European Association of Development Agencies
Association Européenne des Agences de Développement

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY POST 2013

DOING MORE AND BETTER

**Document of the
Round Table of Practitioners in Economic Development**

Meeting of 21 & 22 February 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The Main Focus of the Discussion on the Period Beyond 2013

In a nutshell, the focus of the discussion on the period beyond 2013 relates to the future structure of the EU budget. Whatever shape it takes then, the present structure is more than likely to be reviewed. For memory, the EU budget for 2008 breaks down into the following shares:

- Agriculture   31.6%
- rural development   11.0%
- Sustainable growth   44.9%
- Global player   5.7%
- Citizenship, security,
  justice, others   6.8%

As far as the cohesion policy is more specifically concerned, the main themes of the discussion on the period beyond 2013 can be illustrated with the few quotes below from the speech of Commissioner Danuta Hübner delivered at the Informal Summit of Ministers in charge of territorial cohesion and regional policy on 24 November 2007.

(…) Today regions cannot develop without thinking how to become competitive players on the global market and how to plug in into external world. Successful regions are those which have managed to internationalize their economies. (…)

Within this approach, a consensus seems to materialise around the idea that European cohesion policy is, first and foremost, a development policy whose main objective is to foster growth and ensure equality of opportunity throughout the Union. It is worth repeating once more that the essence of the paradigm shift we have been talking about in the past months is in the increased focus the policy should put on opportunities for the future, by mobilising underexploited potential, rather than on compensation for the problems of the past. (…)

Allocation of cohesion policy resources will continue to follow an inverse relation with the wealth of countries and regions. Discussion will certainly be passionate on the intensity of this relation, but the fundamental principle is not under question.

Competitiveness on the contrary is a more elusive notion, whose measurement in the context of cohesion policy is more difficult. I consider that we need to demonstrate that European cohesion policy contributes to improving the competitiveness position of regional economies by focusing on the provision of public goods and, I would add, 'European' public goods. (…)

Yet, I think the time is ripe to start moving from asking questions to exploring options. I would like today to start this joint reflection by concentrating on two questions, the answer to which – I would argue – would largely condition the debate on the future of the policy.

Let me start from where I finished in my concluding remarks at the Cohesion Forum and go again back to OECD report which, in its review of the Euro area, said that "the Community could achieve more with its regional budget if it were more performance-based". I believe that this is the single, most important issue we need to address for a successful reform of European cohesion policy. We must make this policy more performance oriented. (…)

(…) One of the most heated debate the policy faces concerns the perception of its value-added, in particular in relation to European concerns and priorities.

The challenge here is in the wide variety of investments which can be financed by the cohesion policy. Many of them make socio-economic sense when seen from a local perspective. Not always the same can be said when the same investment is considered from the point of view of the European taxpayer.

Again, we need to look attentively to this issue and, in particular, to develop a solid understanding of what the notion of 'European public goods' means in the context of cohesion policy. In my view the delivery of European public goods will be one of the main criteria against which the performance of the policy will be evaluated.

Let me add a third and final consideration. I think we all agree that European cohesion policy is about solidarity and about economic progress. We also agree that the policy has helped changing the modus operandi and the mind set of many public administrations by introducing an evaluation culture, stimulating strategic thinking, supporting dialogue among partners, improving accountability and transparency. We also agree that European cohesion policy is a main element of the visibility and legitimacy of the European construction.

These are many objectives, even for a fully-fledged development policy, such as European cohesion policy. Yet, we know that the policy is sometimes perceived as a simple redistributive instrument. While we may disagree with this view, I think that we should examine why such perception exist.

A part of the answer may be the architecture of the policy and the link between objectives, instruments, and governance system. For the current period we reduced the number of objectives and established a clearer link between objectives and funds. I wonder however whether the current architecture is not yet as simple and clear as we would want it to be. Whether we should not think of a structure where each component is associated with one objective, one instrument and one main level of responsibility in designing, programming and implementing interventions. (…)

A Basic Realisation

In a federation of Member States such as the EU, economic development rests on three hierarchical levels of intervention, i.e. for memory:

- Macroeconomic: economic, social and environmental convergence between Member States;
- Mesoeconomic: reducing disparities between regions;
- Microeconomic: increasing business competitiveness.

At a time of decisive budgeting choices for the post-2013 period, it is useful to examine both the relevance of Community intervention at each of those levels and reforms concerning the nature of intervention to increase its positive outcomes and added value.

Due to the limited budget available, the EU Cohesion Policy should mainly be measured in terms of mesoeconomic impact.

In this context, it is useful to look at the objectives of the EU. How to balance a representation reflecting the European social model with the need to invest in the development of competitive advantages (infrastructure, education and training, entre-preneurship and innovation) and the attractiveness of the regions.

There is a need to ponder which of the macro, meso and microeconomic levels of intervention is most appropriate and to ascertain the consequences of substituting Community Interest Programmes for the principle of subsidiarity.

As far as the cohesion policy in particular is concerned, there would be a need to identify the different scenarios describing trends in disparities between Member States and regions by 2013 and 2020. This requires an in-depth examination of the objectives of EU intervention, i.e. eliminating interregional disparities (GDP, unemployment, income, infrastructure …), investing in regional added value (skills, innovation, enterprises, …) or cushioning the negative impact of regional crises (production unit closures, environment, …). Once a choice is made, the other objectives would be in the hands of Member States or regions themselves. If this choice is indeed made, there will still be a need to define the best framework for Community intervention in order to guarantee an integrated approach.

Seven Key Questions for Discussion

In order to do more and better, the following questions have to be kept in mind. The European Cohesion Policy has to provide support to all EU regions in order to improve their competitiveness and their attractiveness within environmental limits. For the lagging ones, this includes also investment in infrastructure.

1. How to define for the EU Cohesion Policy its own ambitious vision based on the assessment of which will be the challenges to be faced by regions in 2020 ?

2. To what extent should Community intervention (regulations, budget, expenditure, coordination) look for a macroeconomic rather than a meso or microeconomic impact?

3. Are transnational cooperation and a Community-based vision of the cohesion policy the two main forms of added value for Community intervention?

4. Will the EU be able to reconcile the principle of subsidiarity with the notion of Community Interest Programmes ?

5. Can the EU radically reform its organisational chart to embrace an integrated approach of economic development?

6. Will all the postulates of previous programming periods still be relevant in the post-2013 economy?

7. Can the EU turn a grant-based culture into financial engineering practices?

PART 1 : REFLECTIONS AND PROPOSALS

1. THE MACRO, MESO AND MICROECONOMIC CONTRIBUTIONS OF EXISTING COMMUNITY POLICIES

1.1 Background

Table 1 below seeks to identify the main – macro, meso or microeconomic – focus of major Community policies.

It shows that the foreseen impact of a majority of EU interventions in terms of regulations and budget is rather macroeconomic in nature. A successful European regional policy needs to help regions to maximize the benefits of those EU interventions.

This impact is further compounded both by the monetary policy of the European Central Bank and by the conditions surrounding the changeover to the Euro and the efforts made to meet –at least in part – the objectives of the Lisbon Strategy and the Single Market. Furthermore, the framework of the competition policy too, is rather macroeconomic since it constrains regional initiatives in support of business.

Admittedly, the impacts of the Competitiveness and Employment objective of the ERDF and of the interventions of the European Investment Bank in the form of global loans are respectively meso and microeconomic.

Also, the Convergence and Competitiveness and Employment objectives have a recognisable microeconomic impact in the form of their contribution to SME support systems.
And with a total budget representing only 1.24% of the EU GNI, the sole intervention of the European Union can hardly be expected to radically change the fundamentals of the European economy, whether at macro, meso or micro level.

Table 1: Impact of Community policies

Community Policies	Level of intervention			Comments
	Macro	**Meso**	**Micro**	
CAP	***		*	The aim of the CAP is to maintain food self-sufficiency for the EU and secure a decent income for farmers through guaranteed minimum prices.
Rural Development	***	*	*	The aim of rural development is to encourage farmers to diversify their activities and improve economic cohesion in rural areas.
Cohesion Fund	***	**		The aim of the Cohesion Fund is to help trailing countries bridge the development gap through infrastructure and environmental interventions.
ERDF	***	**		By design and due to its operational planning approach – i.e. by Member States – and financial method (grants), the impact of the ERDF is macroeconomic. See also the 4th Report on Social and Economic Cohesion, which notes stronger convergence between Member States than among regions and underscores that a majority of Objective 1 regions are indeed catching up.
ERDF – Convergence Objective	**	***	*	Via its funding of infrastructure, the Convergence strand of the ERDF promotes economic cohesion, which is a macroeconomic objective.
ERDF – Competitiveness and Employment objective	**	***	*	The focus on measures aiming to promote innovation and competitiveness contributes to entrepreneurial and regional dynamism.
RTD-FP7		*	*	With its emphasis on RTD excellence and competitive research, RTD-FP7 has a macro and microeconomic impact.
ESF	***	*	*	The main impact of the ESF is macroeconomic through its refinancing of national employment policies.
CIP	***		*	CIP primarily impacts the framework conditions surrounding entrepreneurship and therefore has macroeconomic objectives. Through the EIF, the GIF (High Growth and Innovation SME Facility) has a microeconomic impact.
TEN (+EIB Infrastructure investment)	***	*	*	As they seek to interconnect different parts of Europe, the different components of the TEN Policy are macroeconomic in nature.

Community Policies	Level of intervention			Comments
	Macro	Meso	Micro	
EIB – Global Loans		*	***	With its interventions in the form of global loans, the EIB enables the banking industry to help businesses secure finance.
Single Market	***		*	Eliminating obstacles to trade contributes to cohesion and business development.
Changeover to the Euro	***			The introduction of the single currency affects macroeconomic parameters in the Euro zone.
Lisbon Strategy	***		*	The main aim of the Strategy is to improve the framework conditions of EU economic competitiveness. This induces an impact at business level.
Competition Policy	***		*	By avoiding distortions of competition between businesses and territories, the Competition Policy has an economic impact at both macro and micro level.

1.2 **Macroeconomic Challenges**

The macroeconomic impact of any economic policy can be measured using indicators such as:
- GDP growth;
- unemployment rate flows;
- interest rate levels;
- inflation levels;
- public deficits;
- trade balance;
- quality of life (education, health, environment, purchasing power);
- RTD spending;
- energy independence;
- ageing and migration trends;
- environment.

Regardless of the possible impact of the EU budget, it is evident that:
➔ the introduction of the Euro has had a significant impact on interest rates, inflation and public deficits;
➔ GDP growth is sluggish and unemployment still runs high in Europe compared to other regions of the world;
➔ public deficit reductions among Member States are small;
➔ there are significant differences between the Member States in terms of their balance of trade. For instance, although Germany and France both have the single currency, the former's trade surplus amounted to roughly €63.8 billion at end April 2007 while the latter's foreign trade deficit totalled €9.1 billion;
➔ the preferred delivery mechanisms of Community Policies (grants or the OMC – Open Method of Coordination) are not the most effective in terms of return on investment.

Also worth investigating at this stage is whether the sum of small scale projects in terms of financial critical mass – and in some cases, ambition – supported under the different Community Policies is sufficient to deliver a genuine impact in macroeconomic terms. EU policies should help stakeholders at national and regional level create critical masses in order to maximise the benefit of the EU budget.

Worth noting finally is that the obvious lack of synergies among Community Policies when it comes both to their implementation and governance (pre-allocation in the case of a number of policies including the Structural Funds and CAP; calls for proposals for the rest) means that the impact of the EU is less significant than it would be if Community Policies were better coordinated.

Owing to a lack of competences in the fields of education, health and taxation, the EU impact on the standard of living of the EU population and on some important parameters of overall economic development is marginal at best.

If it is assumed that the EU Cohesion Policy is supposed to deliver GDP convergence among the Member States, it must also be acknowledged that enlarging the EU to 12 new Member States with very low comparative GDP levels created a serious difficulty when it comes to demonstrating that this policy is successful, since its intervention scope changes constantly.

Similarly, the low level of EU budget allocation to RTD means that instead of funding projects striving to radically change the EU economic environment and turn RTD into a key tool delivering positive macroeconomic outcomes, the EU is confined to promoting transnational cooperation and propping the hatching of a few technological projects that require competences not easily available within national borders.

1.3 **Mesoeconomic Challenges**

The mesoeconomic impact of policies must be measured using the following indicators:

- spatial planning and development (provision and interconnection of infrastructure with European networks/grids);
- territorial cohesion (between urban and rural areas);
- business support infrastructure;
- quality of human resources (education, training, talent, creativity);
- specialisation of the productive environment (clusters, champions);
- attractiveness for foreign investors;
- availability of equity, in particular venture capital;
- academic role in transferring knowledge to the regional economy;
- demography, including brain drain;
- improvement of standard living conditions at regional level.

