

EUROREGIONS AND MANAGEMENT OF CBC FUNDS:

THE ROLE OF EUROREGIONS / CBC REGIONS IN THE MANAGEMENT OF EU PROGRAMMES

**A SUMMARY OF EXPERIENCES GAINED UNDER
INTERREG IIA & INTERREG IIIA PROGRAMMES**

***Presentation prepared for the BEN-project conference in Umea (Sweden)
by***

***Dr. Thomas Stumm
EureConsult S.A., Luxembourg
(May 2006)***

Introduction to INTERREG IIA-IIIA programme management

In order to assess the plethora of diverse co-operation & management arrangements, one should focus on **the most important common functions that can be observed in practice throughout all INTERREG IIA / IIIA programmes:**

- Strategic decision making at programme level based on a cross-border partnership (Monitoring Committee).
- Administrative programme management on a day-to-day basis (Programme Secretariats).
- Appraisal of projects, project selection and information / technical assistance provided to project promoters.
- Financial management of the Interreg programmes.

Introduction to INTERREG IIA-III A programme management

A structure for joint strategic decision making, mostly in form of a “Monitoring Committee”, can be found in all INTERREG programmes.

Considerable variations can normally be observed throughout the different programmes with respect to their actual composition and the responsibilities allocated to the MC (e.g. overall monitoring, project approval, programme evaluation, programme review & modifications).

According to the partnership principle laid down in the Structural Funds regulations, also other “non-administrative” partners need to be included into the wider horizontal programme partnership.

Introduction to INTERREG IIA-IIIA programme management

The degree to which **joint structures for administrative management of INTERREG programmes on a day-to-day basis** are reflected by the nature of the programme secretariat. Arrangements found can

- take the form of a joint or separate “Programme Secretariat”
- assign joint administrative management functions to already existing permanent cross-border such as Euroregions or similar bodies.

Ongoing programme management could also include the appointment of a joint programme manager or of programme managers on either side of the border.

Introduction to INTERREG IIA-IIIA programme management

The setting up of a **system for the operational implementation process of INTERREG programmes** normally comprises procedures for project submission, project appraisal (assessment of project applications) and final project selection.

An important element in this context is also the provision of targeted information on the programme and advisory support for project promoters. These functions can be performed separately, but in most case jointly on ground of common procedures and with joint technical working groups or committees being involved in the appraisal/selection process.

In addition, also technical assistance officers or project assessors and other support facilities had frequently been put into place to assist project promoters.

Introduction to INTERREG IIA-IIIA programme management

The system for **the financial management of INTERREG programmes covers issues such as the payment system, control, financial responsibility and final liability**. It can

- be partially and fully integrated systems (joint bank account for EU-support, sometimes even national co-financing)
- or separate systems, based upon the use of normal national procedures on either side of the programme area.

INTERREG IIA experience¹:

Strategic decision making partnership, Monitoring Committees (1):

- In assessing the degree of joint decision-making achieved and breadth of **strategic decision-making partnership** one has to conclude that, although there are several examples of successful cross-border partnerships, **the majority of programmes along internal EU borders is still characterised by significant weaknesses** (prevalence of separate national-side decision making and narrow range of partners).
- Along **external EU borders**, the composition of strategic programme decision making structures on the EU side was generally as variable as in case of the internal borders. However, when taken together with the non-EU side, there were very serious obstacles in achieving joint decision-making at strategic level, mainly due to the incompatibility of the rules and regulations applying to the two sides (under Interreg and Phare/Tacis/Meda respectively).

¹ The following pages summarizing INTERREG IIA experience are based upon the findings of the "EX-POST EVALUATION OF THE INTERREG II COMMUNITY INITIATIVE (1994-99). FINAL REPORT, December 2003 (revised)". The full report is available for download on the website of DG REGIO (INFOREGIO).

INTERREG IIA experience:

Strategic decision making partnership, Monitoring Committees (2):

- In some programmes, MCs are only or predominantly composed of EU and national level partners (e.g. E/P, IRL/UK, G/I).
- In the majority of other internal border programmes, MCs were - in addition - also composed of regional-level (or local) representatives.
- Many programmes have included existing cross-border structures and other non-public organisations (i.e. social & economic partners, private/voluntary sectors) in the strategic decision making partnership.
- A considerable number of programmes were still characterised by significant weaknesses regarding the wider horizontal partnership (e.g. E/P, G/I, IRL/UK, F/UK, F/B, F/B/L, D/LUX, D/F, F/I, F/CH, I/CH and D/A).

