



Brussels, 23.7.2014
SWD(2014) 242 final

PART 1/23

COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT
Accompanying the document

COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION

Sixth report on economic, social and territorial cohesion: Investing in Europe's Future

{COM(2014) 473 final}

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	I
CHAPTER 1: SMART GROWTH	1
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. THE CRISIS SUSPENDED THE REDUCTION IN REGIONAL DISPARITIES	1
Box on regional economic disparities in the world.....	10
Box on Turkey.....	11
Box on Western Balkan.....	11
3. CENTRAL AND EASTERN MEMBER STATES MAINTAIN A STRONG INDUSTRIAL SECTOR, BUT THEIR AGRICULTURE NEEDS TO CONTINUE TO MODERNISE.....	12
4. CONSTRUCTION AND INDUSTRY MOST HIT BY THE CRISIS.....	14
5. THE CRISIS LED TO EMPLOYMENT LOSSES, BUT ALSO SOME PRODUCTIVITY GAINS	17
6. GROWTH IN METROPOLITAN REGIONS MORE PRONE TO BOOMS AND BUSTS THAN IN RURAL REGIONS.....	20
6.1. Capital metropolitan regions performed well until the crisis led to above average employment losses.....	20
6.2. GDP growth in rural regions was lower prior to the crisis, but proved more resilient during the crisis years.....	24
Box on Commuting and functional geographies.....	25
Box on new degree of urbanisation and urban-rural typology.....	29
Box on EU-OECD city and commuting zone definition and metropolitan regions.....	29
7. START-UPS RATES AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP RELY ON INDIVIDUAL INITIATIVE AND THE RIGHT INSTITUTIONAL ENVIRONMENT.....	31
8. INNOVATION REMAINS SPATIALLY CONCENTRATED.....	37
8.1. R&D and the 2020 target.....	38
Box on Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme.....	42
Box on Research Framework Programmes	43
8.2. Patenting in the EU and the USA	44
9. TERTIARY EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT IS INCREASING, BUT LARGE DISPARITIES PERSIST	48
10. GAPS IN THE DIGITAL AND TRANSPORT NETWORKS ARE BEING FILLED, BUT MORE REMAINS TO BE DONE	52
10.1. Digital networks are spreading, but unevenly	52
Box on the digital agenda.....	53
10.2. Road network in central and eastern member states still considerably less developed.....	54

Box: Common transport policy contributes to cohesion and regional development, by improving accessibility	58
10.3. Low speeds and low frequencies of trains in central and eastern member states limit their appeal compared to the car.	58
11. TRADE AND FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTMENT STIMULATE GROWTH IN THE EU-12.....	63
12. REGIONAL COMPETITIVENESS PRODUCES LIMITED REGIONAL SPILL-OVERS IN EU-13	66
13. CONCLUSION	69
CHAPTER 2: INCLUSIVE GROWTH.....	72
1. INTRODUCTION.....	72
2. CRISIS WIPES OUT MOST EMPLOYMENT GAINS SINCE 2000.....	72
2.1. Employment rates declined rapidly in the regions most affected the crisis.....	73
2.2. Unemployment highest in the EU in over a decade	76
2.3. Women have far higher unemployment rates in southern EU regions.....	79
2.4. Reduction in early-school leavers is on track.....	82
2.5. Lifelong learning is stagnating	84
2.6. Adult proficiency in literacy and numeracy needs to be increased in several EU Member States according to OECD PIAAC.....	86
3. POVERTY AND EXCLUSION INCREASE DUE TO THE CRISIS.....	87
Box: What does it mean to be ‘at-risk of poverty or social exclusion’ (ARPE)?.....	88
3.1. Severe material deprivation is highest in the towns, suburbs and rural areas of less developed Member States	88
3.2. Very low work intensity in more developed MS is concentrated in cities.....	90
3.3. Higher urban risk of poverty in more developed MS and a higher risk in towns, suburbs and rural areas in less developed MS	91
3.4. Cities in less developed Member States are close to the 2020 targets, while cities in more developed Member States lag behind	95
Box on Social inclusion and social protection policies	97
3.5. Quality of life in European cities varies	97
3.6. Crime rates are higher in urban regions, border regions and tourism destinations	101
4. MOVEMENT OF PEOPLE WITHIN AND BETWEEN MEMBER STATES IS SPURRED BY DISPARITIES IN EMPLOYMENT, WAGES AND HEALTH	103
4.1. The EU is highly urbanised and is still urbanising but only slowly	103
4.2. Net migration is the main source of population growth in the 2000s	106
4.3. More foreign-born workers have joined the labour market with varying success.....	113
4.4. Life expectancy is high, but regional disparities persist.....	116

4.5.	Human development is improving in Central and Eastern Member States, but the crisis reduced it in Spain, Greece and Ireland.....	119
5.	CONCLUSION	121
CHAPTER 3: SUSTAINABLE GROWTH.....		123
1.	INTRODUCTION.....	123
2.	THE EU NEEDS TO MITIGATE AND ADAPT TO CLIMATE CHANGE.....	124
2.1.	The EU needs to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions to reach the 2020 targets	126
2.2.	The EU needs to increase the use of renewable energy to reach the 2020 targets	129
2.3.	EU needs to adapt to more frequent and disastrous natural hazards	133
3.	SHIFTING TO MORE SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT CAN INCREASE ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND IMPROVE AIR QUALITY	135
3.1.	Improving accessibility and energy efficiency.....	136
3.2.	Large cities provide better access to public transport	140
3.3.	Congestion is high in several of the large EU cities.....	143
3.4.	Air quality can still be improved in many places in the EU.....	144
4.	MAKING CITIES MORE ATTRACTIVE CAN BOOST EU RESOURCE EFFICIENCY.....	147
4.1.	Cities use land more efficiently	147
4.2.	National and local policies can shape the location and land use intensity of new developments by promoting more compact cities	156
5.	IMPROVING ECO-SYSTEMS AND REDUCING ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS CAN MAKE THE EU MORE EFFICIENT AND A BETTER PLACE TO LIVE.....	157
5.1.	Preserving water quality and protecting species and habitats	157
5.2.	The treatment of urban wastewater is necessary for ensuring high quality of water.....	160
5.3.	Solid waste management improving but there is still a long way to go in many EU regions	163
5.4.	Sound ecosystems offer many vital services	164
5.4.1.	Air quality is still too low in many EU cities	168
5.4.2.	Floodplains can regulate water flows and improve quality efficiently.....	170
6.	CONCLUSION	173
CHAPTER 4: PUBLIC INVESTMENT, GROWTH AND THE CRISIS		174
1.	INTRODUCTION.....	174
2.	THE SHARE OF GROWTH ENHANCING SPENDING IN PUBLIC EXPENDITURE HAS DECREASED	174
2.1.	The crisis pushed up government deficits	174
2.2.	Public investment supports economic growth.....	178

