Toepel, Kathleen

Article — Digitized Version

Evaluation Measures of the Structural Funds Interventions in the New German Länder: An Overview

Vierteljahrshefte zur Wirtschaftsforschung

Provided in Cooperation with:
German Institute for Economic Research (DIW Berlin)

Suggested Citation: Toepel, Kathleen (1996) : Evaluation Measures of the Structural Funds Interventions in the New German Länder: An Overview, Vierteljahrshefte zur Wirtschaftsforschung, ISSN 0340-1707, Duncker & Humblot, Berlin, Vol. 65, Iss. 3, pp. 323-330

This Version is available at:
https://hdl.handle.net/10419/141139

Evaluation Measures of the Structural Funds Interventions in the New German Länder — An Overview

By Kathleen Toepel

Summary

With the strong increase in the budget of the Structural Funds after the reform of 1993, the complexity of the various instruments and implementation procedures and the still existing regional economic and social disparities in the European Community, prior appraisal, monitoring and ex post evaluation of the Community interventions, become more important than before. In order to gauge their effectiveness, the interventions should be examined to appraise their impact with respect to the main objectives of the Structural Funds and to analyse their effects on specific structural problems.

After a description of the legal framework and the new requirements for the evaluation of Structural Funds interventions generally, the article gives an overview of the Structural Funds interventions in the New German Länder since 1991. It shows the development of the evaluation measures undertaken so far, and presents some questions discussed about the EC promotion measures in Eastern Germany from a conceptional point of view.

1. Introduction

In future, regional and social disparities in Europe and their removal gain in importance. With the realization of the Single Market Programme, the future Economic and Monetary Union, the widening of the European Union and last but not least the transformation process in central-eastern European countries, the regional question gets an new dimension. The European Union has three main instruments aiming at the removal of regional and social disparities within the Community: the Structural Funds, i.e. the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), the European Social Fund (ESF) and the European Agricultural Guarantee and Guidance Fund (EAGGF, Guidance Sector). With the strong increase in their budget after the reform of 1993, the complexity of the various instruments and implementation procedures and the still existing regional economic and social disparities in the European Community, ex ante appraisal, monitoring and ex post evaluation of the Community interventions, become more important than before.

After a description of the legal framework and the new requirements for the evaluation of Structural Funds interventions generally, the article gives an overview of the Structural Funds interventions in the New German Länder since 1991. It shows the development of the evaluation measures undertaken so far, and presents some questions discussed about the EC promotion measures in Eastern Germany from a conceptional point of view.

2. Legal framework of evaluation

In 1993 a revision of the Structural Funds regulations for the period 1994-1999 was adopted by the Council of Ministers. The budget was sharply increased to ECU 141,5 billion for this six-year period. With now a third of the total Community budget, the Structural Funds are the favoured instrument of the policy of economic and social cohesion that expresses intra-Community solidarity. Compared with the fundamental reform of the Structural Funds in 1988, the changes now made seem a lot less far-reaching. The major principles of the reform of 1988 (concentration of effort, partnership, programming, additionality) are maintained or have been attempted to be strengthened. Nonetheless, the adopted changes should not be underestimated. New regions are involved, the programming arrangements have been amended and new types of measure may be part-financed by the Community.

The reform of 1993 is to be seen as a part of the continuous efforts made in recent years to make the Community's structural policy more effective. The effectiveness of the Funds depends mainly on the quality and relevance of the measures undertaken, as well as the capacity of the Member States, regions and other potential beneficiaries to implement them. Yet the accession of the New German Länder and Sweden, Austria and Finland has brought a further substantial widening of regional disparities, with the newcomers to be added at both ends of the scale of per capita GDP and unemployment. The accession of Eastern Germany nearly quadrupled the difference in terms of GDP per capita between the 10 strongest and the 10 weakest regions of the Community[1].

With the strong increase of the budget of the Structural Funds, the complexity of the various instruments and implementation procedures and moreover the increasing need for the Community to overcome the regional economic and social disparities, prior appraisal, monitoring and ex post evaluation of the Community interventions become more important than before. In order to gauge their effectiveness, the interventions should be examined to appraise their impact with respect to the main objectives of the Structural Funds and to analyse their effects on specific structural problems.