INTERREG IIA experience:

Day-to-day administrative management of INTERREG IIA programmes, Programme Secretariat (1):

More fully integrated programme management could typically be found on internal EU borders with a long tradition of cooperation, and in many cases, pre-existing permanent cross-border structures.

Many programmes established a joint secretariat located on one place within the eligible area (permanent cross-border structure or a structure specifically created was mandated to fulfil joint management tasks).

INTERREG IIA experience:

Day-to-day administrative management of INTERREG IIA programmes, Programme Secretariat (2):

Partially integrated (and in a few cases more-or-less separate) programme management was observed in the majority of the programmes and was typically associated with multiple structure/location secretariats.

The majority of programmes located the secretariat on different places within the eligible area (i.e. no common structure with a joint office or joint staff). Competent public authorities on either side of the border performed day-to-day management functions.

Some secretariats (or parts of it) were even located outside the eligible area (e.g. in the capital cities of Member States). State-level administrations performed day-to-day management in a centralised manner.

**INTERREG IIA:
Day-to-day management arrangements along internal EU-borders**

Model 1a:
The secretariat was located in one place within the eligible programme area, with a pre-existing permanent cross-border structure (i.e. Euroregion or a similar organisation) mandated to fulfil joint administrative management tasks and thus serving the whole cross-border area.
Prominent examples for fully integrated management systems are all 5 Interreg IIA programmes covering the borders D/NL and D/NL/B. The programmes were embedded in “Interreg-agreements” and each Euregio could play a central role in the entire administrative management and operational implementation process of Interreg IIA programmes (project appraisal & pre-selection, participation in decision making regarding final project approval and financial allocation).
Other, however far less integrated models can be found along several Scandinavian internal maritime borders.

Model 2a:
The secretariat was located in different places within the eligible Interreg IIA programme area (i.e. no common structure with a joint office or joint staff), with the competent central/regional/local level authorities on either side of the border performing the bulk of day-to-day management functions and thus serving the different “national” parts of the cross-border area. A separation of secretariat functions for Interreg IIA programmes can be found along many borders, independently of their experience in mutual co-operation, but one has to distinguish between different degrees of effective separation:

- Interreg IIA programmes with separate management structures that established intensive day-to-day working contacts in order to co-ordinate and integrate their decisions (e.g. DK/D D/LUX, D/F, F/B/LUX).
- Separate administrative programme management, characterised by a less intensive day-to-day co-ordination between the competent authorities (state and/or regional level) and by an ex-post integration of different aspects/views during joint monitoring/steering committee meetings (e.g. F/UK, F/B, F/S, F/I, I/EL, D/A, I/A).
- “Virtual joint secretariats”, with programme management actually carried out in a separate and even rather centralised manner (e.g. IRL/UK).

Model 1b:
The secretariat was located in one place within the eligible Interreg II programme area, with a permanent common structure specifically created by the competent national/regional authorities for fulfilling tasks related to joint programme management and thus serving the whole cross-border area.
The establishment of joint secretariats can be observed in a number of Interreg IIA programmes, mostly covering borders characterised by a well developed or long-standing tradition of co-operation (D/F-PAMINA; D/F/CH, B/NL).

Model 2b:
The secretariat as a whole (or parts of it) was located outside the eligible programme area (e.g. in the capital cities of Member States concerned), with State-level administrations on either side of the border performing day-to-day management functions in a very centralised manner for the different “national” parts of the cross-border area. (e.g. Madrid and Lisbon in case E/P or in Athens in case of “Greece external borders”).

INTERREG IIA experience:

System for the operational implementation process of INTERREG programmes:

EU-borders characterised by a long-standing tradition of cross-border co-operation: Project selection mechanisms of programmes were mostly well-integrated and characterised by a real cross-border partnership. Also the quality of information and programme publicity was – with some exceptions - generally of a very high quality.