Box: The economic literature on the effect of government expenditure on growth.....	179
2.3. Public expenditure increased, but now come down	181
2.4. Public investment increased and then dropped	182
3. REGIONAL AND LOCAL AUTHORITIES PLAY A KEY ROLE IN PUBLIC EXPENDITURE AND INVESTMENT	183
3.1. Regional and local authorities are responsible for a large share of public expenditure	183
3.2. Regional and local authorities manage the majority of public investments	188
3.3. The crisis ended a period of sustained growth of public expenditure by regional and local authorities.....	189
3.4. Investing during times of crisis: direct financing and regional and local investment.....	192
3.5. Revenue at sub-national level relies primarily on transfers	193
3.6. Public deficit and public debt of sub-national governments	196
4. CONTRIBUTION OF COHESION POLICY TO PUBLIC INVESTMENT IN THE MEMBER STATES	199
5. INVESTMENT, STATE AIDS, AND EIB LOANS	201
5.1. Competition policy	201
5.2. European Investment Bank.....	204
6. CONCLUSION	206
 CHAPTER 5: THE IMPORTANCE OF GOOD GOVERNANCE FOR ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT	 207
1. WHY SHOULD THE EU FOCUS ON GOOD GOVERNANCE?.....	207
2. DOING BUSINESS IS EASIER IN THE NORTH OF THE EU.....	209
Box Ease of doing business varies within a country	210
Box on E-Government and public e-Tendering can improve the ease of doing business and reduce costs.....	212
3. MOST EUROPEANS THINK CORRUPTION IS WIDE SPREAD AND A MAJOR PROBLEM.....	213
Box: Ways of tackling corruption	217
4. GOVERNANCE INDICATORS VARY BETWEEN AND WITHIN EU MEMBER STATES	218
4.1. Some regions have a far higher (or lower) quality of government.....	219
Box How does European quality of Government index constructed?	220
4.2. The authority of EU regions is growing	222
5. POOR GOVERNANCE LIMITS THE IMPACT OF COHESION POLICY	226
5.1. Poor governance can slow down investment, leading to funding losses.....	226
5.2. Poor governance can reduce the leverage effect of Cohesion Policy.....	228
6. CONCLUSION	230

CHAPTER 6: THE EVOLUTION OF COHESION POLICY	231
1. INTRODUCTION	231
2. AS THE FUNDING GREW, THE GEOGRAPHY BECAME SIMPLER	232
2.1. Cohesion Policy expenditure increased as a share of GNI.....	232
2.1.1. Cohesion Policy in the 1990s	232
2.1.2. Cohesion Policy since 2000.....	233
2.2. The geography of the policy became simpler between 1989 and 2013	235
Box on Macro-regional cooperation.....	240
Box on Territorial Cooperation programmes started in 1989 with INTERREG	241
2.3. Funding remains concentrated on the less developed regions.....	242
Box: Allocations and payments.....	243
2.4. The European Structural Investment Funds and Cohesion Policy	243
2.4.1. The Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) and rural development	244
2.4.2. The Common Fisheries Policy and Integrated Maritime Policy.....	246
2.5. Aid intensities in less developed regions rose up to 2000-2006 and have since declined.....	248
Box on Outermost regions.....	251
3. HOW HAVE THE GOALS CHANGED OVER TIME?	251
3.1. The initial focus was on training and mobility	252
3.2. The 1970s and 1980s saw structural unemployment and rapid changes in agriculture and manufacturing.....	252
3.3. The countries joining the EU in the 1980s and 2000s lacked key infrastructure.....	252
3.4. Improving transport and environmental infrastructure.....	254
3.5. The Lisbon and Gothenburg Agenda	255
3.6. Europe 2020, poverty reduction, climate change mitigation and beyond GDP	255
Box on Committee of the Regions and the territorial dimension of Europe 2020 and other EU policies.....	258
3.7. Beyond GDP: poverty, human development and well-being.....	258
3.8. What are the goals of Cohesion Policy?.....	259
Box on Territorial Cohesion and the Lisbon Treaty of 2007	261
4. THE ECONOMIC RATIONALE UNDERLYING THE POLICY HAS BECOME MORE INTEGRATED	262
4.1. Cohesion Policy has moved beyond first nature determinants of growth.....	263
4.2. Cohesion Policy can boost growth through investment in second nature determinants of growth.....	264
4.3. Cohesion Policy supports market integration and can help less developed regions grow faster.....	266

