

May 2013

EPRC POLICY BRIEFING

Commission perspectives on the 2014-2020 Partnership Agreements & Programmes: A comparative review of the Position Papers

The post-2013 reform of EU Cohesion policy is at a critical juncture. Following the agreement by the Heads of State on the 2014-2020 EU Budget in February 2013, the inter-institutional negotiations between the Council of Ministers and the European Parliament on Cohesion policy funding and on the regulatory package are currently underway. In parallel, the strategic planning for the next round of Structural and Cohesion Funds programmes is well-advanced in many Member States.

This EPRC Policy Briefingⁱ reviews the Commission's emerging position on the new Partnership Agreements and Operational Programmes, based on a comparative analysis of the Commission's Position Papers for all Member States.

This Policy Briefing is a summary of a more extensive review of the Position Papers, published in the EPRC European Policy Research Paper series (No.84), and is available here: http://www.eprc.strath.ac.uk/eprc/documents/PDF_files/EPRP_84.pdf

Further detail on the preparations and progress made by the Member States has been reviewed in other EPRC reports prepared under the IQ-Net programme of research and knowledge exchange.ⁱⁱ

The European Commission's Position Papers

The purpose of the Commission's Position Papers is to provide a framework for dialogue on the new Partnership Agreements and Operational Programmes before the formal negotiations. The Commission launched its internal preparations in 2011 through inter-service discussions structured around five thematic task forces linked to EU2020 themes: "Smart Growth" (RTDI, ICT, SMEs) led by DG REGIO and DG EMPL (with DGs RTD, ENTR, EAC, CNECT); "Sustainable Growth" led by DG REGIO (with DGs ENV, CLIMA, ENER); "Transport" led by DG REGIO (plus DGs MOVE, CLIMA, ENV); "Employment/Social Inclusion" and "Education", both led by DG EMPL. The task forces were

set up to develop the Commission's negotiation mandate for each country, including guidance on best practices for tackling country challenges, an assessment of the fulfilment of ex-ante conditionalities and to support horizontal consistency across Member States in the selection of thematic objectives. The work was coordinated with the Commission's Europe 2020 country teams to ensure coherence with Council recommendations formulated in the context of the European semester process. Following the finalisation of the country Position Papers, they were sent to the Member States and discussed in bilateral meetings towards the end of 2012.

Key challenges

The Position Papers begin with an assessment of the main challenges faced by each country. This includes a review of the national macro-economic context and fiscal developments. The main regional disparities in GDP and/or labour market indicators are briefly identified, though not in all cases. Progress against Europe 2020 headline targets for each Member State are illustrated in a table, followed by an assessment of key challenges in the domains of: (i) research & innovation (R&I) and competitiveness; (ii) the labour market and education; (iii) energy and natural resources; and, for the less-developed Member States, (iv) infrastructure; and (v) public administration capacity.

While the focus is primarily on national challenges, there is recognition of the territorial dimension of some of the thematic challenges in some of the papers, notably: the problems faced by remote and scarcely populated areas; agricultural/rural areas challenges, including low productivity and untapped innovation / economic potential; urban-rural differences; biodiversity challenges in particular territorial sites; the regional/sub-regional impact of climate change and demographic change; uneven performance in R&I across regions; regional differences in broadband coverage; employment, education variations across regions; and the local dimension of poverty.

Priorities for funding

In line with these challenges, the main priorities for funding are:

1. Innovative and competitive business and research environment
2. Enhancing labour market participation and education outcomes
3. Promoting energy efficiency, renewable energies and protecting natural resources
4. Sustainable and modern transport and network infrastructure
5. Supporting the quality, effectiveness and efficiency of public administration

A subset of the first 3 priorities is identified for most of the EU15 countries with mainly RCE regions/funding, while a broader range of priorities is suggested for countries with higher shares of Convergence regions/funding, usually extending to the last two priorities on transport/network infrastructure and public administration modernisation. The number of priorities identified across countries ranges from 3 to 5:

- 3 priorities (AT, CY, DE, DK, FI, IE, MT, NL, PT, SE, SI, UK). In the case of Portugal, the energy efficiency and natural resources priority contains the priority for transport and network infrastructure too, which is a separate priority in some other cases (e.g. ES).
- 4 priorities (EE, ES, FR, HR, HU, IT, LT, LV, PL). For France there is a fourth priority specifically for the outermost regions.
- 5 priorities in the remaining countries (BG, CZ, GR, RO, SK)