EU-borders characterised by an existence of weak informal co-operation only or by an existence informal/partially formalised co-operation: Project selection and the provision of technical support to project promoters had frequently been carried out in a separate manner and was often characterised by weaknesses.

INTERREG IIA, project submission / appraisal / selection, information & support

Integrated approaches	Separate approaches
<p>A highly integrated approach and a truly joint realisation of all these strategic tasks at a high quality level was achieved especially under those programmes, where common secretariats with extensive responsibilities in this respect have played a crucial and pro-active role in this process. Very positive examples are the Interreg IIA programmes covering the borders D/NL, D/NL/B, B/NL, D/F and D/F/CH, but also the Interreg IIA programmes covering the borders between DK/S (Øresund) and SF/S (Islands).</p>	<p>Different degrees of “separateness” were observed on internal EU borders characterised by co-operation ranging from “partially formalized” (F/B, F/UK, UK-IRL) to weak and informal (E/F, E/P, EL/I, F/I). Project selection carried out in a quite separated way through a national pre-selection made by the competent technical units of national, regional or local level administrations on either side of the programme area. The same applied to the provision of publicity and information about the Interreg IIA programmes and technical support to project promoters.</p>
<p>A significant degree of integration was achieved also in external EU-borders that are characterised by a long-standing tradition of cross-border co-operation or by an existence of partially formalised co-operation (with Switzerland and Norway): common project selection procedures and a high quality in the provision of programme information or technical support to project promoters (see box below). A crucial factor of success was – again - the positive and pro-active role played by existing common programme secretariats with extensive responsibilities in this respect (Scandinavia) or the important multiplier function of existing cross-border co-operation structures, even if not acting as programme secretariats (F/CH).</p>	<p>In case of external EU borders, characterised by a rather weak tradition of co-operation (informal co-operation only), project selection processes were predominantly separate. In most cases, this was due to the fact that the operational incompatibility of different EU-funding programmes (i.e. Interreg–PHARE/TACIS) has practically not allowed the setting-up of joint procedures.</p> <p>Nevertheless, there is a group of programmes which established relatively “decentralised” and participatory selection processes on the EU-side of external borders. This was the case under the Swedish and/or Finnish external border programmes with Russia and Estonia (SF/S/NOR/RUS-Barents, SF/RUS-Karelia, SF/RUS-South East Finland, SF/EST-South Finland Coastal Zone), but also under the 4 Austrian external border programmes (Austria/Czech Republic; Austria/Slovakia, Austria/Hungary, Austria/Slovenia).</p>
<p>A rather fragmented approach has been applied by Interreg IIA programmes lacking of a common permanent programme secretariat (F/B/LUX, D/LUX and D/F-SaarLorWestpfalz). They have established a project selection procedure that combined a nationally-oriented pre-assessment element and a common decision making element (approval). This procedure has caused lengthy periods between the project application and the final approval. With regard to the provision of information and technical support, all 3 programmes were also characterised by a rather technocratic/administrative approach and relatively poor information flows to potential project promoters.</p>	<p>The 4 German external border programmes “Pomerania”, “Brandenburg” (D/PL), “Saxony” (D/PL/CZ) and “Bavaria” (D/CZ) demonstrate however that a certain degree of cross-border interaction can be achieved with third country partners, mainly due to an involvement of existing permanent cross-border structures, established outside of Interreg.</p>

INTERREG IIA experience:

Cross-border financial management under INTERREG IIA (1):

The overall level of integration for financial management was lower than the one achieved for administrative management.

- Among all 59 INTERREG IIA programmes implemented during the years 1994-99, a total of 18 INTERREG IIA programmes have established a **completely integrated or partially integrated cross-border financial management system**.
- These were programmes on the internal EU borders, with a long tradition in cooperation and pre-existing permanent cross-border structures (Eureregios or similar structures).

