Minutes
Fourth meeting of the group of high-level specialists on the future of Cohesion Policy – Role of place-based policies and development strategies

23 May 2023, Brussels

1. Nature of the meeting

The fourth meeting of the group of high-level specialists on the future of Cohesion Policy took place on 23 May 2023. The recording of the public and web streamed session of the meeting is available at https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/policy/how/future-cohesion-policy_en.

This session was followed by a non-public discussion between members of the group.

13 members attended the meeting in person and one online. The Commission services were represented by Peter Berkowitz, Directorate B - Policy, Directorate General for Regional and Urban Policy (DG REGIO), Normunds Poppens, Director-General (Acting), DG REGIO, Andriana Sukova, Deputy Director-General - Funds, Fair Transition and Analysis, Directorate General for Employment, Social Affairs & Inclusion (DG EMPL), DG EMPL and Ruth Paserman, Director, Directorate G - Investment (DG EMPL), accompanied by staff from both DGs and the Secretariat General.

2. Points discussed

A. Opening remarks

The meeting started with opening remarks from Commissioner for Cohesion and Reforms, Elisa Ferreira, followed by an introduction to the meeting from the Chair Andrés Rodríguez-Pose.

Opening and welcome by Commissioner for Cohesion and Reforms, Elisa Ferreira

The Commissioner welcomed all participants and thanked them for participating in the fourth meeting of the group, emphasising the importance of the discussion about a possible revision of Cohesion Policy. The Commissioner noted that the fourth meeting focuses on how to reinforce the effectiveness of place-based approaches to development.

The previous three meetings focused on how to modernise Cohesion Policy, how to strengthen the resilience of regions facing crises and how to address different development needs of people and places. The need for Cohesion Policy and its success were emphasised during the opening speech along with key aspects of Cohesion Policy that need to be protected: shared management, multi-level governance, the partnership principle and subsidiarity.

Indeed, the Commissioner recalled that the 8th Cohesion Report underlined the need to complement nationwide structural policies with place-based policies, as well as reinforce the place-based and participatory delivery of cohesion policy, with the aim of strengthening the resilience of regions most hit by past crises. Place-based approaches have been strongly embedded in key policy concepts and mechanics of cohesion policy from its early stages, making cohesion policy unique among other EU policies and instruments. Shared management encourages programmes to address place-specific needs in a bottom-up approach. An emphasis on multi-level governance along with subsidiarity and partnership promote the involvement in

programme development and implementation of regional, local and territorial authorities, social partners and organisations from civil society. Yet, and although the rationale for a further strengthening of place-based approaches in cohesion policy is clear, there are some challenges to this:
1) EU objectives in the areas such as energy, environment, digitalisation, R&D and transport often entail pan-European approaches, which requires finding the right balance in facilitating local action,
2) There is a limited human capital to implement in particular place-based green and digital transitions, and
3) Unclear division of competences between national, regional and local levels and weak sub-national administrative structures can be a major obstacle for place-based approaches.

The recommendations from the nine meetings will feed into the reflection process on Cohesion Policy post-2027 and drafts of the Ninth Cohesion Report for the beginning of 2024. The Eighth Cohesion Report is the starting point for the discussion of the future of Cohesion Policy.

Welcome and introduction by Andrés Rodriguez-Pose

The Chair introduced the topic of the fourth meeting. Previous meetings focused on what Cohesion Policy is for, the objectives and areas to be involved. The fourth meeting focuses on implementation. He recalled the change of paradigm known in 2009 with the issue of a place-based narrative seeking to re-legitimise and reconnect the policy with its foundational principles. He questioned the viability of top-down policies —decided by experts with the approval of decision makers— as a way to promote economic development across the whole of Europe. The reform of Cohesion Policy from 2014 introduced place-based policies, in particular with the concept of smart specialisation. Smart specialisation has been a successful concept implemented beyond the EU, inspiring policies in Norway, Turkey, the United Kingdom, and more recently the United States of America. Even if successful to a certain extent, place-based policies have often been implemented too quickly, with no sufficient resources, resulting in strategies developed at sub-national levels that do not match the need of the regions concerned. Hence, many subnational development strategies do not use the full potential of the place-based approach. Very often individual EU regions pursue their own objectives, which makes it hard to benchmark the effects of Cohesion Policy. The Chair raised the question of how to improve Cohesion Policy effectiveness, by continuing the place-based approach or by introducing a place-sensitive approach.