Business competitiveness and innovation is listed as the first funding priority for the majority of countries. Other priorities at the top of the list in several countries are supporting labour market participation (BG, ES, IE, RO, SI and UK) and infrastructure development (PL). However, in all Position Papers the Commission notes that “there is no ranking in the presentation of the priorities”. In the case of Greece, an additional clause to this standard sentence calls for “major efforts” focused on the modernisation of the public administration. In several countries, the modernisation of public administration (GR, IT, RO, SK) – including of the judiciary (BG, RO) – is identified as a distinct funding priority, although in a range of other countries it takes the form of a thematic objective *within* a funding priority (CZ, FR, HU, HR, LT, LV, PL, PT, SI, SK) (see below).

Thematic objectives

The funding priorities are broken down into thematic objectives, sub-priorities and specific objectives in an Annex to each Position Paper. The thematic objectives correspond to those identified in the Regulations and are listed for each Member State. The number of objectives ranges from 7 to all eleven. Reflecting the goal of concentration and the more limited eligibility menu for more developed regions, the lowest number of thematic objectives can be found in the EU15:

- 7 objectives (AT, DK, NL, UK), in all cases excluding ICT, low-carbon economy, transport/network infrastructure and institutional capacity.

At the other end of the spectrum, thirteen Member States are expected to invest in all:

- 11 objectives (BG, CZ, EE, GR, HR, HU, IT, LT, LV, PL, PT, RO, SK).

For the remaining Member States, the range is between 8 and 10 objectives.

- 8 objectives (FI, IE, SE), in all cases excluding institutional capacity, transport/networks and ICT.
- 9 objectives (DE, LU), excluding institutional capacity and transport in both cases;
- 10 objectives (BE, CY, ES, FR, MT, SL), excluding the institutional capacity objective in most countries, with the exceptions of FR (excluding transport infrastructure) and SI (excluding ICT);

Put another way, all Member States are expected to invest in R&I (T01), SME competitiveness (T02), low-carbon economy (T04), protecting the environment and resource efficiency (T06), employment and labour mobility (T08) and social inclusion and combating poverty (T09). By contrast, around half

of the EU28 are not expected to invest in the institutional capacity objective (T011), while a third of are not expected to invest in the ICT (T03) or transport infrastructure (T06) objectives.

Country-specific recommendations for 2012

Within the framework of the European semester, another tool for aligning Cohesion policy with the Europe 2020 strategy are the annual country-specific recommendations (CSRs), which should provide a strategic reference point for the programming of the Partnership Agreement and Operational Programmes. The Commission's country papers list the relevant CSRs for 2012 under the corresponding thematic objectives.

The largest number of recommendations relate to thematic objectives that are mainly funded by the ESF: employment and labour mobility (TO8); education, skills and lifelong learning (T10); social inclusion and combating poverty (TO9); and institutional capacity (T11). A significant number of recommendations are also identified under the R&I (TO1) and low-carbon economy (TO4) objectives, where the ERDF plays a stronger role. By contrast, there are no country-specific recommendations for any Member State relating to climate change adaptation, risk prevention and management (T05) and only 1-2 Member States have CSRs relating to the ICT (TO3) and Environmental protection and resources efficiency (TO6) objectives.

Ex-ante conditionalities

Ex-ante conditionality requirements aim to ensure that an appropriate policy, legal and administrative framework underpins the investments made by the ESI Funds thereby contributing to their effectiveness. The conditionalities and key criteria are defined in an Annex to the draft General Regulation, all of which need to be fulfilled by the approval of the Partnership Agreements or a deadline agreed with the Commission (31 December 2016 at the latest). Based on current experiences, the Commission Services have identified a range of 'critical' conditionalities for the Member States in their respective Position Papers, mainly relating to strategic policy frameworks, the implementation of EU acquis and legislation.