INTERREG IIA experience:

Cross-border financial management under INTERREG IIA (2):

A fully integrated cross-border financial management of Interreg IIA programmes normally involves the existence of a single and joint bank account for EU support and national co-financing, but also the existence of jointly agreed rules that govern all technical and procedural aspects of the financial management process (e.g. control and audit, final liability etc.). During the 1994-99 period, such a fully integrated financial management can only be found along EU-internal borders that were characterised by a long-standing tradition of co-operation and an extensive degree of institutionalisation in form of permanent cross-border Euregios (D/NL and D/NL/B²). Along these borders, fully integrated financial management was achieved through the conclusion of specific “Interreg-agreements” between all public programme partners. These agreements clearly defined the final liability, provided that Interreg funds and national co-financing were transferred to a single joint account at a public bank and set out all other necessary technical provisions for audit and control.

² D/NL & D/NL/B (Ems-Dollard, Maas/Rhein, EUREGIO, Rhein-Maas-Nord; Rhein Waal)

INTERREG IIA experience:

Cross-border financial management under INTERREG IIA (3):

A partially integrated cross-border financial management was realised along many other EU borders characterised by a long-standing tradition of co-operation and the existence of Euregios or similar permanent cross-border co-operation structures. It normally involved the establishment of a single and joint bank account for Community support at a private or public bank, with national co-financing provided separately by each side.³ Only in some exceptional cases, parts of the national co-financing for projects had been transferred to this account.⁴ A partially integrated approach was also adopted by 2 multilateral Scandinavian Interreg IIA programmes covering the external border with Norway and Russia. This approach has ensured the joint financial management of Interreg IIA Community support for the 2 involved EU-Member States Sweden and Finland.⁵

³ D/F (Saar-Lor-Westpfalz, PAMINA); D/LUX, D/F/CH (Oberrhein-Mitte-Süd); DK/D (Sønderjylland/Schleswig, Storstrøm/Ostholstein, Fyn/K.E.R.N); SF/S (Islands).

⁴ B/NL (Scheldemond, Middengebied).

⁵ S/SF/NOR (Kvarken-Mittskandia ; North Kalotte); S/SF/NOR/RUS (Barents).

INTERREG IIA experience:

Cross-border financial management under INTERREG IIA (4):

The other **41 INTERREG IIA programmes have carried out financial programme management separately on either side of the border**, using completely separate systems based on normal national procedures for each side of the programme. This approach was adopted

- by 18 INTERREG IIA programmes covering EU-internal borders with different levels of tradition in cross-border co-operation,
- by the 23 INTERREG IIA programmes covering one EU-Member State and one or two neighbouring third countries, for which this approach was a rather logic solution.

INTERREG IIIA experience:

In an internal study elaborated by the Association of European Border Regions for DG-REGIO⁶, a provisional overview on the main features of 32 INTERREG IIIA programme management arrangements has been realised. Although this review does not cover all of the existing 64 INTERREG programmes, its main findings give already an interesting insight into the current situation.

For strategic co-operation at the level of INTERREG IIIA programmes, the principal programme partners have frequently concluded specific “Interreg-agreements”, “partner conventions” or “memoranda of understanding” that specify particular tasks and responsibilities of the different programme management structures (e.g. Managing Authority, Payment Authority, Joint Technical Secretariat).

Within this wider context, no case is known where an EEIG has been used as a legal instrument for establishing joint programme-level structures that are responsible for administrative and financial management, co-ordination, implementation and monitoring of INTERREG IIIA programmes.

⁶ European Commission, DG-REGIO: Towards a new Community legal instrument for public law based Trans-European Co-operation among territorial authorities in the European Union (Synthesis Report, March 2004).

INTERREG IIIA experience:

In the context of the INTERREG IIIA programmes carried out along various EU-borders, one can basically observe three practical solutions.

- A truly cross-border and fully decentralised programme management structure.
- A one-sided joint programme management structure.
- A bi-national programme management structure.

INTERREG IIIA experience:

A truly cross-border and fully decentralised programme management structure (1):

The most important feature is that already existing cross-border structures or specifically created cross-border structures with an own legal personality based on public law are normally entrusted with substantial tasks in the context of the INTERREG IIIA programme management (i.e. assuming the role/parts of the role of the Managing Authority, the Paying Authority and the Joint Technical Secretariat).

Under this option, one or more programme-specific conventions or agreements were frequently concluded among the principal programme partners. They define the basic responsibilities with regard to the programme, specify the role of the different programme management structures (e.g. Managing Authority, Payment Authority, Joint Technical Secretariat) and / or regulate a delegation of administrative/technical and financial management tasks to the cross-border structures. The most developed agreements also regulate aspects related to eligibility and defined the nature of a cross-border project.

