

INTERREG-A Inner Scandinavia

Cross-border development partnership Priorities and Achievements (2007 – 2010)



FINAL REPORT – DEC 2011





EUROPEAN UNION European Regional Development Fund



INTERREG-A Inner Scandinavia

Cross-border development partnership Priorities and Achievements (2007 – 2010)

© INTERREG Sverige - Norge

www.interreg-sverige-norge.com

Hedmark fylkeskommune

Forvaltende organisasjon

Besøksadresse Parkgata 64 Postadresse N-2325 Hamar +47 62 54 40 00 interreg@hedmark.org

IGOT - CEG – NEST Final Report Nov 2011

IGOT - Centro de Estudos Geográficos da Universidade de Lisboa Núcleo de Estratégias e Políticas Territoriais (NEST)

Edifício da Faculdade de Letras Alameda da Universidade 1600-214 Lisboa Portugal Tel.: + 351 217940218 / 217965469 Fax: +351 217938690 www.igot.ul.pt - www.ceg.ul.pt/ ceg@campus.ul.pt

- Project Coordinator: Eduardo Medeiros
- Project Leader: Luís Moreno
- Project Consultant: Eduarda Costa
- Project Consultant: Iva Pires
- Analyses & Text: Eduardo Medeiros
- Statistics, Cartography and Graphics: Eduardo Medeiros
- Revision: Luís Moreno, Eduarda Costa and Iva Pires

ISBN 978-972-636-212-8 Lisbon, December 2011

| Table of c | ontents |
|------------|---------|
|------------|---------|

| Executive Summary | 6 |
|---|----------------------|
| Part 1 - Territorial Cohesion trends in Inner Scandinavia (1995-2010) | 22 |
| 1.1 - A balanced socioeconomic services distribution? 1.2 - Towards a more balanced and polycentric territory? 1.3 - The role of territorial cooperation in Inner Scandinavia – ever increasing intensity of cross-border cooperation 1.4 - Enhancing environmental sustainability and preparing for climate change? | . 40 . 53 . 55 |
| Part 2 - Inner Scandinavia - INTERREG-A sub-programme (2007-2013) | 61 |
| 2.1 - Programme main objectives 2.2 - Approved projects coherence and relevance | |
| Part 3 - Synthesis of mid-term evaluations (2007-2010) | 80 |
| 3.1 - Projects effectiveness (objectives vs results) | . 80 |
| 3.1.1 - Contribution to the regional seven policy areas 3.1.2 - Job creation 3.1.3 - Contribution to reduce the barrier-effect | . 84 |
| 3.2 - Projects efficiency (inputs vs outputs) | . 90 |
| 3.2.1 - Efficiency in main evaluation domains3.2.2 - Efficiency in the seven political areas | . 94 |
| 3.3 - Main obstacles to cooperation | 113 |
| References 1 | 16 |
| List of figures and tables 1 | 21 |
| Acknowledgments1 | 23 |

Executive Summary

Introduction:

The past 17 years have seen substantial progress in the Swedish-Norwegian INTERREG-A programme, which has entered into its third generation (2007-2013), with the overarching goals of strengthening the attractiveness and competitiveness of the border region. This progress can be witnessed by the improved selectivity of the projects (fewer, with more funding and more focused on innovation) and the involved partners (increasing participation of universities and research centres).

However, in spite of the well-known maturity of this Nordic cross-border programme, many challenges lie ahead, as the Swe-Nor border region continues, in general, its territorial exclusion path, in the Scandinavian socioeconomic context, where the main urban agglomeration areas (Stockholm, Oslo and Gothenburg) take advantage of their competitive territorial advantages (human capital, knowledge centres, decision making structures, access to capital, accessibilities, etc.).

Even so, the actions and interventions put forward by the Swe-Nor INTERREG-A have had a positive mitigation effect in this persistent territorial exclusion process, typical of most European border areas. Indeed, in a broad assessment, this programme has been crucial in supporting the local/regional socioeconomic activity, both directly (firms and local/regional entities) and indirectly (innovation, training, knowledge diffusion, etc.). In addition, on a regional perspective, the establishment and the strengthening of cross-border intangible networks (ex: cross-border committees), as well as some physical connections - in a minor degree - have contributed to increase the territorial articulation of the border area.

Finally, and more importantly, this Nordic cross-border programme has been critical in reducing the barrier effect, in all its dimensions (institutional-urban, economy-technology, social-cultural, environmental-heritage, accessibilities), in

6

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

the border area. In this sense, the Swe-Nor INTERREG-A programme has been achieving its main goal of bridging the border territory. Another positive note is the fact that many regional stakeholders start to look at this programme, not only as a means to develop their own side of the border, but as a specific crossborder development programme, which complements the existing regional development programmes in: (i) exploring regional complementarities; (ii) reducing the border barriers; (iii) boosting the territorial capital and (iv) pursing territorial cohesion. This requires a solid and sustainable cross-border regional development plan, which involves the local and regional partners, as well as the private (firms) and the knowledge centres (the triple helix model).

In this context, the main purpose of this report was, at first, to provide evidence in whether the territorial cohesion goal can be achieved in Inner Scandinavia, through the INTERREG-A sub-programme interventions, in supporting territorial cooperation/governance, environmental sustainability, socioeconomic cohesion and a more articulated and polycentric development. Secondly, 24 Inner Scandinavia INTERREG approved projects were assessed it terms of their relevance, effectiveness and efficiency, in order to produce overall conclusions on the programme/Inner Scandinavia partnership capacity to achieve their goals, within their 2 / 8 (sub-targets) political priorities and third: to elaborate recommendations for the next Swe-Nor INTERREG-A programming period (2014-2020).

Territorial Cohesion trends in Inner Scandinavia:

The Green Paper on Territorial Cohesion expressed its goal of 'turning territorial diversity into strength' in European regions. Yet, in our view, it failed in producing a convincing conceptual approach in order to clarify the territorial cohesion concept. Nevertheless, this report reaffirmed the importance of promoting: (i) territorial concentration (overcoming differences in density); (ii) territorial connection (overcoming distances) and (iii) territorial cooperation (overcoming division).

In a quest to see beyond these territorial cohesion proposed dimensions in the Green Paper on Territorial Cohesion, we assessed the territorial cohesion trends in Inner Scandinavia in view of a more holistic conceptual approach, which understands territorial cohesion as the process of promoting a more cohesive and balanced territory, by: (i) supporting the reduction of socioeconomic territorial imbalances; (ii) promoting environmental sustainability; (iii) reinforcing and improving the territorial cooperation/governance processes; and (iv) reinforcing and establishing a more balanced and polycentric urban system.

Under this view, we built up a simplified Territorial Cohesion Index, with several statistical indicators, related with the chosen components of each one of the four dimensions selected for the territorial cohesion concept. This was done for two periods of time, covering the last decade (1998 and 2008), in all Scandinavian provinces (NUTS III), based on the methodology used in the United Nations Human Development Reports, to create the Human Development Index.

The first main conclusion from the obtained regional Territorial Cohesion indexes, built with the selected indicators, was that: over last decade (1998-2008), Inner Scandinavia did not achieve the goal of territorial cohesion, since the growth of this indicator was slightly lower than the Scandinavian average. Not unexpectedly, the provinces with larger urban agglomerations (Oslo, Stockholm) showed better performance in this index. But many others, located in quite peripheral and rural areas in the north of Scandinavia, also obtained above average results.

When it comes to Inner Scandinavia, which was delimited in this particular analysis, by its four main provinces (Hedmark, Akershus, Värmland and Dalarna), the best 'results' were obtained by the two northern provinces, perhaps because our methodology only regards the socioeconomic dimension as one of the four pillars of territorial cohesion. Yet, it goes without saying that the obtained results should be read with caution, since they are dependent of the selected variables.

8

Nevertheless, the report should be taken on consideration by the Inner Scandinavian regional authorities, with a view to promote regional development policies. Consequently, there should be a more proactive approach in: (i) promoting a more polycentric and balanced territory; (ii) supporting environmental sustainability; (iii) stimulating socioeconomic cohesion and (iv) reinforcing territorial cooperation/governance.

In concrete terms, to achieve the goal of territorial cohesion over the next decade, Inner Scandinavia should put more attention in the provision of crossborder public transports, which are taken as one of the most important services of general interest. This provision, of course, should go hand in hand with the prevailing Norwegian and Swedish regional policies to promote competitiveness of the main regional urban centres. Yet, a broader cross-border territorial vision should be followed in stimulating a more polycentric and balanced territory, namely by establishing an reinforcing the cross-border physical links (accessibilities), between the four main urban border constellations (Hedmark Cassiopeia, Dalarna Andromeda, Akershus Cancer and Värmland Semi-Hercules).

In addition, at the relational level, spatial integration in Inner Scandinavia can be improved by better exploring the territorial diversity in terms of regional specializations, in a development strategy that promotes regional complementarities, focused not only on economic competition but also in several other functions, such as education, culture and social infrastructure. But, for this vision to become a reality, it needs to be built in common interests with the input of all participants. Under this view, for instance, the northern and more rural area could develop a common tourist attractive regional brand, while the more urbanized areas should strengthen their position in the innovation European panorama, through increased cooperation and knowledge transfer.

9

Inner Scandinavia projects relevance, effectiveness and efficiency

This part of the report provides a reflection and distils the main findings, from 24 INTERREG-A Swe-Nor (2007-2013) evaluated projects in Inner Scandinavia, in terms of their relevance, effectiveness and efficiency. This evaluation was carried out on June 2011, in Inner Scandinavia, and is based on a series of targeted interviews to project leaders, in the Norwegian part of the border. In this sense, it must be said that some findings are largely dependent on the respondent's views.

In this light, one might argue that this methodological approach does not bring to the fore a complete picture of the projects effects (downstream and upstream), since many other project beneficiaries (ex: students, firms) had no possibility to express their opinion on the project utility, quality and results. Indeed, we honestly agree that further enquires to several elements, which were supported by the projects, could add further complementary insights to the present analysis. Even so, we are absolutely sure that the large majority of the answers provided in the 24 interviews are genuine and reliable, and can be extremely useful to make this report an important decision-making aid tool, to the INTERREG-A Inner Scandinavia secretariat goal of continuously improving the cross-border cooperation process in the border area.

Has previously said, INTERREG-A should not be viewed as another overlapping regional development programme, but as a tool to reduce the barrier effect along the border and, at the same time, assist border areas to overcome specific socioeconomic development problems and to reinforce their territorial articulation, both in the relational dimension (establishment of networks), and in the morphologic dimension (infra-structures).

Accordingly, the 24 approved projects relevance should largely depend on their contribution to accomplish these goals, and also to attain the main objectives defined in the Swe-Nor INTERREG-A IV (2007-2013) programme (strengthen the border regions attractiveness and competitiveness) and, more specifically, the seven Inner Scandinavia main political areas: Innovation; Climate Change;

Education; Culture; Urban-rural Development; Environment/Nature Protection and Public Health.

From this perspective, and considering that the programme SWOT analysis and the main strategic guidelines are adequate and consistent with the Swe-Nor border region strengths (large protected natural areas and substantial natural resources), weaknesses (structural weaknesses of firms and territorial isolation), opportunities (tourism and innovation) and threats (young migration and competitive disadvantages), and that the seven mentioned Inner Scandinavia political areas cover the region's needs, we can undoubtedly state that, in overall terms, the relevance of the analysed 24 projects is very high.

More specifically, a positive note should be given to the Inner Scandinavia secretariat meticulous work in selecting the projects, which a subject of a scrupulous evaluation, in order to see if they fulfil the programme purposes. In addition, it should be said that the analysed projects relevance was largely concentrated essentially in two political areas: innovation and education. This is a consequence of the larger financial support given to the 'economic growth' priority of the programme, and also the recognition that the support put on innovation and human capital should stand as an utmost goal to explore the Inner Scandinavia territorial capital.

This chosen path to stimulate cooperation across Inner Scandinavia, through increasing emphasis on innovation as a driver for economic and regional growth, in order to strengthen regional economic activity and competitiveness, fits well within the region territorial potentials (balanced distribution of universities and research centres) and the cross-border added value of supporting knowledge diffusion across borders. On the other hand, the financial constraints of the programme limit its influence in solving all the problems and satisfying all the needs of the border area, as well as avoiding several threats. So, it makes sense that the available funds should be concentrated in a limited number of areas which could help the border regions grasp specific development opportunities.

11

It is also noteworthy that, besides the projects relevance and adequacy to the regional development main goals, the projects in this study are also characterized by high levels of genuinity (100% 'pure' cross-border projects), continuity (more than 80% will continue even without INTERREG support), and additionality (more than 70% would not take place without INTERREG). Yet, the evaluation of these projects should also concern on whether the objectives formulated in the programme are being achieved and how appropriate the solutions chosen have been. In other words, the *effectiveness* of projects (objectives *vs* outputs) should be assessed.

However, the collected data only leads to general conclusions on their effectiveness, based on the projects average achievement ratios. Nevertheless, in some cases, this data does not represent sufficiently robust evidence for estimating the effects associated with achieved outputs and results, since some projects are at their starting phase. In spite of these setbacks, our analysis shows that there is a quite satisfactory level of progress in terms of produced outputs (immediate results) and results, across the whole spectrum of the defined Inner Scandinavia political areas, with particular emphasis on the Innovation, Education and Climate Change.

Concerning the latter goal (Climate Change), the programme dedicated around 20% of its total funding (40% on innovation and 10% on education), which definitely puts the Swe-Nor INTERREG-A as a political driving force in the climate action in Inner Scandinavia. Evidently, this delicate issue should be viewed with care when it comes to the practical impacts of the approved INTERREG-A projects which deal with energy and climate change, since atmospheric space has no borders whatsoever. In any case, a proactive approach to intervene on climate issues requires a solid 'step by step' approach in favouring the use of renewable energy and promoting public and private practices on energy efficiency. In this light, we can state that the inner Scandinavian programme is leading the way in climate pilot action in the region.

Anyhow, it is not possible to conclude that the produced outputs and results were already shaped into sustainable territorial impacts. Still, it is possible to reason, to a certain degree, that the estimated 100-150 sustainable jobs

created by the analysed projects, will greatly contribute to achieve the desirable long term results (impacts) in many of them. At the same vein, the support given to small firms (ex: tourism field) and to entrepreneurship promotion (ex: amongst the young), can be seen as a 'seed planting' long-term development strategy, to stimulate local/regional economy.

Finally, the effectiveness of the 24 assessed projects can also be proven by its positive contribution to reduce the barrier effect along Inner Scandinavia border. In fact, our analysis showed that almost all the projects contribute strongly to increase the border permeabilization in, at least, one barrier effect dimension. Yet, they focus mainly in improving the economic/technologic permeabilization of the border, by establishing and reinforcing networks between universities and companies.

When it comes to the projects efficiency - which can be viewed as an equation between the programme inputs and the results obtained or, preferably, the impacts produced - our analysis was mainly based on the answers provided by the interviewed projects leaders, and on our own value of judgement of the projects efficiency in certain domains. Yet, it needs to be said that the assessment of the possibility of achieving a more cost effective performance with some other types of interventions (non INTERREG), merits more careful investigation.

Nonetheless, it is difficult to imagine other type of regional development programme which could overlap the goals of the INTERREG-A Community Initiative. Consequently, in this report the efficiency of the projects was assessed in view of the relationship between the investments and the produced results in: (i) reinforcing partnership/network strengthening; (ii) contributing to knowledge production and (iii) supporting local economy and entrepreneurship. In this vein, most of the analysed projects show high levels of efficiency in using the programme funds.

Regarding their efficiency in supporting the seven Inner Scandinavian political areas, we can conclude that, for instance, the money spent on the Innovation and Education goals has produced, so far, quite positive outputs and results,

namely by stimulating cross-border 'knowledge transfer' and by enhancing 'human capital'. There is also evidence to suggest that the allocated investments on nature and environmental protection, as well as the support to promote the efficient use of energy, are well interlinked with the goal of promoting tourism activity in the border area, directly or indirectly. As a consequence, the projects efficiency profit with that approach.

On the other hand, some projects (a few) could improve their efficiency if they can be integrated in a more holistic approach of regional development, with a view to produce additional spin-offs to the local/regional economy. For example, the very interesting idea of exploring sports activities in the border region could be integrated in a regional strategy to both reduce the language barrier amongst youth and to achieve the Inner Scandinavia political goal of 'Public Health'.

Added value and persistent obstacles of cross-border cooperation

One of the most important aspects associated with the cross-border cooperation process is the added value that it brings to the territorial development of border regions. In light of this, we assessed the added value of the analysed 24 projects within a typology proposed by the AEBR. Concomitantly, we concluded that, in terms of their added value, three areas were particularly beneficiated by the projects: (i) networking; (ii) human capital and (iii) knowledge exchange/production.

But many other areas of added value were indicated by the project: (i) increase understanding and collaboration; (ii) implement the principles of subsidiarity and partnership; (iii) increase socioeconomic cohesion; (iv) promote involvement by all actors; (v) mobilize endogenous potential by strengthening the regional and local levels; (vi) promote the participation of partners from the economic and social sectors; (vii) create additional development in certain regional development fields; (viii) disseminate knowledge concerning the border region and (ix) promote regional experts and key institutions networks. Regarding the main obstacles and challenges encountered by the project leaders during the project implementation, we can summarize the following: (i) some key partners quit the projects; (ii) physical distances are too large and territories lack proper connection infrastructures; (iii) language barriers in the beginning of the project make it difficult to engage the projects 'cruise speed'; (iv) some bureaucratic procedures need to be mitigated; (v) administrative rules and procedures (ex: school systems) are quite different.

Conclusions and Recommendations:

Looking across the main findings presented in this report, one can draw the following overall conclusions and recommendations on the main aspects of the evaluation:

The role of territorial cooperation to achieve Territorial Cohesion:

In our view, territorial cooperation should be regarded as one of the four pillars of territorial cohesion, together with (ii) polycentrism, (iii) socioeconomic cohesion and (iv) environmental sustainability. Consequently, the solidification of the cross-border cooperation process in Inner Scandinavia is a key condition to achieve the goal of a more balanced and harmonious territory in the region.

For the pillar number two: 'establish and reinforce a balanced polycentric territory', the INTERREG-A programme can ultimately contribute to a more polycentric, articulated and balanced Inner Scandinavia territory by: (i) reducing the barrier effect along the border; (ii) stimulating, establishing and reinforcing relational multi-level networks; (iii) by strengthening the physical connections (roads, rail and public transports) and by (iv) develop the urban constellations possible links and complementarities.

Under pillar three: 'supporting socioeconomic cohesion', the investigated crossborder project have a decisive role in supporting the economic activity by: (i) capitalizing knowledge and innovation transfer along the border; (ii) solving structural problems of labour market; (iii) gradually harmonize the education systems and promote students mobility; (iv) stimulating entrepreneurship and by (v) bringing new knowledge (seminars) and new markets to firms.

Finally, the pillar of 'environmental sustainability' will gain from the process of cross-border cooperation in Inner Scandinavia, since it has had a key role in solving and anticipating environmental problems (climate change, pollution), promote the efficient use of clean energy and reinforce the collaboration between the national protected areas, within a larger strategy to promote a regional touristic common brand, which could attract more visitors and better explore one of the major regional territorial capitals: wilderness and large protected natural areas.

In sum, the implementation of a sound cross-border cooperation action plan, through a careful selection of the INTERREG-A projects in Inner Scandinavia can have a decisive role in achieving the goal of territorial cohesion, as long as they support territorial networks (physical and relational), environmental sustainability, socioeconomic cohesion and cross-border governance structures.

The contribution of the 24 analysed projects to territorial cohesion in Inner Scandinavia:

The Swe-Nor INTERREG-A IV programme, on its own, does not have enough financial capacity to invert the territorial exclusion process in the border area. Yet, it has had a strong mitigating effect in reducing this persistent trend in most European border regions. This is also true for Inner Scandinavia, which has a more socioeconomic and demographic dynamic area (Oslo – Hamar), and two other socioeconomic vibrant 'islands' (Karlstad and Falun/Borlänge). The remaining territory faces depopulation and socioeconomic vulnerabilities. Regarding the role of the 24 analysed projects to promote Territorial Cohesion in the region, the following conclusions can be drawn:

• The polycentrism in the region was only backed by the reinforcement of relational networks. Here, the Hedmark-Dalarna network project has

potential for fortifying political relations between the two neighbour regions. As an enlarged (area) ARKO has contributed to stability in the relations between Värmland and Hedmark for decades. To cover the whole functional cross-border partnership area, also the important region of Akershus may join political cross-border institutions parallel to the INTERREG-A programmes. In addition, most projects had their 'foundation' around the four regional major urban agglomerations (Hamar, Lillestrøm, Karlstad and Falun/Borlänge), which benefits urban and universities networking. Disappointingly, the reinforcement of physical connections was highly neglected by the projects.

- The socioeconomic cohesion in the region was favoured by the majority of the 24 assessed projects, which already show considerable achievements in boosting regional innovation, education and entrepreneurship. All these areas have positive, direct and indirect, effects in the regional economy, especially because they are based on the concretization of the triple helix model, by involving universities, government and firms in the process.
- The environmental sustainability is also being targeted by several projects. Some have supplied additional knowledge on energy efficiency and the use of renewable energy. Others have started a pioneering approach to natural protected areas closer collaboration in the region. Furthermore, the transversal goal of approving environmental sustainable projects has also helped to bring additional strength to this pillar of territorial cohesion.
- Lastly, the pillar of territorial cooperation/governance was targeted by all the analysed projects, by mobilizing local/regional stakeholders and by strengthening the already high level of partnership and participation of actors from the economic and social sectors.

In conclusion, the cross-border cooperation process in Inner Scandinavia shows a higher degree of maturity in managing the available INTERREG-A IV financial resources, by focusing in exploring the territorial capital of the region. This is being done by following a path of innovation (supporting entrepreneurship and university/firms collaboration) and environmental sustainability (supporting energy efficiency and natural protected areas collaboration), in order to achieve the INTERREG-A main goals of regional competitiveness and attractiveness. Yet, as in all programmes, there is always space for improvements and recommendations.

Recommendations:

- The present 'governance structure' of the Swe-Nor programme, with three sub-programmes, seems to be working perfectly well in achieving the programme's goals. Hence, the Inner Scandinavia sub-programme should continue to implement its cross-border strategy under the auspices of the EU subsidiarity principle, and using the experience and knowledge of its highly prepared secretariat, in cross-border issues.
- The Swe-Nor INTERREG-A IV vision and strategy has a strong rationale and is adequate to the region needs, with its two main goals: economic growth and attractive living environment. Yet, in Inner Scandinavia, the evaluation of the programme's outputs, results and impacts requires a balance between the EU principle of concentration (two main priorities) and their sub-categories, the seven political areas. Hence, we recommend the unification of some of these areas in four main political goals: (i) innovation (competence and entrepreneurship); (ii) tourism (culture/heritage, environment-climate change, sports-language/health); (iii) infrastructure (public transports and road/rail capacity) and (iv) institutional partnership and networks.
- Physical accessibilities should be improved, namely between Hedmark and Dalarna provinces (Hamar – Falun). This would require the financial reinforcement of the programme. As known, cross-border cooperation has intangible aspects, but eventually, face to face relations are necessary and of outmost importance to solidify cross-border networks. Consequently, the intensification of the cross-border process between Hedmark and Dalarna faces big challenges, in reducing the physical territorial distances.
- The "growth corridor," Oslo-Karlstad-Stockholm has huge potential if developing the major roads and the railway, to standards more close to the other legs of the "Nordic Triangle."

- Pioneering projects in establishing public transport links could be set up. This could be done, for instance, by extending existing bus routes along the Swedish and Norwegian sides of the border. A master-plan for the reinforcement of east-west connections in the entire Sweden-Norway programme or even-border, stands as an option as well.
- Hedmark, Akershus and Dalarna may by their own means join the vast group of Nordic cross-border committees, in order to consolidate its vision and development strategy. As is the case of other cross border committees, their scope may be primarily focused on cross-border regional analysis, political meeting arenas and joint lobby to authorities at national and supra national level.
- The ARKO Committee would gain in its intervention powers and crossborder influence by extending its influence to the whole area of Värmland (S), and Akershus (N). By doing so, this Committee would fill up the remaining Swedish-Norwegian cross-border area not covered but such cross-border organizations.
- The goal of environmental sustainability may go hand in hand with a broader vision and strategy of tourism exploration, with a view to link the regions environmental quality and potential with the possibilities to promote economic activities in the region.
- The Swedish secretariat is doing a very good job but, according to some project leaders, it could be more flexible, as far as possible.
- Territorial complementarities could be explored at the regional level (between the four regional urban constellations). In this regard, the approved INTERREG-A projects can play an important role in reinforcing the regional specialization, by improving competence and entrepreneurship in certain clusters. Furthermore, cross-border cooperation could have a key role in reinforcing 'urban-rural collaboration' in areas such as innovation/knowledge, tourism and manufacturing, by fostering knowledge transfer.
- The concentration of projects in the main regional urban agglomerations should continue, since this strategy enhances the possibilities to choose

investments in critical innovative areas that can make the region more qualified and competitive, while favouring the green economy.

