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|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Basic info** | **Baden-Württemberg** | **Thüringen** | **Germany** | **Unit** |
| Population [2008] | 10749.8 | 2289.2 | 82217.8 | thous. |
| GDP [2008] | 380876 | 47468 | 2561740 | mln EUR |
| Population [2014] | 10631.3 | 2160.8 | 80767.5 | thous. |
| GDP [2014] | 440057 | 54549 | 2915650 | mln EUR |
| ***Total allocation*** |
| Allocation ERDF+CF [2000-2006] | 102.8 | 1872.6 | 15336.1 | mln EUR |
| Allocation ERDF+CF 2007-2013 | 199.6 | 1904.3 | 15913.7 | mln EUR |
| Ratio [period 2007-2013 to 2000-2006] | 1.94 | 1.02 | 1.04 | ratio |
| ***Absorption rates ERDF+CF*** |
| Absorption rate 2000-2006 [final] | 98.4 | 98.4 | 98.4 | per cent |
| Absorption rate 2007-2013 [in 2014] | 76.4 | 89.0 | 82.3 | per cent |

The total allocations across case study regions differ considerably in both programming periods, due to their varying eligibility for funding. Thüringen was an Objective 1/Convergence region, thus receiving much higher allocations than the wealthier region of Baden-Württemberg (B-W). The gap has decreased in the 2007-2013 programming period, but still, in per capita terms, Thüringen got approx. 45 times more funds than B-W, and 4.5 times more than the national average. Analysis of the absorption rate for the 2007-2013 period shows a relatively good performance of Thüringen, exceeding the national average by 7 pp., while B-W notes 6 pp. less than the average.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Thematic structure** [NUTS-1, 2007-13, ERDF+CF] | **Baden-Württemberg** | **Thüringen** | **Germany** |
| ***% of allocation*** |
| Category A “Innovative environment”: business support, human resources, IT infrastructure and services, research and technology | 78.7% | 50.7% | 52.3% |
| Category B ”Basic infrastructure”: energy, environment and natural resources, transport infrastructure | 14.5% | 38.4% | 32.5% |
| Category C “Quality of life”: social infrastructure, tourism and culture, urban and rural regeneration | 3.4% | 9.9% | 13.3% |
| ***Rate of absorption [in 2014]*** |
| Category A “Innovative environment”: business support, human resources, IT infrastructure and services, research and technology | 73.1% | 89.7% | 83.2% |
| Category B ”Basic infrastructure”: energy, environment and natural resources, transport infrastructure | 81.8% | 88.3% | 81.9% |
| Category C “Quality of life”: social infrastructure, tourism and culture, urban and rural regeneration | 102.8% | 89.6% | 79.7% |

\* % of allocation does not add to 1, because the “technical assistance” is not included in any of the categories.

The thematic structure of allocation in Thüringen is rather similar to the national average, while B-W deviates from this pattern, strongly prioritizing investments in the innovative environment. In terms of allocation for the Category C both case study regions fall behind the national average, but this phenomena is more pronounced for B-W.

The rate of absorption broken down by thematic categories shows a very well balanced spending in case of Thüringen. B-W exhibits a different pattern, where size of the allocation seems to be negatively correlated with the rate of absorption, up to an overspending observed in the Category C.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Regional OP** [ERDF] | **Baden-Württemberg** | **Thüringen** | **Germany** | **Unit** |
| ***Allocations to Regional OPs*** |
| Allocation 2007-2013 | 150.7 | 1581.5 | 14388.8 | mln EUR |
| Allocation 2014-2020 | 246.6 | 1165.1 | 11061.4 | mln EUR |
| Ratio [period 2014-2020 to 2007-2013] | 1.64 | 0.74 | 0.77 | ratio |
| ***Reported achievements: period 2007-2013 [as in 2013]*** |
| Jobs created | 4098 | 8456 | 104012 | jobs |
| Start-ups supported | 24 | 183 | 748 | start-ups |
| Km of new roads | no data | 50.3 | 293.5 | km |
| Research, technology and development (RTD) projects | 4 | 519 | 8294 | projects |

The allocations to the Regional OPs in question exhibits a diverging trend, with B-W noting a significant increase, while the Thüringen’s OP lost approx.. ¼ of its allocation in the current programming period. However, in per capita terms, the gap between the two regions remain considerable and in favour of Thüringen.

The reported number of created jobs related to programme allocations suggests that the OP B-W is more efficient than OP Thüringen in creating new jobs. There is a stark difference in number of RTD projects supported, in favour of the latter programme. It is also this programme that shows a considerable focus on building basic infrastructure – although there is no data for B-W, the reported achievements of Thüringen in constructing new roads constitute a significant part of the national effort.