <b>201</b>        | <b>283</b>        | <b>58</b>          | <b>449</b> |  | <b>100</b>                   | <b>100</b>        | <b>100</b>         | <b>100</b> |

Source: own calculations based on DG REGIO data

## POLICY IMPLEMENTATION

### Main points from last year's country report

- The implementation rate<sup>9</sup> at end-2009 was 14% of total allocation. It was highest for the Convergence Programme (CP) of Hainaut (18%) and lowest for the Competitiveness and Employment Programmes (CEP) of Brussels and Flanders (7% each). For the two Cross-Border Cooperation Programmes (CBCP) France-Wallonie-Vlaanderen and Vlaanderen-Nederland it was respectively 7% and 10%.
- If capital transfers under financial engineering measures, which have not actually been spent on the ground (i.e. they have not yet gone to final beneficiaries), are excluded the implementation rate by end-2009 is estimated to be just 7% (instead of 18%) in Hainaut and 4% (instead of 14%) in the Walloon region.

<sup>8</sup> For more details on ERDF co-financed measures to increase energy efficiency and renewable energy in Belgium see: Greunz L. (2011) Policy paper on renewable energy and energy efficiency of residential Housing – Belgium, Evaluation Network delivering Policy analysis on the Performance of Cohesion Policy 2007–2013, Report for the European Commission, Directorate-General Regional Policy  
[http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/pdf/eval2007/expert\\_innovation/2011\\_synt\\_rep\\_be.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/pdf/eval2007/expert_innovation/2011_synt_rep_be.pdf)

<sup>9</sup> The implementation rate is defined as the share of total allocation (national and ERDF) spent. Spending refers to certified eligible expenditure paid by beneficiaries.

- In Hainaut and the Walloon region, programme implementation by end-2009 was most advanced for enterprise support – essentially investment grants to companies – while very little was spent on the sustainable territorial development priority. In the Flemish region, absorption was highest in spatial planning and infrastructure projects carried out by the public sector. Very little was spent in respect of entrepreneurship.
- As a consequence of the recession in 2008–2009, the implementation of the programme in the Brussels region was affected by the difficulty of the region to provide the necessary co-funding, which led the European Commission to grant an advance of the overall allocation.

### Developments in 2010

Overall, according to the annual financial plans of the Operational Programmes (OPs), the implementation rate at end-2010 should have amounted to 67% of total allocation (see Table B). According to the AIRs, the actual implementation rate was 21%, which is only around 7 percentage points higher than at end-2009. While progress was made in all regions during 2010 to implement the Cohesion policy programmes, it was much slower than planned and did not allow any catching up with the delay accumulated at the beginning of the programming period.

**Table B – Planned and actual implementation rates (AIRs 2009, 2010 – ERDF funding)**

|   | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| <b>"planned" implementation rate: planned expenditure in percentage of total allocation</b> |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Hainaut   | 26   | 48   | 67   | 82   | 92   | 98   | 100  |
| Walloon region  | 13   | 26   | 40   | 54   | 69   | 84   | 100  |
| Brussels region   | 13   | 27   | 41   | 55   | 70   | 85   | 100  |
| Flemish region  | 13   | 27   | 41   | 55   | 70   | 85   | 100  |
| <i>Total Belgium</i>  | 19   | 37   | 53   | 67   | 80   | 91   | 100  |
| CBC-Vlaanderen-Nederland  | 13   | 27   | 40   | 55   | 69   | 84   | 100  |
| CBC-France-Wallonie-Vlaanderen  | 13   | 27   | 40   | 55   | 69   | 84   | 100  |
| <b>"actual" implementation rate: actual expenditure in percentage of total allocation</b>   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Hainaut   |      |      | 18   | 22   |      |      |      |
| Walloon region  |      |      | 14   | 17   |      |      |      |
| Brussels region   |      |      | 7    | 11   |      |      |      |
| Flemish region  |      |      | 7    | 26   |      |      |      |
| <i>Total Belgium</i>  |      |      | 14   | 21   |      |      |      |
| CBC-Vlaanderen-Nederland  |      |      | 10   | 15   |      |      |      |
| CBC-France-Wallonie-Vlaanderen  |      |      | 7    | 20   |      |      |      |

Source: own calculations based on DG REGIO data

The pace of programme implementation was highest in the Flemish region where the implementation rate increased from 7% at end-2009 to 26% at end-2010 (see Table C). This was partly due to the reallocation of funding in 2010 (of EUR 15 million) from support for entrepreneurship (priority axis 2) where financial absorption until end-2009 was very weak



towards the improvement of context conditions for businesses and spatial planning (priority axis 3) where financial absorption was and is strongest. Despite the shift of funding, the implementation rate of measures supporting entrepreneurship is still lowest (13% of allocation). On March 10, 2010 it has been decided to widen eligibility of funding within this priority to include investment in infrastructure as long as it promotes entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial skills, creates an environment which facilitates growth and takeover and promotes the internationalisation of enterprises.

**Table C – Allocation (ERDF and national funding), Expenditure (Certified eligible expenditure paid by beneficiaries) and Implementation rates (end-2009 and end-2010)**

|   | Allocation 2010 |                   | Expenditure      |       | Implementation rate                 |      |
|---|-----------------|-------------------|------------------|-------|-------------------------------------|------|
|   | EUR million     | distribution in % | EUR million 2009 | 2010  | Expenditure 2009 in % of Allocation | 2010 |
| P1: Job and business creation   | 385.9           | 36                | 151.0            | 159.4 | 39                                  | 41   |
| P2: Human capital, know ledge, know -how and research                     | 241.3           | 23                | 40.4             | 55.8  | 17                                  | 23   |
| P3: Balanced and sustainable territorial development                      | 430.2           | 40                | 3.6              | 18.8  | 1                                   | 4    |
| Technical assistance  | 12.5            | 1                 | 0.0              | 0.6   | 0                                   | 5    |
| Hainaut   | 1070.0          | 100               | 195.1            | 234.6 | 18                                  | 22   |
| P1: Job and business creation   | 222.7           | 31                | 79.9             | 83.0  | 36                                  | 37   |
| P2: Human capital, know ledge, know -how and research                     | 177.8           | 25                | 15.3             | 26.4  | 9                                   | 15   |
| P3: Balanced and sustainable territorial development                      | 312.3           | 43                | 3.8              | 10.3  | 1                                   | 3    |
| Technical assistance  | 7.5             | 1                 | 0.0              | 0.5   | 0                                   | 7    |
| Walloon region  | 720.4           | 100               | 99.0             | 120.2 | 14                                  | 17   |
| P1: Support for territorial competitiveness                               | 71.9            | 62                | 5.8              | 9.4   | 8                                   | 13   |
| P2: Strengthening territorial cohesion                                    | 38.7            | 34                | 1.5              | 2.2   | 4                                   | 6    |
| Technical assistance  | 4.6             | 4                 | 0.6              | 1.0   | 13                                  | 21   |
| Brussels region   | 115.2           | 100               | 7.8              | 12.6  | 7                                   | 11   |
| P1: Know ledge economy and Innovation                                     | 120.6           | 24                | 6.7              | 27.5  | 6                                   | 23   |
| P2: Entrepreneurship (*)  | 83.1            | 17                | 1.3              | 10.9  | 2                                   | 13   |
| P3: Improving the basis for economic structuring and spatial planning (*) | 158.1           | 32                | 14.2             | 61.5  | 9                                   | 39   |
| P4: Urban development   | 120.6           | 24                | 10.0             | 28.1  | 8                                   | 23   |
| Technical assistance  | 16.1            | 3                 | 1.6              | 3.5   | 10                                  | 22   |
| Flemish region  | 498.3           | 100               | 33.7             | 131.5 | 7                                   | 26   |
| P1: Economy   | 94.9            | 50                | 12.4             | 17.4  | 13                                  | 18   |
| P2: Environment   | 45.5            | 24                | 3.4              | 7.4   | 7                                   | 16   |
| P3: People  | 37.9            | 20                | 1.9              | 3.2   | 5                                   | 9    |
| Technical assistance  | 11.4            | 6                 | 1.2              | 1.2   | 10                                  | 10   |
| CBC-Vlaanderen-Nederland  | 189.7           | 100               | 18.8             | 29.2  | 10                                  | 15   |
| P1: Economic development  | 78.5            | 32                | 4.9              | 16.1  | 6                                   | 21   |
| P2: Territorial identity  | 75.2            | 30                | 7.1              | 18.2  | 9                                   | 24   |
| P3: Accessibility and development of services                             | 29.0            | 12                | 1.4              | 4.0   | 5                                   | 14   |
| P4: Sustainable development   | 50.8            | 20                | 2.2              | 10.2  | 4                                   | 20   |
| Technical assistance  | 15.1            | 6                 | 0.9              | 2.1   | 6                                   | 14   |
| CBC-France-Wallonie-Vlaanderen  | 248.5           | 100               | 16.5             | 50.7  | 7                                   | 20   |
| Total Competitiveness and Employment and Convergence programmes           | 2403.9          |                   | 335.6            | 498.9 | 14                                  | 21   |