- The role of universities and research centres in the programme (number of projects and financing) is adequate and it should be, at least, maintained.
- Cross-border sports activities could be intensified in light of the public health political goal. Yet, in our view, they should be closely connected with a regional tourism strategy to attract visitors interested in open air physical activities. Moreover, the participation of youth in these sport activities could be used to reduce the language barrier along the border.
- An organized and complete database with possible local and regional firms, divided by economic activity, could be put online, in order to facilitate the projects partner's selection and the access of this information to some project leaders.
- The Inner Scandinavia secretariat is known to be always present when necessary and to follow the projects closely. Yet, some project leaders stated that after the initial phase, the connection with the secretariat fades away, probably a bit too much.
- As far as possible, we also recommend that the mid-term and post evaluation procedures could extend beyond the opinions of project leaders and take on consideration some project beneficiaries, like students and firms.
- Job creation goals should be regarded as a concrete mean to achieve an integrated regional development approach in the border area. It is true that unemployment rates are low in the Norwegian part of the border. However, INTERREG-A is neither an Hedmark or an Akershus regional programme by itself, and should be regarded as a cross-border intervention plan. As such, the high levels of unemployment in the Swedish side of the border should be taken in consideration by the approved projects.
- The number of projects supporting the green economy (energy efficiency and energy renewable production) already comprising a fair proportion of programme budget, could be even enlarged in the next programming period, and supported by the EU 2020 agenda of smart, sustainable and inclusive growth.

- The involvement of youth in the programme is considerable at an estimated figure of 25 000 persons involved in the Inner Scandinavia projects (up to November 2011). This high level should be maintained, both by favouring entrepreneurship learning (exploring their creativity and ideas), and also by involving them in sports and cultural cross-border activities.
- Impact projects, according to Inner Scandinavia four criterias pr 31.12.
 2010 make up 80% of total investments. In the next programming period this level should be maintained. In certain policy areas, individual projects may be even larger, and also increase, in relative terms, with the present INTERREG-A generation.
- New projects should, as much as possible, continue to establish a pro-active and on-going interaction, with the existing regional and sectorial development strategies. This would help to ensure complementary, coordination and synergy.
- Where possible, a future Inner Scandinavia Partnership Committee could experiment with the new EGTC (European Groupings for Territorial Cooperation), or other tailor made measures, with a view to reduce the administrative/regulation barrier and to prepare the setting-up of fully integrated cross-border programme management structures for the next programming period.

Part 1 - Territorial Cohesion trends in Inner Scandinavia (1995-2010)

The objective of 'territorial cohesion' was finally included in the EU Treaty (Lisbon) when it came into force in 2009, alongside with the goals of economic and social cohesion, which were "expressed in the Single European Act and became reality in 1988, with the adoption of the first regulation which gave birth to Cohesion Policy" (EC, 2008c: 2).

In concrete terms, the Article 3 of the Lisbon Treaty expressed the EU will to "promote economic, social and territorial cohesion, and solidarity among Member States" (EC, 2010c), and the article 174 tries to bring some elucidation to this goal by referring that it can be achieved by promoting an overall harmonious development and by reducing disparities between the levels of development of the various regions and the backwardness of the least favoured regions. Further on, it expresses a particular concern to rural areas and regions affected by industrial transition, and the ones which suffer from severe and permanent natural or demographic handicaps as cross-border and mountain regions, which fit perfectly to most of Inner Scandinavia territory.

To gather some perspective on this issue, we must say that the rationale of promoting a more balanced and harmonious EU territory dates back from 1999, when the ESDP (European Spatial Development Perspective - Towards Balanced and Sustainable Development of the Territory of the European Union - EC, 1999b) was released. Interestingly, for the first time, a spatial approach to tackle some EU unbalances and inequalities was envisioned, by suggesting the integration of the 'Territory' as new dimension of European Policy.

Yet, what places this report as a cornerstone of the existing EU territorial studies, is the concrete recommendations made to achieve the goal of a more balanced and harmonious territory, by setting out objectives which should be pursued by European institutions, governments and regional/local administrative territories. Amongst them, three policy guidelines stood out as the main pillars to support a balanced EU spatial structure:

- Development of a balanced and polycentric urban system and a new urbanrural relationship;
- Securing parity of access to infrastructure and knowledge;
- Sustainable development, prudent management and protection of nature and cultural heritage.

A couple of years later, these ideas were developed in the EU Second Cohesion Report (EC, 2001), which dedicated an entire topic to territorial cohesion, as its successor also did – the Third EU Cohesion Report. In the latter, however, this concept is further clarified by stating that "territorial cohesion extends beyond the notion of economic and social cohesion by both adding to this and reinforcing it. In policy terms, the objective is to help achieve a more balanced development by reducing existing disparities, avoiding territorial imbalances and by making both sectorial policies which have a spatial impact and regional policy more coherent. The concern is also to improve territorial integration and encourage cooperation between regions" (EC, 2004: 27).

Since then, in our view, only two major EU documents brought additional insights to the conceptual analysis of territorial cohesion: the Green Paper on Territorial Cohesion (EC, 2008d) and the EU Fifth Cohesion Report (EC, 2010), even though the clarification of territorial dimensions is far from being achieved, in both of them. However, the former (Green Paper), can be considered as a 'launching pad' for the academic discussion around this concept when it reaffirms that "territorial cohesion is about ensuring the harmonious development" of the EU territory and "about making sure that their citizens are able to make the most of inherent features of these territories. As such, it is a means of transforming diversity into an asset that contributes to sustainable development of the entire EU". Further on, in a rather dispersed manner, it identifies three main goals to attain Territorial Cohesion:

- Promote Concentration: to overcome differences in density;
- <u>Connect Territories:</u> to overcome distances;
- <u>Promote Cooperation:</u> to overcome division.

As regards the Fifth Cohesion Report, it introduced a renovated perspective of territorial cohesion. In other words, it not only associated this concept with the traditional vision of promoting a more balanced and harmonious EU territory, but also highlighted other topics: "as with economic and social cohesion, territorial cohesion highlights a number of issues that merit more attention. economic and social cohesion focuses regional disparities on in competitiveness and well-being; territorial cohesion reinforces the importance of access to services, sustainable development, 'functional geographies' and territorial analysis" (EC, 2010: 24).

However, this 'more complete view' of territorial cohesion still lacks precision in certain aspects, especially when it brings to the fore the interesting idea of 'functional geographies', by mentioning that "the pursuit of territorial cohesion implies a more functional and flexible approach" and that "such a flexible geography can better capture the positive and negative externalities of concentration, improve connections and facilitate cooperation and so be more effective in furthering territorial cohesion".

All these reports and insights, together with some other written analysis (mainly published papers), provided us an academic updated knowledge about the territorial cohesion concept, which we deeply analysed in a previous work, some years ago (Medeiros, E. 2005). In spite of that, we continue to defend the four dimensional model we proposed in that study, with some slight improvements (Fig. 1.1).



Figure 1.1 – The territorial cohesion star



PART 1 - TERRITORIAL COHESION TRENDS IN INNER SCANDINAVIA (1995-2010)

Socioeconomic Cohesion dimension (distribution):

In our view, the Socioeconomic Cohesion dimension - which can also be referred as the 'distribution dimension' of the cohesion - should be included as one of the main dimensions of the territorial cohesion concept and not at the same level as the latter, as expressed in the Lisbon treaty and in the Fifth Cohesion Report, as it is fairly obvious that to achieve territorial cohesion the EU needs to tackle persistent socioeconomic imbalances.

The same idea is expressed in the ESPON Synthesis Report III which notes that "territorial cohesion adds to the concept of economic and social cohesion by translating the fundamental EU goal of balanced and sustainable development into a territorial setting" (ESPON, 2006: 1). In the same line of thought, the fourth Cohesion Report claims that the Territorial Cohesion extends beyond the notion of Socioeconomic Cohesion.

In fact, it is commonly agreed that the EU Cohesion policy is essentially aimed at addressing economic and social inequalities (Bache, 2008) and that the access to services of general economic interest are recalled the Article 14 of the EU Treaty (former article 16) to have a crucial role in promoting social and territorial cohesion. In the same vein, a European Commission report (2007b: 4) this picture by stating that these services completes (energy, telecommunications, transport, audio-visual broadcasting and postal services, education, water supply, waste management, health and social services) are essential for the daily life of citizens and enterprises, and reflect Europe's model of society, since "they play a major role in ensuring social, economic and territorial cohesion throughout the Union and are vital for the sustainable development of the EU in terms of higher levels of employment, social inclusion, economic growth and environmental quality".

To put simple, we can associate this dimension to one of the main ESDP objectives: securing parity of access to infrastructure and knowledge, with a view to reduce territorial imbalances in the socioeconomic domain. For instance, these imbalances can be observed in the access to markets and

essential services, knowledge and basic infrastructure. As such, we propose three main components related with this dimension: (i) knowledge, (ii) income and (iii) access to public services.

Environmental Sustainability dimension:

As in the previous discussed dimension, the choice for the Environmental Cohesion aspects was mainly due to another paramount ESDP objective towards a more balanced and harmonious EU territory: sustainable development, prudent management and protection of nature and cultural heritage. Curiously, by the time when we defended the inclusion of this dimension as one of the main pillar of territorial cohesion, some of our academic colleges showed their scepticism concerning this decision, since, according to them, there was no solid ground theory relating both at the time (2003). On the other hand, the lack of environmental regional indicators at the EU regional level (namely in the 1990s) raises barriers to a solid ground analysis of this dimension.

Accordingly, as a recent European Environment Agency report stresses: "much of the discussion has focused on economic and social aspects rather than the environmental dimensions" of the territorial cohesion concept (EEA, 2010: 7). So, it was with great satisfaction that we saw an EU report discussing the importance of the environmental issues to promote a more balanced and sustainable EU territory and suggesting the full integration of the environmental dimension in the EU Cohesion Policy. To that end, this report also states that "to ensure that sustainable development is pursued throughout Europe, the concept of territorial cohesion needs to incorporate the idea of sustainable development - including the environmental dimension".

In other words, the environmental and sustainability dimensions of territorial cohesion need to be seen as an integrated part of this concept. In this regard, the referred report goes a step further by expressing the idea that "territorial cohesion can be seen as the 'spatial representation of sustainability', which would mean that assessing policies in terms of the environmental dimensions of

PART 1 - TERRITORIAL COHESION TRENDS IN INNER SCANDINAVIA (1995-2010)

territorial cohesion could become an important step towards the better integration of environment and sustainability" (EEA, 2010: 8). This idea might sound a bit too restricted when viewed with the complexity and the vast scope of the territorial dimension of development. Whatever the case, the integration of the environmental dimension into the territorial cohesion concept seems logical since it seems unreasonable to exclude the environmental issues from the EU Cohesion Policy discussion nowadays in Europe. Thus, ultimately, we argue the inclusion of the Environmental Sustainability as one of the four pillars of the Territorial Cohesion concept sustained by three main components: (i) environment, (ii) energy and (iii) climate change.

Territorial polycentricity dimension (morphology):

The reduction of territorial disparities is one of the main objectives of the European Spatial Policy (ESPON ATLAS, 2006: 14). Accordingly, the EU Territorial Cohesion objective should be concerned with counteracting the present European core-periphery pattern, by supporting policies which provide opportunities and living conditions in all parts of Europe. In this regard, the Third ESPON Synthesis Report is clear when it predicts that "in the long-term the enlargement or dispersion of the Pentagon (the area delimitated by London, Hamburg, Munich, Milan and Paris) and strong urban agglomerations in more remote locations, might contribute to increased territorial cohesion" (ESPON, 2006: 15). Equally, the ESDP emphasizes that "the concept of polycentric development has to be pursued, to ensure regionally balanced development" in order to avoid excessive economic and demographic concentration in the core area of the EU (EC, 1999: 20).

Moreover, according to the Leipzig Charter, one of the three main strategic principles for the EU development policy with a view to achieve territorial cohesion is related to the establishment of a balanced territorial organization based on a European polycentric urban structure, in order to make better use of available resources in European regions. (LC, 2007: 1 and EC, 2007: 3). Of course, the analysis of polycentrism largely depends on the studied territorial scale. For this reason, some authors consider the concept of polycentric

27

development to be 'rather fuzzy' since it means different things to different actors and on different scales, and also that the "the concepts of territorial cohesion and polycentric development still need to crystallize out on the European scale" (Meijers, Waterhout and Zonneveld, 2007: 3).

Nonetheless, we argue that there is a strong case in putting the territorial polycentricity as one of the main pillars of the territorial cohesion concept, as a mean to enhance the EU territorial capital in a more balanced and connected Regional/National/European urban network. The use of this dimension, however, requires particular attention to the fact that polycentricity has two complementary aspects: one relates with the morphology (number of cities, connectivity, distribution and hierarchy) and the other with the relations between urban settlements (flows, networks, cooperation, functional complementarity) (ESPON 1.1.1, 2004: 3). As such, and since the next discussed Territorial Cohesion dimension covers, in large measure, the latter one (relations), we decided to focus entirely on three components related with the morphologic aspect: (i) hierarchy, (ii) density and (iii) connectivity.

Territorial cooperation/governance dimension:

The last dimension is not directly related to any main objective of de ESDP. Yet, this document supports the idea that an integrated spatial development requires new ways of horizontal and vertical cooperation, with a view to reinforce urban and regional networks and partnerships. It is also important to notice that, even though we decided to name this dimension as 'Territorial Cooperation', the notion of 'Territorial Governance' - which is regarded "as a process of the organization and co-ordination of actors to develop territorial capital in a non-destructive way in order to improve territorial cohesion at different levels." (ESPON 2.3.2, 2006: 13) - was also implicit, although it was not particularly developed in our previous study (E. Medeiros, 2005). For that reason, we decided to make an upgrade of our model by placing both names in the designation of this fourth and last pillar of the Territorial Cohesion concept.

PART 1 - TERRITORIAL COHESION TRENDS IN INNER SCANDINAVIA (1995-2010)

Clearly, we can see a complement in the 'barrier breaking effect/bridging territories' aim of the territorial cooperation objective and its crucial contribution to achieve the ESDP goals (ESPON, 2007b: 3) - both in the cross-border strand and in the transnational one – and the territorial governance objective as a "condition *sine qua non* to guarantee more balanced development across Europe and to achieve territorial cohesion" (ESPON 2.3.2, 2006: 12), because it offers an alternative to a typical 'hierarchical type of government' (Schout and Jordan, 2007: 838) thus allowing a more active public intervention and collective action to take place at different territorial levels, through a more integrated territorial development policy.

From this territorial governance perspective, which views the Territory as a rich complex system of public and private actors (Faludi, 2004: 1353), the territorial cooperation brings an additional contribution to the Territorial Cohesion by enhancing a more integrated territorial approach through the development of multi-level spatial development strategies. Equally, Gualini (2008) also suggests that territorial cohesion "can only gain effective meaning through its appropriation and enactment by local-regional governance actors". However, there should always be an administrative body with full powers to implement policies, because without them there would be a real risk of undermining the efficiency of policies (MNE, 2009: 8).

As one might understand by now, the task of measuring both territorial cooperation and territorial governance is far from being an easy and simple task, due to lack of appropriate data related with its three components: (i) horizontal cooperation, (ii) vertical cooperation and (iii) openness/participation. Even so, concerning the governance components, the Eurostat proposes the use of several indicators as the E-government availability and usage and the level of confidence in EU institutions as we will see in the next topic dedicated to suggest indicators and to build an aggregated index to measure the territorial cohesion concept. In sum, its four dimensions and the related components and some chosen indicators can be seen, in our proposed analytic model of the territorial cohesion concept, (Fig. 1.2), in order to facilitate its understanding.

29



Figure 1.2 – The analytic model of the territorial cohesion concept

Needless to say, if we cannot measure the trends conducive to territorial cohesion or its opposite trend (territorial exclusion), then all this presented theoretical framework becomes useless. So, we build up a territorial cohesion aggregated index, with the indicators detailed in the previous figure, for two periods of time (1998 and 2008), which covered the last decade, based on the methodology used in the United Nations Human Development Reports, to create the Human Development Index.

PART 1 - TERRITORIAL COHESION TRENDS IN INNER SCANDINAVIA (1995-2010)

The result was a simple Territorial Cohesion Index (one statistical indicator for each one of the components) for the Scandinavian Peninsula provinces (NUTS III), which produced a quite unevenly trend territorial picture (Fig. 1.3), even in Inner Scandinavia where, curiously, the southern provinces (Akershus and Värmland), are amongst the areas with worst territorial cohesion performances in the last decade in Scandinavia.





Source: Author cartography

Suffice it to say, that these results should be read with care, since they are based on the evolution of the chosen indicators. Even so, they encompass several territorial cohesion dimensions and counteract the common socioeconomic assessing tools which overvalue the economic (GDP) dimension. In this light, a recent UN report expressed that "it is now almost universally accepted that a country's success or an individual's well-being cannot be evaluated by money alone. Income is of course crucial: without resources, any progress is difficult. Yet, we must also gauge whether people can lead long and healthy lives, whether they have the opportunity to be educated and whether they are free to use their knowledge and talents to shape their own destinies" (UN, 2010).

1.1 - A balanced socioeconomic services distribution?

Article 14 of the Lisbon Treaty recognizes the role of services of general economic interest to promote territorial cohesion of the EU and its Member-States. In concrete terms, the Protocol n^o 26 of the Treaty emphasises the importance of services of general interest associated with the following topics (EC, 2010c):

- The essential role and the wide discretion of national, regional and local authorities in providing, commissioning and organising services of general economic interest as closely as possible to the needs of the users;
- The diversity between various services of general economic interest and the differences in the needs and preferences of users that may result from different geographical, social or cultural situations;
- A high level of quality, safety and affordability, equal treatment and the promotion of universal access and of user rights.

In sum, this document highlights the need to secure the access to services of general economic interest to all population (equality), no matter where they live, and in a 'tailor made' procedure which fits local/regional needs (adaptability), always with high quality provision standards. Still, it does not define what kind of services should be included in this overall denomination.

Anyhow, a more recent EU document attempts to clarify this 'concept' by stating that it "may apply to different situations and terms, depending on the Member State, and Union law does not create any obligation to designate formally a task or a service as a service of general economic interest" (EC, 2010d: 16). Further on, it leaves some general clues on what should be considered as a service of general interest¹:

• They should play a preventive and social cohesion role in customising assistance to facilitate social inclusion and the safeguard fundamental rights, and also for persons faced by personal challenges or crises;

¹ Content arranged by the author

- They should include activities to ensure that the people concerned are able to completely reintegrate into society and also complement/support the role of families in caring for the youngest and oldest members of society in particular;
- They should include activities to integrate people with long-term health or disability problems;
- They should include social housing, which provides housing for disadvantaged citizens or socially less advantaged groups.

This EU recognition of the "crucial importance of well-functioning, accessible, affordable and high-quality services of general interest for the quality of life of European citizens, the environment and the competitiveness of European enterprises", is also expressed in the EU White Paper on services of general interest (EC, 2004b), following a debate on the Green Paper, which has strongly confirmed the importance of services of general interest as one of the pillars of the European model of society, as well as for ensuring territorial cohesion and competitiveness of the European economy.

The same document, proposes a definition of services of general interest as being the services covering "both market and nonmarket services which the public authorities class as being of general interest and subject to specific public service obligations" (EC, 2004b: 22). Furthermore, in annex 3, it provides a list of some services which can be included in this definition: electronic communications, postal services, electricity, gas, water, transport and broadcasting.

Curiously, since services of general economic interest are somewhat different from ordinary services that public authorities consider paramount to be provided, even where the market is not sufficiently profitable in supplying them², and considering that they should be accessible and affordable for everyone, health and education provision should also be present in that list.

With this in mind, Germany, for instance, established a number of services of public interest which should be provided to all inhabitants, at reasonable costs,

² http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/other/l26087_en.htm

despite their dwelling location and cultural provenience. As a matter-of-fact these provisions are considered "a prerequisite for people to perform their essential functions such as working, living mobility, and for the economy, the production and sale of goods and services" (FOBRP, 2006: 30):

- Public transport infrastructure;
- Supply of drinking water;
- Waste disposal;
- Education;
- Health care.

In the same vein, the EU White Paper on services of general interest notes that "the provision of high quality, accessible and affordable services of general interest meeting the needs of consumers and enterprises is therefore an important element contributing to reach the strategic goal of the Union to become the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion" (EC, 2014b: 4).

When it comes to Inner Scandinavia provision of services of general interest, it comes immediately to mind the 'Nordic Welfare state' political and social vision prevalent in both Scandinavian countries. In particular, Sweden is considered to be, not only the best example of the archetypal 'Nordic welfare state', but also among the best examples of the 'agentification' of the public sector (Nordregio, 2007: 39). In spite of that, in recent years, Swedish politics seem to "have shifted from a focus on regional equalisation policy to the creation of competitiveness based on the endogenous strengths of each region, combined with support to the primary sector for the securing of public goods, such as various environmental benefits" (Nordregio, 2011b: 19).

In contrast, the Norwegian welfare state, developed after 1945, continues to support the maintenance of established settlement patterns, in an attempt to reverse the relative decline of jobs and population in rural areas. However, it is

PART 1 - TERRITORIAL COHESION TRENDS IN INNER SCANDINAVIA (1995-2010)

interesting to see that, while in the 1960s and 1970s the focus was in developing infrastructure and industry, as well as promoting the decentralisation of higher education, since the 1980s, the Norwegian regional policy started to put more attention into the promotion of competitiveness and the development of regional urban centres (Nordregio, 2011b: 20).

In fact, it seems that, when "compared with the other Nordic countries, Norwegian policies remain to a much greater extent focused on adapting to the situation in the different regions of the country" (Nordregio, 2011b: 20). Indeed, the present Norwegian regional development rationale is a mix of both promoting decentralized growth and provide infrastructure and growth centres (Nordregio, 2011b).

Hence, the bottom line is: both Sweden and Norway are deeply keen in securing a solid provision of essential and basic socioeconomic infrastructures to the whole territory (including rural areas). Yet, while Norway has enough financial resources (oil economy) to allow this kind of support, even in sparsely populated areas (based on the individual's basic choice of where to live and work), Sweden, in turn, has a more pragmatic vision, of making the most out of the human and natural resources available in rural areas.

To reach these regional development goals, the national/regional/local authorities of both countries support 'normally non-profitable' services which cover most parts of Inner Scandinavia, like public transports (bus connections³). The occurrence of public infrastructures is extended to the presence of Health facilities and Regional Universities (Fig. 1.4), which evidently privilege the larger urban agglomerations.

³ <u>http://www.hedmark-trafikk.no/, http://www.akershus.no/tema/Statistikk/Trafikk/, http://www.varmlandstrafik.se/</u>, <u>http://dalatrafik.se/</u>



Figure 1.4 – Main education and health infrastructures in Inner Scandinavia - 2011

Source: Data – (Nordregio, 2011 + 4) – Author cartography

In that respect, Hedmark Høgskolen, with its five 'campus' (Evenstad, Rena, Blæstad, Elverum and Hamar) can be regarded as a 'knowledge descentralization' regional example, by broadening the territorial radius to academic learning. Instead, Värmland and Dalarna concentrate their main university campus in two locations, the regional capital and a second tier city. For its part, Akershus Høgskolen is concentrated in the province capital (Lillestrøm) and just completed the process of 'melting' with Oslo University.

So, in a broad assessment, we can conclude that Inner Scandinavia is quite well served with services of public interest (access to public transports, health and education infrastructures). However, at the cross-border perspective, there is a clear lack of public transports links and also an absence of social services sharing (E. Medeiros, 2010). A positive note goes to the fact that, despite the presence of many depopulated areas in Inner Scandinavia, there is a large share of employment in Education and Health/Social Services, which might indicate that the threshold to extinguish these infrastructures, due to lack of inhabitants, was not achieved yet.

⁴ <u>http://tidsskriftet.no/article/622468 + http://www.regjeringen.no/ + http://www.inetmedia.nu/halsa/sjukhus.shtml</u>)


Figure 1.5 – Employment in education sector in Inner Scandinavia - 2009

Source: Data - SCB + SSB – Author cartography



Figure 1.6 - Employment in health/social work in Inner Scandinavia - 2009

Source: Data - SCB + SSB – Author cartography

INTERREG-A INNER SCANDINAVIA. PARTNERSHIP AND ACHIEVEMENTS

Despite this present scenario, it is a well-known fact that demographic changes, resulting from fluctuations in natural population change (births – deaths) and net migration (immigration – emigration) contribute to shape the structure of territories, and eventually manifests itself in increased or reduced presence of services of general interest. Hence, it is important to closely track demographic alterations in a medium-long term perspective, which usually follow the trends that have occurred in recent years and decades (Fig. 1.7).



Figure 1.7 – Population Change - 1995-2010 (%) and Population Density - 2010

Source: Data - SCB + SSB – Author cartography

In this perspective, large parts Inner Scandinavia have experienced significant decreases in population and with particular intensity in large areas in the Swedish part of the border, most of them in northern Värmland and Southeast Dalarna: Torsby, Hagfors, Flipstad, Ludvika and Avesta municipalities - Fig. 1.8). These losses are often correlated with the presence of relative rural and already sparsely populated areas, with a combine effect of fertility decline and population ageing.