5.	THE DIVISION OF FUNDING BETWEEN POLICY AREAS HAS EVOLVED AS THE GOALS OF THE POLICY HAVE CHANGED	267
	Box on Financial instruments in 2007-2013	269
6.	THE IMPACT OF THE CRISIS ON THE 2007-2013 PERIOD	271
	6.1. ESF and the reaction to the crisis	274
7.	CONCLUSION	275
CHAPTER 7 IMPACT OF COHESION POLICY		276
1.	INTRODUCTION.....	276
2.	THE RESULTS OF PROGRAMMES IN 2007-2013	277
	2.1. The European Regional Development Fund and Cohesion Fund	277
	2.1.1. Gross jobs directly created	277
	2.1.2. Enterprise support.....	277
	Box - Examples of enterprise support schemes.....	278
	2.1.3. Support for RTDI	278
	2.1.4. ICT infrastructure	279
	2.1.5. Transport.....	279
	2.1.6. Environmental infrastructure	281
	2.1.7. Renewable energy and increased energy efficiency.....	282
	2.1.8. Tourism, cultural activities, social infrastructure, land reclamation and urban renewal.....	282
	2.2. The European Social Fund	284
	2.2.1. Access to employment.....	284
	2.2.2. Social inclusion policies	285
	2.2.3. Support to enhancing human capital	286
	2.2.4. Improving institutional capacity.....	286
	Box on EU value added through networking and the dissemination of good practice	288
3.	EVALUATION EVIDENCE ON THE IMPACT OF COHESION POLICY	288
	3.1. The state of play and the challenges involved for ERDF and Cohesion Fund co-financed programmes	288
	3.2. Evidence from evaluations of ERDF and CF programmes	291
	3.2.1. Enterprise support.....	292
	3.2.2. Support of RTDI.....	293
	3.2.3. Investment in transport	295
	3.3. Evidence from evaluations of ESF programmes	296
	3.3.1. Enhancing access to employment.....	297
	3.3.2. Equality between women and men.....	297
	3.3.3. Social inclusion - migrants and minorities	299
4.	THE MODELLED IMPACT OF COHESION POLICY 2000-2006 AND 2007-2013.....	300
5.	CONCLUSION	305

CHAPTER 8: COHESION POLICY IN 2014-2020	306
1. KEY ELEMENTS OF THE REFORM.....	306
1.1. New geography and funding	307
Box 1: The Connecting Europe Facility (CEF).....	308
Box : The European Union Solidarity Fund (EUSF)	309
1.2. Thematic concentration in support of Europe 2020	312
1.2.1. Targeting resources at key areas of growth.....	312
1.2.2. Promoting employment, education and social inclusion.....	314
1.3. Strengthening the effectiveness of investment	316
Box : Criteria for fulfilment of ex-ante conditionality in the area of R&D and innovation.....	317
1.4. Achieving and demonstrating results	317
Box : Intervention logic of Cohesion policy in 2014-20 – Example for supporting the high-tech sector in a more developed region.....	318
1.5. Aligning EU investment with the European semester.....	319
1.6. A strategic approach to Public Administration reforms	320
1.7. Sound economic governance.....	321
Box - The link between the macroeconomic framework and the effectiveness of ESI funds	323
Box EU Budget: commitments vs. payments.....	325
Box : Gradual application of macroeconomic conditionality in case of non-compliance under the Excessive Deficit Procedure (indicated timing is purely indicative).....	327
1.8. Preserving growth-enhancing investment	328
1.9. Linking additionality verification to the stability and convergence programmes	329
1.10. Increasing the role of financial instruments	330
1.11. Reinforcing cooperation across Europe.....	331
2. PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT OF THE PROGRAMME NEGOTIATIONS 2014-20	335
2.1. Funding priorities in 2014-20.....	335
2.2. Aligning investment with Country Specific Recommendations	341
2.3. Increasing the impact of investment and delivering results	343
3. ESTIMATED IMPACT OF COHESION POLICY 2014-2020	345
Box –Constructing the simulations	346
3.1. Estimated impact at the national level.....	347
3.2. Estimated impact at the regional level.....	349
3.2.1. Investment in infrastructure.....	350
3.2.2. Investment in human resources	353
3.2.3. Investment in R&D.....	353
3.2.4. Combined impact of investment at regional level.....	355

Map 1 GDP per head (PPS), 2011	2
Map 2 Growth of GDP per head in real terms, 2001-2008	4
Map 3 Growth of GDP per head in real terms, 2008-2011	4
Map 4 NAFTA GDP per head, 2012.....	9
Map 5 Russia, India, China and Brazil, GDP per head, 2010.....	9
Map 6: Turkey, GVA per head 2010.....	11
Map 7 Metropolitan regions by type	28
Map 8 Urban-rural regional typology.....	28
Map 9 REDI combined index.....	36
Map 10 REDI individual dimension.....	36
Map 11: Total expenditure on R&D, 2011.....	39
Map 12 Total expenditure on R&D, distance to national target, 2011.....	39
Map 13 Regional Innovation Scoreboard, 2014.....	41
Map 14 Regional innovation growth performance, 2008-2014	41
Map 15 Patent applications to the EPO, 2008-2009.....	46
Map 16 US, patent applications, 2011-2012	46
Map 17 Population aged 25-64 with tertiary educational attainment level, 2013.....	47
Map 18 Population aged 25-64 with low educational attainment level, 2013	47
Map 19 Population aged 30-34 with a tertiary educational attainment, 2011-13	51
Map 20 Population aged 30-34 with high educational attainment 2011-13 Distance to national 2020 target	51
Map 21: Households with a broadband connection, 2013	54
Map 22: Travel speed on the core TEN-T road network, 1955-2030	56
Map 23 Highest speed on railway network, 1990	61
Map 24 Highest speed on railway network, 2013	61
Map 25 Passenger trains on TEN-T railway network, 2010	62
Map 26 Access to passenger flights, 2011	62

Map 27 Employment in foreign firms, 2010.....	65
Map 28: Regional Competitiveness index, 2013.....	69
Map 29 Employment rate, (ages 20-64), 2013.....	74
Map 30 Employment rate, (ages 20-64), 2013 - Distance to National 2020 target.....	74
Map 31 Unemployment rate, 2013.....	77
Map 32 Change in unemployment rate, 2008-2013.....	77
Map 33 Youth unemployment rate, 2013.....	78
Map 34 Population aged 15-24 not in employment, education or training, 2013.....	78
Map 35 Difference between female and male unemployment rate, 2013.....	80
Map 36 Difference between female and male employment rate, 20-64, 2013.....	80
Map 37 Gender balance of population 50-54 with tertiary education, 2011-13.....	81
Map 38 Gender balance of population 30-34 with tertiary education, 2011-13.....	81
Map 39 Early leavers from education and training aged 18-24, average 2011-2013.....	83
Map 40: Early school leavers aged 18-24 in 2011-13 - Distance to national 2020 target.....	83
Map 41 Low achievers in mathematics, reading and science.....	84
Map 42 Participation of adults aged 25-64 in education and training, 2013.....	85
Map 43 At-risk-of-poverty rates, 2011.....	93
Map 44 Population at-risk-of-poverty-or-social-exclusion, 2012.....	94
Map 45 Population at-risk-of-poverty-or-social-exclusion in 2012, distance to national 2020 target.....	94
Map 46 Registered thefts of motor vehicles per capita, 2008-2010.....	102
Map 47 Registered domestic burglaries per capita, 2010.....	102
Map 48 Population change, 1961-2001.....	105
Map 49 Total population change, 2001-2011.....	109
Map 50 Natural population growth, 2001-2011.....	110
Map 51 Net migration, 2001-2011.....	110
Map 52 Regions for cross-border cooperation, 2014-2020.....	112
Map 53 EU Life expectancy, 2011.....	117