In theory, the main contribution of EU policies to mesoeconomic development should come from the Structural Funds. The GDP of the most disadvantaged regions – the so-called Objective 1 regions – has undeniably grown faster compared to regions whose GDP is at 75-125% of EU average. Worth noting in this respect however, are:

- a chronic difficulty when it comes to focusing appropriate levels of EU funding on the most effective measures and – as already underscored in section 1.2 – encouraging synergies among policies;
- a high level of differentiation between regional (ERDF), rural and fishing-area development policies;
- the absence of a regional dimension to the ESF despite growing recognition of human resources as an important factor for endogenous development and evidence of increasingly asymmetric labour skills at regional level. The ESF is still too influenced by national parameters to effectively strengthen the endogenous potential of EU regions.

Worth mentioning is that in 2000, per capita GDP in 24 EU27 regions was above 125% of EU average while 100 – of which 52 were EU12 regions – were below 75%. In 2004, 46 EU27 regions were above the 125% threshold and 70 below 75%.

It is noticeable that smaller Member States have higher GDPs per capita compared to larger Member States. This should encourage the latter to consider more carefully the regional level as the right level of action and intervention. Indeed, the regional level can create critical mass with populations of 3 to 8 millions, i.e. orders of demographic magnitude which are undoubtedly more relevant when it comes to the efficiency of regional development policies.

Finally, it is worth underscoring – and improving public actor awareness of the fact – that it is innovative businesses that create jobs rather than infrastructure, framework conditions, strategies and "toolkits" (including clusters) as such. Additionally, regional development models based on the triple helix should evolve toward a "quadruple helix" emphasising the vital need for readily available private investors in order to deliver business growth and possibly turn innovative ideas into products and services endorsed by the market.

Table 2 introduces EU investment trend data in the different Member States over the four Structural Funding periods (1989-2013).

Table 2a: Evolution of EU Structural Funding investment in Objective 1, 2, 5a and 5b regions between 1989-1993 and 2006-2013[1]

in € millions

EU15	2007-2013[2]	2000-2006	1994-1999	1989-1993	2007-2013 ratio in %[3] 1989-1993
A	1,073	1,473	1,623[4]	–	66.1
B	1,846	1,829	1,626	694	266.0
D	22,694	28,156	18,685	5,909	378.9
DK	453	745	678	291	155.7
E	27,789	43,087	30,383	14,134	196.6
F	11,961	14,620	11,327	5,304	225.5
FIN	1,425	1,836	1,704[4]	–	83.6
GR	18,031	20,961	13,980	7,726	233.4
I	24,895	28,484	18,975	10,822	230.0
IRL	751	3,088	5,620	4,252	17.7
L	45	78	76	31	145.2
NL	1,476	2,635	1,843	714	206.7
P	16,337	19,029	13,980	8,171	199.9
S	1,446	1,908	1,420[4]	–	101.8
UK	8,826	15,635	9,146	6,276	140.6
Σ EU15	138,978	183,564	126,317	64,323	216.1
Index	216.1	285.4	196.4	100.0	
EU12	2007-2013	2004-2006			
BG	3,873	–			
CY	363	113			
CZ	15,522	2,621			
EE	1,992	695			
H	14,519	3,207			
LT	3,965	1,538			
LV	2,647	1,164			
MT	495	89			
PL	39,486	12,810			
RO	11,143	–			
SK	6,231	1,757			
SLO	2,407	456			
Σ EU12	102,643	24,450			
Σ EU27	240,621	208,014			
Index	375.6	323.4		100	

---

[1] Excl. Community Initiatives and Cohesion Fund.
[2] Convergence and Competitiveness and Employment Objectives. For this period, rural development and the instrument in favour of fisheries areas are excluded.
[3] 2007-2013 in the cases of Austria, Sweden and Finland. 1995-1999
[4] 1995-1999.

Table 2b: Evolution of Cohesion Fund intervention

in € millions

EU12	2007-2013	2000-2006[5]	1994-1999
BG	2,283	–	
CY	213	60	
CZ	8,819	936	
EE	1,152	309	
H	8,642	1,113	
LT	2,305	608	
LV	1,540	515	
MT	284	22	
PL	22,176	4,179	
RO	6,552	–	
SK	3,899	571	
SLO	1,412	189	
Σ EU12	59,197	8,495	
E	3,543	12,357	na
GR	3,697	3,388	na
IRL	–	584	na
P	3,060	3,388	na
Σ EU15	10,300	19,717	15,150
Σ EU27	69,497	28,212	15,150

RDAs are of course interested in the mesoeconomic area and recommend that the EU Cohesion Policy focuses its aims and objectives to help regions improve their attractiveness which is obviously more than just infrastructure, but also measures improving the competitiveness of enterprises and the reinforcement of the quality of the local workforce. This means that DG Regio has to make sure that policies such as CAP, skills, transport, enterprises, innovation, State aid, which have a regional dimension, are better coordinated with the Cohesion Policy.

---

[5] In the case of the EU10, the amounts only cover the period 2004-2006.

1.4 **Microeconomic Challenges**

The microeconomic impact of policies can be measured using the following parameters:
- number of business developments and new jobs;
- business innovation capacity;
- number of entrepreneurial growth companies (EGCs)
- number of spin-outs and spin-offs
- integration of marginalised population groups
- export / internationalisation of SME turnover.

In this field, a number of key realisations about Community Policies are unavoidable, including:

1. the existence of significant overlaps between the different policies managed by DGs Regio, Enterprise, and Research and Industry;
2. the rooting of most Community interventions in means-based (framework conditions and exchange of experience) rather than result-oriented approaches (private investment flows);
3. the limited financial resources of certain Community policies restricting funding to small-scale projects that fail to generate the kind of critical mass needed to provide strong leverage;
4. the scattered nature of EU intervention due to interests and attention being divided between local companies and businesses with a strong or a latent potential for innovation[6]. According to the principle of subsidiarity, the EU's limited funding should primarily be invested in the latter while the former are the responsibility of the Member States or regions;
5. State aid regulations need to be adapted to regional economic development realities.

---

[6] Innovation is not only high tech, it has also to be understood as product, process, and business model innovation.

2. CHALLENGING THE OVER-ARCHING PRINCIPLES of COMMUNITY INTERVENTION

The seven key principles governing Community intervention in the regional development field since 1988 are:

1. subsidiarity;
2. partnership;
3. multi-annual planning;
4. additionality;
5. cofinancing;
6. the n + 2 rule;
7. the intensity of EU financial efforts is determined by the litmus test of regional GDP levels compared to 75% of EU average.

While these principles are laudable in theory, in practice they compromise the effectiveness of Community intervention because they all dilute the visibility of EU intervention – and therefore its objective evaluation – and reduce to nothing the Community impetus that could be achieved with intervention in the form of Community interest programmes.

Indeed, the requirement of compliance with the seven principles above means that Community interventions can often be characterised as "accessories" to practices that are:

- conservative due to risk adverse consideration (preference for infrastructure, cofinancing through grants);
- minimalist (small-scale projects);
- fashion-dependent (all about incubators [1989-2006], then clusters [2007-2013]);
- reactive (as opposed to proactive) or frozen (what of the need to adjust to new challenges emerging in the course of the programming period?);
- the reflection of an over-simplified vision of regional issues: indeed, the Europe of the Regions is characterised by relatively wealthy regions with high unemployment rates and relatively poor regions with low unemployment rates and declining populations. Should this not lead to a new approach being developed in terms of the method used to pick those regions that qualify for a comparatively higher rate of Community aid?

The above realisations warrant a discussion of the notion of Community added value. Two types of Community added value are self-evident and can readily be ascribed to Community policies: stimulation of transregional cooperation initiatives and support for a community vision of cohesion. The EU could play a major role by eliminating a shortcoming that characterises so many national and regional programmes, i.e. the belief that territories are closed excellence systems and as such capable of producing domestically all the skills they need to develop world-class clusters.

At present unfortunately, when it comes to the Structural Funds for instance, the scope of transregional cooperation activities is limited to exchanges of experience rather than cross investment in regional development actions. Furthermore, the cohesion policy vision seems altogether too reliant on fashions: no sooner has its focus been placed on the Lisbon agenda than a debate is already underway regarding its contribution to the issue of climate change. While Europe will self-evidently remain competitive in a globalised economy only if it successfully builds an economy resting on the knowledge-based society, its only hope of successfully taking up this particular gauntlet is heavy long-term investment in fields

including education, research, innovation, access to venture capital and entrepreneurship. In-depth thinking is more than needed on the types of investment that can deliver genuine Community added value through the concept of Community Interest Programmes through thematic approaches.

It is argued that rather than seeking to be in direct touch with as many operators as possible, the EU should adopt a vision of excellence ensuring that an adequate number of industries, businesses, regions and talents deliver competitiveness for Europe in a global economy.

EU intervention resting on the concept of Community Interest Programmes would have the following advantages:

- ✓ creating a critical mass;
- ✓ meeting the challenges facing the EU in terms of global competitiveness;
- ✓ visibility and responsibility;
- ✓ congruence of instruments with a mid-term vision for the EU;
- ✓ kick-starting thematic innovations (ICT, venture capital, etc.) or public intervention (financial engineering rather than grants) and contributing to the addition of missing infrastructure links in border areas and to interregional cooperation including regions outside the EU;
- ✓ proactive thinking (Community intelligence rather than regional conservatism);
- ✓ avoiding the funding of projects linked to one of the EU policies with money from another policy (support to agro-food by ERDF instead of the CAP).

Reconciling the approach based on Community Interest Programmes with the principles of subsidiarity, additionality and partnership can be achieved through the EU:

- taking over from the Member States on issues that the latter do not consider – or handle as – critical to EU competitiveness;
- ensuring that the amounts invested by the EU in Community Interest Programmes will be matched by equal Member State investment in support of local community projects;
- signing up directly with regional or national partners in charge of delivering Community Interest Programmes.

In this context, EU funding would be based on the new assumptions below:

- ✓ enforcement of co-decision when it comes to selecting project themes and location;
- ✓ control over the use of resources invested by the Member States over and above European fund interventions;
- ✓ evaluation becomes a management tool;
- ✓ flexibility, especially for intangible investments;
- ✓ less regulations.

As part of delivering the Lisbon, Barcelona and Gothenburg Agendas, the concept of Community Interest Programme needs to be identified in the ten themes below:

- eliminating disparities between regions;
- boosting territorial attractiveness;
- developing competitive businesses;
- creating and harnessing knowledge;
- reinforcing talent;
- providing access to finance (venture capital and bank loans);
- adopting environmental and social behaviours that are compatible with sustainable development including when it comes to energy policies;
- managing migration flows;
- supporting internationalisation and globalisation of regional SMEs;

- anticipating industrial change
- helping SMEs to be more global.

Delivering a Community policy based on Community Interest Programmes requires redefining the role of the different key players of the present multi-level governance system by providing more power to regions, both in the managerial and implementation process.

Challenging the over-arching principles of Community intervention under the Structural Funds also requires addressing the absence of strong synergies between the different Community Policies in favour of:

- businesses;
- innovation;
- training;
- RTD;
- the environment;
- the development of rural and fisheries areas;
- competition;

with the aim either of specialising the interventions of each of those policies – and consequently of the corresponding DGs – (Hypothesis 1) or concentrating in a single instrument all forms of Community intervention with a territorial impact (Hypothesis 2).

Under Hypothesis 1 (specialisation), ERDF intervention would be restricted to infrastructure and enterprise real estate efforts while other individual policies would be in charge of intangible investment (see Table 4). This hypothesis would have the benefit of focusing intervention whilst avoiding reservations regarding the earmarking of thematic priorities.

Under Hypothesis 2 (concentration), all financial support under the first six themes listed above would be regionalised and hence managed by DG Regio. This hypothesis would have the advantage of putting an end to fragmented support and overlapping responsibilities.

Based on the existing policies, this hypothesis would suppose that programmes such as Interreg, Regions of Knowledge and Europe-Innova should be merged and transformed into industry-specific trans-regional Community watch and intelligence platforms focusing on issues including eco-innovation, functional foods, technological textile, mainstreaming of ICT in traditional industries. Thematic priorities would be decided annually by EU Commission services. In addition to their technological dimension, individual platforms would also address market and other issues relating to the funding of applied research, innovation and start-ups. The work of the different platforms would be chaired by a Commission Head of Unit. The participation of non-EU regions of excellence would be secured to promote international cooperation, thereby reflecting the new spatial distribution of knowledge generation and exploitation. The EU would make a contribution toward the operating expenses of the secretariat of individual platforms and harness the financial engineering instruments described above to finance the activities generated by the different platforms.