Source: own calculations based on DG REGIO data

Overall the implementation rate by end-2010 was lowest in the Brussels region where just 11% of allocated funds had been spent. The progress was particularly slow for projects aimed at strengthening territorial cohesion (priority axis 2) for which absorption was less than 6% (4% by end-2009). Many of the projects supporting territorial competitiveness (priority axis 1) and territorial cohesion (priority axis 2) consist of investment in infrastructure and the creation of activity space, training centres and of child care facilities. The 2010 AIR states that most of these projects will only be operational by the end of the

programming period and that for some the construction permit was requested only in 2010. According to the Managing Authority, the main reason for delay is the nature of the investment projects which require long preparation and planning. Another reason for the delay is the extensive controls and audits that have been carried out by the Audit and Certification Authorities in 2010. According to the Managing Authority “*The work overload related to these mobilised a large share of Managing Authority members at the expense of their core mission, namely managing and implementing the programme*”<sup>10</sup>.

Implementation of the Hainaut CP and the Walloon region CEP was 22% and 17% of total allocation, respectively at end-2010. In both programmes the implementation rate of measures for supporting job and business creation (priority axis 1) was already high by end-2009 (39% in Hainaut and 36% in Wallonia). This in part was due to capital transfers to financial engineering schemes which represented roughly two thirds of the expenditure under this priority but which however has not been transferred on to final beneficiaries. By end-2010 around 38% of these transfers had been paid out in Hainaut (15% by end-2009) as risk capital, micro-credits and loan guarantees and in Wallonia, the proportion was around 35% (16% by end-2009). Accordingly, the overall implementation rate of the priority at end-2010 of 41% in Hainaut and 37% in Wallonia is much less inflated than it was a year earlier.

Very little has been spent, on the other hand, on projects supporting balanced and sustainable territorial development (priority axis 3) by cleaning up old industrial land, improving accessibility, equipping business areas and regenerating urban centres. The overall implementation rate for these was only around 4% in Hainaut and 3% in the Walloon region. According to the 2010 AIR, the delays come from long administrative and technical procedures. Although no expenditure had taken place by end-2010 on the regeneration of old industrial land and brownfields in Wallonia and only a little in Hainaut, in both, work to clean up several polluted sites had actually begun.

So far as CBCPs are concerned, the situation as regards expenditure relative to allocation is very different from one programme to the other. While the implementation rate of the France-Wallonie-Vlaanderen Programme was 20% by end-2010 (14% by end-2009) it was just 15% for the Vlaanderen-Nederland Programme (10% by end-2009). The main reason for this is the relatively slow progress made under the priority of investment in human capital. The 2010 AIR does not, however, refer to any particular problem in this respect.

## ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE PROGRAMMES SO FAR

### Main points from last year's country report

- By end-2009, most projects were at an early stage of being launched so that it was clearly too early to obtain a representative picture of achievements.

---

<sup>10</sup>Rapport annuel d'exécution 2010, Cellule de Coordination et de Gestion du FEDER 2007-2013, Ministère de la Région de Bruxelles-Capitale, page 13.

- The main outputs from the programmes in Hainaut and in the Walloon region were from investment grants and advanced support services as well as support to R&D, particularly in relation to poles of competitiveness.
- In the Brussels region, most output and result indicators were zero at end-2009. A few tangible outcomes related to the support provided for business start-ups and entrepreneurial awareness-raising among young people in school.
- The AIRs of the Flemish CEP gave little information on the progress of projects implemented in terms of outputs and results. The main information related to the calls for projects launched and the projects selected and/or approved.
- In all three regions, success in meeting the targets set for core indicators was reported to be satisfactory but the indicators concerned referred in many cases to expected outputs and results rather than achieved ones. The 'under-setting' of targets was a feature of all regions and most notably the Flemish one.

Before summarising the main outcomes and achievements of the programmes since then, it is important to recall that expenditure by end-2010 was on average just 21% of total allocation. It is therefore again too early to see significant achievements from the programmes and tangible outcomes from the projects and measures implemented because most of them are not yet completed. Given this, there is also no evidence as yet on whether or not the expenditure is having the intended effects in the different policy areas since these will be only observable when the projects are finished and in operation.

It should also be noticed that 2010 AIRs contain virtually no qualitative information about programme outcomes. They concentrate to a large extent on reporting progress in monitoring indicators and reporting financial absorption. The so called "qualitative analysis" in the AIRs give information on the number of submitted, accepted and rejected projects, the project names and the financial allocations to these but *not* on the purpose, the content or the progress made in carrying the projects out. In particular, the 2010 AIR of the Flemish CEP provides only information on the projects selected in 2010 but there is no mention on the progress in implementing projects selected in previous years or their outcomes. It should be recognised that these shortcomings are much less observed in the AIRs of Hainaut and the Walloon region which are more informative in this regard.

### **Overall developments in 2010**

Following the calls for proposals launched in 2007 and 2008 and the selection process that followed, all budgets with the exception of the aid schemes were allocated to "project portfolios"<sup>11</sup> or individual projects beginning of 2010 in Hainaut and in Wallonia. Both

---

<sup>11</sup> "Project portfolios" are sets of interrelated projects designed and implemented in an as coordinated as possible way to increase the overall impact of the support. This approach was first adopted in the 2007-2013 programming period and was subject of an evaluation in 2010. The main features of these are summarised in section 4 "Evaluation and good practice in evaluation".

programmes were, therefore, fully operational in 2010 and the entire ERDF allocation has been committed.

In the Flemish region, although there has been good progress in implementing the programme in 2010, as shown in the previous section, around 40% of ERDF allocation still needed to be assigned to projects at end-2010. The reallocation of funding in 2010 and the reasons for this set out in the 2010 AIR tend to indicate that the remaining budget might be allocated to areas where financial absorption has been strongest up until now and to the construction of infrastructure, which has been included since March 2010 as eligible expenditure in many parts of the programme<sup>12</sup>.

In the Brussels region, even though official data from DG Regio show that ERDF allocation was nearly fully committed by end-2010, the low implementation rate and the very scarce information on this in the 2010 AIR tend to indicate relatively slow progress in carrying out the projects<sup>13</sup>, so that most indicators on results were still zero by end-2010. It should also be noticed that the Government decided in July 2010 to abandon several projects and to reallocate resources freed up to projects which have applied for additional funding<sup>14</sup>.

The main outcomes of expenditure by end-2010 in the different policy areas covered by the CP and the CEPs are summarised below.

### **Enterprise environment and support to RTDI**

Measures undertaken to support companies, to enhance the business environment and to promote RTDI accounted for two-thirds of the expenditure carried out by end-2010 in Hainaut and in the Walloon region and progress in implementing these was good overall. In the Brussels region the share of spending in this policy area was around three-quarters of total expenditure. In the Flemish region around 28% of total expenditure went to the support of the enterprise environment, RTDI and innovation.

#### *Advanced support services to companies and entrepreneurs*

Advanced support to companies and entrepreneurs are now fully operational in both the Hainaut and the Walloon region and all the various kinds of specialised services initially planned<sup>15</sup> are being delivered. These services include specific advice for SMEs to cope with the recession and this seems to have been much appreciated. The 2010 AIRs indicate that the advice might have contributed to the fact that the number of enterprises given support to expand (1,132 in Hainaut and 889 in the Walloon region) was much higher than the targets set by end-2010 (534 in Hainaut and 239 in the Walloon region).

<sup>12</sup> According to the Flemish Managing Authority, the “Agentschap Ondernemen”, around 90% of funding has been committed by October 2011.