The Chair briefly introduced the agenda for the public session, followed by an internal session. The public session included presentations by academics, Anthony J. Venables and Raquel Ortega-Argilés, and two by institutions with Vasco Alves Cordeiro, (President of European Committee of the Regions) and André Sobczak (Secretary General of Eurocities).

B - Academic Inputs

The ‘Academic Inputs’ session included two presentations, each followed by a discussion.

Anthony J. Venables, invited academic expert (Professor of Economics, University of Manchester; Senior Research Fellow, University of Oxford):
‘The Case for Place-Based Policy’

Anthony J. Venables addressed the following questions:

- How to build the case for a reinforced place-based policy approach to Cohesion Policy?
- How to strengthen the place-based development elements of Cohesion Policy?
- How to increase the effectiveness of place-based Cohesion Policy, in particular for the green and digital transitions?

Establishing a place-based policy requires identifying and understanding the fundamental economic reasons for spatial disparities. Regional disparities can arise as areas are hit by negative economic shocks due to changing technologies or patterns of trade, with rapid economic change as some areas pull ahead of others.

Automatic adjustment mechanisms, moving companies and workers, may not be enough to bring convergence. Persistent regional disparities are caused by the failure of adjustment mechanisms (no possibility of devaluation, wages set at the national level, interest rates) and convergence, enhanced by the labour supply (people move out until real wages are equalised) and migration (that is costly and selective). People are also often locked in career paths because labour demand and job creation —which are interlinked— depend on the location decisions of firms: there is here a 'stickiness', enhanced by a dependence on local business ecosystem (i.e., suppliers/customers, skilled labour force, access to technology/finance) and on clusters (where complementarities exist), both for tradable and non-tradable products. Indeed, agglomeration economies mean that companies may be unwilling to move. Any movement of companies and workers could be selective, potentially concentrating lower skill and lower wage activities in lagging regions. Spatial equilibrium can then result in a potential vicious circle: firms count on the 'first-mover effect', which comes with high uncertainty. Hence, these market failures imply that disparities may persist in the absence of effective policy.

Regional disparities are costly: if a region is lagging behind, the rest of the economy suffers from stranded assets and a loss of talent, even booming places with internationally competitive clusters of activity. Policies to raise a region from a low-level equilibrium need to stimulate large changes in private investment, worker skills and the location of company operations. There are complementarities (reinforcing feedback mechanisms) between different policies, and with private investment decisions.

There is therefore a clear distinction between marginal and transformative change (meaning with indirect effect, and induced changes in private investment). Transformative change requires the use of multiple instruments (soft and hard), together with an engagement with local institutions, concentrated on places where it is likely to succeed. Involving local institutions is important for local knowledge, helping to build institutions that reduce coordination failure.

Selecting places should be based on needs and the likelihood of success. To target policy support, indirect effects are important, but they have wider implications that need to be considered in decision-making (e.g., displacement, skills improvement, short-run employment).

The policy process should involve clear objectives, clarity on how to achieve these objectives, the social value the changes, testing the policy under alternative scenarios, considering indirect effects and unforeseen consequences as well as presenting results in a transparent form.

The green and digital transitions should create new centres of economic activity, but will damage prospects in places that fail to make the required structural changes. Place-based policy will be essential to facilitate the growth of new centres and, if timely, to prevent vicious cycles of relative decline in negatively affected places.

Key issues discussed

The subsequent discussion involved Commissioner Elisa Ferreira, Riccardo Crescenzi, Karl-Heinz Lambertz, Joaquim Oliveira Martins, Peter Osvald, Sari Rautio, Zornitsa Roussinova and Andreea-Alexandra Scrioșteanu.

Firstly, the issue of how to assess the impact of objectives in different regions was raised. That was linked to discussions on two different objectives for place-based policies —'marginal' or 'transformative' changes. Local commitment also involving national and regional levels is important to achieving transformative change.

Yet, transformative policy is expensive and requires triggering indirect effects at scale. There is a need to evaluate the net social value of all the quantity changes that this policy brings out, also in terms of indirect effects and unforeseen consequences (displacement, skills improvement and migration). Death of distance with the possibility to work from home is a fundamental trade off to this regard, questioning the benefit of face-to-face vs. the costs of travel. As the ICT revolution was supposed to lead to convergence (while enabling remote work), it is more than offset by the rise of the knowledge economy (face to face for efficient exchange of complex ideas). Working from home was supposed to undermine the cities but they still benefit from significant agglomeration economies and star power (cities remain more attractive, as the draw on wider hinterland depending on maintaining amenities and public services). The green transition is changing the geography of production: new clusters will develop around renewable energy/minerals, and some existing sectors/clusters will lose economic viability. Complementary investments for new activities are therefore needed, by prioritising already hit areas, before the vicious circle cuts in.