Added value

All of the Position Papers include general statements about the importance of increasing the added value of expenditure, particularly to contribute to Europe 2020 objectives. The need for more innovative approaches and concentration to achieve critical mass is frequently highlighted. Additionally, greater use of financial instruments is encouraged to provide more flexible and sustainable forms of financing, attract private sector investment and improving access to financing for beneficiaries. Certain types of infrastructure expenditure are considered to be of questionable added value in some countries, mainly in the domains of: ICT; environment and transport; sport, culture and tourism; social, health and education.

Table 1: Thematic objectives

Thematic objective	AT	BE	BG	CZ	CY	DE	DK	EE	ES	FI	FR	GR	HR	HU	IE	IT	LT	LU	LV	MT	NL	PL	PT	RO	SI	SE	SK	UK	EU28
1. RTDI	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	28
2. ICT		x	x	x	x	x		x	x		x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x			x		20
3. SME Competitiveness	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	28
4. Low-carbon economy	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	28
5. Climate change & risk prevention		x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		24
6. Enviro., protection & resource efficiency	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	28
7. Sustainable transport & networks		x	x	x	x			x	x			x	x	x		x	x		x	x		x	x	x	x		x		18
8. Employment and labour mobility	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	28
9. Social inclusion and poverty	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	28
10. Education, skills and lifelong learning	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	27
11. Institutional capacity			x	x				x			x	x	x	x		x	x		x			x	x	x	x		x		15
Total Number	7	10	11	11	10	9	7	11	10	8	10	11	11	11	8	11	11	9	11	10	7	11	11	11	10	8	11	7	-

Table 2: Country-specific recommendations for 2012

Thematic objective	AT	BE	BG	CZ	CY	DE	DK	EE	ES	FI	FR	GR	HR	HU	IE	IT	LT	LU	LV	MT	NL	PL	PT	RO	SI	SE	SK	UK	EU28	
1. RTDI		x	X		x	x		x	x	x		x		x		x			x		x	x				x	x		15	
2. ICT		x						x																					2	
3. SME Competitiveness					x		x	x	x	x									x	x						x	x	x	x	11
4. Low-carbon economy		x	X		x	x		x	x				x				x	x	x	x		x		x			x		14	
5. Climate change & risk prevention																													0	
6. Enviro. protection & resource efficiency		x																											1	
7. Sustainable transport & networks		x	x					x					x	x		x			x	x		x		x					10	
8. Employment & labour mobility	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x	x	x	25
9. Social inclusion and poverty	x		x		x	x		x	x					x	x	x	x		x		x	x			x		x	x	x	16
10. Education, skills & lifelong learning	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x			x		x	x	x	x			x				x			x	19
11. Institutional capacity			x	x				x			x	x	x	x		x	x		x			x	x		x	x		x		16
Total number	3	7	7	3	6	5	3	9	6	4	3	2	3	6	2	6	5	4	8	4	3	7	1	5	4	4	6	4	-	

Programme architecture

The Commission underlines that the balance of programme funding, the number of programmes and the most suitable architecture will be developed by the Member States in partnership with stakeholders and with the Commission. The Member States are invited to explore the options available under the new regulations. In some cases, a thorough analysis of existing managing structures is called for to inform the programme architecture (CZ, SE, SK) or the balance of funding between the national and regional level (PL). Recommendations on the overall number of programmes have been made to Spain and Portugal, where the Commission has asked for a reduction. A key issue to consider for a number of Member States is the split between national and regional programmes.

Coordination, complementarity and synergies (incl. ITI, SUD, CLLD)

The Commission encourages all Member States to pursue coordination among ESI Funds and with other EU policies, i.e. Horizon 2020, Erasmus for All, COSME, EIT KICS, LIFE programme etc. Nevertheless, there is limited if any guidance on how the coordination of ESI Funds with other EU Funds should be done. Instead, the main focus is on coordination across the ESI Funds, managing bodies and on the integrated approach to territorial development.

The need for greater strategic coordination is emphasised in several Position Papers involving the creation or developments of better structures and institutional coordination.

A new voluntary provision for the next period is integrated programming through multi-fund (ERDF-ESF) programmes. The Commission notes in many papers that this option could be explored but does not take a firm stance on the issue. By contrast, for Luxembourg the Commission expresses a preference for two mono-fund ERDF and ESF programmes, justified by the country's small size. Another way to coordinate the funds is through the joint planning of project calls. For instance, the Commission suggest issuing joint calls by different Funds on those topics where synergies could be achieved (Slovenia, Spain).