Map 54: USA Life expectancy, 2010	117
Map 55 Infant mortality, 2012	118
Map 56 Road fatalities, 2012	118
Map 57 EU Human development index, 2012	120
Map 58 Change in the EU Human Development Index, 2008-2012	120
Map 59: Potential vulnerability from climate change	126
Map 60 Average suitability for photovoltaic systems	132
Map 61 Congestion index on the high speed road network, 2012	144
Map 62 Annual mean concentrations of PM10, 2011	146
Map 63 Ozone concentration, 2011.....	146
Map 64 Share of Built-up area, 2012	148
Map 65 Built-up area per head, 2012	148
Map 66 Change in land use in Vienna, Palermo, Prague and Helsinki, 1950s-2006.....	152
Map 67 – Land use changes 2006-2012	154
Map 68 Ecological status of main water bodies.....	158
Map 69 NATURA 2000 areas, 2012.....	158
Map 70: Urban wastewater with more stringent treatment, 2010	162
Map 71 Urban wastewater not collected, 2010	162
Map 72: Capacity to deliver ecosystem services, TESI index, EU NUTS 2 regions....	167
Map 73: Green infrastructure, EU NUTS 2 regions (% of the surface area covered with green infrastructure)	167
Map 74: Removal capacity in larger urban zones	169
Map 75 NO ₂ daily average concentrations, 2011	169
Map 76: Nitrogen discharge/retention from Europe's major rivers.....	172
Map 77 Regional aid, 2007-2013	204
Map 78: Corruption Perception Index, 2012	216
Map 79 European Quality of Government index, 2013	221
Map 80 Regional self-rule index, 2011	224

Map 81 Change in regional self-rule index, 1960-2011.....	224
Map 82: Cohesion Policy, categories of regions: 1989-2013	238
Map 83 Europe 2020 index, 2011 distance to EU targets	257
Map 84 Europe 2020 index, 2011 distance to national targets.....	257
Map 85 Structural Funds (ERDS and ESF) eligibility 2014-2020.....	310
Map 86 Cohesion Fund eligibility 2014-2020	310
Map 87 Investment for growth and jobs goal: maximum co-financing rate for Structural Funds support, 2014-2020	311
Map 88 Funding for R&D&I, competitiveness of SMEs and the low carbon economy, 2014-2020.....	313
Map 89 Funding for the low-carbon economy, 2014-2020.....	313
Map 90 Youth employment initiative, 2014-2020	315
Map 91 Cross-border cooperation programmes 2014-2020.....	333
Map 92: Transnational cooperation programmes 2014-20	334
Map 93: Impact of interventions in infrastructure on NUTS 2 regions accessibility, 2030	351
Map 94: Impact of interventions in infrastructure on NUTS 2 regions GDP, 2030	351
Map 95: Short run and long run impact of a reduction in transport costs in five Polish regions	352
Map 96: Impact of interventions in human resources on NUTS 2 regions GDP, yearly average 2014-2023	354
Map 97: Impact of interventions in R&D on NUTS 2 regions GDP, yearly average 2014-2023	354
Map 98: Impact of the 2014-2020 cohesion policy programmes on NUTS 2 regions GDP, yearly average 2014-2023	357
Map 99: Impact of the 2014-2020 cohesion policy programmes on NUTS 2 regions GDP in 2030.....	357

Figure 1: Coefficient of variation (2000 = 100), GDP per head, employment rate, unemployment rate, EU-27 NUTS 2 regions, 2000-2012.....	3
Figure 2: Theil index, GDP per head, EU-28 NUTS 2 regions, 2000-2015	6
Figure 3: GDP per head growth rates of regions in less developed or moderately developed Member States, 2003-2011	7
Figure 4: Growth of GDP per head in real terms, 2001-2015.....	8
Figure 5 Industry (excluding construction) in the EU, 1970-2012	13
Figure 6 Industry (excluding construction) in the EU-12, 1995-2012	14
Figure 7 Agriculture in the EU-12, 1995-2012	14
Figure 8: Agriculture in the EU, 1970-2012	14
Figure 9: Larger metropolitan areas are more productive	22
Figure 10: Population size and productivity by city.....	22
Figure 11: Less fragmented metropolitan areas have experienced higher growth.....	23
Figure 12: Governance institutions and selected outcomes	24
Figure 13 GDP per head and per person employed in the Paris Metropolitan regions, 2010.....	27
Figure 14 Birth rates of enterprises, 2010	32
Figure 15 Death rates of enterprises, 2010.....	32
Figure 16 Tertiary educational attainment country and regional extremes, 2013.....	49
Figure 17 Low education rates by country and regional extremes, 2013.....	49
Figure 18: NGA broadband coverage, 2012 (% of rural and urban population with NGA)	53
Figure 19 - Railway length per capita with trains operating over 120 km/h, 2013.....	60
Figure 20– Change in Railway length per capita with trains operating over 120 km/h, 1990-2013.....	60
Figure 21 Trade between EU-12 and EU-27, 2004-2012.....	63
Figure 22 FDI in the EU-12, 2005-2012	64
Figure 23: Weights used in the regional competitiveness index 2013	66
Figure 24 - Regional competitiveness index, 2013	67
Figure 25 Adult literacy proficiency, 2012	87