INTERREG IIIA experience:

A truly cross-border and fully decentralised programme management structure (2):

Examples for truly cross-border programme management structures are ...

- the 3 INTERREG IIIA programmes covering borders between the Netherlands, Belgium and Germany (NL/B/D, NL/D),
- INTERREG IIIA programme “PAMINA” (D/F),
- INTERREG IIIA programme “Moselle-Sarre-Palatinat Occidental” (D/F),
- INTERREG IIIA programme UK-Northern Ireland/Ireland.

INTERREG IIIA experience:

A one-sided (joint) programme management structure (1):

In this case, the structures (i.e. Managing Authority, Paying Authority, an existing Joint Technical Secretariat⁷) are all located on one side of the border. These structures are all governed by the respective national law of the host country and – where existing – by provisions of existing programme-specific agreements / conventions that have been concluded between the main programme partners. Under this solution, one can either find fully centralised or partly / entirely decentralised management structures.

Partly or fully decentralized single country-solutions for strategic programme management seem in general to work without major legal problems. Although an execution of primary management functions is in all cases mostly the task of regional or local authorities, one can observe under certain INTERREG IIIA programmes some involvement of existing permanent cross-border structures (e.g. B/NL, D/A). **Fully centralised management arrangements** are mainly to be found at the external EU-borders in the South of Europe, with central state authorities being in charge of the respective tasks.

⁷ As some programmes did not establish a Joint Technical Secretariat, the single country principle does not apply for this specific function.

INTERREG IIIA experience:

A one-sided (joint) programme management structure (2):

Examples for partly / entirely decentralised, joint management systems on one side of a border are ...

- The 4 INTERREG IIIA programmes covering the former external EU-borders of Austria (“Austria/Czech Republic”; “Austria/Slovak Republic”; “Austria/Hungary”; “Austria/Slovenia”). The situation at date of the former external border status was partly centralised and partly decentralised (i.e. strong involvement of the Austrian Länder).
- INTERREG IIIA programme “F/UK”,⁸
- INTERREG IIIA programme UK-Wales/Ireland,
- INTERREG IIIA programme “Corse-Sardaigne-Toscane” (F/I),
- INTERREG IIIA programme “Grensregio Vlaanderen/Nederland” (B/NL),
- trilateral INTERREG IIIA programme “Belgium/Luxembourg/France”,
- trilateral INTERREG IIIA programme “Germany/Luxembourg/Belgium”,
- trilateral INTERREG IIIA programme “Rhin Supérieur Centre-Sud” (F/D/CH),
- INTERREG IIIA programme “Germany/Austria”,
- INTERREG IIIA programme “Italy/Austria”,
- 3 INTERREG IIIA programmes “Sønderjylland/Schleswig”, “Storstrøms/Ostholstein” and “Fyn/K.E.R.N”
- 5 INTERREG IIIA programmes covering the former German external borders with Poland and the Czech Republic⁹,
- INTERREG IIIA programme „Skärgården“ (SF/SK),
- multilateral INTERREG IIIA programme “North Calotte/Kolarctic” (SF/S/NOR/RUS),
- INTERREG IIIA programme Karelia“ (SF/RUS),
- INTERREG IIIA programme “South East Finland“ (SF/RUS),
- INTERREG IIIA programme “Southern Finland Coastal Zone” (SF/EE).

Examples for fully centralised management structures are ...

- INTERREG IIIA programme “Spain/Morocco”;
- 5 INTERREG IIIA programmes Greek external borders with Albania, FYROM, Bulgaria, Turkey and Cyprus;

⁸ Merger of the former INTERREG IIA programmes “Transmanche” (Kent, Medway and Nord-Pas de Calais) and “Rives-Manche” (E. Sussex, Brighton & Hove and Somme/Seine-Maritime) into one programme under Interreg IIIA.