In addition, there were questions on how to balance transformational and incremental approaches. Marginal investment can be relevant in some (less developed) areas, but important here is to take a long-term development view. Indeed, considering long-term perspectives and the vision of a city is crucial for the place-based approach. Moreover, regional heterogeneity and local comparative advantages need to be considered when defining place-based policies. During the discussion, the importance of understanding the dynamics and wider systems of places was emphasised. 'Turn-around' cities were noted as a good example of how to successfully implement place-based policies. Understanding the linkages between what the policy does and what it results into can help to overcome the 'stickiness' of activities: a resilience story needs to be built, beyond the opposition between transformational and incremental change.

In addition, demographic challenges are a significant problem that needs to be taken into account in place-based policies, especially the future challenges of lagging regions. Complementarity between policies was also highlighted as being vital to increasing policy effectiveness.

Cohesion policy provides a steady framework with temporal consistency but does not treat all places equally. There is a tension between place-based policies and fiscal policies that needs also to be considered, which EU structural policies (including the ones developed within the European Semester), could better turn into complementarities as well. Not all regions can improve efficiency at the same time: risk is to lose some of them definitely. Differentiation seems then to remain unavoidable. Transformative approaches are also difficult to implement

as the viability of the strategy also depends on the transformative process itself —what is the adequate level to develop place-based policies?

Raquel Ortega-Argilés, invited academic expert (Professor Chair, Regional Economic Development, Alliance Manchester Business School):
'How to reinforce the place-based approach to Cohesion Policy?'

This presentation examined three recent empirical lines of research into the uneven effects of (a) research and innovation policies on regional development and economic cohesion, (b) technological diversification on regional productivity and (c) globalisation and automation on European regions and workers.

Each of these provides different insights and implications for understanding the European regional economic and policy context. A common feature is that regional responses to innovation-related and technological change-related processes and policies are heterogeneous.

Ortega-Argilés posited a different approach to cohesion policy and how the policy should take advantage of the innovation-related challenges and opportunities. Drawing from the results of the first line of empirical analysis, she advocated that, while interregional country inequality had decreased in the last decades thanks to cohesion policy, the effect of policy implementation and grand challenges such as automation or globalisation have contributed to increasing disparities across European regions and communities.

Innovation is among the most important drivers of economic development, productivity and socio-economic cohesion. Smart Specialisation has been one of the major pillars of the last years of European Cohesion Policy and the local and regional innovation and entrepreneurship agendas in Europe. Still, the consequences of their implementation have not been seen spread evenly across the Europe. Interregional inequality in Western Europe was generally much higher in the early decades of the twentieth century when cross-country productivity variations were also much more significant. During the second half of the century, interregional variations fell markedly across Europe as international convergence processes developed. At the end of the century, two interesting cases show opposite evolutions —Germany after the reunification showing drops in their inequality and the UK increasing in recent decades.
The UK interregional input-output analysis finds that innovation-related investment policies that favour regions, which previously had lower levels of public funding, generate the largest overall returns. Regions that are highly connected in terms of income and knowledge networks always benefit from such policies, even if the funding is mainly directed to other places. The reason is that the stimuli to local production and trade also ripple through the interregional trade linkages, thereby benefiting those regions that are already well-connected.
These findings imply that innovation-related investments in many economically less advantageous regions are not a drag on the overall economy. Rather, they act both as a catalyst for narrowing interregional gaps and enhancing aggregate growth.

Similar findings are evident from the UK research regarding the non-linear relationships between EU regional technological relatedness, coherence and productivity and non-linear effects of industrial embeddedness (second strand of research). Enhancing relatedness and embeddedness are such core principles of RIS3 smart specialisation. However, this research suggests that once a region moves beyond average productivity performance, greater technological relatedness or embeddedness leads to adverse "lock-in" types of effects. In economically weaker regions or regions far away from the technological frontier, local

knowledge- and innovation- related investments must be increased to boost regional technological coherence, relatedness and embeddedness to improve the resilience of the innovation system.

