

Moving towards a more result/performance-based delivery system in Cohesion Policy

A regional point of view on
regulation changes, impacts and
consequences imposed by a
performance-based delivery system.

Bruxelles, May 26th, 2011

Public Hearing

Committee on Regional Development - European Parliament

Index

1. **The Cohesion Policy future:** the European Commission, the debate within the European system
2. A result/performance-based delivery system for Cohesion Policy: **Key measures**
3. A result/performance-based delivery system for Cohesion Policy: **a regional approach**
4. Shifting towards a more performance-based delivery system in Cohesion Policy: **Pro and cons**
5. **Conclusions and recommendations**

1. Cohesion Policy

- Cohesion Policy: (artt. 174 – 178 TFEU): reduction of regional disparities, overall harmonious development
- TEU art. 3 put **territorial cohesion** beside economic and social cohesion (territorial dimension of Cohesion Policy)
- Complexity of Cohesion Policy
- Complexity of the context: a new financial multiannual framework, new programming period for structural Funds, Europe 2020 strategy, European semester and the new European economic governance system, MLG, new Cohesion Policy and the EU budget

1. The Commission proposal

- *Fifth Report on economic, social and territorial cohesion*
- **Communication** of the Commission to the European Parliament, the European Council, the European Economic and Social Committee, the Committee of the Regions and to the European Central Bank "*Conclusions of the Fifth Report on economic, social and territorial cohesion: the future of the Cohesion Policy*" **COM (2010) 642/3**
- **Public consultation**
- *Fifth Forum on cohesion* held in Brussels on 31th January - 1st February
- **Communication** of the Commission "*Beyond GDP*" **COM / (2009) 433 def**

1. The debate

- The Commission must take account of the results coming from the debate, the other EU institutions position, and the Academics contributions:
 - European Parliament
 - Committee of the Regions
 - Ministers of Cohesion Policy/EU Council
 - Stakeholders
 - Multi-level institutions
 - Academics (Barca Report, Fitoussi-Sen-Stiglitz Report)
- At stake: new programming period efficiency/effectivity

2. The Fifth Report on cohesion

After Commission charged Mr. Barca to draft a report on Cohesion, in order to give CP a solid theoretical background, Fifth Report try to evaluate the current programming period, in order to decide whether Cohesion Policy has to be maintained and fostered after 2013

Fifth Report on cohesion, Executive Summary:
“Cohesion Policy should cultivate a focus on achievements.”

2. La Comunicazione della Commissione

European Commission Communication
COM (2010) 642/3:

“Further reforms of cohesion policy, while preserving its overall objective, should therefore *aim to steer the policy decisively towards results* and enact the reforms needed in order to achieve results, while cutting red-tape and simplifying the daily management of the policy.”

2. The Barca Report

Policy concept: a place-based development approach

Objectives:

- 1.Reduction of the persistent inefficiency**
- 2.Reduction of the persistent social exclusion**

Current evaluation on CP is very unsatisfactory

Lessons learned:

- **CP is the appropriate background** to build the place-based policy which EU deserves
- Cohesion Policy must face **significant changes**

“... Le politiche place-based sono rischiose, ma la dimensione spaziale dell'intervento pubblico è trasparente, verificabile, e assoggettabile a giudizio da parte della popolazione” (Barca Report, Overview)

2. The Barca Report

- Unsatisfactory quality in evaluation and monitoring system doesn't allow institutions to take the appropriate decisions
- Technical answer: **theory of change**
- **Output vs outcomes, multidimensionality** and quality of evaluation
- Design of policy and choice of targets, baselines and indicators ad hoc: **to manage the entire policy cycle and to be fully responsible**

3. A regional approach to a new performance/result-based system

Expected changes in the system:

- ownership and more **responsibility** for the institutions charged of decisions at all government tiers involved and in all phases
- a stronger **link between policy decision and evaluation/monitoring** processes to grant real **efficiency and accountability**
- **multidimensionality**
- **adequate territorial scale** to be taken into account in all programming and delivering phases

3. A regional approach: expected changes in the delivery system of CP

- A new **strategic framework**
- **Concentration** of resources **and integration of SF**
- **Partnership contracts** with indicators/targets and Regions and MSs commitment
- **Annual Reports on cohesion** to be presented **by regions and MS** in the Europe 2020 **NRP**
- **Adequate and qualified monitoring and evaluation system**
- **Simplification**
- **Rejection of re-nationalization**

3. A regional approach: feasibility and utility of a new performance/result-based system

The proposed renewal of the PC toward a new delivery system, more oriented to results and quality of performances, is:

- feasible
- useful
- and, to the regional level, **necessary**

CP is needed only if really efficient/effective; otherwise, regions cannot get any benefice from it.

4. A new performance/result-based system: pros and cons

- The main effort to be made in terms of re-organization, rationalization, integration
- This common effort is expected to be balanced by a very high quality of the Cohesion Policy effects
- Institutions of all government tiers already have administrative capacity to manage this transition
- ***To work in a better way as a key to get more efficient***
- Political commitment and awareness

5. Conclusions

- We need Cohesion Policy only if it can provide concrete **outcomes to support regions towards sustainable and harmonious development**
- Current evaluation system is not useful to enable us to take appropriate decisions
- **Cohesion Policy needs ownership** and accountability at an appropriate territorial scale
- A **performance/result-based system can** bring the requested changes in the system
- We also need that the **territorial dimension** be taken into account in all phases of CP

5. Conclusions

- Needed **a common, coordinated effort** to shift to the new approach in an integrated way
- Institutions from all tiers of government already have inside adequate structures and **administrative capacity** to tackle this transition
- In particular, Regions are eager to shift to this new approach to be really effective in Cohesion Policy delivery

Recommendations

- ☐ Monitoring and evaluation as key tools of the new approach
- ☐ Territorial dimension
- ☐ Subsidiarity vs strategic ownership have to be dynamically balanced



Thank you for your attention

Elena Tagliani

Unit Forward Studies and Horizontal Policies

DG Territorial Planning and European Relationships

Emilia-Romagna Region

etagliani@regione.emilia-romagna.it