Whether this Community Interest Programme approach is taken into consideration or not after 2013, DG Regio should at least have a overall responsibility to coordinate all EU policies having a regional impact.

3. FINANCING COMMUNITY INTEREST PROGRAMMES

To finance Community Interest Programmes, the EU could consider two finance scenarios, i.e.:

→ Scenario 1: 100% funding of selected projects with grants;
→ Scenario 2: financial engineering.

Of course, this should be aligned with regional investment priorities.

While no detailed explanation is needed about Scenario 1, the characteristics of Scenario 2 would include:

✓ an educational role through subsidies for the development of national or regional strategies in the fields listed above;
✓ equity investment in the nominal capital of specialist loan, guarantee and financial engineering schemes dedicated to the priority themes. Community intervention would be determined according to project quality and amount to a minimum of €50 million representing up to 49% of supported financial instrument capital.
✓ equity investment in repayable short-term loan funds investing in Community Interest research projects, including to finance demonstration;
✓ reimbursement of tax income shortfalls caused by the implementation of tax relief schemes aimed at changing the attitudes of investors (taxation of venture capital), manufacturers and consumers (innovation, RTD, environment, energy);
✓ involvement in PPP[7]s either developed to finance the full range of infrastructure projects – including business facilities (industrial parks, relay workshops, incubators, etc.) – through subsidised and repayable short-term loans or promoting cross-border initiatives (missing links, cross-border industrial zones, etc.);
✓ equity investment in proof-of-concept schemes supporting business developers.

The use of grants would be strictly limited to a number of specific situations including:

• intervention of the EU Globalisation Adjustment Fund;
• intervention in cases of natural or human disasters;
• support for feasibility studies on European Interest Infrastructure;
• pre-accession support;
• co-operation at external EU borders;
• breaking the isolation of peripheral, mountain, island and overseas areas;
• financing the operating expenses of funds in which the EU has invested equity.

The volume of EU grants should not exceed 25 to 30% of total EU cohesion and regional development budgets.

Table 4 below displays the typology of interventions recommended under Scenario 2.

All other forms of intervention should then be considered of national or regional relevance, which means that the principle of subsidiarity should apply and Community intervention should be terminated.

---

[7] PPP has to be considered as leveraging public money with private one.

Table 3: Intervention areas of the different Community Policies –Specialisation Scenario

Regional Policy	• local infrastructure: incubators, industrial/science parks, enterprise real estate, research/technical centres • rehabilitation of brown fields • Territorial marketing
Enterprise and Innovation	• Equity investment in venture capital, guarantee, micro-credits and proof-of-concept funds • Contribution toward the operating expenses of regional business angels networks • Contribution toward the operating expenses of cluster internationalisation initiatives • Co-funding schemes addressing investment readiness, refundable short-term loans for innovation projects, IP exploitation, quality & design and spin-offs • Co-funding regional entrepreneurship and innovation strategies • Contribution to internationalisation schemes • Co-funding schemes addressing the implementation of sleeping innovative projects in SMEs
Training	• Co-funding in-service training in line with regional industrial strategies • Co-funding of entrepreneurship training schemes • Co-funding activities aiming to attract and retain talent – young university graduates – in regional SMEs
Research	• Co-funding of transnational projects • Co-funding of regional industrial partnerships with a focus on research and leveraging research outcomes
Environment and energy	• Co-funding of regional strategies • Co-funding demonstration projects with a strong potential for transfer to other regions

Table 4: Financing Community Interest Projects (Scenario 2)

Community priorities	Intervention method				
	Regional strategies	Equity participation	Refinancing Tax relief	PPPs Equity investment	Repayable (short-term) loans
	Grants	Grants converted into equity participations + loans	Grants	Grants	
1. Eliminating disparities (infrastructure)				X	X
2. Attractiveness	X		X		
3. Gazelles, Champions		X	X		
4. Leveraging knowledge	X	X	X		X
5. Talent	X		X		
6. Venture capital and bank loans		X	X	X	X
7. Sustainable development	X	X			X
8. Migration	X				
9. Anticipating industrial change	X			X	X
10. Helping SMEs to be more global	X				

PART 2 : PROPOSALS

In order to do more and better after 2013, the EU Cohesion Policy should have its own ambitious vision instead of adapting itself to trends or fashions of any other political agendas (i.e. In the past: internal market, enlargement, Lisbon Agenda. Tomorrow: climate change). Strengthening regional competitiveness and attractiveness and reducing disparities among the regions is indeed a big challenge which deserves its own agenda.

To achieve such a vision, the European Commission should use all the opportunities offered by its regulatory, budget and coordination power and responsibilities in view of ensuring :

➔ A good balance between investment in infrastructure and in soft measures to improve the competitiveness and attractiveness of all regions.

➔ Strong coordination of all EU policies having a spatial dimension, even if they are primarily defined as having sectorial one, in order to create critical mass and leverage effects at mesoeconomic level.

➔ A framework for a concept of Community Interest Programmes focusing on thematic priorities to give EU interventions a greater visibility. This should be implemented by programmes rather than by multiple projects.

➔ An increased use of all revolving financial instruments in order to improve the formation and availability of equity capital in the regions.

➔ Qualitative evaluation criteria for the implementation of the cohesion policy in order to ensure higher added value of EU interventions and avoid small-scale "political wishes" projects.

➔ A stronger inside and outside inter-cooperation scheme focusing on helping enterprises to become more global.

➔ Stronger regional dimension of ESF interventions to adjust the skills to the local needs.

➔ Alignment of European funding with regional priorities by providing a greater role to regions in the management and implementation of programmes in order to maximise the leveraging effects of EU financial contributions.

➔ Further administrative simplification in the field of State aid controls, the n+2 rule for intangible investment programmes as well as in terms of prefinancing programmes.

➔ More flexibility in time and in space to recognize changes in circumstances during a 6-7-year period.

➔ Stronger integration of rural development in the cohesion policy.

➔ Eligibility of energy and agro food expenditure under the reformed CAP to avoid the use of ERDF for such investments.

PART 3 : STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

4. ASPECTS OF REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT RELATING TO HUMAN CAPITAL

Regional development and competitiveness are heavily dependent upon the regional human capital. It is therefore crucial in future to improve coordination at regional level between investment into both productive or entrepreneurial capacity financed by the ERDF and human capital financed by the European Social Fund.

Worth noting is that when it comes to human capital, there are huge disparities in Europe – much more so than in the US – in terms of both unemployment and wages. Besides, wide population differences are in evidence in the EU27. Some scientists including James K. Galbraith[8] suggest that:

"(…) The practical steps that would generate convergence within Europe involve personal incomes. The EU has left social welfare policies to Member States – and the inequalities in their economic positions are perpetuated by this decision. This is the problem that policy innovation must now begin to address. Interregional personal income convergence is one key to less inequality and fuller employment in Europe. The direct route is the most efficient way to achieve convergence by contriving to raise the incomes of Europe's poor more rapidly the incomes of the rich (…)".

"(…) The investment required to improve European performance in education would mobilize resources in the lower income areas, while sharply reducing the incidence of youth joblessness by converting the unemployed into students, as does the USA. Let Europe, therefore, fund and build European universities on a scale and of a quality to rival higher education in the US. Here, Europe lags badly, not because of a lack of talent, but because a lack of will and imagination. Let Prague, Warsaw, Budapest, Lisbon and Thessaloniki become true magnets of world learning (…)".

Worth noting is that there are sizeable disparities (see Table 8 below) between Member States and regions when it comes to unemployment rates – an area for which Member States have retained their sovereignty, notably in the field of labour market flexibility: while unemployment decreased slightly (0.7%) between 2000 and 2006, it actually increased in 9 EU15 and 2 EU12 Member States. When it comes to unemployment disparities between regions, there is evidence that:

- at national level: disparities have been reduced in 11 out of 18 Member States for which regional data is available;
- at EU level: there is a very large gap between unemployment rates at both extremes of the spectrum, i.e. 24.2% in 2000 and 20.5% in 2005 respectively between the highest and lowest unemployment rates.

In 2005, the regions with the lowest and highest unemployment rates were reportedly at 32.9% and 292.4% respectively of EU average, i.e. a disparity comparable to that prevailing in GDP terms. However, there is no actual correlation between disparities in regional unemployment rates and GDP.

---

[8] *Maastricht 2042 and the Fate of Europe – Towards Convergence and Full Employment.*

Table 5: Trend in unemployment rate disparities in Europe

5.1 Disparities at national level (in %)

EU15	2000	2006	Δ point %
A	3.6	4.7	+1.1
B	6.9	8.2	+1.3
D	7.2	8.4	+1.2
DK	4.3	3.9	-0.4
E	11.1	8.5	-2.6
F	9.1	9.5	+0.4
FIN	9.8	7.7	-2.1
GR	11.2	8.9	-2.3
I	10.1	6.8	-3.3
IRL	4.2	4.4	+0.2
L	2.3	4.7	+2.4
NL	2.8	3.9	+1.1
P	4.0	7.7	+3.7
S	5.6	7.1	+1.5
UK	5.3	5.0	0
EU12	**2000**	**2006**	**Δ point %**
BG	16.4	9.0	-7.4
CY	4.9	4.6	-0.3
CZ	8.7	7.1	-1.6
EE	12.8	5.9	-6.9
H	6.4	7.5	+1.1
LT	13.7	6.8	-6.9
LV	16.4	5.6	-10.8
MT	6.7	7.3	+0.6
PL	16.1	13.8	-2.3
RO	7.2	7.3	+0.1
SK	18.8	13.4	-5.4
SLO	6.7	6.0	-0.7
EU15	7.6	7.4	-0.2
EU27	8.6	7.9	-0.7
USA	4.0	4.6	+0.6
JPN	4.7	4.1	-0.6

Source: Eurostat

5.2 Disparities at regional level – Difference between the Member States' regions

	2001			2005			2000-2006 trend Gap Δ
	Max.	Min.	Δ	Max.	Min.	Δ	
EU15							
A	5.9	1.9	4.0	0.1	3.2	5.9	+1.9
B	14.5	3.8	10.7	16.3	4.4	11.9	+1.2
D	21.5	2.9	18.6	22.3	5.8	16.5	-2.1
DK	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
E	18.7	4.5	14.2	15.8	5.6	10.2	-4.0
F [9]	14.0	4.9	9.1	13.2	6.4	6.8	-2.3
FIN	14.0	7.0	7.0	11.6	6.9	4.7	-2.3
GR	16.4	6.8	9.6	18.0	7.1	10.9	+1.3
I	25.7	1.9	23.8	16.2	2.7	13.5	-10.3
IRL	4.9	3.6	1.3	4.4	4.3	0.1	-1.2
L	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
NL	3.8	1.5	2.3	6.6	3.3	3.3	+1.0
P [10]	6.9	2.8	4.1	9.1	5.2	3.9	-0.2
S	6.7	3.3	3.4	8.7	5.9	2.8	-0.6
UK [11]	7.7	2.7	5.0	6.3	2.6	3.7	-1.3
EU12							
BG	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
CY	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
CZ	14.4	3.9	10.5	13.9	3.5	10.4	-0.1
EE	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
H	8.5	4.0	4.5	10.6	5.1	5.5	+1.0
LT	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
LV	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
MT	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
PL	24.3	13.0	11.3	22.8	14.3	7.5	-3.8
RO	8.5	5.5	3.0	9.2	5.7	3.5	+5.0
SK	23.9	8.2	15.7	23.1	5.3	17.8	+2.1
SLO	na	na	na	na	na	na	na

Source: Eurostat

---

[9] Excl. DOM
[10] Excl. Autonomous regions
[11] Excl Inner London

5.3   Top 15 of regions with the highest and lowest unemployment rate in 2005

	TOP 15			BOTTOM 15		
1.	Východné Slovensko	SK	23.1	Heref., Worc. & Warks.	UK	2.6
2.	Dolnoslaskie	PL	22.8	Bolzano – Bolzen	I	2.7
3.	Zachodnipomarskie	PL	22.7	North Yorkshire	UK	2.9
4.	Halle	D	22.3	Salzburg	A	3.2
5.	Mecklenburg Vorpommern	D	21.4	Valle d'Aosta	I	3.2
6.	Dessau	D	21.3	Cheshire	UK	3.3
7.	Leipzig	D	20.5	Zeeland	NL	3.3
8.	Warmisko-Mazurskie	D	20.4	Cornwall	UK	3.4
9.	Brandenburg-Nordost	PL	19.9	Dorset & Somerset	UK	3.5
10.	Kujawsko-Pomorskie	PL	19.8	Gloug., Wilt., N. Somerset	UK	3.5
11.	Stredné Slovensko	SK	19.6	Berks., Bucks., Oxfordshire	UK	3.5
12.	Berlin	D	19.4	Tirol	A	3.5
13.	Lubuskie	PL	19.1	Praha	CZ	3.5
14.	Slaskie	PL	19.0	East Wales	UK	3.5
15.	Swietokrzyskie	PL	18.9	Trento	I	3.6

<table>
<tr><td>

i.e. 2 Slovak regions
6 German regions
7 Polish regions

</td><td>

i.e. 1 Czech region
1 Dutch region
2 Austrian regions
3 Italian regions
8 British regions

</td></tr>
</table>

Source: Eurostat

None of the 15 regions with the highest unemployment rates is included in the list of the top 15 regions with the lowest GDP. Would it not be advisable to reckon with this fact in framing the operational method (*modus operandi*) to be used for the EU cohesion policy beyond 2013? Indeed, it can safely be argued that high unemployment may encourage human resources to migrate, thereby contributing over time to an overall reduction in public investment, in turn leading to a loss of regional attractiveness for entrepreneurial activities.

