



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

DIRECTORATE-GENERAL  
REGIONAL POLICY

# **Partnership in the 2000-2006 programming period**

*Analysis of the implementation of the partnership principle*

DISCUSSION PAPER OF DG REGIO

November 2005

1. INTRODUCTION .....	3
2. THE ADDED VALUE OF PARTNERSHIP .....	4
3. METHODOLOGY .....	5
3.1. Internal documents .....	6
3.2. Fiches from social partners.....	6
4. PARTNERSHIP IN THE 2000-2006 PROGRAMMING PERIOD .....	6
4.1. Role of partners in the Structural Funds 2000-2006: results of the survey .....	6
4.1.1. Selection of partners .....	7
4.1.2. Programming .....	8
4.1.3. Implementation.....	9
4.1.4. Involvement in Monitoring Committees .....	10
4.1.5. Evaluation.....	10
4.2. Assessment carried out by the partners on their contribution to the programming cycle .....	11
5. THE 2007-2013 PROGRAMMING PERIOD .....	12
5.1. Concluding remarks.....	12
ANNEX 1 - LIST OF SOCIAL PARTNERS .....	14
ANNEX 2 - INDICATIVE FICHE .....	15
ANNEX 3 - DG REGIO COUNTRY DESK QUESTIONNAIRE .....	16
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	17

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The partnership principle is fundamental to the implementation of European cohesion policy. It implies close cooperation between the Commission, the authorities at national, regional and local level in the Member States and other governmental and non-governmental organisations and bodies during the different stages of the implementation cycle of the Structural Funds. Partnership was already present in the guiding principles in the 1988 reform of the Structural Funds and strengthened with the subsequent reforms of EU cohesion policy, whereby the scope of partnership and the circle of partners have been broadened.

The partnership principle is very much linked to the principle of subsidiarity which implies that decisions should be made at the level most competent to carry them out within the context of a broader cooperative network to be able to pool resources and experiences (see also Article 5 of the Treaty establishing the European Community, Article 8(3) of Reg. 1260/1999).

During the current programming period, 2000-2006, partnership has been expanded under Article 8 of Regulation No. 1260/1999 on the Structural Funds to include national, regional, local and other level authorities as well as the economic and social partners, and other relevant competent bodies representing different civil society groups<sup>1</sup>. The regulation calls for “close consultation” with these partners, although it is for the Member States to establish national rules or practice for their inclusion. Annual consultations on cohesion policy take place between the European-level socio-economic partners and the Commission. Furthermore, Article 15 of Regulation 1260/99 provides for the application of the partnership principle in different stages of the programming cycle, from programme preparation to evaluation.

Over the last few years, various evaluations on the impact of partnership in the Structural Funds have drawn attention to the positive benefit and added value that partnership can bring to the implementation of cohesion policy through enhanced legitimacy, greater coordination, guaranteed transparency, and better absorption of funds through improved selection of projects and dissemination of information to potential project promoters<sup>2</sup>.

In some Member States, the potential benefits from partnership are still not widely understood and the method of its application is not fully transparent. The social partners, via their contacts with the Commission, have expressed concerns about the inconsistency across EU Member States on the application of the partnership principle. In the light of this, the aim of this report is to provide a short survey of the state of play of the

---

<sup>1</sup> By “partners”, the report refers to stakeholders as defined by Art. 8 (1) of Regulation n° 1260/1999.

<sup>2</sup> “The thematic evaluation of the partnership principle: final synthesis report”, Tavistock Institute, 1999; “A Study on the Efficiency of the Implementation Methods for Structural Funds”, ÖIR in association with LRDP and IDOM, 2003; “Opinion on the Partnership for Implementing the Structural Funds” European Economic and Social Committee, 2003; and “The EU 'partnership principle': still a sustainable governance device across multiple administrative arenas?”, Michael W. Bauer, 2002.

application of the partnership principle over the course of the 2000-2006 programming period. The report provides some examples of best practice<sup>3</sup> and suggestions on how to maximize the benefits and added value of the partnership principle in cohesion policy and how to improve its working mechanisms.