Carrying out an evaluation of programmes funded by the Structural Funds is by no means an entirely new step. The regulatory framework is set out in Article 6 of Regulation 2052/88 as modified by 2081/93[2]: "1. Community operations shall be monitored to ensure that the commitments entered into ... are effectively honoured. Such monitoring shall, where necessary, make it possible to adjust operations in line with requirements arising during implementations. ... 2. In order to gauge their effectiveness, Community structural operations shall be the subject of prior appraisal, monitoring and ex post evaluation designed to appraise their impact with respect to the objectives set out in Article 1 and to analyse their effects on specific structural problems."

Articles 25 and 26 of the Coordination Regulation 4253/88 as modified by 2082/93 go further into detail of monitoring, appraisal and evaluation procedures[3]. Within the framework of the partnership, the European Commission and the Member States are responsible to ensure effective monitoring of implementation of assistance, prior appraisal and ex post evaluation. For each year of a multiannual operation the authority designated for this purpose by the Member State shall submit progress reports to the Commission and also a final report after the completion of the operation.

Monitoring shall be carried out by reference to physical and financial indicators specified in the Commission decision approving the operation concerned. The indicators shall relate to the specific character of the operation, its objectives and the form of assistance provided; but also relate to the socio-economic situation and the structural problems in the Member State. These indicators shall be based on regional or national statistics, on information yielded by descriptive and analytical studies and on qualitative analyses. So far the regulatory framework does not provide a certain evaluation method nor specific indicators.

For the evaluation of a specific programme the legal basis is set out in standard clauses of each Community Support Framework (CSF). In addition they also stipulate some basic indicators for ex post evaluation and monitoring. Some differences arise from the legal basis and operational forms of each objective. In particular the timing, the indicators and the emphasis put on the reports differ slightly from country to country and from programme to programme. In cooperation with the representatives of the European Commission the Monitoring Committees define the precise work programme regarding evaluation and monitoring of the specific programme concerned. In recent years, starting in 1993 the Commission has paid more and more attention to evaluation and monitoring than before. The regions promoted feel a strong pressure towards an improvement of the evaluation reports and continuous monitoring of the intervention.

To improve the quality of evaluation measures a specific programme is carried out by the Commission: MEANS — *M*ethods for *E*valuating *A*ctions of *S*tructural *N*ature. It aims at improving evaluation methods carried out in Europe by comparing and collecting best practices, organising workshops for the exchange of ideas and publishing handbooks for different aspects of evaluation and monitoring[4]. These documents are intended to help meet the challenge promoting monitoring and evaluation as a real asset to programme implementation and not just as a response to a regulatory requirement. Of course evaluation is to be carried out in a multitude of very different contexts, that is why the content of all these papers ought to be creatively adopted rather than just formally applied. They are not obligatory from a legal point of view at this moment, but there is a certain pressure to meet a minimum of core suggestions. By opinion of some programme managers, for example in Schleswig-Holstein and Saxony, these handbooks are too complicated for an easy implementation. They need to be "translated" according to the local requirements. Especially high are the expectations and requirements for evaluation in the Objective-1-Regions, as the New German Länder. The next paragraph gives first a short overview of the promotion measures of the Structural Funds in Eastern Germany.

3. European structural policy in eastern Germany

The transformation of the New German Länder from a planned to a market economy and the rather abrupt con-

[1] Cf. Europäische Kommission (1994), Table A. 5, p. 176.

[2] Commission of the European Communities (1993), pp. 49-50.

[3] Commission of the European Communities (1993), pp. 68-69.

[4] Cf. MEANS (1995a-d).

