ASSESSING TERRITORIAL IMPACTS OF THE EU COHESION POLICY IN ALGARVE (1990-2010)
• The TIA methodology should be more detailed in the use of the available regional data (statistics, interviews, bibliography);
• The TIA should be spread to the local level (municipalities);
• The TIA methodology should be operationalised by experts, in order to bring more precise results. The goal of TIA procedures is not to be pain-free. Conversely, it aims to assess the ‘validity and quality’, and the effective impacts of projects, programmes, policies or directives, on a given territory;
• An impact value should be obtained, within a negative/positive scale, in order to make regional comparisons possible, and to present a tangible TIA indicator for policymakers and regional planners;
• Distinct impact values should be obtained for each analysed territorial development dimension (socioeconomic cohesion, environmental sustainability; territorial governance/cooperation, and polycentrism);
• The search of univocal causality relations (cause-and-effect relationships) between the evaluated project/programme/policy/directive and the territorial development evolution (in a select number of years – preferably no less than three years) should be obtained, despite the inherent difficulties of this exercise.
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ALGARVE Baseline Scenario
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## The EU Cohesion Policy in ALGARVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programing Cycle</th>
<th>FUND</th>
<th>M€</th>
<th>Main Intervention Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Accession (1983-93)</td>
<td>ERDF</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Basic Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial ERDF (1986-89)</td>
<td>ERDF</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Accessibilities, Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QCA I (1989-93)</td>
<td>ERDF</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>Urban Renovation, Productive Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>392</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>Libraries, Public Markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QCA III (2000-2006)</td>
<td>ERDF – CF</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>Littoral, Basic Schools, Infrastructures, Accessibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total *¹</td>
<td>509</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>ERDF – CF</td>
<td>1.953</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data (CCDR Algarve) - Adapted
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The EU Cohesion Policy in ALGARVE – ERDF (%)
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- Economic Cohesion: 26%
- Social Cohesion: 13%
- Environmental Sustainability: 26%
- Policentricity: 36%
The EU Cohesion Policy in ALGARVE – ESF (%)

- Inicial Qualifications: 28%
- Long Life Adaptability: 45%
- Social Inclusion: 15%
- Professional Enhancement: 11%
- Gender Equality: 2%
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The EU Cohesion Policy in ALGARVE – EFDR - Municipalities
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Relevance, Financial Intensity and Impacts
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Relevance, Financial Intensity and Impacts
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TERRITORIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT – TARGET_TIA

ESTIMATED IMPACTS - VECTORS

4 = Very significant positive impacts
3 = Significant positive impacts
2 = Moderate positive impacts
1 = Low positive impacts
0 = Null impacts
-1 = Low negative impacts
-2 = Moderate negative impacts
-3 = Significant negative impacts
-4 = Very significant negative impacts
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TERRITORIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT – TARGET_TIA

EX POST:     TIMr = (EIMp . Ip) . Sp

EX ANTE:     TIMr = (EIMql . Elp) . Sp

TIM = Territorial Impacts of ‘p’
EIM = [(EIMql + EIMqt)/2] (for each ‘d’)  -4 ≤ EIM ≤ +4
EIMql = Estimated Qualitative Impacts (for each ‘d’)  
EIMqt = Estimated Quantitative Impacts (for each ‘d’)  
EI = Estimated Intensity  0 ≤ I ≤ +1
S = Regional Sensibility of ‘p’ (for each ‘d’)  0 ≤ I ≤ +1
I = Policy Intensity of ‘p’ (for each ‘d’)  0 ≤ I ≤ +1
QSI = Quantitative Synthetic Index (or statistic indicator)
d = Dimension
p = Policy/Programme/Project
r = Region
in = Initial
fi = Final
max = maximum
### TERRITORIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT – TARGET_TIA MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Posi/Nega</th>
<th>Endo/Exog</th>
<th>Sust/Shor</th>
<th>Mult/Subs</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poli/Inte</th>
<th>Regi/Sens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Cohesion (SOC)</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,25</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Cohesion (SOC)</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>0,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Cohesion (SOC)</td>
<td>Culture / Sports</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>0,75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Cohesion (SOC)</td>
<td>Exclusion/Inclusion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,25</td>
<td>0,75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Cohesion (ECO)</td>
<td>Income</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td>0,75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Cohesion (ECO)</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0,25</td>
<td>0,75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Cohesion (ECO)</td>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0,25</td>
<td>0,75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Cohesion (ECO)</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,88</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,88</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,88</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,00</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,91</strong></td>
<td><strong>0,38</strong></td>
<td><strong>0,78</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sustainability</td>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sustainability</td>
<td>Environmental Protection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,25</td>
<td>0,75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sustainability</td>
<td>Sanitation / Recycling</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sustainability</td>
<td>Biodiversity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,25</td>
<td>0,75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,75</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,75</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,75</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,75</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,75</strong></td>
<td><strong>0,44</strong></td>
<td><strong>0,81</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance/Cooperation</td>
<td>Horizontal Cooperation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0,25</td>
<td>0,75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance/Cooperation</td>
<td>Vertical Cooperation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0,25</td>
<td>0,75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance/Cooperation</td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0,25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance/Cooperation</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0,25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2,00</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,00</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,00</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,00</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,00</strong></td>
<td><strong>0,25</strong></td>
<td><strong>0,88</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphologic Polycentricity</td>
<td>Hierarchy / Ranking</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,25</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>0,75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphologic Polycentricity</td>
<td>Density</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>0,75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphologic Polycentricity</td>
<td>Connectivity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>0,75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphologic Polycentricity</td>
<td>Distribution / Shape</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0,5</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>0,75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0,25</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,50</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,00</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,50</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,06</strong></td>
<td><strong>0,63</strong></td>
<td><strong>0,75</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Average</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,47</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,78</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,66</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,81</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,68</strong></td>
<td><strong>0,42</strong></td>
<td><strong>0,80</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The EU Cohesion Policy in ALGARVE – territorial impacts
Conclusions

• The EU Cohesion Policy was instrumental in improving Algarve’s territorial development. Yet, overall, in the last couple of decades, the territorial impacts of the EU Cohesion Policy in Algarve have to be considered as moderate positive.

• The territorial impact varied substantially as the investment priorities were mainly canalized to the necessary infrastructure endowments (socioeconomic and environmental infra-structures and accessibilities), and the human capital valorization.

• Less positive impacts were detected in two components of the morphologic polycentrism dimension: (i) the urban hierarchy is far from being more balanced, since the bulk of the investments (in total) favoured the most populated urban settlements; (ii) a concentrated and planned growth of the urban perimeters was not attained.
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