## **2. THE ADDED VALUE OF PARTNERSHIP**

The potential added value of a well-organised partnership is widely acknowledged, and supported by the results of studies dealing with the issues of good governance.<sup>4</sup> These study results can be briefly summarised in the following four points:

First, through the involvement of a broad group of participants, a wider range of expertise is available for use during the programming cycle of Structural Funds programmes. This can help to improve the effectiveness of programme development, monitoring and evaluation. By contributing their specific knowledge on a certain subject or region, their awareness of potential project applicants, partners can improve programme effectiveness by raising the efficiency of project selection. Generally speaking, a widely drawn partnership leads to greater commitment and ownership of programme outputs, and hence to a direct interest in the success of the programme.

Second, the participation of regional and local authorities and that of civil society helps to legitimize the decision-making process by counterbalancing any specific political or other influence. Regional and local authorities, socio-economic partners and civil society can contribute also to the transparency in decisions and decision-making processes through their involvement and through their channelling of information.

Third, in many cases the involvement of partners contributes to the development of institutional capacity at sector and territorial levels. To facilitate the involvement of local or regional authorities, their institutional capacity has had to be strengthened, their awareness on European structural policy has been extended, and a more effective dialogue between the different authorities has been established. The participation of the different actors also creates opportunities for reinforcing innovation and learning across organisational boundaries.

In Austria, the responsibilities of management of Structural Funds are shared between the federal and regional authorities. Therefore, the Structural Fund delivery mechanisms considerably contributed to creation of various co-ordination structures (e.g. ÖROK – Austrian Conference on Spatial Planning) and co-operation networks through the introduction of the partnership principle at all stages of the programme management process.

---

<sup>3</sup> These can be found in the text boxes in the relevant sections of the report

<sup>4</sup> W. Bauer, M. (2002); ÖIR in association with LRDP and IDOM (2003); Batterbury, J. S., Kelleher, J. & Stern, E. (1999); European Economic and Social Committee, CESE 1166/2003

Fourth, the analysis also broadly confirms the positive impact that partnership has had on the improvement of the planning and implementation procedures of public administrations responsible for the Structural Funds. In several cases it has led to the creation of a new institutional framework based on a series of cooperative networks or relations with various social and economic partners. In most cases it has enhanced institutional networking and cooperation between national and regional authorities.

In Ireland, social partnership has formed the backdrop to economic development since 1987. This partnership was strengthened through Structural Funds processes and was extended to include the community and voluntary sector as a result of their involvement in Structural Funds. The Ballyfermot Community Civic Centre / URBAN Ballyfermot Programme management is a good example of partnership in action in Ireland, involving representatives from the community, local groups and relevant Government departments on the URBAN Ballyfermot's Board of Directors and its committees, acting as the Managing authority for Urban Programmes in Ireland.

In Spain, Structural Funds has contributed to improved coordination and partnership between the different national and regional administrative bodies which has resulted in developing a more integrated vision of regional issues, thus contributing to a better quality of conception and implementation of programmes.

Perhaps the most significant change in the partnership arrangements during the 2000-2006 programming period occurred in Finland, where despite a traditionally centralised administrative system, regional, local and social actors were given wide-ranging participatory rights in the programmes. In Finland, the Regional Management Committees include representatives from various ministries and their district administrative authorities, regional and local authorities and other organisations. Actors are able to discuss and design future steps in regional planning together with other authorities in the regions concerned. This cooperation has produced positive results and opened up new avenues for regional development. Also the project leaders have received better guidance as the authorities have become better aware of the main issues and the provision of services offered by other authorities.

### **3. METHODOLOGY**

The report is based on the following sources of information:

- (1) Internal documents and assessments of the Commission – short evaluations conducted by the geographical units of DG REGIO on the participation of partners in Monitoring Committees and in other stages of the implementation process;
- (2) Questionnaire filled in by those social partners consulted by the Commission under Article 8 of Council Regulation No. 1260/1999;
- (3) Other literature available: existing reports and academic research.