Economic Assistance by the European Union in Eastern Germany 1991-1993 and 1994-1999

Structural Funds				FIGF	Loans	EC - Programmes	
ERDF	**ESF**	**EAGGF**	Community Initiatives	Guidance of the Fisheries	**EIB**	**Education**	**Research and Development**
1991-1993	*1991-1993*	*1991-1993*	*1992/93*	*1994-1999*	*1990-6/1995*	*1991-1994*	*1991-1994*
1500 MECU[1]	900 MECU	600 MECU	PERIFRA KONVER	83,5 MECU	11 bn DM	LINGUA ERASMUS TEMPUS Action J.Monnet COMETT PETRA EUROTECNET FORCE Youth for Europe	BRITE/EURAM ESPRIT Biotechnology Agriculture Oceanography etc.
1994-1999	*1994-1999*	*1994-1999*	*1994-1999* **Community Initiatives**		*1991-1994* **ECSC**	*from 1995*	**Other Programmes**
6819,8 MECU	4081,1 MECU	2644,3 MECU	RECHAR: 84,27 MECU RETEX: 54,7 MECU RESIDER: 52,24 MECU KONVER: 120,05 MECU INTERREG: 281,6 MECU SME: 151,6 MECU URBAN: 72,7 MECU EMPLOI: 53,2 MECU ADAPT: 57,12 MECU LEADER: 81,0 MECU PESCA: 13,1 MECU		519,3 Mill. DM	SOCRATES LEONARDO Youth for Europe TEMPUS Action J. Monnet	LIFE EUROPARTENARIAT etc.

[1] 1 ECU=1,90DM; MECU: Mill ECU

DIW'96

frontation with the world market have revealed the competitive weakness of the East German economy and led to a rapid decline in output and labour. The creation of a new productive potential is progressing — but only slowly. With the German Unification the regional problems in Germany took on a new dimension. Compared to the other Objective-1-Regions of the EU the New German Länder are on a relatively low socio-economic level, but they are situated in one of the richest member states of the European Union.

The New German Länder were included in the financial assistance by the Structural Funds and other programmes. The Table gives an overview about the instruments of financial assistance of the Community in Eastern Germany. Measured in terms of volume the main instruments are of course the Structural Funds.

During the first programming period (from 1991 to 1993) altogether 3 thousand million ECU out of the Structural Funds have been made available to Eastern Germany. This was equivalent to approximately 180 ECU per capita. Fifty per cent came from the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), 30 per cent from the European Social Fund (ESF) and 20 per cent from the European Agricultural Guarantee and Guidance Fund (EAGGF, Guidance Sector). Because of the lack of reliable socio-economic indicators the funds were distributed among the Länder by head of population. The main fields of assistance were:

1 Investment in economy-related infrastructure (25,2 % of funds)
2 Productive investment (25,3 %)
3 Development of human resources (12,9 %)
4 Combating long-term unemployment (2,2 %)
5 Facilitating the occupational integration of young people (5,5 %)
6 Investment in agriculture and food processing (13 %)
7/8 Development of the rural areas and protection of the environment (14,6 %)[5].

In the different priorities the Structural Funds were acting together. Only the 4th and 5th priority was exclusively financed by the Social Fund and the 6th priority by the Agricultural Fund. The ERDF funds have been coupled with the National Joint Task "Improvement of the Regional Economic Structure", the EAGGF financial assistance has been coupled partly with the National Joint Task "Improvement of the Agricultural Structures and Shore Protection"[6]. From 1991 to 1993, in the framework of the first

[5] Add 1,3 % for technical assistance.

[6] The National Joint Tasks are instruments, where the federal Government and the governments of the Länder are acting together. They are also financed by both. The Joint Tasks are the main coordinating instruments in the field of regional policy resp. agricultural promotion measures in Germany. The coupling of the ERDF to the National Joint Task meant that the enterprises or other potential recipients ask for assistance out of the relevant National Joint Task at the Länder government, not for ERDF funding at the European Commission. Whether they get ERDF funds for their project is pure chance and does not depend on the project, if it is promotable according to the regulations.

priority, 5 800 hectares of industrial sites have been developed with the financial assistance of the *ERDF*, most of them in Mecklenburg-Vorpommern[7]. According to the regulations of the National Joint Task in the second priority the setting up of new plants, the expansion, the relocation and rationalization of existing plants could be promoted by the ERDF. Thus investment of 15,3 bn DM of about 5 800 enterprises has been supported by the Regional Fund. Around 50 per cent of these investment projects were situated in Saxony. With its help about 220 000 jobs were able to be newly established or secured (36 per cent in Saxony). But this is only the number of jobs, which the enterprises planned to realize. It seems doubtful whether all these jobs have really been created.