<sup>13</sup> It can be estimated on the basis of the annex to the 2010 AIR that among the 37 projects initially selected around 60% are delayed or seriously delayed (for one third of these because municipalities find it difficult to provide the necessary co-financing) and around 5% of projects are blocked.

<sup>14</sup> These are “Greenbizz”, “Pôle d’attractivités économiques urbaines”, crèche “Maison rouge”, crèche “Elmer in de stad” and Abatan.

<sup>15</sup> These are know-how, creation, differentiation, development and coordination.

In the Flemish region the advice and services to support entrepreneurship, to facilitate the creation and growth of companies and to promote their internationalisation led to the following main outcomes by end-2010: 62 people launched their own business (25 by end-2010; final target 900), 637 companies received assistance for expanding their activities (75 by end-2010; final target 1,200), 34 companies were helped to develop their exports (34 by end-2010; final target 400).

*Support for RTDI, innovation and technology acquisition<sup>16</sup>*

There was also progress in respect of support to RTDI during 2010 in both Hainaut and the Walloon region. While in 2009 none of the planned initiatives to support innovation and the acquisition of technology in SMEs, except the technology voucher programme, had actually started, during 2010, 5 industrial research projects in companies were supported in Hainaut and 11 in the Walloon region in addition to ERDF co-financed projects in research centres (71 in Hainaut and 43 in the Walloon region). Good progress during 2010 is also reported for the technology voucher programme, since there was an increase of around 130% in the vouchers distributed (1,426 vouchers distributed in 2010 in Hainaut and 2,889 in the Walloon region). Support to research carried out in research centres led to concrete technology developments and patent applications in several areas<sup>17</sup>. The 2010 AIRs mentions that some of these are likely to find application in industry very quickly. Overall, by end-2010 38 new products and processes were developed in Hainaut (16 by end-2009) and 13 in the Walloon region (6 by end-2009).

In the Flemish CEP, support to RTDI is aimed at achieving a more extensive use of the knowledge available by carrying out various kinds of action. By end-2010 the main outcomes of these were: 1,523 companies had adopted new strategies or improved existing ones to make better use of available knowledge (523 by end-2009; final target 300<sup>18</sup>); 472 companies had implemented new knowledge applications and techniques after having received specific advice in this regard (196 by end-2009; final target 680); 612 incremental research projects had been initiated in companies (520 by end-2009; final target 180); 129 collaborations had been established between universities and companies (50 by end-2009; final target 120) and 79 international partnerships had been formed for the development of new knowledge applications (14 by end-2009; final target 60).

<sup>16</sup> For more details on ERDF co-financed measures to promote innovation and R&D in Belgium, see: Greunz L. (2010), Policy Paper on Innovation – Belgium, Evaluation Network delivering Policy analysis on the Performance of Cohesion Policy 2007–2013, Report for the European Commission, Directorate-General Regional Policy [http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/pdf/eval2007/expert\\_innovation/belgium.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/pdf/eval2007/expert_innovation/belgium.pdf)

<sup>17</sup> These are mainly related to the following “project portfolios”: “Walextract”, “Clearzinc”, “Giga” and “Hainaut Biomed”.

<sup>18</sup> This and many of the following end-targets were obviously set far too low but there is no revised value in the 2010 AIR.

*Investment grants and other financial support to companies*

Progress in 2010 was relatively modest in Hainaut and the Walloon region as regards investment grants to companies but these had already absorbed much of the funding available in the first years of the programming period. In 2010, grants helped to start up 4 new businesses in Hainaut and another in the other part of Wallonia and to expand four others in the former region. This brought the total number of companies supported by end-2010 to 77 in Hainaut and 14 in Wallonia.

In the Brussels region, the so called “BRSCO” action provides micro-credit and seed capital to small businesses. In 2010, it supported 43 businesses to start up or expand. Overall, the number of firms supported in the Brussels region increased from 110 at end-2009 to 140 at end-2010 as against a target of 500, including start-ups, by end-2013.

There was noticeable progress as regards financial engineering schemes in Hainaut and Wallonia in so far as part of the funding actually reached final beneficiaries in 2010. While in 2009, the aid scheme was not effective because the main part of spending went to operators responsible for delivering the funding, in 2010 a significant proportion of the funds were paid out. By end-2010 20% of the allocation to risk capital reached companies in Hainaut and 17% in the rest of the Walloon region.

Overall, the measures carried out under this policy area in the CP had supported 284 business start-ups by end-2010 and 597 start-ups in the CEPs (see Tables D and E). These achievements represent, respectively, 42% and 31% of the targets set by the end of the programming period. A direct comparison of the jobs created across regions is not possible because of the different ways in which this is measured and reported by the Managing Authorities (see Tables D and E). Overall, it can be estimated however that by end-2010, around a quarter of the end-target had been reached in the convergence region and on average almost half in the others.

**Human resources**

A very small share of ERDF is allocated directly to support of human resources (Table A) but there are several measures carried out which help to increase human capital.

In Hainaut and the Walloon region, investment in infrastructure to support training and skills in competence centres is one of these but support to human capital is a component of many project portfolios. Overall, by end-2010, nearly 14 thousand workers had received training in Hainaut and over 41 thousand in the Walloon region.

In the Brussels region, the initiatives carried out to raise entrepreneurial awareness of young people were relatively successful, the number reached by these increasing from 2,143 to 4,084 during the year which is fairly close to the target set of 5,000 by end-2013. It might also be mentioned that several seminars on environmental friendly construction were organised by the “sustainable construction” excellence centre in the course of 2010.

## **Territorial development**

There were only very few tangible outcomes by end-2010 from measures implemented to support territorial development in Hainaut and the Walloon region and progress during the year was slow. Most of these projects are aimed at developing infrastructure, improving business sites and regenerating old industrial land and/or urban areas. Lengthy planning and preparation procedures are mentioned as the main reasons for delay. At end-2010, most projects had arrived at the notification stage of works and a few had been completed: the clean-up of 4 polluted sites (one at end-2009; final target: 28), the construction of three office buildings for business start-ups (one at end-2009; final target: 9) and one business park (zero at end-2009; final target 4) in addition to the aerospace business centre at Redu which was already operational in 2009. According to the 2010 AIRs, most projects will only be operational by the end of the programming period. Given the delay it is questionable whether it is still possible to reach the targets set by end of the period particularly as regards rehabilitation<sup>19</sup>.

In the Brussels region, modest progress was made during 2010 to increase the supply of childcare facilities. Out of the 14 projects approved, one was finalised in 2010 and now provides care to 69 children.

In the Flemish region, territorial development is supported through improving transport and logistics, improving business sites, strengthening regional attractiveness and promoting integrated urban development in the main cities. Overall the expenditure carried by end-2010 led to a better transport system for over 2 thousand people (final target: 3 thousand), 402 hectares of building land and activity space for enterprises (63 by end-2009; final target 750) and 16 thousand square metres of renovated commercial areas in cities (6.5 by end-2009; final target 20-30<sup>20</sup>).

## **Aggregated outcomes and achievements**

It is not easy to give an overall picture of achievements in the different policy area for the country as a whole. Nevertheless, the various different indicators published in the AIRs are aggregated and set out in Tables D and E. It is important to emphasise that the figures need to be interpreted with much caution since the indicators have been developed independently by the regions concerned without any attempt at coordination and are in many cases not directly comparable as such. It should also be noted that these kinds of deficiency in the

---

<sup>19</sup> According to the Managing Authority, there is no concern on this and the targets set by end of the period should be achieved.

<sup>20</sup> Please note that this is not the end-target mentioned in the 2010 AIR (which is 200-300 thousand square metres). According to the Agentschap Ondernemen the value indicated in the 2010 AIR “.. *is not realistic for Flanders*” and “*The result indicator is mistaken*”. The Managing Authority provided us with a more realistic estimate of the end-target.

information available are not unique to the Belgian programmes but are evident for most of the CPs and CEPs implemented across Europe<sup>21</sup>.