⁹ INTERREG III A - PHARE-CBC - Bavaria (D) / Czech Republic; INTERREG III A - PHARE-CBC - Saxony (D) / Czech Republic; INTERREG III A - PHARE-CBC - Saxony (D) / Lower Silesia (PL); INTERREG III A - PHARE-CBC - Brandenburg (D) / Woiwodschaft Lubuskie (PL); INTERREG III A - PHARE-CBC - Mecklenburg-Vorpommern/Brandenburg (D) / Woiwodschaft Zachodniopomorskie (PL).

INTERREG IIIA experience:

A bi-national programme management structure (1):

In this case, the most important programme management structures (Managing Authority, Paying Authority, Joint Technical Secretariat) are located on two sides of a common border and are governed by the respective country-specific laws.

Specific conventions / agreements have been concluded between the main programme partners that regulate the overall management system and aspects regarding final liability etc.

In several cases, additional conventions were concluded

- between the Managing and Paying Authorities for regulating the border crossing relations (if both bodies are located in different countries,
- between the programme partners and a public/private bank for regulating (if the latter acts as Paying Authority),
- between the programme partners for specifying task-delegation to a Joint Technical Secretariat.

INTERREG IIIA experience:

A bi-national programme management structure (2):

Under this option, one can find fully centralised and partly / entirely decentralised solutions.

- A fully centralised bi-national management system has only been adopted by the INTERREG IIIA programme Spain/Portugal.
- A partly or fully decentralised bi-national management system has been established for a smaller number of INTERREG IIIA programmes along a number of borders in France, Scandinavia or Germany: The INTERREG IIIA programme “Spain/France”, the programmes covering the French-Belgium border (“France-Wallonie-Flanders”) and the Italian-French land border (“Espace ALCOTRA”), the 2 Scandinavian INTERREG IIIA programmes „Kvarken–MittSkandia” (SF/SK/NOR) and “Øresund Region” (DK/S), but also under the programmes covering the wider cross-border area around the Lake Constance (D/A/CH/LI).

Main features of INTERREG IIIA programmes (1)

No	INTERREG IIIA programme	Overall context			Cross-border co-operation / INTERREG IIIA management		
		Type of EU-border	Main territorial features	Features of the state systems "meeting" at the border	Cross-border structures & legal status of co-operation	Actors involved in INTERREG IIIA management	Nature of the INTERREG IIIA arrangement *)
NORTH-WEST EUROPE							
1	(NL/DE) EUREGIO - Euregio Rhine-Waal - euregio rhine-meuse-north	"old" internal	Land border	Federalised-regionalised	Existing structures (Euregios), public & private-law based co-operation	National, regional & local authorities, cross-border structures	Truly cross-border & fully decentralised management structure
2	(BE/NL) Flanders - Netherlands	"old" internal	Land border	Federalised-regionalised	Existing structures (Euregios), public & private-law based co-operation	National, regional & local authorities, cross-border structures	One-sided management , partly / entirely decentralised
3	(BE/DE/NL) Euregio Meuse-Rhine	"old" internal	Land border	Federalised-regionalised	Existing structure (Euregio), public & private-law based co-operation	National, regional & local authorities, cross-border structure	Truly cross-border & fully decentralised management structure
4	(DE/LU/BE) Germany-Luxembourg-German Speaking Community of Belgium/Walloon Region	"old" internal	Land border	Federalised-centralised	Existing structures, public & private-law based co-operation	National, regional & local authorities	One-sided management , partly / entirely decentralised
5	(FR/DE) PAMINA	"old" internal	Land border	Regionalised-federalised	Existing structures, public & private-law based co-operation	National, regional & local authorities, cross-border structure	Truly cross-border & fully decentralised management structure
6	(FR/UK) Franco-British Programme	"old" internal	Sea border	Centralised-regionalised	No cross-border structures	National, regional & local authorities	One-sided management , partly / entirely decentralised
7	(IE/UK) Ireland - Northern Ireland	"old" internal	Land border	Centralised, with local self-government	Existing structures, public & private-law based co-operation	National, regional & local authorities, cross-border structure	Truly cross-border & fully decentralised management structure
8	(DE/FR/CH) Upper Rhine Centre-South	"old" internal & external	Land border, partly with natural handicaps	Federalised-regionalised	Existing structures, public & private-law based co-operation	National, regional & local authorities, cross-border structure	One-sided management , partly / entirely decentralised

*) According to the classification elaborated in the study for the European Commission (DG-REGIO) "Towards a new Community legal instrument for public law based Trans-European Co-operation among territorial authorities in the European Union (Synthesis Report, March 2004)".