The report concerns the partnership arrangements for programmes supported by Structural Funds in general and there is deliberately no analysis by Fund.

### **3.1. Internal documents**

As a starting point, the Commission prepared an internal evaluation of the involvement of partners during the implementation of the Structural Funds. The geographical desks in DG REGIO examined the situation in each of the Member States analysing the partnership arrangements in a wider perspective involving stakeholders in the different stages of the programming process. The analysis was supported by a questionnaire that focused on the participation of partners in the Monitoring Committees and are differentiated by region and programme (Objective 1, Objective 2, Urban and INTERREG). All together, 176 questionnaires were completed and subsequently summarized to serve as the basis for a series of country fiches.

The second main source of internal information were the “Country sheets on Impact and Added Value” of cohesion policy in the Member States<sup>5</sup>. These sheets are based on different evaluation studies undertaken by the Commission and the Member States themselves. The sheets assess the implementation of cohesion policy in a broader context of which one point of focus is the role of different partners (i.e. regional and local authorities, socio-economic partners and other stakeholders).

### **3.2. Fiches from social partners**

On the basis of the analysis made by DG REGIO’s geographical units, a questionnaire for each Member State was prepared which was then forwarded to the social partners. Fiches were drafted and submitted to the social partners, covering 14 Member States. The new Member States, where programmes have only just begun since enlargement in May 2004, could not be included in the assessment at this stage. The fiches were submitted to the social partners in the course of the regular consultations under Article 8 of Council Regulation No. 1260/1999. They in turn organised the input of social partners at Member State level.

The fiches included a variety of questions on the extent of the participation of partners in the different stages of the programming cycle, from preparation to monitoring. A sample fiche is included in Annex 2<sup>6</sup>.

## **4. PARTNERSHIP IN THE 2000-2006 PROGRAMMING PERIOD**

### **4.1. Role of partners in the Structural Funds 2000-2006: results of the survey**

This section describes the perceptions of DG REGIO Desk officers regarding the role and involvement of partners in the different stages of the programming cycle during the current programming period. The section provides some best practices – in the text boxes – resulting from studies organised by the Commission in the evaluations of the impact of

---

<sup>5</sup> [http://europa.eu.int:8082/comm/regional\\_policy/themes/finper/finper1\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu.int:8082/comm/regional_policy/themes/finper/finper1_en.htm).

<sup>6</sup> Unlike the questionnaires filled in by DG REGIO geographical desk, the fiches completed by the social partners took into account also Objective 3 programmes.

Structural Funds on good governance. The information provided has not been subject to any independent verification.

Partners can perform a variety of functions in the programming cycle, from conception to monitoring. This is summarised in Table 1.

Table 1 – Actors in the programming cycle of the Structural Funds 2000-2006

Phase		Actors	Role of partners
Programming	Development Plan/ Community Support Framework (CSF)	Commission (COM), MS	Consultative
	Single Programming Document (SPD)	National, regional, other level authorities - appointed by the Member State (MS)	Consultative
	Operational Programme (OP)	COM, MS	Consultative
	Programme Complement (PC)	MS or Management authority (MA), Monitoring Committee (MC), partners	Consultative role, or acting through the MA or the MC
Management /Implementation		MS, national, regional, local level authorities, public or private organisations - appointed by the MS	Consultative role, or acting through the MA
Monitoring		MS, national, regional, local level authorities, public or private organisations - appointed by the MS. Actors acting mainly through the MC	Participation in MCs, but - depending on the country -, having different power of legitimacy. Role from consultation to equal voting right.
Evaluation	Ex-ante evaluation	MS or MA, MC, partners	Consultative role, or acting through the MA or the MC
	Mid-term evaluation	Independent evaluator under supervision of the MA, in cooperation with the COM and the MS	Consultative role, or acting through the MA or the MC
	Ex-post evaluation	Independent evaluator under supervision of the COM, in cooperation with the MS and the MA	Consultative role, or acting through the MA

#### 4.1.1. Selection of partners

In most Member States, participating partners are generally chosen by the Managing Authority or in certain cases by regional or local authorities through the Managing

Authority. These authorities decide on the appropriate balance between different partners in terms of their contribution to the programme, specific competencies etc. The survey suggests that in some cases selection is based on the political importance of the partner. Pre-determined procedures or a legislative basis for the selection of partners appear to exist in 4 of the 14 Member States. In two cases, it was noted that it is the social partners who select a candidate from their own group, who is then appointed by the Managing Authority.