**Table D – Convergence objective: Indicators for assessing achievements of the CP – Hainaut (Situation by end-2010)**

| Policy area                      | Main indicators  | Other physical indicators   |
|----------------------------------|--|---|
| Enterprise support and RTDI      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>284 start-ups supported (end-2009: 177; final target: 669)</u></li> <li>• 1,472 direct jobs created (end-2009: 963; final target 6,481)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EUR 635 million Investment induced (end-2009: 434; final target: 1,000)</li> <li>• 303 direct investment aid projects to SME (end-2009: 128; final target: 1,547)</li> <li>• <u>76 RTD projects: (end-2009: 71; final target: 180)</u></li> <li>• 1 cooperation project enterprises-research institutions (end-2009: 1; final target: 10)</li> <li>• 201 research jobs created (end-2009: 171; final target: 180)</li> <li>• 38 new products and processes developed (end-2009:16; final target:73)</li> </ul> |
| Human Resources (ERDF only)      |  |   |
| Transport and telecommunications |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 transport project competed (end-2009: 0; final target: 10)</li> </ul>  |
| Environment and energy           |  |   |
| Territorial development          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>0.1 km<sup>2</sup> of rehabilitated land (end-2009: 0; final target: 1.48)</u></li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 22 tourism projects implemented (end-2009: 22, final target:11)</li> <li>• <u>18 projects ensuring sustainability and improving the attractiveness of towns and cities implemented (end-2009: 19; final target: 21)</u></li> <li>• 19 new businesses located in the newly created activity space (end-2009: 13; final target: 73)</li> </ul>   |

Note: Underlined indicators are those which are available for all Belgian Programmes and can be aggregated.

<sup>21</sup> See Synthesis of national reports 2010, Evaluation network delivering policy analysis on the performance of Cohesion policy 2007-2013, December 2010.  
[http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/pdf/eval2007/cohesion\\_policy\\_synthesis\\_report\\_final\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/pdf/eval2007/cohesion_policy_synthesis_report_final_en.pdf)



**Table E – Competitiveness and Employment objective: Indicators for assessing achievements of the CEPs – Walloon region, Flemish region, Brussels region (Situation by end-2010)**

| Policy area                      | Main indicators   | Other physical indicators   |
|----------------------------------|---|---|
| Enterprise support and RTDI      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>597 start-ups supported (end-2009: 282; final target: 1,910)</u></li> <li>• 727 direct jobs created (end-2009: 462; final target 4,293) in Wallonia</li> <li>• 257 jobs created (final target 660) in Brussels</li> <li>• 9,824 direct <i>and indirect</i> jobs created (end-2009: 978; final target 15,000) in Flanders</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EUR 113 million of investment induced (end-2009: 78; final target: 635) (Brussels not covered)</li> <li>• 332 direct investment aid projects to SME (end-2009: 98; final target: 1,144) (Brussels not covered)</li> <li>• <u>328 RTD projects (end-2009: 215; final target: 724)</u></li> <li>• 44 cooperation project enterprises-research institutions (end-2009: 32; final target: 190) (Brussels not covered)</li> <li>• 111 research jobs created (end-2009: 89; final target: 100) (Wallonia only)</li> <li>• 13 new products and processes developed (end-2009: 6; final target: 89)</li> </ul> |
| Human Resources (ERDF only)      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4,084 students benefiting from education projects (final target: 15,000) (Brussels only)</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 9 education projects (end-2009: 8; final target: 6) (Brussels only)</li> </ul>   |
| Transport and telecommunications |   |   |
| Environment and energy           |   |   |
| Territorial development          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>0.4 km<sup>2</sup> of rehabilitated land (end-2009: 0.1; final target: 2.5)</u></li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 15 tourism projects (end-2009: 14, final target: 12) (Wallonia only)</li> <li>• <u>49 projects ensuring sustainability and improving the attractiveness of towns and cities (end-2009: 38; final target: 136)</u></li> <li>• 7 new businesses located in the newly created activity space (end-2009: 7; final target: 155)</li> </ul>  |

Note: Underlined indicators are those which are available for all Belgian Programmes and can be aggregated.

### 3. EFFECTS OF INTERVENTION

#### Main points from last year's country report

- Although no evaluation was carried out by end-2010 on the impact and wider effects of Cohesion policy in Belgium, the National Strategic Reports (December 2009) tend to indicate that EU support has helped to moderate the negative impact of the crisis in all regions.
- A re-assessment of the options taken and the priorities of the CP and the CEPs in the context of the crisis confirmed in all the three Belgian regions the appropriateness of

the programmes since these are mainly focused on overcoming structural weaknesses.

- According to the 2009 AIRs, micro-loans, cash loans and seed fund have helped companies in Brussels and the Walloon region in particular to better withstand the crisis.

### Developments in 2010

As of October 2011, no additional evidence has become available on the contribution so far of the projects supported to the development of regions in Belgium because no evaluation on this has been carried out since the programmes were adopted in 2007. In reality, an evaluation at this stage of the wider effects of the programmes on the quality of life or the capacity to sustain economic development would not provide much insight because the programmes have not yet generated expenditure sufficiently to produce such effects. By end-2010, only one fifth of the funding had been spent.

There is, however, an indication of positive effects of the programmes in several regards mainly in relation to the “project portfolios” which is a new approach adopted for the first time in the 2007–2013 period to implement ERDF co-financed projects in Hainaut and the Walloon region. Project portfolios are sets of integrated projects designed and implemented in as a coordinated way as possible to increase the overall impact of support. An evaluation of this approach was carried out in 2010 for several measures in the Hainaut CP and the Walloon region CEP (see next section) and was aimed at assessing the value-added in this regard. The results so far tend to indicate that the approach helps to tackle a number of issues which in the past prevented funding from producing its full effects. In particular, the evaluation provides evidence that the approach helps to enhance social networks, collaborations and partnerships, to increase the number of participants in ERDF co-financed R&D projects and so the potential impact of these, to concentrate public money on fewer projects and so increase the size of these and to strengthen the integration of ERDF co-funded projects into national region policy. Although it is not possible to quantify the impact of this approach in terms of growth or job creation, the fact that it helps to combat the main causes of inefficiency identified in the mid-term evaluation of the Hainaut Objective 1 programme in the 2000–2006 period and its update in 2005 is already an achievement in itself and likely to increase the overall impact of funding.

## 4. EVALUATIONS AND GOOD PRACTICE IN EVALUATION

During 2010, two evaluations were carried out on the Hainaut CP and the Walloon CEP. The first assessed the **value added of “project portfolios”** and the second the **pertinence of advanced support services**. Both evaluations are carried out in two parts. The below summarises the main conclusions coming out from the first parts which are planned to be complemented at the end of the programming period by a second evaluation.

**Assessment of the value added of project portfolios<sup>22</sup>**

Project portfolios are sets of interrelated projects in a given policy area which are designed and implemented in a coordinated way to increase the overall impact of support. The evaluation focused on project portfolios in advanced support services (measure 1.3 of the CP and the CEP), support to research centres (measure 2.2.), support to training and competence centres (measure 2.4.), regeneration of old industrial land (measure 3.1.), increasing the accessibility of and equipping business areas (measure 3.2.) and regenerating urban centres (measure 3.3.). The approach of project portfolios was adopted for the first time in the 2007–2013 programming period following strong recommendations by evaluations in the previous programming period<sup>23</sup>. The evaluation is carried out in two parts. The first was finalised in November 2010 and assessed for each of the project portfolios 1) the extent of synergies and partnerships at the conception stage of projects; 2) the degree of actual integration of projects; 3) the impact of this on the development and strengthening of networks; 4) the contribution to the overall strategic objectives pursued by the regional development policy. Overall, 104 projects portfolios were analysed mainly by carrying out interviews, desk research and quantitative cluster techniques. The second part of the evaluation planned in 2013 will mainly focus on the effects of the portfolio approach on the performance of the policy, its effectiveness in enhancing networking between economic players and the identification of best practices and success factors so to improve the policy in the future.

Main conclusions from the assessment of the value added of project portfolios:

- The approach has contributed to increasing the awareness of people involved in the projects on synergies with other projects or other parts of the programme and to recognise the potential benefits from these. The most frequently cited benefits are scale economies, increased visibility and stronger competitiveness of the companies involved.
- Overall, funding of advanced support services appears to be the most integrated measure in both the CP and the CEP and has the most synergy with other measures. Their main expected benefit is increased economies of scale. Strong integration with other measures is also observed for projects supporting research centres and knowledge creation. The main benefit of synergy is increased knowledge sharing. Support to training and competence centres has the lowest level of integration in the programmes.
- The approach of project portfolios contributes to the creation and intensification of social networks and partnerships. In both the CP and the CEP project portfolios for support to research centres (measure 2.2.) have a particular strong potential impact in this regard.