PART 1 - TERRITORIAL COHESION TRENDS IN INNER SCANDINAVIA (1995-2010)



Figure 1.8 – Depopulation intensity in Inner Scandinavia - 1995-2010

Source: Data - SCB + SSB - Author cartography

Curiously, in the Norwegian part of the border, these depopulation figures are not so dramatic, in spite of the rural attributes of most of the area. For instance, the municipality of Tynset seems to resist stoically to these depopulation tendencies present in other rural northern Hedmark municipalities. This proves that external factors associated with the national states policy strategic will (ex: Norway) to support the maintenance of rural population and activities has vast consequences in, at least, hampering or mitigating depopulation in these areas.

On the other hand, the Swedish national strategy to support regional competitiveness will generally favour regional concentration in the larger urbanized areas, as they are better equipped with the key regional development ingredients, which tend to attract entrepreneurs (markets, research facilities, human capital, access to capital, institutional capacity, etc). This explains why the only three municipalities, located in the Swedish side of the border, which did not lose population in the last decade, were the ones where the main regional urban centres are located: Karlstat, Falun and Borlänge.

1.2 - Towards a more balanced and polycentric territory?

When the European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP) was released, it brought to the fore one pioneering specific policy goal for the EU territory: development of a polycentric and balanced urban system and strengthening of the partnership between urban and rural areas (EU, 1999). The pursuit of this objective was largely due to the excessive concentration of economic activities and population in the so-called 'European Pentagon, which causes several disadvantages, like congestion (traffic), environmental (pollution) and social (criminality, exclusion) costs.

Thereby, "polycentricity is opposed to monocentricity, in which service provision and territorial management competence is increasingly concentrated to a single centre. Polycentricity is also opposed to urban sprawl, in which the structure of secondary centres is diluted in a spatially unstructured continuum. Rather, polycentricity is about promoting the balanced and multi-scalar types of urban networks that are most beneficial from a social and economic point of view, both for the core areas and for the peripheries" (ESPON 1.1.1, 2004: 3). To achieve this goal the ESDP proposes several political concrete measures⁵:

- Enable cities and regions to complement each other and co-operate: building on the advantages and overcoming the disadvantages of economic competition between them (also expanded to all urban functions);
- Create networks of smaller towns in less densely settled and economically weaker regions: to maintain viable markets and economic institutions/ services which could not be achieved by the towns on their own;
- Promote urban collaboration networks in areas such as local traffic management, city planning, co-operation between universities and research centres, the management of the cultural heritage and historic city centres, and the integration of new immigrants into urban society;
- Improve territorial links by investing in transport networks;
- Strengthen and improve key services infrastructures.

⁵ Adapted and simplified by the author.

PART 1 - TERRITORIAL COHESION TRENDS IN INNER SCANDINAVIA (1995-2010)

As seen from the above measures, polycentricity has two complementary aspects. The first one (morphology) is related to the physical aspects of a given territory (number of cities, hierarchy, distribution and connectivity). The second aspect (relations) covers the interactions between urban areas (flows, cooperation, complementarity and networks) (ESPON 1.1.1, 2004). There is, of course, much more to say about the polycentrism concept, which goes way beyond the scope of this study.





Source: Data - SCB + SSB – Author cartography

However, one important aspect should be noted: the polycentrism analysis depends on the territorial scale which is being analyses and, in this study we will focus mainly on the regional level (Inner Scandinavia). Yet, since this border region is not an 'island', we shall start by framing it in the Scandinavian urban system context (Fig. 1.9). In this light, we can summarize the Inner Scandinavia urban system in the following main topics:

- No major Scandinavian urban centre is present on the region. However, Oslo city (N) extends its influence in the southwest area (Østfold, Akershus and South half of Hedmark). This is the area with higher urban density;
- Two other small urban clusters are located in the Swedish side of the border: Karlstad and Falun/Borlänge;
- There is a prevalence of small and small-medium towns in the area. Only four municipalities have more than 45.000 inhabitants (Karlstad, Falun, Borlänge and Skedsmo – Fig. 1.10). These can be taken as medium urban settlements within Scandinavian context;



Figure 1.10 – Population in Inner Scandinavia municipalities – 1990-2010

Source: Data - SCB + SSB – Author Compilation

- With few exceptions, most Norwegian urban settlements grew in population in the last 20 years (Fig. 1.11). On the contrary, most Swedish lost population;
- There are only four Functional Urban Areas (FUAs) in the region (Fig. 1.11), encompassing the small and medium sized towns located within or in the fringe of larger agglomerations (Lillestrøm, Hamar, Falun and Karlstad);
- With very few exceptions, most small urban agglomerations located outside these four FUAs are losing population (Fig. 1.12).



Figure 1.11 – Polycentric structures in Inner Scandinavia

Source: Data - SCB + SSB + Nordregio – Author cartography

Figure 1.12 – Population Change - 2000-2010 in Inner Scandinavia main Urban Agglomerations



Source: Data - SCB + SSB – Author cartography

INTERREG-A INNER SCANDINAVIA. PARTNERSHIP AND ACHIEVEMENTS

In sum, within a regional approach, there seems to be four areas with polycentric potential, at the morphologic dimension, in Inner Scandinavia. But, how can small and medium towns contribute to a more balanced territorial development? In this particular aspect, an ESPON synthesis report (ESPON, 2006) points out three different ways, depending on the territorial context⁶:

- If located on the outskirts of the larger agglomerations, they can assist the enlargement of the main agglomeration, by both providing specific functions and adding to the critical mass needed for other services;
- If they are in close proximity to each other, but not dominated by any major agglomeration, they can develop strategic use of synergies and complementarities;
- If they are located in more peripheral and rural areas, they can act as economic engines for a wider territory and also as service centres for the rural hinterland.

In strict terms, the previous analysis showed us that, at the local level, the Inner Scandinavia urban structure does not favour cross-border polycentric interactions, namely within the morphologic dimension. This might be even aggravated if we conclude that "perhaps, polycentric development is not the defining concept or goal for Nordic regions" (Nordregio, 2009: 13).

Interestingly, while the structural reform debate in Sweden has focused on the role of 'functional regions' (1-2 million inhabitants) and regional enlargement - thus reflecting an understanding of broadening regional responsibilities in providing public services and implementing a more effective regional development strategy – in Norway, the debate has been centred in moving tasks and responsibilities from the central state and from the regionalised state to county councils or regional councils. Still, in either case (Norway and Sweden) these debates have not been followed by action (Nordregio, 2009).

⁶ Arranged and summarized by the author.

PART 1 - TERRITORIAL COHESION TRENDS IN INNER SCANDINAVIA (1995-2010)

Furthermore, as far as we know, regional development from a cross-border or transnational perspective, is not being discussed in these on-going territorial structural reforms, in the Nordic countries. This does not mean that discussions in improving cross-border and transnational cooperation within Scandinavia territory are erased from the political agenda at the national/regional/levels. In fact, in some extent, at the regional level, in Inner Scandinavia, there seems to be an increasing preoccupation in improving the cross-border collaboration, to boost regional competitiveness and attractiveness. This is a good sign, since "regional governance has a central role at inter- and intraregional relationships as well as at micro, meso and macro levels" (Nordregio, 2009: 13).

Be that as it may, the goal to achieve a more balanced and harmonious (polycentric) Inner Scandinavia territory should require, in the morphologic dimension, improved cross-border connections in public transportations and in accessibilities, in particular between 'Hamar region' and 'Falun/Borlänge urban area'. In addition, specific economic policy strategies should be put in place in order to turn the small-medium urban centres, which surround the main urban poles in the region, more attractive for the economic activities, so that they do not continue present lower demographic increases when compared with those dominating urban settlements.

At the 'relational dimension', however, polycentrism requires increased levels of cooperation and the establishment of cross-border structures (like the ARKO and TRUST). Notwithstanding, one particular component seems to be widely neglected: functional complementarity. Indeed, "functional specialization is a key concept when analysing and developing small and medium sized towns. Whereas many larger urban areas are able to sustain a large number of functions with wider territorial significance, small and medium sized settlements are often much more focused" (ESPON, 2006: 18). Under this view, and regarding the largely territorial diversity present in Inner Scandinavia, and specifically in the local/regional economic specialization (Fig. 1.13 and Fig. 1.14), this might be better explored with the aim to turn diversity into strength.





Source: Data - SCB + SSB - Author calculations and cartography





Source: Data - SCB + SSB - Author calculations and cartography

INTERREG-A INNER SCANDINAVIA. PARTNERSHIP AND ACHIEVEMENTS

Nevertheless, these intensions are easier said than done, due to the interplay of factors implied. But one way of looking at this regional economic complementary rationale, is to strengthen the already prevailed economic activities (making them more competitive in the national and international markets) at the regional level, in view with the regional innovation strategies, and a broader cross-border strategic intervention (INTERREG-A).

In this context, in Inner Scandinavia, it would make sense to turn its northwest corner into an innovative primary sector innovative cluster, with an eye on the exploration of rural/adventure and ecotourism, taking advantage of the presence of many natural protected areas. This territorial development strategy should be intensified in the north and northeast area, in order to explore the region specific development potentials in promoting a strong brand touristic attractive area (Femund – Rogen), which could be expanded in the Inner Scandinavia central area (Trysil – Sälen), already recognized as a popular winter ski attraction centre.

For its part, the southeast area could be regarded as the 'industrial innovation regional engine', supported on a 'triple helix' model, based on university-industry-government interaction (Etzkowitz, *et al.*, 2007). Finally, the areas located in the four Inner Scandinavia urban constellations (Fig. 1.15), should be viewed as the regional knowledge and innovation centres, *per excellence*. In this instance, they should bring most the human capital and innovative knowhow to the remaining Inner Scandinavian areas.

From this very synthetic and brief overview, needless to say that Inner Scandinavia presents some crucial territorial ingredients to reinforce its crossborder urban complementarities, not only at the main economic functions, but also in improving accessibilities and providing shared services of economic interest (health, education, public transportation). However, the analysis of the potential of cross-border functional integration requires the study of other indicators such as cross-border commuting (ESPON, 2010b) and the presence of nearby poles of attraction.



Figure 1.15 – Possible Inner Scandinavia cross-border urban complementarities

Source: Data - SCB + SSB - Author cartography

In this regard (Norwegian-Swedish cross-border commuters) the picture is not a complex one, since it shows a twofold scenario: (I) a particularly strong commuter influx to Norway and (ii) a residual one in Sweden (Fig. 1.16). Within Inner Scandinavia, the commuter flows intensity from Swedish municipalities to Norway are quite strong, especially in the southwest ones (Årjäng and Eda).

It is also interesting to know that "cross-border commuting characteristically occurs to larger labour markets with a wide variety of job offerings, mainly in the service sector. Thus, clearly the greatest commute from Sweden will be to Oslo. This increased by 45% to 10.000 persons. Commuters to Oslo come from nearly all the different areas of Sweden, that is, from 286 of the 290 municipalities. The largest inbound commute is from Gothenburg and includes

720 persons. Årjäng had a larger commuter flow to the Oslo region than to municipalities in Sweden, and thus was included in Oslo's local labour market⁷⁷.





Source: Data - StatNord - Author Cartography

^{7 &}lt;u>http://www.scb.se/Pages/PressRelease</u> 302949.aspx

PART 1 - TERRITORIAL COHESION TRENDS IN INNER SCANDINAVIA (1995-2010)

Ultimately, there is a quite positive correlation between the Swedish commuter flows into Norway and the unemployment rate in both Scandinavian countries (Fig. 1.17). Indeed, Norway looks to be kind of an employment European oasis due to its lower unemployment rates. On the counterpart, in Sweden, these rates are still quite high (8.1%), in spite of the slight decrease in the first quarter of 2011,⁸ and it is particularly high amongst the young – 39% of total unemployed (15-24 years).



Figure 1.17 – Unemployment rate in Scandinavia - 2009

Source: Data – Nordregio cartography – adapted by the author

Apparently, from these cross-border Scandinavian commuter workers, where only 4% are Norwegians, one might conclude that the possibilities to establish cross-border urban polycentric connections in Inner Scandinavia are low, at least, at the local level. Yet, urban cross-border relations also embark other dimensions, such as the institutional - which will be discussed in the next topic and commercial (trade) related aspects. Thereby, it is interesting to see that, when it comes to Norwegian cross-border expenditure evolution, it has been increasing slightly in the NUTS II around Inner Scandinavia (Fig. 1.18).

⁸ http://www.scb.se/Pages/PressRelease____314922.aspx



Figure 1.18 – Norwegian cross-border expenditure - 2009

Source: Data (SSB) – Author cartography

In the same way, the Norwegian consumers attraction towards the huge commercial centres, located just across the border, in Swedish part of Inner Scandinavia (Charlottenberg and Tøckfors), has increased significantly in the last six years, both in shopping spending and in the number of daytrips (2004-2010 – Table 1.1). However, both these shopping magnet places are not exactly located in larger border urban settlements. Hence, the produced cross-border commercial flows do not contribute so much to reinforce a possible regional polycentric structure between the main Inner Scandinavia Urban Settlements (Hamar – Lillestrøm – Karlstat and Falun/Borlänge).

| Table 1.1 Norwegian cross border trade by destination | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|------------------|--------------|----------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Shopping spendi | ng (NOK million) | Number of da | ytrips (1 000) | | | | | | | | |
| Destination | 2004 | 2010 | 2004 | 2010 | | | | | | | | |
| Strømstad | 4.666 | 5.580 | 3.507 | 3.376 | | | | | | | | |
| Charlottenberg | 765 | 1.985 | 690 | 1.146 | | | | | | | | |
| Tøckfors | 227 | 235 | 235 | 536 | | | | | | | | |
| Other Sweden | 1.634 | 1.533 | 1.379 | 878 | | | | | | | | |
| Other destinations | 1.511 | 725 | 761 | 386 | | | | | | | | |
| Total | 8.804 | 10.525 | 6.573 | 6.323 | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Table 1.1 – Norwegian cross-border trade by destination

Source: SSB

1.3 - The role of territorial cooperation in Inner Scandinavia – ever increasing intensity of cross-border cooperation

The role of territorial cooperation in the Nordic countries, at all territorial levels (local, regional and national) has a long tradition (Nordregio, 2007) and, according to the 'Nordic regional-policy collaboration programme 2009-2002', this collaboration "is to be the driving force in the development of a new, stronger regional policy", and should be sustained "within the three priority action areas: sharing experiences and knowledge building; globalisation and cross-border collaboration; and third-generation regional policy" (Nordregio, 2010b: 7).

To put this vision into practice, it is necessary to implement and reinforce a multi-level governance approach, in order to facilitate the interactions between governmental actors from different levels within different countries. In this respect, fair to say that Scandinavian countries are leading the way in Europe, since they have been developing several cooperative structures (eleven cross-border committees) along the national border, some with municipal character (Ex: ARKO), some with regional (Ex: Mid Nordic Commitee) and even some with a transnational coverage (Baltic Sea Region).

Specifically, more than 70% of these cross-border structures were set-up long before the INTERREG-A initiative was implemented in Scandinavia (1994). This is one unquestionable proof that the cross-border cooperation process in the Nordic countries and, in particular, in Scandinavia, has reached an intense and mature level, at the European context (E. Medeiros, 2010 and IRIS, 2011).

When it comes to Inner Scandinavia, the establishment of cooperative crossborder city networks, which can provide a means of overcoming development disadvantages in border areas, saw its light 44 years ago (1967) with the set-up of ARKO cross-border structure. Interestingly, this 11 municipality's organization was the first (together with the Nordkalottrådet) of its kind in the Nordic countries. Notwithstanding, its main purpose is similar of all the remaining Nordic cross-border committees: to contribute to increased growth and development of the individual border region (Nordregio, 2010). In its latest action plan, ARKO has selected the following priority areas⁹:

- Business-growth-innovation;
- Sustainable development-infrastructure;
- Culture-language-identity.

This concentration in a few number of development priorities is another clear indication of the maturity of the process of cross-border cooperation in this area, unlike what is going on in similar, but younger cross-border structures, in the Iberia Peninsula (E. Medeiros 2011c). At the same time, it goes along with the EU principle of concentration in the most important regional development goals.

Figure 1.19 – Cross-Border Cooperation Committees in Inner Scandinavia and surroundings - 2011



Source: Data – (Nordregio, 2010) + (Nordregio 2010b) + (Fordal, 2007) – Author cartography

⁹ See (Nordregio, 2010) for more detailed information on Nordic cross-border committees

On the other hand, large distances between the main urban constellations (Hedmark *Cassiopeia* and Dalarna *Andromeda*) will continue to challenge the cross-border relations, in an area where almost half a million people dwell (Table 1.2). In addition, that strong urban rural dichotomy call for cross-border regional development strategies involving the encouragement of interaction and connection between small and medium towns and the surrounding rural hinterland.

| | | | | - 1330-2010 |
|---------------------|------------|------------|---------------------------|---------------|
| | Inhab | itants | Pop. Density | Pop. |
| Region | | | (Inhab./Km ²) | Variation (%) |
| | 1990 | 2010 | 2010 | 1990-2010 |
| Østfold (Municip.) | 43.973 | 49.810 | 30,07 | 13,36 |
| Akershus (Municip.) | 187.861 | 244.853 | 71,65 | 31,08 |
| Hedmark | 161.860 | 190.709 | 7,99 | 17,90 |
| Värmland | 284.187 | 273.265 | 15,53 | -3,48 |
| Dalarna | 290.388 | 277.047 | 9,83 | -4,16 |
| ARKO | 120.921 | 113.395 | 8,76 | -5,94 |
| TRUST | 452.248 | 467.756 | 8,99 | 3,76 |
| Nor. border area | 393.694 | 485.372 | 16,77 | 23,66 |
| Swe. border area | 574.575 | 550.312 | 12,02 | -3,82 |
| Inner Scandinavia | 968.269 | 1.035.684 | 13,86 | 7,36 |
| Norway | 4.047.672 | 4.940.418 | 16,07 | 22,06 |
| Sweden | 8.590.630 | 9.415.570 | 22,95 | 9,60 |
| Scandinavia | 12.638.302 | 14.355.988 | 20,00 | 13,59 |
| | | | | |

Table 1.2 – Demographic synthesis of Inner Scandinavia – 1990-2010

Source: Data - SCB + SSB – Author compilation

In strict terms, territorial cooperation, and specifically the cross-border cooperation process in Inner Scandinavia has been crucial in dismantling regional barriers in all dimensions, and also in enhancing the territorial capital of this largely diversified region (structurally weaker regions and stronger ones). In this domain, the INTERREG-A Community Initiative has opened new horizons to territorial collaboration. Yet, this has been a gradual and ever growing process, with different phases (E. Medeiros and B. T. Andersen, 2010). Indeed, the first INTERREG-A generation (1994-1999), with its financial boost contributed to increase cross-border contacts. The next phase (2000-2006) was characterized by a strong additionally of the approved projects. Finally, the maturity of this programme improved even more by focusing in a large percentage of innovative cross-border initiatives in the present phase (2007-2013). These results prove that it is possible to have a cross-border programme encompassing five regions and still achieve the desired results.

1.4 - Enhancing environmental sustainability and preparing for climate change?

Amongst the main challenges identified for the European regions, in the following decades, is the impact of climate change on Europe's environment and its society (EC, 2008f). In broad terms, this goal is deeply interlinked with the EDEC (CE, 1999) territorial development priority to enhance the conservation and management of natural resources and the cultural heritage (environmental sustainability).

Regional planning is about anticipating possible future trends in several domains. This means that regions should prepare themselves for predictable climate change impacts, based on the most recent studies on this issue, in order to mitigate the negative effects in some 'climate sensible economic sectors' (ex: tourism, agriculture, forestry). As it stands, Scandinavian regions can only do so much to reduce the present worldwide climate change trends of increased mean annual temperatures, since atmospheric phenomena's respect no borders. And, for most Scandinavian regions, these trends are not necessarily negative, from the economy standpoint.

Nevertheless, all European regions should contribute to reduce the severity of the predictable climate change territorial impacts by limiting greenhouse emissions and by promoting, for instance, environmental capacity, green infrastructure, and ecosystem services (EC, 2010). In addition, they should foster territorial strategic planning in assessing the potentials of renewable energy production and in encouraging energy efficiency by consumers and firms. But it is important to know that "the emergence of the so-called 'green industry' can, on the one hand, provide a region with the initial competitive advantage it needs to gain the benefits of the expected cleantech explosion, particularly in response to the demands of the bigger markets. But on the other hand, a worldwide clean technology race is to be expected so the competition will be hard and the individual region will have to rely on its own specific potentials and strengths" (Nordregio, 2009b).

PART 1 - TERRITORIAL COHESION TRENDS IN INNER SCANDINAVIA (1995-2010)

Undoubtedly, the access to energy is fundamental to the economic and social activities and development. In Scandinavia, Norway bases its energy production on the extraction of oil and gas, and the renewable energy production (hydro, geothermal, solar and waste) accounts for only 6% of the total production (Table 1.3). On the counterpart, in Sweden, more than half of the total national energy production (54.2%) comes from nuclear energy (Nordregio 2008b), but the share of renewable energy accounts for around 48% of the total production.

| Table 1.5 Energy data in Ocalidinavia 2000 | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|--------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Prod | uction | Imp | orts | Exports | | | | | | |
| | Norway | Sweden | Norway | Sweden | Norway | Sweden | | | | | |
| Coal and Peat | 2203 | 250 | 741 | 2295 | -2236 | -28 | | | | | |
| Crude Oil | 116907 | 0 | 872 | 21739 | -93037 | -466 | | | | | |
| Oil Products | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7415 | -15893 | -11933 | | | | | |
| Gas | 87100 | 0 | 0 | 826 | -82242 | 0 | | | | | |
| Nuclear | 0 | 16650 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| Hydro | 12002 | 5940 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| Geothermal, Solar | 79 | 181 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| Comb. Renew. / Waste | 1321 | 9940 | 39 | 0 | -1 | 0 | | | | | |
| Electricity | 0 | 0 | 293 | 1097 | -1486 | -1265 | | | | | |
| Heat | 51 | 280 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| Total | 219661 | 33241 | 6186 | 33372 | -194894 | -13693 | | | | | |

Table 1.3 – Energy data in Scandinavia – 2008

(in thousand tonnes of oil equivalent - ktoe - on a net calorific value basis) Source: Data - http://www.iea.org/– Author compilation

Yet, while the hydroelectric energy production continues to be the dominant form of renewable and clean energy in Scandinavia, (98% in Norway and 63% in Sweden¹⁰), the potential to explore other sources, like biomass and wind power is yet to reach its full capacity. Curiously, concerning the latter, despite being further away from the Atlantic influence, the Swedish regions have, in general, more wind power potential than the Norwegian ones (Fig. 1.20).

This overall pictured is extended to Inner Scandinavia, where the possibilities of 'extracting wind energy' look to be far larger than in the Swedish part of the border. These potentials vary obviously from place to place. We did not have access to more detailed data on this issue at the local/regional level, but one thing seems clear: "given the high fixed cost of windmill construction and maintenance and the minimal running costs, average production costs of wind

¹⁰ Author calculations based on data obtained in (Nordregio, 2008b)

power fall rapidly as output increases. The generating costs are, therefore, lowest in regions where the potential use is greatest" (EC, 2010).



Figure 1.20 – Wind power potential in Scandinavia - 2009

Source: Data (ESPON, 2010) - Author cartography

Without going into many details, several policy responses should be adopted to, at least, mitigate the possible impacts of climate change in Inner Scandinavia, besides promoting the use of renewable energy sources and energy efficiency. As such, to make the right policy choices in the medium-long term, it is vital to have access to the more recent regional projections on, for instance, the annual temperature changes, the annual rainfall changes, and the annual number of days with snow changes. With these projections, the implications on several key resources and socioeconomic activities could be better assessed:

- Water reserves;
- Winter tourism activities snow cover and floods;
- Agriculture production;
- Soil quality;
- Forests fires;
- Health infrastructures diseases.

Figure 1.21 – Projected increase in annual mean temperature in Scandinavia - 2071-2100 for reference period (1961-1990)



Source: Data (ESPON, 2009) - Author cartography

When it comes to Inner Scandinavia, ESPON estimations on temperature changes for the next 60 years (Fig. 1.21) point out an average rise of 3°C, which is one degree above the declared IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) goal. These predictions are not so severe in other studies (see EC, 2010: 119), but in all of them temperature rise in European regions is inevitable in the long term. Hence, in Inner Scandinavia, positive consequences could be expected, for instance in the agriculture and forest production.

Negative consequences, however, could be anticipated, for example, in the winter sports activities (reduce of snow cover – Fig. 1.22) and the increase of forest fires and floods. At the same time, the rainfall pattern is also expected to change slightly in Inner Scandinavia, with wetter winters and drier summers (Fig. 1.23), which might increase water scarcity on certain occasions, and floods on others. Whatever happens, the climate change vulnerability in Inner Scandinavia should be regarded as a cross-border political priority at the present time, but perhaps included in a wider goal of a cross-border tourism strategy, which does not only include winter tourism activities.