Figure 26 Adult numeracy proficiency, 2012	87
Figure 27 Severe material deprivation by degree of urbanisation, 2008-2012	89
Figure 28 Very low work intensity by degree of urbanisation, 2008-2012.....	90
Figure 29 At-risk-of-poverty rate by degree of urbanisation, 2008-2012.....	92
Figure 30 At risk of poverty or exclusion by degree of urbanisation, 2008-2012 and national 2020 targets.....	96
Figure 31 Population born outside the EU-27, 2001-2012.....	113
Figure 32 Population born in a different EU-27 country per MS, 2001-2012	114
Figure 33 Employment rate by country of birth, 2013	115
Figure 34 – Change in greenhouse gas emissions outside the Emissions Trading Scheme, 2005-2011 and Europe 2020 targets.....	128
Figure 35 – Share of renewable energy in gross final energy consumption, 2006, 2012, target 2020 (% of total gross final energy consumption)	130
Figure 36 - Modal split of Passenger Transport on Land by Country - 2011	137
Figure 37- Modal split Change of Passenger Transport on Land by Country, 1995 - 2011	138
Figure 38 Share of passenger travel by mode of transport in EU Member States, 2011	139
Figure 39 Share of freight by mode of transport in EU Member States, 2011.....	139
Figure 40 - Access to public transport in large European cities, 2012.....	141
Figure 41 - Access to public transport in mid-size European cities, 2012	142
Figure 42. Relationship between population density and sealed soil per head in larger urban zones, 2006.....	149
Figure 43 Population density profile of a selection of large European capital cities, 2006	150
Figure 44 Population density profile of a selection of mid-sized European capital cities, 2006.....	150
Figure 45 – General government balance, EU-27 average, 2000-2013 (% of GDP)....	175
Figure 46 – General government balance, Member States (ordered by deficit in 2012), 2006, 2009 and 2013 (as % of GDP).....	176
Figure 47 – General government expenditure, revenue (EUR bn, 2005 prices) and general government balance, EU-27, 2000-2013 (% of EU GDP)	177
Figure 48 – Average annual change in general government expenditure, volume, 2000-2009, 2009-2013 (%).....	178

Figure 49 – General government expenditure on growth friendly categories (% of total general government expenditure), 2012.....	182
Figure 50 - Public and private fixed investment, EU-27, 1995-2014 (Gross Fixed Capital Formation as % of GDP).....	183
Figure 51 - Sub-national governments expenditure in general government expenditure, EU-27, 1995 and 2013 (% of general government expenditure).....	184
Figure 52 - Sub-national government expenditure, 2013 (% of GDP).....	184
Figure 53 - Growth Enhancing Expenditure, 2012 (% of national GDP).....	187
Figure 54 - Sub-national governments investment, 2000 and 2013 (% of total public investment).....	189
Figure 55 - Average annual change in sub-national government expenditure, volume, 2000-2009, 2010-2013 (%).....	190
Figure 56 - Sub-national government investment, EU-27, 1997-2013 (% of GDP).....	190
Figure 57 – Average annual change in sub-national government investment, volume, 2000-2009, 2010-2013 (%).....	191
Figure 58 - Sub-national governments' investment, 1997, 2013 and historical lows (% of national GDP).....	192
Figure 59: Sub-national direct financing capacity and public investment.....	193
Figure 60 – Annual average change in sub-national government revenue in real terms, 2000-2009, 2009-2013 (%).....	194
Figure 61 - Sources of sub-national government revenue, 2013 (% of total revenue)...	195
Figure 62 – Change in net transfers between central and State-local Governments, 2009-2013 in real terms,.....	196
Figure 63 – Sub-national government expenditure, revenue (EUR bn, 2005 prices) and sub-national governments deficit (% of EU GDP), EU-27, 2000-2013.....	197
Figure 64 - Sub-national governments deficit, Member States, 2007 and 2013 (% of national GDP).....	198
Figure 65 - Consolidated General Government gross debt, 2013 (% GDP).....	199
Figure 66- Contribution of Cohesion Policy (CP) to public investment in the EU-28 (2007-2013).....	200
Figure 67 European Investment Bank loans per Member State, 2007-2013.....	205
Figure 68: WB Doing Business, 2006-2014.....	210
Figure 69 e-Government usage by citizens, 2011-2012.....	212
Figure 70 Enterprises using the internet in public e-Tendering, 2012.....	212

Figure 71: Corruption is a major problem, 2011	214
Figure 72 How widespread is corruption in your country, 2013.....	215
Figure 73: World Bank, Government effectiveness and Rule of Law, 1996-2012.....	218
Figure 74 Cohesion Policy funding absorption and Government effectiveness, 2014 ..	227
Figure 75: Cohesion policy expenditure in the EU, 1976-2012.....	232
Figure 76: Cohesion Policy expenditure per MS, 1990-1999	233
Figure 77: Cohesion Policy expenditure per MS, 2000-2006	234
Figure 78: Cohesion Policy expenditure per MS, 2007-2012	235
Figure 79: Aid intensity in less developed regions by Member State, 1989-2006.....	249
Figure 80: Aid intensity in less developed regions by Member State, 2007-2013 and 2014-2020.....	250
Figure 81: Aid intensities in the outermost regions, 2007-2020	251
Figure 82: Unemployment rate, EU-6 EU-27, 1960-2012	252
Figure 83: GDP per head per enlargement, 1975-2013.....	253
Figure 84: Unemployment per EU enlargement, 1973-2013	254
Figure 85: Share of EU funding reallocated between policy areas	272
Figure 86: Reduction in national cofinancing to end 2013	273
Figure 87: Funding absorption and project selection by Member States for the 2007-2013 programming period	274
Figure 88: Estimated impact of Cohesion Policy 2000-2006 on GDP.....	301
Figure 89 Estimated impact of Cohesion Policy 2007-2013 on GDP.....	302
Figure 90: Principle of excellence.....	321
Figure 91 : Allocation to thematic objectives (EUR billion at current prices).....	336
Figure 92 : Allocations to thematic objectives (% of total).....	336
Figure 93 : Allocation to thematic objective by Fund (EUR billion at current prices)..	337
Figure 94 : Allocations to thematic objectives by Fund (% of Fund total)	338
Figure 95 : Allocation to thematic objective by group of countries (% of total)	339
Figure 96 Allocations to thematic objectives by group of countries (EUR billion at current prices, excluding technical assistance).....	339