<sup>22</sup> SEE, Comase (2010), Analyse de la plus-value générée par les portefeuilles de projets et projets uniques dans le cadre des Programmes Opérationnels FEDER 2007–2013 Convergence, Compétitivité régionale et emploi – Part 1, Evaluation carried out for the Public Service of the Walloon region, DG de l'Animation et de l'Evaluation des Programmes du Département de la Coordination des Fonds structurels.

<sup>23</sup> The mid-term evaluation of the Objective 1 Programme 2000–2006 of Hainaut pointed to a dispersion of efforts and a lack of coherence between interventions. It recommended to better coordinate the projects, in particular those which share the following characteristics: 1) being geographically close; 2) focusing on the same policy area 3) pursuing a joint objective, 4) being related in an “upstream downstream” logic. A need for stronger synergies of interventions was also highlighted in the mid-term evaluations of the Objective 2 Programmes 2000–2006 Meuse–Vesdre and Namur–Luxembourg.

- Although it is difficult to assess the extent to which the portfolio approach is more efficient from a cost-benefit perspective, it appears that the average size of projects in the 2007–2013 period is larger than in previous programming periods. As “spreading” small amounts of money over many different kinds of intervention was identified by previous evaluations as a source of inefficiency, the significantly larger size of the projects now might help to increase the overall efficiency of the programmes.

#### Evaluation of advanced support services<sup>24</sup>

The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the pertinence of projects and actions carried out in the current programming period as regards the provision of advanced support services (measure 1.3.), the effectiveness and efficiency of these and the results achieved in both the CP and the CEP. Several evaluations<sup>25</sup> have recommended that the provision of advanced support services in the region should be more targeted towards the actual needs expressed by the companies and also highlighted the need for a better coordination of the service among providers. These recommendations were taken up in the 2007–2013 programming period by streamlining the service and by simplifying the organisational structure of provision. The aim of this evaluation – at least in part – was to assess whether and to what extent these efforts were successful and helped to improve the efficiency of the system. It was organised in two parts. The first, finalised in March 2011, evaluated the pertinence of the projects selected in the 2007–2013 period as regards the needs expressed by companies and (potential) entrepreneurs as well as the consistency of these with the overall objectives of the policy. The second part is planned to be undertaken in 2012 and will assess effects and results.

#### Main conclusions from the evaluation of advanced support services:

- The assessment by the providers of the need for advanced support services by companies is often informal and uncoordinated. There is no common approach and no sharing of information. Likewise, while most operators adapted their services to the specific needs of companies in the context of the crisis and recession, there was no systematic method to do so and too little experience and information were shared.
- Overall the services and advice offered, however, correspond to the needs expressed by the companies although the importance given in the OPs to some types of service is not justified by the small number of companies identifying them as a need.
- The penetration rate for advanced support services is higher for small (33%) to medium-sized companies (22%) than for very small companies (11%). The

<sup>24</sup> SEE, Comase (2011), Evaluation des résultats des actions co-financées par le FEDER 2007–2013 en matière de stimulation de l’entrepreneuriat, de la création, de développement et de transmission d’entreprises dans le cadre des programmes opérationnels « Convergence » et « Compétitivité régionale et emploi » – Part 1, Part 1, Evaluation carried out for the Public Service of the Walloon region, DG de l’Animation et de l’Evaluation des Programmes du Département de la Coordination des Fonds structurels.

<sup>25</sup> IWEPS (2006), Evaluation des couveuses d’entreprises, des coopératives d’activités et des incubateurs en économie sociale en région wallonne.

SONECOM (2009), Enquête auprès des entreprises sur la perception de l’animation économique en région wallonne, ASE.

ULB (CERT) (2005), Actualisation de l’évaluation à mi-parcours du DOCUP Phasing out objectif n° 1 – Hainaut.

penetration rate is also higher for exporting companies (22%) than for other (7%). It is equally higher in manufacturing than in other sectors. To a certain extent these rates mirror the policy focus of the Programmes on small companies.

- Two main recommendations were formulated: 1) the different operators responsible to provide the services need to collaborate and cooperate more effectively; 2) the range of services should further be streamlined by targeting the service provided on the main needs of companies; 3) the monitoring system for services provided should be simplified and made more operational.

It can be assumed that the results of both parts of the evaluations described above feeds into the policy-making process because this is explicitly stated in the evaluation documents. The results of the first parts of both evaluations are helping to adjust the measures carried out in the remaining period. The conclusions of the second parts are intended to improve the measures and the project portfolio approach in the next programming period.

| Title and date of completion  | Policy area and scope  | Main objectives   | Main findings  | Full reference or link to publication   |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| Analyse de la plus-value générée par les portefeuilles de projets et projets uniques dans le cadre des Programmes Opérationnels FEDER 2007-2013 Convergence, Compétitivité régionale et emploi – Part 1(Part 2 is planned in 2013)  | Thematic evaluation on project portfolios in the following policy areas : advanced support, research centres, training and competence centres, regeneration of old industrial land, accessibility and equipment in business areas, the regenerating urban centre | Assess the value added of project portfolios  | The project portfolio approach contributes to increase synergies with other measures of the programme and helps in social networking.                                    | <a href="http://europe.wallonie.be/sites/default/files/FEDER%20Synergies%20-%20Rapport%20final.pdf">http://europe.wallonie.be/sites/default/files/FEDER%20Synergies%20-%20Rapport%20final.pdf</a>                     |
| Evaluation des résultats des actions cofinancées par le FEDER 2007-2013 en matière de stimulation de l'entrepreneuriat, de la création, de développement et de transmission d'entreprises dans le cadre des programmes opérationnels «Convergence» » et «Compétitivité régionale et emploi» – Part 1(Part 2 is planned in 2012) | Evaluation of the advanced support services to companies and entrepreneurs co-financed by the ERDF (measure 1.3. of the CP and the CEP)  | Assess the pertinence of projects and actions carried out to provide advanced support services, their effectiveness and efficiency and the results achieved | There is too little common approach and information sharing among operators delivering the services. The services provided correspond broadly to the needs of companies. | <a href="http://europe.wallonie.be/sites/default/files/SEE-COMASE-Entrepreneuriat-Rap%20final%2020110307.pdf">http://europe.wallonie.be/sites/default/files/SEE-COMASE-Entrepreneuriat-Rap%20final%2020110307.pdf</a> |

In the Brussels and in Flemish region, no evaluations apart from those already mentioned in last year's report have been carried out. The managing authority of the Brussels CEP plans a mid-term evaluation later in 2011 and had prepared the tender documents for this by end-2010. Its purpose will be to assess progress in implementing the OP from an operational and strategic perspective. It will also contain two thematic evaluations and an assessment of the communications strategy. A mid-term evaluation is also carried out by the Managing Authority of the Flemish CEP and of the Vlaanderen-Netherlands CBCP. The results should be available by end-2011. As in 2008, an evaluation of the communication strategy was conducted in 2010 which assessed the awareness of people in Flanders and the cross border region Vlaanderen-Netherlands of the Structural Funds.

## 5. CONCLUDING REMARKS – FUTURE CHALLENGES

Two challenges were highlighted in the 2010 country report:

- First, each region in Belgium has a high degree of autonomy over the development strategy pursued and the policy put in place but there is not much cooperation or consultation between the regions. This is a source of inefficiency and of potentially perverse effects and works against a critical mass being achieved.
- Second, the information contained in the AIRs of the ERDF co-financed programmes in Belgium is not appropriate for aggregating information and physical indicators across programmes. If the purpose of annual reporting is to provide aggregate information on progress, the system needs a thorough overhaul.

These points remain valid. In addition, it should be noted that the country has formally been without a government since June 13, 2010 and though on a day-to-day basis Belgium is run by a caretaker government which has proved to be relatively efficient, it is now urgent to find a solution to this situation. The deep divisions between the Dutch-speaking and French-speaking halves of the population and the lack of any truly national parties make it very difficult to build a coalition. While for months, the political crisis had relatively little economic consequences because many powers have already been devolved to the regional governments and language communities, a government needs to be formed as soon as possible for the two main reasons:

- First, the financial markets had begun to make the country pay for the failings of its political leaders by early 2011 by increasing borrowing costs. Given the high indebtedness of the country, this has resulted in further budget tightening.
- Secondly, as highlighted several times in this report, the slow progress in implementing the Brussels CEP is due in part to the difficulty Authorities have in finding the necessary co-financing. The critical question of the refinancing of the region is part of the issues which need to be solved by a new coalition. Transfers from other regions to finance the expenditure generated by commuting into the

capital are currently inadequate but cannot be increased until a viable agreement about regional transfers is reached and a central government is formed<sup>26</sup>.