The need for greater integration in specific policy domains is highlighted in various papers, notably across thematic objectives to maximise synergies.

Finally, the integrated approach to territorial development is addressed in this section of the Position Papers, largely restating regulatory provisions and options on sustainable urban development strategies, Integrated Territorial Investments (ITIs) and Community-Led Local Development (CLLD).

Partnership

Cooperative and efficient partnership at all levels is an important ingredient for raising the quality of spending and increasing ownership. Proper and wide consultation of all decisional levels and relevant bodies is recommended. Additionally, the papers note that more could be done to encourage active participation in monitoring committees, to improve the representation of the participating partners and to raise the quality of the debates.

Horizontal principles

The key principles that need to be taken into account in designing and implementing programmes are gender equality, equal opportunities, non-discrimination including accessibility for disabled persons, social innovation, transnational cooperation and sustainable development. The main proposed measures for improving the integration of the horizontal priorities are the issuing of guidance and better monitoring and evaluation of the principles.

Financial management, audit and control

The principle of sound financial management remains the key goal underpinning financial management, audit and control. Most of the country papers include a statement on the need to ensure an effective and efficient control environment and to confirm the operability of the systems in advance. Beyond this, the main recommendations relate to the coordination/independence of audit and control bodies, addressing human resource constraints, simplifying procedures, and the use of simplified costs options:

- Enhanced coordination and independence of audit and control bodies was raised in a number of Position Papers.
- More adequate resourcing of Audit Authorities is recommended in Austria and Italy, while a better allocation of core staff tasks in management and control is needed in the Slovak Republic.
- Simplification of processes and procedures in relation to the signature trail, payments procedures and dispute resolution measures.
- Wider use of simplified costs options is also encouraged in many Position Papers
- The introduction of Joint Action Plans is encouraged in a small number of cases, with a view to simplifying financial management and enhancing the output orientation of approaches to payments

Administrative capacity

Institutional and administrative capacity is increasingly seen as critical to effective and efficient implementation. The Commission's Position Papers propose measures to enhance the capacity for programme management and to reduce the burden of administration on beneficiaries. There is scope for improvement in all Member States, although the greatest challenges faced in the current period were in the EU12, given the major increase in funding and associated institutional adaptations. Within the EU15, the Commission also identifies weak capacity in Greece - due to unclear demarcation between administrative and political levels, policy reforms and changes in the political leadership of ministries – and in the southern regions of Italy. Croatia faces the particular challenge of the capacity risks compared to pre-accession assistance, including new rules, a broader thematic scope and heavier workload associated with an increase in funding allocations.

Looking at the specific proposals for change, the need for a capacity-building strategy is underlined in several papers, either in terms of a domestic administrative modernisation programme or through Technical Assistance under the ESI Funds.

More effective targeting of Technical Assistance is called for in some countries. A number of new requirements may entail the development and reinforcement of certain tasks with corresponding capacity and training needs, e.g. the performance framework, climate change reporting, greater use of financial instruments.

Human resource constraints are highlighted in several papers, particularly owing to high staff turnover and motivational challenges.

Finally, the Commission recommends improvements in administrative capacity to comply with horizontal EU legislation on state aid, public procurement and the environmental 'acquis'.

Turning to beneficiaries, reducing administrative burden and enhancing capacity is an important priority for the Commission. Various Position Papers call for targeted technical assistance to support capacity-building for different types of beneficiaries. The types of actions envisaged include training, advisory services and guidance. Other measures focus on reducing the administrative burden for beneficiaries through reviewing and simplification of procedures, evaluation of administrative burden for beneficiaries and best practice dissemination. Finally, all Member States must comply with the new e-cohesion rules, requiring all exchanges of information between beneficiaries and authorities responsible for management and control of programmes to be carried out solely by electronic data exchange.

Project delivery

Heavily bureaucratic project selection procedures are criticised in a number of the papers. The main recommendations are streamlining procedures, better planning and coordination, more transparent/objective project selection criteria and issuing clear and timely guidance. As regards major projects, key recommendations include developing the project pipeline, tailored assistance, improved coordination and planning of investments and speeding-up decision-making processes

Monitoring & evaluation

All monitoring and evaluation system will needs to be adjusted to the requirements of the new regulations, in particular the performance framework and results orientation. With respect to monitoring, the main proposals relate to improving indicators, data collection arrangements and IT systems. Evaluation should be enhanced by focussing on outcomes, supporting decision-making, involving stakeholders in the process and building capacity.