#### 4.1.2. Programming

The survey revealed that in approximately half of the Member States examined, partners participate in the setting of indicators and targets that are specific and quantifiable for the structural intervention, in the elaboration of the project selection criteria and in the process of project selection itself. In over half of the Member States, partners participate in the drafting of the programme complement. The following table shows the extent of involvement of partners in other phases of the programming cycle aside from the participation on the Monitoring Committees:

Table 2 – Intensity of partnership involvement in the implementation of the Structural Funds

Phase of SF programming cycle		Occurrence of involvement of partners
Conception	Fixing targets for the intervention	51%
	Fixing indicators	46%
	Preparing the programme complement	57%
Management	Elaborating project selection criteria	52%
	Project selection	46%
Evaluation	Drawing up specifications for the mid-term evaluation	64%

In Denmark, where partnership is an accepted part of the implementation of the Structural Funds programmes, the drafting of national programmes is based on a bottom-up process with a wide-ranging partnership. The programme preparation and implementation is decentralised with the lead role played by various local authorities and agencies.

Similarly, a wide range of socio-economic partners and external experts are involved from the development stage of the programmes onwards in Germany.

The survey revealed a general perception that their participation and involvement could be improved at the strategic level, thus in various phases of the programming cycle of the Structural Funds. However in some cases the participation on strategic level is facilitated already.

In the UK as part of the strategy development process (e.g., in the West Midlands), partners are being encouraged not only to put forward ideas on strategic objectives,



priorities and measures but also to identify how these can be measured. The purpose is to encourage partners to be realistic in making proposals for the strategy and to see the rationale for indicators and targets.

The programme planning in Finland for the 2000-2006 period was undertaken through a process of wide consultation with a large number of partners such as regional co-ordination groups, municipalities and districts, and social partners i.e., workers, employers, entrepreneurs, farmers and organisations advocating equal opportunities and protection of environment. The Finnish Ministry of Interior was in charge of the entire process. It initiated the planning, organised the ex-ante evaluation, and established a national co-ordination group. The main preparatory bodies in the regions were the Regional Councils, who formed co-ordination groups with members from the Regions, Employment and Business Centres, Environment Centres and Provincial Governments.

The Austrian regions were key players in preparation of the programming documents for the current programming period in co-operation with the Federal Government. While the 1995-1999 period was considered as a learning process, for the 2000-2006 period, the regions strove to deliver the programme documents that would be more strategically driven. The programming process involved external experts and consultants who coordinated actual drafting of the programming documents. Core planning groups involving implementing authorities led the strategic discussion and different regional management offices, interest groups and social partners actively contributed to the whole drafting process. Several studies and evaluation were taken into consideration.

#### *4.1.3. Implementation*

In most cases, socio-economic partners are not involved in the implementation of Structural Funds interventions –, i.e. in the day-to-day management of programmes, -. There are however some cases when they have consultative role. In some cases socio-economic partners are also involved in project implementation.

In one case it was noted that although the socio-economic partners had the right and the intention to take part in different phases of implementation, it proved to be difficult, due to poorly coordinated multiple institutional structures, where competences and involvements were overlapping one another.

A task force of independent experts (project development specialists) responsible for project selection has been set up in Belgium. Direct involvement of independent specialists in programme implementation has resulted in the improvement in the quality of response to the programme's strategic objectives.