Most of the promoted enterprises worked in the field of mechanical engineering (Thuringia, Saxony, Berlin, Mecklenburg-Vorpommern), of electrical engineering (Saxony-Anhalt, Berlin, Thuringia), of the building trade (Saxony-Anhalt, Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, Brandenburg), of the chemical industry (Saxony-Anhalt, Mecklenburg-Vorpommern), the production of hardware (Berlin, Brandenburg, Thuringia, Saxony) and food processing (Thuringia, Saxony-Anhalt, Mecklenburg-Vorpommern). Construction and equipment of 122 training centres have been financed by the Regional Fund in the frame of the third priority. The shares of investment and job creation in Saxony, Saxony-Anhalt and Brandenburg surpassed the respective shares of population and of funds. In all priorities it is to be seen that — measured in investment as well as in job creation — a sharp south-north differential arose in Eastern Germany.

One quarter of the *ESF* was ran by the federal government. This part has been used to help people who were not entitled to national aid schemes. For instance these persons got additional grants for the care of their children during a training course. The other part of ESF funds has also been used for specific programmes of the Länder. There has been a great variety of different programmes.

The main task of the ESF was to develop the necessary skills and knowledge for a market economy. There was a general need for specific knowledge, for example in new law, economic knowledge, and also a lack of some professions: tax adviser, nursing staff. Thus the ESF financed mainly such training courses but also about new technologies, the protection of the environment, the redevelopment of old industrial sites. People whose qualification became unnecessary, for instance often in agriculture, had to be qualified for new activities in their region, for example in tourism.

By means of ESF, the setting up of enterprises and the employment of young people or long term unemployed has been subsidized. In the course of the programming period the importance of measures designed for groups of persons with specific handicaps on the labour market (unskilled workers, handicapped people, young and elderly people, women) has grown. From the promotion measures financed by the ESF about 300 000 persons[8] profited from the programmes of the Länder and 47 000 persons from the federal programme.

By means of the *Agricultural Fund* investment projects in agricultural production and in slaughterhouses, dairies, market gardens, etc. were supported. From such investment grants about 300 projects profited, most of them were situated in Thuringia. In more than 3000 villages houses were built or reconstructed, traffic and other infrastructural problems were solved. Apart from this the Länder had different priorities: There were also projects of ecologically friendly pesticides (Thuringia, Saxony), of forestry (Thuringia, Mecklenburg-Vorpommern), for the improvement of water supply and waste water disposal (Mecklenburg-Vorpommern) and of conservation (Brandenburg, Berlin, Thuringia, Saxony-Anhalt).

In the meantime a new programming period has started. In 1994 the New German Länder were classified as Objective-1-Regions. The funds have been doubled. Now there are about 13 thousand million ECU available up to 1999. In addition, the New German Länder can now use the Community Initiatives (as INTERREG, RETEX, etc.), as shown in the table. The distribution of funds among the Länder has not been changed so much, but new priorities have been set up. The promotion of technology and the protection of the environment is now given a higher emphasis. The new main priorities are:

1 Productive investment and investment in infrastructure (19,5 % of funds)
2 Support of small and medium enterprises (18,6 %)
3 Promotion of Research and Development (5 %)
4 Protection and improvement of the environment (8,9 %)
5 Promotion of employment, professional training and retraining (21 %)
6 Agriculture, rural areas and fishery (25 %)[9].

After complicated negotiations between the Federal government and the Commission in the new period the ERDF has been given more room for manoeuvre. In the Community Support Framework for the New German Länder the Länder have been granted that they can earmark a part of the ERDF funds for promotion measures outside the Joint Task. This enables the Länder governments to use the funds within the Joint Task if they want to. If not, it facilitates the establishment of new programmes of the Länder or the increased funding of existing programmes.