European Territorial Cooperation

A concise section dedicated to European Territorial Cooperation is included in all of the country Position Papers, outlining strategic principles, key thematic objectives and priorities, and governance considerations.

The Commission calls on a number of countries to pursue a more strategic approach based on: a clear understanding of the major challenges of the border regions and programme areas; taking into account the experiences from previous programming periods; a better awareness of and links with national policies and other Community-funded programmes; and increased sense of partnership. The need to involve private partners in programming is also highlighted

A common recommendation is to develop stronger coherence with programmes under the 'investment for growth and jobs' goal with other EU or national programmes in order to exploit synergies for interventions in different thematic areas (BG, CZ, DE, FR, HU, LT, LU, LV, SE, SI). European territorial co-operation could also help improve coherence, coordination and alignment of policies and instruments having an impact on maritime regions and that allow for the highest European value added (BE, GR).

At the macro-regional level, the objectives of the territorial cooperation programmes as well as future operational programmes of the ESI Funds should all take into account the priorities of the EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region (EUSBSR) (DE, EE, FI, HU, LT, LV, PL, SE) and the EU Strategy for the Danube Region (EUSDR) (AT, BG, CZ, DE, HU, RO, SI). The need to take account of maritime cooperation frameworks such as the Maritime Strategy for the Atlantic Ocean Area is also highlighted (IE, PT).

Concentration on a limited number of priorities (BG, HU, SI) with tangible impact (PT, SK) is emphasised in several papers. Similarly, several countries are encouraged to adopt a more selective approach focusing on a limited number of objectives and greater selectivity in measures, including the establishment of a transparent system of 'flagship projects' that are likely to have a significant impact (CZ, FR, LU).

The key thematic objectives and priorities identified in the country Position Papers are:

- Strengthening research, technological development and innovation (BE, CY, FI, GR, HR, HU, IE, IT, LT, LU, MT, NL, RO, SE, SI, SK, UK)
- Protecting the environment and promoting natural resources efficiency (FR, GR, LV, MT, NL, PT, SK, UK)
- Low-carbon economy, especially energy efficiency (CY, FR, GR, HU, IE, LT, LU, LV, MT, RO, UK), including exchange of experiences and pilot projects (CY, RO)
- Water and flood management, natural and technological risk prevention, climate change mitigation and adaptation (CY, FR, HU, IT, LU, MT, NL, PL, RO, SE, SI), including joint management of environmental resources (water, waste, pollution, nature & biodiversity) across borders and transnationally
- Removing bottlenecks in network infrastructure and improving accessibility (BG, CZ, CY, FR, GR, HR, HU, IT, LT, LV, MT, PL, RO, SE, SI, SK)
- Employment, education and social inclusion (BE, ES, GU, IE, IT, LT, MT, NL, PL, PT, RO, SE, SK, UK)

- Tourism development (CY, GR)
- Institutional capacity development (LT, PT), especially promoting legal and administrative cooperation (PT)
- Promoting the blue/marine economy (BE, CY, ES, FI, FR, GR, IE, LV, NL, PT, SI, UK)

Limited attention is given to ETC governance issues in the Position Papers, beyond the potential use of the European Grouping for Territorial Cooperation instrument if appropriate, and the need to provide sufficient resources and attention to coordination work under macro-regional cooperation.

OVERALL ASSESSMENT

The post-2013 reform of EU Cohesion policy is at a critical juncture. The inter-institutional negotiations between the Council of Ministers and the European Parliament on Cohesion policy funding and on the regulatory package are reaching their conclusion and the strategic planning for the 2014-2020 Partnership Agreements and programmes is in full swing in the Member States. This policy briefing has reviewed the Commission's emerging position on the Partnership Agreements and Operational Programmes, based on a comparative analysis of the of the Commission Position Papers for all Member States.