Worth emphasising by way of conclusion are the substantial disparities in evidence among the EU Member States listed in Table 6 below when it comes to the minimum monthly wage levels, the lowest being at €92 while the highest reaches €1,570.

Table 6: Minimum wage disparities between Member States

6.1 **Statutory national minimum wage in 20 EU Member States**

In €/month

EU15		EU12	
Portugal	€470	Bulgaria	€92
Spain	€666	Romania	€114
Greece	€668	Latvia	€172
France	€1,254	Lithuania	€174
Belgium	€1,259	Slovakia	€217
Netherlands	€1,301	Estonia	€230
United Kingdom	€1,361	Poland	€246
Ireland	€1,403	Hungary	€258
Luxembourg	€1,570	Czech Republic	€288
		Slovenia	€522
		Malta	€585

Source: Eurostat – Population & Social Conditions 71/2007

There is no collective bargaining to set statutory national minimum wages in Denmark, Finland, Sweden, Italy, Cyprus, Austria or Germany.

6.2 **Average wages in European regions in 2000**
(EU25 excl. DK, L, CY, EE, LT, LV, MT, SLO)

	TOP 15			BOTTOM 15		
1.	Inner London	UK	€48,100	Východné Slovensko	SK	€4,980
2.	Brussels	B	€44,250	Zapadné Slovensko	SK	€5,100
3.	Ile de France	F	€43,690	Stredné Slovensko	SK	€5,140
4.	Stockholm	S	€42,120	Dél-Alföld	H	€5,260
5.	Vlaams-Brabant	B	€40,580	Eszak-Alföld	H	€5,300
6.	Brabant Wallon	B	€40,070	Dél-Dumántúl	H	€5,530
7.	Wien	A	€39,700	Stredni-Morava	CZ	€5,700
8.	Antwerpen	B	€38,270	Eszak-Magayarország	H	€5,710
9.	Utrecht	NL	€38,270	Severozápad	CZ	€5,850
10.	Noord-Holland	NL	€38,100	Servervýchod	CZ	€5,890
11.	Hamburg	D	€37,650	Jihovýchod	CZ	€5,930
12.	Zuid-Holland	NL	€37,410	Nyugat-Dumántúl	H	€6,090
13.	Outer London	UK	€37,340	Jihozápad	CZ	€6,090
14.	Groningen	PL	€36,170	Moravskoslezko	CZ	€6,180
15.	Bremen	D	€36,120	Kózép-Dumántúl	H	€6,380

i.e. B 4 regions
      NL 3
      UK 2

i.e. CZ 6 regions
      H   6
      SK 3

Source: J.K. Galbraith, Maastricht 2042 and the Fate of Europe – Towards Convergence and Full Employment, 2006

5. REGIONAL GDP (NEGATIVE) GROWTH BETWEEN 1995 AND 2004

In order to select the regions that will benefit from Community actions, there is a need to reflect on the type of regions which have experienced strong (negative) GDP growth compared to EU average in recent years (see tables below).

In the period 1995-2004, regions with the strongest GDP growth rates share the following characteristics:

→ 13 and 5 respectively out of 30 are UK and Spanish regions;
→ 9 are national capital regions;
→ Only 11 out of 27 EU Member States are represented in this ranking;
→ 10 regions (i.e. one in three) are situated either in cohesion funding recipient (E, P, IRL, GR) or in new Member States.

On the other hand, 21 regions in 7 different Member States have experienced negative GDP growth between 1995 and 2004. Quite remarkably, among them are 7 (former West) German regions and 7 Italian regions.

Table 7: Increase in GDP between 1995 and 2004 in EU27

7.1   Top 30 of the regions

1.	Inner London (UK)	+73.0%
2.	Southern and Eastern (IRL)	+54.8%
3.	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire (UK)	+53.8%
4.	Kózep Magayaraszóg (H)	+45.2%
5.	Praha (CZ)	+42.8%
6.	Bratislava (SK)	+41.4%
7.	Gloucestershire, Wiltshire, N. Somerset (UK)	+40.1%
8.	Bedfordshire & Hertfordshire (UK)	+38.5%
9.	West Midlands (UK)	+37.7%
10.	Attiki (GR)	+37.0%
11.	Surrey, East & West Sussex (UK)	+36.1%
12.	Pais Vasco (E)	+32.1%
13.	Outer London (UK)	+31.8%
14.	Border, Midlands and Western (IRL)	+29.7%
15.	Madrid (E)	+29.2%
16.	Zuid Holland (NL)	+29.2%
17.	Lancashire (UK)	+29.0%
18.	Stockholm (S)	+28.0%
19.	Notio Aigaio (GR)	+28.0%
20.	Madeira (P)	+27.7%
21.	Utrecht (NL)	+27.3%
22.	Navarra (E)	+27.2%
23.	Derby & Nottinghamshire (UK)	+26.4%
24.	Leicestershire, R & N (UK)	+25.7%
25.	West Yorkshire (UK)	+25.6%
26.	Bucuresti Ilfov (RO)	+25.4%
27.	Cantabria (E)	+25.3%
28.	Cataluña (E)	+24.9%

29.	North East Scotland (UK)	+24.8%
30.	South Yorkshire (UK)	+24.5%
NB	Åland (FIN)	+37.0%

Source: Eurostat. EURADA Calculation

7.2 Breakdown by Member State

Country	Nb of regions
UK	13
E	5
IRL	2
NL	2
GR	2
CZ	1
SK	1
H	1
P	1
RO	1
S	1

Table 8: Decrease in GDP between 1995 and 2004 in EU27

8.1 Bottom 21 regions

1.	Valle d'Aosta (I)	-11.6%
2.	Berlin (D)	-9.9%
3.	Hannover (D)	-4.6%
4.	Lüneburg (D)	-4.1%
5.	Yuzhen Tsentralen (BG)	-4.1%
6.	Köln (D)	-4.0%
7.	Abruzzo (I)	-3.4%
8.	Detmold (D)	-3.3%
9.	Cumbria (UK)	-2.4%
10.	Emilia Romagna (I)	-2.2%
11.	Piemonte (I)	-2.1%
12.	Alsace (F)	-1.9%
13.	Severozapaden (BG)	-1.8%
14.	Sterea Ellada (GR)	-1.7%
15.	Friuli-Venezia Giulia (I)	-1.7%
16.	Severen Tsentralen (BG)	-1.2%
17.	Schleswig-Holstein (D)	-1.1%
18.	Umbria (I)	-0.6%
19.	Molise (I)	-0.3%
20.	Norte (P)	-0.2%
21.	Koblenz (D)	-0.1%

Source: Eurostat. EURADA Calclation

8.2   Breakdown by Member State

Country	Nb of regions
D	7
I	7
BG	3
F	1
P	1
UK	1
GR	1

6. Dealing with Prejudice against the Performance of EU Interventions

While Member States blame the EU for failing to deliver economic cohesion[12], it must be acknowledged that few of them are scoring any better individually in the globalised knowledge-based economy. Worse even, they often adopt a conservative stance when it comes to Structural Funding utilisation (the list of so-called "earmarked" priorities – Annex 4 to Regulation N° 1083/2006 – is a genuine patchwork) and continue to prefer subsidies-based approaches to financial engineering even though the former are not most effective when it comes to supporting economic growth.

As illustrated in Table 90 below, a worsening of disparities between wealthy and disadvantaged regions within States has been in evidence in a majority of countries between 2000 and 2004. Even excluding the capital regions of the different Member States from the scope of this analysis, the result is the same – though the gap between rich and trailing regions is somewhat reduced, is illustrated in Table 10. This confirms that the economic policies delivered by the Member States are hardly more effective than the EU Cohesion Policy.

Table 9: Evolution of disparities within individual Member States based on GDP trends (PPS) between 2000 and 2004
Comparison of the averages of the three wealthiest and poorest regions

	2000			2004			Δ 2004/2000
	Average of the 3 wealthiest regions	Average of the 3 poorest regions	Δ	Average of the 3 wealthiest regions	Average of the 3 poorest regions	Δ	
A	30,570	19,974	10,596	32,675	21,700	10,974	+379
B	34,271	16,743	17,528	37,478	18,229	19,249	+1,721
D	36,512	15,009	21,503	37,296	17,070	20,226	-1,277
E	23,864	13,477	10,387	27,548	16,036	11,512	+1,125
F[9]	27,447	17,759	9,688	28,318	18,912	9,406	-282
GR	17,069	11,510	5,559	21,548	12,309	9,239	+3,680
I	30,129	14,532	15,597	29,637	14,638	14,999	-598
NL	29,747	19,533	10,214	33,336	21,715	11,621	+1,407
S	26,131	20,679	5,452	27,976	22,475	5,501	-49
UK[10]	30,176	15,515	14,661	37,124	17,687	19,437	+4,776
Δ Min	19,473	9,031		15,930	10,166		
BG	6,275	5,025	1,250	7,756	5,564	2,192	+942
CZ	16,761	10,354	6,407	21,257	13,015	8,242	+1,835
PL	10,782	6,265	4,537	13,503	7,777	5,725	+1,188
RO	7,307	4,151	3,156	9,962	5,788	4,174	+1,018
H	13,486	7,481	6,239	12,439	9,212	3,227	-3,012
Δ Min/Max	10,486	6,203		13,501	7,451		

Source: Eurostat – EURADA Calculation

---

[12] Despite considerably larger national resources than the EU had at its disposal to face successive waves of enlargement, the integration of the Länder of former East Germany has been neither quicker nor easier.

[9] Excl. the *Domaines d'outremer* (DOM, "Overseas Dominions").

[10] Greater London.

Table 10: **Evolution of disparities within individual Member States based on GDP trends (SPA) between 2000 and 2004**
Comparison of the averages of the three wealthiest (excl. capital cities) and poorest regions

	2000			2004			Δ 2004/2000
	Average of the 3 wealthiest regions	Average of the 3 poorest regions	Δ	Average of the 3 wealthiest regions	Average of the 3 poorest regions	Δ	
A	27,243	19,974	7,269	29,215	21,700	7,515	+246
B	25,462	16,743	8,719	28,279	18,229	10,050	+1,331
D	36,512	15,009	21,503	37,296	17,070	20,226	-1,277
E	23,075	13,477	9,598	26,709	16,036	10,673	+1,075
F[9]	22,694	17,759	4,935	23,330	18,912	4,418	-517
GR	16,882	11,510	5,372	19,242	12,309	6,933	+1,561
I	30,129	14,532	15,597	29,534	14,638	14,896	-701
NL	28,687	19,533	9,154	21,842	21,715	10,127	+973
S	22,371	20,679	1,692	24,003	22,475	1,528	-164
UK[10]	27,722	15,515	12,207	33,774	17,687	16,087	+3,880
Δ Mini	16,062	9,031		14,532	10,166		
CZ	11,257	10,354	903	14,823	13,015	1,808	+905
PL	9,371	6,265	3,106	11,700	7,777	3,923	+817
RO	5,313	4,151	1,162	7,706	5,788	1,918	+792
Δ Mini/Maxi	5,944	6,203		7,117	7,227		

Source: Eurostat – EURADA Calculation

Also worth emphasising is that in a majority of EU Member States, ERDF intervention only represents a small share of the total resources invested nationally into aid programmes. This is evidenced by the data in Table 11 below, which compares 2005 data from the different Member States regarding the amounts of national aid identified by DG Competition as State aid under the Structural Funds (excl. the Cohesion Fund). Only 8 out of 25 Member States receive more EU funding than they spend themselves domestically under national programmes falling under the scope of State aid regulations.