When analysing the uneven effects of globalisation and automation for European regions and workers, the global impacts of automation and import competition probably lead to greater local job polarisation, affecting different labour market segments. Research examining such polarisation in the Netherlands (third strand of research) finds that it is a more serious phenomenon amongst younger workers. In Europe, job polarisation is not necessarily an urban phenomenon as it is the case in the USA. Job polarisation is also evident in smaller centres, and places specialised in either high or low-technology sectors. Taken together, regional performance in Europe is determined by the regional endowments and by the degree of regional resilience to exogenous shocks. The broader goals and key priorities for economically weaker regions are to increase the diversity of related technologies, activities and market segments around existing local core technologies, skills and competences, enhance middle-skills in the local economy and increase the local multipliers for knowledge-related activities and investments.

Better evaluation and ex-ante, concurrent and ex-post assessment of place-based initiatives are needed, together with new evaluation centres that allow increasing understanding of who will be affected or benefit from programmes, in order to:

1. improve evaluation and assessment capacity and skills at the local level,
2. provide platforms to share knowledge across sub-national places and
3. better disseminate the effects of cohesion policy to a much wider audience.

When designing local and regional place-based policies, it is vital to understand that regions and cities in Europe are affected by shocks and the effects of policy interventions. Indirect and induced effects also need to be considered in this uneven distribution of the effects. Sound place and evidence-based policy design with specific place-based considerations during implementation is required where regions, cities and local communities are the core of any policy strategy. At the same time, many difficult challenges (climate change, digitalisation, depopulation and demographic change) will not be solved by focusing on lower levels of government. Multi-level governance will be key to ensuring stakeholder engagement and mobilisation, enhancing policy-sharing and policy-learning and capacity building for local institutions and governance.

Key issues discussed

The subsequent discussion involved Riccardo Crescenzi, Aleksandra Dulkiewicz, Jasna Gabrič, Constanze Krehl, Peter Osvald, Sari Rautio, Andrés Rodríguez-Pose and Andreea-Alexandra Scrioșteanu.

Firstly, the question of which level (EU, national or regional) is in charge of addressing less-developed regions was raised. This should be the responsibility of stakeholder at all levels, as it requires multi-level governance. Furthermore, synergies between more and less developed regions have proved to work. Sectoral platforms were mentioned as they bring together regions that are in different parts of value chains.

Secondly, measuring the effects of different instruments on lagging regions was mentioned. The absorption of R&D funds was discussed, especially targeting absorption capacity in less

developed regions. In addition, the question of how to deal with multinational firms that locate in less developed regions was posed. Evaluations of impacts at many different levels of government are needed to better understand and monitor these developments. For this, competence centres can increase the capacity and skills of evaluations at different levels of government.

The socio-economic aspect of every place-based strategy is important as is encouraging regions to link socio-economic strategic objectives with industrial objectives. To overcome big challenges, more international cooperation is important (e.g. macroregional strategies).

To tackle the long terms effects of polarisation based on age groups, local government and higher education institutions need to work together to tackle the labour market (education). The timeframe of the systemic approach to Cohesion Policy requires coherence and clear objectives.

C - Institutional Input

The public session also included presentations by the European Committee of the Regions and Eurocities, followed by discussions.

Vasco Alves Cordeiro, invited expert (President - **European Committee of the Regions)**

The importance of Cohesion Policy and its revision was highlighted, as was the need to constantly note what Cohesion Policy means. As Cohesion Policy is judged sometimes only in terms of results and not as a policy as such, it is important to recall that Cohesion Policy is about development and progress across Europe. As new challenges are arising, it is a common responsibility (from the EU institutions and the local authorities) to defend cohesion policy. We need a political narrative making clear that cohesion must be embedded in all policies.

There is no alternative to Cohesion Policy. However, recognising and solving current Cohesion Policy problems is essential. Defending Cohesion Policy is vital for the EU, as it has significant importance for the daily life of EU citizens. Cohesion Policy is the responsibility of all levels – EU, national and regional.

Following the introduction, key points were raised. Firstly, the issue of not having a Cohesion Policy has become real, which is why its importance and added value need to be highlighted. Secondly, Cohesion Policy needs to be underpinned by other policies. Thirdly, 'do no harm to cohesion' should be a key principle of Cohesion Policy, with more territorial impact assessments, stakeholder consultations organised by the European Commission, also in partnership with other institutions. The Commission should indicate the potential for territorial impact in new proposals. Moreover, the importance of national government support was emphasised.

