

Generally:

- No regional differences in the use of European funds could be detected
- Mostly use of mainstream funding programmes
- Some special local initiatives for integrated district development or thematic projects
- Financing instruments like JASPERS, JASMINE, JEREMY are known but not used
- JESSICA was not used because of incompatibility with national laws or lack of willingness for implementation by regional authorities or too difficult set-ups or access to better interest rates on the market
- In almost all Regional OPs integrated urban development is a separate priority axis, but often the finances for such measures were not enough or the needs of the cities were different to the funding possibilities within this axis
- Not identifiable, if all themes of an integrated development are fundable through this axis or if the integrated approach is a precondition for funding

Generally:

- In GB, the funding is based mostly on national programmes
- In GER funding on many levels, but for urban development mostly national funds
- Less use of National Programmes in Baltic countries, mostly EU and local level
- Simplification of implementation and administration processes in general
- Need of a flexible budget for mixed social economic and physical regeneration and also more geographical flexibility
- The URBAN Dimension needs an earmarking within ERDF
- Often funds are used for a sustainable development and not so much for an integrated approach. So the integrated approach should be anchored in the national and regional programmes.
- It would be good to involve the cities during the design of new programmes and instruments to guarantee a better use and a coordination with the needs of the cities.

Generally:

- Highlighted can be the good cooperation between e. g.:
 - local municipalities with their regional development agencies
 - local municipalities within the Baltic region and Poland
 - local municipalities with their national authorities
 - local municipalities with their local stakeholders, corporations and citizens
 - trans-national partners in networks

Funds/instruments used on European Level:

- ERDF with URBAN I / II, URBACT I / II, INTERREG/ETC, URBAL, etc.
- ESF
- Cohesion Fund
- Community Programmes: LIFE+, IEE, FP7 (CIVITAS, etc.), etc.
- EAFRD (European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development)
- ENPI (European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument)
- EEA Grants (European Economic Area)
- Baltic Sea Region Programme
- IPA / PHARE
- World Bank Funds

Some Programmes Used at National Level:

- Specific national funds, e.g.:
 - NL: GSB (National major cities policy)
 - GB: English Partnerships and Homes and Communities Agency, Single Regeneration Budget, Working Neighbourhood Fund, NPC Programme, HMRI, Area Based Grant, etc.
 - GER: Socially Integrative City, Urban Renewal Programme, National Urban Development Policy, Urban Regeneration Programme, Research Programme
 - ESP: National Strategic Reference Framework (MENR), E Plan, Plan of Action 2008-2012 of Efficient Energy of Spain (E4), FEESL; Fondo Estatal para el Empleo y la Sostenibilidad
 - CZE: National State fund for transport infrastructure, State fund for environmental policy, Rural Development Programme of the Czech Republic for 2007- 2013

Regional Level:

- **Mentioned were here often only strategic plans and planning documents,** e.g. Strategic Plan of the Province of Jaen; Land Use Plan, Sustainable Development Plans, Ciudad 21, Plan de Calidad y Modernizacion del Ayuntamiento 2010-2013, Catalonia FEDER, Strategic Plan for Prague, Prague Master Plan (Land Use Plan)
- There are often plans for certain sustainable themes (Support of environmental control; Plans for Renewable Energies, etc.) and less for the integrated development
- **Regional Operational Programmes for 2007-13**
- **Special regional funds:** Funds of Pardubicky region, Regional grant programs, Single Investment Programme (SIP), etc.

Programmes and instruments used for funding:

Programmes Used at Local Level:

- **City Development Plans:** STEP 2005, Strategic action plan for urban sustainability,
- **Thematic Development Plans:** Master Plan Traffic, City's Climate Protection Programme, Öko Business Plan, Energy Efficiency Plan, ULI (Urban Air Initiative), Presupuesto de Inversiones por Barrios del Ayuntamiento de Torrent
- Local Agenda 21
- Special Local Initiatives: Rotterdam Pact op Zuid (SouthPact); Liverpool City Council funding for range of initiatives including neighborhoods, skills, economic development, social economy, community enterprise

Examples for Best Practices:

➤ **URBAN I and II**

Integrated approach was anchored in these programmes; combined funding of social, economic and urban development measures was possible

➤ **Rotterdam Pact op Zuid (SouthPact):**

A major source of funding comes from the owners of social housing complexes (Corporations) that have agreed to use their surplus reserves for urban development. The approach for instance totals an additional 10 year investment of € 1 billion of which some € 850 million includes investments from the corporations and only € 170 million of the city.

➤ **Cross Border Cooperation Programme Lithuania – Poland**

Projects are strengthening cross border infrastructure, create links and networks among people

Examples for Best Practices:

➤ **Dewsbury Renaissance Programme by Yorkshire Forward**

YF have also complemented this master planning work with a major pilot programme to raise Ambition and Aspiration (social regeneration)

- The legal framework (taxation law) and funding programmes (funding dedicated to specific redevelopment/maintenance areas) saved Leipzig, turning the disastrous situation 1991 with 70% not refurbished apartments into the opposite now (85% refurbished buildings)

➤ **Ökokauf Wien / Ecobuy Vienna**

Run by the municipality; enables all schools, hospitals and municipal buildings to purchase supplies and equipment that support the ecological aims of the city