Main features of INTERREG IIIA programmes (2)							
No	INTERREG IIIA programme	Overall context			Cross-border co-operation / INTERREG IIIA management		
		Type of EU-border	Main territorial features	Features of the state systems "meeting" at the border	Cross-border structures & legal status of co-operation	Actors involved in INTERREG IIIA management	Nature of the INTERREG IIIA arrangement *)
NORTHERN EUROPE & SCANDINAVIA							
9	(FI/SE/NO) Kvarken - Mittskandia	"old" internal & external border	Land/sea border	Regionalised-centralised	Existing structures, private-law based co-operation	National, regional & local authorities, cross-border structures	Bi-national management partly or fully decentralised
10	(DK/DE) Sonderjylland - Schleswig	"old" internal	Land border	Federalised-regionalised	Existing cross-border structure, based on private law	National, regional & local authorities, cross-border structure	One-sided management, partly / entirely decentralised
11	(SE/NO) Sweden – Norway	external border	Land border	Centralised, with local self-government	Existing structures, private-law based co-operation	National & local authorities, cross-border structure	One-sided management, fully decentralised
12	(DE/PL) Mecklenburg-Vorpommern/Brandenburg - Western Pomerania	"new" internal border	Land border with natural handicaps	Federalised-regionalised-centralised	Existing structures, private-law based co-operation	National, regional & local authorities, cross-border structure	Bi-national management, partly / entirely decentralised
13	(FI/RU) Euregio Karelia	external border	Land border, partly with natural handicaps	Regionalised-federalised	Existing structures, private-law based co-operation	National & regional authorities, cross-border structure	One-sided management, partly / entirely decentralised
14	(SE/DK) Øresund Region	"old" internal	Sea border with fixed link connection	Centralised-regionalised	Existing structures, private-law based co-operation	National & local authorities, cross-border structure	Bi-national management partly or fully decentralised
EASTERN PART OF THE BALTIC SEA AREA							
15	(FI/EE) Southern Finland – Estonia	"new" internal	Sea border	Regionalised-centralised	Existing structures, private-law based co-operation	National, regional & local authorities, (cross-border structures only in monitoring committee)	One-sided management, partly / entirely decentralised
16	(LV/LT/BY) Latvia - Lithuania - Belarus	"new" internal border & "new" external border	Land border, partly with natural handicaps	Centralised, with local self-government	Existing structures, private-law based co-operation	National & local authorities (cross-border structures only in monitoring committee)	One-sided management, fully centralised
*) According to the classification elaborated in the study for the European Commission (DG-REGIO) "Towards a new Community legal instrument for public law based Transeuropean Co-operation among territorial authorities in the European Union (Synthesis Report, March 2004)".							