Source: Data (ESPON, 2009) - Author cartography

Figure 1.23 – Projected change in annual mean precipitation in Scandinavia - 2071-2100 for reference period (1961-1990)



Source: Data (ESPON, 2009) - Author cartography

Part 2 - Inner Scandinavia - INTERREG-A sub-programme (2007-2013)

2.1 - Programme main objectives

The main goal of the Swe-Nor INTERREG-A programme is to strengthen the regions attractiveness (both immigrants and visitors) and competitiveness (SN_INT, 2007: 49). Evidently, both objectives are committed to promote a sustainable development of the border area, thus obliging a pledge to environmental considerations in each approved project. In the same line, the programme highlights the need to achieve equality (min 40% ever gender) and young people participation goals (15%).

This strategy was 'designed' in order to tackle some of the main weaknesses and threats detected in the border area (Fig. 2.1), where the demographic and the economic structure stand out as regional weaknesses, thus contributing to the territorial marginalization and to the competitive disadvantages observed in many parts of the border area.

| Strengths | Opportunities |
|---|--|
| Tradition in CBC contacts Wood and energy Cultural identity Tourism and trade Environmental preservation | Innovation and entrepreneurship The environment as an asset Improving public transports Promotion of joint events Better coordination of resources |
| Weaknesses | Threats |
| Administrative Regulations Public transports Economic Structure Demographic Structure Large distances between | Young migration Depopulation Environmental Territorial marginalization Competitive disadvantages |

| Figure 2.1 – INTE | BREG-A Swe-No | or 2007-2013 | simplified SWOT |
|-------------------|---------------|--------------|-----------------|
| | | | |

Source: (SN_INT, 2007) - adapted

In short, to reverse this persistent scenario, the programme established two main strategic guidelines and the related effective goals:

<u>1 – Strengthen innovation and develop competence and competitiveness, as</u> well as promote interaction between business and research centres:

- Increase accessibility (infrastructure);
- Labour markets integration with a competitive workforce;
- Increase competitive enterprises with attractive working environments.

2 - Strengthen border institutional, cultural and urban-rural connections:

- Improve utilization/management/development of natural and cultural resources;
- Improve public services;
- Increase cultural diversity and quality of life;
- Develop methods and collaboration of local and urban development;
- Improve health, prevent risks and enhance security.

Hence, the relevance of the analysed projects should take on account both the programme SWOT analysis and its approved intervention strategy, which can be seen in more detail in Figure 2.2. Here the relationships between the programme vision, objectives, actions and effective objectives can be observed. This also requires a strong and detailed criteria filter by the programme secretariat in order to properly choose the most appropriate projects, i.e. the ones that have higher probabilities to cover and attain the programme objectives.

In this regard, we had access to the Inner Scandinavian projects evaluation criteria, which looks to be quite demanding and detailed (Table 2.1). This evaluation procedure uses a classification system that can be attributed to six main evaluation criteria (A, B, C, D, E and F) with four different rates: 4 – Very

Good; 3 – Good; 2 – Satisfactory; 1 – Weak. The final result is the statistical mean of the six attributes scores, in each criteria.



Figure 2.2 – INTERREG-A Swe-Nor 2007-2013 simplified strategy

Source: (SN_INT, 2007) - simplified and adapted

Although it might look a bit complex, and somewhat redundant in some aspects, this evaluation method seems to have been working perfectly in filtering the presented INTERREG-A projects. In fact, a closer look at all its questions demonstrates a strong knowledge and maturity of the team which makes the projects evaluation, as it covers both a global and a quite detailed analysis of the project relevance towards the aims of the programme, and the possibility of its success, in materializing the proposed outputs, results and impacts.

Thereby, no major recommendations are made to improve this questionnaire, although it would be advisable that the contribution to some barrier effect dimensions (such as institutional-urban, cultural-social, environmental-heritage, economy-technological and accessibilities) could also be assessed, since an EU/Community main goal of the INTERREG-A programmes is to reduce the barrier effect along the border in all those dimensions.

Table 2.1 – Inner Scandinavia INTERREG-A project evaluation criteria

| 0 - | Basic assumptions | Yes | No |
|------------|---|-----|----|
| 1 | Is the project eligible under the program document for Sweden-Norway | | |
| 2 | Distort competition according to EC law on state aid | | |
| 3 | Creates additionality | | |
| 4 | The application is complete | | |
| 1 - | Quality Rating - content | Yes | No |
| A - | Relevance, basic assumptions and link to the programme | | |
| 1 | Is the project implemented in accordance with the horizontal formal criteria | | |
| 2 | Does the activities have a clear cross-border added value | | |
| 3 | The project includes activities to remove border barriers | | |
| 4 | Are the project's objectives linked and coordinated with regional strategies | | |
| В- | Logical coherence of project proposal | | |
| 1 | Is there a clearly defined task that the project will address connected to expected results | | |
| 2 | There is a good link between objectives, activities and results | | |
| 3 | The action plan clear and connected to defined tasks | | |
| 4 | The project has a good structure in relation to the objectives and results | | |
| 5 | Are activities and results defined in the project plan | | |
| 6 | Is there a good link between the activities in relation to the objectives and results | | |
| С- | - Expected results | | |
| 1 | Is the expected outcome concrete and measurable | | |
| 2 | Has the project given its own indicators to measure other results of the project | | |
| 3 | Is there established a satisfactory plan for the information / communication | | |
| 4 | The results are innovative and give an obvious added value | | |
| 5 | Did the partnership made arrangements ensuring the project results will be permanent | | |
| 2 - | Quality Rating - implementation capacity | Yes | No |
| D - | Implementation Capacity | | |
| 1 | Are the project owners experienced with project activities | | |
| 2 | The project organization is clearly described | | |
| 3 | Project management and coordination is well planned | | |
| Ε- | Partnership strength and quality | | |
| 1 | Does the project involve the partners that are necessary to succeed | | |
| 2 | Are the project tasks part of the partners ordinary business | | |
| F – | Budget and funding | | |
| 1 | Is the budget logically divided between budget lines and components/activities | | |
| 2 | The budget for the organization and management is reasonable | | |
| | The preject evenes has sufficient liquidity | | |
| 3 | The project owner has sufficient liquidity | | |
| 3 4 | Project efficiency is made clear in terms of activity and results | | |

Source – Inner Scandinavian secretariat – adapted and simplified

For the most part, the general overview of the border SWOT analysis is extended to the Inner Scandinavia sub-programme (SN_INT, 2008), which receives increasing 'urban influences' from the close proximity of the Oslo metropolitan area in its south-western corner, and with minor degree, from the

PART 2 - INNER SCANDINAVIA - INTERREG-A SUB-PROGRAMME (2007-2013)

presence of the cities of Karlstad (southeast) and Falun/Borlänge (east) (Fig. 2.3).



Source: Data: (SN_INT, 2008) - Author

Apart from those areas and the further north corner (Tynset), which have registered positive demographic trends since the mid 1990's, the remaining territory faces some risks related with depopulation (sustainability of services of general interest and economic regeneration), as a result of negative natural balances and overall out-migrations (Fig. 2.4). In spite of the presence of vast unpopulated and rural areas, in the last decades, this region has experienced an intensification of cross-border contacts in several domains: trade, commuting, institutional, business, education, housing and culture (SN_INT_2007).

In parallel, the access to university and research centres (knowledge and competence) is quite strong and balanced over the region, thus encompassing a solid platform to boost innovation and regional competitiveness. In the same vein, the attraction of capital and companies can be enhanced by further exploring, in a sustainable way, the territorial capital of the region, to enhance

its prosperity and fulfil the economic growth and attractiveness INTERREG-A main goals.

In this regard, the presence of large and preserved natural areas, which include vast forest fields, make way to tourism opportunities and the wood and paper industry activities. Concerning the former, the mountain areas of Trysil (N) and Salen/Idre (S) are already a part of the Scandinavia's largest winter sports area (SN_INT, 2008).



Figure 2.4 – Population variation in Inner Scandinavia - 1995-2010

Source: Data - SCB + SSB - Author

On the downside, there are still some bottlenecks in the regional connectivity/accessibility, which hamper cross-border flows, in particular the cross-border public transport flows (E. Medeiros, 2010), and some private transport links (low capacity cross-border roads). However, by being located in the 'heart of the Scandinavia Peninsula', Inner Scandinavia benefits from the presence of important road 'arteries' which connect major peninsular urban agglomerations: E18 – links Oslo to Stockholm; E6 – links Oslo to Trondheim (Fig. 2.5).



Figure 2.5 – Transports accessibility in Inner Scandinavia

In this regard, the location of the major Norwegian airport (Gardemoen) has been a major factor to foster regional development in the surrounding area (S. Berger et al., 2004). In fact, it makes sense that the more articulated southern part of Inner Scandinavia (Hamar – Karlstad axis), is the area served with more cross-border crossing infra-structures. Yet, overall, the quality of the roads and the train connections still has some space for significant improvements. In addition, the cross-border transport possibilities are also a cause for concern, if the attractiveness and the economic growth INTERREG-A objectives are to be attained.

All these considerations should be used as 'main criteria' to select the INTERREG projects in Inner Scandinavia which, in short, should help to (i) reduce the accessibilities barrier (infra-structure), (ii) boost the economic and technologic cooperation (innovation), (iii) explore in a sustainable manner the region environmental potential (tourism) and (iv) reinforce the political partnership (Fig. 2.6).

Source: Data Airports – (ESPON 1.2.1, 2004 + <u>http://www.flygtorget.se/Fakta/Flygplatser/Default.aspx</u> + <u>http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Airports in Norway map.svg</u>) - Adapted



Figure 2.6 – Proposed strategic axis for Inner Scandinavia

2.2 - Approved projects coherence and relevance

The term 'relevance', "in the context of an evaluation, refers to the appropriateness of the explicit objectives of the programme in relation to the socioeconomic problems it is supposed to address" (EC, 1999). In other words, the relevance of a project can be assessed by its level of contribution to reach the programme main objectives, in order to tackle the regional/local identified main needs/problems/issues in the SWOT analysis (Fig. 2.7).



Figure 2.7 – Evaluating phases and objectives

Source - (EC, 2008) - adapted

As previously mentioned, the filter used by the Inner-Scandinavia secretariat to select the INTERREG-A projects is guite robust, since it considers the programme main objectives, which was built under the SWOT analysis. Even so, they decided to narrow the programme 'specific objectives' to seven main political areas: Innovation; Climate Change; Education; Culture; Urban-rural Environment/Nature Protection Development; and Public Health. Consequently, the relevance of the analysed projects (Table 2.2) will be viewed under these political goals, with a simple evaluation criteria; W (weak); M (medium) and S (strong) relevance for each one of them (Table 2.3). In addition, this analysis is completed with another, encompassing a more general view of the projects relevance in several parameters (Table 2.4).

| | Name | Main Objectives | Partners | Location(s) | Value (€) |
|---|--|--|---|---|-----------|
| А | Innovation music network | - Enable business in the music industry to grow and develop | - Hamar/Rena - Karlstad/Falun | 1.986.855 | |
| В | The Scandinavian Way | - Support tourism internationalization of Inner Scandinavia | N - Foreningen Mjøskryss S - Region Värmland N - Hedmark Reiseliv BA | - Karlstad - Hamar | 1.441.975 |
| С | Hjerte i Skandinavia A + B | Increase the number of competitive and attractive companies namely in the tourism area | S - Länsstyrelsen Dalarna N - Regionrådet for Fjellregionen | - Falun - Tynset | 3.020.059 |
| D | Barnas grenseland | - Development of tourism industry - Camping, golf, horses. | S - Gränskommittén Värmland-Østfold (v/Årjängs kommun) N - Grensekomiteen Värmland-Østfold v/Marker Kommune)(| - Årjäng - Marker | 1.506.806 |
| E | Hedmark Dalarna-TRUST | - Strengthen the region's competitiveness through a focus on industry and occupation | S - Region Dalarna N - Hedmark fylkeskommune | - Falun - Hamar | 1.425.000 |
| F | Grenseløs fjellopplevelse Fulufjellet | - Support small and medium companies – Eco tourism | S - Fulufjällringen Ekonomisk Förening N - Destinasjon Trysil BA | - Särna - Trysil | 348.750 |
| G | Næringslivet som motor for inkludering | - Including Skilled immigrant workers in the employment market | S - Karlstad kommun N - Hamarregionen Utvikling | - Karlstad - Hamar | 485.417 |
| Η | Kompetansetilførsel Hamar reg | - To promote good cooperation between employers in the regions | S - Utvecklingsbolaget MittDalarna AB N - Hamarregionen Utvikling | - Börlange - Hamar | 773.511 |
| | Entreprenørskap i hele skolen | - Develop young people's entrepreneurial skills in primary, secondary and higher education | S - Ung Företagsamhet Dalarna N - Ungt Entreprenørskap Hedmark | - Falun - Hamar | 2.574.426 |
| J | Bygg og anleggskompetanse | - Strengthen building and construction industry – Training and research | S - Byggutbildning Star i Dalarna AB N - Stiftelsen Norges Byggskole | - Falun - Lillestrøm | 1.572.917 |
| K | Kompetanse i partnerskap | - Eliminate obstacles in the implementation of the master's programs that are developed in UNISKA | S - Karlstads universitet N - Høgskolen i Hedmark | - Karlstad - Elverum, Rena, Hamar, Blæstad, Evenstad | 370.000 |
| L | El-kraft | Skills development tailored labor market needs. Electric power engineering (bachelor) | S - Karlstads Universitet N - Høgskolen i Gjøvik | - Karlstad - Gjøvik | 126.716 |

Table 2.2 – List of Inner Scandinavia INTERREG-A evaluated projects

| М | Universitetssamarbeidet | - Linking universities - higher | S - Karlstads universitet | - Karlstad | 2.115.028 |
|---|-------------------------|------------------------------------|--|-------------------|-----------|
| | UNISKA | education - R & D environments and | N - Høgskolen i Hedmark | - Elverum, Rena, | |
| | | link them to the region's business | | Hamar, Blæstad, | |
| | | community | | Evenstad | |
| Ν | Industricollege | - Collaboration and synergy in | S - Karlstads kommun | - Karlstad | 1.583.333 |
| | - | industrial education | N - Norges Byggskole Stiftelse | - Lillestrøm | |
| 0 | Levende Finnskogen | - New knowledge about the cultural | S - Värmlands Museum | - Karlstad | 1.016.875 |
| | _ | buildings | N - Hedmark fylkeskommune | - Hamar | |
| Ρ | Å gjøre regionale | - Making regional differences into | S - Karlstads universitet | - Karlstad | 1.224.556 |
| | forskjeller til styrke | strengths | N - Østlandsforskning | - Hamar | |
| Q | Fornybar energi, | - Supporting Renewable Energy, | S - Kristinehamns kommun (Stål & | - Kristinehamns | 3.595.000 |
| | energieffektivisering | Energy Efficiency and Environment | Verkstad) | - Lillestrøm | |
| | | | N - Kunnskapsbyen Lillestrøm | | |
| R | Varmeekom | Energy and environment. | S - Karlstads universitet | - Karlstad | 1.570.334 |
| | | | N - Høgskolen i Akershus | - Lillestrøm | |
| S | Green - energi | - Improve energy efficiency in | S - Länsstyrelsen Dalarna | - Sälen, Kläppen, | 604.167 |
| | effektivisering | mountain areas companies | N - Trysil kommune | Stöten and Idre | |
| | | | | - Trysil | |
| Т | Verdens beste | - Sports events for physical well | S - Värmlands Idrottsförbund | - Karlstad | 25.111 |
| | idrettsregion | being | N - Akershus Idrettskrets | - Strømmen | |
| U | Dansregionen A + B | - Contribution to culture and | S - Dans i Värmland | - Karlstad | 2.177.686 |
| | | creativity: dance | N - Hedmark Teater | - Hamar | |
| V | Grensvandring | - Building immigration data | S - Emigrantregistret/Kinship Center | - Karlstad | 1.592.500 |
| | - | | N - Stift. Domkirkeodden, avd Norsk Utvandrermuseum og | - Ottestad, Hamar | |
| | | | forskn.senter | | |
| Х | Naturinformasjon Rogen | - Produce nature information in | S - Länsstyrelsen Jämtlkands län | - Rogens | 61.250 |
| | | national parks | N - Fylkesmannen i Sör-Tröndelag | - Femund | |
| Ζ | Vänerlaksen | - Salmon reintroduction | S - Länsstyrelsen i Värmland | - Karlstad | 3.621.898 |
| | | | N - Fylkesmannen i Hedmark | - Hamar | |

Table 2.3 – Project relevance according to the seven political areas

| Project | | А | | | В | | | С | - | | D | | | Е | | | F | | | G | | - | Н | | | | | | J | | | Κ | | | L |
|---|-------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|---|---|-------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|---|-------|---------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|
| Policy Area | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | Μ | S | W | М | S | W | M S |
| Innovation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Climate Change | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Education | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Culture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Urban-Rural Development | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Environment / Nature Protection | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Public Health | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project | | Μ | | | Ν | | | 0 | | 1 | Ρ | | | Q | | | R | | | S | | | Т | | | 11 | | | V | | | Х | | | Ζ |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ~ | | | | | | | | | | | | U | | | v | | | Λ | | | _ |
| Policy Area | W | M | S | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | M | S | W | M | S | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | M | S | W | M | S | W | M S |
| | W | | S | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | M | S | W | | S | W | | S | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | M | S | W | V М | S | W | | S | W | |
| Policy Area | W | | S | W | M | S | W | M | S | W | M | S | W | | S | W | | S | W | Μ | S | W | М | S | W | м | S | W | V M | S | W | | S | W | |
| Policy Area Innovation | W | | S | W | M | S | W | M | S | W | M | S | W | | S | W | | S | W | M | S | W | M | S | W | M | S | W | V M | S | W | | S | W | |
| Policy Area Innovation Climate Change | W | | S | W | M | S | W | M | S | W | M | S | W | | S | W | | S | W | M | S | W | M | S | W | M | S | W | V M | S | W | | S | W | |
| Policy Area Innovation Climate Change Education | W | | S | W | M | S | W | M | S | W | M | S | W | | S | W | | S | W | M | S | W | M | S | W | M | S | W | V M | S | W | | S | W | |
| Policy Area Innovation Climate Change Education Culture | W | | S | W | M | S | W | M | S | W | M | S | W | | S | W | | S | W | M | S | W | M | S | W | M | S | W | | S | W | | S | W | |

Projects List

| G - Næringslivet som motor for inkludering | M - Universitetssamarbeidet UNISKA | S - Green - energi effektivisering |
|--|---|--|
| H - Kompetansetilførsel Hamar reg | N - Industricollege | T - Verdens beste idrettsregion |
| I - Entreprenørskap i hele skolen | O - Levende Finnskogen | U - Dansregionen A + B |
| J - Bygg og anleggskompetanse | P - Å gjøre regionale forskjeller til styrke | V - Grensvandring |
| | Q - Fornybar energi, energieffektivisering | X - Naturinformasjon Rogen |
| L - El-kraft | R - Varmeekom | Z - Vänerlaksen |
| | H - Kompetansetilførsel Hamar reg I - Entreprenørskap i hele skolen J - Bygg og anleggskompetanse K - Kompetanse i partnerskap | H - Kompetansetilførsel Hamar reg I - Entreprenørskap i hele skolen J - Bygg og anleggskompetanse K - Kompetanse i partnerskapN - Industricollege O - Levende Finnskogen P - Å gjøre regionale forskjeller til styrke Q - Fornybar energi, energieffektivisering |
| Project | | Α | | | В | | | С | | | D | | | Е | | | F | | (| G | | Η | | | Ι | | | J | | | Κ | | | L | |
|--|-------|---|---|---|--------|---|---|----------|---|---|--------|---|---|--------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|--------|---|---|----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Characteristics | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | MS | W | М | S | W | Μ | S | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | М | S |
| Genuine | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Continuity | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Additionality | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Solve Problems | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Satisfy Needs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Avoid Threats | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Crean Opportunition | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grasp Opportunities | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grasp Opportunities | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project | | М | | | N | | | 0 | | | P | | | Q | | | R | | | S | Ē | T | | | U | | | V | | | Х | | | Z | |
| | W | M | S | W | N M | S | W | <u> </u> | S | W | P M | S | W | Q M | S | W | | S | | - | 6 W | T | S | W | U | S | W | V | S | W | X | S | W | Z | S |
| Project | W | | S | W | | S | W | <u> </u> | S | W | - | S | W | r r | S | W | | S | | - | 5 W | T M | S | W | <u> </u> | S | W | | S | W | - | S | W | | S |
| Project Characteristics | W | | S | W | | S | W | <u> </u> | S | W | - | S | W | r r | S | W | | S | | - | 6 W | Т М | S | W | <u> </u> | S | W | | S | W | - | S | W | | S |
| Project Characteristics Genuine | W | | S | W | | S | W | <u> </u> | S | W | - | S | W | r r | S | W | | S | | - | 6 W | Т М | S | W | <u> </u> | S | W | | S | W | - | S | W | | S |
| Project Characteristics Genuine Continuity | W | | S | W | | S | W | <u> </u> | S | W | - | S | W | r r | S | W | | S | | - | 5 W | T M | S | W | <u> </u> | S | W | | S | W | - | S | W | | S |
| Project Characteristics Genuine Continuity Additionality | W | | S | W | | S | W | <u> </u> | S | W | - | S | W | r r | S | W | | S | | - | 5 W | Т М | S | W | <u> </u> | S | W | | S | W | - | S | W | | S |
| Project Characteristics Genuine Continuity Additionality Solve Problems | W | | S | W | | S | W | <u> </u> | S | W | - | S | W | r r | S | W | | S | | - | 6 W | T M | S | W | <u> </u> | S | W | | S | W | - | S | W | | S |

Table 2.4 – Project Relevance according to cross-border cooperation and SWOT main goals

Projects List

| 1.03 | | |
|--|---|--|
| G - Næringslivet som motor for inkludering | M - Universitetssamarbeidet UNISKA | S - Green - energi effektivisering |
| H - Kompetansetilførsel Hamar reg | N - Industricollege | T - Verdens beste idrettsregion |
| I - Entreprenørskap i hele skolen | O - Levende Finnskogen | U - Dansregionen A + B |
| J - Bygg og anleggskompetanse | P - Å gjøre regionale forskjeller til styrke | V - Grensvandring |
| K - Kompetanse i partnerskap | Q - Fornybar energi, energieffektivisering | X - Naturinformasjon Rogen |
| L - El-kraft | R - Varmeekom | Z - Vänerlaksen |
| | G - Næringslivet som motor for inkludering H - Kompetansetilførsel Hamar reg I - Entreprenørskap i hele skolen J - Bygg og anleggskompetanse K - Kompetanse i partnerskap | H - Kompetansetilførsel Hamar regN - IndustricollegeI - Entreprenørskap i hele skolenO - Levende FinnskogenJ - Bygg og anleggskompetanseP - Å gjøre regionale forskjeller til styrkeK - Kompetanse i partnerskapQ - Fornybar energi, energieffektivisering |

PART 2 - INNER SCANDINAVIA - INTERREG-A SUB-PROGRAMME (2007-2013)

To venture furthermore in this 'projects relevance' analysis, it is important to stress out that this evaluation was not only sustained on the appraisal of the Inner Scandinavia cross-border cooperation approved INTERREG-A projects coherence, in view with the defined main political goals. In fact, we decided to complement it by reconstituting the logic of the programme, in order to assess the relevance of the analysed projects, in the light of the main border area needs, problems, threats and opportunities, as well as their degree of additionality, genuinity and continuity.

So, when it comes to the relevance of the 24 analysed projects and the already mentioned seven selected political goals to enhance the cross-border cooperation in Inner Scandinavia (Table 2.2 and Fig. 2.8) several conclusions can be drawn:

- All projects are relevant since they clearly fit in the main goals of the programme;
- More than 80% have a strong relevance in at least one political goal;
- Around 40% have a strong relevance in more than one political goal;
- There is a strong heterogeneity in the distribution of the projects over the seven political areas when it comes to its relevance;
- The projects strong relevance was concentrated essentially in four political areas: Innovation, Education, Culture, Environmental-Nature/Climate Change;
- Two political areas were highly prioritised by the projects in terms of its relevance: Innovation and Education;
- Two political areas were somewhat neglected by the projects when it comes to its relevance: Public Health and Urban-Rural Development. Nevertheless, the latter was indirectly present in several projects with a medium relevance degree.

In sum, when it comes to the 24 Inner Scandinavia analysed projects relevance, it is possible to conclude that, in overall terms, it is quite strong, meaning that all of them respond to the global needs of the border region, in gradually eliminate the barrier effect in several dimensions. Yet, it seems that there is a clear priority in supporting the 'economic growth' main INTERREG Swe-Nor (2007-2014) programme priority, by giving primacy to two political areas: Innovation and Education.