At the moment Saxony deployed most (60 per cent) of the ERDF funds outside. Only the governments of Mecklenburg-Vorpommern and of Saxony-Anhalt did not want to

[7] Figures are based on the yearly reports of the Federal Government to the European Commission. Cf. also Toepel (1996).

[8] As cumulation of different ESF-financed measures in one person was allowed, it is better to talk about 300 000 cases.

[9] Add for technical assistance 2 per cent.

deploy ERDF funds outside the Joint Task at this time. The deployed funds cofinance a great variety of programmes of the Länder. They are mainly used in the field of innovation, of protection of the environment and for the promotion of services for small and medium enterprises.

4. Evaluation of the structural funds interventions in eastern Germany

4.1 First period 1991-1993

In the ex ante appraisal of the first Regional Development Plan (1991-1993) and during the preparation of the Operational Programmes of the first promotion period, the Länder governments or other regional actors on the scene were almost not involved, the programming documents were compiled by the Federal government. The above-mentioned European financial assistance was mainly modelled on the strategy proposed by the Federal government[10].

First there existed a lot of introductory problems of the implementation of the promotion measures itself, as there was a lack of knowledge at the administration — apart from the "employees on loan" from the West German Länder. The employees had — during a time of full reorganization of the administration itself — to get familiar with a very complicated system of economic promotion measures. Problems of the European Community were in former times in the GDR only a subject for specialists, for real life they were not relevant.

Not only the administration but the enterprises as well had to get familiar with the organization of these subsidies, how to get them, how to fill in the application form, etc. That is why, at the beginning of the period, the grants had been allocated at the principle "First come — first served". But in the meantime most of these problems have been solved. Most of the Länder governments set up regional and sectoral priorities in the second year.

The problem of slow disbursement in some of the priorities[11] in some Länder is thus supposed to have been of a rather temporary nature and of course did by no means reach the dimension of other Objective-1-Regions or even Eastern European countries. It has to be seen more or less as a typical outcome of a start-up phase of an assistance programme during which both donors and recipients of assistance lack the appropriate procedures and administration for a trouble-free granting. In a period of a complete reorganization of Eastern German administration itself, the management of a multitude of different problems (e.g. unsolved property problems) — among them the handling of promotion measures — caused high institutional stress for the administration.

With the solving of these introductory problems, more and more the problems of intransparency of aid schemes in general and the lack of their evaluation moved into the focus of discussion. It is still almost unknown among the population that the EU is spending so much money on investment projects in Eastern Germany. Limited coordination and lack of evaluation may be seen also as the outcome of more technical, management related factors such as, e.g. at the beginning insufficient information systems, which do not provide data on the impact of assistance in the necessary quality. This type of restriction tends to lose much of its importance due to learning-by-doing processes on the administration side.

As regards monitoring the first programming period in Eastern Germany was characterized by the implementation of information systems for monitoring. Now the programme managers in Eastern Germany are often better equipped with information systems, including computer hard- and software for monitoring, than the Western German administration, which has much more experiences with Structural Funds interventions.

In 1995/96, the ex post evaluation reports of the first programming period in Eastern Germany have been finished, mostly prepared by external evaluation experts. The main conclusion of most of these reports apart from regional specific questions, was that the underlying strategy of Structural Funds interventions in Eastern Germany with its concentration on productive investment and infrastructure was generally speaking the right strategy[12].

A point in the discussion has been the uncritical — apart from some special arrangements — transfer of almost the whole system of economic promotion measures used in the Western Länder to Eastern Germany which was cofinanced by the Structural Funds. The development of new promotion measures has been seen as too time-consuming. In retrospect compared with e.g. the Eastern European countries it was probably the best way, but this system — well tried under other conditions — proved to be not flexible enough to meet the new regional and structural challenges. The structural adjustment process in the New German Länder is highly dynamic and raises ever more new problems in the medium and long term — in doing so necessary individual promotion measures have to be changed fast.