Figure 97 : Allocations by thematic objective 2014-20 vs. 2007-13 in the EU-28 (% of total).....	340
Figure 98 : Allocations by thematic objective 2014-20 vs. 2007-13 in more developed Member States (% of total).....	341
Figure 99 : Allocations by thematic objective 2014-20 vs. 2007-13 in less developed Member States (% of total).....	341
Figure 100 : Estimated impact of Cohesion Policy on GDP	347
Figure 101: Estimated impact of Cohesion Policy expenditure on GDP in main beneficiary countries, average 2014-2023.....	348
Figure 102 - Cohesion Policy expenditure and impact, average 2014-2023.....	348
Figure 103: Estimated impact of Cohesion Policy expenditure	349

Table 1: Key indicators for Western Balkan, 2003-2012.....	12
Table 2 Change in employment and GVA by sector per group of member states, 2000-2012.....	16
Table 3: Decomposing average annual change in GVA per head per MS, 2001-2008 and 2008-2012.....	19
Table 4 Change in GDP per head, productivity and employment per head by type of metropolitan region, 2000-2008 and 2008-2011.....	21
Table 5: Real GDP per head, productivity and employment per head growth by urban-rural typology, 2000-20011.....	25
Table 6 Total R&D expenditure and the distance to the 2020 target, 2011.....	38
Table 7 Population aged 30-34 with a tertiary education, average 2013.....	50
Table 8 Employment rate of those aged 20-64, 2000 - 2013 and distance to national target.....	73
Table 9 Unemployment rate by category of region, 2000-2013.....	76
Table 10 Early school leavers and distance to national target, 2008-2013.....	82
Table 11 Population change by urban-rural typology, 1961-2011.....	104
Table 12 Population by degree of urbanisation, 1961-2011.....	106
Table 13 Population change, natural change and net migration by urban-rural typology, 2001-2011.....	107
Table 14 Population age structure by urban-rural typology, 2012.....	108
Table 15 - Population change, natural change and net migration in terrestrial border regions, 2001-2011.....	111
Table 16 Built-up area per inhabitant, 2012 (in sq km per million inhabitants).....	147
Table 17 - Sub-national governments expenditure by function, 2013 (% of total Sub-national governments expenditure).....	185
Table 18 - Sub-national governments expenditure by economic sector, 2013 (% of total general government expenditure).....	186
Table 19 Starting a business in 2014.....	209
Table 20 Estimated direct costs of corruption in public procurement.....	216
Table 21 Type of corruption by policy area.....	217
Table 22 Dimensions of regional authority (self-rule).....	223

Table 23 Population by category of region, 1989-2020 (%).....	236
Table 24: Funding for territorial cooperation, 1989-2020.....	241
Table 25: Funding distribution between categories of regions, 1989-2020 (%).....	242
Table 26: Annual Aid intensity per category of region, EUR per head (at 2011 constant prices), 1989-2020.....	243
Table 27 Allocation per fund (EUR billion, at 2011 prices), 1989-2020.....	244
Table 28: Cohesion Policy funding by broad policy area in EU-15, 1989-2013	268
Table 29 Cohesion Policy funding by broad policy area in acceding countries, 2004-2013	269

Executive Summary

This report comes out at the start of a new 7-year programming period for Cohesion Policy, when the situation in the EU is dramatically different from what it was at the start of the previous period in 2007. Then, the EU was still enjoying a sustained period of economic growth. Income levels were rising, as were employment rates and public investment, poverty and social exclusion were diminishing and regional disparities were shrinking. Nevertheless, despite the positive tendencies, disparities between regions of many different kinds remained wide.

The advent of the crisis changed all this. Since 2008, public debt has increased dramatically, income has declined for many people across the EU, employment rates have fallen in most countries and unemployment is higher than for over 20 years, while poverty and social exclusion have tended to become more widespread. At the same time, regional disparities in employment and unemployment rates have widened as have those in GDP per head in many countries while in others they have stopped narrowing. These developments mean that the Europe 2020 employment and poverty targets are now significantly further away than when they were first set and it will require a substantial effort over the next 6 years to achieve them in a context of significant budgetary constraints.

Chapter 1: In its first stage the crisis had a big impact on construction and manufacturing. In both, employment fell markedly, in construction as a result of the collapse of a real estate bubble in some Member States and a reduction in public investment and manufacturing because of a decline in global demand, especially for investment goods. More recently, world markets have expanded and exports have increased giving rise to some growth of manufacturing. This is particularly important for many of the Central and Eastern European Member States where manufacturing accounts for a large share of value-added.

The territorial impact of the crisis has been mixed. In most parts of the EU, metropolitan regions have been shown to be more prone to booms and busts, while overall rural regions have proved more resilient. In the EU-15, second-tier metropolitan regions performed average, while in the EU-13, they outperformed the other regions. Rural regions in the EU-15 had a smaller contraction of GDP than the other regions between 2008 and 2011 due to higher productivity growth. Also in the EU-13, higher productivity growth meant that he closed the growth gap with the other regions.

Not all developments, however, have been unfavourable. Despite the difficult economic context, the proportion of people with tertiary education has increased over recent years in most countries and early school leaving rates have declined. As a result, EU targets for both of these are likely to be reached by 2020 if not earlier. At the same time, R&D has not declined relative to GDP during the crisis and has even started to increase slightly in the past year or two, though not by enough to reach the 3% target set for 2020. Innovation, however, remains highly concentrated in spatial terms and shows no sign of spreading to lagging regions.

Investment in transport and digital infrastructure has reduced the deficiencies in these networks in many rural areas and less developed regions. Access to the internet using the next generation technology, however, creates new challenges for rural areas where this technology is almost non-existent. In addition, completing the trans-European Transport

network will require at least two more decades of substantial investment particularly in most of the Central and Eastern Member States.