Figure 2.8 – Projects relevance in the seven political areas

Hence, the following question can be posed: does this make sense, or should the projects be better dispersed throughout the seven main goals? Well, there is never an easy answer to this question since a multitude of factors intervene to shape these results (secretariat selection criteria; quality of the presented projects, project leaders experience, financial capacity and influence; available funds for each priority, etc.). Nevertheless, one thing looks clear: the INTERREG-A Swe-Nor (2007-2013) programme decided to retain a stronger percentage of funds (55,7%) in the first strategic priority (Economic Growth), since "large parts of the area have a lower level of education than the national average and there is little in the way of entrepreneurial spirit" (CE, 2006).

Under this view, there is some coherence in giving a stronger financial backing to the political areas of Innovation and Education. This is even more important considering that these 24 projects represented more that 90% of the Inner Scandinavia total budget by 31-12-2010. Interestingly, the 'Climate Change' priority is given a strong position in the programme in terms of financial allocations. Yet, the results show that the 'Public Health' priority was strongly overlooked.

According to the above, both analysis shows that the financial lion's part is being destined to the Innovation, Education main goals, when it comes to the number of approved projects (Fig. 2.8). Nonetheless, the use of the financial allocations for each goal (Fig. 2.9) augments the importance of the Climate Change goal since it includes the highly financed related energy projects.





Source: Data: Hedmark INTERREG-A Secretariat projects database - Adapted



Figure 2.9 – Inner Scandinavia allocated funds (2007-2013) per main political area (%)

Source: Data: Hedmark INTERREG-A Secretariat projects database - Adapted

Finally, the relevance of the analysed projects within the programme's rationale, in order to satisfy needs, solve problems, avoid threats and grasp opportunities, has not proven difficult to assess. As a matter of fact, almost all the projects have a medium or strong relevance in all those parameters, and are particularly strong in grasping opportunities, since many of them support the education and innovation paths (seed planting) (Fig. 2.10).





At the same time, all of them are genuine, which means that they are purely cross-border projects focussed on promoting integrated regional development between neighbouring border regions, and to establish genuine cross-border partnerships, in order to further consolidate a bottom-up involvement and participation of relevant actors in Inner Scandinavia. In addition, a large part comply with the INTERREG goals of Additionality¹¹ since, according to the 'project leaders' opinions, most of them would not take place without INTERREG, and the remaining would not have access to such a relevant level of funding.

Finally, and again according to the 'project leaders judgement's', the Continuity of the projects is quite strong, since most of them will continue, one way or

¹¹ Community support for economic and social development must not be substituted for efforts by national governments – (EC, 1999: 31-32).

INTERREG-A INNER SCANDINAVIA. PARTNERSHIP AND ACHIEVEMENTS

another into a new similar project. In this regard, some are expected to have its continuation in a following INTERREG-A project, some will try to find other sources of public/private financing, some with establish new networks with the partners involved, at least in a few collaboration areas. In short, it goes without saying that the actors involved in all these projects find it relevant to continue the crystallization of the cross-border networks even without INTERREG funding's. Under this scenario, the relevance of the projects is even stronger and the intensity of the cross-border collaborations is safeguarded in the long term in Inner Scandinavia.

Concerning the territorial distribution of the 24 analysed projects leaders (Fig. 2.11), they clearly privilege the Inner Scandinavia dominant urban agglomerations (Hamar, Falun, Karlstad and Lillestrøm). Of course, many other locations (urban and rural) get financial support from the programme. There are a number of reasons that justify this picture, ranging from the INTERREG administrative requirements, which has forced out "some actors that used to figure more prominently in Nordic cross-border cooperative ventures in the 1980s and early 1990s, such as those in the voluntary sector and small enterprises" (Nordregio, 2007: 91). Amongst other reasons that explain this predominant distribution of projects in the main urban agglomeration in Inner Scandinavia, is the partner's financial and institutional robustness and experience in cross-border matters (1/3 are universities or research institutes/schools), which is mainly concentrated in those areas.

The longer experience in cross-border cooperation between the Hamar -Karlstad axis also explains why it sustains the large amount of INTERREG-A projects in this border region. Indeed, the 'entrance' of Dalarna's capital region (Falun) in the INTERREG-A Swe-Nor programme is quite recent (2007), so the cross-border connections between the Hamar – Falun/Borlänge axis can be said to be on its starting phase. Even so, when it comes to the projects financial allocation (Fig. 2.12), this more urbanized Dalarna (Falun/Borlänge) area has received an important stimulus to sustain a longer-term cross-border links with the Norwegian part of the border, within the wider network of Inner Scandinavia cross-border activities.



Figure 2.11 – Interreg-IV Inner Scandinavia 24 projects network connections

Source: Data - Inner Scandinavia Projects Database - Author



Figure 2.12 – Interreg-IV Inner Scandinavia 24 project financing distribution

Source: Data - Inner Scandinavia Projects Database - Author

Part 3 - Synthesis of mid-term evaluations (2007-2010)

3.1 - Projects effectiveness (objectives vs results)

Not surprisingly, in the previous topic we reached the conclusion that the programme objectives are coherent with the Inner Scandinavia territorial needs, and that the concrete measures follow on logically from the specific objectives defined for the main axes and measures. In broad terms, this means that the programme points out to a robust internal coherence. It is, however, important to recall that the INTERREG-A Swe-Nor represents only one part of a wide spectrum of public local/regional allocated resources in Inner Scandinavia, and that some needs covered by this programme are also targeted by other policies. As a consequence, its coherence also requires that its objectives are not in contradiction and are not duplicated by other implemented policies.

In the following lines we will discuss on the effectiveness of the analysed projects, in order to check if the objectives formulated in the programme are being achieved with the implementation of the approved INTERREG-A projects. To narrow this analysis we decided to focus mainly on the expected project effects in the Inner Scandinavia seven mainstream policy areas.

3.1.1 - Contribution to the regional seven policy areas

In general, the evidence collected in the interviews with the 24 project leaders, concerning the achievement of the project main goals, shows a highly satisfactory level of progress in terms of the produced outputs and results (Table 3.1). This illustrates that, in overall terms, the objectives formulated in the programme are being achieved, in spite of some difficulties posed by: (i) the 2008 financial crisis; (ii) the structural weakness of many small firms; (iii) the lack of adequate or interested project partners; (iv) the lack of funds in small projects; (v) the existence of too larger areas covered by the project; (vi) the changing/abandon of some partners and (vii) the presence of large distances.

Table 3.1 – Project effectiveness according to the seven political areas

| Project | | Α | | | В | | | С | | | D | | | Е | | | F | | | G | | | Н | | | I | | | J | | | Κ | | | L | |
|---|---|---|---|---|--------|---|---|----------|---|---|--------|---|---|--------|---|---|--------|---|---|--------|--------|---|--------|---|---|------------|---|---|------------|---|---|--------|---|-------|----------|---|
| Policy Area | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | М | S |
| Innovation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Climate Change | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Education | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Culture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Urban-Rural Development | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Environment / Nature Protection | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Public Health | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project | | Μ | | | Ν | | | 0 | | | Ρ | | | Q | | | R | | | S | | | Т | | | U | | | V | | | Х | | | Ζ | |
| Project Policy Area | W | M | S | W | N M | S | W | О м | S | W | P M | S | W | Q M | S | W | R M | S | W | S M | S | W | T M | S | W | U M | S | W | V M | S | W | Х М | S | W | Z M | S |
| | W | | S | W | | S | W | <u> </u> | S | W | - | S | W | | S | W | - | S | W | | S | W | T M | S | W | U M | S | W | V M | S | W | | S | W | <u> </u> | S |
| Policy Area | W | | S | W | | S | W | <u> </u> | S | W | - | S | W | | S | W | - | S | W | | S | W | Т м | S | W | M | S | W | V M | S | W | | S | W | <u> </u> | S |
| Policy Area Innovation | W | | S | W | | S | W | <u> </u> | S | W | - | S | W | | S | W | - | S | W | | S | W | T M | S | W | M | S | W | V M | S | W | | S | W | <u> </u> | S |
| Policy Area Innovation Climate Change | W | | S | W | | S | W | <u> </u> | S | W | - | S | W | | S | W | - | S | W | | S | W | Т м | S | W | M M | S | W | V M | S | W | | S | W | <u> </u> | S |
| Policy Area Innovation Climate Change Education | W | | S | W | | S | W | <u> </u> | S | W | - | S | W | | S | W | - | S | W | | S C | W | Т М | S | W | U M | S | W | V M | S | W | | S | W | <u> </u> | S |
| Policy Area Innovation Climate Change Education Culture | W | | S | W | | S | W | <u> </u> | S | W | - | S | W | | S | W | - | S | W | | S | W | Т м | S | W | U M | S | W | V M | S | W | | S | W | <u> </u> | S |

Projects List

| 1.0]6 | | |
|--|---|--|
| G - Næringslivet som motor for inkludering | M - Universitetssamarbeidet UNISKA | S - Green - energi effektivisering |
| H - Kompetansetilførsel Hamar reg | N - Industricollege | T - Verdens beste idrettsregion |
| I - Entreprenørskap i hele skolen | O - Levende Finnskogen | U - Dansregionen A + B |
| J - Bygg og anleggskompetanse | P - Å gjøre regionale forskjeller til styrke | V - Grensvandring |
| K - Kompetanse i partnerskap | Q - Fornybar energi, energieffektivisering | X - Naturinformasjon Rogen |
| L - El-kraft | R - Varmeekom | Z - Vänerlaksen |
| | G - Næringslivet som motor for inkludering H - Kompetansetilførsel Hamar reg I - Entreprenørskap i hele skolen J - Bygg og anleggskompetanse K - Kompetanse i partnerskap | H - Kompetansetilførsel Hamar regN - IndustricollegeI - Entreprenørskap i hele skolenO - Levende FinnskogenJ - Bygg og anleggskompetanseP - Å gjøre regionale forskjeller til styrkeK - Kompetanse i partnerskapQ - Fornybar energi, energieffektivisering |

In line with these observations, in broad terms, it is safe to assume that the analysed projects are producing the expected effects. Hence, their effectiveness has to be regarded as quite positive, given the difficulties mentioned above. On another level, it is equally true that appropriate solutions have been used to tackle those difficulties in order to achieve the initial goals of the projects, with the help of the competent and experienced programme secretariat, both in Sweden and in Norway.

It is also noteworthy that the support of the projects to each one of the Inner Scandinavia seven political areas should be viewed in a regional socioeconomic development context. Put simple, socioeconomic development can be sought both by external forces (investment, qualified immigration and technology transfer – exogenous development), or by supporting endogenous development (supporting local firms and workers – training, collective services, networking, access to information, innovation, research, etc.). The latter development rationale "presumes that a growth factor already exists in the form of specialization in certain dynamic activities or in the form of a regional competitive advantage" (EC, 1999).

To a certain extent, we can apply both socioeconomic development strategies in the Swe-Nor INTERREG-A IV programme, since it aims to support the (exogenous development) attractiveness and the economic growth (endogenous development) of the border area. More specifically, we can break down the Inner Scandinavia seven political goals to support territorial development into both development rationales and detect which one was more supported by the projects. In this line of thought, we can argue that, for the most part, Inner Scandinavia political goals fit better within the endogenous type of socioeconomic development support. However, if we look from a different angle, there are also tangible signs of the exogenous development support type in some projects, as they aim to attract qualified migrants and cross-border knowledge transfers.

PART 3 - SYNTHESIS OF MID-TERM EVALUATIONS (2007-2013)

Considering that typology and the medium/strong effectiveness of the analysed 24 INTERREG-A projects in each one of the seven policy areas (Table 3.1 and Fig. 3.1), it appears that, to a large extent, the efforts to support endogenous development outweigh the ones used to sustain the exogenous development. In this regard, the Innovation and Education political goals are being supported in an effective manner by involving the local/regional universities and research centres, thus creating sustainable technological cross-border networks.



Figure 3.1 – Projects effectiveness in the seven political areas

Subsequently, this concentration of financial support in the Inner Scandinavia programme innovation-education axis, seems logical, in our point of view, in the sense that, by doing so, the programme is supporting a regional growth factor in order to enhance the regional specialization and competitiveness, by means of increasing the border permeabilization to knowledge, competences and technologic transfer, with the aim to establish and reinforce cross-border networks of firms, actors and universities/research centres.

Despite this preference, the attractiveness related political domains are also being supported in an effective manner, by encouraging territorial rehabilitation in environmental/heritage/culture terms. For instance, there are very interesting projects which are supporting: (i) nature related tourism activities; (ii) energy efficiency; (iii) culture events promotion (sports, dance) and (iv) environmental protected areas divulgation.

3.1.2 - Job creation

It is a widely known fact that regional development goes beyond the objective of economic growth. Although It is not the object of this report to deeply discuss the concept of regional development, we decided to bring one schematic view which contemplates three major dimensions of regional/local development (Fig. 3.2) in order to justify the importance of the number of net jobs created by EU programme and the INTERREG-A in particular.

So, if we take a look at the following scheme, one can understand that, besides the creation of wealth (which is usually associated with economic growth), regional development requires the retention of this wealth in the territory and its distribution. In this sense, the creation of jobs should be viewed of a major pillar of regional/local development, as they usually allow the retention and the distribution of wealth resulted from the regional economic activity.



Figure 3.2 – Regional development domains simplified scheme

Source: (DGPR, 1994) - Adapted

PART 3 - SYNTHESIS OF MID-TERM EVALUATIONS (2007-2013)

It is under this theoretical standpoint that Norway is viewed as the World's most developed country (UN, 2010) since it has been able to share (distribution) the oil production profits to the entire nation, and not retain it within a few (as it is the case of the majority of the remaining world oil nations). This does not mean that every EU Cohesion Policy programme, like the on-going Territorial Cooperation Objective ones (INTERREG IV), should only have as their main goal the objective of sustainable job creation. However, this goal should be present, at least in an indirect mode, in most of them, as the long term aim to boost regional development in the border area, largely depends on job creation.

As such, we decided to include in our questionnaire the 'always' difficult question: how many jobs were created by the project? It is difficult because, in many projects, the main goals were not exactly to create new jobs, (perhaps because in the Norwegian part of the border this is not viewed really as a local/regional major issue) and many of them were in fact part-time or administrative jobs. On the other hand, some projects are at their initial phase and other are just about to finish. Consequently, the data obtained should be looked more as estimates rather than precise created net jobs within the projects (Table 3.2).

| | | | 10 | | 0.4 | - | L 3 | | aici | u ju | 03 | | ale | u b | yц | | <i>n</i> Oj | -010 | | | | | | |
|-------------|---|---|----|---|-----|---|------------|---|------|------|----|---|-----|-----|----|---|-------------|------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Project | Α | В | С | D | Е | F | G | Η | | J | Κ | L | М | Ν | 0 | Ρ | Q | R | S | Т | U | V | Х | Ζ |
| Job Created | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1-4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5-9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10-19 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20-29 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 30-50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| > 50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Table 3.2 – Estimated jobs created by the projects

Projects List

| A - Innovation music network | G - Næringslivet inkludering | M – UNISKA | S - Green - energi effektivisering |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| B - The Scandinavian Way | H - Kompetansetilførsel Hamar | N - Industricollege | T - Verdens beste idrettsregion |
| C - Hjerte i Skandinavia A + B | I - Entreprenørskap i hele skolen | O - Levende Finnskogen | U - Dansregionen A + B |
| D - Barnas grenseland | J - Bygg og anleggskompetanse | P - Å gjøre regionale | V - Grensvandring |
| E - Hedmark Dalarna-TRUST | K - Kompetanse i partnerskap | Q - FEM | X - Naturinformasjon Rogen |
| F - Grenseløs fjellopplevelse | L - El-kraft | R - Varmeekom | Z - Vänerlaksen |
| | | | |

Even so, and when we compare to other INTERREG-A EU known programmes (like the Iberian one), we can say that the estimated number of jobs created by the 24 analysed Inner Scandinavia projects (around a total of 275 – 11,5 per project on average) exceeded all our expectations. Evidently, due to the way the projects are implemented (they require staff to manage them) more than 1/3 of these created jobs are both part-time, and administrative jobs (Fig. 3.3). Furthermore, some of them are not sustainable in time, mainly the ones related to cultural (more volatile and market dependant) activities, like music business, for instance.



Figure 3.3 – Estimated jobs created by the 24 main Inner Scandinavia projects

Additionally, most of the analysed projects produced/will produce spin-off benefits to job creation, especially the ones that support training courses and innovation. Consequently, only in the long term it would be possible to accurately measure the effects and impacts of these projects in this crucial domain of territorial development. As such, we suggest that INTERREG secretariats should try to gather, as accurate as possible, data related to job creation in order to better follow the programme impacts on regional development.

3.1.3 - Contribution to reduce the barrier-effect

Cross-border cooperation has many goals in itself, and they largely depend on the individual border area characteristics. In concrete terms, for the most part, the cross-border strategies are focused in further improving accessibilities (transport and communications), economic activities (in rural and urban areas), institutional networking, solving environmental problems, improving the quality of human resources, building and extending social amenities, enhancing cooperation between universities, solving administrative and everyday problems, etc.¹²

Yet, we can also summarize the cross-border INTERREG programmes strategies as a mean to gradually reduce the barrier effect along the border areas in several dimensions: (i) Institutional-Urban; (ii) Economic-Technology; (iii); Cultural-Social; (iv) Environmental-Heritage; (v) Accessibility (E. Medeiros, 2010). Based on this theoretical background, each INTERREG-A approved project should, at least, have a strong contribution to reduce one of these dimensions of the barrier-effect. As a result, we decided to see if this is true, or not, in the 24 analysed projects. Therefore, a general overview of the evaluation presented in Table 3.3, lead us to the following general conclusions:

- Almost all the projects have a strong effect in the permeabilization of the border in, at least, one barrier effect dimension;
- Almost 2/3 of the projects are focused in improving the economic/technologic permeabilization of the border, by establishing and reinforcing networks between universities and companies (Fig. 3.4);
- The environmental-heritage and the socio-cultural barrier is also being tackled by some projects, both directly (national parks) and indirectly (climate change);
- The improvement of the border area accessibilities is not regarded as a top priority amongst the analysed projects;
- The institutional-urban dimension is being reinforced by quite many projects by inducing and reinforcing cross-border networks.

¹² Based on (AEBR, 2008)

PART 3 – SYNTHESIS OF MID-TERM EVALUATIONS (2007-2010)

| Project | | Α | | | В | | | С | | | D | | | Ε | | | F | | | G | | | Η | | | I | | | J | | | Κ | | | L | |
|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Barrier Effect Dimension | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | М | S |
| Institutional / Urban | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Economic / Technology | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ľ |
| Cultural / Social | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Environment / Heritage | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Accessibility | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project | | Μ | | | N | | | 0 | | | Р | | | Q | | | R | | | S | | | Т | | 1 | U | | | V | | | Х | | | 7 | — |
| Barrier Effect Dimension | W | | S | W | Μ | S | W | М | S | W | Μ | S | W | M | S | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | M | S | W | Μ | S | W | М | S | W | М | S |
| Institutional / Urban | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Economic / Technology | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cultural / Social | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Environment / Heritage | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Accessibility | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | |

Table 0.0 Dualast affasti

Projects List

| | i i ojc | | |
|---|--|--|------------------------------------|
| A - Innovation music network | G - Næringslivet som motor for inkludering | M - Universitetssamarbeidet UNISKA | S - Green - energi effektivisering |
| B - The Scandinavian Way | H - Kompetansetilførsel Hamar reg | N - Industricollege | T - Verdens beste idrettsregion |
| C - Hjerte i Skandinavia A + B | I - Entreprenørskap i hele skolen | O - Levende Finnskogen | U - Dansregionen A + B |
| D - Barnas grenseland | J - Bygg og anleggskompetanse | P - Å gjøre regionale forskjeller til styrke | V - Grensvandring |
| E - Hedmark Dalarna-TRUST | K - Kompetanse i partnerskap | Q - Fornybar energi, energieffektivisering | X - Naturinformasjon Rogen |
| F - Grenseløs fjellopplevelse Fulufjellet | L - El-kraft | R - Varmeekom | Z - Vänerlaksen |

INTERREG-A INNER SCANDINAVIA. PARTNERSHIP AND ACHIEVEMENTS



Figure 3.4 – Projects effectiveness in reducing the barrier effect

To conclude this topic, there is a general impression that there is a quite unbalanced effective contribution from the Inner Scandinavia INTERREG-A approved projects to reduce the barrier-effect in the identified five dimensions along the border, with evident cost to the accessibilities one. In spite of this, one has to understand that, concerning the former (accessibility), the necessary investments to improve the road/rail/transport border connections are usually out of the INTERREG programme financial possibilities. Yet, perhaps it would be possible to support a pilot project to implement one or two cross-border bus connections in the border area.

Even so, almost 90% of the projects are strongly contributing to reduce the barrier effect on the border, at least in one dimension (1/4 in more than one dimension). Here, the 'Economic-Technology' and the 'Institutional-Urban' ones are at the frontline (Fig. 3.4). Yet, even the 'Culture-Social' and the 'Environment-Heritage' barriers as being tackled by a reasonable amount of projects. Hence, overall, we can state that the Inner Scandinavia programme is being strongly effective in dismantling the barriers in the border region, especially when it comes to put the economic and education regional and local actors and entities in close collaboration.

3.2 - Projects efficiency (inputs vs outputs)

Evaluation should bring together all the collected information in a coherent whole, in order to enhance programme managers knowledge about the functioning and main outputs, results and impacts of the implemented programme, "with a view to improving the efficiency and effectiveness of a programme" (EU, 1999). In the previous topic we discussed the effectiveness of the 24 analysed Inner Scandinavian projects. Hence, the following step is to analyse their efficiency which, in the context of evaluation, "is assessed by comparing the results obtained or, preferably, the impacts produced, and the resources mobilised" (EU, 1999). This could be done, for instance, by dividing the budgetary inputs mobilised by the quantity of territorial effects obtained. For the sake of clarity, several questions can be formulated to assess the efficiency of a project/programme:

- Are the effects obtained equal to the inputs?
- Could more effects have been obtained with the same budget?
- Have other interventions obtained the same effects at a lower cost?
- Have the objectives been achieved at the lowest cost?
- Could better effects be obtained at the same cost?

There is, in all of the previous questions, an indisputable relation between the financial allocation of the project/programme (inputs) and the obtained outputs and effects (results and impacts). With this in mind, we elaborated the Table 3.4 which, again, was based on the information gathered in the interviews with the project leaders.

In this context, it is important to stress out that this report presents a general overview of the efficiency of the analysed projects, since it was not possible to visit them all *in loco*. In addition, some of them are still far from being finished. So the analysis was based mostly on the initial obtained results. It is nonetheless worth taking all the possible steps to assess the projects efficiency, using what is available and make it possible to increase, even marginally, the efficiency and legitimacy this programme.

| Project | | А | | | В | | | С | | | D | | E | = | | F | | | G | | Н | | | | | | J | | | Κ | | | L | |
|---|---|---|---|---|--------|---|---|--------|---|---|---|---|-----|-----------------|---|--------|---|---|--------|-----|----------|---|---|--------|---|---|--------|---|---|---|---|---|--------|---|
| Efficiency Domains | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | Μ | S | W | M S | W | М | S | W | М | S V | / M | S | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | М | S | W | М | S |
| Goals / Accountability | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Partnership / Network Strengthening | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Awareness / Knowledge Production | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Implementation / Planning | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Implementation / Fidmining | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| · · | | | | | N 1 | | 1 | | | I | | _ | | _ | | | | 1 | _ | | - | | | | | | | | | V | | | ~ | _ |
| Project | | М | | | N | | | 0 | | | Ρ | | (| 2 | | R | | | S | | Т | | | U | | | V | | | Х | | | Y | _ |
| Project Efficiency Domains | W | M | S | W | N M | S | W | О м | S | W | - | S | W I |) א s | W | R M | S | W | S M | S V | Т / М | S | W | U M | S | W | V M | S | W | X | S | W | Y | S |
| Project Efficiency Domains | W | 1 | S | W | 1 | S | W | - | S | W | | S | W 1 | Ω א s | W | | S | W | | S V | Т / м | S | W | U M | S | W | V M | S | W | | S | W | Y M | S |
| Project Efficiency Domains Goals / Accountability | W | 1 | S | W | 1 | S | W | - | S | W | | S | W 1 |) и s | W | | S | W | | S V | Т / М | S | W | U M | S | W | V M | S | W | | S | W | Y M | S |
| Project | W | 1 | S | W | 1 | S | W | - | S | W | | S | W 1 |) м s | W | | S | W | | S V | Т / м | S | W | U M | S | W | V M | S | W | | S | W | Y M | S |

Table 3.4 – Projects efficiency

Projects List

| A - Innovation music network | G - Næringslivet som motor for inkludering | M - Universitetssamarbeidet UNISKA | S - Green - energi effektivisering |
|---|--|--|------------------------------------|
| B - The Scandinavian Way | H - Kompetansetilførsel Hamar reg | N - Industricollege | T - Verdens beste idrettsregion |
| C - Hjerte i Skandinavia A + B | I - Entreprenørskap i hele skolen | O - Levende Finnskogen | U - Dansregionen A + B |
| D - Barnas grenseland | J - Bygg og anleggskompetanse | P - Å gjøre regionale forskjeller til styrke | V - Grensvandring |
| E - Hedmark Dalarna-TRUST | K - Kompetanse i partnerskap | Q - Fornybar energi, energieffektivisering | X - Naturinformasjon Rogen |
| F - Grenseløs fjellopplevelse Fulufjellet | L - El-kraft | R - Varmeekom | Z - Vänerlaksen |

3.2.1 – Efficiency in main evaluation domains

As said previously, in simple terms, efficiency can be viewed as an equation between the inputs (financial resources allocated to the project/programme) and the obtained results (in the short and long term). In other words, this analysis aims to verify that public action (funding) is satisfying territorial needs and that the public investments have a justifiable *raison d'être*. In the end, the observed reality should provide an opportunity to alert the programme managers of the programme's inefficiencies and draw lessons from the on-going experiences on the field, in order to propose improvements in the future programme implementations.