Table 11: **Importance of State Aid (SA) compared with the Structural Funds (SF)**

Mio €

Country	2000-2006 Structural Funds Yearly average	2005 State Aid (without cost rail transport)	SF / ST Ratio
A	249	1,400	0.17%
B	262	1,200	0.21%
D	4,022	20,300	0.19%
DK	106	1,300	0.08%
E	6,155	3,800	1.61%
F	2,088	9,700	0.21%
FIN	262	2,700	0.09%
GR	2,994	400	7.48%
I	4,069	6,400	0.63%
IRL	441	1,000	0.44%
L	11	-	-

NL	376	2,000	0.18%
P	2,718	1,000	2.71%
S	272	3,100	0.08%
UK	2,233	4,500	0.49%
CY	37	200	0.18%
CZ	873	500	1.74%
EE	231	-	-
H	1,069	1,600	0.66%
LT	512	100	5.12%
LV	388	100	3.88%
MT	29	100	0.29%
PL	4,270	1,900	2.24%
SK	585	300	1.95%
SLO	152	200	0.76%

Sources: Eurostat and DG Competition

This observation is confirmed by the example of the Contract plans signed by the State with the regions in France, as shown in Table 12 below.

Table 12: **Comparison of amounts paid in France as intervention respectively under Objective 2 of the Structural Funds and under the 2000-2006 contract plans signed by the State with the regions**

Mio €

	Total cost	Contribution of the Funds	State-Region Plan
Alsace	293.5	93.4	457.64
Aquitaine	2,036.6	452.9	722.76
Auvergne	1,256.7	299.6	412.63
Basse-Normandie	976.6	265.6	563.145
Bourgogne	753.5	233.7	381.60
Bretagne	1,107.0	403.6	907.07
Centre	634.5	199.3	556.59
Champagne-Ardenne	635.3	207.7	373.88
Franche-Comté	570.2	183.8	335.69
Haute-Normandie	972.4	307.3	513.14
Ile-de-France	414.8	142.3	2,996.31
Languedoc-Roussillon	910.5	270.3	691.35
Limousin	590.6	137.6	331.41
Lorraine	828.5	380.3	816.88
Midi-Pyrénées	1,449.6	404.8	864.61
Nord-Pas-de-Calais	1,882.6	607.4	1,549.24
Pays de la Loire	1,726.3	401.3	719.03
Picardie	1,121.8	254.3	470.33
Poitou-Charentes	915.0	265.6	543.92
Provence-Alpes Côte d'Azur	1,240.4	307.4	1,115.31
Rhône-Alpes	1,400.4	409.1	1,273.03
Programme national informatique	8.0	6.0	

Sources: DG Regio and national data

Worth noting additionally is that the number of regions whose GDP exceeds the national average fell from 77 in 1995 to 71 in 2004 while the number of regions whose GDP topped the EU average increased from 124 to 127 over the same period.

These figures should stimulate a reflection in the sense that normally, regional policies should reasonably be expected to enable regional economies to grow faster than the national economy.

---

[13] Excl. DOM
[14] Greater London

Table 13: **Evolution of the number of regions with a GDP over the European and national average in 1988, 1995 and 2004**

Member State	2004					1995					1988				
	Nb of Regions	Nb of Regions				Nb of Regions	Nb of Regions				Nb of Regions	Nb of Regions			
		EU average		MS average			EU average		MS average			EU average		MS average	
		+	**−**	**+**	**−**		**+**	**−**	**+**	**−**		**+**	**−**	**+**	**−**
A	8	8	1	4	5	9	8	1	4	5	9	4	5	3	6
B	11	7	4	2	9	11	8	3	2	9	11	4	7	3	8
BG	6	0	6	1	5	6	0	6	1	5	–	–	–	–	–
CZ	8	1	7	1	7	8	1	7	1	7	–	–	–	–	–
D	41	25	16	13	28	40	31	9	14	26	31	21	10	9	22
E[1]	17	7	10	7	10	17	6	11	7	10	17	0	17	7	10
F[2]	22	10	12	2	20	22	11	11	3	19	22	5	17	3	19
FIN	5	4	1	2	3	6	4	2	2	4	6	2	4	2	4
GR	13	2	11	2	11	13	0	13	2	11	13	0	13	4	9
H	7	1	6	2	5	7	0	7	2	5	–	–	–	–	–
I	21	13	8	12	9	21	13	8	11	10	21	12	9	11	10
IRL	2	2	0	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	–	–	–	–	–
NL	12	11	1	3	9	12	10	2	4	8	12	5	7	5	7
P	7	1	6	3	4	7	1	6	1	6	7	0	7	2	5
PL	16	0	16	4	12	16	0	16	5	11	–	–	–	–	–
RO	8	0	8	2	6	8	0	8	3	5	–	–	–	–	–
S	8	8	0	1	7	8	8	0	2	6	8	8	0	2	6
SK	4	1	3	1	3	4	0	4	1	3	–	–	–	–	–
UK	37	26	11	8	29	37	22	15	11	26	32	7	25	8	24
Σ	254	127	127	71	183	254	124	130	77	177	189	68	121	59	130

Source: Eurostat –EURADA Calculation

[1] Excl. Ceuta & Millila
[2] Excl. DOM

Also worth noting is that the ranking of the 25 EU regions with the highest GDP remained quite stable between 1983 and 2004. Indeed, 17 regions listed in 1983 were still in the top 25 in 2004. Among the eight new regions joining the list in 2004, four were British, two Dutch, one Czech and one Irish. The complete dataset is provided in the tables below:

Table14: Ranking according to importance of GDP in 1983 and 2004

	REGIONS	GDP 1983	REGIONS	GDP 2004
1.	Hamburg (D)	184	Inner London (UK)	302.9
2.	Ile de France (F)	168	Luxembourg (L)	251.0
3.	Brussels Capital (B)	165	Brussels (B)	248.3
4.	Wien (A)	151	Hamburg (D)	195.2
5.	Bremen (D)	149	Wien (A)	179.9
6.	Darmstadt (D)	149	Ile-de-France (F)	174.5
7.	Greater London (UK)	144	Berks., Bucks., Oxfords. (UK)	173.8
8.	Oberbayern (D)	140	Oberbayern (D)	169.3
9.	Stuttgart (D)	138	Stockholm (S)	165.7
10.	Luxembourg (L)	135	Utrecht (NL)	157.7
11.	Ahvenanmaa/land (FIN)	133	Darmstadt (D)	157.3
12.	Stockholm (S)	132	Praha (CZ)	157.1
13.	Uusimaa (FIN)	131	Southern & Eastern (IRL)	156.5
14.	Lombardia (I)	131	Bremen (D)	155.8
15.	Grampian (UK)	130	North Eastern Scotland (UK)	153.9
16.	Berlin (D)	130	Noord Holland (NL)	153.7
17.	Valle d'Aosta (I)	128	Groningen (NL)	153.7
18.	Emilia-Romagna (I)	128	Antwerpen (B)	144.5
19.	Antwerpen (B)	126	Gloucesters., Wilts., N. Somerset (UK)	143.5
20.	Düsseldorf (D)	125	Salzburg (A)	141.8
21.	Karlsruhe (D)	124	Lombardia (I)	141.5
22.	Mittelfranken (D)	124	Stuttgart (D)	141.0
23.	Trentino-Alto Adige (I)	119	Bolzano (I)	140.2
24.	Saltzburg (A)	118	Bedfords. & Herefords. (UK)	137.6
25.	Noord-Holland (NL)	118	Mittelfranken (D)	137.2

Source: Eurostat

Table 15: Evolution of the number of regions per Member State

1983		2004	
Country	Nb of regions	Country	Nb of regions
D	9	D	6
I	4	UK	5
FIN	3	NL	3
A	2	B	2
B	2	A	2
UK	2	I	2
F	1	CZ	1
NL	1	S	1
L	1	L	1
S	1	IRL	1
		F	1

7. Regional Ranking According to Criteria Including GDP, Unemployment rate, Population Trend, Regional Innovation Performance, Per Capita Disposable Income and Employment

The relative performance ranking of European regions varies depending to the parameter being considered. This is how:

→ 5 British and 5 German regions feature in the Top 25 regions with the highest GDP in 2004;

→ 16 British and 4 Italian regions appear in the Top 25 regions with the lowest unemployment rates in 2005;

→ 9 Spanish and 4 French regions are listed among the Top 25 regions with the strongest population growth rates between 2000 and 2004;

→ 10 German, 4 Finnish and Four Swedish regions appear in the Top 25 regions boasting the best regional innovation performance index;

→ 13 British and 10 German regions feature among the Top 30 regions with the highest per capita disposable income;

→ All British regions rank among the Top 40 regions with the highest growth in per capita disposable income between 1995 and 2004;

→ 10 German, 3 Italian as well as 2 Spanish, French and UK regions are listed in the Top 20 regions when it comes to employment in hi-tech industries.

While the regions of the new Member States have the lowest GDPs in the EU, 12 German and 8 Polish regions feature among the Top 30 EU regions where unemployment ran highest in 2005.

8 German, 6 Polish and 5 Bulgarian regions have the highest negative population growth rates.

Besides, per capita disposable incomes are lower in 2004 compared to 2000 in only 2 EU regions: Berlin (D) and Ionia Nisia (GR).

The differences in evidence in the rankings considered should provide the basis for a reflection both on the type of regions to consider for eligibility to interventions under a Community Cohesion Policy and on the types of measures to promote in particular with a view to overcoming the handicaps of the different regions.

This kind of reflection process needs to be encouraged since few regions perform well against the full range of indicators considered. Indeed, the region of Utrecht (NL) alone appears in four of the six rankings taken into account. However, it is likely that English regions including Berkshire, Buckinghamshire & Oxfordshire and Bedfordshire as well as Hertfordshire would be in the same favourable position if data for the innovation performance index was available at this geographical level in the UK.

Also worth remembering is that over roughly a decade, few regions have been able to generate or manage sizeable improvements against all six regional economic performance indicators. Indeed, it seems that with the exception of capital regions, a majority of EU regions are unable to top average national performances. Unfortunately in their case, comparatively more regions are at times exposed to episodes of declining growth or stagnation than are regularly outperforming the market. This is no doubt explained by a tendency among capital regions to "cannibalise" the benefits of growth.

Finally, Table 23 namely shows that the relative GDP differentials between the regions of individual countries are comparatively smaller than unemployment rate differentials. In only five countries is the reverse true (IRL, PL, S, RO, UK).

Table 16: Ranking according to importance of GDP

16.1 Top 25 in EU27

	REGIONS	2004 GDP	2004 Un-employ-ment	2000-2004 Change in population	Regional innovation performance
1.	Inner London (UK)	302.9	8.9	0.88	0.59
2.	Luxembourg (L)	251.0	5.1	0.97	0.48
3.	Brussels (B)	248.3	15.7	0.97	0.52
4.	Hamburg (D)	195.2	10.3	0.35	0.55
5.	Wien (A)	179.9	8.9	0.99	0.68
6.	Ile-de-France (F)	174.5	9.3	0.62	0.75
7.	Berks., Bucks., Oxfords. (UK)	173.8	3.7	0.07	na
8.	Oberbayern (D)	169.3	4.9	0.86	0.79
9.	Stockholm (S)	165.7	5.7	0.76	0.90
10.	Utrecht (NL)	157.7	3.7	1.12	0.66
11.	Darmstadt (D)	157.3	3.7	0.30	0.69
12.	Praha (CZ)	157.1	3.8	-0.28	0.70
13.	Southern & Eastern (IRL)	156.5	4.5	1.60	0.48
14.	Bremen (D)	155.8	14.3	0.00	0.53
15.	North Eastern Scotland (UK)	153.9	5.2	na	na
16.	Noord Holland (NL)	153.7	4.4	0.63	0.58
17.	Groningen (NL)	153.7	6.4	0.44	0.52
18.	Antwerpen (B)	144.5	6.0	0.40	na
19.	Gloucesters., Wilts., N. Somerset (UK)	143.5	3.3	0.14	na
20.	Salzburg (A)	141.8	3.7	0.51	0.41
21.	Lombardia (I)	141.5	4.0	0.92	0.49
22.	Stuttgart (D)	141.0	6.5	0.43	0.77
23.	Bolzano (I)	140.2	2.7	0.79	na
24.	Bedfords. & Herefords. (UK)	137.6	3.4	0.29	na
25.	Mittelfranken (D)	137.2	8.1	0.30	0.68

Source: Eurostat

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE REGIONS

GDP		Unemployment		Change in Population		Reg. Innovation Performance	
Rate	Nb Regions	Rate	Nb Regions	Rate	Nb Regions	Rate	Nb Regions
≤ 75	0	≤ 5	10	≤ 0	2	≤ 0.25	0
75.1 ≤ 100	0	5.1 ≤ 7.5	7	0.01 ≤ 0.25	2	0.26 ≤ 0.50	4
100.1 ≤ 125	0	7.6 ≤ 10.0	5	0.26 ≤ 0.50	7	0.51 ≤ 0.75	12
125.1 ≤ 150	8	10.1 ≤ 12.5	1	0.51 ≤ 0.75	3	> 0.76	3
> 151	17	> 12.6	2	> 0.76	10		
na	0	na	0	na	1	na	6
EU average = 100		EU average = 9		EU average +0.4		EU average 0.43*	
≤ 100	0	≤ 8.9	21	≤ 0.39	6	≤ 0.42	1
> 100	25	> 9.0	4	> 0.40	18	> 0.43	18

Countries represented in the ranking	
UK	5
L	1
B	2
D	5
A	3
NL	2
IRL	1
CZ	1
I	2
S	1

(*) Based on the rate of the 101st region out of the 203 for which data is available.