This comparative review and associated feedback from Member States provides a mixed assessment of the coherence, consistency and utility of the Commission's analysis and recommendations. On the positive side, the papers provide a succinct analysis of key challenges and priorities across the Member States. Many Member State have welcomed a clear statement of what the Commission regards as important; national officials acknowledge the value in bringing together the expectations of different Commission services and obligations as a basis for informal discussion between Member State authorities and the Commission, especially given the delays in finalising the regulatory framework, and the new requirements for 2014-20. The Position Papers explain effectively how the Europe 2020 goals can be translated into priorities and interventions at Member State level. Highlighting the critical issue of institutional capacity is also important. Further, the Commission is commended for publishing the papers on the DG REGIO website, providing more public transparency to the process compared to the previous period.

However, there are several drawbacks, tensions or inconsistencies in the Position Papers, some of which may be addressed as the Commission clarifies its main negotiation priorities during the formal negotiations, once the official drafts of Partnership Programmes and Programmes have been produced by the Member States.

First, the dominant focus on Europe 2020 objectives and targets detracts attention from the territorial dimension. In particular, the focus on the national level ignores the range of territorial differences within Member States under different thematic priorities and may hinder a place-based approach tailored to territorial needs and potentials. This is particularly important given the stronger thematic/sectoral approach of Cohesion policy for 2014-20.

Second, the integrated approach, which has been presented as a hallmark of the post-2013 reform, is not sufficiently reflected or developed in the Position Papers. While there are many references and

statements calling for synergies across different thematic objectives, there is little in the way of operational guidance on how this ought to be done.

Third, the hierarchy, level of detail and categorisation of sub-priorities and specific objectives varies and is inconsistent across countries. For instance, the same specific objectives appear under different sub-priorities for different countries under some thematic objectives. Specific objectives are sometimes phrased vaguely or confused with interventions. A more general concern among Member States is the range of apparent expectations and lack of prioritisation, an issue of particular concern where national or regional managing authorities disagree with the proposed allocation of funding.

Fourth, the Position Papers have missed an opportunity to encourage knowledge transfer and innovation in programming. Over the past five years, DG REGIO has conducted the most extensive evaluation exercise in the history of the policy, relating to both the 2000-06 and 2007-13 periods. There has also been considerable investment in policy learning, exchange of experience and 'good projects'. The Position Papers would have been an opportunity not just to set out challenges and priorities but also to provide pointers to what has worked (or not) elsewhere, if only as an input to the thinking underway in managing authorities and programme partnerships with respect to the content and structure of programmes and administrative capacity for managing interventions. This would have been particularly valuable given the heightened expectations of performance and results in the new period.

Fifth, there is inconsistency in the prescriptiveness of the governance recommendations. In many instances, there is a restatement of regulatory requirements or vague recommendations, which are of questionable value in providing a strategic steer to programming. In other cases, there is a more prescriptive approach including an exhaustive list of recommendations with significant implications for domestic policies and frameworks, and arguably intruding into domestic competences.

Finally, and fundamentally, many Member States are concerned at the legal status of the Position Papers and the extent to which it is binding in the programming of Partnership Agreements and Operational Programmes. Along with some dissatisfaction with the templates for the PA and OP, there are clearly important issues still to be resolved in the preparation of documents that are sensitive to Member State needs and challenges while meeting the strategic priorities of the Commission in the new period.

ⁱ This Policy Briefing has been drafted by Carlos Mendez, European Policies Research Centre, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, carlos.mendez@strath.ac.uk

ⁱⁱ Michie R and Granqvist K (2013) A Balancing Act: Managing the Programmes, Closure and Preparations for 2014-20, Review of Programme Implementation Spring - Autumn 2012, *IQ-Net Review Paper* No. 31(1)

[http://www.eprc.strath.ac.uk/ignet/downloads/IQ-Net_Reports%28Public%29/Review%20Paper_31\(1\).pdf](http://www.eprc.strath.ac.uk/ignet/downloads/IQ-Net_Reports%28Public%29/Review%20Paper_31(1).pdf)

Kah S (2012) Planning for the future while maintaining focus on spending. Review of programme implementation: Winter 2011 - Spring 2012, *IQ-Net Review Paper* 30(1), EPRC, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow.

http://www.eprc.strath.ac.uk/ignet/downloads/IQ-Net_Reports%28Public%29/ReviewPaper30%281%29final.pdf