In light of this, and considering that, in our judgement, the relevance and effectiveness of the analysed 24 projects is very positive, a first and crucial step to evaluate their efficiency would be to assess what has been produced so far by the projects in order to make it possible to report to political authorities and citizens on results obtained and on the sound use of allocated resources. Concomitantly we decided to make this assessment within four efficiency 3.4 3.5): Goals/Accountability; domains (Table and Fig. (i) (ii) Partnership/Network Strengthening; (iii) Awareness/Knowledge Production; (iv) Implementation/Planning.



Figure 3.5 - Projects efficiency

PART 3 - SYNTHESIS OF MID-TERM EVALUATIONS (2007-2013)

In simple terms, the reading of the previous table and figure, points out to a quite efficient use of resources in all the analysed domains, which is not completely unexpected, due to the Inner Scandinavia secretariat strict monitoring of the on-going projects. In more concrete terms, the 'goal/accountability' domain refers to the adequate use of the available funds in each project, and what has been produced with that money.

Here, some sound examples of what has been produced so far by these 24 analysed projects (Fig. 3.6) can contribute to justify our positive evaluation in terms of their efficiency, since most of them have already produced tangible outputs/results. In that extent, they ultimately meet the demands of policy makers when it comes to the initial formulated local/regional cross-border development strategy (goals/accountability).





There is, unquestionably, a causal link between the implementation of the 24 analysed projects and the support or structuring effect to the Inner Scandinavia business activity, both directly (job creation, energy saving, access to skilled workers, etc.), and indirectly by promoting: (i) network strengthening (creating sustainable cross-border links, internationalization, involving local and regional

stakeholders); (ii) knowledge production (seminars, internet pages, cross-border courses – bachelor and masters); (iii) sound implementation and planning (improving management arrangements and delivery through experience, finding adequate cross-border partners, simplification of procedures).

3.2.2 - Efficiency in the seven political areas

In the following lines we will try to summarize some of our findings concerning the efficiency of the 24 Inner Scandinavia analysed projects and the seven political areas outlined by the regional cross-border secretariat for this INTERREG-A programming period (2007-2013). Yet, prior to that, it is important to state that "even when programmes and instruments fulfil their stated objectives there will also often be unintended consequences. These can be positive or negative" (EC, 2008). In reality, these side effects, can take several forms (EC, 1999):

- <u>Displacement effects:</u> (ex: a job is created and another job is destroyed in the area);
- <u>Deadweight effects:</u> (ex: a job is created which would have been created in any case, even without the aid);
- <u>Substitution effects:</u> (ex: a jobless person is recruited and another one loses her/his job).

However, to a great extent, it is difficult to highlight all these possible 'side effects' of the projects/programme implementation, within the framework of the this report, since it would require another set of interviews with a large number of supported actors (students, workers, companies), as well as the access to more accurate and concrete data related to job creation and business establishment in the border area. Consequently, our efficiency estimates have to be based purely on a simple projects 'input-output' equation. In this regard, we believe it would be interesting to check more closely the produced results in the Inner Scandinavia defined seven political areas.

Innovation and education:

Starting with the political goals of 'innovation and education', in an ever increasing globalized world, European regions can only be competitive if they look at innovation as their main development driver, with a goal to provide quality and innovative products and services, in a worldwide commerce network. In turn, this regional strategy requires a strong investment in human capital (education) and, in particular, in technological training and higher education, in order to increase productivity levels.



Figure 3.7 – Regional Innovation Score in Scandinavia - 2009

Source: Data (INNO METRIX, 2009) - Author

When it comes exclusively to the innovation related indicators (see: INNO METRIX, 2009) Inner Scandinavia looks to have a twofold panorama, where the borderline clearly divides areas with the presence of high innovators in the Swedish part of the border while, in the Norwegian side (namely in Hedmark), this result is reduced in two levels (average innovators). Of course, the data is used at the NUTS II (Fig. 3.7) level which prevents a more detailed picture. Nevertheless, it would not be a surprise to see the cities of Falun/Borlänge

(Dalarna), as well as Karlstad (Värmland) as the main drivers of innovation in the Swedish NUTS II, thus leaving most of the remaining inner rural areas at the same level as Hedmark, in general (N).





Source: Data - SCB + SSB - Author

PART 3 – SYNTHESIS OF MID-TERM EVALUATIONS (2007-2013)

To have a more detailed territorial panorama in this area (innovation) we can use the presence of highly educated inhabitants (tertiary educated people) in a given region (Fig. 3.8), which does not change overnight. In fact, some surveys indicate that very few people, who have started working, interrupt their carrier to spend 3-4 years completing a tertiary course. "This underlines the importance of lifelong learning, which includes access to training of various kinks as well as university courses" (CE, 2010: 37). Nonetheless, this choice requires a certain amount of motivation (to get a new occupation or a higher salary), and also the presence of adequate places (universities and training facilities), which are quite well distributed along Inner Scandinavia main regional urban agglomerations.

It is also not surprising that, in this region, the areas closer to its four main urban hubs (Lillestrøm/Oslo, Hamar, Falun/Borlänge and Karlstad) are obviously the ones with better possibilities to both train and attract highly skilled workers, which are is crucial factor to sustain the regional innovation levels. Indeed, when it comes to human capital attraction, the size of the urban settlements matters. Nevertheless, on certain occasions, small/medium city clusters can reproduce the results obtained in larger towns, if they provide the necessary attractive services, both to business and dwellers. In the latter case, the Hamar region can be regarded as a strong attractive node for innovation and creativity in Norway and consequently in Inner Scandinavia (Fig. 3.9), as it looks to have a strong cultural diversity and tolerance to entrepreneurship and the creative class (see: A. Hauge *et al.* 2010).

There is an estimation that an increase of 10% in the share of highly educated in working-age population, on average, tends to raise the GDP per head by 0.6% a year, making education levels (namely tertiary education) appear as one of the most important growth factors. In addition, the policy and institutional context, related to the quality of governance associated with other factors like the regional age structure, endowment of natural resources and the access to large product or factor markets are considered also as major factors of regional growth (CE, 2010).

97



Figure 3.9 – Creative class index in eastern Norway cities

Source: Data – (A. Hauge et al. 2010) – Author Cartography

Yet, in order to endure a strong and sustainable regional innovation system, the focus of regional policies should also be put upon other factors like R&D expenditure and human resources in science and technology. Moreover, a differentiated innovation support regional policy should be followed in order to balance the Scandinavian territory in terms of its main and medium regional innovation systems cores. However, "in general, it can be said that the regional innovation policies in the Nordic countries have the tendency to favour already strong and competitive regions by using competitive calls, where calls are made for the submitting of applications in a competitive context in order to receive funding" (Nordregio, 2008).

Nevertheless, besides the importance of public funding in boosting regional innovation systems, they should also be linked to private entrepreneurship and SMEs. Whatever the case, regional actors are still considered to be the most appropriate to boost territorial innovation, since they are "able to appreciate local and regional needs" (Nordregio, 2008) when developing innovation policies.

PART 3 - SYNTHESIS OF MID-TERM EVALUATIONS (2007-2013)

Concomitantly, and since it is also evident from the reading of Figures 3.10 and 3.11, that Inner Scandinavia shows a weaker performance in two decisive factors to boost its innovation capacity (human resources in science and technology and total expenditure in research and development), in the Scandinavian context, it seems to make even more sense that this cross-border region should embrace a regional development priority to develop a stronger cross-border regional innovation system.



Figure 3.10 – Human resources in science and technology in Scandinavia -

Source: Data (Eurostat) – Author cartography

This makes even more sense, considering that "smaller labour markets may also have local economies based on innovation processes. Innovation processes should thus be analysed in the light of local 'economic life', and not through top-down political objectives, such as the Lisbon indicators. This perspective emphasises the fact that innovation is not only about high-tech, but it has also concerns the adaptation capacity of local industries to changing economic environments. However, the proximity of small labour markets to universities which can 'produce' the knowledge for developing further innovations is in that sense essential" (Nordregio, 2008).



Figure 3.11 – Total expenditure on R&D in Scandinavia - 2007

Source: Data (OECD, 2011) - Author cartography

This discussion related to the different types and different ways of innovation at the regional arena would take us far beyond the purposes of this report. Even so, in the following we decided to present a brief overview of the variety of roles in which innovation can be understood, based on the Green Paper on Innovation Report (EC, 1995):

- As a renewal and enlargement of the range of products and services and the associated markets;
- As the establishment of new methods of production, supply and distribution;
- As the introduction of changes in management, work organisation, and the working conditions and skills of the workforce.

In sum, and according to this report (EC, 1995), innovation is "taken as being a synonym for the successful production, assimilation and exploitation of novelty in the economic and social spheres". To achieve this goal, actions must be

PART 3 - SYNTHESIS OF MID-TERM EVALUATIONS (2007-2013)

taken in several regional development domains, as previously discussed (human capital, R&D expenditure, regional vision – governance, etc.). In the end, the production of innovative regional products and services can be measured, for instance, by the patent applications in a given territory. And again, concerning the regional distribution of this information in Scandinavia (Fig. 3.12) it becomes obvious that Inner Scandinavia lags largely behind the average results obtained in Scandinavia and, of course, its main hubs of innovation (Stockholm, Malmö, Oslo, Gothenburg, Uppsala).



Figure 3.12 – Patent applications in Scandinavia - 2008

Source: Data (<u>http://stats.oecd.org/index.aspx</u>) – Author cartography

So, the question is: does it make sense to associate cross-border cooperation to improve the innovation indexes in the border region, both in the firms and societies? In this regard, we consider that cross-border cooperation and, in particular, the 24 Inner Scandinavia analysed projects, are giving their contribution to attain the political objective of promoting regional innovation, since a strong effort was put in establishing educational courses and seminars in several technical areas (energy, music, tourism, construction, etc.), in an largely efficient way, considering the feed-back we got from the interviewed projects leaders.

Nevertheless, we should point out that, for this type of innovative actions, it might be especially difficult to collect meaningful information on results and impacts. "Here, the collection of process related information, on the development of capacities and competences of stakeholders can also be an instrument to support programme managers in their management and reporting" (Interact, 2007). And it is exactly here that we believe the Swe-Nor INTERREG-A programme has been contributing to the regional innovation goals, mainly by boosting knowledge and competence transfer from participants at a very early age, as it "offers local and regional actors the possibility to enter into common activities and exchange of experience" (ESPON, 2007).

In sum, the INTERREG-A contribution to a stronger innovation regional system in Inner Scandinavia is mainly focus in the 'innovation process', understood as "a transformation of an idea into a marketable product or service, a new or improved manufacturing or distribution process, or a new method of social service" (EC, 1995: 4), since it stimulates cross-border 'knowledge transfer' and the establishment of new cross-border 'organizational networks'. The other 'dimension' of innovation is more tangible, as it is related to the production of a new or improved product. In the latter, the approved INTERREG-A projects can also give some contribution, but more in the long terms and in an indirect way, in most cases.

Irrespective of the levels of the INTERREG-A projects influence in improving the present Inner Scandinavia innovation panorama, we completely agree with the inclusion of the innovation and education goals in its development strategy, which goes along with the EU 2020 main goal of promoting smart growth, by developing an economy based on knowledge and innovation (EC, 2010b). Yet, to follow this path of a more resource efficient Inner Scandinavia territory, the other two EU 2020 main goals (inclusive growth and sustainable growth) should also be pursued.

PART 3 – SYNTHESIS OF MID-TERM EVALUATIONS (2007-2013)

Climate Change, nature and environmental protection:

In strict terms, the measures and financial resources provided by the INTERREG-A Community Initiative should contribute to reduce the barriers along the border in several dimensions (see: E. Medeiros, 2011). In equal measure, they should help to improve regional the socio economic performance (socioeconomic cohesion), the border area territorial articulation (more polycentric and balanced territory), a well-established, efficient and effective governance system, and finally the regional environmental sustainability (including climate change measures, green and energy efficiency, environmental protection and preservation). In simple terms, cross-border cooperation is mainly about 'borders permeabilization' and 'territorial cohesion'.

As stated earlier, the Inner Scandinavia INTERREG-A sub-programme, in line with the main strategic guidelines of the Swe-Nor (2007-2013) programme, decided to prioritize the support to projects included in two main political goals (Innovation and Education), which received close to half of the total allocated budget, so far (Fig. 3.13). In essence, our evaluation supports this choice, in the light of the regional innovation 'needs' (when compared with the remaining Scandinavian territory). In the end, this financial assistance is expected to provide increases in the regional productivity of the factors of production by increasing production and/or lowering costs, accompanied by changes and improvements in the firm's organisation. Ultimately, this positive cycle will help to achieve one of the two main goals of the 2007-2013 Swe-Nor INTERREG-A programme: Economic Growth.

However, as the Fifth Report on Economic, Social and Territorial Cohesion (EC, 2010: 238) states: "regional economic growth without sound management of the environment is not sustainable. As well as being important in its own terms, a good environment is an essential input to the quality of life and the attractiveness of regions. Environmental problems entail social costs, hold back local business expansion and deter outside investment".

Figure 3.13 – Inner Scandinavia allocated funds (2007-2013) per main aggregated goals adapted to EU 2020 (%)



Source: Data: Hedmark INTERREG-A Secretariat projects database - Adapted

That considered, and taken the Inner Scandinavia 'prevailing' territorial capital in terms of its environment quality and extension, it makes all the sense, in our view, that the analysed sub-programme also uses a large piece of its funds to support projects in the environmental/nature/energy/climate change/rural related issues, as it actually does (37% - Fig. 3.13).

In concrete terms, the 24 INTERREG-A Inner Scandinavia analysed projects, bring to the fore two main general environmental goals: (i) promote tourism economic activity in the region (internationalization, information, preservation and networking); (ii) promote energy efficiency (seminars - knowledge exchange, use of renewable energy and energy efficiency in ski resorts).

Hence, the money put in these projects is not only being used in a widely efficient manner (Fig. 3.14) to tackle environmental problems (related with climate change and environmental preservation), but also to indirectly/directly support local economy, and the tourism in particular, which is based mostly in small (sometimes familiar) firms.



Figure 3.14 – Presentation in Akershus Energy Building – Part of FEM project

Source: Author

In either case, the measures and efforts suggested by the EU Commission (EC, 2008b) to best respond to the efforts to mitigate climate change, by tackling the growth in greenhouse gas emissions, are distributed through a small number of the 24 analysed projects (even though their efficiency should be better evaluated in the course of the next decade). As a consequence, the positive fact remains in the Inner Scandinavia political will to promote such environmental measures

Some other INTERREG analysed projects show a clear sign to embark in a new era, characterized by a stronger collaboration between cross-border protected areas, which was one of the Swe-Nor weaker cross-border links signalized in our previous report (E. Medeiros, 2010) during the last 15 years. Truth is, Inner Scandinavia can be used as a pilot laboratory to foster cross-border cooperation between natural protect areas along the border, as it has two cross-border transboundary natural protected areas (Fig. 3.15) between Sweden and Norway¹³ (Töfsingdalen/Femundsmarka and Trestickla).

¹³ http://www.nordregio.se/filer/other/1048.htm

INTERREG-A INNER SCANDINAVIA. PARTNERSHIP AND ACHIEVEMENTS

In the first one of this two protect areas, a very interesting INTERREG-A project (Naturinformajon Rogen) is on the works in order to reduce the administrative/regulations burden and to produce easy understandable and common information for the visitors (web page, brochures, maps, plates, etc.). In addition, another project (grenseløs fjellopplevelse fulufjellet) is keen to promote the Fulufjället National Park and the surrounding area, including, of course, the Norwegian part of the border, which is expected to have a National Park approved soon. If so, there would be another Inner Scandinavia cross-border natural area, which is good news for the local tourism industry.





Source: Data – (<u>http://www.naturvardsverket.se/</u> + <u>http://www.dirnat.no/nasjonalparker/</u> + (Nordregio, 2010b) + SSB + SCB) – Author cartography

On the same vein, the presence of large rural areas in Inner Scandinavia (Fig. 3.15), justifies the approval of projects aiming to develop urban-rural connections. In this regard, the rational of the Swe-Nor programme (SN_INT, 2007) points out to encourage urban-rural cross-border collaboration in areas such as risk-prevention, disaster planning, quality certification, facilitate rural

PART 3 – SYNTHESIS OF MID-TERM EVALUATIONS (2007-2013)

entrepreneurship, employment, innovations and investments in local services and infrastructure, institutional cooperation on planning and development strategies for clusters of cities and their surrounding rural areas.

In our view, these are all cross-border challenges, and some of them could be regarded more closely in future INTERREG-A approved projects, namely in a continuation of the TRUST project which, in our view, should support the burden of forthcoming urban and institutional collaborations in this border region. And also, whenever possible, this cross-border planning collaboration should deeply consider the challenges posed by the climate change in the rural areas economic activity (tourism, agriculture, cattle production and forest production), since "it is projected that with the continuing warming trend there will be a significant increase in winter temperatures with a considerable reduction in the snow cover and also an increase in precipitation which may cause flooding and the intensification of hydrological cycles" (Nordregio, 2010b: 98).

Indeed, the reduction of the snow cover could undermine the mountain tourism industry in Inner Scandinavia (ex: Trysil and Sälen). The good news is that Sweden and Norway will strengthen their cooperation in relation to climate change with their 'green certificate' initiative, which is intended to improve their security of energy supply (Nordregio, 2010b). Nonetheless true is the possibilities posed by global warming in boosting agriculture production in the region. However, a considerable increase in dry periods could risk the wood production which would be more vulnerable to fires. Be that has it may, the cross-border collaboration in all the specified issues (climate change, environment protection, rural-urban development) should be maintained and enhanced, if possible, in the future INTERREG-A Swe-Nor programming period.

Culture - Health

Even though the cultural dimension does not represent the 'core' theme of intervention of the Inner Scandinavia (2007-2013) sub-programme, it is supported, alongside with the 'health' goal, by almost 15% of the total budget, destined to enhance cross-border cooperation in this border region. All too often, natural heritage has been described as a critical part of the development assets of each country (ESPON 1.3.2, 2004). Additionally, "intangible heritage is also internationally recognized as a vital element in culture identity, promotion of creativity and the preservation of cultural diversity" (ESPON ATLAS, 2006: 44).

As such, cultural heritage can be a formidable pillar to expand economic activity (economic growth objective) and also a factor to improve the quality of life (attractiveness objective), since it can contribute to attract the more creative and educated social classes. All add up, culture can indeed be very important to improve regional competitiveness. In this regard, one regional indicator of the culture intensity is the presence of employment with cultural related professions which, in Inner Scandinavia is, in general, higher in all the Swedish part of the border (Fig. 3.16). This means that there is still some 'work' to do in this regional development domain in this border region.

Hence, it seems logical that the Swe-Nor INTERREG programme continues to support projects within the culture domain. But they perhaps should be linked with a wider regional strategy to sustain and boost the tourism activity. So, when it comes to the approved projects efficiency in this sphere (culture and health - sport activities, for instance) they should be assessed according to their contribution to turn Inner Scandinavia a more attractive place, both for local dwellers, and for visitors.

One idea put forward would be to make the exceptional good idea of promoting cross-border sports (Verdens beste idrettsregion) and dance (Dansregionen) events, through INTERREG-A projects, more linked with the promotion of the tourism activity in the area. This could be done, for instance, by an international
PART 3 - SYNTHESIS OF MID-TERM EVALUATIONS (2007-2013)

promotion of an 'Activity and Health Tourism' in the border area, thus exploring the natural assets of the region (rivers, mountains, snow, fresh air, landscapes, etc.) which are quite suitable for sports and alike (dances) physical activities. In the end, the 'health goal' would be accomplished as well, and the projects efficiency would also be greatly beneficiated from that.



Figure 3.16 - Cultural employment level in Scandinavia - 2004

Source: Data (ESPON ATLAS, 2007) – Author cartography

On a final note, we must highlight the importance of many of these cultural related cross-border projects to involve the youth and thus contributing to reduce the language barrier, which is sometimes widely neglected by the Scandinavian national/regional/local authorities, as a cross-border barrier. In this matter, cross-border sports activities can provide a robust platform to mitigate and even eliminate this barrier, since both Nordic language similarities are quite strong.

3.2.3 - The cross-border added value of the projects

The AEBR has produced several guides, reports and publications on the territorial cooperation issue, and specifically concerning the cross-border cooperation process in Europe. In one of those publications (AEBR, 2008), they produced a quite organized, clear and synthetic typology of the several types of added value brought by the materialization of the cross-border process. Here, we present the main ideas put forward in this publication, in a synthetic manner¹⁴:

<u>1 – European added value:</u>

• Promotion of peace, freedom, security and the observance of human rights.

2 - Political added value:

- Develop European integration;
- Increase trust, understanding and collaboration;
- Implement the principles of subsidiarity and partnership;
- Increase socioeconomic cohesion;
- Secure long-term EU financial support to cross-border cooperation.

3 - Institutional added value:

- Promote active involvement by all actors;
- Promote sustainable and efficient cross-border structures;
- Support the joint drafting and implementation of cross-border programmes.

4 – Socio-economic added value:

- Mobilize endogenous potential by strengthening the regional and local levels as partners for an initiators of cross-border cooperation;
- Promote the participation of actors from the economic and social sectors;
- Harmonize professional qualifications;
- Create additional development in certain fields (infrastructures, transport, tourism, environment, education, research, SME's) and through job creation;
- Improve spatial planning and regional development policies.

5 – Socio-cultural added value:

- Disseminate knowledge concerning the border region;
- Promote regional experts and local key institutions networks;
- Promote equal opportunities and extensive knowledge of the neighbouring country culture (language);
- Produce an overview of the border region (maps, publications, etc.).

¹⁴ Some topics where removed and many others changed by the author.

PART 3 - SYNTHESIS OF MID-TERM EVALUATIONS (2007-2013)

In this light, it would be interesting to relate the cross-border added value produced by the 24 analysed projects and the AEBR proposed typology. This can be done by extracting the interviewed project leader's opinions and by our own extrapolation. Concerning the formers, as a whole, the most important added value brought by the 24 analysed projects can be visible in the form of increased levels in human capital, knowledge production/exchange and cross-border networking (Fig. 3.17). Most of these areas are dispersed around the AEBR proposed typology but are mainly focused in two main topics: institutional added value (promote involvement by all actors) and the socio-economic added value (create additional development in certain fields (human capital and knowledge exchange).



Figure 3.17 – INTERREG-A IV Inner Scandinavia 24 projects added value

Source: Project leader's interviews

Considering the latter approach (our own judgement), we can complement the previous findings by making this general assumption of the Inner Scandinavia cross-border cooperation added value: it is contributing to the whole spectrum of the AEBR main topics in general (European, Political, Institutional, Socio-economic and Socio-cultural), and specifically into the following targets:

INTERREG-A INNER SCANDINAVIA. PARTNERSHIP AND ACHIEVEMENTS

- increase public and political understanding and collaboration;
- implement the principles of subsidiarity and partnership;
- increase socioeconomic cohesion;
- promote active involvement by all actors;
- mobilize endogenous potential by strengthening the regional and local levels;
- promote the participation of actors from the economic and social sectors;
- create additional development in certain regional development fields;
- disseminate knowledge concerning the border region;
- promote regional experts and local key institutions networks.

In conclusion, we can detect a strong political will within the Inner Scandinavia programme to apply objective-led cross-border political strategies to strengthen the bonds between both sides of the border, mainly in two main territorial axes (Hamar-Karlstad and Hamar-Falun/Borlänge). Add to that, both the socioeconomic and the sociocultural added value are being produced, since the former is widely related with the first INTERREG-A Swe-Nor objective of 'Economic Growth' and the latter is also strongly related with the second objective of promoting an 'Attractive Living Environment'.

3.3 - Main obstacles to cooperation

Cross-border cooperation should enhance Inner Scandinavia territorial integration. This should be achieved by progressively eliminating or alleviating remaining obstacles "which still cause a fragmentation of socioeconomic and interpersonal relations" (EC, 2009). In this particular aspect (barriers), we should start to mention that being a part of the Nordic territory, Inner Scandinavia benefits from the fact that this area is characterized by having a long history and tradition in cooperation (Nordregio, 2010), which begun, at a formal stage, in 1951 with the formation of the Nordic Council (Nordregio, 2010).