16.2 Bottom 25 in EU15

	REGIONS	2004 GDP	2004 un-employ-ment	2000-2004 Change in population	Regional innovation performance
1.	Dytiki Ellada (GR)	54.5	12.5	0.28	0.23
2.	Anatoliki Makedonia, Thraki (GR)	56.7	13.2	0.09	0.13
3.	Norte (P)	58.8	7.7	0.58	0.22
4.	Voreio Aigaio (GR)	60.6	9.3	-0.26	0.04
5.	Dytiki Makedonia (GR)	62.7	16.6	0.02	0.07
6.	Centro (P)	64.3	4.3	0.55	0.31
7.	Açores (P)	65.9	na	0.33	na
8.	Thessalia (GR)	66.3	9.8	-0.11	0.10
9.	Extremadura (E)	67.1	17.2	0.22	0.17
10.	Sicilia (I)	67.3	17.2	0.07	0.25
11.	Ipeiros (GR)	67.5	11.2	0.32	0.19
12.	Kentriki Makedonia (GR)	68.2	12.2	0.48	0.27
13.	Campania (I)	68.4	15.6	0.25	0.31
14.	Calabria (I)	68.5	14.3	0.19	0.20
15.	Peloponnisos (GR)	69.0	9.1	-0.01	0.10
16.	Puglia (I)	69.8	15.5	0.16	0.22
17.	Alentejo (P)	70.3	8.8	0.08	0.13
18.	Basilicata (I)	75.4	12.8	-0.16	0.29
19.	Dessau (D)	75.8	22.9	-1.60	0.29
20.	Brandenburg (D)	76.2	19.4*	-0.08	na
21.	Ionia Nisia (GR)	76.7	11.4	1.10	na
22.	Molise (I)	77.1	11.3	-0.05	0.27
23.	Algarve (P)	77.1	5.5	1.83	0.19
24.	Andalusia (E)	77.6	17.	1.16	0.26
25.	Castilla La Mancha (E)	79.1	9.5	1.44	0.17

Source: Eurostat

(*) 2005 data

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE REGIONS

GDP		Unemployment		Change in Population		Reg. Innovation Performance	
Rate	Nb Regions	Rate	Nb Regions	Rate	Nb Regions	Rate	Nb Regions
≤ 75	19	≤ 5	0	≤ 0	8	≤ 0.25	15
75.1 ≤ 100	6	5.1 ≤ 7.5	2	0.01 ≤ 0.25	7	0.26 ≤ 0.50	7
100.1 ≤ 125	0	7.6 ≤ 10.0	6	0.26 ≤ 0.50	4	0.51 ≤ 0.75	0
125.1 ≤ 150	0	10.1 ≤ 12.5	5	0.51 ≤ 0.75	2	> 0.76	0
> 151	0	> 12.6	11	> 0.76	4		
Na	0	na	1	na	0	na	3
EU average = 100		EU average = 9		EU average +0.4		EU average 0.43*	
≤ 100	25	≤ 8.9	20	≤ 0.39	18	≤ 0.42	22
> 100	0	> 9.0	4	> 0.40	7	> 0.43	0
Countries represented in the ranking							
GR	9						
I	6						
P	5						
E	3						
D	2						

(*) Based on the rate of the 101st region out of the 203 for which data is available.

16.3 Bottom 25 in EU27

	REGIONS	2004 GDP	2004 un-employ-ment	2000-2004 Change in population	Regional innovation performance
1.	Nord-Est (RO)	23.6	6.2	-0.05	na
2.	Severozapaden (BG)	25.6	7.6	-2.99	na
3.	Yuzhen-Tsentralen (BG)	25.6	na	-1.35	na
4.	Severen-Tsentralen (BG)	25.6	11.7	-1.21	na
5.	Sud-Muntenia (RO)	28.4	9.6	-0.45	na
6.	Sud-Est Oltenia (RO)	28.8	7.5	-0.47	na
7.	Severoiztochen (BG)	29.3	17.6	-0.99	na
8.	Yugoiztochen (BG)	29.9	13.4	-0.26	na
9.	Sud-Est (RO)	30.7	9.9	-0.24	na
10.	Nord-Vest (RO)	33.0	6.2	-0.24	na
11.	Centru (RO)	35.5	9.6	-0.16	na
12.	Vest (RO)	39.0	8.0	-0.26	na
13.	Eszak Alföld (H)	41.9	7.2	-0.29	0.26
14.	Východné Slovensko (SK)	42.3	24.2	+0.22	0.19
15.	Eszak Magyaroszág (H)	42.5	9.7	-0.52	0.25
16.	Dél Alföld (H)	44.2	6.3	-0.29	0,24
17.	Dél Dunántúl (H)	45.6	7.3	-0.45	0.26
18.	Stredené Slovensko (SK)	46.7	22.1	-0.04	0.27
19.	Yugozapaden (BG)	49.1	7.2	-0.29	0.26
20.	Západné Slovensko (SK)	52.7	14.2	-0.13	0.26
21.	Stredni Morava (CZ)	59.8	9.8	-0.24	0.31
22.	Severozápad (CZ)	60.7	6.7	-0.09	0.12
23.	Moravskoslezsko (CZ)	61.1	14.6	-0.38	0.24
24.	Közép Dunántúl (H)	61.1	5.6	-0.15	0.33
25.	Severovýchod (CZ)	63.7	6.7	-0.12	0.34

Source: Eurostat

Note: Bulgaria: Change in population = 2005 data

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE REGIONS

G D P		Unemployment		Change in Population		Reg. Innovation Performance	
Rate	Nb Regions	Rate	Nb Regions	Rate	Nb Regions	Rate	Nb Regions
≤ 75	25	≤ 5	0	≤ 0	24	≤ 0.25	5
75.1 ≤ 100	0	5.1 ≤ 7.5	9	0.01 ≤ 0.25	1	0.26 ≤ 0.50	7
100.1 ≤ 125	0	7.6 ≤ 10.0	8	0.26 ≤ 0.50	0	0.51 ≤ 0.75	0
125.1 ≤ 150	0	10.1 ≤ 12.5	1	0.51 ≤ 0.75	0	> 0.76	0
> 151	0	> 12.6	6	> 0.76	0		
Na		na	1	na	0	na	13
EU average = 100		EU average = 9		EU average +0.4		EU average 0.43*	
≤ 100	25	≤ 8.9	11	≤ 0.39	25	≤ 0.42	12
> 100	0	> 9.0	13	> 0.40	0	> 0.43	0
Countries represente in the ranking							
RO	8						
BG	6						
H	5						
CZ	3						
SK	3						

(*)   Based on the rate of the 101st region out of the 203 for which data is available.

Table 17: Ranking according to importance of the unemployment rate

17.1 Top 25 of regions with the lowest unemployment rate in EU27

	REGIONS	2004 GDP	2004 un-employ-ment	2000-2004 Change in population	Regional innovation performance
1.	Herefords., Worcesters. & Warks. (UK)	2.6	111.2	0.43	na
2.	Bolzano (I)	2.7	140.2	0.79	na
3.	North Yorskhire (UK)	2.9	112.5	0.41	na
4.	Salzburg (A)	3.2	141.8	0.51	0.41
5.	Valle d'Aosta (I)	3.2	128.2	0.67	0.26
6.	Cheshire (UK)	3.3	129.9	0.06	na
7.	Zeeland (NL)	3.3	118.8	0.43	0.36
8.	Cornwall (UK)	3.4	79.2	0.78	na
9.	Dorset & Somerset (UK)	3.5	99.5	0.38	na
10.	Berks., Bucks., Oxfords. (UK)	3.5	173.8	0.07	na
11.	Tirol (A)	3.5	131.4	0.72	0.47
12.	Praha (CZ)	3.5	157.1	-0.28	0.70
13.	Gloucesters., Wilts., N. Somerset (UK)	3.5	143.4	0.14	na
14.	Trento (I)	3.6	126.9	1.12	na
15.	Shrops. & Staffordshire (UK)	3.6	97.9	0.07	na
16.	Highlands & Islands (UK)	3.7	90.0	na	na
17.	Surrey, E & W Surrey (UK)	3.7	130.4	0.06	na
18.	Utrecht (NL)	3.7	157.7	1.12	0.66
19.	Emilia Romagna (I)	3.8	130.4	1.02	0.47
20.	Cumbria (UK)	3.8	95.3	-0.16	na
21.	Essex (UK)	3.8	104.3	0.27	na
22.	Devon (UK)	3.8	97.0	0.30	na
23.	Bedfords. & Herefords. (UK)	3.8	137.6	0.29	na
24.	Noord-Brabant (NL)	3.9	129.8	0.47	0.68
25.	Hampshire, Isle of Wight (UK)	3.9	118.3	0.26	na
26.	North Eastern Scotland (UK)	3.9	153.9	na	na

Source: Eurostat

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE REGIONS

G D P		Unemployment		Change in Population		Reg. Innovation Performance	
Rate	Nb Regions	Rate	Nb Regions	Rate	Nb Regions	Rate	Nb Regions
≤ 75	0	≤ 5	26	≤ 0	2	≤ 0.25	0
75.1 ≤ 100	6	5.1 ≤ 7.5	0	0.01 ≤ 0.25	5	0.26 ≤ 0.50	5
100.1 ≤ 125	5	7.6 ≤ 10.0	0	0.26 ≤ 0.50	9	0.51 ≤ 0.75	3
125.1 ≤ 150	15	10.1 ≤ 12.5	0	0.51 ≤ 0.75	3	> 0.76	0
> 151		> 12.6	0	> 0.76	5		
Na	0	na	0	na	2	na	18
EU average = 100		EU average = 9		EU average +0.4		EU average 0.43*	
≤ 100	6	≤ 8.9	26	≤ 0.39	11	≤ 0.42	3
> 100	20	> 9.0	0	> 0.40	13	> 0.43	5
Countries represented in the ranking							
UK	16						
I	4						
NL	2						
A	2						
CZ	1						

(*) Based on the rate of the 101st region out of the 203 for which data is available.

17.2 Bottom 25 regions with the highest unemployment rate in EU27

	REGIONS	2004 GDP	2004 un-employ-ment	2000-2004 Change in population	Regional innovation performance
1.	Východné Slovensko (SK)	24.2	42.3	+0.22	0.19
2.	Dolnoslaskie (PL)	22.8	51.7	-057	na
3.	Zachodniopomorskie (PL)	22.7	47.2	-0.44	naa
4.	Halle (D)	22.3	84.2	-1.19	0.42
5.	Mecklenburg-Vorpommern (D)	21.4	78.6	-0.79	0.37
6.	Dessau (D)	21.3	75.8	-1.60	0.29
7.	Leipzig	20.5	85.9	-038	0.57
8.	Warminsko-Mazurskie (PL)	20.4	39.4	-0.51	na
9.	Brandenburg Nordost (D)	19.9	76.2	-0.08	na
10.	Kujawsko-Pomorskie (PL)	19.8	45.4	-0.31	na
11.	Stredené Slovensko (SK)	19.6	46.7	-0.04	0.27
12.	Berlin (D)	19.4	101.2	+0.01	0.74
13.	Lubuskie (PL)	19.1	45.4	-0.28	0.27
14.	Slaskie (PL)	19.0	57.0	-0.69	0.29
15.	Swietokrzyskie (PL)	18.9	39.3	-0.52	na
16.	Magdeburg (D)	18.7	81.7	-1.01	0.35
17.	Dresden (D)	18.3	90.4	-0.67	0,69
18.	Dytiki Makedonia (GR)	18.0	62.7	0.02	0.07
19.	Chemnitz (D)	17.8	81.0	-1.07	0.46
20.	Lodzkie (PL)	17.3	46.7	-0.50	0.29
21.	Thüringen (D)	17.2	81.4	-0.78	0.53
22.	Brandenburg Südwest (D)	16.8	85.7	-0.16	na
23.	Bremen (D)	16.6	155.8	0.00	0.53
24.	Brussels (B)	16.3	248.3	0.97	0.52
25.	Extremadura (E)	15.8	67.1	0.22	0.17

Source: Eurostat

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE REGIONS

G D P		Unemployment		Change in Population		Reg. Innovation Performance	
Rate	Nb Regions	Rate	Nb Regions	Rate	Nb Regions	Rate	Nb Regions
≤ 75	10	≤ 5	0	≤ 0	19	≤ 0.25	3
75.1 ≤ 100	12	5.1 ≤ 7.5	0	0.01 ≤ 0.25	5	0.26 ≤ 0.50	8
100.1 ≤ 125	1	7.6 ≤ 10.0	0	0.26 ≤ 0.50	0	0.51 ≤ 0.75	6
125.1 ≤ 150	0	10.1 ≤ 12.5	0	0.51 ≤ 0.75	0	> 0.76	0
> 151	2	> 12.6	25	> 0.76	1		
Na		na		na		na	8
EU average = 100		EU average = 9		EU average +0.4		EU average 0.43*	
≤ 100	22	≤ 8.9	0	≤ 0.39	24	≤ 0.42	10
> 100	3	> 9.0	25	> 0.40	1	> 0.43	7
Countries represented in the ranking							
D	12						
PL	8						
SK	2						
B	1						
E	1						
GR	1						

(*)   Based on the rate of the 101st region out of the 203 for which data is available.