All stakeholders have a role to play in the implementation of cohesion policy, starting with the place-based approach that needs to be reinforced. Ways to reinforce the 'place-based approach' were defined:

1. We need to have a look at the broad EU policy investment framework. The European semester should include the territorial approach (in the country reports + specific recommendations) in a perspective overcoming the 'carrot or stick' approach.
2. Reintegrate the EAFRD (European agricultural fund for rural development) into the Common Provisions Regulation.

3. Foster the use of specific instruments already available under cohesion policy such as integrated investments, CLLD, and smart specialisation strategies.
4. Strengthen key principles linked to partnership and multi-level governance.

Subnational levels should be better involved, even if it takes more time, in order to make the policy more efficient and more tailor made for the local communities. Cohesion policy has always evolved to support the EU priorities, including new priorities (single market, enlargement, Lisbon agenda, and support to people fleeing Ukraine): today, its flexibility is at stake. Flexibility will need clear rules that can be activated for supporting Member States and regions during future crises.

The importance of the New Cohesion Alliance was mentioned. Finally, cohesion was defined as 'not leaving anyone behind'.

André Sobczak, invited expert (Secretary General – **Eurocities**)

Sobczak also emphasised the importance of the moment, recalling how partnership has been a game changer for cities. However, and while they play a pivot role between people and local stakeholders (associations, companies, networks..), cities often consider the current exercise of the partnership principle as too formal. It needs to be more transparent and better coordinated. During the pandemic, many policies were decided quickly without involving local governments: there is a need to come back to a real partnership principle, where first basis comes from the source. Multilevel governance, to which cohesion policy has massively contributed to, matters for cities as well, particularly when projects undertaken in metropolitan cities articulate with the region implemented at regional level (ex: subway in Italy).

Integrated territorial investments are a good way to overcome difference between cities and rural areas —but in certain countries, there is a backlash between integrated territorial investments that needs to be better tackled in the future cohesion policy.

Current earmarking for cities should be maintained in the future. Moreover, funds should directly support local governments (see US example: during the pandemic, the federal government injected 300 billion dollars to cities directly, using not only GDP as criterion, but also considering the different community needs, level of poverties, housing overcrowd, etc.).

In addition, the current possible synergies between the ERDF and the ESF+ should be maintained and reinforced for the future. It is equally important to continue developing skills in local governments supported by the Cohesion Policy.

Sobczak advocated that the qualitative data collected by Eurocities could be used to assess Cohesion Policy. Eurocities involves local stakeholders, which enables the partnership principle.

In conclusion, rethinking what needs to be done to support the green and digital transitions is needed. In addition, communicating to stakeholders where EU money comes from is important. Furthermore, the need for more integration between ERDF and ESF+ was emphasised. Also, a good example from the US during the pandemic was mentioned where 50 billion dollars were directly allocated to metropolitan areas. The key distribution key was not only based on GDP, but also on different community needs, poverty, population, housing overcrowding, etc.

Key issues discussed

The subsequent discussion involved the Commissioner Elisa Ferreira and Pervenche Berès, Riccardo Crescenzi, Karl-Heinz Lambertz, Peter Osvald and Andreea-Alexandra Scrioșteanu.

Two risks, of flexibility and conditionality, were mentioned. Flexibility requires clear rules during crises to preserve the core of Cohesion Policy as a long-term policy. Concerning conditionality, some countries do not respect the rule of law. The difference between Cohesion Policy penalties for violating rules and enabling conditions from CPR 2021-2027 was explained. It is important to avoid subnational levels being penalised for something that is beyond their ability to address. In addition, it was mentioned that, as demanded by Member States, DG REGIO and DG REFORM offer more technical support to national, regional and local authorities to improve capacity.

During the discussion, the importance of cohesion was emphasised. The trade-off between internal EU cohesion and international competitiveness was also raised. Finally, the importance of addressing the needs of young people through Cohesion Policy was discussed.

E - Key discussion points of the internal session

The internal session as an open discussion addressed (a) procedures and steps to develop key messages and the final report of the group, and (b) critical issues to be considered.

The next Cohesion Policy will still be around in 2035 and thus will operate in a world which is different from today. Consequently, any discussion of the future of Cohesion Policy needs to consider the changing circumstances in which it will operate. These include possible future EU enlargements (including the Western Balkans, Ukraine, Moldova and Georgia), socioeconomic, technological and geopolitical trends which affect cohesion, transitions the EU has embarked on such as the green, digital, just and demographic transitions, applying the rule of law, anti-EU sentiment, and links between Cohesion Policy and other EU policies.