Consequently, when the Swe-Nor INTERREG-A programme was set-up in 1994, there was already established cross-border links in the area, even at the institutional level (ARKO cooperation - 1967). However, this programme represented "a new important source of funding" (Nordregio, 2007: 90), to the regional cross-border activities, and helped to reduce the border barriers in several dimensions and especially in two of them: economy-technology and social-cultural (E. Medeiros, 2010).

Yet, in spite of all positive achievements from the INTERREG-A projects interventions in Inner Scandinavia, the fact remains that some major obstacles to cross-border cooperation are still far from being overcome, as our interviewed panel shows in Table 3.5. And all these opinions reflect a twofold impression of the process of cross-border cooperation in the area: on the one hand, this process involves a strong incentive to join together actors with similar interests. But, on the other hand, sometimes (much more than expected), cross-border collaboration entail difficult challenges when:

- Some key staff quit the projects;
- Physical distances are too large and territories lack proper connection infrastructures;
- Language barriers in the beginning of the project make it difficult to engage the projects 'cruise speed';
- Some bureaucratic procedures need to be mitigated;

 Administrative rules and procedures (ex: school systems) are quite different; Table 3.5 – Main obstacles to cooperation in Inner-Scandinavia

| I able 3.5 – N | Vain obstacles to cooperation in Inner-Scandinavia | | | | |
|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Barrier | Description | | | | |
| Changing of project | - Some quit, others get reformed, others get leave | | | | |
| key members | licences, and others get sick | | | | |
| Institutional change | - Some abandon the project. Some have a completely | | | | |
| and differences | different approach to the project (local or regional) | | | | |
| | because they belong to different types of institutions | | | | |
| Time | - It takes time to establish a solid partnership | | | | |
| Distance | Lack of connections in some areas (northern part of Hedmark, between Hedmark and Dalarna and some parts of Värmland) Distance between companies poses problems in bring them together | | | | |
| Area | - Sometimes the project intervention area is a bit too large and the actors located too far away from the border are not attracted to the project | | | | |
| Language | - On the start of the project | | | | |
| Culture and working | - Swedes are more organized, faster but more | | | | |
| habits | bureaucratic and less flexible | | | | |
| School systems | Several differences (schedules, ECTs, courses length and start, rules, financing, absence of system for common registration and holidays) Sometimes it is difficult to recruit students | | | | |
| | - Difficult to transfer money from one task to another | | | | |
| INTERREG rules | - The Swedish secretariat is a bit bureaucratic | | | | |
| and bureaucracy | To present a report every 3 months sometimes is not justified | | | | |
| Financial crisis (2008) | - Affected the beginning of some projects | | | | |
| Administrative and | - Different rules | | | | |
| customs | - Sweden has to follow EU legislation | | | | |

Source: Interviews to project leaders

Besides all these setbacks, most project leaders seem to be quite open to continue to play in this cross-border cooperation arena in the future. In addition, all of them told us that they are quite happy with the Inner Scandinavia secretariat work, which is quite professional and organized. Furthermore, their staff is viewed as highly flexible, competent and helpful (always available to solve any kind of obstacles), both in the Norwegian and Swedish side of the border.

References

- AEBR (2008) Cooperation between European Border regions, AEBR NOMOS, Baden-Baden.
- Bache, I. (2008) Europeanization and multilevel governance. Cohesion Policy in the European Union and Britain, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, INC. Plymouth.
- Berger, Sune; Ørbeck, Morten; Forsberg, Gunnel (2004) Atlas over Inre Skandinavien, Befolkningsutveckling, näringsliv och livsmiljö, Ett samarbetsprojekt mellan, Karlstads universitet och Østlandsforskning, Karlstad.
- DGT (1992) *Turismo em espaço rural Guia oficial 1992*. Direcção Geral do DGPR (1994) Manual do agente do desenvolvimento rural, Lisbon.
- EEA (2010) The territorial dimension of environmental sustainability. Potential territorial indicators to support the environmental dimension of territorial cohesion. - European Environment Agency. EEA Technical Report nº 92010, Copenhagen.
- EC (1995) Green Paper on Innovation, European Commission, Brussels.
- EC (1999) Evaluation socio-economic programmes Evaluation design and management. MEANS Collection, Volume 1, European Commission, EC Structural Funds, Luxembourg.
- EC (1999b) *European Spatial Development Perspective* ESDP, European Commission Publications Office, Luxemburg.
- EC (2001) Second Report on Economic and Social Cohesion, European Commission, Luxemburg.
- EC (2004) Third Report on Economic and Social Cohesion, Convergence. Competitiveness and cooperation. European Commission, Luxemburg.
- EC (2004b) White Paper on services of general interest, 12.5.2005 COM(2004) 374 final. European Commission, Luxemburg.
- EC (2006) Operational Programme 'Sweden Norway', European Commission, Brussels.
- EC (2007) Territorial Agenda of the European Union. Towards a More Competitive and Sustainable Europe of Diverse Regions. 24/25 May, Leipzig.
- EC (2007b) Services of general interest, including social services of general interest: a new European commitment. Communication from the commission to the European Parliament, The Council, The European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, Brussels.
- EC (2008) EVALSED The resource for the Evaluation for Socio-Economic Development, European Commission, Brussels.

- EC (2008b) Regions 2010 An Assessment of future Challenges for EU Regions, European Commission, Brussels.
- EC (2008c) *EU Cohesion Policy 1998-2008: Investing in Europe's future,* Inforegio, Panorama nº26, June 2008, European Commission, Brussels.
- EC (2008d) Green Paper on Territorial Cohesion. Turning territorial diversity into strength. Communication from the Commission to the Council, The European Parliament, The Committee of the Regions and the European Economic and Social Committee, October 2008, Brussels
- EC (2008e) *Green Paper on Territorial Cohesion, the way ahead*. Inforegio, Panorama nº28, December 2008, Brussels
- EC (2008f) Regions 2020 As Assessment of Future Challenges for EU Regions. Commission Staff Working Document, November 2008, European Commission, Brussels.
- EC (2009) *Ex-Post Evaluation of INTERREG 2000-2006* 1st Interim Report to the European Commission DG REGIO Main Report, CE, Panteia, Brussels.
- EC (2010) Fifth report on economic, social and territorial cohesion Investing in Europe's future – European Commission, Brussels.
- EC (2010b) Europe 2020 A strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth European Commission, Brussels.
- EC (2010c) Consolidated versions of the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union- Official Journal of the European Union, C 83, 30 March 2010, Brussels.
- EC (2010d) Guide to the application of the European Union rules on state aid. public procurement and the internal market to services of general economic interest, and in particular to social services of general interest- Commission Staff Working Document 7.12.2010 SEC(2010) 1545, Brussels.
- ESPON 1.1.1 (2004) *Potentials for polycentric development in Europe*, Project ESPON Report 1.1.1, Luxembourg.
- ESPON 1.2.1 (2004) Transport services and networks policies: Territorial trends and basic supply of infrastructure for territorial cohesion, ESPON, Luxemburgo.
- ESPON 1.3.3 (2004) The Role and Spatial Effects of Cultural Heritage and Identity (2004-2006), Final Report, ESPON, Luxembourg.
- ESPON (2006) Territory matters for competitiveness and cohesion. Facets of regional diversity and potentials in Europe. ESPON Synthesis Report III, results by autumn 2006, Luxembourg.
- ESPON 2.3.2 (2006) *Governance of territorial and urban policies from EU to local level.* ESPON project 2.3.2. Final Report. May 2006, Luxembourg.
- ESPON ATLAS (2006) ESPON ATLAS Mapping the structure of the European territory. October 2006, ESPON, Luxemburg

- ESPON (2007) Territorial Evidence and cooperation: Linking analysis and action, INTERACT-ESPON Synthesis Report, final results by winter 2006/2007, ESPON, Viborg.
- ESPON (2007b) Cross-Border Cooperation Cross Thematic Study of INTERREG and ESPON activities, ESPON, Interact, Luxembourg.
- ESPON (2009) ESPON CLIMATE Climate Change and Territorial Effects on Region, and Local Economies, Revised Interim Report, ESPON, Luxembourg.
- ESPON (2010) *ReRisk Regions at Risk of Energy Poverty, Final* Report, Version 5/11/2010, ESPON, Luxembourg.
- ESPON (2010b) *Metroborder Cross-border Polycentric Metropolitan regions,* Targeted Analysis, 2013/2/3 – Interim Report Version 28/02/2010, ESPON, Luxembourg.
- Etzkowitz, H., Dzisah, J; Ranga, M; Zhoub, C. (2007) *The triple helix model of innovationa*, Tech Monitor, Jan-Feb 2007, pp. 14 23.
- Faludi, A. (2004) *Territorial Cohesion: Old (French) Wine in New Bottles?* In: Urban Studies, Vol. 41, No. 7, 1349-1365, June 2004, pp. 1349-1363.
- FOBRP (2006) *Perspectives of spatial development in Germany,* Federal office for building and regional planning, Berlim.
- FORDAL (2007) Ny hovedveg mellom Kongsvinger og Torsby, Utredning av en forbedret vegforbindelseb Kongsvinger – Torsby, del av vegruten, Oslo – Gävle, Oslo.
- Gualini, E. (2008) Territorial cohesion as a category of agency: the missing dimension in the EU spatial policy debate. Refereed Articles, March 2008, no 28, European Journal of Spatial Development URL: http://www.nordregio.se/EJSD/refereed28.pdf.
- Hauge, A. Kristian, P and Skälholt A. (2010) *Hamar Florida, tur/retur.* fungerer Floridas teorier om den kreative klassen som verktøy for regional analyser? En pilotstudie. Interreg IVA Sverige-Norge og Hamar commune, Østlandsforskning, Lillehammer.
- INNO METRIX (2009) Regional Innovation Scoreboard (RIS) 2009, INNO METRIX, Maastricht.
- INTERACT (2007) Process Monitoring of Impacts Applied study for the European Territorial Cooperation programmes, INTERACT, Viena
- IRIS (2011) Interregs betydning for norsk regional utviklingsarbeit, Iraport IRIS 2011/067, Stavanger.
- LC (2007) Leipzig Charter on Sustainable European Cities, 24/25 May, Leipzig.
- Medeiros, E. (2005) A coesão territorial nas NUTS III de fronteira de Portugal Continental – A iniciativa INTERREG-A e o desenvolvimento regional. O caso da NUT III do Alentejo Central, Tese de Mestrado, CEG, UL, Lisboa.

- Medeiros, E. (coord) (2010) The Cross-Border Cooperation between Sweden and Norway – INTERREG-A Territorial Impacts (1994-2006), INTERREG Swerige-Norge, - IGOT – CEG – NEST Report 2010, Lisbon.
- Medeiros, E.; Andersen B. T. (2010) *Dynamic Swedish- Norwegian cooperation...)*, Public Service, European Union, Issue 20, pp. 296-297.
- Medeiros, E. (2011) (*Re*) defining the concept of Euroregion, European Planning Studies Vol. 19, No. 1, January 2011.
- Medeiros, E. (2011b) *Territorial Cohesion A conceptual analysis*, Regional Studies – Being Reviewed – http://www.fl.ul.pt/pessoais/Eduardo_Medeiros/docs/PUB_PAP_EM_Te rritorial_Cohesion.pdf.
- Medeiros, E. (2011c) *Euro-Meso-Macro. The new regions in Iberian and European space* – accepted for publication in Regional Studies: <u>http://www.fl.ul.pt/pessoais/Eduardo Medeiros/docs/PUB PAP EM Eu</u> <u>ro Meso Macro en.pdf</u>
- Meijers, E. J.; Waterhourt B. and Zonneveld W. (2007) *Closing the GAP: Territorial Cohesion through Polycentric Development*, Refereed Articles, Oct 2007, no 24, European Journal of Spatial Development URL: http://www.nordregio.se/EJSD/refereed24.pdf
- MNE (2009) Contribution of the Portuguese Government for the public consultation on the Green Paper on Territorial Cohesion' Turning Territorial Diversity into Strength. Lisbon.
- Nordregio (2007) *Regional Development in the Nordic Countries 2007*, Nordregio Report 2007:1, Stockholm.
- Nordregio (2008) Regionally Differentiated innovation Policy in the Nordic Countries – Applying the Lisbon strategy, Nordregio Report 2008:2, Stockholm.
- Nordregio (2008b) *Exploring the Baltic Sea Region On territorial capital and spatial integration*, Nordregio Report 2008:3, Stockholm.
- Nordregio (2009) *Polycentricity and beyond in Nordic Regional Governance*, Nordregio Report 2009:9, Stockholm.
- Nordregio (2009b) Renewable Energy and Clean Technology Tools for Regional Development, Nordregio Report 2009, Stockholm.
- Nordregio (2010) Nordic Cross-border Cooperation Committees and Crossborder Authority Integration, Nordregio Electronic Working paper 2010:3, Nordic Working Group 2: Globalization and Cross-border Cooperation, Stockholm.
- Nordregio (2010b) Regional Development in the Nordic Countries 2010, Nordregio Report 2010:2, Stockholm.
- Nordregio (2011) *Megatrends*, Nordregio, Nordic Council of Ministers, Copenhagen.

Nordregio (2011b) - Perspectives on rural development in the Nordic countries -Policies, governance, development initiatives, Nordregio Electronic Working paper 2011:3, Based on discussions and presentations at seminars held by the Nordic working group 1b: Future rural areas Stockholm.

OECD (2011) - Regions at Glance, OECD, Paris.

- Schout J.A. and Jordan A. J. (2007) From Cohesion to Territorial Policy Integration (TPI): Exploring the Governance Challenges in the European Union. In: European Planning Studies Vol. 15, Nº6 July 2007.
- SN_INT (2007) Program för Europeiskt Territoriellt Samarbete Interreg Swerige – Norge 2007 - 2013, Godkänd av EU kommissionen 2007-11-15 – Detta Program Delfinansieras av Europeiska Regionala Utvecklingsfonden Sverige och Norge, CCI: 2007CB163PO016
- SN_INT (2008) Do you have an idea which could further co-operation across borders? – <u>www.interreg-sverige-norge</u> - <u>http://www.interreg-sverige-norge_com/UserFiles/File/Interreg/Intranät/Programbroschyrer%20Sv-Eng/Interregbroschyr_eng_08091</u>, Ostersund.
- UN (2010) *HDR Human Development Report 2010.* 20th Anniversary Edition– The Real Wealth of Nations: Pathways to Human Development, New York.
- Zakaria, A. (2011) A flight plan for the American economy. In Time, May 20, 2011, New York.

List of figures and tables

Figures:

| Figure 1.1 – The territorial cohesion star | .24 |
|---|-----|
| Figure 1.2 – The analytic model of the territorial cohesion concept | |
| Figure 1.3 – Territorial Cohesion Index evolution -1998-2008 | |
| Figure 1.4 – Main education and health infrastructures in Inner Scandinavia - 2011 | 36 |
| Figure 1.5 – Employment in education sector in Inner Scandinavia - 2009 | |
| Figure 1.6 – Employment in health/social work in Inner Scandinavia - 2009 | 37 |
| Figure 1.7 - Population Change - 1995-2010 (%) and Population Density - 2010 | 38 |
| Figure 1.8 – Depopulation intensity in Inner Scandinavia - 1995-2010 | |
| Figure 1.9 – Urban System in Scandinavia | |
| Figure 1.10 – Population in Inner Scandinavia municipalities – 1990-2010 | 42 |
| Figure 1.11 – Polycentric structures in Inner Scandinavia | 43 |
| Figure 1.12 – Population Change - 2000-2010 in Inner Scandinavia main Urban Agglomerations | 43 |
| Figure 1.13 – Employment per main economic activity sectors in Scandinavian municipalities - 2009 | |
| Figure 1.14 – Regional specialization (employment) in Scandinavia - 2009 | |
| Figure 1.15 – Possible Inner Scandinavia cross-border urban complementarities | |
| Figure 1.16 – Commuters from Sweden to Norway and from Norway to Sweden - 2008 | |
| Figure 1.17 – Unemployment rate in Scandinavia - 2009 | 51 |
| Figure 1.18 – Norwegian cross-border expenditure - 2009 | |
| Figure 1.19 – Cross-Border Cooperation Committees in Inner Scandinavia and surroundings - 2011 | |
| Figure 1.20 – Wind power potential in Scandinavia - 2009 | |
| Figure 1.21 – Projected increase in annual mean temperature in Scandinavia - 2071-2100 | 59 |
| Figure 1.22 – Projected decrease in annual number of days with snow in Scandinavia - 2071-2100 | |
| Figure 1.23 – Projected change in annual mean precipitation in Scandinavia - 2071-2100 | |
| Figure 2.1 – INTERREG-A Swe-Nor 2007-2013 simplified SWOT | |
| Figure 2.2 – INTERREG-A Swe-Nor 2007-2013 simplified strategy | |
| Figure 2.3 – INTERREG-A IV Swe-Nor sub-programmes | 65 |
| Figure 2.4 – Population Variation in Inner Scandinavia - 1995-2010 | 66 |
| Figure 2.5 – Transports accessibility in Inner Scandinavia | 67 |
| Figure 2.6 – Proposed strategic axis for Inner Scandinavia | |
| Figure 2.7 – Evaluating phases and objectives | 69 |
| Figure 2.8 – Inner Scandinavia approved projects (2007-2013) per main political area (%) | |
| Figure 2.9 – Inner Scandinavia allocated funds (2007-2013) per main political area (%) | |
| Figure 2.10 – Projects relevance in the several strategic domains | 77 |
| Figure 2.11 – Interreg-IV Inner Scandinavia 24 projects network connections | |
| Figure 2.12 – Interreg-IV Inner Scandinavia 24 project financing distribution | |
| Figure 3.1 – Projects effectiveness in the seven political areas | 83 |
| Figure 3.2 – Regional development domains simplified scheme | |
| Figure 3.3 – Edstimated jobs created by the 24 main Inner Scandinavia projects | |
| Figure 3.4 – Projects effectiveness in reducing the barrier effect | 89 |
| Figure 3.5 - Projects efficiency | |
| Figure 3.6 – Number of projects which produced outputs/results in several domains | .02 |
| Figure 3.7 – Regional Innovation Score in Scandinavia - 2009 | |
| Figure 3.8 – Percentage of population with terciary education in Scandinavia Peninsula - 2010 | 96 |
| Figure 3.9 – Creative class index in eastern Norway cities | |
| Figure 3.10 – Human resources in science and technology in Scandinavia - 2009 | |
| Figure 3.11 – Total expenditure on R&D in Scandinavia - 2007 | |
| Figure 3.12 – Patent applications in Scandinavia - 2008 | |
| Figure 3.13 – Inner Scandinavia allocated funds (2007-2013) per main aggregated goals (%) | |
| Figure 3.14 – Presentation in Akershus Energy Building – Part of FEM project | |
| Figure 3.15 – Natural Parks and renewable energy production (GWh) in Inner Scandinavia | |
| Figure 3.16 – Cultural employment level in Scandinavia - 2004 | |
| Figure 3.17 – INTERREG-A IV Inner Scandinavia 24 projects added value | |
| | |

INTERREG-A INNER SCANDINAVIA. PARTNERSHIP AND ACHIEVEMENTS

Tables:

| Table 1.1 – Norwegian cross-border trade by destination | 52 |
|---|----|
| Table 1.2 – Demographic synthesis of Inner Scandinavia – 1990-2010 | |
| Table 1.3 – Energy data in Scandinavia – 2008. | 57 |
| Table 2.1 – Inner Scandinavia INTERREG-A project evaluation criteria | 64 |
| Table 2.2 – List of Inner Scandinavia INTERREG-A evaluated projects | 70 |
| Table 2.3 – Project relevance according to the seven political areas | 72 |
| Table 2.4 - Project Relevance according to cross-border cooperation and SWOT main goals | 73 |
| Table 3.1 – Project effectiveness according to the seven political areas | 81 |
| Table 3.2 – Estimated jobs created by the projects | 85 |
| Table 3.3 – Project effectiveness in reducing the barrier effect | 88 |
| Table 3.4 – Projects efficiency | 91 |
| Table 3.5 - Main obstacles to cooperation in Inner-Scandinavia | |
| | |

Acknowledgments

| Interreg - Inner Scandinavia | Erik Hagen, Bjorn Terje Andersen, Ole Jørn Alfstad |
|--|--|
| Interreg - Inner Scandinavia 2 | Magnus Dagerhorn |
| Statistics - Norway | Library and Information Centre |
| Statistics - Sweden | Torbjörn Nyqvist, Paula Ljungberg |
| TRAFA Sweden | Anette Myhr |
| PTS Sweden | Pamela Davidsson |
| Socialstyrelsen | Ann Clements |
| Länsstyrelsen Dalarna | Anders Rosén |
| Swedish Association of Local Authorities and Regions | Green Kristina |
| Innovation music network | Jarle Kristoffersen |
| The Scandinavian Way | Anne Hegglund |
| Hjerte i Skandinavia A and B | Ole Sylte Heggset and Cathrine Fodstad |
| Barnas grenseland | Vidar Østenby |
| Hedmark Dalarna-TRUST | Kjell Vaagen |
| Grenseløs fjellopplevelse Fulufjellet | Stig Kvebæk |
| Næringslivet som motor for inkludering | Siri Stensrud and Svein Frydenlund |
| Kompetansetilførsel Hamar reg | Svein Frydenlund |
| Entreprenørskap i hele skolen | Terje Melheim |
| Bygg og anleggskompetanse | Ronny Graskopf |
| Kompetanse i partnerskap | Yngve Haugstveit |
| El-kraft | Halgeir Leiknes |
| Universitetssamarbeidet UNISKA | Einar Hugo |
| Industricollege | Per Erik Jevne |
| Levende Finnskogen | Hans Johnsson |
| Å gjøre regionale forskjeller til styrke | Atle Hauge |
| Fornybar energi, energieffektivisering | Trine Kopstad and Øyvind Michelsen |
| Varmeekom | Jon Samseth |
| Green - energi effektivisering | Klaas van Hoek |
| Verdens beste idrettsregion | Johan Conradsson |
| Grensvandring | Knut Djupedal |
| Dansregionen | Linda Wolden |
| Naturinformasjon Rogen | Therese Ruud |
| Vänerlaksen | Tore Qvenild |

| PROJECT: | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| | <u>I - INTERVIEW</u> |
| 1 - How far the F resources? | Project has achieved its objectives and how well it has used its |
| | |
| 2 - Is the partner | ship working as expected? |
| | ······································ |
| 3 - What are the | biggest problems/barriers encountered during the project? |
| | |
| 4 - How many jo the project? | obs are expected to be created (and are already created) with |
| | |
| 5 - What is goir ends? | ng to happen to the Project when the INTERREG-A funding |
| | |
| 6 – This project v | vould take place without the INTERREG? |
| | ····· |
| 7 – How was the | programme organizational capacity (financial – bureaucracy)? |
| | |
| | |

II - OBSERVATION NOTES

1 - Project Relevance (selection criteria related with programme objectives)

1.1 – Does the project fits within the programme objectives:

| Policy Area | Strong | Weak |
|---------------------------------|--------|------|
| Innovation | | |
| Climate Change | | |
| Education | | |
| Culture | | |
| Urban – Rural Development | | |
| Environment / Nature Protection | | |
| Public Health | | |

| | Strong | Weak |
|---------------------|--------|------|
| Genuine | | |
| Continuity | | |
| Additionality | | |
| Solve problems | | |
| Satisfy needs | | |
| Avoid threats | | |
| Grasp opportunities | | |

| | EG | ALE |
|-------------------|----|-----|
| Intervention Axis | | |
| | | |

Note: EG - Economic Growth ALE - Attractive Living Environment

2 - Project Effectiveness (objectives vs results)

2.1 - What are the expected project effects in the following mainstream policy areas:

| Policy Area | Weak | Medium | Strong |
|---------------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| Innovation | | | |
| Climate Change | | | |
| Education | | | |
| Culture | | | |
| Urban – Rural Development | | | |
| Environment / Nature Protection | | | |
| Public Health | | | |

2.2 – How many jobs are expected to be created by the project:

| Jobs | 0 | 0-4 | 5-9 | 10-19 | 20-29 | 30-50 | > 50 |
|---------------------|---|-----|------------|-------|-------|-------|------|
| Nº of expected jobs | | | | | | | |
| Nº of created jobs | | | | | | | |

2.3 - What are the expected project effects in the following domains of CBC:

| Barrier Effect | Weak | Medium | Strong |
|------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| Institutional | | | |
| Economic / Technology | | | |
| Cultural / Social | | | |
| Environment / Heritage | | | |
| Accessibility | | | |

3 - Project Efficiency (inputs vs outputs)

3.1 – How far has the project reach its objectives in the following areas, so far:

| Efficiency Domains | Weak | Medium | Strong |
|---|------|--------|--------|
| Goals - Accountability: | | | |
| (Investment / objectives) | | | |
| Partnership – Institutional network strengthening | | | |
| (investment / organization capacity and autonomy) | | | |
| Awareness - Knowledge Production | | | |
| (investment / dissemination of information) | | | |
| Implementation and planning | | | |
| (investment / performance) | | | |