Table 18: Ranking according to the rate of change in population

18.1 Top 25 of EU27 regions with the highest population growth rate

	REGIONS	Change in population 2000-2004	2004 GDP	2004 un-employ-ment	Regional Innovation Performance
1.	Baleares (E)	3.10	114.3	9.1	0.16
2.	Flevoland (NL)	2.90	96.4	5.7	0.59
3.	Canarias (E)	2.60	92.8	11.9	0.23
4.	Murcia (E)	2.52	84.4	10.6	0.29
5.	Comunidad Valenciana (E)	2.41	93.9	10.4	0.36
6.	Madrid (E)	2.34	132.1	6.7	0.61
7.	Borders, Midlands, Western (IRL)	1.97	100.1	4.7	0.35
8.	La Rioja (E)	1.90	109.4	5.6	0.23
9.	Algarve (P)	1.83	77.1	5.5	0.19
10.	Cataluña (E)	1.76	120.5	9.7	0.47
11.	Southern & Eastern (IRL)	1.60	156.6	4.5	0.48
12.	Castilla La Mancha (E)	1.44	79.1	9.5	0.17
13.	Languedoc Roussillon (F)	1.44	87.7	11.5	0.44
14.	Navarra (E)	1.21	126.7	5.5	0.48
15.	Lincolnshire (UK)	1.15	93.5	4.6	na
16.	Midi-Pyrénées (F)	1.16	100.2	7.2	0.61
17.	Utrecht (NL)	1.12	157.7	3.7	0.66
18.	Trento (I)	1.12	126.9	3.2	na
19.	Ionia Nisia (GR)	1.10	76.7	11.4	na
20.	Emilia Romagna (I)	1.02	130.4	5.5	0.47
21.	Brussels (B)	0.97	248.3	15.7	0.52
22.	Corse (F)	0.97	87.2	14.3	0.26
23.	Veneto (I)	0.94	127.4	4.2	0.40
24.	Aquitaine (F)	0.93	102.1	8.3	0.44
25.	Lombardia (I)	0.92	141.5	4.1	0.49

Source: Eurostat

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE REGIONS

GDP		Unemployment		Change in Population		Reg. Innovation Performance	
Rate	Nb Regions	Rate	Nb Regions	Rate	Nb Regions	Rate	Nb Regions
≤ 75	0	≤ 5	7	≤ 0		≤ 0.25	5
75.1 ≤ 100	10	5.1 ≤ 7.5	7	0.01 ≤ 0.25		0.26 ≤ 0.50	12
100.1 ≤ 125	6	7.6 ≤ 10.0	4	0.26 ≤ 0.50		0.51 ≤ 0.75	5
125.1 ≤ 150	6	10.1 ≤ 12.5	5	0.51 ≤ 0.75		> 0.76	0
> 151	3	> 12.6	2	> 0.76	25		
Na	0	na	0	na		na	0
EU average = 100		EU average = 9		EU average +0.4		EU average 0.43*	
≤ 100	10	≤ 8.9	14	≤ 0.39	0	≤ 0.42	
> 100	15	> 9.0	11	> 0.40	25	> 0.43	
Countries represented in the ranking							
E	9						
F	4						
NL	3						
I	3						
IRL	2						
B	1						
GR	1						
P	1						
UK	1						

(*)   Based on the rate of the 101st region out of the 203 for which data is available.

18.2 Bottom 25 of EU27 regions with the highest decrease in population

	REGIONS	Change in population 2000-2004	2004 GDP	2004 un-employ-ment	Regional Innovation Performance
1.	Severozapaden (BG)	-2.99	25.6	na	na
2.	Dessau (D)	-1.60	75.8	22.9	0.29
3.	Yuzhen-Tsentralen (BG)	-1.35	25.6	10.5	na
4.	Severen-Tsentralen (BG)	-1.21	26.4	na	na
5.	Halle (D)	-1.19	84.2	23.4	0.42
6.	Yugoiztochen (BG)	-1.16	49.1	7.6	na
7.	Chemnitz (D)	-1.07	81.0	18.2	0.46
8.	Magdeburg (D)	-1.01	81.7	19.9	0.35
9.	Severoiztochen (BG)	-0.99	29.3	17.6	na
10.	Mecklenburg-Vorpommern (D)	-0.79	78.6	21.2	0.37
11.	Thüringen (D)	-0.78	81.4	15.3	0.53
12.	Merseyside (UK)	-0.72	87.3	5.4	na
13.	Slaskie (PL)	-0.69	57.0	19.3	0.29
14.	Opolskie (PL)	-0.68	43.6	17.8	Na
15.	Dresden (D)	-0.67	90.4	17.7	0.69
16.	Northumberland, Tyne & Wear (UK)	-0.65	103.4	5.8	na
17.	Dolnoslaskie (PL)	-0.57	51.7	24.8	na
18.	South Yorkshire (UK)	-0.57	94.9	4.8	na
19.	Itä-Suomi (FIN)	-0.56	85.3	12.5	0.49
20.	Swietokrzyskie (PL)	-0.52	39.3	20.6	na
21.	Bratislavskýa (SK)	-0.52	129.3	8.3	0.66
22.	Eszak Magyaroszág (H)	-0.52	42.5	9.7	0.25
23.	Warminsko-Mazurskie (PL)	-0.51	39.4	20.4	na
24.	Lodzkie (PL)	-0.50	46.7	17.3	0.29
25.	Greater Manchester (UK)	-0.48	116.1	4.8	na

Source: Eurostat

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE REGIONS

G D P		Unemployment		Change in Population		Reg. Innovation Performance	
Rate	Nb Regions	Rate	Nb Regions	Rate	Nb Regions	Rate	Nb Regions
≤ 75	12	≤ 5	2	≤ 0	25	≤ 0.25	0
75.1 ≤ 100	10	5.1 ≤ 7.5	2	0.01 ≤ 0.25	0	0.26 ≤ 0.50	9
100.1 ≤ 125	3	7.6 ≤ 10.0	3	0.26 ≤ 0.50	0	0.51 ≤ 0.75	3
125.1 ≤ 150	0	10.1 ≤ 12.5	2	0.51 ≤ 0.75	0	> 0.76	0
> 151	0	> 12.6	14	> 0.76	0		
Na	0	na	2	na	0	na	13
EU average = 100		EU average = 9		EU average +0.4		EU average 0.43*	
≤ 100	22	≤ 8.9	6	≤ 0.39	25	≤ 0.42	7
> 100	3	> 9.0	17	> 0.40	0	> 0.43	5
Countries represented in the ranking							
D	8						
PL	6						
BG	5						
UK	3						
FIN	1						
H	1						
SK	1						

(*)   Based on the rate of the 101st region out of the 203 for which data is available.

Table 19: Top 25 in EU27 according to the regional innovation performance index

	REGIONS	Regional Innovation Performance	2004 GDP	2004 un-employ-ment	2000-2004 change in population
1.	Stockholm (S)	0.90	165.7	5.7	0.76
2.	Västsverige (S)	0.88	114.1	6.1	0.49
3.	Oberbayern (D)	0.79	169.3	4.9	0.86
4.	Etelä-Suomi (FIN)	0.78	133.4	12.5	0.53
5.	Karlsruhe (D)	0.77	134.3	6.8	0.38
6.	Stuttgart (D)	0.77	141.0	6.5	0.43
7.	Braunschweig (D)	0.76	106.1	10.2	-0.13
8.	Sydsverige (S)	0.76	110.2	7.4	0.57
9.	Ile-de-France (F)	0.75	174.5	9.3	0.62
10.	Östra-Mellansverige (S)	0.74	101.7	6.8	0.32
11.	Berlin (D)	0.74	101.2	18.4	0.11
12.	South East (UK)	0.72	132.9	3.7	na
13.	Tübingen (D)	0.72	120.2	6.0	0.50
14.	Manner-Suomi (FIN)	0.71	115.3	8.8	na
15.	Praha (CZ)	0.70	157.1	3.8	-0.28
16.	Darmstadt (D)	0.69	157.3	3.7	0.30
17.	Eastern (UK)	0.69	118.0	3.6	na
18.	Mittelfranken (D)	0.69	137.2	8.1	0.30
19.	Wien (A)	0.69	179.7	8.9	0.99
20.	Dresden (D)	0.69	90.4	17.7	-0.67
21.	Köln (D)	0.69	120.1	8.1	0.47
22.	Noord-Brabant (NL)	0.68	129.8	4.2	0.47
23.	Pohjois-Suomi (FIN)	0.68	101.6	11.1	0.11
24.	Utrecht (NL)	0.66	157.7	3.7	1.12
25.	Bratislavskýa (SK)	0.66	129.3	5.3	-0.52
26.	Länsi-Suomi (FIN)	0.66	102.0	8.0	0.20

Source: Eurostat

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE REGIONS

GDP		Unemployment		Change in Population		Reg. Innovation Performance	
Rate	Nb Regions	Rate	Nb Regions	Rate	Nb Regions	Rate	Nb Regions
≤ 75	0	≤ 5	6	≤ 0	4	≤ 0.25	0
75.1 ≤ 100	1	5.1 ≤ 7.5	8	0.01 ≤ 0.25	3	0.26 ≤ 0.50	0
100.1 ≤ 125	11	7.6 ≤ 10.0	7	0.26 ≤ 0.50	9	0.51 ≤ 0.75	18
125.1 ≤ 150	7	10.1 ≤ 12.5	3	0.51 ≤ 0.75	3	> 0.76	8
> 151	7	> 12.6	2	> 0.76	4		
Na	0	na	0	na	3	na	0
EU average = 100		EU average = 9		EU average +0.4		EU average 0.43*	
≤ 100	1	≤ 8.9	20	≤ 0.39	10	≤ 0.42	0
> 100	25	> 9.0	26	> 0.40	13	> 0.43	26
Countries represented in the ranking							
D	10						
FIN	4						
S	4						
NL	2						
UK	2						
A	1						
CZ	1						
F	1						
SK	1						

(*)   Based on the rate of the 101st region out of the 203 for which data is available.