Consequently, the coupling of the ERDF financial assistance with the National Joint Task has proved to be the key question during the first period of assistance. As the regulatory framework of the ERDF allows many more types of promotion measures and facts as the regulations of the National Joint Task permit, the ERDF's room for manoeuvre was restricted. This restriction consisted mainly of three points:

— the very close link between the promotion of infrastructure and the predominant use of the promoted projects by trade and industry,

[10] Nägele (1996), p. 209.

[11] Cf. Toepel (1996), pp. 13 fol.

[12] Cf. Pfeiffer/Toepel (1996); Toepel/Weise (1995), p. 32-36; SMWA (1996), p. 191; Schultz (1996), p. 191.

— restricted possibility for the promotion of business centres,

— very close link between the promotion of education facilities and the predominant training for enterprises, which are eligible for assistance.

It is a question whether the National Joint Task is a bottleneck or a funnel for the ERDF financial assistance. In the case of some Länder (especially Berlin) it has been a bottleneck. This can be shown at the fluctuations in granting especially in the first and third priority. Because of little demand in the first years, means of the ERDF were regrouped into other priorities, mainly in the second priority. After a first flexibilization of those regulations, which mainly caused these problems, the granting was progressing[13].

4.2 Second period 1994-1999

Thus the question of the coupling of the ERDF to the National Joint Task became the key question of ex ante appraisal of the Regional Development Plan for the second period (1994-1999). A number of ministries were involved in the preparation of the programming documents according to EC-regulations, thereby creating a higher demand for coordination and also adding internal fragmentation of interests, especially about this question. While the Commission wanted the entire deployment of the ERDF outside the National Joint Task, the Economic Ministries of the Federal government and of the Länder did not at all want to abrogate the coupling and some other ministries (esp. Protection of the Environment, Research & Development) of the Länder wanted at least the partial deployment of the funds.

The report of ex ante appraisal of the Regional Development Plan came to the conclusion, that "a strategy which aims at developing productive investments is the most important contribution which the Commission can make to adapting the New Länder ... But the plan does not cover fundamental elements of the problems in Eastern Germany which are handled outside the plan by Federal government and local authorities ... The plan therefore cannot achieve the common tasks "environment", "integration of trans-European transport and telecommunication networks" or "research and development"[14].

Theoretically there have been three possibilities for solving the problem of the coupling of the ERDF to the National Joint Task:

— Extension of the scope of application of the National Joint Task,

— partial deployment of the ERDF,

— entire deployment of the ERDF outside the National Joint Task.

With an entire deployment of the ERDF outside the National Joint Task there would be the danger that the development of new national instruments extends the existing intransparency of aid schemes. Although the assistance of the EU itself is organized on the basis of a national Regional Development Plan according to the EC-regulations, in the whole system of national economic promotion measures, the danger of double work and overlap or even neutralization of activities would arise, leading to the waste of scarce resources. The National Joint Task is — regardless its specific problems — a well-tried instrument of national regional policy. In fact, the solution found is twofold. On one hand, the ERDF is given a wider room for manoeuvre. A part of the funds can be earmarked for promotion measures outside the National Joint Task.

On the other hand, the scope of application of the National Joint Task has been flexibilized and decisively extended in 1995, which could not be foreseen during the negotiations. These changes could solve the main problems of the coupling in the former period. For instance, there is no longer the very close link between the promotion of infrastructure and its predominant use by trade and industry. The extended scope of application of the National Joint Task and this flexibilization of the ERDF has now to work together.

In 1996 the New German Länder reached the half time of the second programming period. That's why at the moment the reports of interim assessment are produced to be presented at the beginning of 1997. Compared with the former period the terms of reference for the evaluator are much more detailed. The expert carrying out an intermediate evaluation shall answer among others the following questions[15]:

— What are the positive effects and unexpected consequences of the intervention? (impacts)

— Would it be possible to produce more beneficial effects so as to meet the objectives? (effectiveness)

— Could greater impact have been produced using less resources? (efficiency)

— Can greater complementarity be found between the component parts of the programme, its instruments and implementing agencies? (coherence)

— What sort of influence has the partnership and its approach to implementation had on impacts? (delivery mechanisms).