In the 2000-2006 programming period the United Kingdom made serious improvement in its programme management. Among others, it improved the capacity of communities to manage their own regeneration, complementing the positive development of relevant regional capacities, notably in terms of programme partnerships. It has become common to subcontract programme delivery to partner organisations, such as to independent programme management executives (for example in Scotland the Strathclyde European

Partnership Programme Management Executive involves around 200 agencies, including the Scottish Executive, local authorities, enterprise bodies, further and higher education, voluntary and community organisations and the environmental and equality agencies). This allows Managing authorities to concentrate on the strategic management and the monitoring of programmes.

#### *4.1.4. Involvement in Monitoring Committees*

The participation of partners in Monitoring Committees is one of the more visible aspects of the application of the partnership principle in the Structural Funds. In most cases, the social partners have the same participatory or voting rights as other members of the Monitoring Committees. The experience of the Commission is that the representation of the social partners greatly varies. In most cases these relate to trade unions and employers' groups, but it is largely dependent on the type of Structural Funds programme or the Fund (ESF - European Social Fund, ERDF - European Regional Development Fund, EAGGF - European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund, FIFG - Financial Instrument for Fisheries Guidance). Some respondents noted the lack of participation of women's groups in the Monitoring committee meetings.

The survey of social partners shows that in the minority of cases, partners are only consulted without having direct participatory rights in the implementation of Structural Funds or the right to vote. In some cases their main role is to serve as an information channel towards the public. The survey revealed that in those cases, where the selection of partners initiates from the social partners themselves, their representation in the Monitoring Committees was well-organised.

In Greece, partnership working in the Monitoring Committees has ensured the dissemination of information related to Structural Funds programmes and projects and in this way it has helped to increase participation among stakeholders.

The survey showed that the involvement of smaller and less traditional partners, for example, anti-poverty groups, and that of the charity and voluntary sector is limited; and that Monitoring Committee meetings can be rather time-consuming because of the level of technical details discussed. In many cases the partners feel unable/unwilling to increase their participation due to time and capacity constraints. The burdens of complicated administrative procedures and the lack of a regional partnership forum creates constraints to the good functioning of partnership.

#### *4.1.5. Evaluation*

The analysis of the recent mid-term evaluation shows that this exercise was typically carried out with the participation of partners. Regulation 1260/1999 specifically refers to the involvement of the Commission, the Member State, the managing authority, the monitoring committee and the evaluator. In most cases, steering committees were set up, as recommended by the Commission. They usually consisted of a sub-committee of the monitoring committee and their role was to guide the evaluation process from the establishment of terms of reference to the finalisation of the evaluation.

Partnership worked at several different levels during the mid-term evaluation process and in different ways depending on national and regional practice, budgets involved and the scale of the programmes. The role of the steering groups varied across programmes and countries and they were not always involved from the beginning of the process. In general, the steering groups were considered to have led to higher quality and more relevant evaluations possibly reflecting enhanced ownership and involvement in the evaluation process by the partnership. That said, in some cases some partners felt that there was some attempt to steer the evaluation too much towards particular conclusions and recommendations. The presentation of the report to the monitoring committee broadened the involvement of the partnership in the process.

In the survey of social partners, in over half of the Member States, partners were found to participate in the drawing up of specifications for the mid-term evaluations.

#### **4.2. Assessment carried out by the partners<sup>7</sup> on their contribution to the programming cycle**

First, the participation of the partners helps to secure the relevance of Structural Funds co-financed projects, their connection to national and EU policy issues and a better quality of projects. Many partners also see themselves as important in persuading public authorities to simplify administrative procedures.

Secondly, from the survey it seems clear that partners feel that they have an important role in defining the objectives of the Structural Funds interventions, the dissemination of information, and in highlighting problems and implementation issues.

Thirdly, successful partnership arrangements often provide a network for information exchange and the sharing of best practice, thus fostering greater efficiency in the implementation of the programmes. Partnership ensures more bottom-up participation, the introduction of innovative ideas and different perspectives and serves as a network across various policies and sectors.