Table 20: Top 30 of regions with the highest available income per inhabitant

	REGIONS	Available revenue 2004	GDP 2004	2004 un-employ-ment	2000-2004 change in population	Regional Innovation Performance
1.	Inner London (UK)	€23,383	302.9	8.9	0.88	0.59
2.	Hamburg (D)	€23,081	195.2	10.3	0.35	0.55
3.	Surrey, E & W Surrey (UK)	€21,224	130.4	3.3	0.06	na
4.	Ile-de-France (F)	€20,912	174.5	9.3	0.62	0.75
5.	Berks., Bucks., Oxfords. (UK)	€20,892	173.8	3.7	0.07	na
6.	Oberbayern (D)	€20,391	169.3	4.9	0.86	0.79
7.	Bedfords. & Herefords. (UK)	€20,321	137.6	3.4	0.29	na
8.	Outer London (UK)	€20,175	113.9	5.5	0.35	na
9.	Stuttgart (D)	€19,913	141.0	6.5	0.43	0.77
10.	Essex (UK)	€19,570	104.3	3.8	0.27	na
11.	Bremen (D)	€19,517	155.8	14.3	0.00	0.53
12.	Darmstadt (D)	€19,220	157.3	3.7	0.30	0.69
13.	Tübingen (D)	€19,074	120.2	6.0	0.50	0.72
14.	Detmold (D)	€19,036	109.1	9.2	0.23	0.43
15.	Karlsruhe (D)	€19,012	134.3	6.8	0.38	0.77
16.	Wien (A)	€18,964	179.9	8.9	0.99	0.68
17.	Düsseldorf (D)	€18,830	129.2	9.7	-0.10	0.49
19.	Vlaams-Brabant (B)	€18,780	130.1	5.0	0.45	na
19.	Mittelfranken (D)	€18,731	137.2	8.1	0.30	0.68
20.	Kent (UK)	€18,687	99.2	4.5	0.24	na
21.	Cheshire (UK)	€18,630	129.9	3.1	0.06	na
22.	Freiburg	€18,415	114.6	6.1	0.56	0.63
23.	Hampshire, Isle of Wight (UK)	€18,408	118.3	3.3	0.26	na
24.	Gloucesters., Wilts., N. Somerset (UK)	€18,396	143.5	3.3	0.14	na
25.	Köln (D)	€18,378	120.1	8.1	0.47	0.69
26.	North Yorskhire (UK)	€18,340	112.5	2.6	0.41	na
27.	Herefords., Worcesters. & Warks. (UK)	€18,236	111.2	3.2	0.43	na
28.	Stockholm (S)	€18,148	165.7	5.7	0.76	0.90
29.	Niederösterreich (A)	€18,109	104.4	4.2	0.45	0.37
30.	Dorset & Somerset (UK)	€18,103	99.5	3.5	0.38	na

Source: Eurostat

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE REGIONS

G D P		Unemployment		Change in Population		Reg. Innovation Performance	
Rate	Nb Regions	Rate	Nb Regions	Rate	Nb Regions	Rate	Nb Regions
≤ 75	0	≤ 5	14	≤ 0	1	≤ 0.25	0
75.1 ≤ 100	2	5.1 ≤ 7.5	6	0.01 ≤ 0.25	6	0.26 ≤ 0.50	3
100.1 ≤ 125	12	7.6 ≤ 10.0	8	0.26 ≤ 0.50	17	0.51 ≤ 0.75	10
125.1 ≤ 150	7	10.1 ≤ 12.5	1	0.51 ≤ 0.75	2	> 0.76	4
> 151	9	> 12.6	1	> 0.76	4		
Na	0	na	0	na	0	na	13
EU average = 100		EU average = 9		EU average +0.4		EU average 0.43*	
≤ 100	2	≤ 8.9	25	≤ 0.39	12	≤ 0.42	1
> 100	28	> 9.0	5	> 0.40	18	> 0.43	16
Countries represented in the ranking							
UK	13						
D	12						
A	2						
B	1						
F	1						
S	1						

(*)   Based on the rate of the 101st region out of the 203 for which data is available.

Table 21: Ranking of the regions with the highest increase of the available income between 1995 and 2004

	REGIONS	↗ Available income 1995-2004	2004 GDP4	2004 un-Employ-ment	2000-2004 change in population	Regional Innovation Performance
1.	Inner London (UK)	€10,917	302.9	8.9	0.88	0.59
2.	Southern & Eastern (IRL)	€10,320	156.6	4.5	1.60	0.48
3.	Surrey, E & W Surrey (UK)	€9,793	130.4	3.3	0.06	na
4.	Berks., Bucks., Oxfords. (UK)	€9,625	173.8	3.7	0.07	na
5.	Attiki (GR)	€9,116	112.7	9.1	0.49	0.46
6.	Essex (UK)	€9,093	104.3	3.8	0.27	na
7.	Borders, Midlands, Western (IRL)	€8,884	100.1	4.7	1.97	0.35
8.	Cheshire (UK)	€8,829	129.9	3.1	0.06	na
9.	Bedfords. & Herefords. (UK)	€8,809	137.6	3.4	0.29	na
10.	Kent (UK)	€8,691	99.2	4.5	0.24	na
11.	Hampshire, Isle of Wight (UK)	€8,143	118.3	3.3	0.26	na
12.	Dorset & Somerset (UK)	€8,093	99.5	3.5	0.38	na
*						
40.	Pais Vasco	€5,986	125.4	9.7	0.32	0.55
41.	Navarra (E)	€5,804	126.7	5.5	1.21	0.48
42.	Ile-de-France (F)	€5,632	174.5	9.3	0.62	0.75
43.	Kentriki Makedonia (GR)	€5,385	68.2	12.2	0.48	0.27
44.	Åland (FIN)	€5,369	146.3	na	0.63	0.30
45.	Madrid (E)	€5,336	132.1	6.7	2.34	0.61
46.	Etelä-Suomi (FIN)	€4,492	133.4	7.3	0.53	0.78
47.	Stockholm (S)	€4,760	165.7	5.7	0.76	0.90
48.	Cataluña (E)	€4,868	120.5	9.7	1.76	0.47
49.	Liguria (I)	€4,826	109.7	5.7	0.06	0.44
50.	Anatoliki Makedonia, Thraki (GR)	€4,808	56.7	13.2	0.09	0.13
51.	Aragon (E)	€4,746	107.4	5.6	0.78	0.45
52.	Cantabria (E)	€4,741	98.1	10.5	0.74	0.27
53.	Hamburg (D)	€4,679	195.2	10.3	0.35	0.55
54.	La Rioja (E)	€4,665	109.4	5.6	1.90	0.23
55.	Friuli Venezia Giulia (I)	€4,612	117.4	3.9	0.45	0.44
56.	Franche-Comté (F)	€4,553	97.7	8.2	0.39	0.51
57.	Asturias (E)	€4,548	87.0	10.4	-0.08	0.27
58.	Alsace (F)	€4,475	107.8	7.6	0.70	0.55
59.	Centre (F)	€4,451	100.9	7.4	0.34	0.46
60.	Castilla y León (E)	€4,440	94.9	10.7	0.04	0.35

Source: Eurostat –EURADA calculation

(*) The 27 British regions (UK) are classified from the 13th to the 39th rank.

It should be noted that only two regions saw their available income per inhabitant decrease. These are Berlin (D) [-138 €] and Ionia Nisia (GR) [-556 €].

Table 22: Top 20 of regional employment in high technology sectors (2006)

22.1 Top 20 in terms of absolute employment

	REGIONS	% total employment EU27
1.	Ile de France (F)	4.32%
2.	Lombardia (I)	2.52%
3.	Madrid (E)	2.08%
4.	Oberbayern (D)	1.82%
5.	Düsseldorf (D)	1.53%
6.	Danemark	1.50%
7.	Darmstadt (D)	1.49%
8.	Lazio (I)	1.47%
9.	Berks., Bucks., Oxfords. (UK)	1.42%
10.	Outer London (UK)	1.39%
11.	Cataluña (E)	1.30%
12.	Mazowieckie (PL)	1.26%
13.	Rhône-Alpes (F)	1.26%
14.	Köln (D)	1.16%
15.	Karlsruhe (D)	1.15%
16.	Stuttgart (D)	1.14%
17.	Kozep-Magyarorszag (H)	1.12%
18.	Southern & Eastern (IRL)	1.11%
19.	Etelä-Suomi (FIN)	1.10%
20.	Piemonte (I)	1.06%

Source: Eurostat

22.2 Top 20 in terms of relative employment

	REGIONS	% total employment
1.	Berks., Bucks., Oxfords. (UK)	11.4%
2.	Stockholm (S)	9.3%
3.	Ile de France (F)	8.6%
4.	Karlsruhe (D)	8.3%
5.	Kozep-Magyarorszag (H)	8.3%
6.	Freiburg (D)	8.2%
7.	Oberbayern (D)	7.9%
8.	Etelä-Suomi (FIN)	7.9%
9.	Darmstadt (D)	7.7%
10.	Oslo og Akershus (N)	7.7%
11.	Hampshire & Isle of Wight (UK)	7.6%
12.	Surrey, East & West Sussex (UK)	7.4%
13.	Oberpfalz (D)	7.4%
14.	Espace Mittelland (CH)	7.4%
15.	Bedfordshire & Hertfordshire (UK)	7.3%
16.	Zürich (CH)	7.3%
17.	Vlaams-Brabant (B)	7.2%
18.	Praha (CZ)	7.1%
19.	Pohjois-Suomi (FIN)	7.1%
20.	East Anglia (UK)	6.9%

Source: Eurostat

Table 23: Interregional disparities in the EU Member States

	2004 GDP				2005 unemployment				Change in population		Reg. Innovation performance		2004 Available income		
	Average	Max.	Min.	Δ Max Min	Average	Max.	Min.	Δ Max Min	Max.	Min.	Max.	Min.	Max.	Min.	Δ Max Min
A	128.7	179.7	89.8	2.0	5.2	9.1	3.2	2.8	0.72	-0.03	0.68	0.29	18 964	16 586	1.14
B	124.4	248.3	81.6	3.0	8.4	16.3	4.4	3.7	0.97	+0.11	0.61	0.49	18 780	12 319	1.41
BG	33.2	49.1	25.6	1.9	10.1				-2.99	-0.26	na	na	na	na	na
CY	[91.4]	-	-	-	[5.3]	-	-	-	1.64	-	[0.32]	-	na	na	na
CZ	75.2	157.1	59.8	2.6	7.9	13.9	3.5	3.9	0.58	-0.38	0.70	0.12	5 786	3 777	1.53
D	115.8	195.2	75.8	2.6	11.2	22.3	5.8	3.8	0.86	-1.60	0.79	0.32	23 081	13 950	1.65
DK	[124.5]	-	-	-	[4.8]	-	-	-	[0.30]	-	[0.68]	-	[16 491]	-	-
E	100.7	132.1	67.1	1.9	9.2	15.8	5.6	2.8	[3.10]	-0.08	0.61	0.16	14 986	8 896	1.68
EE	[55.7]	-	-	-	[7.9]	-	-	-	-0.37	-	[0.38]	-	[3 475]	-	-
F	112.3	174.5	87.2	2.0	9.5	13.2	6.4	2.1	1.44	-0.10	0.75	0.26	20 912	14 104	1.68
FIN	115.5	133.4	85.3	1.6	8.4	11.6	6.9	1.7	0.53	-0.56	0.78	0.49	15 539	13 013	1.19
GR	84.8	112.7	54.5	2.1	9.8	18.0	7.1	2.5	1.10	-0.26	0.46	0.01	17 918	6 197	2.74
H	64.0	66.8	41.9	1.6	7.2	10.6	5.1	2.1	-0.04	-0.45	0.60	0.24	6 749	3 394	1.98
I	107.4	141.5	67.3	2.1	7.7	16.2	2.7	6.0	1.12	-0.19	0.57	0.20	17 917	10 348	1.73
IRL	141.4	156.5	100.1	1.6	4.3	4.4	4.3	1.0	1.97	1.60	0.48	na	17 535	16 099	1.08
L	[251.0]	-	-	-	[4.5]	-	-	-	[0.97]	-	[0.48]	-	na	na	na
LT	[51.1]	-	-	-	[8.3]	-	-	-	[-0.50]	-	[0.33]	-	[2 868]	-	-
LV	[45.5]	-	-	-	[8.9]	-	-	-	[-0.64]	-	[0.31]	-	[3 288]	-	-
MT	[74.4	-	-	-	[7.0]	-	-	-	[1.15]	-	[0.32]	-	na	na	na
NL	130.0	157.7	96.4	1.6	4.7	6.6	3.3	2.0	2.90	-0.08	0.68	0.35	15 504	12783	1.21
P	74.8	105.8	58.8	1.8	7.6	9.1	4.5	2.0	1.83	-0.08	0.42	0.13	10 951*	7 237*	1.51
PL	50.7	76.8	35.2	2.2	17.7	22.8	14.3	1.6	0.71	-0.68	0.51	0.21	4 448	2 690	1.65
S	120.3	165.7	101.7	1.6	7.5	8.7	5.9	1.5	0.76	-0.45	0.90	0.50	18 148	14 194	1.27
SK	56.7	129.3	42.3	3.1	16.3	23.1	5.3	4.4	0.22	-0.52	0.66	0.19	5 634	3 034	1.85
SLO	[83.3]	-	-	-	[6.5]	[6.5]	-	-	[0.10]	-	[0.52]	-	na	na	na
RO	34.0	64.5	23.6	2.7	7.2	9.2	5.7	1.6	0.04	-0.47	na	na	2 501	1 436	1.74
UK	123.0	302.9	79.2	3.8	4.7	7.8	2.6	3.0	1.15	-0.72	0.72	0.41	23 383	15 075	1.55
EU27	100.0	302.9	23.6	12.8	9.0	22.8	2.6	8.8			0.90	0.01	23 282	1 436	16.3

[ ]   National data only
(*)   2003 figures