---

<sup>26</sup> According to Charles Picqué, Minister President of Brussels, there is a need for additional EUR 500 million annually «*if one wants to get out and implement development policies in Brussels*» (Source: Le Soir, 15 April 2010). The agreement on the special law of financing of 25 September 2011 proposes a refinancing of Brussels of EUR 134 million in 2012 and EUR 461 million by 2015 and foresees an increasing amount of refinancing thereafter.

## REFERENCES

### Mid-term evaluations

ULB, DULBEA, FUCAM, (Novembre 2003), Evaluation à mi-parcours de la mise en oeuvre du phasing out objectif n° 1 en Hainaut, Résumé opérationnel.

ULB, DULBEA, CERT, (Octobre 2005), Actualisation de l'évaluation à mi-parcours du DOCUP phasing out objectif n° 1 – Hainaut, rapport final.

ADE, Merit, (novembre 2005), Mise à jour de l'évaluation à mi-parcours du DOCUP, Objectif 2 Meuse-Vesdre (2000– 2006), Rapport Final.

ADE, Merit, (novembre 2005), Mise à jour de l'évaluation à mi-parcours du DOCUP, Objectif 2 Namur-Luxembourg (2000– 2006), Rapport Final.

### Evaluations carried out in 2010

SEE, Comase (2010), Analyse de la plus-value générée par les portefeuilles de projets et projets uniques dans le cadre des Programmes Opérationnels FEDER 2007–2013

Convergence, Compétitivité régionale et emploi – Part 1, Evaluation carried out for the Public Service of the Walloon region, DG de l'Animation et de l'Evaluation des Programmes du Département de la Coordination des Fonds structurels.

SEE, Comase (2011), Evaluation des résultats des actions co-financées par le FEDER 2007–2013 en matière de stimulation de l'entrepreneuriat, de la création, de développement et de transmission d'entreprises dans le cadre des programmes opérationnels « Convergence » et « Compétitivité régionale et emploi » – Part 1, Part 1, Evaluation carried out for the Public Service of the Walloon region, DG de l'Animation et de l'Evaluation des Programmes du Département de la Coordination des Fonds structurels.

### Official planning and evaluation documents

Rapport Stratégique National de la Belgique (2009)

Belgian Stability Programme 2009–2012

Belgian Stability Programme 2011–2014

#### *Convergence Objective:*

Programme opérationnel “Convergence Hainaut”, Intervention FEDER 2007–2013, (2007).

Complément de programmation, “Convergence Hainaut”, Intervention FEDER 2007–2013, (2007)

Evaluation Ex ante, Programme opérationnel “Convergence Hainaut”, Intervention FEDER 2007–2013, (2007)

Rapport annuel d'exécution – 2008, Programme opérationnel “Convergence Hainaut”, Intervention FEDER 2007–2013, (2009)



Rapport annuel d'exécution – 2009, Programme opérationnel "Convergence Hainaut", Intervention FEDER 2007–2013, (2010)

Rapport annuel d'exécution – 2010, Programme opérationnel "Convergence Hainaut", Intervention FEDER 2007–2013, (2011)

*Competitiveness and Employment Objective:*

Programme opérationnel "Compétitivité régionale et emploi Wallonie", Intervention FEDER 2007–2013, (2007).

Complément de programmation, "Compétitivité régionale et emploi Wallonie", Intervention FEDER 2007–2013, (2007)

Evaluation Ex ante, Programme opérationnel "Compétitivité régionale et emploi Wallonie", Intervention FEDER 2007–2013, (2007).

Rapport annuel d'exécution – 2008, Programme opérationnel "Compétitivité régionale et emploi Wallonie", Intervention FEDER 2007–2013, (2009).

Rapport annuel d'exécution – 2009, Programme opérationnel "Compétitivité régionale et emploi Wallonie", Intervention FEDER 2007–2013, (2010).

Rapport annuel d'exécution – 2010, Programme opérationnel "Compétitivité régionale et emploi Wallonie", Intervention FEDER 2007–2013, (2011).

Programme opérationnel "Compétitivité régionale et emploi Bruxelles Capitale", Intervention FEDER 2007–2013, (2007).

Evaluation Ex ante, Programme opérationnel "Compétitivité régionale et emploi Bruxelles Capitale", Intervention FEDER 2007–2013, (2007).

Rapport annuel d'exécution – 2008, Programme opérationnel "Compétitivité régionale et emploi Bruxelles Capitale", Intervention FEDER 2007–2013, (2009).

Rapport annuel d'exécution – 2009, Programme opérationnel "Compétitivité régionale et emploi Bruxelles Capitale", Intervention FEDER 2007–2013, (2010).

Rapport annuel d'exécution – 2010, Programme opérationnel "Compétitivité régionale et emploi Bruxelles Capitale", Intervention FEDER 2007–2013, (2011).

Operationeel Programma, Doelstelling « Regionaal Concurrentievermogen en Werkgelegenheid Vlaanderen », EFRO 2007–2013, (2007).

Ex ante evaluatie van het Operationeel Programma, Doelstelling « Regionaal Concurrentievermogen en Werkgelegenheid Vlaanderen », EFRO 2007–2013, (2007)

Jaarverslag – 2008, Operationeel Programma, Doelstelling « Regionaal Concurrentievermogen en Werkgelegenheid Vlaanderen », EFRO 2007–2013, (2009)

Jaarverslag – 2009, Operationeel Programma, Doelstelling « Regionaal Concurrentievermogen en Werkgelegenheid Vlaanderen », EFRO 2007–2013, (2010)

Jaarverslag – 2010, Operationeel Programma, Doelstelling « Regionaal Concurrentievermogen en Werkgelegenheid Vlaanderen », EFRO 2007–2013, (2011)

*Cross-border co-operation Objective:*

Operational Programme, “Cross-border co-operation – France-Wallonie-Vlaanderen”, ERDF 2007–2013

Ex ante evaluation of Operation Programme “Cross-border co-operation – France-Wallonie-Vlaanderen” ERDF 2007–2013

Annual implementation report 2008, Operational Programme, “Cross-border co-operation – France-Wallonie-Vlaanderen”, ERDF 2007–2013.

Annual implementation report 2009, Operational Programme, “Cross-border co-operation – France-Wallonie-Vlaanderen”, ERDF 2007–2013, (2010)

Annual implementation report 2010, Operational Programme, “Cross-border co-operation – France-Wallonie-Vlaanderen”, ERDF 2007–2013, (2011)

Operational Programme, “Cross-border co-operation – Vlaanderen-Nederland”, ERDF 2007–2013

Ex ante evaluation of Operation Programme “Cross-border co-operation – Vlaanderen-Nederland” ERDF 2007–2013

Annual implementation report 2008, Operational Programme, “Cross-border co-operation – Vlaanderen-Nederland”, ERDF 2007–2013.

Annual implementation report 2009, Operational Programme, “Cross-border co-operation – Vlaanderen-Nederland”, ERDF 2007–2013, (2010)

Annual implementation report 2010, Operational Programme, “Cross-border co-operation – Vlaanderen-Nederland”, ERDF 2007–2013, (2011)

**Other references**

Bureau Fédéral du Plan, (2010) Nouvelles perspectives économiques régionales 2009–2015

Bureau Fédéral du Plan, (2010), Perspectives économiques 2010–2015

Bureau fédéral du Plan, Institut Bruxellois de Statistique et d'Analyse Studiedienst van de Vlaamse Regering Institut Wallon de l'Evaluation, de la Prospective et de la Statistique (2011), Perspectives économiques régionales 2010–2016.