In light of all these changes, key questions are:

- What is the responsibility of Cohesion Policy?
- Cohesion Policy cannot solve all problems. What should it focus on?
- What can Cohesion Policy achieve with a place-based approach?

1. Conclusions/recommendations/opinions

Cohesion Policy is not a charity nor a compensatory policy. It is about development, prosperity and progress across all regions in the whole of the EU. It is also a way to ensure the involvement of European citizens in European integration.

However, this is not turning out as envisaged, as many places and people are being left behind. This undermines the prosperity and well-being of people in these regions, as well as overall prosperity and social cohesion in the EU.

This situation stems from market failures and the failures of traditional automatic adjustment mechanisms (price mechanisms, migration, costs, and stickiness of our economies):

- Economic activity is sticky as it tends to cluster in large agglomerations (especially the most innovative sectors) seeking economies of scale.

- Migration is costly and selective, involving mainly the young and most skilled people, which leads to a brain drain and has significant implications for the sources of migrants.

Hence, policy intervention is necessary because we cannot rely only on market forces, and our action must be as efficient as possible because resources are limited, and there is a lot of competition.

We need to level up. Policy interventions should not lead to a levelling down. They have to level up and encourage the economic potential that has remained untapped in many places in Europe. There is a need for transformative interventions, particularly in regions facing development traps. Compensatory measures have short-term effects, and any sort of intervention should not undermine the dynamism of the places that are on the forefront. In this respect, investing in cities is also necessary, so focusing resources on a few areas may not work.

There may not be a need to invest more, but to invest better in different types of places (large agglomerations, intermediate cities, smaller cities, towns and rural areas) to ensure their economic potential is mobilised. Transformational interventions may imply difficult political choices where not all places can win; some places might be lost —though this is controversial.

For Cohesion intervention to work it needs to be transformative, not limited to a bunch of piecemeal changes. Marginal interventions do not suffice to get a region out of a low-level trap. Transformative interventions are needed. The question is how to accomplish these? Ideas include the need for systemic interventions, more cooperation, the long-term perspective (sustainable policies for a long-time), involving citizens as well as local and regional institutions, local and regional commitment, recognising complementarity and the taking into account wider (global) development context.

Cohesion Policy investments need to consider:

- automation and globalisation have led to job polarisation, which is more serious for younger than for older workers;
- weaker regions need to diversify related technologies, while improving middle-skill components;
- shifts in economic geography from the green and digital transitions;
- indirect effects and unforeseen developments;
- exploiting spatial spill overs and feedback effects;
- promoting coordination at different levels of government;
- enhancing learning and knowledge transfer mechanisms, in terms of governance (multilevel governance), but also in terms of coordination across regions.

All this implies investing in the right institutions and governance to ensure that place-based policies remain place-based and work.

2. Next steps

The group has five more meetings scheduled up to December 2023, each with an established agenda. All information about these meetings will be published on the group web page: https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/policy/how/future-cohesion-policy_en

Next meetings

Fifth meeting	04 July 2023	Reinforcing territorial cooperation and addressing challenges to European integration
Sixth meeting	14 September 2023	Anchoring financial support from the policy in reforms, in the context of the European Semester and in synergy with other EU policies
Seventh meeting	10 October 2023	Increasing policy effectiveness through renewed conditionality mechanisms
Eighth meeting	14 November 2023	Revisiting the delivery mode/ mechanics taking into account priorities
Ninth meeting	14 December 2023	Enhancing the policy capacity to respond to sudden shocks and crises

3. List of participants

Speakers:

- Ferreira, Elisa – Commissioner for Cohesion and Reforms
- Venables, Anthony J. – Professor of Economics, University of Manchester; Senior Research Fellow, University of Oxford
- Ortega-Argilés, Raquel – Professor Chair, Regional Economic Development, Alliance Manchester Business School
- Alves Cordeiro, Vasco – President, European Committee of the Regions
- Sobzak, André – Secretary General, Eurocities

Members of the reflection group:

In person:

- Andor, László
- Berès, Pervenche
- Crescenzi, Riccardo
- Dulkiewicz, Aleksandra
- Gabrič, Jasna
- Krehl, Constanze
- Lambertz, Karl-Heinz
- Oliveira Martins, Joaquim
- Osvald, Petr
- Rautio, Sari
- Rodríguez-Pose, Andrés
- Roussinova, Zornitsa
- Scrioșteanu, Andreea-Alexandra

Online

- Trüpel, Helga