The onset of the crisis led to major reductions in the EU in trade and foreign direct investment, which are important sources of growth for the less developed Member States. Fortunately, exports of the EU-13 to other EU countries have shown significant recovery and now account for a larger share of their GDP than before the crisis, while FDI has also picked up.

Competitiveness remains low in most regions in Central and Eastern Member States, though capital city regions are typically the exceptions. These tend to be highly competitive, but for the most part they do not as yet generate any measurable spill-overs to benefit other regions. Most regions close to the capital in these countries, therefore, do not gain perceptibly from their proximity, while in many more developed Member States the regions neighbouring the capital also tend to have high levels of competitiveness. Indeed, in some Member States, such as the Netherlands, Germany and Italy, other regions with an important second-tier city have a higher level of competitiveness than the capital city region.

Chapter 2: The crisis has wiped out half of the employment gains made between 2000 and the onset of the recession, particularly in the southern Member States. As a result, in transition and less developed regions, employment rates are around 10 percentage points below the national target as compared to only 3 percentage points below in the more developed regions. Increases in unemployment have also been larger in these regions, averaging 5 percentage points between 2008 and 2013 as against 3 percentage points in more developed regions.

Although 2013 was the first year in which the average rate of unemployment in the EU was the same for women as for men, big disparities remain in some parts, unemployment being much higher for women than for men in many southern regions. Employment rates for women remain lower than those of men in all EU regions. While the gap is relatively small in a number of Swedish and Finnish regions, it is more than 20 percentage points in Italy, Greece, and several regions in Romania, the Czech Republic and Poland. On the educational front, however, in nine out of ten regions more women than men aged 30-34 have a tertiary-level qualification.

Higher risk of poverty and social exclusion is another legacy of the economic crisis. There are now around 8 million people at risk of poverty in the EU, the increase being particularly pronounced in Greece, Spain, Italy and the UK. A key issue is the variation within countries. The risk of poverty tends to be much lower in cities than in the rest of the country in less developed member States, while in cities in the more developed Member States, the reverse is the case. Accordingly, in the latter, to meet the national Europe 2020 poverty targets requires a major reduction in the number of people at risk of poverty or exclusion in urban centres, while in the less developed countries the main challenge is to reduce the numbers at risk in more rural areas.

The large disparities in employment, income levels and social well-being are major factors underlying population movement within the EU. In Central and Eastern Member States, there has been a tendency over the past 20 years for people to move from rural areas to urban ones, especially to the capital city, as well as to other parts of the EU. The combination of a natural decline in population and outward migration has led to a significant reduction of people living in rural regions in the EU-13 over the past decade.

In the EU-15, on the other hand, the population has risen on average in rural regions because of net inward migration more than offsetting a natural reduction in population.

In the EU-15, over the past decade the contribution of net inward migration to population growth was three times larger than that of the natural increase. By contrast, in the EU-13, net outward migration contributed twice as much to population decline as the natural reduction.

Wide variations remain across the EU in life expectancy and mortality rates. Life expectancy differs by more than 9 years between the 10 regions where it is highest and the 10 where it is lowest. Equally, infant mortality and deaths from road accidents in relation to population differ by a factor of four between the 10 best and worst performing regions.

Chapter 3: The crisis has had mixed effects on the environment. The reduction in economic activity and income has made it easier to reduce greenhouse gas emissions; though energy efficiency has not increased greatly so that this reduction may well be reversed when demand picks up. The crisis has also reduced the cost of allowances for greenhouse gas emissions in the European Trading Scheme, so depressing the economic incentives to invest in energy efficiency and renewable energy and delaying the transition to a low-carbon economy. The European Commission has postponed the auction of some allowances in response to these low prices.

Some progress has been made across the EU in improving the treatment of urban wastewater and solid waste. More towns and cities now meet the quality standards set in the EU Directive on urban wastewater treatment and more solid waste is recycled, or incinerated with energy recovery, and less is dumped in landfills. In both cases, however, more needs to be done and substantial investment is still required particularly in many of the less developed Member States and regions.

The quality of the 'services' provided by the eco-system differs substantially across the EU. The services concerned can fulfil important functions such as cleaning air and water, retaining water to reduce flood risks and removing carbon. The recent floods in many parts of the EU and the low air quality in many cities underline the need for them. The advantage of investing in such services is that it can often be cost-efficient while helping to limit the loss of bio-diversity.

The urban dimension of sustainable growth is one of many contrasts. On the one hand, air quality is poor in many cities, made worse by traffic congestion, and cities are more vulnerable to heat waves, due to the 'heat island' effect, as well as to flooding because of their proximity, in many cases, to rivers and the sea and the large expanse of sealed surfaces.

On the other hand, cities offer major advantages in terms of eco-efficiency, since the close proximity of different locations reduces the need to travel long distances. Public transport is also more available in cities, offering a more energy-efficient means of travel, and people living in cities on average use less energy to heat their housing. Equally, cities use land much more efficiently than other areas where population density is much lower and built-up land per inhabitant is much higher

Chapter 4: In most Member States, the government budget has been in significant deficit over the crisis period and public debt levels have risen dramatically, in some cases well above 100% of GDP. The deterioration in public finances has led to the widespread

implementation of fiscal consolidation measures and many governments have cut back public investment markedly. On average, public investment in the EU declined by 20% in real terms between 2008 and 2013, in Greece, Spain and Ireland, by over 60% and in the EU12 countries, where Cohesion Policy funding is particularly important, by 32%. This could well depress growth rates over the medium-term.

As a result of the cut-backs in national expenditure, there is increased reliance on Cohesion Policy to finance growth-enhancing investment. In 2010-2012, Cohesion Policy funding was equivalent to 21% of public investment in the EU as a whole, to 57% in the Cohesion countries taken together and to over 75% in Slovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria and Lithuania. Without this funding, public investment in the less developed Member States would have declined even further.

Local and regional governments in the EU are responsible for almost two thirds of all public investment and, accordingly, the reductions which have occurred have had a big impact on them. The political autonomy (or self-rule) of regions has tended to grow over the past few decades, with substantial increases in many Member States. In Italy, in particular, the degree of self-rule in regions is now higher than in the Federal states of Germany, Austria and Belgium.