During the first promotion period the task for the evaluator was mainly to reduce the existing opaqueness of Structural Funds interventions in the New German Länder. Now questions of efficiency and effectiveness moved more and more into the focus of interest. Additionally, the partial deployment ofthe ERDF outside the National Joint Task and its spread over a great variety of promotion measures complicates the task for the evaluation expert.

---

[13] Toepel (1996), p. 16.

[14] Schrumpf et al. (1993), p. 78-79.

[15] Cf. Terms of reference for the evaluation of ERDF/ESF in the New German Länder.

In addition the methodological "stone of wisdom" of evaluation research is not found yet. Numerous different methods are currently used throughout Europe for estimating the effects of Structural Policy. They differ in terms of their usability under different conditions, their coverage of effects measured, their costs and prerequisites concerning the data. Since different evaluation methods lead to different results in terms not only of reliability, but also of the effects measured, the methodological choice determines to a reasonable extent the results that will be produced. The methodologies applied cover the full-range between microapproaches (e.g. case studies and survey techniques), statistical approaches, multipliers and coefficient methods and sophisticated econometric models[16]. For macro-approaches the requirements regarding the data are high; it is often the case that an evaluation can only take place after a long time span after finishing an intervention. For an intermediate evaluation they are not applicable. That's why even for the intermediate evaluation in the New German Länder, case studies and survey techniques are dominant. Such micro-approaches are usually applied if different effects have to be disentangled on a disaggregated level as it is the case in the New German Länder.

At the moment it is not possible to show some results of this intermediate evaluation because these reports have to be finished in the beginning of 1997. But these evaluations are very important for the future Structural Funds interventions in the New German Länder and they will have consequences for the enlargement of the European Union towards Eastern Europe, too. Apart from conclusions for the tuning of the further promotion measures, they should give some clues for the applicability of Structural Funds interventions under the existing regulatory framework during a transformation process from a planned to a market economy and for the necessary amendments. The New German Länder have been facing some similar implementation and coordination problems, although the external aid in Eastern Germany from the European Union is in its volume and type not comparable with the external assistance for Eastern Europe (e.g. PHARE, TACIS) so far. In the meantime most of these Eastern German problems have gradually lost their importance, due to the advancement of the transformation and the technical assistance from the EU and the Western German Länder.

5. Conclusion

The experience of the New German Länder has shown, that the coupling of the ERDF to only one kind of promotion measures — well tried under other conditions in Western Germany — proved to be not flexible enough to meet the new regional and structural challenges. The structural adjustment process in the New German Länder is highly dynamic, the uncovered need for investment is enormous and necessary individual promotion measures have to be changed fast. The distribution of funds should be exclusively indicative and as flexible as possible. In the case of the New German Länder it is still necessary to promote productive investment, but also to ask for higher efficiency and coordination of the whole system of economic promotion measures including Structural Funds.

---

[16] Cf. MEANS (1995c) pp. 24-29.

References

Commission of the European Communities (1993): Community Structural Funds 1994-1999 — Revised Regulations and Comments. Luxemburg, August.

Europäische Kommission (1994): Wettbewerbsfähigkeit und Kohäsion: Tendenzen in den Regionen — Fünfter Periodischer Bericht über die sozioökonomische Lage und Entwicklung der Regionen der Gemeinschaft [Competitiveness and Cohesion: Tendencies in the Regions — 5th Periodical Report on the Socioeconomic Situation and Development of the Regions in the Community]. Luxembourg.

MEANS (1995a): Organising Intermediate Evaluation in the Context of Partnerships. MEANS-Handbook No. 1, Lyon.

MEANS (1995b): Identifying the Structuring Effects of Community Interventions. MEANS-Handbook No. 2, Lyon.

MEANS (1995c): Measuring the Employment Effects of Community Structural Interventions. MEANS-Handbook No. 3, Lyon.