Greunz L. (2010), Country reports on achievements of Cohesion Policy – Belgium, Expert Evaluation Network delivering Policy analysis on the Performance of Cohesion Policy 2007–2013, Report for the European Commission, Directorate-General Regional Policy ([http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/pdf/eval2007/country\\_reports/belgium.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/pdf/eval2007/country_reports/belgium.pdf))

Greunz L. (2010), Policy Paper on Innovation – Belgium, Evaluation Network delivering Policy analysis on the Performance of Cohesion Policy 2007–2013, Report for the European Commission, Directorate–General Regional Policy

[http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/pdf/eval2007/expert\\_innovation/belgium.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/pdf/eval2007/expert_innovation/belgium.pdf)

Greunz L. (2011) Policy paper on renewable energy and energy efficiency of residential Housing – Belgium, Evaluation Network delivering Policy analysis on the Performance of Cohesion Policy 2007–2013, Report for the European Commission, Directorate–General Regional Policy

[http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/pdf/eval2007/expert\\_innovation/2011\\_synt\\_rep\\_be.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/pdf/eval2007/expert_innovation/2011_synt_rep_be.pdf)

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author is most grateful

- for information and feed–back from:
  - Wim de Clerck, Deputy director of Agentschap Ondernemen Afdeling Europa – EFRO;
  - Corentin Dussart, Coordinator of Cellule de Coordination et de Gestion du FEDER 2007–2013 Ministère de la Région de Bruxelles–Capitale;
  - Jean Janss, Inspector general of Département de la Coordination des Fonds structurels, Secrétariat general, Service Public de Wallonie;
- and assistance from:
  - Etienne Keszei, Cellule de Coordination et de Gestion du FEDER 2007–2013 Ministère de la Région de Bruxelles–Capitale;
  - Roel Loos, Agentschap Ondernemen Afdeling Europa – EFRO;

## 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 macro-economic indicators and projections

|   | 2009  | 2010  | 2011 | 2012 | 2013-2016 | Averages  |           |           |
|---|-------|-------|------|------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
|   |       |       |      |      |           | 1996-2002 | 2003-2009 | 2010-2016 |
| <b>GDP in volume - growth rate (% pa)</b>                                   |       |       |      |      |           |           |           |           |
| Belgium   | -2.8  | 2.1   | 2.2  | 2.2  | 2.2       | 2.4       | 1.4       | 2.2       |
| Brussels region   | -0.3  | 1.9   | 2.1  | 2.3  | 2.1       | 2.8       | 1.3       | 2.1       |
| Flemish region  | -3.4  | 2.2   | 2.3  | 2.2  | 2.2       | 2.5       | 1.4       | 2.2       |
| Walloon region  | -3.1  | 2     | 1.9  | 2.2  | 2.2       | 2         | 1.4       | 2.1       |
| <b>GDP per person employed in volume - growth rate (% pa)</b>               |       |       |      |      |           |           |           |           |
| Belgium   | -2.7  | 1.2   | 1.1  | 1    | 1.1       | 1.3       | 0.4       | 1.1       |
| Brussels region   | -0.9  | 1.3   | 1.2  | 1.2  | 1         | 2         | 0.9       | 1.1       |
| Flemish region  | -3.1  | 1.3   | 1    | 1    | 1.2       | 1.2       | 0.4       | 1.1       |
| Walloon region  | -3.3  | 1.1   | 1    | 1.1  | 1.1       | 1.1       | 0.2       | 1.1       |
| <b>Salary costs in real terms - growth rate (% pa)</b>                      |       |       |      |      |           |           |           |           |
| Belgium   | 1.5   | -2.1  | -0.3 | 0.9  | 1.5       | 1.1       | -0.2      | 0.7       |
| Brussels region   | 1.6   | -2.6  | -0.7 | 0.5  | 1.4       | 1.5       | -0.3      | 0.4       |
| Flemish region  | 1.8   | -1.9  | -0.1 | 1.1  | 1.7       | 1.1       | 0         | 0.9       |
| Walloon region  | 0.7   | -2.2  | -0.2 | 0.8  | 1.1       | 0.7       | -0.4      | 0.4       |
| <b>Employment - growth rate (% pa)</b>                                      |       |       |      |      |           |           |           |           |
| Belgium   | -0.4  | 0.6   | 1    | 1    | 1         | 1         | 0.9       | 1         |
| Brussels region   | 0.2   | 0.5   | 0.7  | 1    | 1         | 0.9       | 0.5       | 0.9       |
| Flemish region  | -0.5  | 0.7   | 1.1  | 1    | 1.1       | 1.2       | 1         | 1         |
| Walloon region  | -0.3  | 0.7   | 0.8  | 1    | 1         | 0.8       | 1.1       | 0.9       |
| <b>Unemployment rate (*)</b>  |       |       |      |      |           |           |           |           |
| Belgium   | 12.5  | 12.6  | 12.3 | 12.2 | 11        | 13.5      | 13.2      | 11.9      |
| Brussels region   | 20.5  | 21.2  | 21.2 | 21.1 | 19.5      | 19.8      | 20.6      | 20.7      |
| Flemish region  | 8.4   | 8.4   | 8.1  | 8    | 6.8       | 10.1      | 9.1       | 7.7       |
| Walloon region  | 17.5  | 17.4  | 17.2 | 16.9 | 15.7      | 18        | 18.5      | 16.5      |
| <b>Employment rate (15-64)</b>  |       |       |      |      |           |           |           |           |
| Belgium   | 63.4  | 63.4  | 63.6 | 64   | 65.6      | 60.9      | 63.1      | 64.4      |
| Brussels region   | 58.6  | 58.2  | 58.1 | 58.2 | 59.3      | 57.3      | 59.3      | 58.6      |
| Flemish region  | 67.3  | 67.4  | 67.7 | 68.1 | 69.8      | 64        | 66.7      | 68.5      |
| Walloon region  | 58    | 58    | 58.2 | 58.6 | 60.4      | 56.2      | 57.8      | 59.1      |
| <b>Disposal income of households in current prices - growth rate (% pa)</b> |       |       |      |      |           |           |           |           |
| Belgium   | 1.1   | 2.2   | 4.2  | 4.1  | 3.9       | 2.8       | 3.3       | 3.7       |
| Brussels region   | 1.9   | 2.8   | 4.7  | 4.7  | 4.5       | 2.6       | 3.5       | 4.3       |
| Flemish region  | 1.1   | 1.9   | 4.2  | 4.1  | 3.9       | 3         | 3.3       | 3.7       |
| Walloon region  | 1     | 2.2   | 3.9  | 3.9  | 3.7       | 2.4       | 3.2       | 3.5       |
| <b>Public finance balance (EUR million) (***)</b>                           |       |       |      |      |           |           |           |           |
| Belgium   | -2608 | -2471 | -379 | 252  | 2398      | -         | -         | -         |
| Brussels region   | -321  | -221  | -250 | -222 | -258      | -         | -         | -         |
| Flemish region (**)   | -1087 | -1041 | 384  | 787  | 2326      | -         | -         | -         |
| Walloon region  | -899  | -493  | -267 | -210 | -37       | -         | -         | -         |
| French Community  | -241  | -656  | -180 | -4   | 470       | -         | -         | -         |

(\*) unemployment also includes the older unemployed persons not seeking work

(\*\*) including the Flemish Community

(\*\*\*) the value for 2016 is presented under the column 2013-2013

Source: HERMREG – Bureau fédéral du Plan (2011), Perspectives économiques régionales 2010–2016