The overall principle of the de-centralisation of management, both from the Commission to the Member State and from the central level in the Member State to sub-regions, seems to have proved fruitful in Denmark. The sub-regional level is the first contact point for the public and potential project promoters in the respective geographical areas. The sub-regional secretariats then recommend approval (or non-approval) to the Danish central managing authorities, who take the final decision on a grant, usually following the recommendations of the sub-regional secretariats.

Fourthly, by representing a specific sector of the population, partners can identify the needs of the groups they represent and any related problems of implementation.

Further, partners are also able to provide political and technical advice and by having a more strategic approach to the cohesion policy, are able to shift the focus away from process and administration to strategy.

---

<sup>7</sup> See List of Social partners in Annex 1

Most mid-term evaluations of 2000-2006 Structural Fund programmes in the UK have highlighted the perceived benefits of partnership-based strategies. Positive effects of partnership approaches cited in mid-term evaluations include the establishment of democratic and inclusive approaches, the sharing of intelligence to target resources to meet local needs and the introduction of new organisation to regional/sub-regional programmes. The emphasis on the partnership principle has acted as a catalyst at regional and local level for improved partnership structures and contributed positive effects in terms of capacity building.

## **5. THE 2007-2013 PROGRAMMING PERIOD**

### **5.1. Concluding remarks**

This analysis suggests that partnership can contribute to the effectiveness, efficiency, legitimacy and transparency of Structural Funds operations, and to the commitment to, and ownership of, programme outputs. The analysis also shows that there have been efforts to improve the functioning of partnership. Where it is well implemented, partnership has also generated further benefits such as the improvement of institutional capacities at different levels (local, regional and national), better inter-institutional coordination and communication at the national level, or a better involvement of civil society.

Although it is clear from the analysis that a wider range of partners than ever before is involved in cohesion policy, in some cases, the involvement of partners at different stages of the programming cycle is not considered as equally necessary and sometimes is even seen as causing an additional burden on time and resources. It is not always clear whether the selection of partners is based on their specific expertise or on political preference. Some partners indicated a preference for matching the specific expertise of the partners with a particular stage in the programming cycle for maximum impact and efficiency. Many partners felt that their role was little known or recognized with little public awareness of the issue. In the survey, the social partners called for the rules on their role and the transparency of the selection process to be more clearly defined.

For the next period, the partnership principle will be implemented in accordance with the provisions of the new Council Regulation for 2007-2013. The Commission's proposal<sup>8</sup> seeks to reinforce the partnership principle notably by adding civil society, environmental partners, NGOs and gender equality organisations. However, it is highly likely that the new regulatory framework will bear many similarities to the present one, in particular, by allowing Member States to implement the partnership principle in accordance with national practice. Even so, there remains a number of ways in which the principle could be implemented more transparently and more effectively. Some tentative suggestions for the next period include:

---

<sup>8</sup> Proposal for a Council Regulation laying down general provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund and the Cohesion Fund, article 10; COM (2004) 492 final

- First, Member States themselves could decide to organise a seminar at the start of the next programming period to discuss the envisaged partnership arrangements with the partners. This would ensure that partners are made aware of possibilities from the beginning while providing the public authorities the opportunity to outline their expectation of the partners.
- Secondly, the Member States could provide more information during the negotiations on the content of the operational programmes on how they intend to implement the partnership principle. This could involve the identification of the partners to be consulted, the stages of the programming cycle requiring the participation of the partners and the responsibilities and participatory rights of the partners.
- Thirdly, the Managing Authorities could decide to appoint a representative as a one-stop shop responsible for relations with the partners. This individual would act as a point of liaison between the partners and the Managing Authority.