MEANS (1995d): Applying the Multi-criteria Method to the Evaluation of Structural Programmes. MEANS-Handbook No. 4, Lyon.

Nägele, Frank (1996): Regionale Wirtschaftspolitik im kooperativen Bundesstaat — Ein Politikfeld im Prozeß der deutschen Vereinigung [Regional Economic Policy in the cooperative Federal State — politics in the process of German Unification]. Opladen.

Pfeiffer, Ingo, Kathleen *Toepel* (1996): Studie zur Evaluierung des operationellen Programms des EFRE in Thüringen 1991-1993 [Study of the Evaluation of the Operational Programme of ERDF in Thuringia 1991-1993]. Study commissioned by the Thuringian Ministry of Economic Affairs and Infrastructure (duplicated as typoscript).

SMWA (Sächsisches Staatsministerium für Wirtschaft und Arbeit [Saxonian Ministry of Economic Affairs and Labour], Hrsg.) (1996): Evaluierung des Operationellen Programms des EFRE 1991 bis 1993 für den Freistaat Sachsen — Abschluß- und Evaluierungsbericht [Evaluation of the Operational Programme of the ERDF 1991-1993 in Saxony]. Dresden, June.

Schultz, Birgit, Bodo *Middeldorf* et al. (1996): Evaluierung des Mitteleinsatzes des EFRE im Rahmen des Operationellen Programms Mecklenburg-Vorpommern 1991 -1993 [Evaluation of ERDF promotion measures within the framework of the Operational Programme Mecklenburg-Vorpommern 1991-1993]. Study of Prognos AG commissioned by the Ministry of Economic Affairs and of the European Union Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, January.

Toepel, Kathleen (1996): Zwischenbilanz der Strukturfondsinterventionen und anderer EU-Programme in den neuen Bundesländern [Interim Balance of Structural Funds Interventions and other Programmes of the EU in the New German Länder]. Sonderheft des DIW, Nr. 159.

Toepel, Kathleen, Christian *Weise* (1995): Die Förderung von gewerblichen Investitionen in Ostdeutschland durch den Europäischen Fonds für Regionale Entwicklung — Fallstudien Ostberlin, Brandenburg und Mecklenburg-Vorpommern [Productive Investment in the New German Länder — Case Studies of East Berlin, Brandenburg and Mecklenburg-Vorpommern]. Study commissioned by the EC Commission GD XVI and Ecotec Research and Consulting Ltd., Diskussionspapier des DIW, Nr. 108.

Schrumpf, Heinz et al. (1993): Ex ante evaluation of the 1994-1999 development plan for the New German Länder. Essen, October.

Zusammenfassung

Evaluierungsmaßnahmen der Strukturfondsinterventionen in den neuen Bundesländern — Ein Überblick

Mit den gestiegenen Strukturfondsausgaben nach der Strukturfondsreform von 1993, der zunehmenden Komplexität der Instrumente und der Umsetzungsmodalitäten sowie angesichts immer noch vorhandener wirtschaftlicher und sozialer Entwicklungsunterschiede in der Europäischen Union gewinnt die Evaluierung der Strukturfondsinterventionen an Bedeutung, sowohl ex-ante, begleitend als auch ex-post. Um ihre Effektivität beurteilen zu können, müssen die Strukturfondsinterventionen hinsichtlich ihrer Auswirkungen auf die Hauptziele der europäischen Strukturpolitik und ihres Beitrags zur Lösung spezifischer struktureller Probleme evaluiert werden.

Nach einer Einführung in die rechtlichen Rahmenbedingungen und die neuen Anforderungen an die Evaluierung der Strukturfondsinterventionen allgemein, liefert der Artikel einen Überblick über die Strukturfondsförderung in den neuen Bundesländern seit 1991. Er zeigt die Entwicklung der bisher durchgeführten Evaluierungsmaßnahmen und stellt einige Hauptdiskussionspunkte hinsichtlich der EU-Förderung in den neuen Bundesländern als Ergebnisse der Evaluierungen dar.