**Annex Table B – Public finance: receipts and expenditure (EUR million)**

|   | Brussels region |       |       | Flemish region and Community |        |        | Walloon region |       |       | French Community |       |       |
|---|-----------------|-------|-------|------------------------------|--------|--------|----------------|-------|-------|------------------|-------|-------|
|   | 2009            | 2010  | 2011  | 2009                         | 2010   | 2011   | 2009           | 2010  | 2011  | 2009             | 2010  | 2011  |
| Primary balance: Receipts - Expenditure | -250            | -141  | -158  | -930                         | -775   | 718    | -672           | -264  | -13   | -116             | -516  | -13   |
| Receipts                                | 2,660           | 2,852 | 2,965 | 23,271                       | 24,123 | 26,427 | 6,408          | 6,719 | 7,051 | 8,746            | 8,796 | 9,576 |
| Own tax revenue                         | 1,060           | 1,193 | 1,233 | 3,747                        | 4,497  | 4,781  | 2,077          | 2,277 | 2,378 | 0                | 0     | 0     |
| Earmarked taxes                         | 856             | 889   | 978   | 17,287                       | 17,196 | 18,785 | 3,383          | 3,358 | 3,612 | 7,797            | 7,735 | 8,497 |
| Non-tax revenue                         | 419             | 441   | 444   | 1,646                        | 1,827  | 2,226  | 434            | 427   | 446   | 665              | 698   | 701   |
| Transfers of public sub-sectors         | 325             | 330   | 310   | 547                          | 555    | 586    | 513            | 657   | 615   | 284              | 363   | 378   |
| Primary expenditure                     | 2,910           | 2,993 | 3,123 | 24,202                       | 24,898 | 25,709 | 7,080          | 6,983 | 7,064 | 8,862            | 9,312 | 9,589 |
| Final primary expenditure:              | 2,099           | 2,157 | 2,252 | 19,849                       | 20,383 | 21,063 | 4,996          | 4,816 | 4,853 | 6,648            | 6,866 | 7,128 |
| Remuneration                            | 752             | 778   | 812   | 8,882                        | 9,061  | 9,430  | 1,149          | 1,186 | 1,230 | 4,367            | 4,470 | 4,636 |
| Purchases of goods and services         | 405             | 427   | 431   | 3,508                        | 3,511  | 3,535  | 950            | 977   | 956   | 1,015            | 1,089 | 1,123 |
| Investments                             | 489             | 494   | 458   | 1,376                        | 1,519  | 1,528  | 369            | 333   | 349   | 214              | 213   | 224   |
| Transfers to households and NPIs        | 286             | 314   | 368   | 4,448                        | 4,639  | 4,728  | 1,341          | 1,316 | 1,344 | 968              | 988   | 1,040 |
| Transfers to business                   | 167             | 144   | 183   | 1,552                        | 1,569  | 1,754  | 1,179          | 989   | 960   | 75               | 101   | 100   |
| Transfers to public sub-sectors         | 811             | 836   | 871   | 4,353                        | 4,514  | 4,646  | 2,084          | 2,167 | 2,211 | 2,214            | 2,446 | 2,460 |
| Interest payments                       | 71              | 80    | 92    | 157                          | 266    | 334    | 227            | 229   | 254   | 125              | 140   | 167   |
| Overall balance                         | -321            | -221  | -250  | -1,087                       | -1,041 | 384    | -899           | -493  | -267  | -241             | -656  | -180  |

Source: HERMREG – Bureau fédéral du Plan (2011), Perspectives économiques régionales 2010–2016

**Annex Table C – Public finance: growth of main expenditure at real prices (% pa)**

|                                  | Brussels region |       | Flemish region and Community |      | Walloon region |      | French Community |      |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|-------|------------------------------|------|----------------|------|------------------|------|
|                                  | 2010            | 2011  | 2010                         | 2011 | 2010           | 2011 | 2010             | 2011 |
| Primary expenditure              | 0.7             | 0.8   | 0.7                          | -0.2 | -3.5           | -2.3 | 2.8              | -0.5 |
| Final primary expenditure:       | 0.6             | 0.9   | 0.5                          | -0.2 | -5.7           | -2.6 | 1.1              | 0.3  |
| Remuneration                     | 1.3             | 0.7   | -0.2                         | 0.6  | 1              | 0.2  | 0.2              | 0.2  |
| Purchases of goods and services  | 3.2             | -2.5  | -2.1                         | -2.7 | 0.6            | -5.5 | 5                | -0.4 |
| Investments                      | -1.1            | -10.5 | 8.1                          | -2.8 | -11.8          | 1.3  | -2.7             | 1.8  |
| Transfers to households and NPIs | 7.4             | 13.5  | 2.1                          | -1.5 | -5.8           | -1.5 | -0.1             | 1.7  |
| Transfers to business            | -15.7           | 22.9  | -1.1                         | 8    | -17.9          | -6.3 | 31.8             | -4.7 |
| Transfers to public sub-sectors  | 0.9             | 0.7   | 1.5                          | -0.6 | 1.7            | -1.4 | 8.1              | -2.8 |

Source: HERMREG – Bureau fédéral du Plan (2011), Perspectives économiques régionales 2010–2016

**Annex Table D – Broad policy areas and correspondence with fields of intervention (FOI)**

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

| Policy area                |                                 | Code | Priority themes   |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|------|---|
| 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 and energy  | Energy infrastructure           | 33   | Electricity   |
|                            |                                 | 34   | Electricity (TEN-E)   |
|                            |                                 | 35   | Natural gas   |
|                            |                                 | 36   | Natural gas (TEN-E)   |
|                            |                                 | 37   | Petroleum products  |
|                            |                                 | 38   | Petroleum products (TEN-E)  |
|                            |                                 | 39   | Renewable energy: wind  |
|                            |                                 | 40   | Renewable energy: solar   |
|                            |                                 | 41   | Renewable energy: biomass   |
|                            |                                 | 42   | Renewable energy: hydroelectric, geothermal and other   |
|                            |                                 | 43   | Energy efficiency, co-generation, energy management   |
|                            | Environment and risk prevention | 44   | Management of household and industrial waste  |
|                            |                                 | 45   | Management and distribution of water (drink water)  |
|                            |                                 | 46   | Water treatment (waste water)   |
|                            |                                 | 47   | Air quality   |
|                            |                                 | 48   | Integrated prevention and pollution control   |
|                            |                                 | 49   | Mitigation and adaption to climate change   |
|                            |                                 | 50   | Rehabilitation of industrial sites and contaminated land  |
|                            |                                 | 51   | Promotion of biodiversity and nature protection (including Natura 2000)                                   |
|                            |                                 | 52   | Promotion of clean urban transport  |

| Policy area                |                             | Code | Priority themes   |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|------|---|
|                            |                             | 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 Table E – Evaluation grid for examples of good practice in evaluation

It should be noticed that although the study is reported in the assessment grid below, it is not the intention to prise it as example of good practice in evaluation as such. It is however relatively innovative in several parts and it makes original use of the information available.

| BASIC INFORMATION   |     |    |
|---|-----|----|
| Country : Belgium   |     |    |
| Policy area<br>Project « portfolios » for support provided to advanced services, research centres, training and competence centres, regeneration of old industrial land, accessibility and equipment in business areas, regenerating urban centres  |     |    |
| Title of evaluation and full reference<br>Analyse de la plus-value générée par les portefeuilles de projets et projets uniques dans le cadre des Programmes Opérationnels FEDER 2007–2013 Convergence, Compétitivité régionale et emploi – Part 1(Part 2 is planned in 2013)  |     |    |
| Intervention period covered (2000–2006; 2007–2013; specific years)<br>Part 1: 2007–2010; Part 2: 2007–2013  |     |    |
| Timing of the evaluation (when it was carried out)<br>2010  |     |    |
| Budget (if known): EUR  |     |    |
| Evaluator (External evaluator, internal evaluator, EC)<br>SEE, Comase   |     |    |
| Method (counterfactual analysis, process analysis, case study, econometric model, analysis of indicators, etc.)<br>Construction and analysis of indicators, cluster analysis, mapping methods   |     |    |
| Main objectives and main findings (very short description – 3–4 lines)<br>Objectives: Assess the value added of “project portfolios” in different measures of the CP and CEP as opposed to single, individual projects. <u>Objective of Part 1</u> (2010): Evaluate 1) the extent of synergies and partnerships at the conception stage of projects; 2) the degree of project integration; 3) the potential impact on the development and strengthening of networks; 4) the potential contribution to the overall strategic objectives pursued by the regional development policy. <u>Objective of Part 2</u> (2013): Assessment of the effects of the project portfolios on the performance of the policy, the effectiveness to enhance social networking.<br>Findings (Part 1): “Project portfolios” have helped to raise awareness on the benefits of synergies and contribute to the creation of partnerships and the intensification of networks. They have also contributed to increase the average size of projects which is seen as positive given the previously observed trend to “spread” money. |     |    |
| Appraisal (Why you consider the evaluation an example of good practice: – 2–3 lines)<br>The study is original and innovative in several parts. The adopted approach to assess the different research questions is clearly set out, the methods are appropriate. Original use is made of the information available.  |     |    |
| 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? – (this is not a relevant question for this evaluation)  | –   | –  |
| RELIABILITY OF FINDINGS   |     |    |
| Evaluation design   |     |    |
| Is the approach adopted by the evaluation and method used clearly set out?  | x   |    |
| 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   | 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- (this is not a relevant question for this evaluation) | - | - |
| 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? – (this is not a relevant question for this evaluation)   | - | - |
| Do the policy recommendations follow clearly from the findings of the analysis?   | x |   |