INTERVIEWS

| | Γ | | 1 - Goals | 2 - Partnership | 3 – Problems | 4 - Jobs | 5 – Future | 6 – Added-Value | 7 – Secretariat |
|---|---|-----------------------------|--|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| ļ | A | Innovation music network | 1 - Goals For the most part the project has achieved its goals: (Goal/Output) Supporting new Companies (30/40) Supporting existing companies (30/45) (Start-up new jobs (18/9) Student getting jobs (18/9) Student getting jobs (18/9) Publishing Research papers (4/4) Establishing new bachelors (1/2) | 2 - Partnership - The partnership is going very well - We have been partners since 2003 and know each other very well - We have a new partner in Dalarna is in the first INTERREG | 3 – Problems - Two researchers quit their jobs and it has not worked so well since (they were central people) - In Autumn 2009 one organization quit and we connected with Hedmark University. Since this new ownership we have worked very well - A Swedish manager project got pregnant and had to find a new partner. Now all is OK. | 4 - Jobs The goal was 90 and we achieved 89 43 are fulltime jobs We have also supported business creation The problem is that most of the companies are small and the jobs might not be sustainable in time because the music business is quite volatile and dependent on the market | 5 – Future - It is going to continue. - We have established a long term cooperation with the new created bachelors (Falun – Hedmark) - The networking will continue especially in the fields of song writing and music production - The informal networks will continue - The Interreg project will continue but with another partner (Orebro) because the Falun partner is getting financing from another | 6 – Added-Value - No. - There was some cooperation before in talent competitions but the INTERREG was crucial to strengthening the cooperation and work in educational fields - Added value: Networking, Human Capital, Education, Bring knowledge also in understanding business industry (from Sweden), competence (from Norway), complementarity, informal networking | 7 – Secretariat We are very happy with the Norwegian secretariat The Swedes are more bureaucratic and distant We are happy with the 4 times evaluation reports |
| E | 3 | The Scandinavian Way | - The goal of increasing tourism activity in this area was reached (10%) and the goal of increasing the number of tourism | - It is working very well - There are common purposes in our region | - It takes time to establish a solid partnership, and by the time the project ends the partnership is very solid - It is difficult to involve small | - Creating jobs it is not the main goal (unemployment is not the problem in Hedmark) - There are | programme. It will continue in another project (Inner Scandinavia export for season) | No. The money needed had to come from this kind of funds Added value: Networking, Business organization business, knowledge production, competence, stimulating | The secretariat is very professional and they always have a good advice (quick) In Sweden they are a bit more bureaucratic but |

| | | by 5% was also reached - The number of 120 business partners in participating in the project was almost reached (110) - There is a goal to bring more international tourists | | companies in seminars because they have very few people. - Distance (northern part of Hedmark has very few connections with varmland and it is difficult of finding partners - The language was difficult at the start – the Swedes do not find partners | some indirect jobs that could be created by the project - 3 administrative jobs | | economy | they also have a lot of experience |
|---|------------------------|--|--|---|--|--|---|--|
| С | Hjerte i Skandinavia A | Goals have been overachieved in promoting business activities 1000 participants (500 Nor + 500 Swe) together with project A 50 Institutional cooperation's and several new methods There was a problem in finding business for men (women dominate) | - The partnership is working very well - Yet, the Swedes are a bit more fast in the procedures | - Swedes work a bit faster and the distances are too long - There are long distances in travelling | - 4 Administrative jobs (2 Nor and 3 Swe) - 15 jobs (Swe + Nor) (together with project B) | No. It is difficult to continue and keep the project going. The parts of the projects with more sustainability are the: 1 – Small scale tourism 2 – Event development 3 – Support business activities | Additionality is very strong Added Value in human capital and in boosting economic potential | - We are quite happy with them - Once we had no answer from Sweden |
| D | | - In general, the project has achieved its | It has worked very well. We had previous | - The companies located far away from the project are more | - Administrative jobs only: 3 part time in | - It is going to continue - We have | - No. - Added Value: Create a common destination for | Very happy with the Norwegian part of the border, |

| | | goals, in most areas. - Yet, it was difficult to involve the companies in to the project - They have reached the goals of 60 companies, but it takes time to reach the desired goals | experience | difficult to get involved - Some companies have been in some other projects and are a bit tiredthey are willing to participate but do not create so much as themselves - We had hopes to create some more products to sell, but we have not achieved this goal - It was difficult to work on the commercial and cultural areas | Swe and 2 part time in Nor; 2 fulltime jobs - Some companies have created jobs and activities, but it is not certain that it resulted from the project (30 persons worked in the theatre project and 25 in the TV) | established a company (3 municipalities Nor- Swe) to work further on - We are planning in making a new project but maybe the area is too large | tourism across borders, competence, education, networking, knowledge exchange | - We think in the Swedish side it is not so easy |
|---|---------------------------|--|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| E | Hedmark Dalarna- TRUST | By the end the project will reach most of its goals in order to stimulate attractiveness It is expected to have 500-600 persons attended seminars (quality before quantity) It has been using resources very well because there has been a lot of CBC activities, especially | Yes, it is working well There was some small problems: it took some time to recruit persons to meet together The project only started at 2009 May | One important and dynamic project leader retired (some setback) It has proved difficult to recruit companies from the other side of the border to participate in seminars because of the distance | No direct jobs created Some spin- offs are expected from the established contacts between companies and border municipalities There are however several bonus from the project: Infrastructure E16, Another | - It will continue as a CBC Committee - It is close to be formalized as a border committee, | - Yes (Nordic Council) - Knowledge exchange - knowledge exchange - Institutional added value - Political added value | - The secretariat is working very well (not many problems) - it is more bureaucratic in the Swedish part of the border (less flexible) |

| F | Grenseløs fjellopplevelse Fulufjellet | communication activities (facebook, twitter) - It is working as an incubator to develop new partnerships and projects - Objectives have been achieved - It is a small project and it is not easy to establish new business | - Working very well - The previous experience helped to establish partnership links | - The fact that there are more companies in the Swedish side of the border provokes some imbalances - Excessive bureaucracy, especially in the Swedish side of the border - Very small companies (sometimes they take too long to check email) | Interreg B and C, Tourism project (11.000.000 NOK) - No new jobs but some will me maintained: - Nor: 2 fulltime; 3-4 part time - Swe: 3-4 jobs | - This project is a continuation of a previous Interreg project, so it will not continue. - Yet, we hope that by approving a national park in the Norwegian part of the border, this project will continue to bring positive effects to the local economy | - The Interreg was crucial because without it would not be possible to finance some activities like the internet page (Norway does not have a national park) which has been very important in the marketing the area in a partnership to attract outside visitants | -The Norwegian secretariat works very well. There is a trust relationship established and the meetings arranged before the projects implementation allow everyone to see the feasibility of the project. - In Sweden the bureaucracy is stronger and the financial support in the initial stages, from the local and regional administrative authorities is not as strong as in |
|---|---|--|---|--|---|--|--|---|
| G | Næringslivet som motor for inkludering | - On general, the goals of the project have been | - Working better than expected - It has been a very | - The involvement of some municipalities: it was difficult in getting | - 13 Jobs from the project (not necessarily | - The Norwegian department of immigration | - It could, yet, the INTERREG adds more added value in: | Norway - The secretariat has been working very well on the |
| | | achieved, since it intends to promote the | positive experience in promoting more interaction by | them to participate - It was also difficult to get the commercial | sustainable) - 2 Administrative | expressed interest in take a similar pilot project under | Awareness, knowledge production, networking, mentality, clarification, | project since they have been shown keen interest |

| inclusion of foreigner skille workers in th market employment b changing th Nordic mentality - However, th commercial sector has bee showing som resistance, and i Norway the goa of include 40% of the trainees ha not bee achieved (onl one employed s far out of 16). - In Sweden th results are bette (12 out of 29) - Nevertheless the project ha helped to ope entrepreneurs minds to the skill of foreig employees an also (mos working place employ fev people and som are afraid t disrupt th | however, some adjustments in order to improve the partnership | sector to participate and take part in the process - The industrial sector does not see much ahead (normally 6 months) and are afraid of employ them | jobs -Yet, the most important aspect of the project is to create awareness on how to work with qualified people and to create a new mechanism which contributes to create an integrated network and also to change the mentality | the umbrella of national funds | understanding | - However, it would be nice to have more contacts: more meetings |
|--|--|---|--|-----------------------------------|---------------|---|
|--|--|---|--|-----------------------------------|---------------|---|

| | | environment), that is why in some municipalities the project was not succeeded | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|---|--|
| н | Kompetansetilførsel Hamar reg | In 6 months we will achieve the objectives (they have applied to an extension since they have struggled to meet the requirement) 60 companies networks were established and 100 persons were involved in meetings) | - Working very well - The intensity of cooperation is growing and it has been fun from the start (good chemistry) | A Norwegian project leader was sick and had to leave Distance Difficult to bring Swedish companies to hamar and Norwegians to Falun | - Its not the goal here to create jobs and how to meet challenges and attract people | - The project was already extended into another project (cooperation between companies) | - No. Added value: - Alert the politicians to understand the opportunities to engage and increase CBC in recruitment, producing meeting points | Very happy There is a need to a more frequent communication Hedmark are also competitors |
| I | Entreprenørskap i hele skolen | - The project is going very well but the full results will only be visible in several years - The seeds of entrepreneurship are being planted: 11.000 students are involved and many teachers have been receiving training on this matter - Increased of 10- 15% involved in | - The partnership is working well, there are a lot of contacts - The Norwegian side has helped Sweden at the primary school level - | The organizations in both countries have many differences The language barrier is there, especially at the young age levels Differences at the school system There is more flexibility in the Swedish educational system to open schedules to entrepreneurship activities Teachers have | - 1 administrative - Possibility to have more than 100 jobs in the future - There is already a innovative product created by the project (regulated chair) with 3-4 people involved | - It will continue because the project is anchored in schools and it will have a strong base to continue and teachers are more aware and the contacts and meeting points are established | No: INTERREG was necessary to take it to the next level Added value: Knowledge exchange, Networking, Human Capital, Motivation, Hedmark got 5 national prizes, out of 16 because they learned with the swedes | In general they have received great help from the secretariat However, there could be more contact and meetings to show the ongoing results |

| | Bygg og | | difficulty in leaving school – it is getting more difficult to get teachers involved because they have to leave school | - 2 | - It will continue | - No (at least not in an | - Very happy with |
|---|-------------------|--|---|---|--|---|---|
| J | anleggskompetanse | project has in spite c achieved its aims difference of crating networking, improve competence and cooperation between schools, companies and regional levels - However it is still at a initial stage, so it has just produced a conference in Trysil with several teachers in construction | | administrative full job - 1 20% job - The idea is not to create jobs directly, but to improve the quality of the jobs (create more skilled workers) | not as a project but as an agreement (3 hedmark Schools and 7 Dalarna Schools) - | organized manner) - Added Value: Improve Competence, Networking, Increase qualification | secretariat work - The Swedish side is a bit more bureaucratic - He is happy with 4 time reports |

| к | Kompetanse i partnerskap | Better than expected in fully integrate the Master degree project: more than 100% The plan has been followed 45 of the initial 50 students continue studying 6 conferences are planned An open programme invites guests from region | It is working very well There was one partner that got is pension and never got a substitute | - At the initial stage, differences in the education systems (ECTs) but all were resolved and the fully integrated programme was achieved | - No direct jobs - 5-6 partial jobs (1-2 to two positions in Norway and 3 to 4 positions in Sweden) - 20%-25% of the students already improved their job positions (10 students) - Most of the students are leaders in a intermediate level and 5-6 are at the top level | - It will continue in another INTERREG project with the same goals, plus an internationalization (in English) of the project, by attracting foreign students | - Without the INTERREG there would be no project (not enough financial support): people meet once in a month - Added value: Human Capital, knowledge production, leadership competence | - We are very happy with the secretariat - All the small problems are solved with flexibility in the Norwegian side of the border - In the Swedish side there is more bureaucracy and distance |
|---|-----------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|
| L | El Kraft | The goals have been achieved so far: the course is working well with 32 students : 10 Gjovik, 6 Karlstad and 18 Ostfold Before the project there was a pre-project which detected the needs for the power plants. There is also around 6 students | - The partnership is going very well, there is a lot of coordination | Norway had to expand the project time on one year Different systems of education (length of the courses, rules, start time of the course Absence of system for common registration In Sweden the course has to take 20 weeks long There are different | 32 Jobs in the future, because of the needs of these companies More people in the future because there is a growing student demand of this course | - There is an agreement to continue with the project even if one of the partners leaves it | No. The funding was crucial to start with the project Added value: Human Capital, Competence, Contacts, Economic Growth, Some more students | We are very happy with the secretariat work The Swedish one is more bureaucratic After the 3rd report we were told that the report we were using was wrong We would suggest 2 reports a year The report is not |

| | Universitetssamarbeidet | using the course by distance - Almost all | - It is working well | holiday periods - It has been proven | - 10 Jobs from | - Uniska will | - Yes. | easy to write – not too open - The project spending (980.000 NOK exceeded the initial budget (700.000 NOK) - Satisfied. |
|---|-------------------------|--|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| М | UNISKA | indicators are completed, with some exceptions | Yet, it is a big network and is expanding (two Norwegian partners are expanding. The partnership is active and well working but sometimes it is difficult to find the common glue since not all partners are participating in all projects (it is a complex project) | difficult to involve small companies, promote contacts and build relations - The fact that 7 partners are involved (60-70 people directly involved on the process) makes it difficult to operate the project - The required detailed information in the budget makes it difficult to transfer money from one task to another | incubators (students) - 20-50 jobs expected from small enterprises - Seeds have been planting and a lot of indirect jobs are expected - Several joint arenas between students and job market are on the going | continue, but without INTERREG support. - It needs to have full dedicated staff to maintain the network (permanent secretariat) and to focus in sustainable energy and bio energy | Added value: - Human capital, knowledge production, Networking, Collaborating with working sector (finding out if education is relevant to the working market | The Norwegian part is more flexible (ready to help if changes are needed) In Sweden the bureaucracy is stronger The reports should me made 2 times a years and not four times (time consuming) The reports should have a general view of the Swedish and Norwegian problems |
| N | Industricollege | - So far we are reaching the goals of the project - we targeted 220 companies and we reached 300 (will reach 350) - There is 550 | It is working very well amongst the main partners Yet, we have not managed to recruit some under partners, especially in the Swedish part of the border | There has been some lack in continuity in the programme management in the Swedish side of the programme - The financial crisis which coincided with | - Only administrative jobs: 2 fulltime in Norway and 5 in Sweden - It possibly saved some layoffs in several | - It is being discussed, but some areas will continue for sure (training teachers, horizontal competences, | - No - Added value: Human Capital, Networking, Competence, Knowledge exchange, Education, Integration, equality | Very happy with the secretariat in Norway. They have been working for some years In the Swedish side there is new people and the control is more |

| | | manufacturing | | the beginning of the | companies | | | bureaucratic. |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|---|----------------------|
| | | companies in the | | project made the first | departments by | | | - Reporting 4 times |
| | | region and 200 | | two years very difficult | teach them | | | a year is quite |
| | | were interviewed | | - Several companies | how to work | | | usefull |
| | | - We could not | | have fired many | with continued | | | |
| | | reach the girls | | people and some of | improvement | | | |
| | | goals so much | | them where trained by | training | | | |
| | | - We have been | | state programes | - | | | |
| | | reaching the 10% | | | | | | |
| | | increase in the | | | | | | |
| | | number of | | | | | | |
| | | students in the 4 | | | | | | |
| | | technical colleges | | | | | | |
| | | in Sweden and 2 | | | | | | |
| | | in Sweden | | | | | | |
| | | - Several | | | | | | |
| | | seminars have | | | | | | |
| | | been established | | | | | | |
| | | in both border | | | | | | |
| | | areas and the | | | | | | |
| | | pupils have | | | | | | |
| | | moved around | | | | | | |
| | Levende Finnskogen | - The aims are | - Very well with the | - The project owners | - 4 fulltime jobs | - The persons | - It could be, but the | - Great job |
| | | quite high | project owners | on both sides of the | - 1 part time | involved will | INTERREG was essential | especially initially |
| | | - So, most of | - Time is needed to | borders have different | job | continue to meet in | to bring money to the | with the guidelines |
| | | them are going to | get to know each | working strategies | - Several | order to created a | project. | - in Sweden the |
| | | be achieved, | other well | (one is a regional | indirect jobs | sustainable | Added value: | bureaucracy is less |
| ~ | | mainly the ones | | administration office | will be | environment | Tourism, Establishing | flexible |
| 0 | | related to basic | | and the other is a | produced | | networks, Knowledge | |
| | | resources and | | Museum) | (tourism and | | production, Human | |
| | | documentation | | - | preservation) | | capital, Nature and | |
| | | - The project will | | | | | heritage Preservation, | |
| | | need another step | | | | | | |
| | | to apply the | | | | | | |
| | Å gigro rogionala | research | It is working well | The project leader | No isha | The colleboretier | The project would rever | The corretoriet is |
| Ρ | A gjøre regionale | - Objectives are | - It is working well | - The project leader | - No jobs | - The collaboration | The project would never | - The secretariat is |

| | forskjeller til styrke | being achieved ("we are getting there" - Publication is on its way together with other reports | but not in a fluent process - It could be more efficient | changed in Sweden - We are working at different paces. The Norwegian research centre works faster than the Swedish academic partners - Geography is a problem (distances) | directly - Perhaps the 3 PhDs can get a good position | process will continue, perhaps with less intensity - Hence, the network will continue with a book and publication | take place without the INTERREG - Human capital - knowledge production | very helpful - The flexibility is perfect |
|---|------------------------|--|--|---|--|---|---|--|
| Q | FEM | For the most part we are achieving our goals (creating more business, collaboration in clean tech energy) There are however some areas where the results have been better Almost 2000 kids (1975) were involved in energy challenges. An energy league joined together 100 people There are a lot of spin-offs from the project (lots of companies that use the project as a platform to | - It has been working better that expected - There are many partners in the project (companies, regional and local authorities and different organizations) | There as been some challenges as, for instance, make the projects mach (it takes some time – 1-2 years) The idea is to look ahead | - 50 (goal) - 50 achieved so far part time and fulltime (no administrative jobs included) | The project will continue The projects will be carried out in a stand-alone mode (institutions will run the projects by their own) They will act as facilitators and make the thing happening | - No. Added value: - Networking, Human Capital, innovation, Know how, Competence, Good at different things, interaction | In general we are very satisfied, The Norwegian secretariat is very easy to contact and flexible The Swedish side is more bureaucratic and We think we should only report when we do not follow the project plan Report 4 times a Year is good to receive the money Report 2 times a year is good not to have so much bureaucracy |

| | | meet) | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|--|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| R | Varmeekom | So far we are achieving our objectives (establish a master degree course – involve the public and the private sector) The first phase of the project was meant to identify the main topic of the master degree (biomass, measurement techniques, Heat/Power, Solar Energy | - It is working very well - There is a big advantage to work together with the Swedes | Differences in the scholar system (how to apply for a course) There is a challenge in how to make the courses compatible Recruiting students is not being easy (perhaps the connection with Oslo will make it easer The Master degree is still not approved | None. Two part time administrative jobs (20% time) Indirect jibs will be created | - The Project will continue (it is decided) - The project will go international (become a Member of a Brussels Organization) make it a EU master – Germany (koln) and Austria) | - No. Added Value: - Human Capital, Knowledge transfer, Efficiency use of energy, access to facilities, Breaking barriers | It is working very well. Norwegians are more flexible Swedish more bureaucratic (There is a managing the budget) There was an agreement to have a report made twice a year |
| S | Green - energi effektivisering | Achieved most objectives It was a bit delayed and was extended a few months Norwegian side: worked more practically Sweden less efficient (spent a bit more money on studies) Good results on energy savings by present ideas on | It could have worked better. There was a transfer of knowledge and best practice from Norway to Sweden The Swedish part dominated the project | Distance Few knowledge transfer from Sweden and some critics The Dalarna secretariat had to much bureaucracy without positive inputs The 3 month reports does not make sense | - 3 Administrative jobs, and several indirect by involving electric technicians, building contactors and isolation workers. | - The project will continue in the following project generation | Yes, there could be some other public funding Added-Value: Reach a broader public Network establishment Knowledge production | Norwegian is happy Swedish side has more bureaucracy and is a bit more difficult to work with (it is extra work without consequence) The 3 months report should be eliminated |

| Т | Verdens beste idrettsregion | seminars - Good acceptance in applying new ideas (ex: limit power use, use of led lights, heat recovery) - The project will end in a year and we still did not reached all our objectives - We have 3 main objectives: 1- Put together 400 youngsters (less 17 than expected) 2 - Develop 20 sports events, 3 - Test methods to involve groups with fewer opportunities - We have been contributing to involve the clubs in thefold) sports | - The partnership is working very well | The inclusion of other 2 regions in Norway (Hedmark and Ostfold) was not positive to the project because it is hard to put all the strings together with so many partners It is a big project with too much work a high level of control The accounts control are too bureaucratic and it takes time to receive the money Distance between the Norwegian partners: it is hard to get day to day contact | - 1 Swedish: fulltime and 1 Norwegian fulltime | - We are creating a strategy in order to continue this project in a different perspective (explaining the value of sports) | - No. It needed Interreg to involve media (more people) and to develop broader ideas (movies) - Added value: Network strengthening, health, leadership, sports facilities, non formal understanding | Norwegian: working well and we had not so many issues The advice to have four partners was not very useful Some payments were not made (20.000 NOK) We think that a model of a 2 year period report would be better |
|---|--------------------------------|---|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| U | Dansregionen A + B | events (more than 20) - We did achieve all the initial goals and a bit more. | - The partnership went very well. We collaborated for 5 | - Distance was the main barrier, even within Hedmark. | - 3 fulltime jobs | - The project is finished for us because the | - No. Added Value: Networking, expanding | - Most of the times there was no problems. |
| Ŭ | | - The project was quite successful | years. | | | secretariat wants to connect this | dance in the county, help local people in getting | - The secretariat was helpful. |

| | | in setting up dance shows, cooperate with local communities, young people, etc. | | | | project with the health issues and this is not our field of work. The Swedish partners have to find another Norwegian partner if the project continues | contacts, bring youth to the dance activity. | - In the end, it took a lot of time to get the last payment and there was some misunderstandings. |
|---|---------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| V | Grensvandring | - The main goals have been achieved so far, namely in building the migration database that will expand into a Nordic project (Imiweb) and afterwards into a EU project (migraportal) | - It is working quite well and will continue in another project related to migration | Not big problems but 3 challenges: 1 – The application is somewhat too detailed and requires detailed work 2 – The Swe-Nor administrative and the rules are slightly different 3 – People who original run the project left and some initial information was not passed to the present project leaders | - 2 Administrative jobs - More or less 3 part time jobs - There is a possibility to create some jobs in the long term by managing the database and the webpages - There has been some spin offs from the project (exhibits) | - It will continue, but the partners cannot continue to finance it, they have to find other financing sources | - No. Added value: knowledge production, information, networking, job creation, | Very well satisfied. The Norwegian secretariat are very helpful and the Swedish as well I would suggest 3 reports a year |
| × | Naturinformasjon Rogen | - The results will be achieved - The web page is working, and information brochures, plates, maps, with common information | - It is working very well | The regulations and rules are different in both sides of the border Distances: it takes a lot of time to meet the other side There are 9 protected areas with | 1 full job 2 part time jobs Several other jobs by supporting tourism activity | - We believe it will continue to have support from regional administrations because the product has to follow up | - No (maybe), because it requires a lot of money Added value: Knowledge production, new information, support economic growth and local economy | We are quite happy: good communication. A bit to much bureaucracy because we have to report 4 times a year and it takes time to get results |

| | | | | different approaches to reach people and it has been a challenge to work together in order to produce easy understandable information for visitors - Custom rules | | | | (2 times would be enough) |
|---|-------------|--|---|--|----------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| z | Vänerlaksen | So far the project has achieved the initial goals (it has less than 6 months) At the moment they are putting up the plan and establishing the connections, getting foreign knowledge, | - Its has worked very well so far - The involvement of the Swedish and Norwegian governments has been a key issue to boost the project | EU legislation has to be followed There is a need to involve the Dam owners in the project There are technical problems to be solved | administrative | - It would need to continue anyway. The main job has to be completed by the end of INTERREG (preparation) | - Interreg is very important because it permitted a quick start of the project Added Value: knowledge production, practical items, habitat enhancement, support economic diversity (bringing fishing in summer) | - Happy with the secretariat work |



IGOT - Centro de Estudos Geográficos da Universidade de Lisboa Núcleo de Estratégias e Políticas Territoriais (NEST)

Edifício da Faculdade de Letras Alameda da Universidade 1600-214 Lisboa Portugal Tel: + 351 217940218 / 217965469 Fax: +351 217938690 www.igot.ul.pt - www.ceg.ul.pt/ ceg@campus.ul.pt