Chapter 5: The EU has given increasing attention to the importance of governance and the quality of public institutions over the past few years, including in relation to Cohesion Policy programmes. For example, an anti-corruption report has been adopted in 2014 and many of the country-specific recommendations made as part of the European Semester concern issues of administrative capacity. Initiatives, such as e-Government and e-Procurement, can help both to increase efficiency and reduce the opportunities for abuse of power. In addition the development of national anti-corruption and anti-fraud strategies is likely to strengthen administrative capacity and lead to funds being used more effectively.

As regards Cohesion Policy, improving institutional capacity and public administration is one of the 11 key thematic objectives for the period 2014-2020. One of the reasons for this is the observed link between low levels of government efficiency and the absorption rate of Cohesion Policy funding for the 2007-2013 period, which is so low in some cases that there is a serious risk that Member States will lose significant amounts of the funds available to them.

While countries in the North of Europe score well in surveys of governance and ease of doing business, there are still too many Member States where the standard of public authorities is perceived to be low and significant numbers of people report paying bribes. New research has revealed that the ease of doing business and the quality of institutions also vary in many cases within countries, which implies that more targeted interventions may be needed to bring the situation in lagging regions up to standard. Research has also indicated that governance problems can act as a brake on social and economic development and limit the impact of Cohesion Policy investment.

Recognising the key role of regional and local authorities in public investment, the OECD has recently adopted principles on the effective management of public investment which apply across all levels of government.

Chapter 6: Cohesion Policy was born out of concerns that obstacles to economic development, such as a lack of innovation, labour force skills, infrastructure or institutional quality, will permanently depress growth and productivity and lead to lower standards of living. Over the years, the financial support under the policy, which has consistently focused on less developed regions, has shifted away from investment in hard infrastructure towards business support and innovation, employment and social inclusion to overcome these obstacles.

The nature of Cohesion Policy and its objectives have also evolved. The geographical coverage has been simplified, with all regions being eligible for a measure of support, while in addition to its focus on reducing economic disparities, the policy has become more closely aligned with the overall strategy of the EU. Accordingly, in the 1990s, funding was extended to environmental and trans-European transport infrastructure and in the 2000s, Cohesion Policy was directed towards the pursuit of the Lisbon and Gothenburg strategies for growth and sustainable development. In the new period, Cohesion Policy is an integral part of the Europe 2020 strategy with a strong focus on employment, innovation, sustainability and reducing poverty and social exclusion.

Successive enlargements of the EU have changed the challenges which Cohesion Policy has to confront and increased the difficulty of tackling them. Not only have they led to a much greater number of regions with low levels of development but they have also increased the territorial diversity of the EU.

With the introduction in the Lisbon Treaty of territorial cohesion as an explicit objective of Cohesion Policy, a stronger emphasis has been given to access to services, functional geography, territorial analysis and sustainability. This shift is mirrored in the increased focus on sustainable growth in Europe 2020 and in the recognition of the importance of moving beyond GDP when assessing territorial development. The debate on how to measure progress and the role of Cohesion Policy in this respect is still ongoing.

Chapter 7: Cohesion Policy in the 2007-2013 period made a substantial contribution to growth and jobs. It is estimated to have increased GDP by 2.1% a year on average in Latvia, 1.8% a year in Lithuania and 1.7% a year in Poland in relation to what it would have been without the investment it has funded. It is also estimated to have increased the level of employment, by 1% a year in Poland, 0.6% in Hungary, and 0.4% in Slovakia and Lithuania. The estimates of the longer-term effects are larger because of the impact on the development potential of economies. In both Lithuania and Poland, GDP in 2020 is estimated to be over 4% above what it would be without the investment concerned and in Latvia, 5% higher.

Over the same period, Cohesion Policy has been important in sustaining public expenditure in vital areas, such as R&D, support for SMEs, sustainable energy, human resource development and social inclusion. In some Member States, it also helped further national reform efforts, especially as regards education systems, the labour market and public administration.

There is clear evidence that the policy is producing tangible results in many areas. Support had been provided to over 60 000 RTD projects by the end of 2012, over 21 500 co-operation ventures between enterprises and research centres, and almost 80 000 business start-ups. In addition, the funds had provided over 5 million more people with access to broadband, 3.3 million with an improved supply of drinking water and 5.5 million with main drainage and a connection to waste water treatment facilities.

Between 2007 and 2012, the policy has supported up to 68 million individual participations in labour market programmes¹, 35 million of them involving women, 21 million young people, 22 million unemployed and nearly 27 million of those with low levels of education (compulsory schooling or below). The ESF helped 5.7 million people find employment and almost 8.6 million to obtain qualifications, while Member States reported that it had contributed to over 400,000 business start-ups or people becoming self-employed.

Major results are still expected from the 2007-2013 programmes over the remaining months up to the end of 2015. The payments data however underline the need to step up the completion of these programmes. Although there is an inevitable delay between expenditure on the ground and Commission payments being made, there is evidence of serious delays in a number of countries in projects being selected for support and being carried out. This is especially the case in areas such as RTDI, rail, ICT and broadband and investment in both renewable energy and energy saving, where authorities have limited experience or projects are relatively complex.

Chapter 8: In 2014-20, a third of the EU Budget will be invested under Cohesion Policy to help address disparities between regions while at the same time contributing to the achievement of the Europe 2020 goals. The two objectives are fully compatible with each other. Indeed, the pursuit of the Europe 2020 goals can be seen as a means of furthering regional development aims and of strengthening the various elements which determine the growth potential of regions.

The new Cohesion Policy is not only fully aligned with the Europe 2020 strategy and its headline targets but it is also linked to the European semester and the EU economic governance process. This will ensure that the effectiveness of investment is not undermined by unsound economic and fiscal policies. Member States and regions are also required to put in place sound regulatory, administrative and institutional frameworks to maximise the impact of investment. Together with a concentration of resources on a few key priorities and a stronger focus on performance and results, it will increase value for money and the contribution of Cohesion Policy to growth and job creation.

¹ Reporting counts all instances of participation and many people may have participated several times. Participations can range from a short interview, to counselling, training or work experience.