## **ANNEX 1**

### **LIST OF SOCIAL PARTNERS**

INVOLVED IN THE ANALYSIS

#### **CEEP**

**European Centre of Enterprises with Public Participation and of Enterprises of General Economic Interest**

#### **COPA-COGECA**

**Committee of Professional Agricultural Organisations in the European Union - General Confederation of Agricultural Co-operatives in the European Union**

#### **ETUC**

**European Trade Union Confederation**

#### **EUROCHAMBRES**

**Association of European Chambers of Commerce and Industry**

#### **EUROPECHE**

**Association of National Organizations of Fishing Enterprises in the EU**

#### **UEAPME**

**European Association of Craft, Small and Medium-sized Enterprises**

#### **UNICE**

**Union of Industrial and Employer's Confederations of Europe**

#### **EUROPEAN WOMEN'S LOBBY**

## ANNEX 2

### INDICATIVE FICHE:

#### Partnership in Structural Funds Interventions

**Country:**

**Partner in charge of the analysis:**

1. Do the conclusions drawn from this analysis confirm or run counter to their own experience?
  
2. Is participation by the partners in programmes restricted to the Monitoring Committee or participate (or have participated) they on a broader scale, for example:
  - fixing targets for the intervention YES/NON
  - fixing indicators YES/NON
  - preparing the programme complement YES/NON
  - elaborating project selection criteria YES/NON
  - project selection YES/NON
  - drawing up specifications for the interim evaluation YES/NON
  - other aspects of preparation, implementation or monitoring. Please specify:
  
3. Does the present degree of association appear sufficient and how, if at all, it should be improved?
  
4. Please state your opinion on the procedures for selecting partners in the country in question;
  
5. How the presence of the partners adds value in the country in question?

### ANNEX 3

#### DG REGIO COUNTRY DESK QUESTIONNAIRE

ON THE PARTICIPATION OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL PARTNERS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF  
STRUCTURAL FUND PROGRAMMES

(FILLED IN BY THE GEOGRAPHIC UNITS OF THE DG REGIO)

Questions	Replies
Country:	
Managing Unit:	
Name of the programme:	
N° CCI:	
Is it a sector-specific programme?	YES <input type="checkbox"/> If yes, which sector? NON <input type="checkbox"/>
Objective that the programme belongs to	Objective 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Objective 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Community Initiative <input type="checkbox"/>
Territorial coverage	Regional <input type="checkbox"/> Multiregional <input type="checkbox"/> Which region(s)?
1. Do the economic and social partners participate in the Monitoring Committee of this programme ?	YES <input type="checkbox"/> If yes, which partners? NON <input type="checkbox"/>
2. If they do participate in the Monitoring Committee, do they have the same rights as other members?	YES <input type="checkbox"/> NON <input type="checkbox"/>
If their rights are different, explain what rights they do / do not have compared to the others.	
3. Are the partners present in the Monitoring Committee present because they are managing a project or are they involved because their quality of a partner?	
4. If the economic and social partners participate in the Monitoring Committee without managing a project, what is the criteria for their selection and which body is proceeding the selection-procedure?	



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

COUNCIL REGULATION (EC) No 1260/1999 of 21 June 1999, laying down general provisions on the Structural Funds

Proposal for a COUNCIL REGULATION COM(2004)492 of 14 July 2004, laying down general provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund and the Cohesion Fund

Opinion on the Partnership for Implementing the Structural Funds, European Economic and Social Committee, CESE 1166/2003

Batterbury, J. S., Kelleher, J. & Stern, E. (1999), "The thematic evaluation of the partnership principle : final synthesis report", Tavistock Institute

Iurato, G. (2003), "Partnership and Structural Funds: Set up and Conditionings on Regional Participation", The European Union Review, Vol. 8 No. 3,

Harvey, B. (2004), « The illusion of inclusion – Access by NGOs to the Structural Funds in the member states of eastern and central Europe », Brussels: ECAS

W. Bauer, M. (2002) "The EU 'partnership principle': still a sustainable governance device across multiple administrative arenas?", Public Administration, Vol. 80 No. 4

Europe et Société (2003), "Le rôle des partenaires sociaux dans la construction d'une citoyenneté européenne"

Les cahiers de la fondation N° 57-58, octobre 2003 - mars 2004,

ÖIR in association with LRDP and IDOM (2003), "A Study on the Efficiency of the Implementation Methods for Structural Funds – Final Report", Vienna