Main features of INTERREG IIIA programmes (3)							
No	INTERREG IIIA programme	Overall context			Cross-border co-operation / INTERREG IIIA management		
		Type of EU-border	Main territorial features	Features of the state systems "meeting" at the border	Cross-border structures & legal status of co-operation	Actors involved in INTERREG IIIA management	Nature of the INTERREG IIIA arrangement *)
EASTERN PART OF THE BALTIC SEA AREA							
17	(PL/BY/UA) Poland - Belarus - Ukraine	external border	Land border, partly with natural handicaps	Regionalised-centralised	Existing structures, private-law based co-operation	National, regional & local authorities (cross-border structures only in monitoring committee)	One-sided management, fully centralised
18	(LT/PL/RU) Lithuania - Poland - Kaliningrad	"new" internal border & "new" external border	Land border	Centralised-regionalised federalised	Existing structures, private-law based co-operation	National, regional & local authorities (cross-border structures only in monitoring committee)	One-sided management, fully centralised
CENTRAL & EASTERN EUROPE							
19	(AT/HU) Austria – Hungary	"new" internal	Land border	Federalised-regionalised	Existing structures, private-law based co-operation	National & regional authorities (cross-border structure?)	One-sided management, partly decentralised
20	(DE/PL) Brandenburg-Poland	"new" internal	Land border, partly with natural handicaps	Federalised-regionalised	Existing structures, private-law based co-operation	National & regional authorities, cross-border structures	One-sided management, partly / entirely decentralised
21	(PL/SK) Poland – Slovakia PL/CZ	"new" internal	Land border, partly with natural handicaps	Regionalised-centralised	Existing structures, private-law based co-operation	National & regional authorities	One-sided management, fully centralised
22	(DE/CZ) Bavaria - Czech Republic	"new" internal	Land border, partly with natural handicaps	Federalised-centralised	Existing structures, private-law based co-operation	National & regional authorities, cross-border structure	One-sided management, partly / entirely decentralised
23	(HU/SK/UA) Hungary - Slovakia – Ukraine	"new" internal & external	Land border, partly with natural handicaps	Centralised, with local self-government	Existing structures, private-law based co-operation	National & regional authorities	One-sided management, fully centralised
ALPINE AND PERI-ALPINE SPACE							
24	(IT/FR) Italy - France (ALCOTRA)	"old" internal	Land border with natural handicaps / barriers	Regionalised	Existing structures, private-law based co-operation	National & regional authorities (cross-border structure?)	Bi-national management partly or fully decentralised
*) According to the classification elaborated in the study for the European Commission (DG-REGIO) "Towards a new Community legal instrument for public law based Trans-European Co-operation among territorial authorities in the European Union (Synthesis Report, March 2004)".							

Main features of INTERREG IIIA programmes (4)							
No	INTERREG IIIA programme	Overall context			Cross-border co-operation / INTERREG IIIA management		
		Type of EU-border	Main territorial features	Features of the state systems "meeting" at the border	Cross-border structures & legal status of co-operation	Actors involved in INTERREG IIIA management	Nature of the INTERREG IIIA arrangement *)
ALPINE AND PERI-ALPINE SPACE							
25	(AT/CH/DE/LI) Alpenrhein-Bodensee-Hochrhein	"old" internal & external	Land border with natural handicaps / barriers	Federalised-centralised	Existing structures, private-law based co-operation	National & regional authorities (cross-border structure?)	Bi-national management partly or fully decentralised
26	(IT/AT) Italy – Austria	"old" internal	Land border with natural handicaps / barriers	Regionalised-federalised	Existing structures, private-law based co-operation	National & regional authorities (cross-border structure?)	One-sided management, partly / entirely decentralised
27	(IT/SI) Italy - Slovenia	"new" internal	Land border with natural handicaps / barriers	Regionalised-centralised	Existing structures, private-law based co-operation	National, regional & local authorities	One-sided management, partly / decentralised?
28	(AT/DE) Austria - Germany/Bavaria	"old" internal border	Land border with natural handicaps / barriers	Federalised	Existing structures, private-law based co-operation	National & regional authorities (cross-border structure?)	One-sided management, partly / entirely decentralised
IBERIAN PENINSULA AND EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN							
29	(FR/ES) France - Spain	"old" internal	Land border with natural handicaps / barriers	Regionalised	Existing structures, private law based co-operation & public-law based co-operation based on national law	National & regional authorities	Bi-national management partly or fully decentralised
30	(ES/PT) Spain - Portugal	"old" internal	Land border, partly with natural handicaps	Centralised-regionalised	Existing structures, private law based co-operation (changing context due to new inter-state agreement)	National & regional authorities (cross-border structure?)	Bi-national management, fully centralised
31	(EL/BG) Greece – Bulgaria	external border	Land border with natural handicaps / barriers	Centralised, with regional/local self-government	Existing structures, private-law based co-operation	National & regional authorities (cross-border structure?)	One-sided management, fully centralised
32	(EL/TR) Greece – Turkey	external border	Land border with natural handicaps / barriers	Centralised, with regional/local self-government	Existing structures, private-law based co-operation	National & regional authorities (cross-border structure?)	One-sided management, fully centralised
*) According to the classification elaborated in the study for the European Commission (DG-REGIO) "Towards a new Community legal instrument for public law based Trans-European Co-operation among territorial authorities in the European Union (Synthesis Report, March 2004)".							

